

This holds true of the picture given by the attorney from Moses Lake, Wash., of the Conference on World Cooperation and Social Progress in 1951. There were many educational papers on the overshadowing problem of international cooperation presented at that conference: one by H. L. Keenlyside, Director General on the Technical Assistance Administration of the U. N.'s technical assistance program; Dr. Selman A. Waksman, Nobel prize winner in medicine, co-discoverer of streptomycin and incidentally one of the former student leaders of the LID while a student at Rutgers, on the World Health Organization; by William Green, president of the AFL, on what labor had done for international cooperation; by M. J. Coldwell, member of the Canadian Parliament, on the Colombo plan; by Paul R. Porter, Assistant Director of the ECA on international action against inflation and scarcity of raw material, and by Dr. Boris Shishkin, chief economist of the AFL, on the Marshal plan, delivered after Dr. Shishkin has spent 2 years in France in connection with the plan.

V. A fifth assumption of Mr. Earl seems to be (pp. 13-14 of his report) that, when the league grants a citation to a Democratic Socialist, this presentation carries with it proof of the league's commitment to a particular political doctrine advocated by the award winner. Mr. Earl quotes the league's citation to Premier T. C. Douglas of Saskatchewan with a view, I assume, of proving this point.

However, in the course of the last few years, the league has presented awards to men and women long associated with the Democratic, Republican, Liberal, and Socialist Parties, and to those independent of any party; to stated believers in free enterprise, and to advocates of democratic social planning. The league has not asked what politics the receiver of the award had, but what he had accomplished in advancing the democratic ideal. No one maintains that the presentation of honorary degrees by colleges and universities carries with it a commitment by the university to the point of view of the recipient. The same should be true of an award presented by educational societies of the type of the league.

VI. A sixth assumption of Mr. Earl seems to be that, somehow or other, the discussion of socialism and fundamental social change is not appropriate to an educational, tax-exempt society, a point of view again which the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and the Bureau of Internal Revenue have failed to share with him.

That assumption has likewise long been repudiated by economists and social scientists and by the great educational institutions of the country. For whether we like it or not, various types of Socialist thought and movements—Utopian, Fabian, Marxian, revisionism, et cetera—have had a great influence on the intellectual, the economic, and political life of the world. They have profoundly affected economic thought, historical interpretation, industrial motivations, immediate and far-flung social changes, and political institutions throughout the world. The Socialist movement is a significant one in most countries in Western and Central Europe with which the United States cooperates in opposition to Communist aggression and in defense of democracy. It is difficult, indeed, for a person in public life today to do his full part in dealing constructively with domestic and international problems without an understanding of socialism as a theory and as a movement, and of the differences between democratic

socialism, capitalism, communism, fascism, and other systems of thought and action.

That organization is doing a service to the community which seeks, among other things, to promote such an understanding.

Courses on various aspects of Socialist thought and action have been given for a half-century in scores of colleges throughout the country, and have universally been regarded as having a legitimate place in college curricula.

VII. Throughout Mr. Earl's report there likewise seems to be a feeling that it is somewhat un-American and uneducational to discuss the problems of public versus private ownership of enterprises and services. However, ever since the beginning of this country, the city, State, and Federal Governments have assumed greater collective responsibility in the fields of education, health, social security, conservation, et cetera, as a means of meeting certain popular needs, and there is an increasing need for analyzing present-day ventures in public control and ownership, of studying what types of controls to avoid in the future, and what types to encourage. Freedom of inquiry and expression on these controversial problems is of vital importance to our evolving democracy.

VIII. Finally, Mr. Earl seems to assume that it is uneducational to help to form and develop free forums for the free discussion of controversial problems in our colleges and universities, and that, if such forums are formed, the organization sponsoring them must necessarily assume responsibility for the opinions expressed in the student discussions.

However, the great need of our time is the stimulation of hard thinking and courageous expression of opinion on our burning social problems. America has become great because of the fact that, by and large, the expression of conflicting points of view on both technical and social problems has been encouraged, not discouraged, and today the problem of keeping our social engineering space with our technological development makes such freedom ever more important.

Yet, many educators have expressed in recent days a great fear that freedom was now being unduly restricted in many institutions of learning. Dr. Martin Essex, chairman of the committee on tenure and academic freedom of the National Educational Association, recently declared, after an extensive survey, that many faculty members are afraid to express themselves freely on the controversial issues of the day, that freedom to learn is today at a low ebb, and that "we are moving dangerously toward a sterile education." In this situation, the educational activities of the league are more necessary from the standpoint of our evolving democracy than ever before. It is likewise more necessary than ever to realize that no organization developing forums can be responsible for all of the opinions freely expressed therein. If this responsibility were assumed, freedom of speech in such forum would be dead.

#### DETAILED CRITIQUE OF MR. EARL'S REPORT

Commenting more specifically on some of the observations of Mr. Earl in his report and discussion at the hearings, may I make the following observations:

1. *ISS: A study organization.*—As Mr. Earl states, and as the LID proudly proclaims in its literature, the League for Industrial Democracy is the successor to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, popularly known as the ISS. Mr. Earl rightly declares that this organization, formed as a result of a call by a distinguished group of writers and publicists, including Jack London, Upton Sinclair, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Clarence S. Darrow, and Thomas Wentworth Higginson, “the grand old man of Harvard,” had as its object “to promote an intelligent understanding of socialism among college men and women.” It should be added that the society was purely a discussion and study organization connected with no political party. It always made it perfectly clear that membership in it in no way committed the members to a belief in socialism. Such membership indicated merely that the member was interested in learning more about socialism and other movements for social change, or in promoting an understanding of socialism among others. The society throughout its existence contained within its ranks non-Socialists and anti-Socialists as well as Socialists.

That this pioneering educational society was a vital force for good in stimulating hard and constructive thinking on the social problems of the day is attested by the number of the former student leaders who later distinguished themselves for their service to the community in the fields of business, labor, education, and government. On the completion of the society's 20 years of activity—16 under the name of the ISS, and 4 as the League for Industrial Democracy—Prof. A. N. Holcombe, professor of government, Harvard University, and later president of the American Political Science Association, wrote:

During the 16 years that I have been teaching economics and political science at Harvard, no organization has done so much as yours to stimulate a sympathetic interest in contemporary economics and political problems on the part of students and to direct their private studies into fruitful channels.

Dr. Harry J. Carman, professor of history and later dean of Columbia University and member of the New York City Board of Higher Education, declared in a letter to the executive director:

I have followed your work for a number of years; first as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, and later as the League for Industrial Democracy, and I know that you have accomplished splendid results in an educational way. Despite our boasted progress, we are still ignorant, narrowminded, and, above all, intolerant. Anything which will tend to break down these barriers to real progress, cooperation, and human happiness, is decided worth while, and that, as I see it, is the kind of endeavor in which the League for Industrial Democracy is engaged. My heartiest congratulations and hope for your continued success.

Similar statements were made by Profs. Edwin R. A. Seligman, of Columbia, and John B. Commons, University of Wisconsin, past presidents of the American Economics Association, and a host of leading educators.

The fact that the LID began, therefore, as the ISS should in no way carry with it the inference that the league's background was political. It was an educational society, and entirely independent of any political party, or of commitment to any specific social doctrine.

*Articles in 1932 college paper.*—Following his reference to the organization in 1905 of the ISS, Mr. Earl, on pages 3 to 11 of his report, proceeds to the year 1932, and discusses the articles in a small magazine, *Revolt*, which appeared for two issues in September and

December 1932 and was edited and published by the intercollegiate council of the league, not the general society. The LID as such assumed no responsibility for its editorial policy, and neither the league nor the intercollegiate council were responsible for the opinions contained in the articles appearing in its pages. The council felt that it was performing a useful function in providing a free forum for the expression of opinion of college students and others on the important social problems of the day.

The articles were written at a time when the stated object of the league differed from the present object and, as has been before stated, in the midst of a severe economic depression. They have no relevancy to today's educational activities of the league. Nor has the program of action mentioned by Mr. Earl, formulated by a number of students at two informal student conferences of the general society, any relevancy.

*League organization and other educational activities.*—Pages 11–13<sup>1</sup> of Mr. Earl's report deals with the 1950 conference of the league on Freedom and the Welfare State.

Mr. Earl quotes here a statement by the executive director of the league, and comments on that portion of the report that states that the league is organizing branches, conducting conferences, and scheduling lectures in the colleges, activities which the United States Court of Appeals in the *Weyl v. Commission of Internal Revenue* decision regarded as legitimate functions of an educational tax-exempt society. Mr. Earl, however, seems to look upon these activities as outside the scope of those of tax-exempt associations. We join with the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of educators generally in disagreeing with Mr. Earl.

How else, it might be asked, in response to Mr. Earl's position, can an educational society carry its information and ideas to the public than through the written and spoken word? And what is there non-educational in the formation of study groups and the enlargement of its individual membership through which such information and ideas may be given circulation? Colleges do not cease to be educational because they organize classes and student clubs. The very process of forming and running a democratic organization on or off the campus for the discussion of important public issues is, moreover, an educational process and the league has helped through its college and city chapters to educate large numbers of young men and women in active, constructive, democratic citizenship and leadership.

If all nonprofit organizations were to be denied tax-exemption for organizing branches, publishing literature and arranging lecture trips, few tax-exempt organizations would continue in existence.

*The 1950 Conference on Freedom and Welfare State thoroughly educational.*—Following Mr. Earl's comment on the remarks of the executive director at the 1950 Conference on Freedom and the Welfare State Mr. Earl quotes from some of the addresses of the speakers.

In doing this, he applies a technique similar to that used in describing the 1943 Conference on the Third Freedom—Freedom from Want, mentioned in previous pages under assumption No. IV. He mentions but a few of the articles and addresses presented at the conferences and selects out of their context a few paragraphs from a few addresses which, in his opinion, express an extreme point of view, thus tending

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 756 et seq.

to leave in the minds of the investigating committee an unbalanced and distorted picture of the conference.

As participants in this 1950 conference to discuss Freedom and the Welfare State, the league presented to the luncheon and round table audiences Senator Herbert L. Lehman, to whom an annual award was presented; Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator, Social Security Agency; George Meany, then secretary of the A. F. of L.; Walter P. Reuther, president, UAW-CIO; Dr. Eveline M. Burns of the New York School of Social Work; Corley Smith, economic and social counselor, United Kingdom delegation to the U. N.; Margaret Herbison, Member of Parliament and Under Secretary of State for Scotland; Charles Abrams, housing expert; Prof. Sterling Spero, professor of public administration of the graduate division for training in public service, NYU; Norman Thomas, chairman, Post War World Council; John Roche, assistant professor of government, Haverford College; Bryn J. Hovde, then president of the New York School for Social Research; Israel Feinberg, vice president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers, and Toni Sender, labor representative to the U. N. Economic and Social Council.

The formal speakers and informal participants from the floor were, for the most part, men and women who from their positions in education, labor, government, and the professions had an intimate knowledge of the issues discussed.

From the conference discussion, Mr. Earl selected a few paragraphs contained in the addresses of Messrs. Ewing, Reuther, Feinberg, and Thomas, and made the comment that "Both Mr. Ewing and Mr. Reuther seemed to feel that the real threat to America was from 'reactionaries.'" President Reuther did see as dangers to our economy "the blind forces of reaction," and maintained that, if reaction led to a depression, the Cominform would be provided with a powerful weapon with which to fight western democracy. The quoted paragraphs with which most Americans, I believe, would wholly or in large part agree, were but a part of addresses which emphasized the positive values of constructive welfare legislation, and urged a program in behalf of greater security and abundance. Mr. Ewing reaffirmed in his talk his belief "with all my heart that our American system is the best that man has so far devised." But he declared that it was not perfect and that it could be made better. He recalled that—

a hundred years ago those who opposed the establishment of free public schools called them "socialism" and many people shouted "socialism" when Congress set up the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Reserve system, and passed the Securities Exchange Act and Social Security Act. He concluded that we must build strongly for the future in the fields of housing, labor legislation, conservation, utilization of our great sources of energy, etc.

Why Mr. Earl should think that such remarks were out of place in a free educational forum given over to the discussion of an important social problem, whether or not he agreed wholly with them, many of us fail to see.

Mr. Earl quoted the late Vice President Feinberg as urging that consumer purchase power be increased and that labor should have a greater voice in the formulation of economic decisions. He quoted Mr. Thomas as advocating more democracy in trade union administration, and the strengthening of civil liberties; as blaming the setbacks in civil liberties on "the whole Communist technique of conspiratorial

deceit," on reactionaries, and on those politicians who seek to find an issue in a "socialism versus liberty."

Mr. Earl might not agree with these statements, but he cannot say, merely because of his disagreement, that they have no place in an educational conference.

*Program for democracy—No advocacy of specific bills.*—On pages 14 and 15 of Mr. Earl's report is a summary of a "program for democracy in action in 1953" presented for the consideration of the public by the league's executive director. The program included, among other things, suggestions for labor unity; the purging of corrupt elements from business, labor, and government; a strengthened cooperative movement, a more consistent foreign policy, and programs for conservation, collective bargaining, social security, housing, civil liberties, and so forth.

It was not an official program of the board or the league's membership; was concerned with many developments which required economic rather than political action; urged no specific bills before Congress and provided for no machinery for legislative action. It was similar to those proposed by individuals in many tax-exempt educational societies in the field of conservation, cooperation, and labor relations, and so forth, and presented a summary of issues which are discussed daily in classes of every American university and regarded as an essential part of their educational curriculum.

*Conference on Needed: A moral awakening in America; the Earl picture an unbalanced one.*—Pages 16 and 17,<sup>1</sup> in discussing the league's conference in 1952 on Needed: A Moral Awakening in America, repeats Mr. Earl's same technique of naming only a few speakers, picking a few paragraphs out of their context, and presented a one-sided picture of the conference discussion.

It is true, as Mr. Earl states in describing this conference, that both Walter P. Reuther and James B. Carey, in discussing the activities of Philip Murray—receiver of a leagu award—vigorously criticized at this conference certain practices in the steel industry, where a strike was then being waged; that Dr. Abraham Lefkowitz, an educator, urged that students be inspired with the ideal of cooperation and social service—points of view which are legitimate in any educational program. It is also true that at the conference—a thing which Mr. Earl failed to mention—Wesley F. Rennie, executive director of the Committee for Economic Development, supported the thesis that American industrial and business leaders had become increasingly aware since the thirties of their social responsibility; that Charles Zimmerman, vice president of the ILGWU, urged labor to get rid of corruption within the house of labor, while Louis E. Yavner, commissioner of investigations in New York City under the LaGuardia administration; Rev. John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church, New York; Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy, NYU; Dr. George S. Counts, professor of education, Teachers College; Congresswoman Jacob K. Javits; former Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas; public utility expert Leland Olds; James Rorty, author of Tomorrow's Food; Mark Starr, labor educator, spoke in behalf of higher ethical standards in our political, educational, and international institutions. No one, we believe, could attend the various sessions of the conference without realizing its unique educational values and the wide range of opinions expressed therein. And no one could read Mr. Earl's ref-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 766, 767.

erences to the conference without realizing how inadequate a concept any reader of these references would obtain of the league's 1952 gathering.

*LID pamphlet on public ownership—An educational treatise.*—In previous pages we have dealt with Mr. Earl's presentation (on pp. 16 to 20)<sup>1</sup> of the executive director's pamphlet on *Toward Nationalization of Industry*, a pamphlet originally written in response to a request from high school debating coaches who had scheduled a discussion of public versus private ownership of basic industries among high schools throughout the country. Surely, if it is educational for the Foundation for Economic Education, a tax-exempt organization, to set forth the arguments for private enterprise in forest and public utilities, et cetera, it is educational for the league to set forth the facts which may support control by the community of specific enterprises. The presentation of the contents of this pamphlet, as I have before stated, by Mr. Earl, gives to the committee no conception of the factual nature of its contents; its careful references to over 40 authoritative sources, its selective bibliography, et cetera. Its educational character has time and time again been attested by professors of economics who have used it for collateral reading in their economics classes.

*Mr. Lewis' pamphlet on Liberalism and Sovietism*<sup>2</sup>—*Not a league pamphlet.*—In previous pages of this statement, we have dealt with Mr. Earl's characterization of Mr. Lewis' Liberalism and Sovietism, not a league pamphlet. Of the purpose of this pamphlet, Mr. Lewis recently (July 6, 1954) declared:

This pamphlet was written some time ago, while the Progressive Party was shaping up. The pamphlet's main idea was to prevent liberals from going into the various Communist infiltrated organizations, whose stated purpose was liberal.

Since this period preceded the conviction of Alger Hiss, and the revelations concerning the Rosenbergs, a good many liberal-minded persons tended to fall for the Communist line that it was all right to cooperate with organizations with a sound stated purpose, even if such organizations had Communists in important places in them.

It was this feeling among too many liberals that I wanted to combat, and on the whole I think I have done so fairly well, if the pamphlet is read in its entirety.

*Other league pamphlets—elsewhere discussed.*—I have also dealt with Mr. Earl's discussion on pages 23–27<sup>3</sup> on *Democracy vs. Dictatorship, The New Freedom: Freedom from Want, Toward a Farmer-Labor Party, Forward March of American Labor, and World Cooperation and Social Progress.*

After commenting on the league's activities of former years, some as far back as the early thirties, it is regrettable that Mr. Earl did not give a fair-minded description of the educational activities of the last year or so, activities far more relevant to the problem which he poses than are those of past years. To these activities, Mr. Earl has seen fit to devote but 10 lines.

The summary of the league's 1953–54 activities is, therefore enclosed.

*Gaps in report.*—Finally, Mr. Earl's report is as conspicuous for what it leaves out as for what it includes.

The Washington State attorney, for instance, has nothing to say concerning the research activities of the league during the years, which have been the basis for much of its book and pamphlet, its lectures, and other educational activities.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 767, 768.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 771.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 773.

One of the volumes made possible through the efforts of the league was *Social Economic Movements*, a college textbook on comparative economic systems, which was used in past years as a text in some 40 institutions, which was republished in Great Britain, and which was regarded by Wesley C. Mitchell, late president of the American Economics Association and director of research of the National Bureau of Economic Research, as—

the most comprehensive survey of plans for bettering social organization that I have ever seen. The book is one that the world much needs and I hope many people will read.

The book, writes Prof. Louis M. Hacker, dean of the School for General Studies—

is amazingly complete; both trustworthy and a very useful handbook.

Similarly the books made possible by the league on *Power Control*, *A Program for Modern America*, *Concentration of Control in American Industry*, and its many symposia, have received high praise for their scholarship and accuracy.

A careful analysis of the league's conferences, its popular and scientific pamphlets, and so forth, instead of the hop, skip, and jump method of research observed in Mr. Earl's report would give a more accurate idea of the league's educational accomplishments.

---

I, Harry W. Laidler, being first duly sworn, on oath declare that I have prepared the foregoing statement; that it is true and correct with respect to those matters stated upon personal knowledge and with respect to those matters not stated upon personal knowledge, it is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

HARRY W. LAIDLER, *Executive Director.*

Sworn to before me this 14th day of July 1954.

MURIEL J. COMBERBATCH,  
*Notary Public State of New York.*

Term expires March 30, 1954.

#### STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

This statement is submitted by the American Council of Learned Societies in accordance with the procedure established by the committee and communicated to the council by telephone to its counsel on July 8, 1954.

In the preliminary reports prepared by the staff of the committee and in the testimony taken in open hearing by the committee, interest and concern were expressed in the activities of the council. Without directly and specifically charging any improper activity, the reports and testimony strongly implied that this organization, together with others, has engaged in some kind of conspiracy with the foundations, and that it has acted as a "clearinghouse" for the development and propagation of ideas that are in some indefinite way not consistent with our form of government.

The fantasy of these suggestions has been fully demonstrated in the testimony given on behalf of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council on Education. Presumably, the decision to dispense with further open hearings records the committee's judgment



that the charges and innuendoes contained in the staff reports and in the early testimony were so completely without foundation as not to warrant serious consideration. The American Council of Learned Societies agrees with this conclusion. Nevertheless, serious charges have been made and publicized. In order to keep the record straight, the council believes it desirable to avail itself of the committee's offer to present a factual picture of the council's organization and activities.

At the very outset it should be stated that to the knowledge of the council no individual member of the council, its board of directors, or staff is now or ever has been a Communist. No society constituent of the council is or has been listed by the Attorney General or in any other way designated as a subversive organization.

On the contrary, it is our belief that one of the most effective ways to combat subversive ideas and activities is by the spread and promotion of the humanistic studies with which the council is concerned.

#### ORIGIN AND ORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The American Council of Learned Societies was founded shortly after World War I to represent academic societies concerned in the fields of humanities in joint dealings with comparable groups in other countries. The council remains today a federative body of humanistic learned societies, for the purpose of dealing with the interests of those organizations which extend beyond the scope of any of the particular constituent societies.

To explain more precisely the council's area of concern, it is desirable to attempt a definition of "the humanities" as a field of study. Many such efforts have been made, without any wholly satisfactory result. It is possible to get some view of what is meant by listing the constituent societies of the council:

- American Philosophical Society
- American Academy of Arts and Sciences
- American Antiquarian Society
- American Oriental Society
- American Numismatic Society
- American Philological Association
- Archaeological Institute of America
- Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis
- Modern Language Association of America
- American Historical Association
- American Economic Association
- American Folklore Society
- American Philosophical Association
- American Anthropological Association
- American Political Science Association
- Bibliographical Society of America
- Association of American Geographers
- American Sociological Society
- College Art Association of America
- History of Science Society
- Linguistic Society of America
- Mediaeval Academy of America
- Far Eastern Association
- American Society for Aesthetics
- American Musicological Society

The humanities are concerned, then, with the things that are specifically human about man—his language, his history, his attempts to reach beyond knowledge of his tangible world through philosophy

and religion, and his realization of beauty through literature, music, and the arts.

The council maintains an office at 1219 16th Street NW., Washington D. C., with a full-time staff of about a dozen people. The names and addresses of the staff as well as of the present officers and directors of the council are attached. In the past, administrative expenses, including office rent and staff salaries, have run to about \$100,000 annually.

#### ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL

Within the humanistic field, the council's activities are directed broadly at the training and development of American scholars, the provision of new implements of study and research in these disciplines, and the addition to our humanistic knowledge. Any selection of the activities of the council for description here can only be illustrative of the range of its concern.

One further introductory remark is appropriate. In general, the council's activities touch directly only a relatively small group of scholars in institutions of higher learning, libraries, museums, and the like throughout the country. But, although these programs do not achieve great public notice, the council has always worked completely in the open, and has been subject to the fullest scrutiny by anyone interested. Its activities are reported in Bulletins recording its annual meetings and the work of the year there discussed. In recent years it has published a quarterly Newsletter, and of course, much of the research which the council fosters eventually finds its way into print.

So far as known to the council, none of these activities—all of them widely publicized—has ever called forth any question or complaint as to the propriety or integrity of the council's operations.

*Wartime language program.*—Before turning to the council's present-day activities, it may be instructive to review the one program in its history which had a direct impact on large numbers of American men and women. That was the council's work in the development of language training during World War II. It is very proud of its achievement in preparing the common defense, and this effort also illustrates the unexpected values which are sometimes derived from careful research in remote and what some may consider "impractical" fields of study.

Languages and linguistics, of course, are the basis of all the work in the humanistic disciplines. They have been of concern to the council from its beginning. In 1927, accordingly, the council began the collection and study of the American Indian languages, then rapidly disappearing, as an undertaking in the interest of pure linguistic science. The funds were supplied by the Carnegie Corporation.

It soon turned out that these languages could not be fitted satisfactorily into the descriptive patterns derived from Greek and Latin which had been worked out for the study of European languages. The small group of American linguists engaged in this study began to develop a completely new and American approach to the study and description of linguistic phenomena, which, a decade later, became the new science of American descriptive and structural linguistics. So rapid were the strides in this field, and so fruitful the development, that it can only be compared to the process that took place in the same period in the much more publicized field of nuclear physics.

A year or more before the American entry into World War II, members of the council and its staff began to realize that, in the event of war, there would be an urgent national need for training in Asiatic languages. Yet teachers, textbooks, dictionaries, teaching materials to fill that need were not available. The council began to examine the possibility of applying the new techniques developed in the study of American Indian languages to the study and teaching of other languages not in the European tradition, and specifically the languages of Asia which were destined to become crucially important.

With funds from the Rockefeller Foundation, the council started its intensive language program. Before Pearl Harbor, this program had developed a general approach to the problem of teaching Americans to speak these exotic languages, and had made substantial progress in the preparation of teaching aids and tools in specific languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Persian, Siamese, Malay, and Turkish. The work had progressed to the point that, at the outbreak of the war, the council was prepared to move into a full-scale teaching operation. This was done rapidly, beginning with Siamese at the University of Michigan, and by the summer of 1942, 56 courses were being taught in 26 institutions, in 22 languages, most of which had never before been formally taught in the United States.

When, early in 1942, the Armed Forces turned their attention to the language training problem, the pioneering developmental work done under the auspices of the council was ready to hand. A fruitful collaboration was established, with council staff members advising and consulting with the various branches of the Armed Forces which needed people with special language proficiencies. The council staff was expanded; in the work of preparing dictionaries, texts, and teaching manuals in a multitude of languages there were at times as many as 100 people on its payroll. The money was supplied by the Armed Forces.

The council participated with the Army in the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) language and area courses; with the Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS) of the Adjutant General's Office; and with the Language Branch of G-2 in organizing the operation of classroom instruction and the production of teaching tools.

At the end of the war, the whole enterprise was dropped by the Army as a part of our sudden demobilization. The council continued to publish textbooks and dictionaries through Henry Holt & Co., and to produce new ones slowly as the funds could be found. Among the casualties of this sudden termination was an almost completed Korean-English dictionary, which would have been immensely useful a few years later, but which, at the time, was still reposing on file cards, unpublished.

*American studies.*—Most of the council's current activities are not so spectacular as the wartime language program just discussed. But this does not measure their usefulness.

The improvement of college and university study of the American tradition and experience has always bulked large in council concerns. A fair share of our effort and of the funds which we have had available to aid research and publication have been directed in this field.

Perhaps the largest undertaking in this area is the Dictionary of American Biography, of which the first 20 volumes appeared from 1928 to 1936 and the first supplementary volume in 1944. Funds for

this enterprise came from the New York Times, assisted by the large foundations.

The project envisages a single ready reference for the facts about the lives of distinguished Americans. Unfortunately, the dislocations of the war threw the work somewhat off schedule. We have just succeeded in raising funds for the compilation of the second supplementary volume, and are now entering upon its production. We hope to have the whole operation back on schedule before long.

Of equal scientific importance, but without such wide appeal, is the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada. Here the attempt is to analyze and record the variations and nuances in spoken English from section to section of the continent. The first six immense volumes, covering New England, appeared between 1939 and 1944. Continuation of this work proceeds very slowly as the funds for it can be secured. Unfortunately, this may be too slowly, since regional variations in American speech are beginning to become obscured or to die out.

*Extending humanistic scholarship beyond the West European tradition.*—The modern study of humanities began with the Renaissance and its liberating rediscovery of the great civilizations of classical antiquity. It was for the study of these classical civilizations of Greece and Rome that the early humanistic tools and training were designed. The results of this orientation for the subsequent development of the West are so great as to defy description. Nevertheless it had an unfortunate effect, from the point of view of the study of humanities, in that traditionally these studies have concentrated on the classical and Mediterranean civilizations, and the West European and American traditions derivative from them, to the almost complete neglect of the rest of human experience.

Starting from a conference held on December 1, 1928, to discuss means for the development of Chinese studies in the United States, the council has taken leadership in correcting this deficiency by creating in American universities and colleges a better basis for studying the civilizations of Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe, particularly Russia. It has used every means available to it, including the provision of fellowships and study aids, to develop Americans trained in these fields, and to produce the implements—guides, translations, textbooks, bibliographies, catalogs—without which this kind of study cannot be carried on. It is not too much to say that there has been no significant improvement in the study of these areas in any American university or college, so far as the humanistic fields are concerned, in which the council has not been in some way involved.

In this broad field of endeavor, a number of lines of activity emerge clearly. One of the most important of these is the program of translating significant works of humanistic study from their original languages into English. In the past, these translation programs have included works in Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Hebrew languages.

The council's most recent effort in this field is a near eastern translation program. The five modern Arabic works which have so far been published under this program include analyses of the great controversies that pervade contemporary Muslim religion. Five more volumes are just going to press and about twenty others are in various stages of editorial progress.

Currently also it is bringing to a close a Russian translation series, which has concentrated on contemporary works. Among the 30 to 40 published volumes of this series are Vishinsky's Law of the Soviet State, Berg's Economic Geography of the U. S. S. R., Glebov's History of Russian Music, and others. It has also reprinted about 30 books in the original Russian, which were otherwise unavailable in this country. Among these was the 1941 5-year plan, of which only one copy had previously existed in the United States. These works have been invaluable, not only to American scholars, but to our foreign policy officials and intelligence agencies such as the CIA, and they are, often, the only authentic source materials that are available to scholars and others interested in these fields.

Another comparable translating venture is the Current Digest of the Soviet Press. This is a weekly publication containing sixty to seventy thousand words of translation of current Russian press and periodical literature. It was begun by the council, and is now carried on by it jointly with the Social Science Research Council from headquarters in New York. It has been justly called the biggest hole there is in the Iron Curtain.

*Language and linguistics*—In recent years a grant of funds from the Ford Foundation has made it possible to take up again some of the work in language teaching materials and methods which was left unfinished at the end of the war. The council now has work going in about 20 languages, including the revised Korean-English dictionary. Its ambition is to have a good American textbook on modern linguistic principles, a satisfactory students' dictionary, some graded readings, and a set of phonograph records to be used in teaching for every significant Asian language, that is, every language spoken by more than 10 million people.

Meanwhile, the work has been expanded to include the problem in reverse: i. e., methods of teaching English to speakers of other languages. This too has required the creation of new techniques and new materials, the most important of which is a series of textbooks for teaching English to Koreans, Indonesians, Turks, Persians, Thais, Serbo-Croatians, Burmese, Vietnamese, Greeks, Chinese, and to speakers of Spanish.

*The problem of highly trained and specialized personnel*.—In the future, no less than in the past, the people of the United States will not be able to depend upon numbers to maintain its leadership and security. We are a small numerical minority of the world's population. Our continued progress, our security, even our survival will depend, as it has in the past, on our ability to utilize our resources of trained intelligence. An increasing recognition has been given to this problem in the laboratory and engineering sciences. But the need is no less pressing in the fields of humanistic study. The council has directed, and intends in the future to direct its attention to this weak spot in the Nation's armor.

Naturally, officers and staff members of the council have a very wide acquaintance among scholars and teachers professionally concerned with the humanities. Concerning some of the people the council has detailed information derived from its special activities. For instance, its work in the development of Asian and Russian studies has given it, for many years, comprehensive knowledge of the academic personnel working in those fields. And the many applications

for its various fellowships, study-aids, and grants-in-aid of research comprise a file of the academic and professional careers of many scholars in all humanistic fields.

Up to 1949 the collection and dissemination of this information was haphazard and incidental. In that year, however, money was secured from the Rockefeller Foundation to make more formal investigations into the supply, potential, and distribution of trained personnel in the humanities. Hardly had these studies started when the Office of Naval Research and the Department of Defense became interested in the same problems, and asked the council to make a more elaborate investigation of them. With the cooperation of as many of the constituent societies as possible, the council gathered detailed professional information from some 27,000 scholars and students in the humanities and social sciences, probably about half of those professionally engaged in these fields. From these materials, when they had been coded and indexed, the Bureau of Labor Statistics abstracted the statistical information required by the Office of Naval Research. The Office was supplied with a microfilm of the schedules for its records, and the schedules themselves became what is now called the National Registration in the Humanities and Social Sciences, an imperfect instrument, but still the best accumulation of such personnel information available.

This kind of personnel work is done in close cooperation with the National Science Foundation, which maintains a similar register in the natural and physical sciences. In conjunction with the foundation, the council compiled and published a book, *Classifications for Surveys of Highly Trained Personnel*, which is now the standard guide on the subject.

It is hoped that work in this field can be improved to the point where the registration can be a source not only of information about the professional competences of individuals, but a basis for analysis of American potential in trained specialists in the humanistic fields, so that gaps in our specialized armament can be discovered and filled and we can be prepared for any emergency which the future might bring. Anyone who participated in the frenzied search for specially trained personnel in the early days of World War II realizes the magnitude of this task. We should never have to face its like again.

#### THE CHARGES MADE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

Against the background of the factual description of the council and its activities presented above, it is useful to examine more directly some of the charges made against the council before this committee, either in staff reports or in testimony. Other witnesses have sufficiently indicated the difficulty of trying to pinpoint the charges and identify them with any precision. Nevertheless, it is easy to see what the gravamen is.

It is suggested that the council, together with other research councils, has dominated American scholarship. It is implied that this power has been exercised to foist upon America policies and ideas alien to its heritage, and indeed subversive of its institutions. The mechanisms by which this end was achieved are said to be that the council has acted as a clearinghouse for channeling moneys from the foundations to students and causes congenial to these subversive ends.

and as a recruiting agency to place similarly oriented individuals in positions of importance in government.

As for the allegation of dominance there must be more than a little irony in it for anyone who has visited the offices of the council or read its financial reports and the reports of its annual proceedings. To make such a charge demonstrates an almost unbelievable ignorance of the mode of organization of American scholarship.

The American tradition, as has been pointed out in other statements to the committee, places the responsibility for scholarship, science, and higher learning in private, not governmental, hands. The result has been a national structure for the cultivation of this field of human activity of which Americans have every right to be proud, and which attests the fundamental soundness of that tradition.

It is a truism that Americans are the world's greatest joiners. Behind this truism, however, is the fact that our fantastic genius for spontaneous self-organization is one of the elements that has made this country what it is, and in particular has preserved vast areas of activity from governmental control.

This free-enterprise, self-organizing capacity is found in American business, philanthropy, politics, and social activity. It is found also in the fields of science, scholarship, and higher learning. We have almost 2,000 separate institutions of higher learning, each going its own way, without centralized planning or control. In many countries, abroad, they would be marching in step under the direction of a governmental ministry of education.

Much the same is true of the organization of science, scholarship, and higher learning outside the universities. Abroad this is usually taken care of by a national academy of arts and sciences, such as was founded in France by Louis XIV and in Russia by Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine. Such academies are governmentally controlled and supported. Their members are selected, of course, for scholarly and scientific eminence, but too frequently with at least one eye on their conformity with the government.

In the United States we do it differently. Our instinct for private organization has led to the formation of private associations—professional, scientific, or learned societies—to pursue a shared interest in some scientific or scholarly activity. There are literally thousands of these societies, of all sizes, interests, and degrees of formality. Most of them have only local importance. Perhaps a couple of hundred have national membership and significance. Practically all of them are freely open to any person who shares their respective interests and is able to pay the usually modest dues.

In general, each of these private scientific or learned societies devotes itself to a specific branch of study: History, chemistry, archaeology, geology, etc. But sometimes, interests call for activity across these artificial lines which separate the branches of learning. Among the most important of these is the promotion of research and scholarship in the whole field of which the particular branch is a part. For these limited purposes, the most important of these scientific and learned societies have joined together in four national groups called councils: The National Research Council, based on constituent societies in the natural, mathematical, and biological sciences; the Social Science Research Council, based on societies concerned with economics, political science, sociology and the like; the American Council on

Education, based on societies as well as institutions of higher learning concerned with the techniques of college education; and the American Council of Learned Societies, based, as has been shown, on societies concerned with the humanistic studies.

These councils differ somewhat in size, structure, wealth, and methods of operation, but they are all distinctly private organizations, based on private associations and dependent upon private sources of funds for their support.

While the four councils are quite separate in every respect, they did, in 1944, create a mechanism for functioning together whenever that seems desirable. Two delegates from each of the councils meet approximately once a year in an informal group (it does not even have its own stationery, much less a staff) known as the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. This board is quite without power and is simply a consultative body, which on rare occasions is used to carry forward enterprises in which all the councils have an interest.

For about a generation these organizations have devoted themselves to the creation of an American scholarship worthy of the richest and most powerful nation in history; and not without success. Nothing like this simple, democratic structure of scholarship and higher education exists in any other country. The caricature of it presented in the preliminary staff studies of this committee is so greatly at variance with the fact that they might have been written by some ill-informed foreigner.

So much for the charge of dominance. There remains the charge that the council acted as a clearinghouse for channeling foundation funds in the subversive directions identified by the committee staff. This requires a few words about the finances of the council and its relation to the foundations.

For a few years in the early thirties the Rockefeller Foundation did make available modest free funds which the council could spend for research in any way it chose. That practice was preceded and has been supplanted by a system in which the foundation money coming to the council is specifically earmarked for projects presented to and passed on in advance by the particular foundation making the grant.

In the 35 years of its existence, the American Council of Learned Societies has received and expended about \$9 million. A little more than half of this has come from the great foundations. A detailed analysis of the source of all its financial support since 1937 was presented in response to the questionnaire distributed by the Cox committee and is available to this committee.

The money coming from the foundations falls generally into two categories. The first covers general administrative expenses and has run, as indicated above, to about \$100,000 annually in recent years. Both the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation have made substantial contributions for these purposes. More and more in recent years, however, the tendency has been to try to meet these costs from administrative charges against funds for specific projects. At the present time the council is receiving no contribution for central administration from either of these foundations, except as a percentage charge against funds for specific programs.

The second category of contributions from the foundations comprises grants for the support of specific projects for which the council is responsible. Such projects originate with the council staff, com-



mittees, or members. They must, of course be approved by the board of directors. Thence they are submitted to the foundations for support. Usually, if the program receives such support, it is administered by a special committee appointed by the board of directors for the purpose.

Such projects or programs may be works of research conducted by the council itself, such as the Dictionary of American Biography. In that case, the special committee picks the editor, who in turn selects the contributors, and the work proceeds under the supervision of the editor and the committee.

In other cases, the project may be a special fellowship or study aid program. The council has no such funds at present. In the past, it has conducted some 25 separately organized and financed programs of aid to individuals for study, research, or publication in the humanities. From 1926 to 1954 it has made slightly more than 2,000 awards to about the same number of people. The stipends have ranged between \$100 and \$6,000 and have averaged about \$1,000. Such fellowship and study-aid programs are short-term operations, extending not more than 3 years. They are likewise administered by specially appointed committees who review the scholarly and technical qualifications of the applicants and make the awards. The names of all individuals who have received such awards and the subject-matter of the research are regularly published, were presented to the Cox committee, and are available to this committee.

All of the council's projects, of whatever nature, are presented to the foundations on their merits and in competition with projects sponsored by colleges and universities, other research institutions, individuals, and even its own constituent societies. Not only are the funds received from the foundations extremely limited both in amount and in the freedom with which they may be disposed of, but the council as a matter of policy does not interpose itself between any foundation and any other agency or individual in search of funds. Foundation policies and decisions in such matters are made by the foundations themselves.

Finally, there is the question of recruiting Government personnel. As has been indicated above, the council's contacts with scholars in the humanistic fields and its more recent work on the national registration in the humanities and social sciences have made it a valuable source of information about the professional and technical competence of individuals in those fields of endeavor. Institutions and agencies in need of such specialized personnel sometimes request information of this character from the council, and within the limits imposed by available staff time, the council responds. Such requests are infrequent, and come predominantly from universities and colleges, museums, libraries, and the like, and only very occasionally from the Government. Since the registration has been in usable shape, that is roughly the last year and a quarter, the council has responded to about 15 such requests, only one of which came from a Government agency.

The information supplied in response to such requests is in no sense a commendation. To the best of the council's knowledge, it is not treated as such by the requesting agency or institution. Indeed, where the reference is to the registration, as it has invariably been since that

has been completed, the only information given is that supplied by the individual himself.

The council has assumed that it is not in the American tradition, in a register designed for employment purposes, to inquire about the individual's race, religion, or politics. Any information it might have on these points might be accidental or untrustworthy. It goes without saying, moreover, that the council has no facilities for investigation and clearance of individuals on security matters. It is not a proper body for such work in any case. Where requests for information come from a Government agency, therefore, the council takes no responsibility for such questions and properly assumes that any individual who is hired will have to meet the applicable security standards imposed by the Government.

#### CONCLUSION

The body of this statement has been directed, as was no more than proper, to the assumptions and presuppositions which were implicit in the reports of the committee staff and some of the friendly testimony which the committee heard. But the council cannot let this opportunity pass without saying vigorously and directly that it does not share a number of those assumptions and preconceptions.

It believes that, far from being committed to any particular body of doctrine, America is a land of boundless experiment, of constant and relentless search for better ways of doing things, for richer experience, to make human life fuller and more attractive. Nothing could be less American than an assumption that Americans had reached the ultimate boundary of thought—political, economic, social, or cultural as well as physical—in 1903 or 1953, or are destined to reach it in 2003.

A corollary of this interpretation of our tradition is the belief in the maintenance of a completely free market in ideas, no matter how unpalatable they may be to our preconceived notions. The moment we have to protect any mature American from any idea whatsoever, that moment we must stop boasting about American democracy.

The American Council of Learned Societies is concerned with thought, with ideas, with mankind's concept of itself and its place in nature. It believes that the best interests of America require uncompromising exploration of any thinking that mankind has ever done or is doing. There is no subversion comparable with an interference in the traffic in ideas.

Ideas are explosive materials. They must not be handled carelessly nor ignorantly. All the activities of the American Council of Learned Societies have been directed at creating and fostering in America the mechanisms through which ideas can be handled understandingly and without fear.

To this end it has done whatever it could to develop Americans trained to participate fully in the pursuit and communication of all humanistic knowledge and to provide the tools of study, teaching, and research with which such trained Americans have to work.

The council is proud of its record in these activities. It holds, moreover, that in the harsh decades ahead, many of our most pressing problems will lie in the very fields of the humanities with which the council is concerned. In its opinion no work is more important to the future security and welfare of the Nation.

## VERIFICATION

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
County of Essex, ss:

I, Mortimer Graves, swear and affirm that I am executive director of the American Council of Learned Societies; that I have read and am familiar with the contents of the foregoing statement; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief every statement of fact contained therein is true.

MORTIMER GRAVES,  
*Executive Director, American Council of Learned Societies.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of July 1954.  
My commission expires November 30, 1956.

[SEAL]

KATHLEEN T. FLYNN,  
*Notary Public.*

ANNEX TO STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

## ADMINISTRATION

*Officers*

C. W. de Kiewiet, University of Rochester, chairman.  
Theodore C. Blegen, University of Minnesota, vice chairman.  
William R. Parker, New York University, secretary.  
Sidney Painter, Johns Hopkins University, treasurer.

*Board of directors*

Walter R. Agard, University of Wisconsin.  
Curt F. Bühler, Pierpont Morgan Library.  
Irwin Edman, Columbia University.  
Rensselaer Lee, Columbia University.  
Roger P. McCutcheon, Tulane University.  
Henri Peyre, Yale University.  
Robert Redfield, University of Chicago.  
B. J. Whiting, Harvard University.

## STAFF OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mortimer Graves, executive director.	Shirley D. Hudson, public affairs officer.
D. H. Daugherty, assistant to the director.	Alice M. Harger, bursar.
J. F. Wellemeyer, adviser on personnel studies.	Catherine E. Berry.
William A. Parker, secretary for fellowships.	Elizabeth H. Cizek.
	M. Frances Cochran.
	Hilda H. Melby.
	Anna Stern.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR S. ADAMS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN  
COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.

I am Arthur S. Adams, president of the American Council on Education. My request to appear before you was made by the authority and direction of the executive committee of the council, and I shall present a statement which that committee has unanimously approved. We are deeply concerned that the special committee may obtain a true picture of the role that philanthropic foundations have played in connection with education. We believe deeply and firmly in the importance of education to American principles and institutions. There often comes to my mind the historical fact that when the settlers of our country first came to its shores, they addressed themselves to

building a school building almost before they had provided shelter for themselves. The whole story of American greatness, to my mind, has been written in terms of educational opportunity.

Especially in times such as these, there is need for a clear and accurate public understanding of what our schools and colleges are trying to do. I believe that this committee has the opportunity to perform a great service by assisting the people to gain such a picture. Hence, although it was the understanding of many of us that the central focus of the investigation was to be the activities of foundations, it is gratifying that the focus has been broadened to include not only the relationships of foundations to education but also the relationships of education to the public welfare. This affords a magnificent opportunity for the committee to present a clear-eyed judicial appraisal of the importance of education to our society.

Now, let me comment briefly on some of the reasons why philanthropic foundations have flourished and multiplied in American society as nowhere else in the world. It is not because we have a monopoly of wealth; great fortunes have been amassed in other countries. I suggest it is because a climate has been established here, an atmosphere of freedom which encourages private initiative not merely for selfish purposes but for the public welfare. Both Federal and State Governments, from the beginning of our history, have maintained the position that it is in the public interest for individuals and groups of individuals to contribute voluntarily to worthy causes.

Advocates of centralized national planning and action have always contended that many of these causes could be served more efficiently by Government. In criticism of private initiative, they have pointed out that at times it has resulted in duplication of effort, lack of coordination, sometimes even naive support of dubious causes. One can accept these criticisms in large part and still assert with deep conviction that despite failures and mistakes, private funds, dispensed by independent agencies, have by and large made an impressive and creditable record. Both the mistakes and the achievements are symbols of free enterprise as we in America know it.

Now suppose that the climate in America should change, and it should become established policy that Government should regulate the purposes of private foundations, their methods of operation, and the appointment of their trustees and other personnel. What incentive would remain for anyone to give to them? It would be much easier simply to let the Government collect the money in taxes and take the total responsibility for the public welfare.

I take it that none of us desire such developments. I urge this committee to protect the climate of freedom in which we now live. True freedom means the right to make mistakes as well as to achieve successes. Federal control of foundations operating within the broad limits of public welfare would not last long. Foundations would simply disappear. Free enterprise of any sort vanishes under Government dictation.

Against this background, let us consider briefly the frame of reference supplied to this committee by its director of research to assist it in the current investigation. I would respectfully suggest that the committee scrutinize the document with great care before determining what guiding principles should be adopted. Several of the basic assumptions are open to serious question. I am confident that the com-

mittee desires to approach the study without prejudice in the interest of truth. The search for truth will obviously be severely hampered if the committee at the very beginning accepts a series of dubious concepts as the basis for its study.

I suggest, for example, that the committee give special consideration to the application of the term "un-American." The report of the research director asserts that a political change so drastic as to constitute a "revolution" took place in this country between 1933 and 1936, "without violence and with the full consent of the overwhelming majority of the electorate." He might have added that it was approved by the Congress as sound public policy and by the Supreme Court as constitutional. Later in the report there seems to be a definite implication that some, at least, of the changes made at that time were un-American.

It is a strange doctrine indeed that the overwhelming majority of the American people, acting through their own political and social agencies, can adopt un-American policies. Certainly the American people can make mistakes; they can also rectify mistakes. One may consider the 18th amendment to have been right or wrong, and its repeal to be either right or wrong; but surely both the adoption and the repeal of prohibition were American actions. To take any other position is to assume that the power resides somewhere, in some group, to pass judgment on the decisions of the American people made in accordance with the Constitution, and to declare some of these decisions un-American. I am confident that this committee desires neither to arrogate that power to itself nor to confer it upon its research staff.

This matter is closely related to the definition of "the public interest." The research director has recommended that this phrase be defined in terms of "the principles and form of the Federal Government, as expressed in our Constitution and in our other basic founding documents." What this passage seems to imply, in context, is that a foundation or other agency operates in the public interest only when it promotes acceptance of a particular theory concerning government, called in legal circles, I believe, a strict interpretation of Federal powers.

If this committee desires to discover to what extent foundations and other organizations have spent money and energy in promoting a special theory in constitutional law, it has every right to do so. I respectfully suggest, however, that if the committee discovers, as it well may, that little time and money have been so spent, it should report the fact in those terms. To report such a conclusion to the American people as a finding that foundations and educational agencies have failed to operate in the public interest would be a semantic distortion of the first order. The American people have more than an impression—they have a conviction—that efforts to control disease, to alleviate poverty, to advance science and technology, to expand libraries and museums, and to do many other things having nothing to do with the promotion of a special brand of political philosophy contribute to their welfare. Such activities are therefore, in any reasonable definition of the term, "in the public interest." All of these areas happen to be among those in which foundations have been especially active.

I would suggest further that as part of the process of establishing a reasonable framework for its investigation, this committee consider

the historic purpose of tax exemption. It would appear that this privilege was originally related to the principle, stated frequently by the Founding Fathers, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Tax exemption was presumably granted to local and State governments to reinforce their freedom from Federal control. Tax exemption was presumably granted to churches to reinforce the provision of the first amendment guaranteeing freedom of religion. Tax exemption was presumably granted to educational institutions and agencies to reinforce the constitutional provision against Federal control of education. Similarly, tax exemption was presumably granted to other agencies, such as hospitals, charitable and welfare organizations, and philanthropic foundations, on the theory that private initiative should be encouraged in certain broad areas of concern for the public welfare.

A contrary principle, frequently advanced in recent years and seemingly implicit in the report of this committee's research director, is that tax exemption not only confers the right but carries along with it the obligation of Federal supervision and, if need be, control. This doctrine is itself one of the most revolutionary concepts in the history of American Government. It could lead to Federal control, either by direct regulation or by threat of removal of the tax-exempt status, not merely of foundations but of health services, education, religion, and the operations of State and local government. It would seem to be highly important that this committee take a stand on this issue and announce in clear terms the extent to which it believes Federal control of tax-exempt institutions and agencies is justifiable. I should think the committee might question, for example, the assumption implicit in the report of its research director that the Government should determine the scope and direction of research and instruction in the social sciences.

We come now to the reason why the American Council on Education has become involved in this investigation. The argument of the research director seems to be this:

1. That beginning in 1933, a political "revolution" took place in the United States, supported by an overwhelming majority of the electorate, which in some of its manifestations seems to the research staff to be un-American.

2. That the approval of this so-called "revolution" by the electorate resulted from their indoctrination by the Nation's educational institutions.

3. That the indoctrination was engineered by a closely knit group of national organizations, including the American Council on Education.

The flimsiness of this line of reasoning can be demonstrated in many ways. One is to consider the time factor.

Of the population over 25 years of age in 1932, comprising roughly 88 percent of our potential electorate, more than 60 percent had received no formal education beyond the eighth grade. This fact seems to warrant the inference that more than half the voters completed their formal education before 1920. Yet the research director, in his own report, notes that the American Council of Learned Societies was founded in 1919, the National Research Council in 1916, the Social Science Research Council in 1923, the American Council on Education in 1918, and the John Dewey Society in 1936. The assumption that these organizations engineered a program of mass indoctrination through the schools that brought about the "revolution" of 1933 would

seem to be an undeserved tribute to their power, since in 1920 the oldest had been established only 4 years and the 2 youngest had not yet been conceived.

Let us approach this matter in another way. The director of research says his procedure has been to reason from total effect to primary and secondary causes. It would appear that in this instance he may have omitted the primary causes and have gone far beyond the secondary. Would he seriously contend that the farmers who roamed the roads of Iowa with pitchforks and shotguns in the early 1930's, or the industrial workers who stood in mile-long bread lines, or the veterans who sold apples on street corners, or the bankrupt businessman who jumped from 10-story windows did so because of something in their educational curriculum? Whatever one's political persuasion may be, one must concede that surely, the economic forces which brought the industrial machine grinding to a halt constituted more important causes for social change than any possible influence of the little red schoolhouse.

What, then, is the role of education in social change? It would appear that in a democratic society such as ours, where, as in all societies, constant changes are required to maintain equilibrium between the rights of the individual and the protective functions of government, education serves two essential purposes: first it strengthens the conviction that necessary adjustments can be made by peaceful means, and, second, by spreading knowledge, it assists the people and their leaders to discover what the appropriate adjustments are. To say that education provides the motivation for change because it performs these functions is like saying that fire engines cause fires because they are usually present at the scene and seem to have a significant role in the proceedings.

It seems apparent, from some of the testimony previously presented before this committee, that the director of research and his staff have done a considerable amount of research in the library. In that process, they have uncovered, in books and periodicals, numerous statements by educators advocating specific programs. Individual educators, like members of other professions, are human and are prone to argue that their ideas are worthy of immediate universal adoption. It would be an unwarranted inference to assume, however, that such statements invariably, or even usually, reflect prevailing beliefs or practices. The gap between theory and practice is as great in education as in other areas of human activity, such as ethics, and as great as the gap between individual opinions and the consensus in other professions, such as politics.

Furthermore professors, as the great historian Carl Becker once remarked, are by temperament people who think otherwise. If all their ideas were simultaneously adopted, the result would be utter chaos. Hence, by carefully selecting his excerpts, one can secure evidence from educational publications for almost anything he may set out to prove. The only way to find out what educational institutions are actually doing is to examine them at firsthand, without preconceived ideas. That is a vast undertaking, which the research staff of this committee has apparently not undertaken and has certainly had inadequate time to complete.

I suggest to the committee, therefore, that it be wary of conclusions based on the wishful thinking of individual educators as expressed in books and periodicals. To consider such material as presenting an accurate picture of educational practice is like judging the accomplishments of a session of Congress by a selected group of bills introduced rather than by the sum total of legislation actually passed.

With regard to the American Council on Education itself, I have brought with me a supply of pamphlets that describe its objectives and operations and list its membership. You will note that members of the council are institutions and organizations, not persons. You will note further that the largest group of members is composed of colleges and universities. That fact explains why the major interest of the council has traditionally been and is now in higher education, although it has a general concern with the whole range of education.

The council is thoroughly democratic in organization. Its governing body is the membership, represented by duly appointed delegates at the annual meeting. The interim policymaking body is the executive committee, elected by vote of the members. Membership dues comprise the major source of income for central operations.

The council has no power to regulate its members in any respect, nor has it ever attempted to exercise such power. Although the basic reason for this policy is that it represents a sound concept of service to education and to the public, a second reason is wholly practical. Since all authorities on higher education agree that its dominant characteristic is diversity, any effort toward regimentation from a central headquarters would mean disaster for the organization through the immediate loss of numerous members. The truth of this statement is clear from a mere listing of the affiliations of member institutions. One hundred and twenty-eight are affiliated with the Catholic Church, 61 with the Methodist Church, 24 with the Lutheran Church, 29 with the Baptist Church, 35 with the Presbyterian Church, and 60 with a dozen other denominations. Twenty-nine are supported by municipalities, 261 by 48 States, and 28 by other public and private agencies. A final 200 are privately supported, without special affiliation, and are administered by their individual boards of trustees. The constituent organization members of the council have a similar diversity of support and orientation. The most challenging problem of the council, under these circumstances, is to discover issues on which there is such agreement among council members as to warrant joint consideration.

Let me say emphatically that the college curriculum is not one of the matters on which agreement has ever been reached among institutions of higher learning. The standard educational curriculum apparently discerned by this committee's director of research is sheer fantasy. The idea that such diverse institutions as the University of Notre Dame, Southern Methodist University, Yale, and the University of California have adopted or would ever adopt the same curriculum is simply inconceivable. This diversity, reflected in the freedom of choice which every institution exercises with respect to its curriculum, is, in fact, the distinctive genius of higher education in America.

Yet American institutions of higher learning, and in fact educational institutions at all levels, do have some ideas in common, and feel that those ideas should be vigorously expressed. That is why they have created and now support national organizations such as the American Council on Education. In serving the cause of educa-



tion, these organizations do believe, with great sincerity, that they render a national service. Unless the members likewise believed it, there would be no such organizations.

One of the central ideas that the American Council on Education is authorized and directed by its members to express is that the independence of colleges and universities should be maintained at all costs and against all agencies, including the Federal Government, that might attempt to dominate them. The basic reason is that they are opposed in principle and in practice to indoctrination. Although they approach their goals in many and varied ways, they share the purpose of preparing students to think for themselves and to continue the habit of study to the end that they may be well-informed and effective citizens. The distinctive product of higher education in the United States is not a person taught to embrace certain prejudices but a person trained to make intelligent decisions on issues as they arise. And this, in the expressed opinion of great American leaders, from Thomas Jefferson to Dwight D. Eisenhower, is a basic pro-American service.

The plain fact is that the schools and colleges of this country do not have the power to achieve mass political indoctrination even if they had the desire to do so. Political indoctrination of the great mass of American citizens is impossible for any institution or group of institutions so long as freedom of speech and press continue to exist. Indoctrination requires a negative as well as a positive force to be effective, as both Hitler and Stalin well know. Not only must a single doctrine be presented with persistence, but access to all other doctrines must be denied. The only agency in this country capable of mass political indoctrination is the Federal Government, and even the Government could not be successful by controlling the schools alone; it would also have to control the pulpit, the press, radio, television, and all other media of mass communication. Mass indoctrination is therefore a theoretical as well as a practical impossibility in America today. It simply does not exist. It cannot exist so long as any minority is free to raise its voice.

Let me summarize. The standard educational curriculum postulated by the committee's director of research is nonexistent. If the executive committee or staff of the American Council on Education had any desire to promote such a curriculum—which they do not—they could not do so, because the council's membership would literally dissolve if they did. If the council cannot promote such a curriculum itself, it certainly could not effectively participate in an alleged conspiracy among national educational organizations to reach the same objective. The alleged conspiracy, also, is a figment of imagination.

I am at a loss to understand what factual basis there could conceivably be for the allegations apparently made by the director of research against the American Council on Education. I shall be glad to answer questions, to the best of my ability and knowledge, about any of the council's operations. As I indicated at the outset, we welcome the opportunity to assist the committee in constructing a true picture of the part which educational institutions, educational organizations, and foundations interested in education have played in the development of American civilization.

The first draft of the above statement was prepared for presentation to the committee at the direction of the executive committee of

the American Council on Education, on the assumption that it would represent testimony offered voluntarily on the council's initiative. Subsequently I received a subpoena to appear, and therefore felt it necessary to revise the first paragraph in order to remove any implication of presumptuousness on the part of myself or the executive committee.

I swear that the revised draft above, different in only this respect from the first draft, of which some copies are still in circulation, is accurate and true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

ARTHUR S. ADAMS,  
*President, American Council on Education.*

WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

Subscribed and sworn to before me a notary public in the District of Columbia on this 21st day of July, 1954, by Arthur S. Adams who is personally known to me.

[SEAL]

ELEANOR QUILL, *Notary Public.*

My commission expires January 14, 1957.

**STATEMENT OF H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR., PRESIDENT AND TRUSTEE, THE FORD FOUNDATION**

BEFORE THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES CONGRESS  
KINGDOM OF DENMARK, CITY OF COPENHAGEN,  
*Embassy of the United States of America, ss:*

H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

1. I am president of the Ford Foundation.
2. Attached hereto are three documents:

Statement of H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president and trustee of the Ford Foundation, to the Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations, House of Representatives, 83d Congress;

Reply by the Ford Foundation to allegations directed specifically against it contained in the record of the committee's public hearings to date (supplement A to statement of H. Rowan Gaither, Jr.);

History of the establishment of the Fund for the Republic (supplement of H. Rowan Gaither, Jr.).

These documents were prepared for submission to the Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations in connection with the testimony which I intended to give before that committee at the invitation of its counsel.

3. Having been informed that no representative of the Ford Foundation will be heard by the committee, I submit these statements for the record and swear that they are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of July 1954.

THEODORE SELLIN,  
*Vice Consul of the United States of America.*

## THE FORD FOUNDATION

This sworn statement is submitted on behalf of the Ford Foundation in compliance with a request dated July 2, 1954, from the counsel for the special committee of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, to investigate tax-exempt foundations.

The authorized purposes of the committee, as stated in House Resolution 217, are—

to determine if any foundations and organizations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.

With reference to those authorized purposes, I wish to state:

The Ford Foundation devotes its resources entirely to the purposes for which it was established. As set forth in its charter, these are to "engage in charitable, scientific, and educational activities, all for the public welfare."

The Ford Foundation has not used any of its resources for un-American or subversive activities.

The Ford Foundation has not used any of its resources for political purposes, propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.

The trustees and staff of the foundation are loyal, responsible Americans. Our operating procedures insure responsible and careful decisions in hiring staff, planning our program, and making grants. The Ford Foundation's entire program is aimed at advancing the best interests of the American people.

To aid the committee in completing its investigation and to answer the general allegations in the record of these hearings, this statement is primarily a description of the personnel, policies and programs of the Ford Foundation. In separate supplements hereto, detailed answers are made to specific allegations against the Ford Foundation and certain individuals and organizations associated with it. Before turning to those subjects, however, I must comment on certain procedures of this committee and on some of the testimony presented to it.

The Ford Foundation, along with others, has been maligned in public by the witnesses called by this committee in the opening weeks of the hearings. This testimony has ranged from sweeping innuendoes to detailed allegations of wrongdoing. We have grave doubts as to the validity of any of the material charges against American philanthropy and education, and insofar as they refer to the Ford Foundation, we state they are erroneous and baseless. We had hoped, of course, to have the opportunity of replying to the charges in public so that the real record of the Ford Foundation would be known to all those who may have been misled by those charges. We therefore regard the decision of the committee to discontinue public hearings and to limit the foundations' defense to written statements or closed sessions as a puzzling and unexpected act of injustice. However, we are ready to cooperate with the committee on the terms which it has set, because it is imperative, in our view, that the committee now receive all the information it requires in order promptly to complete its investigation in every respect.

To leave this investigation in any sense incomplete would be a reflection on the Congress and a disservice to the public. Moreover, it

would leave the door ajar to repeated investigations with all of their immense cost in terms of time, money, and effort to the Congress and to the foundations, and their unavoidable effect on the morale, initiative, and freedom of scientific, educational, and charitable organizations. Postponing or delaying completion of this investigation for any extensive period would produce these same undesirable effects.

The second preliminary topic I would like to discuss relates to certain testimony presented in these hearings by staff members and by witnesses procured by the staff. These individuals have put before this committee a theory about foundations which is erroneous and which could cause grave damage.

From the record of the public hearings, this theory appears to be about as follows:

Most trustees of most foundations have had so little time to spare from other activities that the foundations have been taken over by staff members, who are running them for their own purposes.

These schemers really make the decisions as to how foundation money is spent; they have a master plan for society; and they are intent upon reshaping the country to fit that plan.

To this end they have engineered a giant conspiracy, subverting our people, our institutions, and our Government to produce the major political, social, and economic changes of the past 50 years.

Their partners in this conspiracy include the faculties and administrators of American colleges and universities, the members of the learned and educational organizations of the country, and public servants in State and Federal Government.

This theory is the sheerest nonsense. I believe this statement will show that it is false insofar as it is applied to the Ford Foundation. While I do not speak for the thousands of other American foundations, my experience in this field leads me to believe that the theory is no more applicable to them.

Contrary to the premise of the theory, the trustees and officers of the Ford Foundation are neither dupes nor plotters, nor are they delict in their duty. They are respected men of wide experience and alive to their responsibilities.

In attempting to portray the historic changes of the twentieth century as the result of a conspiracy, the theory ignores such factors as two world wars; an economic depression of global proportions; the emergence of the United States and Russia as world leaders of conflicting ideologies; the rise of nationalism and new nations in the less developed parts of the world; and vast scientific and technical change.

A main element of the theory is that the conspiracy has long been spreading through all levels of American education. If so, one can only wonder how such a situation has escaped detection by thousands of local school boards, parent-teacher associations and school teachers. We think the theory is an affront to the commonsense of the American people, who have presumably been the objects of the conspiracy and whose major decisions it is said to have dictated. Contrary to the notion that our educational system has been subverted, we share with most Americans the view that our public and private schools have served us well and deserve considerable credit for the advances we as a Nation have achieved.

Although the overwhelming majority of the press has derided the conspiracy theory presented in these proceedings, important segments

of the public may have gained the impression that it has been proved to the satisfaction of this committee. The other trustees and I are concerned with this possibility. Accordingly, we hope this committee will take positive steps to dispel any such impression, because it carries damaging implications not only for all private philanthropy, but for all science and education.

#### PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY IN A FREE SOCIETY

One of the most productive characteristics of American life has been the practice of voluntary giving for the public good. Since the very beginning of our history, the American people have recognized a duty to give to their churches and schools and to charitable causes, and they have looked upon the right to join together in private action for the public welfare as an important element in the idea of a free society.

In the past, private philanthropic efforts were devoted largely to providing education, supporting religion, and alleviating human suffering. As the Nation expanded, the role of philanthropy grew with it. Today private giving is related to every important charitable, scientific, educational, cultural, religious, economic and social need; and this breadth of voluntary effort is one of the sources of strength of our society.

This is not to say, of course, that private giving offers the only approach to our problems. Compared to the giant resources of Government, those of private philanthropy are meager. But in a free society some things, of course, are inappropriate to Government and must be handled by private means. The function of private giving, through foundations and otherwise, is something special. And the principle of private giving, I think, is vital.

The American people, it is estimated, give \$5,600 million a year to private efforts for those causes they wish to support. Of this amount, however, less than 3 percent comes from foundations. We are thus dealing here with only a fraction, a small fraction, of private giving. At the same time, it is, I believe, an important fraction because there are things that a philanthropic foundation can do more efficiently than any other institution. The hopes of our people to solve some of their sorest problems often depend upon the existence of foundations, even though they represent only 3 percent of our national philanthropic effort.

Take for example the vital work of searching out and eliminating some of the causes of human suffering, whether due to physical or to social factors. Foundations are particularly able to organize and conduct these searches for several reasons:

One is that such searches often risk unpopularity and misunderstanding, and it has often been difficult to obtain initial or continuous public financial support for them. Frequently only a foundation can take on this kind of responsibility.

Second, such searches can require coordinated attacks on problems with multiple causes—juvenile delinquency, for example. Foundations can bring together into common endeavor the needed variety of persons with special skills and professional training.

Third, such searches can be long and drawn out. Sometimes they fail completely. Because foundations can assume financial risks in

the initial phases of exploratory research that the general public or the Government cannot or should not take, they have often paved the way for more general public support of such endeavors.

The fight against cancer is an example of such pioneering. The foundations were among the first to support organized research into this disease. Government participation came later. And finally the fight was so dramatized that millions of individuals began to make donations for an all-out attack.

Incidentally, the fight against cancer illustrates the three basic types of work supported by the large foundations, which are the acquisition, dissemination, and application of knowledge.

Scientists and scholars engaged in the search for new knowledge—if their findings upset the status quo—must sometimes fight for their discoveries tooth and nail. And foundations in supporting their researches must be prepared to join in the fight to defend the principal of freedom of inquiry.

Man's right to acquire knowledge and to use it freely is one of our noblest traditions. It was expressed in our earliest state papers, both in colonial days and in the early years of the Republic. The suppression of ideas, and not the free exploration of them, was the great fear of our Foundation Fathers—as it must be ours. It was the author of our Declaration of Independence and the Virginia bill of rights who said:

Here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it.

This committee is conducting its inquiry at a time when reason is being challenged on many fronts. The basic propositions of our own national life have never existed in many areas of the world. Even where they have at one time existed they have now all too often been driven out. Freedom of inquiry, with all other liberties, is suppressed in a growing number of police states. Education in such countries has become a tool of autocratic control; its content dictated by the state and its use prescribed by the state.

We have also seen, in a few harried years, man's technical advances in some areas of knowledge so outstrip his progress in others that he stands in greater danger of their misuse. Scientific advances have inevitably been followed by new social, economic, and political problems. Men trained by knowledge and experience to deal with such problems have got to be brought together in patient, wise, and cooperative efforts.

The great responsibilities of our generation are to preserve our fundamental beliefs, to encourage progress and to solve in a peaceful way the social, economic, and political problems which confront us. Foundations are equipped to assist in these great undertakings.

However, the potential usefulness of foundations at this critical time in history would be destroyed if the Nation were to forsake its heritage of freedom and accept the conspiracy theory advanced in the record of these hearings. This committee has received statements from earnest and informed men disproving this theory with clear and open expositions of the achievements and actual methods of their organizations. On behalf of the trustees of the Ford Foundation, I join in rejecting this frightened and mistaken theory; we reject also the related allegations directed specifically against the Ford Founda-

tion. In this connection, I am submitting, as supplement A to this statement, a detailed denial of such allegations.

#### POLICIES AND OPERATIONS OF THE FORD FOUNDATION

The role of foundations has been so distorted in these proceedings, and their importance so obscured, that it may assist the committee to know how one foundation, the Ford Foundation, took its place in American philanthropy and how it actually conducts its affairs.

The remainder of this statement describes what the Ford Foundation is, how it operates and what it does.

The Ford Foundation is a Michigan nonprofit corporation incorporated in 1936. The trustees of the Ford Foundation, in addition to myself, are—

Henry Ford II, chairman ; president, Ford Motor Co. ;  
Frank W. Abrams, associated with Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey for 42 years and chairman of its board at the time of his retirement last year ;  
James F. Brownlee, partner of the New York investment firm of J. H. Whitney & Co. ;  
John Cowles, publisher, Minneapolis Star and Tribune and chairman of the board, Des Moines Register and Tribune ;  
Donald K. David, dean, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration ;  
Mark Ethridge, publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal and Louisville Times ;  
Benson Ford, vice president, Ford Motor Co. ;  
Laurence M. Gould, president, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. ;  
John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase National Bank of the city of New York and former United States High Commissioner for Germany ;  
Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co. until 1950 and now chairman, executive committee, W. R. Grace & Co. ; and  
Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., judge of the United States District Court in Boston and president, board of overseers, Harvard University.

From 1936 to 1948 the income of the Ford Foundation was relatively small and its grants were made largely to local Michigan charities in which the Ford family had a particular interest. In the fall of 1948, the trustees anticipated greatly expanded resources due to the settlement of the estates of Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. Edsel Ford. They felt that to allocate this money wisely, they would have to begin by identifying those urgent human problems to the solution of which a foundation might make effective contribution.

To aid them in this task the trustees decided to appoint a study committee which would draw upon the advice of the best minds of the country. The committee's task was to define and examine the most pressing needs and to recommend a policy and program to the trustees. I was asked by the trustees to organize and direct that committee.

The study committee agreed at the outset that its purpose was not to compile a comprehensive catalog of projects which the foundation might undertake, but to identify the areas where problems were most serious and where the foundation might make the most significant contribution to human welfare.

This committee was hard at work for many months. We believe the conclusions and recommendations of the committee were influenced by the best judgment of our times. Hundreds of leading Americans were consulted in lengthy personal interviews. Advisers represented every major segment of American life, and every field of knowledge. The committee secured the opinions and points of view of officials in State and Federal Government, representatives of the United Nations and its affiliated agencies, business and professional leaders, and the

heads of many private organizations. Administrators and teachers of leading universities and colleges contributed generously of their time and thought. The views of military leaders and of labor were sought and obtained. Conferences were held with the heads of many small enterprises as well as those of large corporations.

Experts were asked for recommendations not only on problems within their special fields, but on more general problems as well. **Incidentally, experts from the physical and medical sciences who were consulted by the committee agreed that the most urgent needs for foundation action were in the area of the social sciences, even though attention to their own special fields might thereby be postponed.**

I would like to add that this practice of consulting the best available outside experts has since been steadfastly followed by the foundation in its operations. Each year we obtain the opinions of hundreds of consultants and advisers on the various parts of our programs.

The results of the study, including the proposed areas in which the Ford Foundation would spend its funds, were adopted by the trustees and were published and widely distributed in September, 1950. The five major areas of foundation attention announced at that time still form the basis of its program today. These can be briefly described: The foundation supports efforts to promote international understanding and peace because without peace civilization may well be doomed. It aids the strengthening of democratic institutions and processes because they are fundamental to human welfare. It helps programs to make our free economy stronger and more stable because economic health is necessary to man's attainment of his other goals. It believes that education is vital to a free people, and supports its advancement on all levels. Finally, it holds that a better understanding of man will aid his progress, and therefore supports projects to increase such knowledge.

The trustees I listed are responsible for determining policy to guide the foundation in contributing to these objectives and for approving and authorizing the specific actions undertaken in pursuit of them. They fully recognize this responsibility and spend a great deal of time carrying it out. All foundation expenditures are made pursuant to a specific grant, appropriation or authorization by the trustees. The trustees establish and review the procedures for following up the results of grants. They select the foundation's principal policy-making personnel and review operating procedures, including those for the selection and supervision of other personnel.

Formal meetings of the trustees are held at least quarterly, and each lasts at least 2 days. Prior to each meeting, the trustees receive a comprehensive docket setting forth the background of each proposal scheduled for consideration at that meeting, including such details as the history, organization, and operations of the proposed grantee, the qualifications of the personnel involved, and the comments of advisers used in the development of the project. Between formal meetings, the other officers and I frequently consult with individual trustees to review new proposals or consider operating matters. Ad hoc committees of the trustees are established to deal with special program or administrative matters from time to time. Such a committee may continue work on a major grant from its preliminary stage, before it is ever incorporated in a docket, until the grant has been completed and



the followup action is taken. In addition, most of the trustees are members of either the executive or finance committees, which meet often with the chairman, Mr. Ford, and with me.

The trustees of the Ford Foundation take their responsibilities most seriously. They feel deeply that the purpose of their effort is the advancement of the public welfare and that the resources of the foundation are devoted to the public interest.

At the same time, they are responsible for the management of an organization which is private, independent, nonpolitical and non-governmental. The philosophy which pervades their actions rests squarely on the American concept of private initiative and free enterprise. They are guided always by the responsibility to act in the public interest, but as private individuals operating a private organization they must accept the full responsibility for their decisions. To this end they have formulated a number of general policies. I would like to mention four in particular:

First, the foundation's funds can be given only for scientific, educational and charitable purposes. These are its charter purposes and are the permissible areas of operation for tax-exempt organizations. All of its private domestic grantee organizations are themselves exempt from Federal income taxes under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. As representatives of the Internal Revenue Service testified to this committee, no un-American, subversive, or political organization can receive or retain this exemption privilege. Foundation operating policy and procedures assure that its funds will not go for un-American or subversive activities, or for propaganda or for attempts to influence legislation. After I have described the program of the foundation, I believe it will be clear that the activities supported by the foundation adhere strictly to basic American traditions and principles. It should also be clear that these activities are not propagandistic or partisan even though they involve subjects which are from time to time in the area of public debate and controversy. Propaganda and partisanship are excluded from research and educational activities by the high standards of objectivity and scholarship which the foundation insists upon in its grantees.

Second, the foundation has to have a program so that it can select from thousands of applications those relatively few it can support with its limited resources. The Ford Foundation endeavors to make grants only for those projects which clearly embrace one or more of the program objectives I have outlined. Projects must be sponsored and conducted by reliable organizations and competent persons. By its program the Ford Foundation concentrates dollars and efforts upon what are felt to be important needs instead of scattering its funds inadequately and wastefully over a large number of projects.

Third, the foundation tries to administer its gifts in ways which give general strength to its grantees—schools, colleges, and other private organizations—in addition to helping accomplish the particular purposes of its grants.

Fourth, the foundation seeks new opportunities for service arising from changing needs and conditions. It continuously reexamines its program and plans. Its arrangements with its grantees are such that the foundation retains the freedom to change its own program or to shift emphasis within its program.

I believe that the foundation's adherence to these general policies, as shown by the detailed record of its operations, answers the allegations of the staff and its witnesses. It also answers the major questions with which this committee is concerned.

#### HOW A GRANT IS MADE

The board of trustees makes the grants of the Ford Foundation. The only exception is a very limited number of small grants which I am authorized by the trustees to make when emergency needs arise between meetings of the board. I make no recommendation to the board on grants without first getting the advice of the officers of the foundation, which is based on extensive staff studies and reports.

The vice presidents and secretary constitute a program committee which meets several times a week and reports to me its findings on every grant proposal. This involves not only an appraisal of the proposed project but a careful inquiry into the qualifications of the agency conducting it.

If a project is approved by me for recommendation to the board, it is then fully analyzed in materials supplied to the trustees for their study well in advance of their meetings. Rejections of important proposals are also reviewed by the board of trustees.

In voting to support an activity, the trustees specify such terms and conditions as they think necessary for its efficient execution.

Let me give you an example of the processing of a grant:

At their last meeting the trustees voted to make a grant of \$500,000 to the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania for a study of consumer expenditures, income, and savings in the United States. This action was the culmination of months of study, investigation, and consultation by the foundation's staff; of a careful appraisal of the results of this work by several trustees individually before their meeting; and of discussion and inquiry at the meeting itself.

The proposal had originated 6 months earlier. At a cost of more than \$1 million, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics had gathered data on consumer behavior in interviews with 12,500 families in 91 cities. The original purpose was to revise and improve the Consumers' Price Index. This initial purpose was fulfilled, but Government funds were not available to finance additional analysis of the data which would be of great usefulness to economists, sociologists, and marketing and advertising experts. A general public benefit would also accrue, since economists are generally agreed that a greater knowledge of consumer behavior would be useful in understanding and minimizing fluctuations in the economy as a whole.

The desirability of tabulating and further analyzing the data was initially brought to the attention of the Ford Foundation by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in December 1953. In January 1954, members of the foundation staff discussed the project in greater detail with Mrs. Aryness J. Wickens, Deputy Commissioner of Labor Statistics, and Mr. Robert Behlow, the Bureau's Coordinator of special projects. It was decided that Mrs. Wickens would hold a series of conversations with various universities to explore the possibility of a cooperative project. As a result, the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania was selected to participate in the project.

In April 1954, the Wharton School, with the assistance of the Bureau, submitted to the foundation a detailed proposal on the project's scope, general purposes, and uses. They submitted descriptions of the source of books of basic data to be prepared by the Bureau and of research studies to be undertaken by the Bureau, the Wharton School, and faculty personnel of the University of Michigan, Yale University, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology. They also gave details of a proposed budget for the project, in addition to many other exhibits and schedules.

The foundation then sent copies of the proposal to seven independent, outside experts for their appraisal.

Dr. Neil H. Jacoby, member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; Dean E. T. Grether, School of Business Administration, University of California (Berkeley);

Professor Bertrand Fox, director of research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University;

Professor Theodore Schultz, department of economics, University of Chicago; Professor George Katona, program director, survey research center, University of Michigan;

Dr. Ralph A. Young, director of research, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; and

Professor Franco Modigliani, School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

The consensus of this group was very favorable and resulted in constructive suggestions for the conduct of the project.

The validity of the sample used by the Bureau in assembling the original data was the subject of consultation with three experts on sample design:

J. Stevens Stock, Alfred Politz Research, Inc.;

Vergil D. Reed, vice president, J. Walter Thompson Co.; and

W. Edwards Deming, Bureau of the Budget and New York University.

These men all endorsed the sample used.

Conferences were then held with those who would be responsible for conducting the project:

Dean C. Canby, Balderston, the Wharton School;

Dr. Dorothy Brady, Chief, Division of Prices and Cost of Living, Bureau of Labor Statistics;

Dr. Irwin Friend, professor of finance, University of Pennsylvania; and

Dr. Raymond T. Bowman, professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania.

The proposed budget was carefully examined, and it was found possible to provide for nearly all the main points of the project even though the requested funds were reduced from \$688,150 to \$500,000.

During April the vice president responsible for economic development and administration programs and the staff member who had assisted him in investigating and preparing the proposal presented it to the foundation's program committee, where it was the subject of a series of meetings. The committee approved it and transmitted it to me. I reviewed it, approved it, and asked the secretary to summarize the proposal, with my recommendation, for inclusion in the docket being prepared for the trustees' May meeting. After this and prior to the meeting, the proposal was the subject of several discussions be-

tween individual trustees and various officers of the foundation. At the meeting, the proposal was repeated by oral summary; and, after discussion, the trustees voted a grant for the project.

#### RELATIONSHIPS WITH GRANTEES

The Ford Foundation is almost entirely a grant-making institution. While it occasionally administers activities directly, by far the major part of its program consists of the gift of money to others. From the outset the trustees adopted the policy of avoiding direct operations wherever practicable. Among other results, this policy makes a large operating staff unnecessary. It guarantees a wide and continuing representation of many different viewpoints. It enables the foundation to take advantage of the specializations offered by various existing institutions. It retains flexibility for the foundation. Finally, it enables the foundation to strengthen the grantees themselves and to support that multiplicity of educational and scientific organizations which is in itself necessary in a free society.

*Direct grants.*—A considerable part of the foundation's program is in the form of direct grants to colleges, universities, or other operating institutions. Such grants are made after careful consideration of the merits of proposals and also of the qualifications of the individual or organization that would carry it out.

Once a grant is made to support a project, full responsibility is placed upon the grantee for its effective execution subject to the terms and conditions of the grant. Within those limits, the foundation makes no attempt to direct the detailed administration of the project, influence its course, or control its results. Of course, it follows up to determine that the funds are properly expended for the purposes of the grant and to learn what has been accomplished. But discharging this responsibility is to be carefully distinguished in every way from the domination or direction of grantees.

*"Intermediaries."*—A formulation sometimes finds it useful to work through an independent outside agency in administering a program. There is nothing sinister or mysterious about the use of such agencies—which are sometimes called "intermediaries"—nor do they constitute bottlenecks or centers of control. They often take care of the administration of projects involving several operating agencies, such as a program of coordinated study by several universities. Their service to foundations provides a practical business solution to a variety of operating problems.

The Social Science Research Council, for example, performs the valuable function of bringing together individuals of common scholarly or technical interest and serves as a clearing house of information. Many scholarly organizations serve as foundation intermediaries and fill a real need for interuniversity and intergroup organization. Such agencies are indispensable if rapid development of education and research is to continue.

When the services of an intermediary are needed, the Ford Foundation prefers to support a competent agency that is already established in the field and let it deal directly with other groups and individuals in the selection and support of individual projects. Sometimes, however, qualified intermediary organizations to carry out a particular kind of program do not exist, and in such cases the foundation coop-

erates in establishing a new organization to fill the need. Six such independent grant-making organizations have been established: The Fund for the Advancement of Education; the Fund for Adult Education; East European Fund, Inc.; the Fund for the Republic, Inc.; Resources for the Future, Inc.; and Intercultural Publications, Inc.

Each of these organizations has its own independent board of directors, and its own staff. I make reference to these particular intermediaries at this point because it allows me to clear up a confusion reflected in the views of some witnesses in these proceedings. It is often assumed that the staff members of these organizations are employees of the Ford Foundation, which they are not; or that their detailed administration is my responsibility or that of the foundation's trustees, which it is not. The trustees are fully acquainted with their proposed programs, but these intermediary organizations are responsible for the selection of projects to carry out those programs. They are not subsidiaries or divisions of the Ford Foundation. Their creation enabled the foundation to focus the special skills and competence of their respective organizations on detailed and technical activities in specific areas. It gave broad representation to new viewpoints. It tended to decentralize rather than to centralize administration of projects. And it enabled the foundation to remain a small and flexible organization. The performance of these organizations has confirmed the soundness of the trustees' judgment in establishing them.

#### EXAMPLES OF FORD FOUNDATION PROJECTS

I turn now to examples of projects the Ford Foundation has supported since 1950 when it began full-scale operations.

During the period January 1951 to December 31, 1953, we committed a total of approximately \$119 million. Of this sum, about \$87,500,000 went to United States institutions operating within the United States, and another \$19 million went to the United States institutions operating abroad. The amount that went directly to foreign institutions was \$12,500,000.

Every cent of this money has been spent for one ultimate purpose—a stronger American society and a stronger free world. Within this broad purpose the grants made have been directed towards 1 or more of the 5 program objectives announced by the trustees in 1950. The full list of foundation grants has, of course, been made available to this committee and to the general public.

#### *Support of education*

The Ford Foundation has spent the largest share of its funds since 1950 in the field of education. Indeed, the support of education in the broader sense encompasses most of our activities. The foundation's assistance for research and training in foreign policy and world affairs, for the study of human behavior, for work on problems in economic development and administration, for broader understanding and better functioning of free institutions, has all, in a sense, been aid to education—education directed to the development of the free and self-reliant mind and the growth of the human spirit.

In its approach to problems of education, the foundation does not attempt to promote any particular point of view. It is governed by the belief that in democratic countries there should be no single school

of thought concerning education and no central point of control, either in the hands of government or in the hands of some private group. We believe that our public-school systems must remain under decentralized control and that our private schools, colleges, and universities must retain their independence. To whatever extent our schools are drawn under central control, our democracy is to that extent weakened.

We believe also that our dual system of private and tax-supported institutions of higher education must be preserved. Despite the excellence of our State colleges and universities and the extensive diversity of their control, we regard the continuance of private colleges and universities as a most important national obligation.

Within this century the demands made upon these various institutions have been immense. The number of our young people attending college has increased almost tenfold; there are today some 2¼ million students in college. The growth of the demands on both elementary and secondary schools has been no less spectacular.

An enormous burden has correspondingly been thrown upon the teaching profession, and upon the administrative structure and facilities of our schools and universities. Intensifying this strain have been such other factors as the growing complexity of industrial life, with its requirements for training in vocational skills, and the dislocations resulting from the draft.

The trustees' appraisal of the opportunities for foundation action in advancing education brought them to the conclusion that two independent nonprofit organizations should be established to deal with some of the complex problems in education today. These were created in March 1951 and are headed by distinguished boards of directors. One is the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the purpose of which is to encourage and improve formal or institutional education, and which is under the chairmanship of Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The other, the Fund for Adult Education, has been established to support education for those whose formal schooling is finished, and is under the chairmanship of Clarence Francis, until recently chairman of the board of General Foods Corp.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education concentrates upon five major educational objectives. These are—

Clarifying the function of the various parts of the educational system so they can work together more effectively;

Improving the preparation of teachers at all levels of the education system;

Improving curricula;

Developing increased financial support for educational institutions; and

Equalizing educational opportunity.

As of the end of 1953, the foundation had made grants aggregating \$30,850,580 to this fund. The fund, in turn, had disbursed \$22,242,568 for the benefit of hundreds of colleges, school systems, and teachers throughout all of the 48 States.

As of December 31, 1953, grants of \$22,400,000 had been made to the Fund for Adult Education. After an initial period of surveys and experimentation, the fund's program was devoted largely to adult study and discussion activities involving the collaboration of a great many voluntary groups and associations.

Of the foregoing sum, \$9 million was granted to help extend and develop educational television. The fund offered to match money raised locally for building and operating educational television stations in about thirty cities and university centers. Stations already are on the air with fund assistance in Madison, Wis.; San Francisco, Calif.; East Lansing, Mich.; and Pittsburgh, Pa., and others soon will be operating. With help from the fund, a center to produce and exchange program materials for these stations has been established at Ann Arbor, Mich.

The foundation has felt from the beginning that it should try to help develop the educational possibilities of standard television. Through its TV-radio workshop, the foundation supports the production of OMNIBUS, a 90-minute television program designed to demonstrate that commercial television may serve as a cultural and educational medium and still attract a large audience.

#### *Peace and international understanding*

Throughout most of their history, the religious spirit and humanitarian motives of the American people have led them to give help to people abroad. In more recent years, the recognition has grown that such help is also in our enlightened self-interest, since our own freedoms and even our survival can now depend on happenings thousands of miles from our shores. Because of this recognition the American people are carrying unprecedented burdens in an effort to establish a just peace throughout the world. In this effort the Ford Foundation feels it can as a private agency play a small but significant role.

In its international activities, the Ford Foundation supports three kinds of projects: foreign economic development, research and training in overseas problems, and educational activity on international affairs.

*Economic development.*—These projects are concentrated in South and Southeast Asia and the Middle East. The emerging powers in these areas are important to the United States and to the free world. Their choice between the democratic forms of government they prefer and the totalitarian forms which threaten them, depends largely upon their ability to make political and economic progress. The trustees have responded to requests of governments and private institutions in these areas for assistance in the production of food, in improving the techniques of village industry and in basic education. In India, for example, aid has been given to the Allahabad Agricultural Institute, which is supported by 5 American and 2 British religious organizations, to train a group of leaders who can teach better agricultural techniques in the villages. In Pakistan, the foundation has helped to establish a polytechnic institute and industrial training center, to ease the acute shortage of mechanically skilled workers in that country. In the Middle East, aid has been given the American University in Beirut for creation and support of an experimental farm and applied agricultural research program.

*Overseas training and research.*—The trustees recognized that the United States, in exercising its responsibilities of world leadership, has been handicapped by inadequate knowledge of other parts of the world and by a dearth of trained people. They decided, therefore, to support research and training projects on foreign areas in American universities for at least 5 years. The University of Michigan,

for example, received a grant last year under which a number of graduate students was taken to the Near and Middle East for field training under faculty supervision. Another example was the grant to the Hoover Institute and Library at Stanford University to improve its collection of materials on Asia and the Near and Middle East.

*Educational activities on international problems.*—If our capacity to work toward peace is to be increased, there must be a broad base of public understanding of international problems both in the United States and abroad. The trustees, therefore, have authorized the support of a variety of educational activities involving the dissemination of information and knowledge through voluntary organizations, publications, and other media. A grant to the Council on Foreign Relations, for example, enabled it to organize a study group on United States-Soviet Union relations composed of business and industrial leaders, scientists and scholars, to analyze the issues in conflict between the free nations and the Soviet Union. The foundation also has facilitated the travel and interchange of scholars and others, such as 4-H Club leaders, to increase their general understanding of international affairs.

In response to a special opportunity to strengthen an outpost of freedom surrounded by Soviet-controlled territory, the foundation has made grants to build a library and lecture hall at the Free University of Berlin, which was established following the war by students and teachers who fled the Communist-dominated university in the Soviet sector of the city.

Sometimes our efforts in distant parts of the world are misconstrued. For example, a well-known newscaster said a few months ago:

The Ford Foundation has allocated 250,000 American dollars to the American Council of Learned Societies for the study of Telegu. It has handed over a quarter of a million dollars for the study of Telegu, which is a neglected oriental language spoken mainly in Hyderabad India \* \* \* If the disturbed dead could turn in their graves, Old Henry would be whirling tonight.

Actually, only a few thousand dollars of the total grant went for work on Telegu. But more important than that are the following facts: Telegu is today the language of more than 30 millions of Indians. Most of them live in Andhra on the eastern coast of India. It is true that the language has been neglected—by us, but not by the Russians. Telegu-language publications from Moscow are distributed every day. There is a Russian-Telegu dictionary. There is no comparable English dictionary. The Ford Foundation believes it is money well spent to help bridge the language gap between the United States and those millions of Indians.

Neither the laws of this country nor the articles of incorporation of the foundation prohibit or limit philanthropic activity abroad, and such activity is in keeping with some of the finest traditions of American life. It is also in line with the policies of the American Government, which is carrying on large-scale assistance programs in foreign areas.

In working abroad, the activities of a foundation must be consistent with the established goals of our Government; and our operating procedures and policies assure such consistency. But a foundation cannot become a mere tool of Government policy, or it will certainly end by



compromising both the Government and itself and diminishing the effectiveness of its own activity.

Operating in countries on the border of the Communist world, as we do, has its risks. These are sectors where Communist and democratic ideas are in conflict every day. The foundation has not, of course, worked in Communist countries, and we would withdraw our support from a country the minute a Communist takeover appeared inevitable. But we are willing to enter the fight to help people protect their freedom—even though at times the tide seems to be running against them, even though their country may not do everything exactly to our liking. The alternative is to leave the battlefield to communism.

*The strengthening of democratic institutions*

The Ford Foundation hopes to strengthen democratic institutions and processes because they are fundamental to the advancement of human welfare. In considering how to work toward this vitally important objective, the trustees and their advisers have had to assess the stresses and strains put upon American democracy by the upheavals of the first half of this century and especially by the internal and external threats of communism. In this connection the trustees decided after many months of careful staff work and consultation to establish the Fund for the Republic, Inc. This new, independent, nonpartisan organization, devoted to the problem of achieving security with freedom and justice, has received \$15 million from the foundation. I am submitting a separate report on the details of this fund's establishment as supplement B to this statement.

The trustees in analyzing our democratic strengths and weaknesses were led to a consideration of interracial relations. To increase the Negro's opportunity for education, the foundation made a grant of \$1 million to the United Negro College Fund, Inc.

We have been concerned with the need for improving the administration of criminal justice. To this end a grant of \$50,000 was made to the American Bar Foundation, created by the American Bar Association.

Three groups seeking to improve the efficiency of Government at all levels have been supported: The National Civil Service League, the National Municipal League, and the Public Administration Clearing House.

Underlying their consideration of this part of the program was an awareness on the part of the trustees of the need for a widespread understanding of American ideals and traditions. They therefore have supported a number of important activities directed toward this end, in addition to the Fund for the Republic. The Advertising Council, Inc., received \$50,000, matched by funds from other sources, for a restatement of our national beliefs and ideals. Through the fund for Adult Education, \$500,000 went to the American Library Association to provide opportunities and materials for study and discussion of the basic national documents, ideas and experiences that constitute the American heritage. Almost 300 groups in 28 States are already participating in this program. Again through this fund, over a million dollars of foundation money went into the development of recorded educational radio programs. The first of these—a series of 13—dramatized the life and work of Thomas Jefferson and was broadcast over 168 stations throughout the Nation. The National Broadcasting

Co. in cooperation with the National Association of Educational Broadcasters adapted a part of the series for television, and the scripts were also published in book form.

### *The behavioral sciences*

All the areas of the foundation's program concern the behavior of human beings. Clearly, the success of efforts to eliminate war, to strengthen free societies and to lift civilization to higher levels depends upon man's better understanding of himself. We recognize that our present knowledge of human behavior is inadequate, and that there are too few people capable of adding to this knowledge or even able to apply effectively what is now known.

The foundation's interest in this field is in no sense diminished by the difficulties which men face in the advance toward knowledge of human behavior, and by the fact that quick results are not to be expected. Here again is an area of effort that appears peculiarly appropriate to a foundation. Societies make progress when they can invest substantial resources in the acquisition of knowledge and in the training of scientists and scholars, and when they have faith that the investment will ultimately yield worthwhile returns. The foundation shares the faith of this country in scientific knowledge and education. In promoting the study of man it has confidence that the institutions and scholars it supports will in the long run contribute to the solution of many of man's problems.

The foundation's program to increase understanding of human behavior includes grants to universities and other educational organizations (1) to improve the competence of behavioral scientists and scholars; (2) to improve the sciences and disciplines which are concerned with behavior; (3) to improve the methods employed by the universities and scholars in scientific research and training; and (4) to strengthen the basic resources of universities and colleges that are engaged in training and research in human behavior.

### *Economic development*

Another major objective of the Ford Foundation is to help keep our economy viable and stable because economic health is necessary to man's attainment of his other goals. In developing this program and in screening the many worthwhile applications submitted to the foundation, the trustees and officers have sought the advice of numerous American businessmen and economists. The grant to the Wharton School described earlier is an example of one of the ways in which the foundation is attempting to enhance our economic strength by assisting research and training in our educational institutions.

Another type of activity was the establishment of Resources for the Future, Inc., an independent agency concerned with the whole problem of wise use of our national resources. This agency sponsored the Mid-Century Conference, which was held in Washington last year, to discuss various aspects of the conservation, development, and use of our resources. More than 1,500 persons, including the President of the United States, took part. Here many different views, including those of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and Government, converged and often conflicted. The nonpartisan sponsorship of the conference and the objective methods by which it was conducted show how a foundation can properly support activities on subjects that are often controversial.

Manpower is a critical national resource, and as such is another subject of interest to the foundation. In the present period of preparedness we must obviously make the maximum use of our manpower. The foundation has provided substantial support to Columbia University for the National Manpower Council, established in 1951.

Other projects looking toward economic development and political stability, particularly in the newer nations of the free world, have received substantial support by grants to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The foregoing outline of some of the activities of the Ford Foundation suggests the scope and character of our program as of today, after 3½ years of expanded operations. We expect this program continually to evolve as conditions change. As old problems come nearer to solution and new problems arise, the foundation must be able to respond and move in new directions. We will make mistakes, and may incur criticism. But our usefulness is really at an end if ever we become more interested in playing it safe than in serving humanity.

#### CONCLUSION

The Ford Foundation is a young foundation. It took its place among the large philanthropic organizations with its expanded program only in 1950. But even though it is still in the formative period of finding the most effective ways to serve the public welfare, it has had the opportunity and privilege to meet thousands of people, including representatives of hundreds of private organizations that are dedicated to the common good. It has therefore had an unusual opportunity to observe American private philanthropy in action, and to become acquainted with the people who run the organizations that constitute important parts of philanthropy. It has also had the opportunity to study the benefactions which flow in increasing volume from philanthropy to education, science, and charity.

The trustees and officers of the Ford Foundation, therefore, have no hesitancy in defending the institutions and individuals that make up American private philanthropy. We attach great importance to the successful defense of private philanthropy in America because it is an important exercise of the rights of private association and private action, and we have seen the collapse of free forms of society where such rights are curtailed. We think the public interest has not been served through the attacks which within the last 2 years have twice been leveled on so vital a part of our free and democratic system.

To date the record of this committee, because of its almost complete preoccupation with alleged shortcomings of foundations, has virtually ignored the great contributions of foundations to the public welfare. To leave the record in this imbalance would be inconsistent with this committee's declared purpose of conducting a fair inquiry.

The Ford Foundation respectfully submits that this committee has an unusual opportunity to render a great service at the time it makes its report to the Congress:

First, it can dispel public misunderstanding by denouncing all irresponsible testimony given in its public hearings insinuating that foundations have been party to a subversive conspiracy;

Second, it can restate and reaffirm the vital role of private philanthropy in America and in the free world;

Third, it can encourage the maintenance and growth of conditions under which philanthropy can flourish as an integral and indispensable part of the total American democratic system; and

Fourth, it can testify to all the adherence of the vast part of American philanthropy to the law, to public policy, and to our national objectives.

We hope that the committee will choose this constructive course.

#### SUPPLEMENT A

#### REPLY BY THE FORD FOUNDATION TO ALLEGATIONS DIRECTED SPECIFICALLY AGAINST IT CONTAINED IN THE RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE'S PUBLIC HEARINGS TO DATE

During the course of this investigation, several statements have been made attacking purposes, personnel and programs of the Ford Foundation. These statements or allegations appear in the speech of Mr. Reece before the House of Representatives on July 27, 1953, when he presented House Resolution 217, which speech has now been repeated in the record of this committee; in reports subsequently prepared by the committee staff; and in the testimony of certain witnesses.

Except for a few miscellaneous criticisms, these allegations follow two general themes: that certain present or former employees of the foundation are of "dubious" loyalty, and that certain grants have been made to individuals or organizations of questionable loyalty or for questionable purposes.

We believe the record of this committee's hearings does not substantiate these allegations. An examination of the press releases of the committee and the transcript of the hearings strongly suggests that many of the allegations—having been made perhaps carelessly or for partisan purposes—have now been forgotten, if not actually disavowed, by their authors.

We recognize therefore that it is not necessary to deal with all these allegations as if they were well-documented and seriously intended. Indeed it is impossible to deal with all the innuendoes and implications, for often the statements are vague and ambiguous; and it seems unnecessary to bother with those clearly irrelevant to the scope of the inquiry, as for example the farfetched charge that the Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations have violated the antitrust laws.

Nevertheless, we believe that the dignity and prestige of the Congress give even trivial and baseless comments a certain standing once they become part of the official record. It is our hope, by presentation of the following information, to set the record right and, insofar as we are able, to prevent further undeserved injury to the individuals and institutions concerned.

#### I. CHARGES REGARDING THE LOYALTY OF CERTAIN PRESENT OR FORMER EMPLOYEES

We state for the record as follows:

1. Since the beginning of full-scale operations in 1950, the Ford Foundation has hired several hundred full-time, part-time and temporary employees, consultants and advisers. To the best of our knowledge and information, the record does not contain a single instance of anyone having been hired in any capacity by the Ford Foundation

who had ever been a member of the Communist Party or of any other subversive organization.

2. In the hiring of personnel, the foundation follows the practices of any well-managed private organization. A careful investigation is made of the competence, character and integrity of all potential employees before they are hired. Regular supervision is of course exercised over employees after they are hired, and in no instance to date has any incident arisen or any information been discovered leading us to doubt the loyalty of any employee.

3. Based on the foregoing, we believe the officers and staff of the Ford Foundation are, without exception, men and women of competence, integrity and loyalty.

The foundation has carefully reviewed the allegations which have been placed in the record of this investigation against various of its employees. In general the allegations involve no more than legitimate differences of opinion between the person criticized and the critic. But by the clever use of innuendo, the suggestion is conveyed that there is something "dubious" if not actually subversive about the person with whom the critic disagrees.

Without exception, we reject the insinuations made in the record of the hearings of this committee to date that certain Ford Foundation employees are disloyal or subversive. Based on our investigations we believe these insinuations are erroneous and without substance. We are forced to the conclusion that the purpose in giving circulation to the allegations and to the material offered in their support was to cast doubt upon the loyalty of men against whom no real evidence was available, and thereby to reflect doubt upon the purposes and character of the Ford Foundation.

In reaffirming the foundation's confidence in the loyalty and competence of the men involved, it is not intended to say that all they have ever said or done, or all they may say or do in the future, necessarily represents foundation policy. They are men of standing and ability. Like all citizens, they have their views on public issues, and as free citizens they have the right to express them. If the committee wishes to question any of these persons further, we are certain they would be happy to provide whatever information is requested, and the committee should feel free to call upon them directly.

*Case No. 1: Mr. Bernard Berelson*

*Allegation.*—On pages 90–91 of the transcript<sup>1</sup> of these hearings,<sup>2</sup> the following statement appears:

Bernard Berelson is the director of the Ford Foundation's behavioral sciences division, which has just been allotted \$3,500,000 for the creation of a center for advanced study in behavioral sciences which will consider social relations in human behavior. Berelson, while on the faculty of the University of Chicago, served on a committee to welcome the Red Dean of Canterbury, the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, world renowned apologist for communism who sports a Soviet decoration for his work in behalf of his Kremlin masters. The welcoming committee for the Red Dean of Canterbury was organized under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, an agency which has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States.

<sup>1</sup> References to the transcript of hearings throughout are to stenographic transcript prepared by Alderson Reporting Co., Washington, D. C.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

Mr. Berelson joined the staff of the foundation in July 1951. At the present time he is the director of the behavioral sciences program of the foundation.

Mr. Berelson is a social scientist of national reputation, who in the course of his career has been research director of the bureau of applied social research at Columbia University and dean of the Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago. He is a past president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. He is the author of several books and numerous articles of acknowledged scientific merit.

In connection with the reference made to him in the record of these hearings Mr. Berelson states that:

(a) He is not nor has he ever been a member of or in any way affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

(b) He is not and has never been a member of any organization cited by the Attorney General as subversive.

(c) He has never served on any welcoming committee for the Dean of Canterbury sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship or by any other organization.

In connection with the incident mentioned, he states:

I recall signing a petition at the University of Chicago sometime between 1949 and 1951, asking the State Department to reconsider its adverse ruling on the Dean of Canterbury's application for a visa to enter this country, and to grant the dean such a visa.

I was not endorsing the dean's views, but merely expressing my belief that the United States in cases such as this should not place itself before the world in the ridiculous posture of appearing fearful of ideas with which we as a Nation do not agree.

This is the closest I ever came to "serving" on any committee concerning the dean and I have never seen or heard the dean.

#### *Case No. 2: Dr. Philip E. Mosely*

*Allegation.*—On page 91 of the transcript of these hearings,<sup>1</sup> the following reference appears:

The East European fund was established by the Ford Foundation, is financed by it and deals with issues relating to the Soviet Union and its European satellites, and particularly with the settlement and adjustment of Soviet refugees who have come to the United States. The president of this fund is Dr. Philip E. Mosely, who is also director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University. Some years ago Professor Mosely made the following evaluation of the Soviet Union in a pamphlet he wrote for the Foreign Policy Association, also supported by foundations: "Over the long run, great numbers of people will judge both the Soviet and American systems, not by how much individual freedom they preserve but by how much they contribute, in freedom or without it, to develop a better livelihood and a greater feeling of social fulfillment."

Garet Garrett, editor of American Affairs, said that this is straight Communist Party ideology: "It means only that pure Communist ideology may be thus imparted by Columbia University's Russian Institute through the Foreign Policy Association."

Dr. Mosely, who is an eminent scholar and authority on the policies of the Soviet Union, has been president of the East European fund since January 1952. The fund is an independent corporation established and financed by the Ford Foundation. One of its purposes is to help refugees from the Soviet Union to make reasonable economic, social and cultural adjustments to American life.

Dr. Mosely's special knowledge has been drawn upon repeatedly by our Government. For example, in 1951-52 he appeared at the request of the Attorney General of the United States as a principal expert witness in an action brought before the Subversive Activities

Control Board to compel the Communist Party of the United States to register as a Communist-action organization under the Subversive Activities Control Act. The report of the Subversive Activities Control Board in this case, Senate Document No. 41, 83d Congress, 1st session, dated April 20, 1953, reads in part as follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD

Dr. Philip E. Mosely, professor of international relations at Columbia University and director of the university's Russian Institute, was petitioner's principal witness for the purpose of establishing that respondent's (Communist Party of the United States—CPUSA) views and policies do not deviate from those of the Soviet Union. Dr. Mosely has had a distinguished and active career in the field of international relations, and for more than 20 years has devoted his research primarily to Russian political and diplomatic history. While so doing, he has had occasion to analyze carefully the publications and other documents issued by respondent and the Soviet Union. He is eminently qualified to testify as an expert on evidence relative to the "nondeviation" criterion of the act.

Dr. Mosely's testimony traced the continuing stream of international questions upon which both the Soviet Union and the CPUSA have announced a position. He enumerated some 45 international questions of major import, extending over the past 30 years, with respect to which there was, as revealed by his testimony, no substantial difference between the position announced on each by the Soviet Union or its official and controlled organs and that announced by the CPUSA or its official and controlled organs.

In connection with his appearance in this case, a list of some 88 major publications by Dr. Mosely on subjects relating to Soviet policy was submitted to establish his qualifications as an expert.

With reference to the allegations made against him in the record of this investigation, the original source of the single criticized sentence, quoted out of context and twisted out of its original meaning, is Dr. Mosely's Face to Face with Russia, No. 70 of the headline series of the Foreign Policy Association, Inc., published on August 20, 1948.

The sentence quoted cannot be understood except in the context of the four preceding sentences and the single sentence following it in the original pamphlet:

As we have seen, most of the problems we face in dealing with the Soviet Union are not direct Soviet-American problems, but are rather problems in third areas. The problem of Iran is not solely whether Soviet influence will dominate there, or whether British-plus-American influence will balance Soviet pressure. It is whether Iran can develop its resources and reshape its social and political structure to survive in the modern world. The same problems, written even larger, confront India, China, Indonesia, and the Arab East.

Over the long run great numbers of people will judge both the Soviet and American systems, not by how much individual freedom they preserve, but by how much they contribute, in freedom or without it, to develop a better livelihood and a greater feeling of social fulfillment. The shape and purpose we give to our dealings with peoples in the non-Soviet world will determine whether American leadership continues to be acceptable to them (pp. 51-52).

The point of view expressed in these two paragraphs is that which underlies the point 4 program to assist the economic and social development of the underdeveloped countries and thereby to influence their political orientation in a way favorable to the free world and therefore to the interests of the United States.

In addition to the direct allegation against Dr. Mosely quoted above, reference was made (p. 92, Reece hearings transcript)<sup>1</sup> to the fact that Dr. Mosely heads the Russian Institute at Columbia University, of which Philip C. Jessup and Ernest J. Simmons were identified as board members. If the implication is that Dr. Mosely is

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

somehow suspect because of his association either with the institute or these two men, or both, we believe it is pertinent to note that the institute is being used as a center to train United States Army, Air Force, and Navy officers as well as State Department personnel. It seems to us unlikely that such functions would be entrusted to the institute if the Government had any question relating to its security.

*Case No. 3: Mr. Bernard L. Gladieux*

A number of allegations have been made concerning Mr. Gladieux in the record of these hearings (pp. 92-96, Reece hearings transcript).<sup>1</sup> These are enumerated and specifically refuted in a statement which Mr. Gladieux has prepared and signed under oath. He has asked that the committee accept this statement, which is being submitted herewith, as part of its record. Mr. Gladieux has also stated that if the committee wishes to ask him to appear and testify, he will be glad to comply.

Mr. Gladieux has been a member of the staff of the Ford Foundation continuously from November 1950, until the present. He was originally employed on the basis of an outstanding record of service as a Government official and on the highest recommendation of responsible people. The foundation believes that Mr. Gladieux's statement speaks for itself. We have had close contact with him during his 3½ years of service with us, and there is nothing in his record of service to make us doubt his character, his integrity, or his complete loyalty. Based on the foregoing, we believe that the accusations which have been made against him in the record of the hearings before this committee are false.

*Case No. 4: Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins*<sup>2</sup>

Concerning the allegations made in these hearings about Mr. Hutchins, there is little to add to what is already a matter of public record. He has been a leading figure in American education and public life for nearly 30 years. His views on such matters as civil liberties, academic freedom, and the right of universities to carry on their work without political interference are well known.

The foundation feels it is unnecessary to repeat what Mr. Hutchins has already stated, before the Cox committee and on other public occasions, with respect to such criticisms of his views and actions as are in the record of this investigation.

Mr. Hutchins served the foundation as an associate director from late 1950 until May 1954. No action or statement of his during that time would lead us to have the slightest doubt of his deep and complete devotion to the ideals and interests of our country.

## II. CHARGES MADE REGARDING DUBIOUS GRANTS

We state for the record as follows:

1. As a matter of policy and patriotism as well as for reasons of scientific integrity, the foundation would not make a grant to a subversive individual nor to a subversive organization.

2. The record of the foundation shows that of the hundreds of grants it has made, it has never given money to any organization on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations and that it has never made a grant to any individual known by it to be subversive.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37, 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.



3. The foundation's policies, program, and operations are controlled by its trustees, who are men of the highest patriotism, with broad managerial experience and national reputation. Foundation grants are carefully investigated before they are made, and are subsequently reviewed and evaluated.

4. Our practice of regular public reporting exposes foundation grants and policies to constant public scrutiny.

5. The entire program of the Ford Foundation is devoted to the welfare of the American people. In this positive and constructive sense, it is totally pro-American and actively antisubversive.

*Case No. 1: Alleged subversive and un-American propaganda activities*

In the record of these hearings (pp. 70-71, Reece hearings transcript)<sup>1</sup> it is stated that—

Important and extensive evidence concerning subversive and un-American propaganda activities of the Ford Foundation which was available to the (Cox) committee of the 82d Congress was not utilized. Thus the Ford Foundation—which is the wealthiest and the most influential of all foundations—was not actually investigated. In fact, the hearings on the Ford Foundation constituted merely a forum for the trustees and officers of this foundation to make speeches instead of answering specific questions regarding the many dubious grants made by them.

The above statement must also be read in light of another made at the same type (pp. 64-65, Reece hearings transcript),<sup>2</sup> in which the procedures of the Cox committee are referred to as follows:

The usual jurat was omitted. As a result of this, neither the Congress nor the people know whether these officers and trustees were telling the truth \* \* \* In view of these circumstances, much of the testimony has no more validity than common gossip, and no proper investigation has taken place.

The witnesses for the Ford Foundation before the Cox committee were Messrs. Henry Ford, II, Paul G. Hoffman, Robert M. Hutchins, and H. Rowan Gaither. These are not men whose veracity changes with place and circumstance. The suggestion that because they were then not under oath their statements had "no more validity than common gossip" is contemptible.

In the Cox investigation, the foundation was not asked to testify or submit information under oath. Had it been asked to do so, it would have readily complied. In that investigation, as in the present one, the foundation has cooperated to the fullest with staff and committee members. It has answered all questions and has provided without exception whatever information has been requested.

With reference to the statement that the Cox committee had "important and extensive evidence concerning subversive and un-American propaganda activities of the Ford Foundation," we remind this committee of the following:

1. In answering the Cox committee questionnaire, the Ford Foundation stated that it had not made grants to any organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General or, insofar as it could discover, to any individual who had ever been cited or criticized by the House Un-American Activities Committee or the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security (answers D-10 and D-14 to Cox questionnaire).

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

2. In its final report, the Cox committee came to the following conclusion:

\* \* \* It seems paradoxical that in a previous congressional investigation in 1915 the fear most frequently expressed was that the foundations would prove the instruments of vested wealth, privilege, and reaction, while today the fear most frequently expressed is that they have become the enemy of the capitalistic system. In our opinion, neither of these fears is justified. (H. Rep. 2514, 82d Congress, 2d sess., p. 10.)

It is impossible to believe that the Cox committee would have come to such a conclusion had there been any important and extensive evidence of the kind alleged.

*Case No. 2: The Fund for the Republic*

A number of statements have been made in these hearings (pp. 57, 58-59, 74, 103-105, 110, Reece hearings transcript)<sup>1</sup> to the effect that the creation of the Fund for the Republic by the Ford Foundation was an affront to the Congress; that its purpose is to investigate the Congress and interfere with the investigation of subversive activities in this country. Such criticisms are baseless.

Full public information has been made available from the start describing the actual purposes of this important undertaking. Supplement B attached summarizes the materials previously made available to this committee regarding the origins and purposes of the Fund for the Republic.

The counsel to this committee has indicated that the Fund for the Republic would be asked to make a further statement in its own behalf covering its operations to date. The foundation will provide any further information which may be reasonably required by the committee in order to aid it in disproving the charges which have been made against the fund.

*Case No. 3: The television program Assembly VI and the employment of Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.*

Mr. Schlesinger was once employed by the TV-Radio Workshop, at that time an agency of the Fund for Adult Education, a grantee of the Ford Foundation. He was hired by them to narrate Assembly VI, a television series reporting on the United Nations General Assembly meetings in Paris, November-December, 1951. It has been suggested (pp. 107-108, Reece hearings transcript)<sup>2</sup> that Mr. Schlesinger's employment as narrator for these television films was improper because of his viewpoint on certain political questions. It should be noted that even in the criticism of his views, no statement is made that Mr. Schlesinger or his viewpoint is subversive or in any way disloyal.

In any case, Mr. Schlesinger was not employed because of his political opinions, nor did his employment by the TV-Radio Workshop signify endorsement of his personal views by the Workshop. Mr. Schlesinger is a well-known author, a Pulitzer prize winner in history, and is a highly competent radio and television commentator. These are the reasons why his services were used.

The program which Mr. Schlesinger narrated was broadcast over the NBC television network and consisted of 12 weekly one-half hour programs, beginning November 10, 1951. The series received favorable public comment from critics and listeners all over the Nation. A careful review of the scripts of these programs will reveal no evidence whatever of a lack of objectivity on the part of Mr. Schlesinger. More-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 27, 40, 41, 42.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

over, except for the statements in these hearings, the foundation has never heard criticism from any source alleging bias of any kind in these programs:

*Case No. 4: Fellowship grant to Moses Finley (Finkelstein)*

On page 110 of the transcript of these hearings,<sup>1</sup> the following allegation is made:

Another example of the kind of grants the Ford Foundation makes was revealed in the testimony of William M. Canning, a former member of the faculty of the City College and of Xavier University, who said under the oath at the hearings of the Internal Security Subcommittee that Moses Finkelstein, a City College teacher and later a professor at Rutgers University under the name of Finley, was a member of the Communist Party and that recently this man received a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Finley was one of 988 winners of faculty fellowships given by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, a grantee of the Ford Foundation, to enable younger faculty members in colleges throughout the country to improve their competence in undergraduate teaching. The fellowships covered compensation as well as travel and tuition costs. The total of these awards to date has been \$5,950,000, plus travel and tuition costs. Mr. Finley's fellowship was for the academic year 1951-52, and amounted to \$4,000. He received in addition \$660 in travel expenses.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education, at the time of establishment of the faculty fellowship program in April 1951, appointed a committee on administration to administer the program. Its chairman was President Victor L. Butterfield of Wesleyan University. Other members of this committee were—

Chancellor Harvie Branscomb, Vanderbilt University  
 President Mary A. Cheek, Rockford College  
 Dean Fred C. Cole, Schools of Arts and Sciences, Tulane University  
 Dean Paul A. Dodd, College of Letters and Science, University of California at Los Angeles  
 Dean Eldon L. Johnson, School of Liberal Arts, University of Oregon  
 Chancellor Arthur H. Compton, Washington University (St. Louis, Mo.)  
 President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College  
 President Albert W. Dent, Dillard University  
 Dean William C. DeVane, Yale College, Yale University  
 Dean O. Meredith Wilson, University of Utah  
 Dean Francis Keppel, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University  
 Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, then president of Lawrence College  
 President Goodrich C. White, Emory University  
 Dr. Payson S. Wild, Jr., vice president and dean of faculties, Northwestern University

All applicants are required to have assurance by the institutions in which they are employed of their reemployment for the following academic year, and their applications have to be fully recommended by their employing institutions.

Newark College of Rutgers University was the sponsoring institution for Mr. Finley, whose project involved research in the legal history and economics of the business practices of ancient Greece.

Rutgers University endorsed him "without reservation" on the application for the fellowship. In addition, endorsements were received from several outstanding scholars of law, ancient history and Greek and Latin, testifying to Mr. Finley's abilities as a teacher and scholar.

The fellowship to Mr. Finley had been granted prior to the hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in which Mr. Finley was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

cited. Obviously, if such charges had been known at the time the grant was made, they would have been carefully investigated.

It is our understanding that there was no adverse information known to Rutgers University, the National Selection Committee or the Fund for the Advancement of Education regarding Mr. Finley at the time of his selection. The point of view reflected in the allegations which have been made in this instance would hold these non-governmental organizations culpable for a grant to an individual about whom no adverse information was known or available to a private agency at the time of the grant. This view is taken despite the fact that careful procedures have been established to assure an intelligent and objective administration of the fund's fellowship program; despite a national selection committee made up of eminent educators from all over the country; and despite the fact that the alleged error in the selections constitutes only a minute fraction of 1 percent of the total number of fellowship awards.

The foundation feels this is not a reasonable standard by which to judge Rutgers University, or the Fund for the Advancement of Education or the Ford Foundation.

*Case No. 5: Alleged "grant to a person who wants to abolish the United States"*

On page 111 of the transcript of these hearings<sup>1</sup> the following statement appears:

Another dubious grant of a different character was made to Mortimer Adler who received \$600,000 from the Ford and Mellon Foundations to set up the Institute of Philosophical Research. Professor Adler is such an ardent advocate of world government that according to the Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 29, 1945, he said: "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States."

Mr. Mortimer Adler is president and director of the Institute for Philosophical Research, which is supported jointly by grants made in June 1952, from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, a Ford Foundation grantee, and the Old Dominion Foundation. The grant to the institute by the Fund for the Advancement of Education was to provide assistance in clarifying basic philosophical and educational issues in the modern world.

Mr. Adler has described the facts about the statement attributed to him as follows:

"In October, 1945, I lectured at a small Catholic girls college in Cleveland, Ohio, the name of which I have now forgotten. The lecture was on the necessity of world government to procure world peace. In the course of the lecture, I said that just as our Founding Fathers were willing to abolish the separate and independent status of New York, Virginia, Massachusetts, etc., in order to form the more perfect union of the United States of America, so we, in our day, must be willing to abolish the separate and independent status of the United States in order to form the more perfect union of a world federal republic, constituted along democratic lines. I went on to say that the citizens of other independent states, such as England, France, and Russia, must be equally willing to abolish the separate and independent status of their states. Since I thought such willingness was very unlikely, I predicted that we would not see world government or world peace in our generation.

The next morning the Cleveland Plain Dealer reported the speech under the headline: "Adler Says: Abolish the United States." Several weeks later the story from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, with headline, was reprinted in the Congressional Record as the result of some Clevelanders' sending the clipping from the Plain Dealer to his Congressman.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 42.

Mr. Adler also has stated that the theme of his Cleveland speech was in substance identical to that of his book, *How To Think About War and Peace*, which was published in 1943 and received generally favorable reviews. Mr. Adler's views on world federalism are widely known, and, whatever one may think about that point of view, we have never heard of any serious suggestion that it is subversive.

*Case No. 6: Alleged "Grant to promote socialism"*

The foundation in these hearings (pp. 111-112, Reece hearings transcript) <sup>1</sup> has been criticized for having made a grant to the Advertising Council, Inc., because that organization published a pamphlet, *The Miracle of America*, which allegedly contains Socialist propaganda.

The Ford Foundation in July 1951, made a grant of \$50,000 to the Advertising Council, Inc., of Washington, D. C., to help finance a series of discussions by a group of prominent men of varied backgrounds to be known as the American Round Table. The purpose of these discussions was to develop a clear-cut statement of the beliefs and ideals of our free American society.

The Advertising Council is a public-service organization maintained by American business and the advertising industry to provide free national advertising in support of major public-service programs. It is an organization with a magnificent record of service to the American Government during and since the war.

Some of the wartime campaigns of the council, carried on in cooperation with the Government, were: Air-gunner recruitment; Army nurse recruitment; care of the wounded; Christmas packages for men overseas; reduction of industrial accidents; metal-scrap salvage; and victory gardens.

The postwar campaigns have included the following: Armed Forces blood-donor campaign; better schools; civil defense; ground observer corps recruitment; fight tuberculosis; get out the vote; help for hospitals; jobs for veterans; our American heritage; religion in American life ("Go to Church" campaign); and highway safety.

The members of the council are eminent Americans. The last six chairmen of its board have been:

Stuart Peabody, assistant vice president, the Borden Co. (present chairman)  
Philip L. Graham, publisher, the Washington Post and Times-Herald, Washington, D. C.

Howard J. Morgens, vice president, the Procter & Gamble Co.

Fairfax M. Cone, president, Foote, Cone & Belding

Samuel C. Gale, vice president and director of advertising and public service, General Mills, Inc.

Charles G. Mortimer, president, General Foods Corp.

President Eisenhower, in 1953, on the 10th anniversary of the council, wrote as follows:

The Advertising Council and the business concerns associated with it need no praise from me. The results of your work are obvious. The various Government departments whose programs you have done so much to forward have reason to be grateful to you. Your combined efforts have been worth many millions of dollars to our Government. And I like to think that the public spirit which has motivated you will continue to grow under this administration.

With reference to the charges contained in the record of these hearings regarding the Advertising Council, Mr. T. S. Repplier, president,

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

issued a public statement on July 29, 1953, reprinted in the Congressional Record of Friday, July 31, 1953, which stated in part:

Representative Reece mentions the council's public policy committee and states that several members of this committee have Communist-front affiliations. So far as we know, all members of this committee are Americans of unquestionable loyalty. The committee was set up as one of the checks and balances of the Advertising Council. All new programs are passed upon by the council's board; but as an additional check, they must also secure a favorable vote by three-fourths of the public policy committee. This committee was deliberately chosen to represent all phases of American life, including the major religions, business management, labor, medicine, education, social service, and so forth.

In regard to the council's booklet, *The Miracle of America*, it is dismaying to read that the Congressman regards this as a "rewrite of the British Labor-Socialist Party platform." The booklet has been praised editorially by such non-Socialist publications as *Banking*, published by the American Bankers Association, *Business Week*, the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Chicago Tribune*, and others. It was reprinted in its entirety in *Our Sunday Visitor*, a Catholic publication. The Army reprinted 55,000 copies for installations in the United States and abroad. The United States Chamber of Commerce distributed the booklet to all member chambers and urged its local use. About 140 leading American companies have purchased the booklet in bulk for distribution to their employees, including General Motors, General Electric, General Mills, Republic Steel, Standard Oil of California, Union Carbide & Carlson, Western Electric, and many other prominent American corporations who are scarcely prone to promote socialism.

It would seem that after 11 years of free service to the country in war and peace, the Advertising Council might be spared these accusations, which could only arise from inaccurate information.

*Case No. 7: Alleged grant to "pro-Communist India"*

On pages 112 and 113 of the transcript of these hearings<sup>1</sup> the following statement is made:

The Ford Foundation has singled out India for some of its largest grants and is spending millions of dollars in that nation. Is there some special significance to singling out India for large Ford Foundation grants, in view of the fact that the head of the Indian Government is more sympathetic to the Soviet Union than toward the United States, and that he wants the United States to recognize Red China and admit that Communist nation, which is slaughtering Americans in Korea, to the United Nations? I am greatly concerned with what is being done with the Ford Foundation millions in India. That nation is a potential ally of the Soviet Union, and if the Ford Foundation projects in any way are fostering a pro-Soviet attitude in India, the consequences may be disastrous for the future of America. The stakes are very high, for if India should definitely become a Soviet ally, the power of the Kremlin's block would be immeasurably increased. My fear of what the Ford Foundation might be doing in India is increased by the fact that in the case of China the activities of the Rockefeller Foundation in that nation helped, instead of hindered, the advance of communism.

As we interpret this statement, activity by the Ford Foundation in India is criticized on two grounds: (a) Because the head of the Indian Government disagrees with certain policies of the American Government; and (b) because Ford Foundation projects may have the effect of encouraging a pro-Soviet attitude in India.

With reference to the wisdom of giving American assistance to India despite the fact that India at times disagrees with some American policies, Mr. John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on April 5, 1954, said:

\* \* \* Freedom accepts diversity. The Government of India is carrying on a notable experiment in free government. It provides a striking contrast with the neighboring experiment being conducted in China by the Communist police-state system.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

We believe that it is important in the United States that India's 5-year economic plan should succeed, and that to continue to help in this is legitimately in the enlightened self-interest of the United States.

The New York Times on Monday, June 14, 1954, reported a speech of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, which is pertinent in this context, in part as follows:

Governor Dewey warned yesterday against listening to the critics of leaders in other free nations. These critics, he said, tear down the leadership of these free countries "just because their governments are not like ours."

The Governor emphasized that "we ourselves are far from perfect," and that "we had better grow up fast enough to extend to others, from France to India and from Indonesia to Britain, the same tolerance of their difficulties which we ask them to extend to us."

As to the fear that Ford Foundation projects may have the effect of encouraging a pro-Soviet attitude in India, perhaps it will be most helpful to the committee if we describe the nature and objectives of our activities in that country and the policies and procedures which have been established to insure that projects are soundly conceived and properly administered.

One of the five major objectives of the Ford Foundation, as announced by the trustees in 1950, is to contribute to the mitigation of international tensions—in short, to peace. The interest of the foundation in the possibilities for highly useful work in India began following a visit and firsthand inspection by a number of foundation officials in the summer of 1951. At the time that newly independent country was in the fourth year of its drive to raise food production and develop its resources so as to provide a more nearly adequate existence for its 375 million people. Indian leaders were keenly aware of the threat to governmental stability, and perhaps even to national independence, which continued economic distress would produce. Foundation assistance to Indian development began in late 1951.

India is a country of some 500,000 villages, in which live nearly 85 percent of the population. Much of the activity of the foundation therefore has been concentrated on problems of village and agricultural improvement. The most important projects which have been supported include the following:

1. Development projects, 1 in each of 15 major states in India. Each project includes about 100 villages. Trained Indian extension workers go into the villages and work with the people to improve agricultural practices, literacy, and public health. Full financial responsibility for these projects was assumed by the Indian Government during 1953, and the Indian Government is now actively engaged in expanding this program to include the whole of India.

2. Thirty-four centers to train a total of four to five thousand village extension workers per year. These are the grass roots teachers needed for the village development program.

3. Three public-health training centers to train 300 public-health workers annually in the methods of village health work. These trained workers in turn will teach the men who will go into the villages to help improve health conditions.

4. Publication of a farm journal for the increasing number of village farmers who are able to read.

5. A study of secondary education in India looking toward improvement in teacher training.

6. Assistance on the problem of creating new employment opportunities in agriculture and industry.

7. A number of grants to American colleges and universities for research on India. Cooperation is being encouraged between Indian and American scholars and academic institutions. Fellowships and foreign travel grants have also been made available for Americans to study in India. Through these arrangements it is hoped that knowledge and research on Indian problems will be advanced in both India and the United States.

The foundation program in India was most carefully developed. After an initial on-the-spot survey, discussions were held with a large number of American experts in government and in private life. Over a period of several months, meetings were held to obtain advice and guidance from the many voluntary American organizations with long experience in the area. Only then was an appropriation of funds made.

Once established, the program has been administered with care so as to insure effective use of the funds provided, and to guarantee it would in no way prejudice the foreign policies of this country. Views are regularly exchanged between foundation officials and United States Government agencies concerned in the giving of technical assistance in India. A resident representative is maintained by the foundation in New Delhi who follows the day-to-day progress of programs, and consults regularly with officials of the Indian Government and of the American Embassy.

### III. MISCELLANEOUS ALLEGATIONS

In addition to the above allegations regarding the staff and certain grants of the Ford Foundation, other miscellaneous charges have been made.

#### *Case No. 1: Report of Norman Dodd, committee research director*

In the report presented to this committee by its research director, Mr. Norman Dodd, in the opening week of hearings, the following statements appear (pp. 131-132, Reece hearings transcript):<sup>1</sup>

Finally, I suggest that the committee give special consideration to the Ford Foundation. This foundation gives ample evidence of having taken the initiative in selecting purposes of its own. Being of recent origin, it should not be held responsible for the actions or accomplishments of any of its predecessors. It is without precedent as to size, and it is the first foundation to dedicate itself openly to "problem solving" on a world scale.

In a sense, Ford appears to be capitalizing on developments which took place long before it was founded, and which have enabled it to take advantage of—

- The wholesale dedication of education to a social purpose;
- The need to defend this dedication against criticism;
- The need to indoctrinate adults along these lines;
- The acceptance by the executive branch of the Federal Government of responsibility for planning on a national and international scale;
- The diminishing importance of the Congress and the States, and the growing power of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and
- The seeming indispensability of control over human behavior.

We have studied these comments. We are frankly at a loss to understand what they mean and what criticism is intended. It is true that the foundation, like any private organization, has taken initiative in selecting purposes of its own. Avowedly, the trustees have dedicated the program of the foundation to the solution of human problems.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 50.



On the other hand, we have never had the slightest interest in discouraging any responsible criticism of the educational system and we are not involved in any attempt to indoctrinate adults, encourage national and international planning by the Federal Government, diminish the importance of Congress, or establish control over human behavior.

Following the introductory comments quoted above, Mr. Dodd continued with these words (pp. 132-133, Reece hearings transcript):<sup>1</sup>

As if they had been influenced directly by these developments, the trustees established separate funds for use in the fields of education, national planning, and politics. They set up a division devoted to the behavioral sciences, which includes a center for advanced study, a program of research and training abroad, an institutional exchange program, and miscellaneous grants in aid.

Supplementing these major interests are such varied activities as: a TV-radio work shop, external grants, intercultural publications, and an operation called the East European fund, which is about to be terminated.

When it is considered that the capital resources of this foundation approach, or may exceed, \$500 million, and that its income approximates \$30 million each year, it is obvious that before embarking upon the solution of "problems," some effort should be made by the trustees to make certain that their solution is in the public interest.

To correct the more important errors of fact in the first paragraph above, the Ford Foundation has established several separate funds, including two in the field of education, but it has not established funds, nor indeed has it supported any projects, directed toward national planning or politics.

As to the third paragraph, quoted above, the trustees have decided to concentrate the work of the foundation on certain problems for the very reason that their solution is judged to be of the greatest importance to human welfare. If Mr. Dodd's comment is meant to suggest that the Ford Foundation trustees do not carefully measure foundation activities in terms of their contribution to the public interest, he is wrong.

The concluding portion of Mr. Dodd's comments on the Ford Foundation (pp. 133-134, Reece hearings transcript)<sup>1</sup> reads as follows:

It is significant that the policies of this foundation include making funds available for certain aspects of secret military research and for the education of the Armed Forces. It becomes even more significant when it is realized that the responsibility for the selection of the personnel engaged in these projects is known to rest on the foundation itself—subject as it may be to screening by our military authorities.

In this connection, it has been interesting to examine what the educational aspect of these unprecedented foundation activities can be expected to produce. The first example in a pamphlet in which the Declaration of Independence is discussed as though its importance lay in the fact that it had raised two, as yet unanswered, questions:

1. Are men equal? and do we demonstrate this equality?

2. What constitutes "the consent of the governed"? and what does this phrase imply in practice?

By inference, the first question is subtly answered in the negative. By direct statement the second is explained as submitting to majority rule—but the restriction of the majority by the Constitution is not mentioned. Only an abridged version of the declaration is printed. It is interesting that this should omit the list of grievances which originally made the general concepts of this document reasonable.

After a review of the list of our grants, we have concluded that Mr. Dodd's reference to the support of "secret military research" must be based on a misinterpretation of the grant by the Ford Foundation to the Rand Corp. The Rand Corp. is a nonprofit research institution

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 50.

engaged primarily in research on problems of air warfare and other defense matters under contract with Government agencies. The president of the Ford Foundation was one of the organizers and is now chairman of the board of directors of the Rand Corp.

To enable Rand to carry on a program of unclassified research in the public interest, the trustees of the Ford Foundation on July 15, 1952, made a grant of \$1 million. The financial arrangements were made in such a way that the grant also added to the general financial and organizational strength of Rand. To repeat, the research being financed under our grant is entirely of an unclassified character.

The Ford Foundation takes no part in the selection of Rand personnel. Because of the nature of the primary work of Rand, its employees engaged in classified work are presumably cleared under the usual security procedures and regulations of the Government.

Regarding Mr. Dodd's reference to education in the Armed Forces, the foundation, through the fund for the advancement of education, has made funds available for a project for this purpose. It may be helpful to summarize the information on the nature and origin of this particular project which the fund has furnished us:

In the summer of 1951, at a time when there was some discussion in the press of education in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense invited the Fund for the Advancement of Education to provide expert counsel on the so-called I and E (information and education) program of the Armed Forces.

Because of the importance of the problem and as a matter of national service, the fund employed two consultants to prepare a report and recommendations.

At the same time, an advisory committee was appointed, composed of—

Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University  
 Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College  
 Henry T. Heald, chancellor of New York University  
 Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times  
 Milton C. Mumford, vice president of Marshall Field & Co.  
 James J. Reynolds, Jr., vice president of American Locomotive Co.  
 John Mayer, vice president of Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.

As a result of the consultants' initial reports, the fund was asked to undertake the preparation of several kits of materials for the information and education program, and several additional consultants, under the direction first of William Litterick, former director of research at Stephens College, and then of Dean John Bartky, of the Stanford University School of Education, were added to the project in a Washington office.

These consultants were selected and appointed by the fund; their work does not involve the use of any classified material whatsoever.

Mr. Dodd makes reference to a pamphlet on the Declaration of Independence which was prepared in connection with this project. He states that only an abridged version of the declaration is printed and criticizes the pamphlet in certain other respects.

The pamphlet in question is part of a kit of materials on the Declaration of Independence for use in discussion groups among the troops. The materials were actually prepared in final form by armed services personnel from data given them by the fund's project personnel. The kit contains four items: two large wall posters, one reading "The Declaration of Independence," and the other reading "All Men Are Created Equal—Consent of the Governed," a pamphlet entitled "You and

Your USA—The Declaration of Independence,” which reprints this document in its entirety; and a second pamphlet entitled “You and Your USA—Group Leader’s Guide—The Declaration of Independence.”

The purpose of these materials is to assist in stimulating a thoughtful discussion on this historic document by our men in the service. Their intent is to encourage each man to think through its meaning for himself. The mistaken suggestion that these prepared materials somehow give a biased interpretation of the meaning of the Declaration of Independence is best refuted by an examination of the material itself, and copies are submitted as exhibit 1 hereto.<sup>1</sup>

*Case No. 2: Testimony of Mr. Aaron M. Sargent*

Mr. Sargent in his testimony asserted that there is “not a single restrictive clause” in the articles of incorporation of the Ford Foundation; that the foundation and the funds it has helped to establish have “unlimited power to administer and receive funds” for “whatever a self-perpetuating board says is charitable or welfare”; and finally, he asserts that in determining what is charitable or welfare “there is no control whatsoever” (pp. 849–850, Reece hearings transcript).<sup>2</sup>

As a corporation organized under the provisions of the General Corporation Act of Michigan, the foundation is subject to the laws of that State. The foundation’s activities are also subject to review by the Bureau of Internal Revenue because of its exemption from income taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The foundation is, moreover, subject to all the normal police and investigatory processes of such organizations as the Federal Bureau of Investigation so far as violations of law are concerned. The policy of the foundation to make full public reports on all its activities subjects it to general public scrutiny. Its financial statements are audited by independent public accountants. In view of these various legal and other safeguards it is hardly accurate to suggest that, in carrying out their responsibilities, the trustees of the Ford Foundation are subject to “no control.”

If Mr. Sargent intended to propose additional restrictions upon the functions of foundations and the powers of their trustees, he did not specify what he had in mind. We cannot believe that even he was proposing to substitute Government control for the basic concept of trustee responsibility.

At other points in his testimony, Mr. Sargent made the following statements:

The Ford Foundation used its financial power to attempt to resist the will of the people of Los Angeles in connection with a pamphlet known as the E in UNESCO (p. 850, Reece Hearings transcript).

Mr. Paul Hoffman, the president of the Ford Foundation, personally appeared before the Los Angeles Board of Education and sought to prevent the removal of these pamphlets out of the Los Angeles city schools by the action of a duly constituted board of the city of Los Angeles, and in so doing he engaged in lobbying, an activity prohibited to the Ford Foundation. \* \* \* He did it as president of the Ford Foundation and used the power of the Ford Foundation as a leverage in the case (pp. 850–851).<sup>3</sup>

He was there using the weight and prestige of the Ford Foundation to try and influence a city board of education in support of this proposal (p. 864).<sup>4</sup>

The Ford Foundation has never attempted to “resist the will of the people of Los Angeles” in connection with a UNESCO pamphlet or any other matter.

<sup>1</sup> Not printed in record, included in committee file.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 379.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 379.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 385.

Mr. Hoffman on August 25, 1952, upon request, appeared as a private citizen before a hearing of the Los Angeles School Board to protest the banning of certain UNESCO publications from the Los Angeles public schools. Mr. Hoffman made it explicitly clear at the beginning of his statement that he was appearing purely in a private capacity and not as an officer of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Hoffman is the father of seven children and he has been a resident of and prominent civic leader in the Los Angeles area for many years. Under the circumstances, it seems not unusual that he should have been asked to appear to give his personal views on the matter under discussion and, in view of his great personal interest in the Los Angeles school system, that he should have accepted the invitation. Surely, his assumption of the duties of the presidency of the Ford Foundation did not divest him of his rights to express his personal opinions.

### SUPPLEMENT B

#### HISTORY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

A complete statement of the background and establishment of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., was furnished to this committee on March 11, 1954, in response to a request from the committee counsel. That statement included full texts of all those portions of the minutes of all meetings of the Ford Foundation board of trustees concerning the fund, together with related material in the dockets for such meetings, and various press releases. This statement digests those materials and is submitted to facilitate the incorporation of such material in the record.

The grant to the Fund for the Republic was designed to implement a specific part of the Ford Foundation's broad five-point program. This program had been developed by a study committee which had been established in 1948. During the many months of its work, the study committee reviewed existing materials and consulted with hundreds of American leaders in all parts of the country as a basis for recommending those areas in which the foundation could make the greatest contribution to the public welfare. The committee's study was considered by the trustees over a period of time, and in September of 1950 the trustees published their report outlining the expanded program for the foundation.

In that report, the foundation recognized the following facts: First, that one of the major problems of any democratic society is how to secure greater allegiance to the basic principles of freedom and democracy in an ever-changing world. There is real danger that the gap between profession and pursuit of the ideals of American freedom may widen under the tensions and pressures of the international crisis. Second, that the spread of communism represents one of the most critical threats to the American public welfare. And third, that some of the measures taken to deal with the threat of communism in themselves pose grave problems concerning traditional American freedoms.

After the adoption of the foundation's expanded program in 1950 there followed a period of intensive planning and reexamination of these problems and of ways in which the foundation could help solve them through scientific study and educational activity. The results of these efforts supported the trustees' earlier decision that it was appropriate and important for the foundation to attempt to deal with

these problems, and by the time of the trustees' meeting of October 4, 1951, they had decided that a new and separate agency should be established for this purpose. The importance and complexity of this area of American concern necessitated, in the opinion of the trustees, the formation of an independent corporation directed by distinguished Americans who could specialize in making a concentrated attack upon threats to democratic processes. In October 1951 the trustees specifically stated that the purposes of the new agency were to be those set forth in the President's report to their meeting. This report said in part:

The stated objectives of the fund shall be to help promote within the United States security based on freedom and justice. In this endeavor the fund would take into account:

(a) The danger to the national security from the persistent Communist attempt to penetrate and disrupt free and peaceful societies;

(b) The danger to the national security arising from fear and mutual suspicion generated by international tension;

(c) The danger to the national security arising from fear and mutual suspicion fomented by shortsighted or irresponsible attempts to combat communism through methods which impair the true sources of our strength;

(d) The need to understand and vindicate the spiritual and practical significance of freedom and justice within our society which are enduring sources of its strength; and

(e) The need to dedicate ourselves anew to the demonstration within America of a free, just, and unafraid society at work.

After this meeting, the trustees and the staff continued to consider more detailed aspects of the organization and program of the agency which was to be established. Fourteen months after the trustees had originally decided to create the fund, and 5 years after the trustees had first announced their interest in dealing with the problems for which the fund was created, the fund for the Republic, Inc., was finally incorporated on December 9, 1952. An initial appropriation of \$1 million was made to enable the fund to begin operations.

The fund began with a board of directors made up of prominent and public-spirited citizens as follows:

James Brownlee, partner, J. H. Whitney & Co., New York City

Malcolm Bryan, president, Federal Reserve Bank, Atlanta, Ga.

Huntington Cairns, lawyer, Washington, D. C.

Charles W. Cole, president, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Russell L. Dearmont, lawyer, St. Louis, Mo.

Richard Finnegan, consulting editor, Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago, Ill.

Erwin N. Griswold, dean, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.

William H. Joyce, Jr., chairman, Joyce, Inc., Pasadena, Calif.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Ill.

M. Albert Linton, president, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Jubal R. Parten, president, Woodley Petroleum Co., Houston, Tex.

Elmo Roper, marketing consultant, New York City

George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College, New York City

Eleanor Bumstead Stevenson, Oberlin, Ohio

James D. Zellerbach, president, Crown-Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

Each of the directors of the fund had been approved by each of the trustees of the foundation. I feel sure that the members of this committee would recognize the board as a distinguished group of loyal Americans.

Following its organization, the fund first concentrated on detailed development of its program and method of operation. A planning committee of the fund's board of directors was established under the informal chairmanship of Dean Griswold. Mr. Paul Hoffman was

elected chairman of the board, and Mr. Bethuel M. Webster was selected as counsel to the fund. By February 23, 1953, the directors of the fund had progressed sufficiently in their planning of the fund's program and operations to be able to present to the foundation a proposal requesting further foundation support in the amount of \$14 million. Included in that proposal was the following statement:

The directors see a pressing need for a clear statement in contemporary terms of the legacy of American liberty. They believe that such a statement is one of the most valuable contributions the fund can make in the near future.

A major factor affecting civil liberties is the existence of communism and Communist influence in this country. The directors propose to undertake research into the extent and nature of the internal Communist menace and its effect on our community and institutions. This research would be carried on concurrently with the study of the legacy of American liberty mentioned above.

The fund's proposed program was presented to the foundation's trustees by four of its directors and its counsel. The directors were Messrs. Hoffman, Griswold, Joyce, and Parten. The fund's representatives discussed their plans in detail with the foundation's trustees. In a later executive session, the trustees again reviewed the entire matter. They concluded that the foundation should support the fund by making a grant \$14 million. This sum was to support the fund's operations for a period of 5 to 10 years; that is, the grant was made to support a program of from \$1,500,000 to \$3 million a year. The grant was not payable until the fund had been specifically ruled by the Treasury Department to be exempt from income taxation under section 101(6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The fund was ruled exempt on January 20, 1954. After reviewing the matter at their next meeting, the trustees of the Ford Foundation approved the final payment of the grant, which payment was made on February 16, 1954.

I do not wish to discuss the details of the fund's program to date, since I understand the committee is going to obtain that information from the fund's distinguished chairman, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman. However, I would like to discuss one of its activities, which was used as a basis for criticizing the foundation for establishing the fund. I refer to the fund's proposal to study some aspects of legislative investigations. In our preliminary thinking about the fund, it was apparent that a study of legislative investigations was an appropriate activity for the fund. Shortly after its establishment, the fund made a grant of \$50,000 to the American Bar Foundation to support such a study by a special committee of the American Bar Association. This committee is headed by Mr. Whitney North Seymour and made up of eminent members of the bar. Such a study is appropriate, it is needed, and I hope the trustees of the fund take the necessary action to see the need is filled. As the Supreme Court of the United States said in *U. S. v. Rumley* in 1952, and I quote:

There is wide concern, both in and out of Congress, over some aspects of the exercise of the congressional power of investigation.

I need hardly labor the point. The President of the United States has similarly expressed concern over some of these problems and it is clearly in the national interest and in the best American tradition that a philanthropic foundation give support to students of the subject. I would like to point out that the critics of such a study did not even wait to see whether the study would be fair, would be objective, or even whether it would be made. Instead, through distortion of the

facts, they suggested that the entire \$15 million of our grant to the fund was somehow going to be used to attack Congress as a whole, or its investigating powers in particular. This was not true; and it would have been clear that it was not true to anyone who had sought to determine the truth before he spoke.

The trustees of the Ford Foundation are proud of their act in creating the fund for the Republic. The problems which the fund was created to help solve are increasingly crucial ones. The threat of communism concerns every American. The need for restating and defending the basic traditions of American freedom, especially in the light of tensions, events, and implications in the present world situation, similarly becomes more pressing.

I am sure that when this committee reviews the facts it will agree with the trustees of the foundation that the creation of the fund was appropriate and patriotic, and that the fund's activities constitute a promising start on a vital and noble task.

#### STATEMENT OF PAUL G. HOFFMAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC.

I expected to testify on June 29 at the request of the special committee. A day or two before the 29th I was told that the hearings had been terminated or suspended, that my engagement was canceled. I am sorry I have thus been kept from testifying in person as to the purposes, program, and activities of the fund for the Republic and from answering questions.

I submit this statement not because the transcript of hearings contains evidence concerning the fund—for none has been offered so far—but because Representative Reece's speech of July 27, 1953, now a part of the record of the investigation, contains references to the fund, and to me personally, which, in the interest of accuracy and fairness, require comment.

Mr. Reece said:

The Members of this House were amazed when they read just recently that the Ford Foundation \* \* \* had just appropriated \$15 million to be used to "investigate" the investigating powers of Congress, from the critical point of view (transcript 57).

No Congressman \* \* \* could fail to be alarmed at the fact that \$15 million \* \* \* was to be expended to attack the Congress for inquiring into the nature and extent of the Communist conspiracy \* \* \* (transcript 58).

The Communists have their own agency to smear the committees of the United States Congress and to defend Communists hailed before them. It is called the Civil Rights Congress and has been listed by the Attorney General as Communist and subversive. To give it liberal respectability, Mr. Paul Hoffman, former president of the Ford Foundation, was made chairman of this king-sized civil rights congress endowed by the Ford Foundation. The Fund for the Republic, as this Ford Foundation agency is named, has announced that it will make grants for an immediate and thorough investigation of Congress (transcript 58-59).

\* \* \* the previously mentioned Ford Foundation grant makes available \$15 million for investigating congressional methods of inquiries into communism and subversion. \* \* \* (transcript 74).

\* \* \* a grant of \$15 million, to protect the civil liberties of Communists and to investigate the Congress of the United States \* \* \* is really peanuts to the Ford Foundation. \* \* \* Here is the last of the great American industrial fortunes \* \* \* being used to undermine and subvert our institutions, \$15 million being set aside to investigate the Congress of the United States \* \* \* (transcript 103).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 25 et seq.

The declaration that the fund for the Republic is a "king-sized civil rights congress" (and thus subversive)—"given liberal respectability" by my appointment as chairman—would be actionable as slander but for the fact that it was uttered by Representative Reece on the floor of the House. But I pass that, not without feelings of chagrin and shock that the privilege of the House should be so abused.

The documents and data requested by the special committee have been supplied; and it is hoped that the committee will refer to this body of information rather than to the Reece speech for the facts. The plain truth is that there is no basis whatever for the charge that the Fund for the Republic was established to attack the Congress. The facts pertinent to the charges are as follows:

In December 1952 the fund approved a grant of \$50,000 to American Bar Foundation, a tax-exempt organization, to finance seven different studies bearing on individual rights as affected by national security proposed and to be conducted by a special committee of the American Bar Association. A description of the grant is contained in materials submitted to your counsel and staff. One of the seven proposed studies was—The extent to which Congress should limit the scope and regulate procedures of its investigations—a topic concerning which many Members of Congress have manifested interest. In a speech in the House on August 1, 1953, shortly before his resignation from Congress to become president of the Fund for the Republic, former Representative Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, described his personal familiarity with the plans of the ABA committee, pointed out that the ABA committee was approaching its task with full appreciation of the importance of the congressional investigating process, and made it a matter of record that he himself had introduced the chairman of the ABA committee to the Speaker and to the minority leader of the House of Representatives—both of whom expressed interest in, and offered suggestions concerning, the study and plans outlined by the ABA committee chairman.

Your counsel and staff have been supplied with the statement of William J. Jameson, president of the American Bar Association, printed in the January 1954 issue of the ABA Journal, describing the study which is being made with the fund's grant. In an editorial in the July 1954 issue the ABA Journal it is said:

The American Bar Association will welcome at its annual meeting in August the forthcoming report of its special committee on individual rights as affected by national security headed by the highly respected, highly competent Whitney North Seymour, of New York City. Mr. Seymour is already nationally recognized as an outstanding lawyer in the field of civil liberties. His committee will, no doubt, have proposals relating to procedures for our investigating agencies. These proposals will be based upon the sober second thought of the capable, qualified lawyers whose loyalty to our American institutions is unimpeachable. Congress and the public are much in need of such sound advice today. Our people recognize that we need investigating procedures and procedural standards which will be fair as well as effective. In such fair procedural standards we will find security both for our lives and our liberties.

Meanwhile, as your committee knows, the Congress itself, aware of abuses and of the need for satisfactory procedures, is looking for the answer to a serious problem.

The notion suggested by Mr. Reece that \$15 million was to be expended "to attack the Congress for inquiring into the nature and extent of the Communist conspiracy" is met by the fact that the Fund



for the Republic itself has just about completed one phase of an inquiry into the nature and extent of the internal Communist menace. The consultants on this project—an undertaking in which I have been greatly interested since before the establishment of the fund—are Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of the Harvard Law School, Prof. Clinton Rossiter of Cornell, and Father Joseph M. Snee, S. J., of Georgetown. Briefly, the study about to be completed consists of the preparation of a comprehensive bibliography of materials concerning communism in the United States and a definitive digest of public proceedings in which communism was involved. The bibliography and digest, together with microfilm copies of the principal records of public proceedings, will be reproduced in such form as to be widely available to interested persons throughout the country. The directors of the fund take some satisfaction in the fact that in one of the fund's first endeavors it is making available for the first time in convenient form basic information of incalculable value not only to the Government and to the Congress but to all persons and agencies engaged in fighting the Communist menace.

In his speech of July 1953 Representative Reece said "some large foundations must answer" the following question:

Have they financed studies regarding the excellence of the American Constitution, the importance of the Declaration of Independence, and the profundity of the philosophy of the Founding Fathers? And, if not, what is their excuse for neglecting the study of the basis of the American Republic? (Transcript 68-9.)<sup>2</sup>

I am happy to say that it has been the purpose of the Fund for the Republic since it was established to reexamine, with a view to greater understanding and wider application, the sources of strength in our society as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and in our free institutions, and that projects suggested for this purpose are being considered and advanced as rapidly as circumstances permit.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the officers and directors and staff and resources of the Fund for the Republic are devoted exclusively to the purposes and program of the fund itself. The fund is a tax-exempt membership corporation engaged in research and education. Its financial resources consist of \$15 million granted by the Ford Foundation but administered by the fund's own board of directors. The Fund for the Republic is completely independent of the Ford Foundation—except that it is obliged by the terms of its grant to engage in activities consistent with its tax-exempt status.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

*County of New York, ss:*

Paul G. Hoffman, being duly sworn, says:

I am chairman of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. I have read and know the contents of the foregoing statement, and the same is true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

PAUL G. HOFFMAN.

Sworn to before me this 21st day of July, 1954.

ROSE BERLIN,

*Notary Public, State of New York, No. 31-5288500.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH E. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, CARNEGIE  
ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE****INTRODUCTION**

The Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations has now ended public hearings without giving the foundations themselves an opportunity to testify. This would have been a violation of fair procedure in any case, but it was rendered extraordinarily so by virtue of two facts. First, the bulk of the testimony presented in the hearings had, apparently by design, been hostile to the foundations. Secondly, a month after the hearings closed, the staff was permitted to introduce extensive material attacking certain foundations, including the Carnegie Endowment, with inadequate opportunity for challenge.

Under the circumstances it is important to give a short summary of the history and record of the endowment before commenting on statements made concerning it.

**THE RECORD OF THE ENDOWMENT**

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which is entirely separate from all the other organizations created by Andrew Carnegie, was established by him in 1910 with a trust fund of \$10 million. He directed that the principal of the fund should remain intact and that the income should be administered by his trustees "to hasten the abolition of international war."

This objective is spelled out in the endowment's charter as follows: "to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States; to advance the cause of peace among nations; to hasten the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy; to encourage and promote methods for the peaceful settlement of international differences and for the increase of international understanding and concord; and to aid in the development of international law and the acceptance by all nations of the principles underlying such law." From the beginning these objectives have been the basis for the work of the organization, for its educational activities and for the research which it has undertaken and supported.

These facts furnish the explanation for several differences between the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and other foundations to which this committee has directed its attention. In the first place, the endowment has a specific set of objectives toward which all its efforts are directed. Secondly, it has comparatively limited resources; the endowment's income on its fund has never reached \$600,000 a year and is now slightly over \$500,000. In this connection, it should be noted that a tabulation based on the questionnaires submitted 2 years ago to the Cox committee placed the endowment below 30 other foundations in terms of net worth.

A third distinction, arising in part from the relatively limited resources of the organization, is that the endowment is not primarily a fund-granting foundation. Although in former years a fair proportion of the endowment's funds were expended in grants, it has always carried on operations of its own. Today the endowment functions almost exclusively by carrying out—through its own staff or through contracts—specific programs authorized by the endowment's trustees.

The objectives spelled out in the charter as the focus of the endowment effort in the pursuit of peace were defined by trustees named by Mr. Carnegie and working in consultation with him. He was inspired to establish this institution by admiration for the policies of President William Howard Taft, and his principal associates in its formation—men whose vision and leadership have most influenced its activities—were Elihu Root and Nicholas Murray Butler. Among the other distinguished Americans who made up the original board of trustees and assisted in charting the course for the endowment were John W. Foster, John Sharp Williams, and Joseph H. Choate. The high caliber of the original board has been maintained throughout the years. Trustees have included leaders of both major parties in the United States and eminent citizens from all sections of the country. One President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and one Presidential nominee, John W. Davis, have been trustees. There were also five Secretaries of State: Messrs. Foster and Root, Robert Bacon, Robert Lansing, and John Foster Dulles. Trustees who have served as Senators included Mr. Root, Mr. Williams, Mr. Dulles, George Gray, and Robert A. Taft. The board has been characterized by the faithful attendance of its members at meetings, despite a wide geographical distribution, and by their profound and active concern with the endowment's work.

The record shows that the trustees of the endowment and its staff have for 43 years conscientiously pursued the purpose for which Mr. Carnegie established the organization. In doing so they have had repeated occasion to applaud the wisdom of Mr. Carnegie who, not pretending to a clear knowledge of the future, gave the trustees appropriate discretion in these words:

Lines of future action cannot be wisely laid down. Many may have to be tried, and having full confidence in my trustees I leave to them the widest discretion as to the measures and policy they shall from time to time adopt, only premising that the one end they shall keep unceasingly in view until it is attained, is the speedy abolition of international war between so-called civilized nations.

I can speak from personal knowledge only of the years since July 1, 1950, when I became the endowment's president, and all of my statements as to its activities before that date are based on its records. Moreover, none of the members of the senior staff concerned with recommending policy to the trustees and carrying out their decisions was with the organization before the end of World War II. The history of the endowment prior to that time, however, is a matter of record in year books which were widely distributed from the beginning. Despite the international wars which have engulfed the world—and which have frustrated, in a manner which Mr. Carnegie could not have foreseen in 1910, the efforts to achieve peace—the endowment's record is one in which the trustees and staff take pride.

A few examples taken from this record may serve to illustrate the methods by which the original instructions of Mr. Carnegie have been carried out.

People in many foreign nations have learned about the American principles of liberty through the endowment. The texts of our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence were translated into several foreign languages and widely distributed, and the teaching of American history was financed in the universities of England, France, and other nations.

The endowment pioneered in the "exchange of persons" and so helped to launch the mounting flow of exchange students, teachers, technicians, and agriculturalists which today is actively supported by the United States and other governments and by private organizations.

Nearly 20 years in the writing, James T. Shotwell's monumental Economic and Social History of the World War was completed by the endowment in 1937 and distributed to governments, libraries, and universities throughout the world. Over 250 authors, researchers, and editors of many nationalities collaborated in the preparation of this comprehensive analysis in some 150 volumes of the effects of the First World War. This study remains a major contribution to the world's knowledge of the effects of war, both immediate and long-term, on governments and on the economic and social life of belligerents and neutrals.

From the beginning the trustees and staff of the endowment have devoted a very substantial part of their efforts to increasing public knowledge about and understanding of international relations. Like Mr. Carnegie, they have been convinced that in those countries where public opinion is the basis of official policy, policy can only be consistently wise when it rests upon informed public opinion. It is this conviction which has determined the endowment's educational activities.

These activities have been very diverse. Among them has been the distribution abroad of important collections of books on American history, government, law, economics, and literature in major cities of Europe, Asia, and South America. A similar activity for a similar purpose was the fostering of international relations clubs on college and university campuses, chiefly but not exclusively in the United States. The point of view which has underlain these educational activities is well expressed in a statement made about the international relations clubs in 1941, and in slightly different form many times before:

The purpose of the endowment in undertaking this work is to instruct and to enlighten public opinion. It is not to support exclusively any one point of view as how best to treat the conditions prevailing throughout the world but to fix the attention of students on those underlying principles of international conduct, of international law and of international organization which are essential to a peaceful civilization.

Over a 20-year period the endowment spent \$184,000 toward cataloging and reorganizing the Vatican library's priceless historical collection, thus making it readily available to scholars for the first time.

The active leadership and support of the endowment was the chief force behind the research, publication, and development that took place in the field of international law in the first half of this century. Carnegie fellowships in this field have helped train many persons for their present positions of responsibility in American public and academic life.

Canadian-American relations, an example to the world of peaceful international cooperation, were the subject of a 25-volume history prepared and published by the endowment. This work formed a model for subsequent studies of friendly relations among other nations.

Turning now to the period on which I can report from personal knowledge, there are four current programs to which the endowment today devotes the greatest part of its funds.

First, in the new building at First Avenue and 46th Street in New York, there is an international center which was designed to provide convenient, well-equipped facilities for organizations presenting programs on world affairs. Since its opening in June 1953, there have been more than 750 programs in the center attended by more than 30,000 persons. Fulbright scholars have held discussions in the center; the Christian Science Monitor Youth Forum meets there; students from Africa have arranged an exhibit of native art of the Gold Coast; Columbia University has scheduled some of its bicentennial events there.

Second, there is a program on universities and world affairs. On the basis of experience in trial surveys at 8 universities and in regional conferences attended by representatives of more than 200 colleges and universities, the endowment has encouraged American institutions of higher learning to conduct self-surveys and appraisals of their activities bearing on world affairs. One hundred colleges and universities have survey committees cooperating in the program; each committee is appointed by the president of the university and reports to him. Each university committee reviews its program and activities in its own way and makes recommendations looking toward a more effective use of the university's resources. The endowment makes no recommendations. It acts as a clearing house for the exchange of information between cooperating institutions and in compiling results of the survey in a series of eight volumes to be published next year.

Third, there is a publications program. Primary emphasis is on International Conciliation, a periodical now published five times a year. Each issue is devoted to a study of some problem of international organization, selected particularly from fields in which information is not easily available. A special number each fall presents background information on issues before the current session of the United Nations General Assembly.

In two series of books and pamphlets, the endowment has undertaken studies of various organs and activities of the United Nations. Subjects have included the International Court of Justice, the Security Council, the General Assembly, and disputes brought before the United Nations. Other publications have dealt with a variety of topics such as institutes of world affairs and current research in world affairs.

Finally, there is a series of studies now in progress in representative countries throughout the world concerning their national policies and attitudes toward international organization, particularly in regard to the United Nations. Arrangements for the studies vary from one country to the next. The normal pattern is for some leading private institution to assume responsibility for the study in its country. The studies will be published in a series of some 20 volumes.

In undertaking these studies the endowment has assumed that international organization is here to stay in some form or other and that it is and will remain an important factor in international life. We are trying to find out, if we can, why these countries joined the United Nations, what they expected to get out of joining it, what they have in fact got out of it, and what they think may be the future. We also hope that these studies will help in preparing for the proposed conference to review the United Nations Charter. In addition, we hope to encourage research in the field of international organization in general.

Today the endowment distributes over four thousand copies of its annual report to libraries, colleges and universities, newspaper and radio stations, organizations and individuals concerned with international relations, and to all the Members of the Congress of the United States.

We believe the activities which are summarized above, and described in greater detail in those reports, are in keeping with the purposes for which the organization was founded and are in the public interest. The story is one which the trustees and staff of the endowment are glad to submit for the records of this committee.

#### STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE ENDOWMENT

I turn now to specific statements concerning the endowment, made either in the hearings of the special committee or in memoranda prepared by the committee's staff which have been brought to our attention. In considering these statements and the following comments thereon, it is important to bear constantly in mind the distinction between facts and inferences which witnesses or staff drew from them.

##### *1. Alleged aid to individuals and organizations with leftist records or affiliations*

The associate staff director of the committee referred in the hearings to testimony before the Cox committee which he alleged showed that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace gave grants to 15 "individuals and organizations with leftist records or affiliations" (transcript, p. 1022).<sup>1</sup> This misleading statement must not stand unchallenged. It is true that the Carnegie Endowment made at one time or another grants or payments to 1 organization and 14 individuals that, in the language of the counsel for the Cox committee, had been "cited or criticized by the House Un-American Activities Committee or by the McCarran committee \* \* \*" (Cox committee hearings, p. 583). To have been "cited or criticized," however, is not proof of "leftist records or affiliations" and there was no reference by any member of the Cox committee or its counsel, or by me, to "leftist records or affiliations." Furthermore, the record of the Cox committee hearings contains no shred of evidence, nor even an allegation, that any of the work performed with endowment funds had a "leftist" character.

My testimony before the Cox committee showed that grants made by the endowment to the Institute of Pacific Relations, the only organization involved, ceased in 1939, years before any question was raised about the activities of that organization (Cox committee hearings, p. 581). Moreover, the chairman of the present committee indicated that \* \* \* up until the late forties the IPR had an excellent standing \* \* \* (transcript, p. 1192).<sup>2</sup>

Of the individuals named who had been "cited or criticized," Alger Hiss constitutes a special case. With regard to him, there is nothing to be added to the detailed testimony of John W. Davis and Henry M. Wriston on his connection with the endowment (Cox committee hearings, pp. 569-572, 183-184). As to the other 13, the officers of the endowment did not, according to its records, have at the time the payments were made any knowledge of the citations or criticisms, and indeed most of the payments took place before any such citations or

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 472.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 541.

criticisms had been published. Furthermore, the total received by these 13 people amounted to \$3,701.67, less than one-fiftieth of 1 per cent of all endowment expenditures.

## 2. "A propaganda machine"

At the hearing on May 11, the committee counsel made the following statement:

\* \* \* we suggest that a proper subject of inquiry for the committee is whether or not propaganda is desirable for a foundation which operates as a fiduciary manager of public funds. The case of the Carnegie endowment we will be glad to introduce evidence later to show that they were consciously produced, a propaganda machine. We are anxious to get the facts \* \* \* (transcript (*ibid.*, p. 52), May 11, pp. 137-138).<sup>1</sup>

This statement must presumably be read in the light of the definition of propaganda given the previous day by the research director:

Propaganda-action having as its purpose the spread of a particular doctrine or a specifically identifiable system of principles, and we noted that in use this word has come to infer half-truths, incomplete truths, as well as techniques of a covert nature (transcript, May 10, p. 37).<sup>2</sup>

Using this definition, the answer to the counsel's charge is that the endowment is not and never has been "a propaganda machine." Nor has it ever disseminated "half-truths" or "incomplete truths," or used "techniques of a covert nature."

Certainly it is a fact that the endowment has advocated world peace and international understanding, but what reasonable person would disapprove these ends or characterize the activities of the endowment in pursuit of them as "the spread of a particular doctrine or a specifically identifiable system of principles"?

Moreover, if, as seems to be the case, the research director included the Carnegie endowment as one of the foundations engaged in education for international understanding which are "discrediting the traditions to which (the United States) has been dedicated" (hearings, May 10, p. 45),<sup>2</sup> he is drawing an inference for which there is not a shred of evidence. The methods of the endowment have been truly educational and not propagandistic, and its whole tradition has been as American as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

To understand the endowment's approach to its task, one must look to its history, placing its educational activities on behalf of international peace and understanding in historical perspective.

Today, to be in favor of peace, is like opposing sin. People differ on the best way to attain the goal but not on the general aim. This was not clearly so in 1910. War was respectable in many quarters and was regarded as an ordinary instrument of national policy.

In working for peace and international understanding in the early days of the endowment the founders were neither pacifists nor advocates of the doctrine that peace could be attained by mere altruism or by emotional fervor. They believed, on the contrary, that the road to real peace was through the development of law, through research, and through education of the peoples and leaders of the world in terms of hard realities.

Unfortunately, war came in 1914. That war itself, however, gave the peoples of the world a drastic and expensive education on the im-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

portance of peace. As Nicholas Murray Butler told his fellow trustees in 1920:

\* \* \* It is no longer necessary to discuss (the desirability of international peace) with anybody. The elaborate moral arguments and pleas that were heard for a hundred years before the outbreak of the Great War were made so much more effectively, so much more convincingly, by the war itself, that they now sound like pleas in a dead language. We are now confronted with the problem of how most wisely to insure the maintenance of international peace and how most effectively to carry forward an ordered civilization.

Butler saw that the war had underlined the importance of international relations and shown that what concerned each nation concerned all. As a matter of fact, the peoples of the world would never again be able to remain apart. Indeed, they would be increasingly drawn closer together due to an event 7 years before the endowment was founded, the successful experiment of Orville and Wilbur Wright at Kitty Hawk.

During the interwar period the endowment's activities both in research and in education were primarily addressed to the problem defined by Dr. Butler: "How most wisely to insure the maintenance of international peace and how most effectively to carry forward an ordered civilization." The problem was an immense one, and the outbreak of war in 1939 showed that the solution was not yet at hand.

Since the end of World War II the United States has embarked on a new phase in foreign policy. One of its major decisions was to work through an international organization, and subsequently also through regional organizations, to achieve peace, which is the goal of the endowment. The policy of participation in international organizations has had the overwhelming support of the United States Senate, with votes of 89 to 2 for the United Nations Charter, of 72 to 1 for the Rio Treaty, and of 82 to 13 for the North Atlantic Treaty. This policy has been of a bipartisan character and clearly reflects a belief that membership in these international organizations is in the national interest of the United States.

The endowment has pursued a program of research and education in relation to these organizations. The effort has been directed toward making them better understood and toward the problem of improving these still far from perfect instruments.

In charging that the endowment has been "a propaganda machine," the staff of this committee must have overlooked the objectives assigned as early as 1911 to the Division of Intercourse and Education:

To diffuse information and to educate public opinion regarding the causes, nature, and effects of war, and means for its prevention and avoidance.

To cultivate friendly feelings between the inhabitants of different countries, and to increase the knowledge and understanding of each other by the several nations.

A comparison of the research director's definition of propaganda with these objectives and with the activities of the endowment must surely lead fair-minded persons to conclude that the endowment has steadily pursued those goals by methods which are educational in the best sense. If in a few instances in the past the endowment strongly advocated particular means for the advancement toward peace, these efforts were, like all other endowment activities, thoroughly American in character; they were without exception in support of projects endorsed by the incumbent President of the United States. This is



true, for example, of the World Court, which was endorsed by Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In support of the argument that the endowment has engaged in propaganda, Mr. Dodd referred specifically to the international relations clubs and the international mind alcoves. The endowment's support of the international relations clubs was not propagandistic either in intent or in fact. The statement quoted above (p. 5) to the effect that the "purpose of the endowment in undertaking this work is to instruct and enlighten public opinion \* \* \*" is exact, and it was adhered to. As to the international mind alcoves, these were started during World War I. The phrase "international mind" had been coined by Dr. Butler in 1912 in a statement, framed copies of which were hung over each alcove :

The international mind is nothing other than that habit of thinking of foreign relations and business, and that habit of dealing with them, which regard the several nations of the civilized world as friendly and cooperating equals in aiding the progress of civilization, in developing commerce and industry, and in spreading enlightenment and culture throughout the world.

The endowment sent collections of books to libraries in small communities throughout the United States to interest the general reader in foreign affairs and in other lands. No library received the books except upon request. These collections were given the name International Mind Alcoves. It is also to be noted that the State library commissions or State librarians of 34 States were at their own request placed upon the list of recipients of alcove collections; through their offices the books were sent by mail to inaccessible small communities.

What should be stressed in this regard is that the books did not emphasize any one point of view. They were small collections of books on one particular subject, which in this case was international relations rather than, say, engineering or English literature. Not by the widest stretch of the imagination could such action be called propaganda.

As to the international relations clubs, the first of these were established under the leadership of the endowment just prior to World War I, and the largest number came into being in the period between the wars. The clubs were formed purely for educational purposes. They were helped by the endowment through the sending semiannually of collections of books and pamphlets dealing with important international questions and by arranging for occasional speakers on request.

It should be noted that most of the clubs were set up at a time when there was little or no formal teaching of international relations on college campuses throughout the United States. To encourage interest in the study of foreign relations in colleges is not propaganda but education.

3. *Committee staff memorandum: "Summary of activities of Carnegie Corporation of New York, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation"*

Section II of this summary of activities, the only part which relates to the endowment, is an amazing document which, were it not to become part of the record of a congressional committee would not require even the following brief comments.

To one familiar with the work of foundations, it appears to be confused, disorganized, inaccurate, and full of inconsistencies. It assumes a relationship between the Carnegie Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation which did not in fact exist. It appears to imply that there

is something discreditable or not in the public interest in research study and education in international relations and international organization, entirely disregarding the fact that no organization can work effectively for international peace (which is the precise purpose for which the endowment was founded) without intensive attention to the whole field of international relations including present and potential international organization.

Diligent efforts to disentangle the charges against the Carnegie Endowment suggest that there are four:

(a) That the endowment has consistently worked for world peace;

(b) That the endowment has been of service to the United States Government;

(c) That the endowment has engaged in propaganda;

(d) That the endowment has supported not only subversive and leftist organizations and individuals, but certain other organizations disapproved by the authors of the memorandum.

With respect to (a) and (b), we feel indebted to the memorandum for showing that the endowment has consistently sought to carry out the wishes of Mr. Carnegie, and that it has been of service to the United States Government in times of both peace and war. If the endowment is criticized on these counts, I can only assume that the committee staff is critical of American efforts toward world peace and of patriotic service to the United States.

Moreover, it simply is not true that the endowment "has not sponsored projects advocating other means" for achieving peace than international organization (*ibid.*, p. 876), or that it has sought to "achieve peace through a world-government arrangement" (*ibid.*, p. 889).

The propaganda charge has been answered on pages 10-14 of this statement (*ibid.*, p. 1057). I am more confused than ever, however, as to what the staff means by propaganda, and am left with the impression that there is no conceivable foundation activity—at least in the field of international relations—which staff members would be willing to call educational.

The final charge relating to alleged support of subversive individuals or organizations has also been dealt with above (pp. 8-9 of this statement, *ibid.*, p. 1056-57).

The memorandum also speaks disparagingly of certain other institutions which the endowment has at one time or another assisted or cooperated with. I refer to such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, and the Institute of International Education. These can speak for themselves. As president of the Carnegie Endowment I can say that I believe our cooperation with them promoted the purposes of the endowment and was in the public interest.

#### CONCLUSION

It is clear that I have a very different view from certain members of the committee's staff as to foundations and their role in American life. It is evident that these staff members are unhappy about changes

during recent decades in American attitudes toward foreign relations and in our country's position in the world. They appear to feel these changes should not have occurred, that the changes resulted from certain tendencies in research and education, and that foundations are primarily responsible. I have the impression that they go so far as to believe that governmental intervention of some kind in the work of the foundations would be a corrective.

My own outlook in relation to the particular work in which the endowment is active is quite different. I believe the changes which have occurred in American policy and attitudes in the international field have resulted from democratic adjustment to the problems created by modern social and political upheavals, new inventions, and two world wars. One of our major problems has been to protect our national security in a world of new power relationships and at the same time to seek roads toward a lasting international peace. I rejoice that this country has been able to grapple with these problems as they arose by the orderly procedure of constitutional government. The education of the public and its leaders is vital to the success of such a procedure.

As a relative newcomer to foundation work, I express the belief that foundations by their promotion of research and of education, both formal and informal, in the field of international relations have made a valuable contribution in the public interest during these past 40 years not unlike in importance the contributions of foundations in other fields.

I have examined the record of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace with some background of training in the appraisal of historical evidence. To me this record shows that the endowment, within the limits of human fallibility and of time, resources, and circumstance, has endeavored to carry out Andrew Carnegie's original intention. The goal has been to rid the world of war. That international peace, founded upon freedom and justice, is in the national interest and is a prime objective of the Government and people of the United States is beyond and above all dispute.

JOSEPH E. JOHNSON.

I, Joseph E. Johnson, being first duly sworn on oath, declare that I have read the foregoing statement; that it is true and correct with respect to those matters stated upon personal knowledge, and that with respect to matters not stated upon knowledge, it is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

JOSEPH E. JOHNSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of August 1954.

ELIZABETH S. GROVER,  
*Notary Public, State of New York.*

Term expires March 30, 1954.

STATEMENT OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION AND THE  
GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD, BY DEAN RUSK, PRESIDENT

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 3, 1954.*

HON. B. CARROLL REECE,  
*Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt  
Foundations,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the honor to transmit herewith sworn statements on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board about certain matters raised before the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations of the 83d Congress.

We had expected that our organizations would be given the same opportunity to present our case before the committee that was afforded to our critics. When the committee announced on July 2, 1954, that no further public hearings would be held, we immediately sent a telegram to the committee, reading as follows:

The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board have been informed that the congressional Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations decided today to terminate its public hearings. We have not commented upon the issues thus far raised because we expected to appear and have an opportunity to reply in public hearings.

We must assume that the committee's decision means that it will not submit a report to the Congress containing any material adverse to our two foundations on which we are not fully heard. This is fundamental in view of the nature of the charges and innuendoes made against our foundations by committee staff and other witnesses. These charges and innuendoes are not supported by the facts.

We shall avail ourselves of the committee's invitation to submit a sworn written statement on issues raised before it for inclusion in the permanent record of the Congress and in any official publication of the proceedings of the committee. We note that the committee expects our statement to be made public; we fully agree in view of the wide publicity already given to adverse testimony. The record of our two foundations over the past half century testifies convincingly to their integrity, patriotism, and devotion to the public interest.

We received from you on July 3, 1954, the following telegram in reply.

Re your telegram: The Rockefeller Foundation and all others who were expected to be called as witness will be given ample opportunity to make statements for the record just as they might have done in open hearings and will also have opportunity to give full information which may be necessitated by the presentation to the committee for the record of further data by the committee staff. All statements by witness or the staff which are presented for the record will be made available to the press.

The accompanying statements, which are submitted pursuant to our telegram quoted above, consist of a foreword by John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the boards of trustees of the 2 organizations, a statement in behalf of the 2 organizations by the undersigned as president of both, setting forth comments and principles which are applicable in respect of both organizations, and separate supplemental statements by each organization, dealing with certain specific grants which were referred to in the public hearings or in committee staff reports.

We wrote to you on June 4, 1954, requesting to be advised as to the particular grants, out of the more than 41,000 made by these 2 founda-

tions, which would, in the opinion of the committee, call for discussion by us. In reply, counsel for the committee informed us by telephone that we ourselves would have to determine this from the testimony received by the committee and that we would have opportunity to submit materials, subsequent to testimony, on any matter on which we would need more time for research in our records. Your telegram of July 3 also mentioned giving us an "opportunity to give full information which may be necessitated by the presentation to the committee for the record of further data by the committee staff.

We respectfully submit that the committee has presented us with formidable dilemmas.

The first has to do with the subjects we should cover in our reply. We find in the present record of the committee no prima facie case of any instance of wrongdoing on our part. Were we to undertake to make a full statement on all matters commented upon before the committee we would have to range over most of our tens of thousands of grants and deal with a full half century of the social, economic, and political history of the United States. Yet we have been asked to reply promptly and briefly. In the attached statement we have tried to state our position on a series of issues which seem to us to be the most relevant and important. Even so, we are not able to discuss, in a brief statement, the large numbers of grants which would substantiate our view. More important, we have no assurance that we have dealt with all of the issues which might seem important to one or another member of the committee.

A second concern relates to the future procedures of the committee. Are we to know what information comes to the attention of the committee or its staff which might be critical of our two foundations? Will we be given full opportunity to know about and to reply to material which might influence the committee toward conclusions adverse to us?

We believe, and the chairman has so stated, that the committee does not wish to inflict injury upon established institutions such as ours. We suggest that the committee insure this by affording the foundations an opportunity to be heard on the draft of any report which the committee proposes to submit. We see no other way to insure that we are responsive to the real issues in the minds of the committee which would have been disclosed had public hearings not been terminated.

We hope that the committee will find the attached statements useful in its deliberations.

Respectfully yours,

DEAN RUSK,

*President, the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board.*

FOREWARD BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES, THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD

One of the basic factors that give our American democracy its strength is the sense of responsibility on the part of the individual for his fellow citizen and his community. Philanthropy, whether it be on an individual or foundation basis, is an important expression of this fundamental. The giving of the individual will always be para-

mount, but foundations have come to play an increasingly important role.

The wise distribution of philanthropic funds is more difficult than is commonly supposed. Fully appreciating this fact, my grandfather established the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board in order to provide the continuing wisdom and insights of a group of distinguished and experienced men. To them was given broad discretion.

The charter of the Rockefeller Foundation provides that its funds shall be spent for "the well-being of mankind." This gives great latitude as to the fields of program, but no latitude as to the purpose or objective—man's well-being. Thus, in considering program or individual projects the primary concern of the trustees is to make sure that the action taken will effectively advance the interests of man or, differently expressed, the public interest. An important guide toward this end has been the founder's statement that, "The best philanthropy involves a search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source."

While my grandfather never participated in the affairs of the foundation or the General Education Board once they were formed, he followed with great interest for nearly 25 years their programs and progress. To him, to my father who was chairman of both boards until 1940, and to the other members of our family, the achievements of these two foundations have been a source of genuine satisfaction. We feel a deep sense of gratitude to their trustees and officers who have rendered such devoted service over the years.

The trustees of both the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board have noted the expressed desire of the members of the special committee to investigate tax-exempt foundations to carry out their responsibilities in such a way that their report will make a constructive contribution insofar as the future of foundations is concerned. The trustees feel confident that the statements which are submitted herewith will be received and considered in this spirit.

## I. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

The Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board are two foundations established and endowed by John D. Rockefeller in 1913 and 1903, respectively. In accordance with the usual practice, this statement is presented by their president as an authoritative expression of the views of the two corporate bodies. It is verified by him under oath, as are the separate supplemental statements of the two organizations.

The connection of the incumbent president with these two foundations dates from his election as a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation in April 1950, and as a trustee of the General Education Board in December 1951. As to events prior to those dates, this statement and the supplemental statements are necessarily based not upon the president's personal knowledge of the activities of the 2 organizations but upon his information and belief, derived from the extensive records of the 2 foundations and from discussions with present and former trustees, officers, and staff. In the case of 2 foundations which are 41 and 51 years old, a considerable number of important participants are no longer alive and others are widely scattered.

Among the criticisms of the Cox committee's investigation of foundations in 1952, advanced as reasons for a second investigation, was the fact that foundation witnesses were not sworn when testifying before that committee. It was said on the floor of the House that— as a result of this, neither the Congress nor the people know whether these officers and trustees were telling the truth.

We protest this statement and we do not know what the speaker meant when he added:

For the sake of the foundations, this error should be rectified.<sup>1</sup>

We have no objection to testifying under oath. The omission of an oath was not at the request of the Rockefeller Foundation or the General Education Board but was the decision of the Cox committee, with the apparent consent of all committee members then present. Had the witnesses who testified in behalf of our organizations been under oath, their testimony before the Cox committee would have been the same, with the understanding which was clearly implicit throughout those hearings that as to facts not within their personal knowledge they were testifying upon information and belief. We have no double standard for testimony, depending upon whether it is sworn or unsworn.

We affirm unequivocally the integrity, patriotism, sense of responsibility and devotion to the public interest of all those, whether trustees or officers, who have over the past half century made the decisions which carried out the trusts laid upon the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board. There is no trace of Communist infiltration into either of these foundations. In the course of the present investigation, it has been stated or implied by witnesses before the committee that they are in some way involved in an extraordinary catalog of offenses, ranging from aiding and defending Communist practices in the schools to violation of the antitrust laws. Although it is hard to believe that the committee has taken seriously the great majority of these charges, we shall try to be responsive and at the same time, to furnish information about the actual roles of our two foundations over the past decades.

We comment in this and in 2 supplementary statements, 1 for the Foundation and 1 for the Board, on what seem to us to be the more important issues raised before this committee. If we do not respond to every expressed or implied charge, it should be understood that we do not concede them. We are confident that the committee will agree that we would not show a proper respect for the Congress were we to assume that the committee itself has embraced all of the bizarre innuendoes presented in the testimony.

The record of this investigation suggests to us that foundations are not the only institutions under scrutiny here and may, in fact, be serving as an indirect channel for criticism of important segments of our national life, such as our educational systems, our scholarly organizations, and many established polices of the Government itself.

Our 2 foundations can state our own actions and why we have made the grants we have made, now amounting to more than \$800 million. We can also state the basis of our confidence in the institutions and organizations to whom we have made these grants. We should regret, however, being placed in the position of speaking for those for

<sup>1</sup> Congressional Record, July 27, 1953, p. 10190. See also *ibid.*, p. 28 et seq.

whom we are not accredited spokesmen. Our school systems, our colleges and universities, and our research and scholarly organizations are able to speak for themselves and we would not wish their position to be prejudiced by any failure of our own to present their views adequately.

We feel strongly about some of the fundamental issues which have been raised before this committee; some are of greater moment to our free society than is the position of any particular foundation; if we speak forcefully, we believe that we owe the committee a duty to do so.

## II. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

### A. PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY AND FREE ENTERPRISE IN PHILANTHROPY

The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board have always acknowledged that their funds are held as a public trust. Our trustees recognize a heavy public responsibility, arising from the voluntary action of John D. Rockefeller in committing substantial private funds to a public purpose, from the policy and laws of the State of New York and of the United States which permit the two foundations to act corporately for a public purpose, and from the important privileges granted to educational, religious, and charitable institutions by certain Federal and State tax laws.

Though dedicated to the public interest, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board retain many of the essential attributes of private, independent organizations. They are nonpolitical and nongovernmental in character. In each case their policies and decisions are in the hands of a board of trustees of responsible citizens, who contribute time and a lively interest to their activities and who select officers and professional staff to carry out their policies. The foundation and the board hold and invest their own funds and decide how to spend them for the purposes for which they were created. They are private in that they are not governmental; they are public in that their funds are held in trust for public rather than private purposes. As social institutions, they reflect the application to philanthropy of the principles of private initiative and free enterprise, under public policies which have long recognized the benefits of such activity to a free society.

Most of the discussion of the free-enterprise system in America has focused upon its accomplishments in lifting the figures of national production and the general standard of living to levels never before attained in any other country. With Government controls limited, the release of the energies behind individual initiative has been given, we believe deservedly, a large measure of the credit for these extraordinary results. Less attention has been paid to the reliance we have placed upon the philanthropic impulse of private citizens. This has been left in large measure free from Government control and has been given positive encouragement through the tax laws. The result has been an impressive voluntary outpouring of wealth for charitable, educational, scientific, and religious purposes, transforming material wealth into opportunities for pursuing the enduring values of the mind and spirit.

The voluntary association of private citizens for the carrying out of public tasks is deeply rooted in our tradition and saves us from a



dismal choice between leaving many tasks undone or handing them over to an all-pervasive Government. It has been argued that the favored tax position of schools and colleges, foundations, and a large number of charitable activities rests upon the propositions that they do what Government itself would otherwise have to do from public funds and that independent organizations can do many of these tasks better than could Government. While there is evidence that such views have had a strong influence, a more fundamental basis for the public policy on the matter appears to us to be the importance in a free society, of encouraging the widest diversity of individual and group effort in order that citizens may share directly in the privileges and responsibilities of free institutions.

President Eliot of Harvard, speaking in 1874, long before our foundations were established, said:

\* \* \* In England and the United States, the method of doing public work by means of endowments managed by private corporations, has been domesticated for several centuries; and these are the only two nations which have succeeded on a great scale in combining liberty with stability in free institutions. The connection of these two facts is not accidental. The citizens of a free State must be accustomed to associated action in a great variety of forms; they must have many local centers of common action, and many agencies and administrations for public objects, besides the central agency of Government. \* \* \* To abandon the method of fostering endowments, in favor of the method of direct Government action, is to forego one of the great securities of public liberty.<sup>2</sup>

These are among the basic considerations which have led the Congress, the legislatures of the 48 States, and the courts to shape the laws and public policy in such a way as to encourage private philanthropy. The principles involved were brought to our shores by the first settlers and have been reflected in official attitudes throughout our history. The Congress has affirmed its support of this policy by recent increases in the permissible deductions for charitable contributions made from individual and corporate incomes. One of the two recommendations of the Cox committee was the following:

2. That the Ways and Means Committee take cognizance of our finding that the maintenance of private sources of funds is essential to the proper growth of our free schools, colleges, churches, foundations, and other charitable institutions. We respectfully suggest that the committee reexamine pertinent tax laws, to the end that they may be so drawn as to encourage the free-enterprise system with its rewards from which private individuals may make gifts to these meritorious institutions.<sup>3</sup>

We conclude that the underlying public policy is firmly established and represents not only a traditional attitude of long standing but the present policy of Federal and State governments.

We wish to emphasize that the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board have conformed to all applicable laws and authoritatively expressed public policies, and will continue to do so. This is our duty as citizens, and was clearly the wish of our founder. We shall be attentive to the views of responsible critics, but we do not expect to treat criticism as legislation or to accept the adverse witnesses who have testified before this committee as exponents of public policy. Our trustees would violate their trust if they should fail to bring to bear

<sup>2</sup> Charles W. Eliot. Exemption From Taxation of Church Property and the Property of Educational, Literary, and Charitable Institutions, American Contributions to Civilization and Other Essays and Addresses (New York: The Century Co., 1907), pp. 340-341.

<sup>3</sup> U. S. Congress (82d Cong., 2d sess.), House Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and Other Organizations \* \* \* (final report \* \* \* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953), p. 13.

upon its performance the full extent of their experience and judgment and should substitute therefor the least common denominator of divergent views from every quarter.

Where public interest and private initiative are subtly merged, as in the case of an endowed foundation, how is the public interest safeguarded? In the case of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, continuous effort is made to do so along several lines.

First, and most important, the trustees and officers in the performance of their duties are infused with a deep sense of public obligation. Having been entrusted with decisions to spend funds for the public good, they bring to their tasks the best of their judgment and skills, a disinterested rather than a partial view, and as much imagination and insight as their capacities permit. Their decisions cannot hope to win universal approval, and occasional mistakes may occur, for these are inevitable accompaniments of risk bearing. In judging the record of these trustees and officers, it is not reasonable or proper to use, as a test, one's agreement with each individual decision. The fair test is the seriousness and general competence of the attempt, on the part of trustees and officers, to discharge faithfully their difficult duties.

Second, we appraise our own judgments through the advice and counsel of many others who can contribute the wisdom of experience and special knowledge. This is a continuous process, systematically pursued by the officers, involving consultation with hundreds who give generously of their time and thought to the problems presented. Some of it is reflected in a more formal arrangement when competent individuals are invited to serve the foundation on boards of consultants on such matters as medicine and public health, agriculture, or legal and political philosophy.

Third, we respond fully to our obligation to conform to all relevant laws, to make regular reports to public authorities to whom such reports are due, and to use our best efforts to furnish information requested by any official body.

Fourth, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board keep the public informed as to their activities through regular publications which are given wide circulation.

#### *Publications*

In their long series of annual reports, the foundation and the board have sought to tell in plain terms both what they were doing and why. The policies of the trustees, the thinking which led to the development of those policies, and the methods of the officers in applying those policies, have been regularly disclosed. Grants have been listed, with a statement of their purpose and amount. These annual reports, supplemented frequently, in the case of the foundation, with brief reports entitled "The President's Review," have been given the widest distribution, both in the United States and abroad, to the press and to leading libraries, as well as to individuals and institutions on extensive mailing lists. In the last few years the foundation has also issued quarterly reports at the end of each calendar quarter covering grants made during that period. Since 1914, the general education board's annual reports have been equally complete and detailed.

In addition to these regular reports, special volumes are published where it is felt that they would meet a scientific, scholarly, or general interest. Recent examples are the volumes *Yellow Fever*, edited

by Dr. George K. Strode; *The Story of The Rockefeller Foundation*, by Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick; *Crete: A Case Study of an Underdeveloped Area*, by Dr. Leland G. Allbaugh; and *The Sardinian Project: An Experiment in the Eradication of an Indigenous Malarious Vector*, by Dr. John A. Logan. To these are added a large number of technical articles arising from the research of the foundation's own staff in such fields as virus diseases and agriculture.

Our heavy correspondence and press clippings every year bear witness to the attentive reading of these reports and the widespread interest they have aroused.

In his report to the committee, its director of research charges that the foundations have not reported the purpose of certain grants "in language which could be readily understood."<sup>4</sup> In our case, the record of careful and full reporting makes it evident that any allegation of attempted concealment or distortion is without substance.

#### B. THE TAX EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE

The American Governments, Federal and State, from their earliest days have used the tax laws as effective and versatile instruments for the encouragement of voluntary private philanthropy. This encouragement has taken a variety of forms: Exemption of philanthropic enterprises from income tax, exemption of bequests to philanthropic organizations from estate and inheritance taxes, exemption of inter vivos gifts to such organizations from gift taxes, permission to deduct contributions to such organizations from income otherwise subject to tax.

Although tax privileges in one or more of these various forms doubtless have an important influence on the organization of foundations today, it should be noted that the tax element played no significant part in the creation of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board by John D. Rockefeller. In 1903, when the General Education Board was founded, there were neither income nor estate taxes, and although the 16 amendment, authorizing a Federal income tax, had become part of the Constitution before the incorporation of the Rockefeller Foundation in May 1913, the first income tax law under the new amendment was not enacted until the following October, and the tax which it imposed was at too low a rate to have an appreciable influence.

The statement has been frequently repeated in the course of this investigation that a large part (sometimes placed at 90 percent) of the funds distributed by tax exempt foundations represent money which, but for the tax-exemption privilege, would belong to the Government. As to our two foundations this assertion is not correct. For example, the ordinary annual income of the Rockefeller Foundation in recent years has averaged around \$15 million. Dividends received from corporate stocks held by the foundation account for 91 percent of this amount. We are advised that if the Federal income-tax exemption were withdrawn, the tax payable by the foundation on the basis of the above figures, under the present corporate income-tax structure, would be about \$865,600, or at a rate of between 5 and 6 percent rather than 90 percent. This is due in part to the 85 percent dividend receipts credit, in part to the costs of operating the foundation's programs in

<sup>4</sup> Stenographic transcript (hereinafter cited as transcript), *ibid.*, p. 49.

public health and agriculture, costs which would clearly be deductible in arriving at taxable income, and in part to the right to deduct, in any event, in arriving at taxable income, contributions made to other tax-exempt organizations not in excess of 5 percent of the donor's net income. These figures do not take into account capital gains (as in 1952) or losses (as in 1951) resulting from the sale of investment securities.

Nor can it be supposed with any certainty that a repeal of the existing income-tax exemption of foundations would result in any significant increase of the public revenues. True, a fund which had been distributing all or the major part of its income in grants might not be able to deduct more than a limited percentage of this total in computing its income subject to tax, though it might well be held that the usual limitation is inapplicable to a corporation whose sole authorized activities consist of charitable operations and grants. In any event, the removal of the exemption might serve to influence some boards of trustees, as a matter of provident discharge of their trust, to discontinue grants and substitute direct operations in such fields as scientific research, health, or public welfare, on such a scale that the clearly deductible costs of operation would exhaust the income, leaving nothing against which the tax could be assessed. Although the benefits which could be derived from such direct operations might be of great significance, there would be a corresponding loss of flexible and strategic financial reserves available for the support of research and scholarship in established institutions of learning—particularly where uncommitted funds are needed to follow up on promising new leads in scientific and scholarly investigation. Even though it would be possible to discourage the grant-making function of foundations by changes in existing tax laws, these changes would not insure additional funds for the Public Treasury and might, in fact, work against the public interest.

It should further be noted that under their present status the funds of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board are a part of the general stream of enterprise which produces taxation for the support of the Public Treasury. As has been indicated, their funds are invested largely in corporate stocks and other types of securities.<sup>5</sup> The Rockefeller Foundation pays substantial taxes through the corporations whose stocks it holds. We are advised that during 1952 the foundation's share of corporate taxes, based upon its own holdings of corporate stocks, amounted to approximately \$12,785,000. Our two foundations also pay other taxes; for example, the transportation tax on the travel of staff, the tax included in rent and on supplies, and social-security taxes on payroll to name a few. When the foundation or board makes a philanthropic gift, such funds or the income therefrom go quickly into the payment of salaries and travel, the purchase of equipment and supplies, and a wide range of similar uses which are tax yielding in character. Apart from money which goes directly into the Public Treasury as taxes, both the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board have contributed substantially (over \$75 million) to tax-supported institutions and agen-

<sup>5</sup> The recommendation has been advanced before this committee that foundations should not hold more than 10 percent of the stock of any one corporate enterprise. Our foundations voluntarily adopted this principle some years ago and at present have reduced all of their holdings below this level with the exception of one company, our stock in which (22 percent of the shares outstanding) resulted from a gift. We are planning to make a similar reduction in this holding.

cies, such as State universities, public boards of education and boards of health. These contributions have been much larger than any income tax we might have paid had we not been tax exempt.

In broader terms, the activities of such agencies as endowed foundations make an important contribution to the economic structure upon which Government finance must rest. If, for example, the support of economic research makes it possible for both business leadership and Government to understand more clearly and more accurately the surging processes of our productive system and, on the basis of such knowledge, to make decisions which level off the peaks and troughs of the business cycle and sustain a high and steady national production, the benefit to the public purse is obvious. It is even more obvious that the virtual elimination of yellow fever, the sharp reduction in malaria and hookworm, have direct economic benefits as well as those which are measured in terms of the physical welfare of human beings.

The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board are large net contributors to, and not charges upon, our national wealth and Public Treasury. We believe that we clearly pay our way.

What has been said is not intended to depreciate the value of the exemption from Federal and State income tax of activities of a charitable, educational, or religious nature. The need for more, rather than less, private enterprise in such fields adds importance to the encouragement which legislatures have given through such exemptions to the prospective donor. The importance of the exemption should not, however, be unduly exaggerated in terms of dollars, nor should the fact of exemption be made an excuse for characterizing foundation funds as Government funds, or for restricting such funds to fields in which Government itself operates, or for projecting Government into fields which are better left to the private citizens of our richly diverse society.

#### C. INTELLECTUAL SURVEILLANCE

Much of the testimony heard by the committee bears directly or indirectly upon a fundamental and sensitive problem of foundation activity—that of foundation control over studies aided by foundation funds.

The implied premise of much of the criticism of foundations to be found in the testimony is that foundations should be held responsible for the views expressed by those who receive foundation grants. This, in turn, rests upon the premise that the power of the purse means control over the product. The criticism fails because of the errors in its premises.

The product to be expected from a foundation grant of the type so frequently criticized in testimony is an intellectual product. The exercise of control would frustrate the principal object of the grant, namely the unimpaired thinking of the scientist or scholar. If the answer were to be determined in advance, there would be no need to make the grant or conduct the study.

It should be noted that one of the committee's witnesses, Dr. Thomas Henry Briggs, testified:

It should go without saying that a foundation should never "attempt to influence findings and conclusions of research and investigations either through designation of personnel or in any other way."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Transcript, p. 271, *ibid.*, p. 102.

Under our general practice, we consider that our responsibility is to make a sound judgment at the time a grant is made, a judgment which encompasses the importance of the purpose for which the grant is requested and the capacity and character of the individuals and institutions who are to make use of it. But having made the basic judgment that the recipient has the capacity and character to carry out the study, we exercise a minimum of further control. Ordinary prudence and the obligations of our trust require that we insist upon financial accounting, to assure ourselves that funds are used for the purposes for which they were appropriated. Where a second grant to a particular undertaking is up for consideration, some assessment of the work done under the first grant is necessarily involved. Frequently, those who are working under foundation grants are visited by one or more officers of the foundation while the grant is still current, primarily to keep us informed as to what is going on in the field. If the foundation should discover that an improper use were being made of its funds, such as for subversive activities, the foundation would undoubtedly intervene.

Subject to the foregoing, it has been our consistent policy not to attempt to censor or modify the findings of scholars and scientists whose work we are supporting financially. This long-standing policy, which we believe to be wise, rests both upon principle and upon very practical considerations.

The following are among the more important of these :

1. For the foundation to exercise intellectual supervision over its grantees would require the foundation itself to formulate an officially approved body of doctrine in almost every field of human knowledge. This is not our role, and is quite beyond our intentions or our capacities.

2. In most cases, the foundation could make itself responsible for scholarly or scientific conclusions only if it, with its own staff, substantially repeated the studies in question as a basis for its own finding. This, too, we could not undertake except where our own staff is engaged in research, as in virus diseases and agriculture.

3. The role of surveillance would add enormously to the staff and overhead costs of the foundation and consume philanthropic funds for unnecessary and socially undesirable functions.

4. The foundation is almost never the sole contributor to the recipient of a grant; in fact, in the vast majority of cases it is a minority contributor. We see no basis in principle for the foundation to assert a right of control taking precedence over national governments, state legislatures, departments of education, boards of trustees of colleges and universities, faculties, other private donors, publishers, etc. For foundations to attempt to exert such authority would lead to the confusion of responsibility.

5. No institution, scholar or scientist of character would accept a grant which is conditioned upon intellectual control. To any scholar worthy of the name, nothing is more important than his intellectual freedom.

6. The foundation necessarily makes a grant before the results of the studies financed by the grant can be known. It is difficult to see how this order of procedure could be reversed.

The considerations outlined above seem to be conclusive against the exercise of intellectual control by a private foundation over the recipients of its grants. We believe that a free society grows in

strength and in moral and intellectual capacity on the basis of free and responsible research and scholarship. We shall continue to support vigorously this concept which lies at the heart of free institutions and we will oppose any effort by government to use the tax-exempt status to accomplish indirectly what could not be done directly under the Constitution.

#### D. CONGRESSIONAL JURISDICTION

We respect the heavy responsibility which rests upon the Congress for carrying out the onerous tasks placed upon it under the Constitution, but we submit that there are wide areas in the life of our people which were not intended to be subject to congressional regulation and control. We have welcomed the statements of the chairman and of other members of the committee which indicate that this important principle is receiving the committee's attention.

However, the committee has heard considerable testimony maintaining that foundations have contributed too much toward an empirical approach as contrasted with a philosophical approach to certain studies. We shall speak of this point later; for the moment, we wish merely to observe that the relation between empirical studies and fundamental or general principle is an intellectual issue which is as old as man himself, which entered our literature at least as early as Plato and Aristotle, and which will endure as long as there are men to think. It is not a question which any foundation, or all the foundations, can or should referee or decide, and our foundations have never attempted to do so. Nor is it, we submit, a matter under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Similarly, the curriculums of our schools are in the hands of tens of thousands of agencies which are independent in curriculum matters; these are the State and local educational authorities, teachers in our schools and colleges, and the boards of our independent educational institutions of all levels. The great strength of our educational system is its variety of patterns and its decentralization of control. We believe that it is not for government, nor for foundations, nor for any other group, to attempt to impose conformity upon this variety. If anyone has the impression that the foundations have the power to do so, he is wrong as a matter of fact. If anyone has the impression that our particular foundations have exerted pressure to produce such uniformity, he is equally wrong.

#### E. PERSPECTIVE AND DISTORTION

The Cox committee reported to the Congress that it had been "allotted insufficient time for the magnitude of its task."<sup>7</sup> We respectfully submit that the present committee faces even greater limitations of time and staff if, even though giving attention to fewer foundations than did the Cox committee, it extends its inquiry into a half century of social, economic, and political change in the United States.

The committee has before it a number of reports prepared by its own staff which purport to deal with these complex events. They have been widely regarded as a confused and inadequate review of the decades they purport to cover and are particularly deficient at the

<sup>7</sup> Final report, p. 6.

very point of greatest interest to this committee, namely, the responsibility of the foundations for the events themselves.

We ourselves do not find them to be a competent review of the trends they discuss, more particularly as to their sweeping generalizations, their proposed definitions of key terms, the accuracy and relevance of their charts and tables, and the imbalance of the selected quotations which they contain. We assume that we are not called upon to persuade staff members that they have been wrong about views which they have now placed in the public record as sworn testimony and that the committee will adopt procedures which will not permit staff to participate in both an accusatory and an adjudicating role.

Although several sections of this statement have a direct bearing upon these staff reports, we offer here brief comments on three of them.

*Report of the director of research*<sup>8</sup>

The committee's director of research described the logic used in the preparation of his initial report as "reasoning from a total effect to its primary or secondary causes."<sup>9</sup> If we read his report fairly in the context of this investigation, his logic produces the following: (1) A revolution occurred in the United States in the years 1933-36; (2) this revolution occurred without violence and with the full consent of an overwhelming majority of the electorate; (3) this could not have happened had not education in the United States prepared in advance to endorse it; (4) the foundations contributed funds and ideas to education; (5) therefore, the foundations are responsible for the revolution.

The report in question seems to give little weight to the great depression of the early 1930's, to World War I, and to World War II. Since the foundations have been charged with some undefined responsibility for an increase in the powers and functions of government, surely it is relevant that war and depression brought about an increased exercise of power by both the executive and legislative arms of the National Government under the Constitution. Surely it is also relevant that, while some measures adopted by Government during these decades were abandoned, others have continued, despite changes in party control, as a part of ongoing public policy. In any event, a number of allegations heard in the course of these hearings appear to be directed, not at foundations, but at the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government and at the electorate. We must strongly protest any attempt to involve our two nonpolitical organizations in questions which are so basically political, both because the charges are unsupported and because it would be out of character for our two philanthropies to attempt to reply to such attacks in effective political terms.

We must also comment upon the use of the word "revolution" in the report of the director of research. The word has strong emotional associations. It is frequently used in debate between political parties and between factions within a political party—and in such use, it is ordinarily accepted as a forensic figure of speech.

We object, however, to the use of the word "revolution" in an official proceeding where the implication is a charge of wrongdoing. Such a figure of speech should not be used as a basis for alleging improper conduct or for impugning the reputations of respectable and law-

<sup>8</sup> Transcript, p. 12 ff., *ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Transcript, p. 46, *ibid.*, p. 20.



abiding citizens. It does not help to put the word in quotation marks—these become lost. It does not help to say, at the beginning of the report, “In no sense should they [i. e., the statements in the report] be considered as proof”<sup>10</sup> for such statements are overlooked. It does not even help that the report came only from a member of the staff, for it has already been attributed in the press to the committee itself.

As a recent statement of the American tradition on such matters, we cite the following portion of an address made by President Eisenhower on May 31, 1954, at the Columbia University bicentennial dinner in New York:

Whenever, and for whatever alleged reason, people attempt to crush ideas, to mask their convictions, to view every neighbor as a possible enemy, to seek some kind of divining rod by which to test for conformity, a free society is in danger. Wherever man's right to knowledge and the use thereof is restricted, man's freedom in the same measure disappears.

Here in America we are descended in blood and in spirit from revolutionaries and rebels—men and women who dared to dissent from accepted doctrine. As their heirs, may we never confuse honest dissent with disloyal subversion.

Without exhaustive debate—even heated debate—of ideas and programs, free government would weaken and wither. But if we allow ourselves to be persuaded that every individual—or party—that takes issue with our own convictions is necessarily wicked or treasonous—then indeed we are approaching the end of freedom's road.<sup>11</sup>

*Report of the Assistant Director of Research on “Economics and the Public Interest”*<sup>12</sup>

A further issue of major importance is raised by this report, which is entitled “Economics and the Public Interest.”

In his introduction, the writer of the report says:

This report is made for the purpose of showing the nature and increasing costs of governmental participation in economic and welfare activities of the Nation.

The body of the report contains a number of tables reflecting the upward trend of Federal Government expenditures for such purposes as housing and slum clearance, social security and health, education (including the GI bill of rights), public works, food programs, etc. The foundations are brought into the picture by statements in the preface to the report to the effect that “Most, if not all of these newer activities of government are recommended in \* \* \* reports by various educational groups, social science, and others, supported by foundation grants,”<sup>13</sup> and that “Much of this planning was done with the aid of social scientists in government employ \* \* \* [many of whom] were directly or indirectly connected with educational organizations who have and still are receiving very substantial aid from the large foundations.”<sup>14</sup>

The implication of these statements is that a grant by a foundation to educational groups or institutions, or for the training of individuals through fellowships, makes the foundation responsible for the views of such groups, organizations and individuals on public issues. The report in question seems to assign this responsibility to us even in the case of employees of Government who are known to work under the policy direction of the President, Cabinet officers, and the Congress.

<sup>10</sup> Transcript, p. 42, *ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>11</sup> The Department of State Bulletin, vol. XXX, No. 781, Publication 5503 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June 14, 1954), p. 902.

<sup>12</sup> Transcript, p. 1407, *ibid.*, p. 628.

<sup>13</sup> Transcript, p. 1403, *ibid.*, p. 627.

<sup>14</sup> Transcript, p. 1405, *ibid.*, p. 627.

We do not see how such responsibility could possibly be assigned to foundations, if for no other reason than that it would be wholly contrary to public policy to give foundations the power to exercise it. Nor do we see why funds from foundation sources should be considered as so different in this respect from funds from all other sources.

Let us assume, however, for the sake of argument, that if the statements in the report were borne out by the facts, the foundations would be properly chargeable with a share of the responsibility for the increases in governmental expenditure resulting from "these newer activities of government." Would this be reprehensible "error," amounting to misconduct on the part of the foundations? If so, how much graver must be the responsibility of the Members of Congress who actually determined the policies and voted the funds in support of measures which, according to the words of the report, "may be said to be subversive, un-American, and contrary to public interest."<sup>15</sup> And how has the Supreme Court of the United States escaped impeachment for sustaining the constitutionality of such measures?

We respectfully urge the committee to reread the report and to compare the views of the Federal Constitution expressed by its author with those of the Supreme Court as set forth by Justice Cardozo (an appointee of President Hoover) in *Helvering v. Davis* (301 U. S. 619 (1937)), upholding the constitutionality of the old-age benefit provisions of the Social Security Act:

Congress may spend money in aid of the "general welfare." Constitution, art. I, sec. 8; *United States v. Butler* (297 U. S. 1, 65); *Steward Machine Co. v. Davis*, supra. There have been great statesmen in our history who have stood for other views. We will not resurrect the contest. It is now settled by decision. *United States v. Butler*, supra. The conception of the spending power advocated by Hamilton and strongly reinforced by Story has prevailed over that of Madison, which has not been lacking in adherents \* \* \* (p. 640).

\* \* \* Counsel for respondent has recalled to us the virtues of self-reliance and frugality. There is a possibility, he says, that aid from a paternal government may sap those sturdy virtues and breed a race of weaklings. If Massachusetts so believes and shapes her laws in that conviction, must her breed of sons be changed, he asks, because some other philosophy of government finds favor in the Halls of Congress? But the answer is not doubtful. One might ask with equal reason whether the system of protective tariffs is to be set aside at will in one State or another whenever local policy prefers the rule of laissez faire. The issue is a closed one. It was fought out long ago.<sup>16</sup> When money is spent to promote the general welfare, the concept of welfare or the opposite is shaped by Congress, not the States. So the concept be not arbitrary, the locality must yield \* \* \* (pp. 644-645).

<sup>16</sup> IV Channing, *History of the United States*, p. 404 (South Carolina Nullification); 8 Adams, *History of the United States* (New England Nullification and the Hartford Convention).

Our foundations have taken no position either for or against social-security legislation. We are not quoting the opinion of Justice Cardozo as an expression of the views of our foundations on the broad question of constitutional interpretation which he discusses. Again our foundations have no corporate opinion on such issues. But we respectfully submit that on such matters, as on the other controversial matters covered in the assistant research director's report, where the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government have spoken in their support, the measures in question cannot properly be characterized as "revolutionary," "subversive," or "un-American."

<sup>15</sup> Transcript, p. 1412. *Ibid.*, p. 629.

*Report by the legal analyst*

The policy issues presented by this report, parts I and II, are discussed in other sections of this statement. This report contains, however, statistical information about our grants which, on the basis of our own records and published reports, is so inaccurate as to be seriously misleading. The following items illustrate these inaccuracies.

*Regarding grants by General Education Board to Dec. 31, 1952*

	According to—	
	Report of legal analyst, <sup>1</sup> pt. I	GEB records
Columbia University.....	\$7,607,525	<sup>2</sup> \$3,804,644
College Entrance Examination Board.....	3,483,000	None
National Education Association.....	978,312	495,743
Progressive Education Association.....	4,090,796	1,622,506
Teachers College.....	11,576,012	1,540,397
Lincoln School.....	6,821,104	5,966,138
University of Chicago.....	118,225,000	25,090,562

<sup>1</sup> Transcript, p. 1568. Ibid., p. 701.

<sup>2</sup> Includes amount to Teachers College shown below.

*Regarding grants by the Rockefeller Foundation, 1929-52*

	According to—	
	Report of legal analyst, <sup>1</sup> pt. I	RF records
American Council on Education.....	\$1,235,600	\$397,400
Columbia University.....	33,300,000	<sup>2</sup> 5,113,248
London School of Economics.....	4,105,592	938,397
Teachers College.....	1,750,893	644,271
University of Chicago.....	<sup>3</sup> 25,087,000	13,170,103

<sup>1</sup> Transcript, p. 1574. Ibid., p. 703.

<sup>2</sup> Includes amount to Teachers College shown below.

<sup>3</sup> The legal analyst's report added to this figure a personal gift of \$35 million by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., which resulted in a total figure of \$60,087,000. The personal gift has been eliminated in this comparative statement, which is limited to the foundation's contributions.

*Regarding further grants by the Rockefeller Foundation*

	According to—	
	Report of legal analyst, <sup>1</sup> pt. II	Rockefeller Foundation records
American Council of Learned Societies (1925-52).....	\$11,069,770	\$4,758,775
American Historical Association (1925-37).....	190,830	43,001
Institute of International Education (1928-52).....	1,406,405	561,505

<sup>1</sup> Report, pt. II, p. 51. Ibid., p. 294.

If we are furnished information as to the figures desired, we shall be glad to supply them in the interest of an accurate permanent record.

## F. SCOPE OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

At the first public hearing, the chairman of this committee included the following in his remarks about the scope of the present inquiry:

Moreover, and again with an occasional exception, we shall chiefly confine our attention to the work of foundations in what are called the social sciences.

Little criticism has come to us concerning research or other foundation activities in the physical or exact sciences, such as medicine and physics.<sup>16</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

If we shall not spend much time in exposition of what great amount of good the foundations have admittedly done, it is because we deem it our principal duty fairly to seek out our error. It is only through this process that good can come out of our work. It will be for Congress, the people, and the foundations themselves to judge the seriousness of such error, and to judge also what corrective means, if any, should be taken. Our intention has been, and I wish to make this doubly clear, to conduct an investigation which may have constructive results, and which may make foundations even more useful institutions than they have been.<sup>17</sup>

We appreciate the fact that the chairman has taken note of large fields of foundation activity which have, over the years, become largely noncontroversial in character. With full confidence in the importance and usefulness of our support for work in the social sciences, we urge the committee to take all of our activities into account in any evaluation of our two foundations. In the case of the Rockefeller Foundation, for example, its grants in the social sciences represent 15 cents of the foundation's dollar expended. We believe that these appropriations have rendered a notable public service. But the broader question of the benefit to the public of any particular foundation necessarily involves a view of its work seen as a whole.

The committee has had little attention drawn to the wide-ranging scope of the private philanthropy provided by our two foundations. It would be impossible for us to summarize this activity in the space reasonably available to us. We respectfully urge any committee members who have not had an opportunity to do so to read Raymond B. Fosdick's book, a copy of which we are furnishing each member of the committee, our replies to the Cox committee questionnaire, and our testimony before that committee.

We append two tables<sup>18</sup> which we believe will be of some assistance. The first is a summary table covering both organizations, which was furnished to the Cox committee, but now is brought up to date through 1953. The second is a breakdown of grants of the Rockefeller Foundation to show something of the larger purposes for which they were made.

Mindful of the chairman's desire to concentrate: (a) on the social sciences, and (b) on seeking out error, we are naturally interested in the standard by which error is to be identified. If knowledge is much more elusive in the study of human affairs than in the case of physical phenomena, just so is it more difficult to be certain about what constitutes error.

Any scholar or scientist is subject to temporary errors; under conditions of freedom, corrections are worked out in the process of scientific and scholarly debate, oral or written, and the issues resolved by further testing and experimentation. It is not impossible for such issues to remain unresolved indefinitely, where no existing hypothesis appears adequately to explain all the data which must somehow be taken into account. Such differences are not treated as charges and countercharges but are the bricks out of which the edifice of knowledge is gradually built.

<sup>16</sup> Transcript, p. 3, *ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>17</sup> Transcript, p. 5, *ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Appendixes A and B.

If, however, we classify as error any departure from a generally accepted principle of dogma, or any view which opposes one's own, or any questioning of one's own commonsense experience, or any view which conflicts with one's own interest, then an official search for error must evoke the gravest misgiving. We have supposed that our constitutional arrangements and public policies make room for the widest divergence of ideas, while exacting a course of conduct from each of us which shares equitably the privileges and responsibilities of freedom.

We do not feel it necessary to consider at length the full implications of the above comments, because we believe that there are other questions which would be more immediately helpful to the committee in judging the role of our foundations in the social-science field. These questions are—

(1) Is it a reasonable exercise of the discretion vested in the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation to appropriate funds in support of social studies as a contribution to the well-being of mankind?

(2) Is it a reasonable exercise of such discretion for the trustees to make such grants almost exclusively to colleges, universities, and other research and scholarly organizations?

(3) Is it a reasonable exercise of such discretion to make such grants to such institutions, without requiring that the resulting studies conform to predetermined views of the foundation itself?

(4) Does the totality of grants made in support of the social sciences by the Rockefeller Foundation represent a body of research and investigation which is consonant with the public interest of the United States and with the well-being of mankind? We believe that all four questions must be answered affirmatively.

### III. ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

#### A. ORGANIZATION AND PURPOSES

The Rockefeller Foundation was chartered by a special act of the Legislature of the State of New York in 1913 for the purpose of promoting the well-being of mankind throughout the world. In 1929 the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, another philanthropic foundation established in 1918 by Mr. Rockefeller, was consolidated with the Rockefeller Foundation. The total of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts to the foundation was \$182,851,000, and the assets of the memorial at the time of consolidation had a value of \$58,756,000. By the end of 1953, the foundation had made 30,572 grants, totaling \$501,749,878 in expended and authorized appropriations. Its remaining capital funds have a present market value of approximately \$366 million.<sup>19</sup>

The General Education Board was incorporated in 1903 by a special act of Congress for the purpose of promoting education in the United States of America, without distinction of race, sex, or creed. It received from Mr. Rockefeller \$129,209,117 in a series of grants and an additional \$15,751,625 from the Rockefeller Foundation, making a total of \$144,960,742.<sup>20</sup> The board has made 11,237 grants totaling \$317,733,124, for the benefit of education in this country. Its funds

<sup>19</sup> As of July 21, 1954.

<sup>20</sup> An additional \$116,615 was received in gifts from other sources.

have now been distributed or allocated except for a relatively small balance of about \$700,000<sup>21</sup> and, for this reason, it is in the process of winding up its activities.

Although they are legally independent of one another, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board have had close ties. For many years a substantial majority of both boards of trustees has been identical. Since 1936 they have had the same chairman (successively John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Walter W. Stewart, John Foster Dulles, and John D. Rockefeller 3d) and the same president (successively Raymond B. Fosdick, Chester I. Barnard, and Dean Rusk). For a much longer period they have had a common treasurer; they are both served by the same comptroller. They have occupied offices on adjoining floors of the same building, which has fostered close contacts between the two staffs.

The operations of each organization have been in a broad sense coordinated with those of the other. Thus the foundation, authorized under its charter to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world, has tended to defer to the General Education Board on opportunities for aid to education as such within the United States, the field to which the board is directed by its charter. Of course, the Rockefeller Foundation has made substantial sums available to educational institutions in the United States and other countries in connection with its own activities.

#### B. TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY

The allegation has again been made before this committee that the trustees of foundations abdicate their responsibility. The Cox committee inquired into this point in 1952, hearing considerable testimony upon it, and reached a finding favorable to foundation trustees which concluded with the following statement:

As to the delegation by trustees of their duties and responsibilities, the problem is basically the same one that confronts the directors of a business corporation. Both must rely in large measure upon their staffs. There is this one important difference, in the opinion of the committee. The trustees of a public trust carry a heavier burden of responsibility than the directors of a business corporation. In fairness it should be said that in the opinion of the committee this principle is fully recognized by the trustees of foundations and that they make a determined effort to meet the challenge.<sup>22</sup>

It is difficult to understand the allegation in the case of the General Education Board prior to the recent curtailment of its activities, or its survival in the case of the Rockefeller Foundation, where the facts conclusively refute it. The explanation may lie in the quandary in which a hostile critic finds himself when he wishes to attack a grant which has been made by a board of trustees of distinguished citizens whose broad experience, public service, and loyalty cannot be effectively questioned. He elects to retreat into the position that "These men obviously didn't do it," rather than face the fact that such men might disagree with him.

The trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation, a complete list of whom is attached,<sup>23</sup> fully recognize a heavy responsibility for the trust which has been placed in their hands. They meet it in the following manner:

<sup>21</sup> As of July 21, 1954.

<sup>22</sup> Final report, p. 11.

<sup>23</sup> Appendix C.

(A) *Board meetings*

The full board of trustees meets twice each year, in April (1 full day) and in December (2 full days). The 1st day of the December meeting is ordinarily given over to a general discussion of the policies and procedures of the foundation; it is here that the trustees are afforded an opportunity to raise new ideas and offer criticisms and suggestions about the work of the foundation in its broadest aspects. As for the appropriations of funds to be considered at the 2 full meetings, the trustees are provided a docket at least 10 days in advance, which contains a description of the activities for which funds are recommended by the officers. The distribution of such a docket prior to each meeting gives the trustees an opportunity to study proposed actions in advance and to be prepared to offer suggestions or raise questions or consult with others before final action is taken. At each meeting, proposed appropriations are presented orally by the officers and are subject to discussion, approval, modification, or rejection by the full board. This consideration is not merely formal in character but includes the type of exchange which develops a consensus in the board and between the board and the officers which gives direction and guidance to the work of the foundation.

(B) *Executive committee*

The executive committee of the board of trustees has seven regular and two alternate members under the chairmanship of the president. It meets at least six times a year at the offices of the foundation. It receives an advance docket and considers proposed appropriations with the same procedures used by the full board. It is limited in the amounts it may expend between board meetings without the express authorization of the board.

(C) *Special policy committees*

From time to time the chairman of the board of trustees may appoint a special policy committee of the trustees to review the policies and operations of the foundation. Such reviews extend over a period of months and require substantial commitment of time and interest from the trustee members of such committees. Their conclusions and recommendations are reported to the full board where thorough discussion serves to clarify policy and to readjust the work of the foundation to changing conditions.

(D) *Other trustee committees*

Other standing committees of the board are the finance committee, the nominating committee and the committee on audit, whose functions are indicated by their titles.

(E) *Informal discussion*

The trustees take a lively interest in the work of the foundation which leads to a considerable amount of informal discussion among themselves, between trustees and officers, and between trustees and individuals outside the foundation.

(F) *Publications*

The trustees receive and read the publications of the foundation, including a monthly confidential report prepared by the officers for the information of the trustees. The latter report is "confidential" largely because it is intended only for use within the foundation itself and because it occasionally discusses the progress of scientific and scholarly studies before the scientists and scholars themselves are ready to make their findings public.

(G) *Visits to foundation activities*

Many of the trustees have an opportunity from time to time to see firsthand some of the work being supported by foundation appropriations, both in the United States and abroad. On occasion, 2 or 3 members of the board may be asked specifically to visit a particular activity, such as the Mexican agricultural program, on behalf of the foundation. Since trustees are men whose other interests require travel, they frequently avail themselves of opportunities to discuss foundation affairs with our representatives stationed abroad and to visit one or another project.

(H) *Election of officers*

One of the most important duties resting upon trustees is the election of the officers of the foundation. This is particularly true in the case of the president, the two vice presidents, the secretary, the treasurer, the comptroller,

and the directors of the four divisions. With the exception of the president, the treasurer and the comptroller, the officers are elected annually upon the nomination of the president. It is fair to say that the procedures of the foundation give the trustees an excellent opportunity to know and to judge the personalities, character, and quality of work of the principal officers of the foundation.

It should be obvious from the above summary account that the role of a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation is an active one, particularly for those trustees who serve on one or more of its committees. Despite the demands made upon trustees' time, the attendance of trustees at board and committee meetings establishes a remarkable record of attention to duty on a voluntary and unremunerated basis. Absences are almost invariably limited to those who are ill, out of the country, or prevented from attending by some other clearly overriding consideration. Over the past 5 years, for example, if we exclude only trustees actually abroad or on formal leave of absence, attendance at board and executive committee meetings has averaged 86 percent of the membership. This compares most favorably with the experience of large business corporations.

We conclude these remarks about the role of trustees by repeating here a portion of the testimony given before the Cox committee by Chester I. Barnard, former president of the foundation and general education board:

\* \* \* I have been a director of business corporations and still am for 40 years. I never have seen any board that I have been on—and I know how many of the others operate—in which the attention to the policies and the details by the directors or trustees, whichever they use, were such as it is in the Rockefeller Foundation. I do not know any organization in which a week in advance you have a complete docket book with the explanation of every item over \$10,000 that you are going to be asked to vote on, and that includes with it a detailed list of every grant-in-aid, of every scholarship or fellowship that has been granted and any other action taken, and that has attached a list of the declinations. That is just as important from a trustee's point of view as the approvals.

Nor have I ever known of any organization in which so much careful attention was given to it.

In 12 years I have missed no meetings of the board of trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation and only 3 of its executive committee meetings, and that is not unique at all. That is some record for people who are busy, and every one of the members on this board is busy. They read the docket book in advance. In addition to the docket book every single item in most circumstances has to be presented by the director of the division which proposes it, and he has to subject himself to cross-examination, and he gets it. He doesn't get it on every item, of course, but he gets it. So the matters that come before the board of trustees of this foundation in my experience have been given more careful attention by more competent people than I have seen in any other institution. There is just nothing like it, and the idea that this thing has been run without adequate attention by the trustees, that it is just in the hands of a bureaucracy of officers, just certainly isn't true, and it ought to be recorded here that it isn't true.<sup>24</sup>

#### C. OFFICER AND STAFF RESPONSIBILITY

More has been said about trustees than about the officers and full-time professional staff, since the role of the latter is better understood. The officers and staff of the Rockefeller Foundation are organized, broadly speaking, into the divisions of medicine and public health, natural sciences and agriculture, social sciences, humanities, and in administration. The full-time personnel of the general education board has now been sharply reduced because of the liquidation of its activities.

<sup>24</sup> U. S. Congress (82d, 2d sess), House Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and Comparable Organizations. Hearings (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953, p. 562).



While, as has been shown, the trustees do not "abdicate" their responsibilities to the officers of the foundation, they must and do rely heavily upon the officers for the effective performance of the foundation's tasks. The officers make recommendations on policy, seek the most promising opportunities for the application of foundation funds, review and investigate requests, propose grants for trustee consideration, and keep in touch with educational, scholarly and scientific leadership in many countries. Some are engaged directly in scientific research in such fields as virology and agriculture. In addition to handling the extensive administrative business of the foundation, the officers are responsible for the approval of small grants and the award of fellowships under general policies established by the trustees and from funds made available by them for that purpose.

It should be noted that the officers act as a group; their decisions and recommendations are not made individually but in a process of discussion which brings to bear a variety of experience and judgment. The divisions hold frequent staff meetings on requests falling within their respective fields of interest; discussions between divisions occur where proposals involve more than one; finally, proposals to the trustees are considered in a conference of the principal officers of the foundation, where criticism and discussion can take place on the broadest basis.

The bylaws of the Rockefeller Foundation provide that the president is the only officer eligible to serve as a trustee. Among the principal officers of the foundation are always a number who by experience and capacity would be entirely qualified to serve as trustees and, were they not officers, might well be invited to join the board. In fact, then, the affairs of the foundation are in the hands of a board or trustees of 21 distinguished citizens an officer group of highly qualified individuals, all of whom can be relied upon to carry the heavy burdens of their philanthropic trust with care and a deep concern for the public interest.

#### D. TYPES OF GRANTS

The trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation determine, on recommendation of the officers, what grants are to be made by the Foundation, but the trustees delegate to the officers restricted authority to make certain smaller grants in categories described below. The trustees also determine, upon recommendations of the officers, what expenditures are to be made for administration and similar purposes.

The foundation makes grants both to individuals and institutions. Grants to individuals are in the form of fellowships or of travel grants and are limited in amount and duration. Grants to institutions are, in accordance with the policy of the foundation, made only to other tax-exempt institutions in the United States and to such institutions abroad as are comparable in character and purpose to those receiving tax exemption in this country. By following this policy, the foundation is assured that its grants to institutions in the United States are limited to those which the Government itself has recognized as being philanthropic in character.

In brief, the foundation's grants are handled as follows:

1. The board of trustees, at its meetings, may make grants without limit in amount, from either income or principal.

2. Between meetings of the board, its executive committee, consisting of seven members and two alternate members (all trustees) may make grants from either income or principal, subject, however, to the following limitations:

- (a) Each grant must be in accordance with the general policies approved by the board;
- (b) No grant may increase by more than \$500,000 a grant previously made by the board;
- (c) No new grant may exceed \$500,000; and
- (d) Total grants between meetings of the board may not exceed \$5 million unless authorized by the board.

A summary of the minutes of each meeting of the board and of the executive committee, listing all grants, is sent to all trustees immediately following the meeting. All actions of the executive committee are reported to the board at the first board meeting following such actions.

3. The trustees delegate to the officers authority to make certain smaller grants in the following categories:

(a) *Grants-in-aid.*—These are allocations made by the officers from funds appropriated for this purpose annually for each division of the foundation by the trustees. Each allocation is limited to \$10,000; total allocations to a project may not exceed \$10,000 in any one year, and total support of a project through grants in aid may not extend beyond 3 years or be in excess of \$30,000. The formal action authorizing the grant in aid must be signed by the director of the division concerned, by the president or vice president, after examining the supporting materials, and by the comptroller, who certifies the availability of funds for the purpose. The usual grant in aid is about \$2,000; not more than about 7 percent are for as much as \$10,000. All allocations are reported promptly to the executive committee of the board of trustees.

(b) *Director's fund grants.*—A director's fund of not more than \$5,000 is set up annually for each division (as an allocation from the grant-in-aid appropriation made by the trustees). Individual allocations from this fund may not exceed \$500 and are made through a written action signed by a division director and certified by the comptroller. All such allocations are reported twice a year to the trustees. The fund provides a flexible mechanism for prompt response to the needs of individual scholars and scientists at strategic times in the development of their work. The grants are used for such things as equipment, honoraria, travel, materials and research assistance.

(c) *Fellowship awards.*—These are awards made by the officers from funds appropriated annually for this purpose by the trustees. The action making the foundation's award is signed by the director of the division concerned, the president or vice president, and the comptroller. All fellowship appointments are reported promptly to the executive committee.

#### IV. FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

##### A. BACKGROUND OF FOUNDATION INTEREST

In a formal sense, the Rockefeller Foundation undertook financial support for social studies when, in 1929, it was consolidated with the

Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and continued an interest already developed by the latter philanthropy.

In much broader terms, the foundation came to believe that its commitment to promote "the well-being of mankind throughout the world" compelled it to give attention to the baffling complexities of human relations—to the processes by which men earn a living and the difficulties they encounter in working out tolerable relations among individuals, groups, and nations.

From the beginning the foundation never considered that it had or should have solutions to social problems behind which it should throw its funds and influence. It has had no nostrums to sell. Its approach rested upon a faith that the moral and rational nature of man would convert an extrusion of knowledge into an extension of virtue, and that he could make better decisions if his understanding could be widened and deepened.

The experiences of World War I and the painful uncertainties of the postwar and depression period seemed to reflect a growing and menacing gap between man's technical and scientific capacity and his apparent inability to deal with his own affairs on a rational basis. In any event, it did not appear that we could escape fundamental political, economic, moral, and social problems by concentrating upon "safe" scientific subjects. Successes in public health were to mean rapidly falling death rates and increased population pressures upon resources. The study of nuclear physics, at first only a brilliant extension of man's intellectual curiosity, was to lead to hydrogen weapons.

There was no illusion about the rudimentary character of the so-called social sciences or about the severe limitations which are encountered in attempting to apply the methods of the physical sciences to man's own behavior. Nevertheless, it was felt that there might be sufficient regularity about human behavior to permit fruitful study, and that a scientific approach might evolve methods of study which, if not a direct application of techniques developed in the older sciences, might lead to surer bases of knowledge than we now have. In any event, the possibility was worth the effort and the very attempt might uncover promising leads which would increase our knowledge to a constructive degree.

A further impulse behind the interest in social studies was a conviction that the strengthening of our own free institutions required a better understanding of the processes of a free society and the framework within which a citizen enjoys the privileges and bears the responsibilities of liberty itself. At a period when free institutions came under challenge from totalitarian ideology of both the left and the right, it was felt that penetrating studies of our own free economic and political institutions would help them to withstand assault.

It was fully appreciated that social studies would involve controversial subjects. It was felt, however, that a private foundation could, without itself taking sides on controversial issues, make a contribution by supporting objective studies which might illuminate such issues and reduce contention.

Three brief excerpts from our records throw light upon the way in which the foundation has approached the support of the social sciences. The first is a memorandum prepared by the executive committee of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in 1924, referred to by Dr. Thomas Henry Briggs in his testimony before this com-

mittee,<sup>25</sup> the gist of which is quoted in Mr. Fosdick's history of the foundation:

The present memorandum proposes to indicate principles which affect the ability of the memorial to become associated with projects in the field of social science. Certain principles would seem to make association undesirable. It appears advisable:

1. Not to contribute to organizations whose purposes and activities are centered largely in the procurement of legislation.
2. Not to attempt directly under the memorial to secure any social, economic, or political reform.
3. Not to contribute more than a conservative proportion toward the current expense of organizations engaged in direct activity for social welfare.
4. Not to carry on investigations and research directly under the memorial, except for the guidance of the memorial.
5. Not to attempt to influence the findings or conclusions of research and investigations through the designation of either personnel, specific problems to be attacked, or methods of inquiry to be adopted; or through indirect influence in giving inadequate assurances of continuity of support.
6. Not to concentrate too narrowly on particular research institutions, incurring thereby the danger of institutional bias.

Certain principles would seem to make assistance from the memorial desirable. It appears appropriate:

1. To offer fellowships to students of competence and maturity for study and research under the supervision of responsible educational and scientific institutions.
2. To contribute to agencies which may advance in indirect ways scientific activity in the social field.
3. To make possible the publication of scientific investigations sponsored by responsible institutions or organizations through general appropriations to be administered in detail by the sponsoring agency.
4. To contribute toward the expenses of conferences of scientific men for scientific purposes.
5. To make possible, under the auspices of scientific institutions, governmental agencies or voluntary organizations, demonstrations which may serve to test, to illustrate or to lead to more general adoption of measures of a social, economic or governmental character which have been devised, studied and recommended by responsible agencies.
6. To support scientific research on social, economic and governmental questions when responsible educational or scientific institutions initiate the request, sponsor the research and assume responsibility for the selection and competence of the staff and the scientific spirit of the investigations.<sup>26</sup>

The second quotation is a brief statement on controversy adopted by the trustees of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and subsequently by the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation, following the merger in 1929 of the two philanthropies:

Subjects of a controversial nature cannot be avoided if the program is to concern itself with the more important aspects of modern social life. In fact, successful treatment of issues of a controversial sort would be so important a contribution to the fundamental objectives of the program that the existence of militant differences of opinion cannot be thought to preclude the promotion of inquiry under appropriate auspices.<sup>27</sup>

The last is taken from a memorandum prepared by the director of the division of social sciences of the foundation in 1944:

1. Though the degree of social need is always pressing toward grandiosity, modest work will, in the long run, be most effective.
2. In recommending grants officers should try to anticipate the future—never merely ride the coattails of an already discernible trend.
3. The social sciences division has no "nostrums" to sell. In choosing the objects of grants the guiding tendency should be not to pronounce answers but to

<sup>25</sup> Transcript, p. 271 ff. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>26</sup> Raymond B. Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1952), pp. 200-201.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 202.

discover truth—not to manipulate new forces but to understand them—not to choose society's path but to illuminate it.<sup>28</sup>

#### B. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

It has been suggested to this committee that foundations have had an adverse effect on scholarship and research through an undue emphasis on empiricism and "a premature effort to reduce our meager knowledge of social phenomena to the level of applied science."<sup>29</sup>

We have presumed to question whether this committee has a mandate from the Congress to inquire into the decision of foundation trustees as to the distribution of funds between empirical and nonempirical studies or to inquire into the current practices of our colleges and universities in this regard. But we do not seek to evade the merits of the issue.

The history of the intellectual processes by which man has accumulated knowledge shows that observation, experimentation, induction, deduction and verification have each had an important role to play and that it is by their skillful and imaginative combined use that we have been able to push back the frontiers of knowledge. Without empirical examination, general propositions fail to establish and maintain contact with reality; without general concepts, fact-finding becomes aimless wandering and produces helter-skelter collections of unrelated bits and pieces. By observation and experimentation man refines his ideas about the world in which he lives; by other rational processes he reduces his masses of fact and impression to a degree of order and gives them meaning. After enough regularity has been exposed to justify the construction of a general theory, then and only then can occur the crucial test of verification. Throughout this process the questions "What is it?" and "How does it happen?" are among the tools man uses while seeking an answer to the underlying question, "What does it mean?"

The interplay of observation, experimentation and theorizing has produced brilliant results in the natural sciences, enabling man to fight back at disease, to harness new forms of power, and to wrest a more abundant living from his environment. But even in the case of the natural sciences, the path he has traveled has been a tortuous one, filled with false leads, imperfect observation, inexact experiment, theories which claimed too much, and contradictory facts for which he could find no adequate explanation. New ideas have had to run a gantlet of prejudice and entrenched opinion. Today's firmly held truth is modified by tomorrow's fresh discovery. And still today, as man looks out from peaks of knowledge which he dared not hope to scale, he sees still higher peaks on the distant horizon and vast fields of ignorance still to be explored. The process continues—with new findings, new mistakes, new instruments, new techniques, and most important of all, new concepts and fresh imagination.

It was inevitable that an attempt would be made to apply the methods of the natural sciences to human affairs. Chemical and physical approaches to the subtle problems of living matter—once considered dominated by mysterious "vital forces" had striking and

<sup>28</sup> Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, pp. 211-212.

<sup>29</sup> Transcript, p. 42, *ibid.*, p. 19.

promising successes. It was wholly natural to attempt to apply similar analytical and quantitative techniques to social problems. It should not be surprising that this attempt would encounter major obstacles—as did the efforts of those who first tried to apply Newton's physics and Lavoisier's chemistry to biology and medicine. The techniques appropriate to the laboratory were insufficient for the study of man in his social environment; the circumstances of study were different in fundamental respects; conditions could not be readily controlled so as to study one factor at a time, as the physical scientist often does. The basic equipment of the scientist was nevertheless required: careful examination of the evidence, an objective approach to data, and a lively and fertile imagination in the construction of hypotheses to be tested, and, throughout, a clear recognition that there must be a joint emphasis on speculation and experience. Beyond that, techniques had to be revised and improved; the danger of seeing too much had to be avoided; and the disconcerting influences of undetected factors had to be faced. Although his problems of procedure were difficult enough, the social scientist also faced the resistance and even hostility of man himself, with his personal or group interests affected and his emotions and traditional patterns upset by new knowledge.

The social scientist persists in his effort to learn more about human behavior, despite the modest beginnings and the challenging complexity of his task. He believes that he is beginning to know something, even though he is sure that he does not know everything. He is in position to throw some light on some situations, knowing better than most where his present limitations are. For example, we know a great deal more now than we did 20 years ago about the processes by which we make a living in a free enterprise economy—more about capital growth, the labor force, the market, rates of productivity, prices; and this knowledge is becoming more accessible to the tens and hundreds of thousands whose decisions determine the ebb and flow of our economic life. We know more about the consumer, his plans and prospective demands, his liquid assets, his preferences. We know more about personnel selection and training, the motivations which affect productivity, the techniques of management. We know more about the processes of normal development, the way in which people learn. We can be quite accurate about short-range population predictions affecting such matters as our requirements for schools and teachers or our pool of manpower for military service. We at least know something about what new knowledge we need to extend these predictions over a longer range.

These few examples are given to illustrate that our knowledge about human affairs is increasing, even if slowly and imperfectly, and that such knowledge as we have can contribute practical benefits while the search continues. If there are claims being made which seem overreaching, if social scientists are in disagreement among themselves and with the layman, if there are many questions which cannot be answered, all this is entirely normal. If there are errors and a danger that we shall be misled by errors, the safeguard is the classic and traditional one: free debate, the empirical testing of opposing views, and a standing invitation to confront error with truth. Our society is deeply in debt to the best of the social scientists. They are among the most important of today's pioneers.

As far as the Rockefeller Foundation is concerned, we attach no particular importance to the argument about whether the term "social

science" is properly used. Some of those who object to it probably overestimate the certainties of the natural sciences. Some who use it may claim too much for our knowledge of man. It is our view that much more can be known about man than we now do and that knowledge is to be preferred to superstition or prejudice. If a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, the remedy is to advance further into the unknown and seek out its mysteries, not to retreat into enforced ignorance.

Our foundations have provided funds for promising studies of an empirical character in the social sciences, largely in the fields of economics and human behavior, and we take genuine satisfaction from them. These studies have been, for the most part, much more than mere fact finding; they have been accompanied by a sensitive interest in generalization and underlying principle. It has been our impression that those who are engaged in such studies are much aware of the importance of general concepts and are the first to recognize the inadequacies of the tentative generalizations thus far reached. The final answers have not been found is a reason for continuing the effort rather than for abandoning the approach.

It should not be surprising that, on a comparative dollar basis, foundation funds might seem to be more heavily concentrated in empirical studies. They represent a relatively new field for academic development and reflect, as the president of the Social Science Research Council has pointed out, the pragmatic element in the American experience. Further, they are expensive and are often beyond the reach of ordinary college and university budgets. Under these conditions, foundation support is required if significant advances are to be made.

Alongside of empirical studies, our foundations have been interested in philosophy and theory and have made many grants for the more speculative fields. We have an active interest in moral, political, and legal philosophy, in moral and spiritual values, in the philosophy of history and the theoretical aspects of economics and international relations. If the amounts have not been large in total, it is partly because large amounts are not needed, as contrasted with empirical studies. A further reason is that the special combination of interest and speculative capacity is somewhat rare, professional opportunities are limited, and large numbers of scholars in these fields do not come forward. Finally, it is not at all clear just how a foundation interest is best expressed; perhaps what is most needed is fellowship or grant-in-aid opportunities for younger scholars and a certain amount of free time for older scholars in widely diverse fields who wish to philosophize about their experience and get their thoughts into more systematic form. These are questions to which we are giving continuous attention.

## V. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

### A. INTRODUCTION

We turn now to the specific questions which the Congress has referred to this committee for determination. According to the report of the committee's director of research, these questions are the following:

Have foundations—

Used their resources for purposes contrary to those for which they were established?

Used their resources for purposes which can be classed as un-American?  
 Used their resources for purposes which can be regarded as subversive?  
 Used their resources for political purposes?  
 Resorted to propaganda in order to achieve the objective for which they have made grants?<sup>30</sup>

#### B. CONFORMITY TO CHARTER PURPOSE

The first question cited above is whether foundations have used their resources for purposes contrary to those for which they were established. As to the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board, the answer is clearly "No."

Let us first consider the foundation. It would surely be hard to find words of broader import than those used in its charter to describe its purpose, "to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." Only one inference can fairly be drawn from this wording: that the intent of the founder was to place no limitation on the discretion of those who from time to time would be responsible for controlling the destinies of the foundation, so long as their decisions could reasonably be regarded as contributing to the well-being of mankind.

This was the determination of Mr. Rockefeller, based upon his long experience of personal giving, and his knowledge of the pitfalls awaiting donors who attempt to circumscribe too narrowly the purposes for which philanthropic funds will be available over a considerable period of years. He preferred to leave the decision as to program and policy in the hands of succeeding boards of trustees, believing that a trust in their wisdom and experience was less likely to be frustrated than an attempt on his part to anticipate the needs of later generations.

Where the charter uses such broad language to describe the organization's purpose, a strong presumption of validity attaches to the determinations of its trustee, unless they fall clearly beyond the generally recognized area of permissible philanthropic giving. Whose judgment is to be substituted for that of the trustees, as better qualified to determine the purposes for which the Rockefeller Foundation was established? Is a grant to be condemned as not within those purposes because, for example, it is in support of studies relating to the United Nations? True, there was no United Nations when the foundation was established in 1913. But the foundation's charter was framed to meet the needs of an unforeseeable future. That was the precise reason for stating the organization's purpose in such comprehensive terms. Those who would impose a restrictive interpretation on such language have a heavy burden of proof to carry, and may fairly be said to expose themselves to the suspicion of wishing to substitute their own political and economic predilections for the open-minded, farseeing vision of the foundation's creator.

Turning to the General Education Board, we find that its charter expresses a similar breadth of purpose. The special act of Congress incorporating the board in 1902 declared its object to be "the promotion of education within the United States of America without distinction of race, sex, or creed." The types of education to be encouraged, the methods to be pursued, the institutions to be benefited, were wisely left to the discretion of the Board's trustees. With respect to the General Education Board we repeat what we have said as to the foun-

<sup>30</sup> Transcript, p. 47, *ibid.*, p. 21.



dation, namely, that those who claim that the organization's resources have been used for purposes which are contrary to those so broadly expressed in its charter have a heavy burden of proof to carry, and one which, we submit, has been far from sustained in this investigation.

A criticism has at times been made that the interest of the Rockefeller Foundation in the social sciences represented a departure from "the wishes of the founder." There was discussion in the foundation from the beginning about a possible interest in the social sciences; Mr. Rockefeller himself established the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial to carry on his wife's interest in social-welfare activities. At an early stage the memorial decided to concentrate largely in the social-science field; this interest became a part of the program of the Rockefeller Foundation upon the consolidation of the two philanthropies in 1929.

It should be pointed out that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., served as chairman of the board of trustees of the foundation for 22 years (1917-39). He had been intimately associated with his father's developing philanthropy and served the foundation during the period when the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities were added to its program.

John D. Rockefeller 3d, the present chairman of the board, testified at some length on this point before the Cox committee in 1952.<sup>31</sup>

There is no credible evidence to support the assertion that our two foundations have in some reprehensible way departed from the purposes of our founder or the purposes inscribed by public authority in our charter.

#### C. ALLEGED SUPPORT OF UN-AMERICAN OR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

We come next to allegations that the foundations have promoted "un-American" or "subversive" action. This has been defined to this committee by its director of research as "any action having as its purpose the alteration of either the principles or the form of the United States Government by other than constitutional means."<sup>32</sup>

The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board would never knowingly participate in or support un-American or subversive action. We were requested to report to the Cox committee the names of recipients of grants who had been listed by the Attorney General as subversive or who had been cited or criticized by the House Un-American Activities Committee or the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. No grant has ever been made by either foundation to a recipient whose name appears on the Attorney General's list of subversives. This list, however, applies to organizations only, not individuals, and to the best of our knowledge there is no similar comprehensive list of individuals who have been officially designated by government as subversive. Consequently, independent philanthropic bodies such as our foundations, whose earnest desire is to avoid gifts to subversive individuals, are without reliable and positive guidance in making their grants. The House Un-American Activities Committee has published Cumulative Index V to its publications, but this document states: "The fact that a name appears in this index is not per se an indication of a record of subversive activities. It

<sup>31</sup> Hearings, pp. 565-568.

<sup>32</sup> Transcript, p. 37, *ibid.*, p. 17.

simply indicates that said name has been mentioned in connection with testimony or a report submitted.”<sup>33</sup>

In making their reports to the Cox committee, our two foundations revealed the names of all grant recipients who, so far as we could discover, had ever been commented upon adversely by either of the House or Senate committees above mentioned, or who had been listed in any report of either committee as having been identified by a witness as a Communist, as one of a group affiliated with an alleged Communist-front organization, or as one of the participants in some form of pro-Communist activity. Because they came within one or another of these categories, the Rockefeller Foundation named 2 organizations and 23 individuals who had benefited from its grants, and the General Education Board named an additional six individuals to whom or for whose support it had made grants.

The reporting of these names was by no means an acknowledgment by our foundations that the organizations and individuals were in fact subversive. On the contrary, a number of them have steadfastly denied under oath any Communist affiliations, and now occupy positions inconsistent with any serious doubt as to their loyalty. Two of the individuals have admitted that they were Communists at one time, but they have publicly renounced the party. Neither of the two organizations has been placed on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. Furthermore, in most cases the grants were made by our foundations long before the recipients were named even in the manner above mentioned, and also before the slightest question had been raised about them.

Our foundations refrain as a matter of policy from making grants to known Communists. This rests upon two elements, the clearly expressed public policies of the United States, within which our foundations operate, and the increasing assaults by communism upon science and scholarship which would lead our foundations, on intellectual grounds alone, to withhold support.

We recognize the necessity for Government to seek out and deal with subversive activity from any quarter. In this, Government is entitled to the sympathetic assistance of all responsible citizens. Where freedom and security are balanced against each other and it becomes necessary to locate the line which separates permitted and prohibited conduct, difficult decisions have to be made which reach into the fundamentals of our society. For example, the definition of subversion is a matter of extreme difficulty.

On broad grounds of public policy, we believe that private citizens and organizations should approach unofficial definitions of subversion with the greatest caution. This is not merely because the task is difficult, as the Congress has found it to be on the official plane. If private organizations and associations should produce their own definitions of subversion and should act toward their fellow citizens on the basis of such private definitions rather than of those furnished by duly constituted authority, the mutual confidence and trust which are the cement of our democratic society would rapidly crumble away. The presumption of innocence is more than a luxury to be enjoyed in settled times; it is a vital element in a society of freemen who work together by consent and not by force. Under the American system,

<sup>33</sup> Cumulative Index to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities: Index (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953), p. 1.

tyranny in government can be struck down at the ballot box but it is far more difficult to hold private organizations to proper standards if these organizations intrude upon security activities which are at the heart of the governmental function.

A private citizen or organization can properly look to Government for guidance in matters affecting loyalty and subversion. When one turns to public laws and to official declarations of public policy for a definition of the term "subversive," one finds a lack of precision which itself may reflect differences about what constitutes wise policy in this field as well as possible concern about the impact of applicable constitutional provisions. For such constitutional provisions as those concerning treason, bills of attainder, free speech, free press, and due process of law enjoin caution upon Government lest the voice of the opposition be silenced by public authority and fair differences of opinion lead to the persecution of those with whom we do not agree.

We attempt to set standards for our activities and appropriations which go far beyond any definition of subversion. We believe objective scholarship to be inconsistent with attitudes predetermined by a totalitarian ideology or with conclusions which are reached to conform to a dictated pattern. The search for the highest quality, for scholars and scientists of complete integrity, for men and women of fine character and acknowledged capacity for leadership necessarily means that questions of loyalty arise only in the rarest instances.

But we have always kept in mind the importance of the nonconformist in the advancement of human thought. This is not communism—it is the antithesis of communism, which regiments its followers and tolerates no dissent from the dogma of the Kremlin. Mistakes can and will be made and private organizations cannot guarantee a perfect record, any more than can an intelligence agency of Government itself. So long as there is alertness to the dangers involved, and reasonable effort to avoid them, we believe that the public interest will be adequately protected. It would be gravely injurious to the public interest if fear should lead to such restrictive procedures as to impair seriously the work of the foundations at the frontiers of human knowledge.

We expect Government, acting under the law and the Constitution, to identify what is subversive. We expect that the standard of conduct thus defined will be applied by due process. We believe that private citizens and organizations are entitled to rely upon a man's reputation among his fellows for character, honesty, loyalty, and good citizenship and that private citizens and organizations should not enter upon certain of the techniques of investigation appropriate only to Government. We recognize that this is a field of infinite complexity and are prepared to cooperate in any reasonable way to take account of dangers from any source.

#### D. SUPPORT OF PRO-AMERICAN PROJECTS

We turn next to the related question whether our foundations have adequately supported pro-American projects.

Our grants are made almost exclusively to colleges, universities, and other research and scholarly organizations. We affirm our confidence in them as patriotic institutions which recognize their obligation to serve the public interest. The diversity of interest and aspiration among the American people forbids our thinking of pro-American

in terms of a narrow formula couched in purely political terms. Institutions which nourish the entire range of the religious, scientific, economic, social, artistic, and cultural values of our society are, in the deepest and best sense, pro-American in character. We know of no class of institutions more alive to our basic values and more concerned to see them understood and appreciated than are our colleges and universities. We know of no better investment in the future of our country than our substantial grants to such institutions.

If we think, not of institutions, but of the kinds of work performed or supported, again we believe that our two foundations have contributed immeasurable benefits to our country. We mention, but do not emphasize, that a very large portion of our funds has been spent in the United States. We would suppose that a 35-year campaign against yellow fever was pro-American and that those who gave their lives in the foundation's successful fight against this pestilence served America, as well as the rest of mankind, as truly as did the soldier who gave his life in battle. The building of a giant telescope on Mount Palomar, the campaign against hookworm, the large and sustained interest in Negro education, large-scale support for the study of the economics of a free-enterprise system, the provision for thousands of fellowships, are all examples of activities of which America has been a major beneficiary. It does not diminish America's gain to know that others benefited as well, nor does it subtract from the end result to know that the impetus came from a desire to "promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world."

In a somewhat narrower sense, however, our two organizations have consciously sought ways and means of contributing to the strengthening of our national life. This has been expressed in large support for medical education in the United States, in grants for extensive studies of our own economy, in support for studies of our legal and constitutional system, our State and local governments, by interest in national, regional, and local history, in support for both creation and appreciation in the arts. Materials available to the committee will show many hundreds of grants for such purposes. In American history, for example, they will show 33 grants in 1953, 27 in 1948, and 25 in 1943—just to take 3 typical years.

In addition to American studies in the United States, we have encouraged American studies abroad, parallel to area studies of other cultures in this country, as a means of establishing a base of knowledge for broader and more accurate understanding between Americans and the peoples of other cultures. Grants for this purpose have gone to such universities as Oslo, Munich, Ankara, Tokyo, Kyoto, and Doshisha, to name a few.

We see no basis for any assertion that we have been negligent about the interests of our own country in carrying out the mandates of our charters.

From the context in which the question of pro-American projects was introduced, we infer that it was intended to raise the question of foundation support specifically for patriotic organizations. Nothing we say is intended to deprecate in any way the value of patriotic and civic societies, which keep alive a love of country and a respect for the American tradition. In a free society, particularly where there is a strong emphasis upon individual liberty and initiative, there is an important role for those who regularly remind us of the claims of the

Nation upon our interest and loyalty. But we question whether the Congress would wish to use its investigatory or tax power to press particular claimants upon philanthropic funds which are entrusted by law to the judgment and discretion of boards of trustees. Such claims, if officially supported, would quickly multiply until they encompassed every worthwhile purpose in our society and would not obviate the ultimate need to make difficult choices in applying limited funds to vast human needs. It is not surprising that our foundations, which have largely concentrated upon basic research and support in certain fields for institutions of higher education, should have had little or no contact with patriotic, veteran, or civic groups whose activities are of a quite different nature. We have supposed that it has been well understood that we have elected to work in other directions, since we have very little correspondence in our files from such groups raising the possibility of foundation support. Such as we have concerns itself largely with local hospitals or other local charities which, from the beginning, it has been the policy of our organizations not to assist.

There are some indications in the record of these hearings that the term "pro-American" includes repentant Communists. We know of repentant Communists who have benefited directly or indirectly from our grants. If it transpires that a former Communist is to be included among those to benefit from a proposed grant, our inclination would be to make a judgment, however hazardous it might be, on the merits of each particular case—a judgment as to the ability, character, integrity, and present loyalty of the individual concerned. The fact that a person may in earlier years have been a Communist would not in itself disqualify him for a foundation grant. Nor does the fact that he has repented give him a claim to foundation assistance superior to that of persons without a Communist record.

The committee will recognize that the problem is not a simple one. For it, apparently, is only in very special cases that a former Communist and his sponsoring institution gain immunity from continual harassment. Further, a difficulty arises in applying our usual tests of high intelligence, strong character, qualities of leadership, and unusual promise for the future. One questions whether there is particularly fertile ground for foundation aid among those who have already demonstrated political naïveté, and have shown a willingness to submit their minds and spirits to totalitarian discipline. We are not prepared to express a general view on such cases; it is a matter to which we have given considerable thought and which will continue to receive our attention. It is also one of the questions about which public policy needs clarification by those in responsible authority.

#### E. ALLEGED "POLITICAL" ACTIVITIES

Another allegation has been that foundations have promoted "political" activities. On this the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board enter a categorical denial and observe that no evidence whatever has been produced which relates us in any way to support for any political candidate or any political party.

On our boards of trustees are some who, quite outside of their service to our foundations, have publicly identified themselves with one or the other major political party. Some trustees have accepted public

service, whether political or nonpolitical in character, under every administration in office since our foundations came into existence. Many trustees, however, have not indicated a political position, even to their fellow trustees. We do not ask trustees or prospective trustees about their politics and have no intention of doing so. Emphasis is upon the nonpolitical and nonpartisan character of our work. The same holds true insofar as our officers are concerned. It is clearly understood that no one connected with our foundations may properly identify these philanthropic institutions with political partisanship in any form.

Since it is well understood that we do not participate in partisan politics, the criticism has taken the form of a charge that we have favored "attitudes normally expected to lead to legislative action."<sup>34</sup> Such a charge eludes examination. The Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board do not adopt "attitudes normally expected to lead to legislative action." We have supported studies about a wide range of human affairs, the purpose of which has been to add to our knowledge and to illuminate problems with fact by seeking out the underlying facts and principles. If legislatures make use of such knowledge in the course of lawmaking, the relation is much too remote, and the intervening factors far too complex, to sustain a charge that the work of our foundations has promoted "political activities."

#### F. ALLEGED "PROPAGANDA"

This investigation has heard a great deal of talk about "propaganda," coupled with the specific charge that foundations have violated their tax-exemption privilege by carrying on "propaganda" activities. The Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board deny this charge and affirm that we have exercised great care to avoid any such infraction of our tax-exemption privilege. No inquiry has ever been directed to the Rockefeller Foundation or the General Education Board by the Bureau of Internal Revenue or the Internal Revenue Service raising any question of violation in connection with any grant ever made by either organization.

Where support has been extended to studies in political science, economics, sociology, or international relations, areas in which controversy is almost unavoidable, these boards have never sought to promote a partisan or doctrinaire approach to the subjects, but have been interested solely in the highest standards of objective, scholarly research. If in rare instances the recipient of a grant has departed from these standards, this has not been done with the consent or approval of our organizations.

The trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation, to their abiding honor be it said, have held true to the concept of trusteeship which has forbidden them to employ the large funds under their control for advancing the ideas or interests of any particular class or school of thought. It is significant that the most violent and unrestrained charges of "propaganda" have come from the mouth of a witness who seriously maintained that the Federal income tax reflected a Socialist plot to destroy the Government.<sup>35</sup> This is the man who charges that the foundations, through their influence on education, "are directly

<sup>32</sup> Transcript, p. 27, *ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>35</sup> Transcript, p. 526, *ibid.*, p. 210.

involved" in a movement which is "the greatest betrayal which has ever occurred in American history."<sup>36</sup>

It should be a sufficient answer to these irresponsible allegations for the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board to point to the roster of leading citizens drawn from many walks of life who for periods of 41 and 51 years, respectively, have guided the activities of these two organizations as members of their boards of trustees and as officers. They have included bankers and corporation executives, officers of leading universities, eminent figures in medicine and the law, Nobel Prize winners, outstanding newspaper publishers, occupants of high governmental office. They have come from no one section of the country, and have been chosen with complete disregard for partisan political affiliation. It is beyond belief that these men have been guilty, as charged before this committee, of either perpetrating or conniving at "the greatest betrayal" in American history, or of not knowing what they were voting funds for. Such charges are, we submit, false on their face, irresponsible in origin, and an imposition on the time and attention of this committee.

What are the controlling rules and principles with respect to propaganda activities and their effect on the tax exemption of foundations? They have been plainly stated for the benefit of this committee by the Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Norman Sugarman. He has referred to section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, which grants exemption to any foundation—

\* \* \* organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes \* \* \* no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation." [Italics supplied.]

The italicized words were added by an amendment adopted in 1934. As Mr. Sugarman said:

The committee reports and the language of the 1934 act establish that the words "carrying on propaganda" do not stand alone, but must be read together with the words "to influence legislation." Thus the law expressly proscribes only that propaganda which is to influence legislation."<sup>37</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*  
Congress saw fit only to circumscribe the exemption with a restriction against substantial activities to influence legislation.<sup>38</sup>

As Mr. Sugarman also pointed out, the income-tax regulations defining what is an educational organization entitled to exemption throw additional light on the meaning of the word "propaganda" as it is used in the tax law. This paragraph (regulations 118, sec. 39, 101 (6)-1 (c)), after stating that an educational organization is one designed primarily for the improvement or development of the individual, adds that, under exceptional circumstances, it may include "an association whose sole purpose is the instruction of the public," and continues as follows:

An organization formed, or availed of, to disseminate controversial or partisan propaganda is not an educational organization within the meaning of the code. However, the publication of books or the giving of lectures advocating a cause of a controversial nature shall not of itself be sufficient to deny an organization the exemption, if carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence

<sup>36</sup> Transcript, p. 508, *ibid.*, p. 211.

<sup>37</sup> Transcript, pp. 925-926, *ibid.*, p. 436.

<sup>38</sup> Transcript, p. 934, *ibid.*, p. 438.

legislation forms no substantial part of its activities, its principal purpose and substantially all of its activities being clearly of a nonpartisan, noncontroversial, and educational nature.

We think the committee will be interested in comparing those provisions of the law and the regulations with the definition of propaganda which the committee's director of research, after 6 months' study, offered as a guide to assist in determining the question whether foundations had forfeited their exemption by their conduct in this field. That definition is as follows:

*Propaganda*—action having as its purpose the spread of a particular doctrine or a specifically identifiable system of principles \* \* \* in use this word has come to infer half-truths, incomplete truths, as well as techniques of a covert nature.<sup>39</sup>

In spite of his reference to half-truths, incomplete truths, and techniques of a covert nature, not a word in the report would suggest that, as Mr. Sugarman later so clearly demonstrated, "propaganda" was not forbidden to a tax-exempt organization unless it is used "to influence legislation."

In order to be sure that it is conforming to public policy in this respect, the Rockefeller Foundation follows the practice of making no grants to any American organizations which have not themselves established their right to tax exemption by a ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

#### G. ALLEGED "INTERNATIONALIST" BIAS

In his report to the committee, its director of research stated that his studies of foundation activities "seemed to give evidence of a response to our involvement in international affairs".<sup>40</sup> While we were at first inclined to believe that this was intended as a compliment, a closer examination of the context made it plain that it was offered as a derogatory allegation. This was confirmed by our study of part II of a later report by the committee's legal analyst, received by us on July 19, 1954, which purported to deal with the "internationalist" activities of the Rockefeller Foundation. Before examining some of the curious charges made in these staff reports, it might be well to look at some facts.

The foundation is a philanthropy whose activities are not limited by national frontiers and whose charter purpose is the promotion of "the well-being of mankind throughout the world." It has been active in varying degree in more than 90 foreign countries or territories. It now has offices or laboratories in London, Paris, Tokyo, Cairo, New Delhi, Poona, Mexico City, Bogotá, Medellín, Rio de Janeiro, Belém, Port of Spain, Ciudad Trujillo, Lima, Santiago, Johannesburg. Its officers travel into almost every area on this side of the Iron Curtain.

The international character of the foundation's work has been one of its major characteristics. Whether in medicine and public health, natural sciences, agriculture, social studies or the humanities, the foundation has sought the most fertile ideas, the most urgent needs, the most capable men, and the most promising institutions wherever they could be found. There is nothing mysterious or sinister about the reasons for this.

<sup>39</sup> Transcript, p. 37, *ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>40</sup> Transcript, p. 45, *ibid.*, p. 20.



First, Mr. Rockefeller's philanthropic interest was worldwide in scope, and was rooted in the sympathetic concern which Americans have shown for the needs of people in other lands throughout our history.

Second, an attack upon certain types of problems, such as yellow fever, malaria, wheat stem rust, compels a pursuit of the problem across national boundaries.

Third, the general body of knowledge, scientific or otherwise, is an international heritage and grows through the labor of scientists and scholars in many centers of learning, in many laboratories, in many countries. The most cursory glance at the list of Nobel prize winners and the most elementary understanding of the history of our culture make it clear that this is so.

Fourth, any philanthropy which is committed to an interest in the well-being of mankind throughout the world cannot reasonably ignore the vast problems which are comprised in the term "international relations." If this was true in earlier decades, it is underscored with fateful emphasis by the statement of the American Secretary of State at the 1953 meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations that "Physical scientists have now found means which, if they are developed can wipe life off the surface of this planet."<sup>41</sup>

We accept as an established fact that the United States is involved in international affairs and that this involvement produces an impact upon every home and every citizen. It is as much a part of the environment in which we live as is the air we breathe.

This recognition does not mean that the Rockefeller Foundation has any formula of its own as to just how the problems of international relations should be resolved. We have no corporate position on such questions as World Government, Atlantic Union, the role of the United Nations, international trade policies, regulation of armaments, security alliances, and so forth. We believe that problems of relations among peoples and governments are proper subjects of examination and study, that knowledge about them is to be preferred to ignorance, and that reliable information will put men into position to make wiser decisions.

In the field of international relations, the foundation has pioneered in what has come to be called technical assistance, primarily in such fields as medicine, public health, and agriculture. In addition, it has provided support for studies or for creative work in such fields as international economics, international law, comparative government, history, creative arts, and the so-called area studies, that is, studies which cut across cultural boundaries and establish a bridge of information and understanding despite differences in language, race, creed, and cultural tradition.

We have attempted to be helpful and cooperative in our attitude toward existing machinery of international cooperation, whether the League of Nations, the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, etc. Where an international body is undertaking work in which the foundation has an interest, an occasional grant has been made by the foundation to support such work. On other occasions officers and staff of the founda-

<sup>41</sup>The Department of State Bulletin, vol. XXIX, No. 744, Publication 5196 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, September 28, 1953), p. 404.

tion have been loaned to international organizations for particular jobs, as in the field of medicine and public health. In working with international organizations, the foundation does not enter into the political discussions and decisions which might be made by those bodies. Our collaboration rests upon a joint interest in activities appropriate to philanthropy.

A complaint has been made that we have directed education "toward an international frame of reference."<sup>42</sup> What we have done has been to provide financial support to colleges, universities, and other educational bodies to enable them to do what they themselves have wanted to do, namely, to study the world outside as well as inside the United States and to find a reasonable place in school and college curricula for learning about other peoples and their cultures as well as our own. We find it puzzling to be called upon to defend what seems to us to be so obvious, that American scholarship should encompass other cultures and that educated Americans should know something about the world in which they live. This is particularly true today when American citizens are called upon to have reliable information and balanced judgments about complex international issues which affect the the very life of the Nation.

Turning to part II of the report of the committee's Legal Analyst, it is not easy to discover exactly what our sins are supposed to be. Indeed, its preface states: "There is no distinction here as between so-called good or bad activities of the foundations \* \* \*."

The report contains a number of statements which are clearly in error. For example: "As a matter of fact, the [Carnegie] Endowment and the foundation concentrated their grants among the same agencies in practically every case."<sup>43</sup> This is simply not true, quite apart from whether it would have been reprehensible.

Again, the report refers to "\* \* \* activities of the foundation in connection with 'one-world' theories of government and planning on a global scale \* \* \*."<sup>44</sup>

If the expression "one-world theories of government" means anything, it means world government. No shred of evidence is presented in the report to show that the Rockefeller Foundation or any of the organizations to which it has made grants has advocated world government. In an appendix referred to as Exhibit-Rockefeller, the report gives a number of quotations from our annual reports and president's reviews. One of these, taken from the 1946 president's review, reads: "The challenge of the future is to make this world one world—a world truly free to engage in common and constructive intellectual efforts that will serve the welfare of mankind everywhere."

That this sole reference to "one world" (an expression first popularized by a former Republican candidate for the Presidency) had nothing whatever to do with world government is apparent.

The legal analyst's report, part II, contains the following paragraphs:

There is nothing ambiguous about the warning on page 9 of the 1941 annual report of the foundation:

"If we are to have a durable peace after the war, if out of the wreckage of the present a new kind of cooperative life is to be built on a global scale, the part that science and advancing knowledge will play must not be overlooked."

<sup>42</sup> Hearings, p. 20.

<sup>43</sup> Report of the Legal Analyst, pt. II, hearings, p. 882.

<sup>44</sup> Report, pt. II, *ibid.*, p. 871.

This statement appears in the report for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1941—not quite four weeks after Pearl Harbor—yet there can be no doubt that as far as the foundation was concerned only “a cooperative life \* \* \* on a global scale” could insure “a durable peace.”<sup>45</sup>

We gladly reaffirm the quoted portion of the 1941 annual report but it is interesting to see the full context. We quote three full paragraphs:

“If we are to have a durable peace after the war, if out of the wreckage of the present a new kind of cooperative life is to be built on a global scale, the part that science and advancing knowledge will play must be overlooked. For although wars and economic rivalries may for longer or shorter periods isolate nations and split them up into separate units, the process is never complete because the intellectual life of the world, as far as science and learning are concerned, is definitely internationalized, and whether we wish it or not an indelible pattern of unity has been woven into the society of mankind.

There is not an area of activity in which this cannot be illustrated. An American soldier wounded on a battlefield in the Far East owes his life to the Japanese scientist, Kitasato, who isolated the bacillus of tetanus. A Russian soldier saved by a blood transfusion is indebted to Landsteiner, an Austrian. A German soldier is shielded from typhoid fever with the help of a Russian, Metchnikoff. A Dutch marine in the East Indies is protected from malaria because of the experiments of an Italian, Grassi; while a British aviator in North Africa escapes death from surgical infection because a Frenchman, Pasteur, and a German, Koch, elaborated a new technique.

In peace as in war we are all of us the beneficiaries of contributions to knowledge made by every nation in the world. Our children are guarded from diphtheria by what a Japanese and a German did; they are protected from smallpox by an Englishman's work; they are saved from rabies because of a Frenchman; they are cured of pellagra through the researches of an Austrian. From birth to death they are surrounded by an invisible host—the spirits of men who never thought in terms of flags or boundary lines and who never served a lesser loyalty than the welfare of mankind. The best that every individual or group has produced anywhere in the world has always been available to serve the race of men, regardless of nation or color.<sup>46</sup>

Apparently the focus of interest of the legal analyst's report, pt. II, is to be found in the following quotation from its first page:

At the same time that Carnegie and Rockefeller agencies were concentrating on the chaotic condition of education in the United States (discussed in pt. I), organizations bearing the same family names were focusing attention on other types of conditions which in the opinion of the trustees required improvement. While these so-called problems covered such varied fields as public health, malaria in Africa, and exchange of professors and students of international law, there was an indirect relationship between them, and also between them and education: namely, all of them were on the periphery—if not directly in the center—of international relations and governmental activities.

That both the foundation and the endowment did carry on activities which would directly or indirectly affect legislation is borne out by their own statements, as found in their annual reports.

That they both engaged in propaganda—as that word is defined in the dictionary (on page 49 of the report this becomes “in the sense defined by Mr. Dodd in his preliminary report”), without regard to whether it is for good or bad ends—is also confirmed by the same source.

That both had as a project “forming public opinion” and “supplying information” to the United States Government to achieve certain objectives, including an internationalist point of view, there can be no doubt.

None of these results is inherent in the purposes of either of these organizations.

Our comments on the above quotation follow:

(1) The Rockefeller Foundation has carried on public health activities, fighting malaria and yellow fever, for example, in many for-

<sup>45</sup> Report, pt. II, hearings, p. 895.

<sup>46</sup> The Rockefeller Foundation, annual report, 1941, pp. 9-11.

ign countries, and has invariably had cordial relations with the governments of those countries. The suggestion that there was an "indirect relationship," apparently regarded as sinister, between these activities and other "on the periphery" of "international relations" and "governmental activities" is so vague and unintelligible that we can make no reply without further specifications.

(2) It is true that studies supported wholly or in part by our grants may have indirectly affected legislation. The intelligent and alert legislator is constantly in search of help from the work of scholars, and like the experienced foundation officer, is quick to distinguish between true, objective scholarship and propaganda masquerading as such. Does the legal analyst mean to suggest that foundations should withhold support from sound, independent scholars for fear that their studies will not remain sterile, but will impress legislators sufficiently to influence their official action?

Neither of our foundations have ever been directly involved in an attempt to influence legislation affecting the subject matter of its grants or has ever made a grant to an organization for the purpose of assisting in influencing legislation.

(3) As to the allegation that the foundation has engaged in propaganda, our first observation is that even if the definitions of this word referred to by the legal analyst are accepted as relevant, the charge cannot be sustained. We have never offered remedies of our own as a cure for public problems. We cannot suppose that the term is intended to apply to foundation publications emphasizing the importance of fighting disease, the desirability of constantly advancing the frontiers of knowledge, or the urgent need for peace in a troubled world.

But the fact is that the definitions of propaganda referred to are not relevant to this inquiry because they ignore the statutory qualifications of this word as it is used in the section of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with tax-exempt institutions. As Mr. Norman Sugarman, Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, brought out in his testimony, the Internal Revenue Code denies exemption on account of propaganda activities only where the alleged propaganda is designed to influence legislation.<sup>47</sup> The only institutions in the United States receiving grants from our foundations are institutions whose right to tax exemption has been affirmed by executive ruling. As against the legal analyst's viewpoint, we adopt and follow the determinations of those who are charged with the duty of applying and enforcing the definition as it appears in the Internal Revenue Code.

A possible key to a better understanding of the report is to be found on page 59:

There has been a singular lack of objectivity and a decided bias toward a socialized welfare state in the proposals of these organizations, and every effort has been made by them to advance the philosophy of "one world" to the complete disregard of comparable effort on behalf of a more "nationalistic" viewpoint.

We have commented earlier (p. 15) on increases in Federal powers and expenditures, probably referred to in the above quotation as "a socialized welfare state." What is the more "nationalistic" viewpoint to which reference is made? Just as we do not use our funds to support doctrinaire world government, neither do we use them to support

<sup>47</sup> See our discussion on p. 1100 ante.

doctrinaire isolation. It is precisely at points where such extreme views converge in controversy that research and scholarship can contribute to our public life.

The committee's staff reports repeatedly confuse the study and discussion of public issues with the systematic propagation of particular points of view. There is much evidence that we have given financial support to the processes of study and discussion because, indeed, we have. There is no evidence that we have, as foundations, systematically urged solutions of our own, for we have not.

The legal analyst's report concludes with 32 pages of quotations from the publications of the Rockefeller Foundation during the years 1932-51. We regret that there is not space to reprint them here for we would stand on them now. We see no conflict between respect for our own national life and culture and a desire to increase "the infinity of threads that bind peace together" through channels of international cooperation. It is on this basis that we have made large numbers of grants both for the strengthening of our own national life and for more accurate and deeper understandings across national frontiers.

#### H. ALLEGATIONS OF FAVORITISM

We turn next to the charge that "only a few [colleges] had participated in the grants which had been made" by foundations and that foundations have been guilty of "favoritism in making \* \* \* grants."<sup>48</sup> Such charges have no basis in fact when applied to the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, but we would not wish the wide scope of our grants to becloud an underlying issue. Our position is that the concentration or dispersion of grants is a matter which lies within the discretion of our trustees. They have no obligation to effect a wide distribution of their funds; the test is whether they have reasonable ground to believe that their appropriations promote our charter purposes. In stating the facts as to the wide range of institutions which have received our grants, we wish to avoid even the appearance of criticism of any foundation which might have concentrated upon a single or a few institutions.

A study of grants made by the foundation since its establishment in 1913 and of grants made by the General Education Board since it was chartered in 1903 reveals the following facts as of December 31, 1953.

The number of institutions and organizations in this country that have received grants from one or both of these boards totals 1,061. These institutions are distributed in 45 States and the District of Columbia. If assistance given through the foundation's operating program in public health is included, the distribution of funds covers all 48 States.

The Rockefeller Foundation has made grants to 611 institutions and organizations in the United States, involving a total of over \$216 million. This figure does not include grants for our operating programs in public health and agriculture, or for fellowships and travel grants. The 611 recipient institutions were located in 41 States and in the District of Columbia. They were both public and private and included great universities, small independent colleges, agricultural colleges and institutes of technology, medical schools and teaching hospitals, special laboratories, art institutes, symphony societies, mu-

<sup>48</sup> Hearings, pp. 18, 19, 20.

seums, special research bureaus, and various organizations of scholars and scientists.

The General Education Board's record also shows a wide distribution and a great variety in the types of institutions to which grants were made. Grants have been made in 44 States to 598 organizations. They were made to public and private universities, small liberal arts colleges, State departments of education and agriculture, State teachers colleges and normal schools, agricultural and technical institutes, libraries, community schools, medical colleges, museums, and various scholarly and professional organizations.

It should be stressed, however, that it has not been the objective of the Rockefeller boards to distribute their funds with a view to securing extensive institutional representation or geographic coverage. Rather they have sought to place their funds wherever they would be most effective in carrying out the purposes of their charters.

Thus, in an effort to improve knowledge and practice in the field of public health, the foundation made large grants to Harvard University and John Hopkins University, institutions which were prepared to establish strong schools of public health, whose faculties could furnish leadership not only within their own institution and locality but for the field of public health as a whole.

Likewise in seeking to advance knowledge of the biological sciences, grants were made to institutions that had built up strong departments in this field and had attracted to their faculties scientists who were engaged in significant research. Advanced research in this field is carried on most effectively where there is ready association with scientists working in related fields, such as physics and chemistry, where contact is possible with doctors trained in medicine, surgery, dermatology, etc., where laboratory facilities are generous and graduate assistants are available. Hence, large grants for the expenses of research in biology have been made to such institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, Johns Hopkins University, and California Institute of Technology, not because these institutions were located in particular sections of the country, or because they were favored institutions, but because they offered exceptionally good opportunities to advance knowledge in a certain field.

While it is true that the total funds given to such great universities as Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, and California were considerably larger than those given to many other institutions, the reasons for this lay not in any favoritism toward the institutions but in the fact that they gave clear evidence of interest and significant achievement in important fields of learning and had demonstrated their ability to provide an especially favorable setting for the advancement of research and training in these fields.

Support for our great universities results in direct benefits to institutions in all parts of the world through the advanced training which they are able to offer. For example, the Rockefeller Foundation has given large grants in support of chemistry and biology at the California Institute of Technology. In the last 5 years alone, 314 post-doctoral faculty members of some 200 colleges and universities in the United States and abroad have taken advanced training in these 2 departments alone. Ninety-nine doctor of philosophy degrees have

been given to representatives of an almost equal number of institutions.

The Rockefeller Foundation has given \$4,687,083.90 to the Harvard University School of Public Health. In the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, 119 graduates were distributed across the length and breadth of the country, with 21 going to the Army, Navy, and Air Force; 22 to the United States Public Health Service; 42 to local and State health services; 19 to teach in other centers; and the remaining 15 to other posts.

It is also relevant, in view of the charge that foundations tend to favor the large institutions, to point out that some of them became large and strong because of substantial foundation assistance. Chicago, Emory, Vanderbilt, Tulane, California Institute of Technology are among those whose growth has been actively encouraged by funds from the Rockefeller boards; Duke is an example where large support has come from another foundation.

In all these grants, no individual project or institution has been considered an end in itself. Rather an effort has been made to choose for assistance only those projects or persons that gave promise of becoming, in the words of one of our early trustees, "the seed corn for the future." The idea is to help establish standards that will lead to continuous improvement in the quality of research and scholarship.

This has been true in the program of the General Education Board as well as in that of the foundation, although geographical considerations played a greater role in the work of the board, which recognized a special regional interest in the South. From the beginning, the board stressed the importance of establishing standards of excellence and strove, not to help all institutions, or even those whose need was greatest, but rather to strengthen a number of soundly established colleges and universities in strategic locations so that they would set standards and stimulate similar development in other institutions of the region, and thereby contribute enduring benefits to all education in this country. Grants involving more than \$190 million (in amounts of \$1 million or more) for endowment, buildings and equipment, and for the increase of teachers' salaries, were made to 37 colleges and universities scattered throughout the country. Because of the special needs of the southern region 21 of these institutions were in the South. If some of them received substantially more than others, the answer may be found both in their needs and in the opportunities they offered for contributing to the strength of American education. A further explanation lies in the high cost of certain kinds of education—such as medical education. For example, board grants for the building, equipment, and endowment of the School of Medicine and a Teaching Hospital at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., totaled \$15 million. Similarly, grants for Meharry Medical College in Nashville, for the training of Negro doctors, totaled \$4,800,000.

We are very much aware that the legitimate needs of the Nation's schools and colleges are vastly greater than the total resources of our two organizations. We have not taken the view, however, that since we could not do the entire job we should do none of it. Consequently, choices had to be made.

The General Education Board has spent over 80 percent of its resources in direct support of institutions of higher education. That endowment, capital plant, and other forms of basic support were con-

sidered vitally important (and proved to be costly) is testified by the fact that the board now terminates its 51 years of activity, having spent its capital and income, as well as substantial grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, for the purposes for which it was created. There has been no regret that the continued activity of the board itself seemed less important than the encouragement which its funds could give to our colleges and universities. There was regret that more funds were not available to continue a job which was in no sense completed. We hope that others will see in the experience of the General Education Board the deep and enduring satisfaction which comes from investment in vital institutions of learning.

In the case of the Rockefeller Foundation it continues to commit a large share of its resources to institutions of higher education (over 50 percent in 1953). Some indication of the relation between our assets and the existing need is given by the fact that our colleges and universities, in the United States alone, could wisely use in a single year additional funds equal to the present assets of the foundation.

#### I. RELATION WITH THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Some mention has been made in these hearings of an alleged "purposeful relationship" or "operational relationship between foundations, education, and government."<sup>49</sup>

That there are many relationships between education, particularly public education, and government is a matter of common knowledge. The annual expenditure of approximately \$7 billion of public funds for education, the many services which educational institutions provide for Government by contract or otherwise, and the importance to the Nation of a well-educated population, are major elements in this common interest.

The very limited relations which the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board have had with government are apparently not so well understood. We have been concerned to preserve our nonpolitical and nongovernmental status. While acting within the broad framework of public policy, we do not consider that we are agents or instruments of government. We have no clandestine arrangements with government; we are independent philanthropies committed to publicly known purposes and activities.

Our operational contacts with government arise in the following ways:

(a) We are encouraged by public official statements to continue our activities abroad as an expression of technical assistance in the private nonpolitical field.

(b) Our officers traveling abroad sometimes pay calls upon American Embassies, Legations, and consulates and exchange general information about the situation in a particular country, as do American businessmen or other citizens traveling abroad.

(c) On occasion, an officer or officers of the foundation may be asked to serve in an individual capacity on some governmental advisory body. The foundation accepts the public duty to free a portion of the time of its personnel for such service, even though the service itself is not rendered as a representation of the foundation.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 20.



(d) The foundation, with a long experience in what has come to be called technical assistance, is sometimes consulted by public officials in regard to methods of rendering such assistance, but this has happened infrequently.

(e) Our two boards have made grants for projects sponsored by agencies of government, such as the Library of Congress, the United States Office of Education, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, State departments of education, State boards of health, local government agencies and, of course, to State-supported colleges and universities.

#### J. SCHOOL AND COLLEGE CURRICULA

It has also been charged that foundations have been responsible for "changing both school and college curricula to the point where they sometimes denied the principles underlying the American way of life"<sup>49</sup> and for promoting "a national system of education."<sup>50</sup>

Our two foundations have had neither the power nor the intent to bring about such changes. Responsibility for American public education rests with 48 State boards or State departments of education and with some 99,000 local school boards whose members are chosen in accordance with the laws of their communities. It has been noted that among the outstanding characteristics of the American system of education are its diversity, the absence of centralized control, and acceptance of both public and private agencies in the accomplishment of its purposes.

The vast majority of young people in the United States are educated in publicly supported and publicly controlled institutions. In 1950 attendance at the public elementary and secondary schools and at public institutions of higher education was 26,564,436; at private institutions it was 4,723,132.<sup>51</sup> Standards and regulations for the accreditation of public school teachers are determined by State laws and State boards of education, and teachers' salaries are determined and paid by local school boards or under authorities approved by State legislatures.

The past few decades have witnessed numerous new developments in American education. One of the greatest factors in this change has been the phenomenal growth of our school population. From 1900 to 1950 the enrollment in our public secondary schools rose from 519,257 to 5,706,734.<sup>52</sup> This meant not only a tremendous increase in the number of teachers required and more facilities for training them, but it almost completely changed the job of the secondary school. Instead of dealing with a student body of fairly similar background and purposes, it had to provide for the educational needs of young people who varied greatly not only in their economic and social backgrounds, but in their abilities, their interests, and their plans for the future. In many communities not more than 5 percent would go on to college, and the traditional college preparatory curriculum had little meaning for them.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>51</sup> U. S. Office of Education, *Biennial Survey, 1948-50* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953, ch. I, table 3, p. 6).

<sup>52</sup> U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1953* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953), table 140, p. 125.

This big change had its impact also on the colleges when the problem arose of articulating the secondary school's curriculum with the college curriculum, when college enrollments also began to show large increases, and when changing teacher certification requirements and the need for more teachers laid new burdens on teacher-training facilities.

All these changes led to much discussion among educators about ways in which the secondary schools and colleges could be improved. A number of State departments of education began studies of the problem, as did a great many educational organizations, such as the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Council on Education, the Progressive Education Association, the American Historical Association, the Mathematical Association of America, and the Society for Curriculum Study. The United States Office of Education made a national survey, arranged for conferences, and issued a publication on Needed Research in Education, and the various university schools of education encouraged their faculties to undertake studies of the problems of general and teacher education.

Some of the witnesses before the committee seem to regard these activities as the fruit of a malevolent impulse to subvert our institutions. No doubt some of the studies referred to were unproductive, or went off on the wrong track. Teachers and college professors are as liable to error as the members of any other profession. But the wholesale accusations against our leading teachers' organizations, which have occupied so much of the committee's time, are believed to rest upon a perversion of the facts and to be an unwarranted attack upon the loyalty, patriotism, and intelligence of a devoted group of public servants.

During the period of rapid change in our school population, new teaching devices had become available to the schools in the form of radio and films, research had produced a number of new methods of testing and measuring, studies of human behavior were throwing new light on the learning process, and advances in science made it necessary to change the content of many courses of study.

Meanwhile, the country was not only undergoing a vast industrial development but experiencing a great economic depression and two world wars. These were the things that were responsible for changing American education—and not the activities or funds of any foundation.

With so many cataclysmic changes occurring in so brief a time, it is difficult to assign relative importance to the various forces just mentioned. Few can doubt, however, that the great depression of the thirties was a prime factor in a reappraisal of educational thought. In a period of insecurity, it was but natural that questions should arise as to the effectiveness of our educational system. It was but natural, too, that the millions of restless, unemployed young people would have questions as to the value of their school experience and that educators should reexamine not only the purpose but the techniques of education. Consequently, the years that followed witnessed a considerable number of studies and experiments relating to new educational programs and methods. As a result much was written and many controversies developed, although actually few far-reaching

changes occurred in curricula and methods in the high schools and colleges. Ray Lyman Wilbur, a former president of Stanford University, once said that "Changing a curriculum is like trying to move a cemetery." The few school systems and colleges where considerable changes were introduced attracted much comment and perhaps tended to distract attention from the more persistent and extensive problems of teacher shortages, crowded classrooms, and outmoded school facilities that were products of the depression and of the war years.

It is in this setting that we must consider the role of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board in educational change.

Except in the fields of public health, medicine, and agriculture, the Rockefeller Foundation has not engaged in or supported educational activities in the narrowly professional sense of that term; its work has been concerned chiefly with the support of advanced research and the training of personnel for leadership in the fields of science and scholarship. This work has inevitably served not only to increase the body of knowledge available for educational purposes, but by its emphasis on excellence, it has raised standards of research and teaching in the United States and throughout the educational world.

In the field of public health, the work of the foundation has been trail-blazing, both in this country and abroad. The education of doctors and scientists for public health work has been forwarded by liberal support of many postgraduate schools of hygiene of university grade; public health nurses have been trained in institutions from Johns Hopkins and Toronto to Bangkok and Peking; national and local health departments in 68 countries have been strengthened with equipment and essential services.

In medical education in the United States, the joint efforts of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, with contributions of over \$100 million, matched many times by the generosity of others, were to a great extent responsible for raising the teaching of medicine in the United States from the very immature position it occupied in 1910 to a status of excellence that today is shared with only a few countries in the world.

A few exceptional grants by the foundation have been directly concerned with educational activities. One of these was the support given to the Commission on the Financing of Higher Education of the Association of American Universities.<sup>53</sup> This commission was set up by the association to study and make recommendations about ways of meeting the growing financial problems of our institutions of higher education. The Institute of International Education in New York City has received a number of grants<sup>54</sup> from the foundation toward its general support. These grants were made in the belief that it is rendering important services as a clearinghouse of information on student-exchange programs and in helping Government agencies and many colleges and universities to handle the complicated problems involved in the administration of these programs.

Obviously none of the efforts just described has been instrumental in changing both school and college curricula in the direction of uniform patterns, or in promoting a national system of education.

<sup>53</sup> A grant of \$400,000 made in 1949.

<sup>54</sup> Grants totaling \$388,356.89 during the period 1937-53; prior to 1929 other grants had been made by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

In considering these charges as they relate to the General Education Board, it should be noted that the board has never sought to impose a particular doctrine of education or to promote particular forms of curriculum organization or courses. To be sure, the \$99 million which the board spent to support pioneering efforts in medical education resulted in widespread changes in that field. The funds, however, were granted to strengthen established institutions and to permit them to offer more through training to medical students.

The great bulk of the board's funds—more than \$250 million—were used for endowment, buildings and facilities, increased funds for teachers' salaries, and help in meeting current expenses for established institutions whose activities and traditions had long been part of the American scene. Some were church-affiliated colleges, others were well-known independent institutions, and some were State supported. All were striving to set standards of educational excellence; all had had difficulty in providing the evermore costly type of higher education demanded and needed by the American people. In this strengthening and support of traditional American education, the role of the General Education Board was simply that of a donor of funds to institutions that had demonstrated their ability to meet the recognized educational needs of their communities and to exert leadership in the maintenance of standards of excellence.

A small part (8 percent of the board's grants has been used, either directly or through endowment and support of schools of education, for study and experimentation with educational methods and procedures. No program of education can remain static and be healthy.<sup>55</sup> There must be constant experimentation with improved methods and study of ways to utilize new knowledge if American education is to be adequate to its task.

The board's interest in experimentation dates back to 1917 when the Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University, was established for the purpose of experimenting with educational procedures and materials. The grant was made in response to a growing recognition among educators that the curricula of both the elementary and secondary schools were no longer meeting the educational needs of great numbers of their pupils.<sup>56</sup>

This was the beginning of the board's activity in the science of education. A few miscellaneous grants were made in the years that followed, e. g., the grant to the University of Buffalo for a study of the articulation of the college with secondary schools, grants to Antioch and the University of Chicago for curriculum experimentation, and the grant to the American Council on Education for the cooperative test service which was to prepare objective tests for use at the secondary school and junior college levels. In 1933, however, following an extensive survey of recent educational developments participated in by 55 experts in various fields of education, the board began a phase of its program concerned especially with the improvement of education at the secondary school and junior college levels. During the next 6½ years, while the major part of its funds continued to be spent on strengthening educational institutions, on support of studies in agri-

<sup>55</sup> "Education which is not modern shares the fate of all organic things which are kept too long."—Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929), p. 117.

<sup>56</sup> For a fuller discussion of this grant, see the General Education Board's supplemental statement, p. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 1141.

cultural economics, nutrition, and forestry in the South, and on basic studies of child growth and development, grants were also made for studies and experiments concerned with the improvement of general education or, as later described, with "the care and education of young people of high school and junior college age."<sup>57</sup>

This program on which some \$8,500,000 was spent, stimulated a widespread interest in educational improvement. Through support of research, it helped to build up a much-needed body of organized psychological, physiological, and social knowledge about youth; and it did much to encourage a continuing consideration of problems involved in the care and education of youth in modern society.

It did not, however, attempt to promote any specific form of reorganized education or to introduce any particular ideas or materials into the curriculum. Rather it provided opportunity for study and deliberation by 17 national and regional organizations, 6 statewide organizations, and 10 local educational groups; it supported research at 5 university schools of education, and enabled 21 colleges and universities to engage in research and experimentation of a great many different kinds. This opportunity was still further enlarged by the support of cooperative studies involving many schools and colleges, each one of which was enabled to study its own particular problems in a manner decided by its own staff and administration. Thus there was the cooperative study of general education which involved 22 colleges interested in improving their general education program. There was the 8-year study of the 30 schools, in which a group of high schools ranging from the frankly conservative to the advanced progressive worked together to find out ways of evaluating the results of their programs. There was also the cooperative study of teacher education in which some 25 universities and colleges engaged in teacher education, 25 school systems, and 10 States with programs of inservice teacher education, pooled their experience and tried out various ways of making teacher education more effective.

Efforts to develop new instructional materials were aided and again these efforts included many different approaches to the problem. Because it was quite generally admitted that new materials were needed, particularly in the social studies and in the natural sciences, grants were made, for instance, to Stanford University for an inquiry into ways of improving teaching and developing new materials in the social studies; to the Society for Curriculum Study to enable it to prepare a series of teaching units on areas in American life, called *Building America*;<sup>58</sup> to the National Education Association and the National Council on Social Studies for a series of teaching materials to be prepared by a group of scholars and experienced teachers; and to Teachers College of Columbia University for new teaching materials in the natural sciences. At the University of Chicago aid was given to the establishment of a center where research materials on child growth and development were assembled and made available to teachers of educational psychology.

Obviously this diversified program in which so many institutions and so many people with different points of view and different experiences participated was no effort on the part of the board to slant

<sup>57</sup> General Education Board, annual report, 1940, p. 3.

<sup>58</sup> For a fuller discussion of this grant, see the General Education Board's supplemental statement, p. 8. *Ibid.*, p. 1142.

school and college curricula in a particular direction. Furthermore any careful examination of these school and college curricula will reveal not only that they continue to show the wide diversity that is one of the strengths of our educational system, but also that they are more concerned with education for good citizenship than ever before in our history and that through them all runs a common core of loyalty to our American way of life.

Here it may be of interest to note that the number of States which required by law the teaching of the United States Constitution increased from 5 in 1917 to 40 in 1940, and the number of States making the teaching of United States history mandatory in the high schools increased from 15 to 26 in the same period.<sup>59</sup> Our foundations do not claim credit for this development any more than we accept responsibility for alleged inattention to such matters.

As for the charge of promoting "a national system of education"—if what is meant here is Federal aid for education, the answer is that the General Education Board has itself taken no position on this matter. There are many arguments both for and against Federal aid to education and they have been discussed since the first bill for Federal aid to agricultural colleges was introduced by Justin P. Morrill in 1857. The establishment of the land-grant colleges in 1862 and the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act for Federal aid to vocational education in 1917 show that the issue is not a new one. Studies supported by our foundations on the financing of education reflect a wide variety of views. The fact remains, however, that this country does not have a national system of education and that control of American education, as stated before, lies in the hands of 48 State boards of education, thousands of college and university boards of trustees, and 99,000 local community school boards. No prerogative of the States has been more jealously guarded against Federal encroachment than their educational autonomy. The record speaks for itself.

#### K. COMMUNITY SUPPORT OF EDUCATION

It has been alleged that the foundations have decreased the "dependency of education upon the resources of the local community."<sup>60</sup>

What are the facts? In 1920 public expenditures for education in the United States amounted to \$1,151,748,000.<sup>61</sup> By 1950 this had increased to \$7,011,768,000.<sup>62</sup> In other words, the public, far from relinquishing its responsibility for its schools, had increased its support of them from taxes by more than sixfold. In 1920 the total expenditures of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board were \$8,959,942 or just less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of what the public was then spending for education. In 1950 the expenditures of both boards totaled \$14,414,736, an amount equal to two-tenths of 1 percent of the funds being spent for public education.

In fact the total expenditures of some 100 philanthropic foundations for education and a wide variety of other things have been estimated at

<sup>59</sup> Victor Brudney, *Legislative Regulation of the Social Studies in Secondary Schools, School Law*, reprinted for the National Committee for the Social Studies (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1941), p. 141.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>61</sup> U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract: 1943*, table 231, p. 218.

<sup>62</sup> U. S. Office of Education, *Biennial Survey, 1948-50*, ch. I, table 9, p. 11.

\$133 million for 1950<sup>63</sup>—a small sum when compared with the huge public expenditures for education.

Obviously the contributions of the Rockefeller boards or, for that matter, of all philanthropic foundations, were not relieving the public of its responsibility to support education. Thus, education continues to be paid for at an expanding rate by the local community and is controlled by States and local school boards. Far from decreasing dependency on the local community, the gifts of the Rockefeller boards have served to encourage from public and private sources increased support of needed educational services. From the beginning it has been a policy of these boards to make grants only where there has existed a strong institutional commitment to the work supported and where there has been evidence of a sound base of community support for the institution.

Among the devices used for encouraging the assumption of increasing responsibility on the part of the community has been the making of appropriations payable against matching funds raised from other sources. The success of this device is shown by the fact that a sample of 10 such conditional grants made by the Rockefeller Foundation, totaling \$6,025,000, shows that they encouraged \$9,300,248 in contributions from other sources for the same purposes. Similarly, 10 typical conditional grants made by the General Education Board, totaling \$3,850,000, were in large part responsible for gifts to the recipient institutions of about \$13 million.

Another device for discouraging dependency upon foundation gifts is the tapering grant. In writing about this, Raymond B. Fosdick says:

The proper objective of a foundation, unless created for a particularized purpose, is to prime the pump, never to act as a permanent reservoir. \* \* \* The proportion of a budget which it provides should not be so large as to discourage support from other sources. Its contributions should not dry up the springs of popular giving. On the other hand, when a foundation withdraws from a project, its withdrawal should not be so precipitate as to wreck the enterprise. A tapering down of contributions over a period of years will, under ordinary circumstances, give an organization a chance to build up stable support from its own natural sources.<sup>64</sup>

This persisting concern for a project's ability to secure "stable support from its own natural sources" has been characteristic of the programs of both Rockefeller boards. From the beginning they have been conscious of the importance of avoiding the assumption of obligations that are properly a public responsibility.

At the end of a report (pt. I) furnished to this committee by its legal analyst, she makes the extraordinary contention that the great gifts which foundations have poured into education in this country have involved an "encroachment on State powers" and that in order to accomplish this the States, or at least many of them, have been "invaded as it were through the back door."<sup>65</sup> So far as the General Education Board is concerned, nothing could be further from the truth. Before the committee accepts this conclusion of its legal analyst, why should it not go to the sources, and inquire of the State departments of education with whom the General Education Board has had cordial working relations for 50 years, whether they feel that State prerogatives

<sup>63</sup> F. Emerson Andrews, *Philanthropic Giving* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950), p. 92.

<sup>64</sup> Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, pp. 294-295.

<sup>65</sup> Hearings, p. 709.

in the educational field have been invaded or encroached upon? If space and time permitted, we could furnish innumerable pieces of evidence in contradiction of this perversion of the facts, so far as the General Education Board is concerned.

#### L. TRAINING FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The research director of the committee has called its attention to foundation grants for "training individuals and servicing agencies to render advice to the executive branch of the Federal Government."<sup>66</sup>

Our two foundations have provided funds to a large number of institutions which have trained individuals for participation in all aspects of our national life; Federal, State and local governments, schools, colleges and universities, business, law, medicine, agriculture, scientific research, the creative arts, etc.

We make no apologies for the devotion of funds to the training of individuals for service in executive branch—or any branch—of the Federal Government. We can imagine few better uses, or more pro-American uses, of funds dedicated to the public interest.

#### M. ALLEGED INTERLOCK

Reference has been made in the testimony to an "interlock"<sup>67</sup> among foundations, even to a "diabolical conspiracy."<sup>68</sup> The allegation seems to be that foundations act in concert to use their combined funds to achieve reprehensible objectives by financial pressure and power.

We have already pointed to the well-known intimate association between the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, involving the same founder, a number of the same trustees and officers, the same location, and programs which have reflected some division of responsibility between them. This is the only "interlock" of which we have knowledge.

Some of our trustees also serve as trustees of other institutions and organizations, including other foundations. These were reported fully to the Cox committee, which commented as follows in its report to the Congress: "It is also understandable that the services of an outstanding man should be sought by more than one foundation and that we should therefore find a number of individuals serving on the board of more than one foundation."<sup>69</sup>

The counsel of the Cox committee made the following comment during the hearings of that committee:

Mr. KEELE. The remark that Mr. Sloan made this morning leads me to make a personal observation, which I think good taste would not have permitted had he not made the remark. He said he did not know many of the people in foundation work.

At that luncheon in New York in September, I observed with some amusement that there was more introducing of the members of the various foundations to one another than there was of introducing me to the members of the foundations. It was quite obvious to me that there was a lack of acquaintanceship among the philanthropoids, if we may say so.<sup>70</sup>

The overlapping of trustees between particular foundations occurs, if at all, in the case of 1 or 2 among boards of 15 to 20 in number. If

<sup>66</sup> Hearings, p. 20.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>69</sup> Final report, p. 11.

<sup>70</sup> Hearings, p. 500.



there is any instance of any manipulation of 2 foundations through any such relationship, we do not know of 1.

More than one foundation may from time to time make grants to the same recipient institution. A glance at the public records will show, for example, that our leading universities quite frequently receive grants in the same year from a number of foundations for a variety of purposes. Much more rarely, two or more foundations may make grants to the same study, project, or purpose. Sometimes the foundations would be in touch with each other in that situation; at other times their only contact would be with the applicant institution. Applications themselves sometimes refer to the fact that a request is being submitted simultaneously to more than one foundation.

The principal occasion for consultation among foundations, particularly among those interested in the same broad fields, arises from the desire on the part of each one to use its funds to the best advantage. Obviously, if one foundation is ready to proceed with significant grants in a particular field, others will wish to take that into account in their own plans. With governments and international organizations entering the field of technical assistance, an increase in the number of foundations, and developing interest among business corporations in philanthropic programs, any single foundation must give increasing attention to what others are doing if it is to use its own funds wisely. Informal discussions among foundation officers are the typical means for exchanging such information.

It need hardly be said that such exchanges do not result in agreed lists of preferred applicants nor in blacklists. The applicant who finds his request rejected by a number of foundations is not entitled to attribute his lack of success to a combination against him. On the contrary, foundations are jealous of their freedom of action and judgment, and are little concerned about whether or not another foundation would have made the same decision.

One witness stated, "It is my opinion that the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations are guilty of violation of the antitrust laws and should be prosecuted."<sup>71</sup> Such a charge has no rational substance where, as in our case, there is no monopoly, no combination, no restraint, and no trade.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

The committee's director of research concluded his report with the statement:

It seems incredible that the trustees of typically American fortune-created foundations should have permitted them to be used to finance ideas and practices incompatible with the fundamental concepts of our Constitution. Yet there seems evidence that this may have occurred.<sup>72</sup>

The chairman of the committee, speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives on July 27, 1953, said:

The method by which this is done seems fantastic to reasonable men, for these Communists and Socialists seize control of fortunes left behind by capitalists when they die, and turn these fortunes around to finance the destruction of capitalism.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Hearings, p. 212.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>73</sup> Congressional Record, July 27, 1953, p. 10188; hearings, p. 25.

A full examination of the facts will remove these fears. The Cox committee reported :

It seems paradoxical that in a previous congressional investigation in 1915 the fear most frequently expressed was that the foundations would prove the instruments of vested wealth, privilege, and reaction, while today the fear most frequently expressed is that they have become the enemy of the capitalistic system. In our opinion neither of these fears is justified.<sup>74</sup>

We believe that no evidence received by this committee warrants a change in that opinion. Free enterprise in philanthropy has been an extraordinary success in the United States. Governmental controls should be introduced with the utmost caution, so as not to dam up the stream of philanthropy. However, understanding the desire of the Congress to protect the public interest, we offer the following suggestions which we believe the committee will find constructive.

(1) *Public accounting*

We are convinced that tax-exempt organizations should make regular public reports about their funds and activities. Any such requirement should not be so burdensome as to cause an unnecessary diversion of philanthropic funds to administrative costs. We would not, for example, propose that smaller foundations be required to undertake the extensive publication program of the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board. The character of the essential public disclosure might vary within broad limits.

One of the two recommendations of the Cox committee was the following :

1. Public accounting should be required of all foundations. This can best be accomplished by amendment of the existing laws in substantially the form herewith submitted as appendix A, to which we direct the attention of the 83d Congress.<sup>75</sup>

We understand that legislation giving effect to this recommendation was introduced in the 83d Congress by Representatives Richard M. Simpson (Republican, Pennsylvania) and Brooks Hayes (Democrat, Arkansas), former members of the Cox committee, but that it has not yet been enacted. We would support legislation along such lines.

Otherwise, we see no need for new legislation.<sup>76</sup> Abuses can be dealt with under existing law; the gradual accumulation of legislation affecting religious, education, and charitable activities will, we fear, inject Government more and more into fields which are more appropriate to private initiative and judgment.

(2) *The role of the Internal Revenue Service*

The Internal Revenue Service carries a heavy burden in its duties in connection with the granting and withholding of the tax exemptions provided by law and in reviewing the reports which are required from tens of thousands of tax-exempt organizations. We understand from testimony that only a limited staff is available to review these reports because Service personnel is ordinarily assigned to work most likely to bring in a financial return to the Government in increased collections of taxes due.

Reputable tax-exempt institutions are interested in having the public protected against abuses of the tax-exemption privilege. The Con-

<sup>74</sup> Final report, p. 10.

<sup>75</sup> Final report, p. 13.

<sup>76</sup> See colloquy between Congressman Angier L. Goodwin (Republican, Massachusetts), and T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, hearings, p. 460.

gress may wish to make it possible for the Internal Revenue Service to make modest additions to staff for this purpose, even though such additions would be unlikely to increase tax receipts.

(3) *Congressional investigations*

The role and procedures of congressional investigations are being widely discussed by the public, and now by the Congress itself. We believe that the experience which foundations have had with a second investigation in 2 years might well be taken into account in such discussion.

First, in determining that the public interest requires that an investigation be undertaken, it is suggested that the burden of such an investigation on private citizens and organizations be fully considered. The review of a half century of activity which has been required of our two foundations was costly both in time and energy and in the diversion of funds intended for philanthropy. We have no way of estimating the cost to the colleges and universities of the country of the replies which they were asked to make to inquiries by the committee's staff, but we have been informed that it was substantial. These are not arguments against investigations which are deemed, on sober judgment, to be essential. The regular committees of Congress can readily ascertain the facts before determining whether a full investigation of an entire field is called for.

Second, if it is determined that an investigation is in the public interest, it is suggested that it is most important that the charges be fully and clearly stated. The failure to frame issues in specific terms and from the point of view of established laws and public policy creates serious difficulties. The foundations have been criticized before a congressional committee, largely by the committee's own staff, for actions taken by the Congress itself. The term "propaganda" has been used by the committee's staff without apparent appreciation of its use by the Congress and the courts with respect to tax exempt organizations. Allegations cast in general terms present no ascertainable issue on which to make reply.

Third, it is suggested that there is fundamental injustice in using the staff members of an investigating committee in both an accusatory and an adjudicative role.

(4) *Maintenance of free enterprise in philanthropy*

Since a congressional investigation carries with it implications of governmental intervention, we urge the committee to reaffirm established American policy in support of private initiative and enterprise in the philanthropic field. Human needs are vast and foundation funds are a tiny pool compared to them. Those responsible for the use of such funds would not claim that they always find the right answers, for each grant must, in a sense, compete with every other possible use of the same money. But on one point foundations would generally agree—philanthropy can flourish only in the air of freedom.

Dated August 3, 1954.

DEAN RUSK,  
*President, the Rockefeller Foundation and  
General Education Board.*

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
*County of New York, ss:*

Dean Rusk, being duly sworn, says that he is president of the Rockefeller Foundation and of the General Education Board, the organizations in whose behalf the foregoing statement is made; that the foregoing statement is true to his knowledge except as to the matters occurring prior to the dates (as therein set forth) of his association with said organizations, which are therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and that as to those matters he believes it to be true.

DEAN RUSK.

Sworn to before me this 3d day of August 1954.

[SEAL]

HAROLD B. LEONARD,  
*Notary Public, State of New York.*

Term expires March 30, 1955.

APPENDIX A

*Facts about the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board (as of Dec. 31, 1953)*

	The Rockefeller Foundation	General Education Board	Combined totals
Founded.....	By John D. Rockefeller, 1913.....	By John D. Rockefeller, 1902.....	
Organization.....	Incorporated as charitable corporation by special act of New York State Legislature.	Incorporated as charitable corporation by special act of Congress, 1903.	
Purpose.....	"To promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world."	"The promotion of education within the United States of America, without distinction of race, sex, or creed."	
Management.....	Board of 21 trustees, elected for 3-year term.....	Board of trustees, not less than 9 nor more than 17 in number, elected for 3-year term.	
Program.....	(1) Grants to institutions and agencies in support of projects in fields of medicine and public health, natural sciences and agriculture, social sciences, and humanities. (2) Work in public health and agriculture conducted by foundation's own staff. (3) Fellowships and travel grants for individuals.	(1) Grants toward support of educational institutions, agencies, and projects. (2) Fellowships for individuals.....	
Total funds received from donors (at value when received).....	\$242,247,098.....	\$145,077,357.....	\$387,324,455.
Total income collected.....	\$381,872,606.....	\$127,094,019.....	\$508,966,625.
Total amount of grants.....	\$501,749,878.....	\$317,733,124.....	\$819,483,002.
From principal.....	\$124,590,545.....	\$183,028,084.....	\$307,618,629.
From income.....	\$377,159,333.....	\$134,705,040.....	\$511,864,373.
Existing principal fund (at market Dec. 31, 1953).....	\$313,479,787.....	\$813,418.....	\$314,293,205.
Total number of grants made.....	30,572.....	11,237.....	41,809.
Average number of grants made annually (1946-53).....	953.....	189.....	1,142.
Total amount of grants to recipients in United States, including administration.....	\$334,802,585.....	\$317,733,124.....	\$652,535,709.
Total amount of grants to recipients in foreign countries.....	\$166,947,293.....	None.....	\$166,947,293.
Total number of foreign countries and areas in which grants have been made.....	80.....	None.....	80.
Total number of States (United States) in which grants have been made.....	48 (plus Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and District of Columbia).....	44 and District of Columbia.....	48 (plus Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and District of Columbia).
Total number United States institutions and organizations to which grants have been made.....	611.....	598.....	1,061.

*Facts about the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board (as of Dec. 31, 1953)—Continued*

	The Rockefeller Foundation	General Education Board	Combined totals
Distribution by institutions and organizations in United States (10 largest amounts). NOTE: Donations to American Red Cross and United War Work Fund, and Rockefeller Institute, General Education Board, and China Medical Board, Inc., not taken into account.	(1) University of Chicago, \$14,576,044..... (2) Harvard University, \$12,363,430..... (3) Johns Hopkins University, \$12,027,871... (4) Yale University, \$9,765,120..... (5) National Research Council, \$9,698,552... (6) Social Science Research Council, \$9,580,990..... (7) Columbia University, \$6,480,231..... (8) National Bureau of Economic Research, \$5,845,974..... (9) American Council of Learned Societies \$4,419,262..... (10) Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, \$3,341,234.....	(1) University of Chicago, \$25,090,562..... (2) Vanderbilt University, \$22,642,314..... (3) Johns Hopkins University, \$11,476,113... (4) Emory University, \$9,381,225..... (5) Meharry Medical College, \$8,317,609..... (6) Cornell University, \$8,220,966..... (7) California Institute of Technology, \$8,082,298..... (8) Yale University, \$8,010,491..... (9) Washington University, \$7,928,035..... (10) University of Rochester, \$7,833,470.....	(1) University of Chicago, \$39,666,606. (2) Vanderbilt University, \$24,295,941. (3) Johns Hopkins University, \$23,503,984. (4) Yale University, \$17,775,611. (5) Harvard University, \$17,247,195. (6) Cornell University, \$10,936,769. (7) California Institute of Technology, \$10,251,497. (8) National Research Council, \$10,068,112. (9) Social Science Research Council, \$9,823,172. (10) Washington University, \$9,735,456.
Distribution to colleges and universities by States (10 largest amounts).	(1) Massachusetts, \$15,341,901..... (2) Illinois, \$15,304,888..... (3) Maryland, \$12,053,132..... (4) New York, \$11,149,857..... (5) Connecticut, \$9,811,230..... (6) California, \$8,668,195..... (7) Iowa, \$2,376,054..... (8) Tennessee, \$2,309,890..... (9) Missouri, \$2,022,529..... (10) Pennsylvania, \$1,860,093.....	(1) Tennessee, \$45,156,651..... (2) Illinois, \$28,022,677..... (3) Georgia, \$25,656,912..... (4) New York, \$24,663,209..... (5) Maryland, \$12,436,974..... (6) California, \$10,943,898..... (7) Massachusetts, \$10,775,227..... (8) Missouri, \$9,527,479..... (9) Louisiana, \$9,056,974..... (10) Connecticut, \$8,700,234.....	(1) Tennessee, \$47,466,541. (2) Illinois, \$43,327,565. (3) New York, \$35,813,066. (4) Georgia, \$26,719,112. (5) Massachusetts, \$26,117,128. (6) Maryland, \$24,490,106. (7) California, \$19,612,093. (8) Connecticut, \$18,511,464. (9) Missouri, \$11,550,008. (10) Louisiana, \$9,623,491.
Total number of fellowship grants: Direct..... Indirect.....	7,097..... 3,917.....	2,369..... 220.....	9,466..... 4,137.....
Total amount of fellowship grants: Direct..... Indirect.....	\$23,170,940..... \$11,811,069.....	\$5,016,451..... \$474,761.....	\$28,187,391..... \$12,286,836.....

## APPENDIX B

*The Rockefeller Foundation—Grants to principal field of interest through Dec. 31, 1953*

Division of medicine and public health (May 22, 1913, to Dec. 31, 1953) :			
Investigation and control of specific diseases and deficiencies.....		\$27,387,000	
State and local health services.....		9,975,000	
Medical care.....		1,041,000	
Public health education.....		34,103,000	
Medical education.....		91,434,000	
Psychiatry, neurology, and allied subjects.....		20,041,000	
Fellowships.....		16,454,000	
Endocrinology.....		2,248,000	
Other public health and medical subjects.....		10,012,000	
Field staff.....		25,910,000	
			<sup>1</sup> \$238,605,000
<hr/>			
Division of natural sciences and agriculture (May 22, 1913, to Dec. 31, 1953) :			
Experimental biology.....		25,928,000	
Physics, mathematics, and other nonbiological sciences.....		8,630,000	
Astronomy.....		1,462,000	
Agriculture.....		5,854,000	
General support of science.....		1,057,000	
Other special projects.....		1,609,000	
Fellowships:			
Direct.....	\$3,134,000		
Indirect.....	4,519,000		
		7,653,000	
Grants in aid (since 1944).....		2,850,000	
			<sup>1</sup> 55,043,000
<hr/>			
Division of social sciences (Jan. 1, 1929, to Dec. 31, 1953) :			
General social science including fellowships and research aid.....		15,932,900	
Economics.....		14,205,575	
International relations.....		9,896,957	
Institutional centers for research and advanced training.....		5,693,975	
Public administration.....		7,716,475	
Community organization.....		2,600,400	
Group relations.....		2,390,320	
Development of social sciences in Europe.....		2,336,030	
Other, including cultural anthropology, population, ethics, etc.....		6,027,025	
Unpaid balances of Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial appropriations as of Dec. 31, 1928, transferred to the Rockefeller Foundation.....		12,283,193	
			<sup>1</sup> 79,082,850
<hr/>			

<sup>1</sup> These totals represent gross appropriations; actual expenditures are slightly less.

*The Rockefeller Foundation—Grants to prinipal field of interest through  
Dec. 31, 1953—Continued*

Division of the humanities (Jan. 1, 1929, to Dec. 31, 1953) :

Scholarship and the arts :

History .....	\$1, 046, 853
Philosophy .....	507, 857
Language, logic, and symbolism .....	1, 053, 804
General education .....	345, 875
General purposes .....	5, 514, 927
Literature .....	1, 129, 001
The arts .....	2, 883, 978

\$12, 482, 095

Intercultural understanding :

General .....	307, 865
European studies .....	68, 020
American studies .....	1, 950, 151
Near Eastern studies .....	811, 944
Slavic studies .....	1, 287, 718
South and Southeast Asian studies .....	468, 040
Far Eastern studies .....	2, 231, 689
Latin American studies .....	902, 929
African studies .....	90, 900

8, 119, 256

Other interests :

Film and radio .....	1, 420, 776
Communication research .....	552, 870
Library service .....	4, 962, 207
Archaeology .....	4, 759, 716

11, 695, 569

<sup>1</sup> 32, 296, 920

<sup>1</sup> These totals represent gross appropriations ; actual expenditures are slightly less.



## APPENDIX C

*The Rockefeller Foundation—Board of trustees, July 1, 1954*

Name	Position and address	Terms of service
Bowles, Chester.....	Former Governor of Connecticut and former United States Ambassador to India and Nepal, Essex, Conn.	Apr. 7, 1954, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Bronk, Detlev W.....	President, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, York Ave. and 66th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 1, 1953, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Clafin, William H., Jr.....	President, Soledad Sugar Co., room 1006, 75 Federal St., Boston, Mass.	Apr. 5, 1950, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Dickey, John S.....	President, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.	Apr. 2, 1947, to Apr. 4, 1956.
Douglas, Lewis W.....	Chairman of the board, Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, 1740 Broadway, New York, N. Y., former Ambassador to Great Britain.	Apr. 10, 1935, to Apr. 2, 1947; Dec. 6, 1950, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Harrison, Wallace K.....	Harrison & Abramovitz, architects, 630 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	July 1, 1951, to Apr. 4, 1956.
Kimberly, John R.....	President, Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis.	Apr. 1, 1953, to Apr. 3, 1957.
Loeb, Robert F.....	Bard professor of medicine, Columbia University, 620 West 168th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 2, 1947, to Apr. 3, 1957.
Lovett, Robert A.....	Brown Bros., Harriman & Co., 59 Wall St., New York, N. Y., former Secretary of Defense.	May 20, 1949, to Apr. 3, 1957.
McCloy, John J.....	Chairman of the board, the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine St., New York, N. Y., former High Commissioner for Germany.	Apr. 3, 1946, to June 11, 1949; Apr. 1, 1953, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Moe, Henry Allen.....	Secretary general, John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, 551 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 5, 1944, to Apr. 4, 1956.
Myers, William I.....	Dean, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.	Apr. 2, 1941, to Apr. 4, 1956.
Parran, Thomas.....	Dean, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Apr. 2, 1941, to Apr. 4, 1956.
Rockefeller, John D., 3d.....	Business and Philanthropy, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.	Dec. 16, 1931, to Apr. 4, 1946.
Rusk, Dean.....	President, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, 49 West 49th St., New York, N. Y., former Assistant Secretary of State.	Apr. 5, 1950, to Apr. 3, 1957.
Smith, Geoffrey S.....	President, Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank, Broad and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.	Apr. 5, 1950, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Sproul, Robert G.....	President, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.	Apr. 3, 1940, to Apr. 6, 1955.
Sulzberger, Arthur Hays.....	Publisher, the New York Times, and president and director, the New York Times Co., 229 West 43d St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 5, 1939, to Apr. 3, 1957.
Van Dusen, Henry P.....	President, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 2, 1947, to Apr. 3, 1957.
Wood, W. Barry, Jr.....	Professor of medicine, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.	July 1, 1954, to Apr. 3, 1957.

*General Education Board—Board of trustees, July 1, 1954*

Name	Position and address	Terms of service
Branscomb, Bennett Harvie.....	Chancellor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.	Apr. 3, 1947, to Apr. 4, 1957.
Bronk, Detlev W.....	President, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, 66th St. and York Ave., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 8, 1954, to Apr. 5, 1956.
Coolidge, T. Jefferson.....	Chairman of Board, United Fruit Co., and Old Colony Trust Co., 80 Federal St., Boston, Mass.	Apr. 6, 1950, to Apr. 4, 1957.
DeVane, William C.....	Dean, Yale College, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.	Apr. 6, 1950, to Apr. 7, 1955.
Douglas, Lewis W.....	Chairman of board, Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, 1740 Broadway, New York, N. Y., former Ambassador to Great Britain.	Apr. 8, 1937, to Apr. 3, 1947; Dec. 7, 1950, to Apr. 7, 1955.
Myers, William I.....	Dean, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.	Apr. 3, 1941, to Apr. 7, 1955.
Norton, Edward L.....	Chairman of board, Voice of Alabama, (WAPI, WAFM-TV), 701 Protective Life Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.	Apr. 6, 1944, to Apr. 5, 1956.
Parran, Thomas.....	Dean, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Apr. 3, 1947, to Apr. 5, 1956.
Rockefeller, John D., 3d.....	Business and Philanthropy, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.	Jan. 1, 1932, to Apr. 5, 1956.
Rusk, Dean.....	President, General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation, 49 West 49th St., New York, N. Y., former Assistant Secretary of State.	Dec. 6, 1951, to Apr. 7, 1955.
Sproul, Robert G.....	President, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.	Apr. 4, 1940, to Apr. 4, 1957.
Van Dusen, Henry P.....	President, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 8, 1948, to Apr. 4, 1957.

**SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF THE ROCKEFELLER  
FOUNDATION, BY DEAN RUSK, PRESIDENT**

The Rockefeller Foundation submits this supplemental statement to the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations of the 83d Congress. Its supplements the joint principal statement by the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board of the same date and contains the foundation's comments upon certain specific grants which were referred to in the public hearings on committee staff reports.

This statement is verified under oath. Attention is invited to the second paragraph on page 1 of the principal statement, regarding the president's personal knowledge and statements made upon information and belief.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The American Council of Learned Societies has been mentioned in the testimony as an intermediate organization<sup>1</sup> to which authority (in this instance in the field of the humanities) is delegated by the foundations, and the danger of the concentration of power in the hands of such an organization has been stressed.<sup>2</sup> These observations do not conform to the facts.

The American Council of Learned Societies is a federation of 25 national organizations devoted to the encouragement of humanistic studies. These organizations are recognized learned societies of the

<sup>1</sup> Hearings, p. 601, 602.

<sup>2</sup> Hearings, pp. 469, 601, 612.

United States and represent a combined membership of nearly 50,000 American scholars in these fields. The central function of the council is the encouragement of humanistic studies. In serving this central function, the activities of the council include: (1) the initiation and promotion of research, (2) the dissemination and utilization of the results of research, (3) the training of individuals for research and teaching, (4) the representation at home and abroad of American scholarship in the humanities.

It is our understanding that the American Council of Learned Societies has filed a statement with the committee. This statement will undoubtedly provide ample information of the policies, organization, and program of the council. Our comment here is therefore limited to the relation of the council to the work of the Rockefeller Foundation.

The American Council of Learned Societies receives funds from a variety of sources for various phases of its work. While substantial grants (\$4,788,775) have been made by the Rockefeller Foundation toward general support and for specific projects of the council during a period of more than 20 years, these grants represent slightly less than 15 percent of the funds appropriated by the foundation for work in the humanities. This foundation plays no part in determination of council policies and exercises no authority in the appointment of the council's staff or committees, and in no sense does it delegate responsibility to the council for the conduct of its program in the humanities. Aside from the funds contributed for the general support of the council, appropriations have been made for specific projects which the council was especially well qualified to carry out and for which it had submitted carefully prepared proposals. Such special projects have been directed, in most cases, by committees representative of American scholarship in the particular academic fields involved. These committees also assume responsibility for the selection of recipients of fellowships and grants-in-aid awarded by the council.

The foundation's support has been given to the American Council of Learned Societies in the belief that the organization was playing an important role in the advancement of American scholarship. This role was well stated by Dr. Charles E. Odegaard, former executive director of the council and now dean of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts, University of Michigan, in his 1950 annual report:

\* \* \* the learned scientific societies based on disciplines or fields of interest \* \* \* have attained national representation in their membership. Useful as these are—and no one could deny their significance—there remains a place for something more, for an association supplementary to colleges and universities, academies, and learned societies. Historically, it is the research councils which, within the limits of their slender resources, have tried to fill this supplementary niche. It is our present duty in this council to see as clearly as possible the needs which are not met by other agencies and to set in motion efforts to meet these additional needs by whatever means can be found.

The contribution which the American Council of Learned Societies has made to American culture is evident from the most casual review of that organization's history. Its reliability is attested by the fact that in 1951 the Office of Naval Research, acting on behalf of the three defense departments, signed a contract with the council for the preparation of a national register of humanists and social scientists.

## COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY—RUSSIAN INSTITUTE

The report of the committee's Legal Analyst, part II, refers to foundation support of studies carried on by the Russian Institute of Columbia University, studies which the Legal Analyst characterizes, along with others, as "aimed at the single target of world peace."<sup>3</sup> The quoted phrase is taken by the Legal Analyst from Fosdick's *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, p. 219. Mr. Fosdick's statement was: "There is a sense, of course, in which the foundation's entire work in all fields has been aimed at the single target of world peace." Whether the expression is given the broad meaning in which it was used by Mr. Fosdick, or a narrower and more specific meaning, it is fairly applicable to the foundation's grants for support of Columbia University's Russian Institute.

This report of the Legal Analyst was presented after the committee had cut off public hearings. As a result, we do not have the benefit of any oral testimony by the Legal Analyst, explaining why these grants were thought to be relevant in the committee's search for error on the part of the foundations.

The Rockefeller Foundation takes modest pride in having given substantial aid toward the Russian Institute, which has become one of the major centers for Russian studies in this country. Knowledge of our powerful and unscrupulous rival is the cornerstone of our defense against communism. It is the business of the Russian Institute to supply such knowledge in all its phases. It has provided more trained specialists in the Russian field than any other center in the country. During the last 7 years, the State Department, the Army, the Air Force and the Navy have sent 99 persons to the institute for training. Of the persons who have completed the institute's program, nearly all are making active use of their training in Government service, Government-supported research projects, teaching, journalism and similar useful occupations.

The importance of affording opportunity for study in the Russian field was well expressed by President Eisenhower in his inaugural address as president of Columbia University, when he said:

There will be no administrative suppression or distortion of any subject that merits a place in this university's curricula. The facts of communism, for example, shall be taught here—its ideological development, its political methods, its economic effects, its probable course in the future. The truth about communism is, today, an indispensable requirement if the true values of our democratic system are to be properly assessed. Ignorance of communism, fascism, or any other police-state philosophy is far more dangerous than ignorance of the most virulent disease.<sup>4</sup>

Before the committee itself condemns foundation support of an institution which is playing such a vital role in our defense against communism, we respectfully suggest consultation with those who are responsible in executive capacities for the conduct of our foreign affairs and for the defense of the country.

## CORNELL CIVIL LIBERTIES STUDIES

The report of the committee's Legal Analyst, part II, is critical of the foundation's grants to Cornell University in support of these studies on the ground that they were under the direction of "two indi-

<sup>3</sup> Report of Legal Analyst, hearings, p. 893.

<sup>4</sup> The New York Times, Oct. 13, 1948, p. 21.

viduals" who were not "sufficiently impartial to insure a 'factual examination' or an 'objective finding.'" <sup>5</sup> These two individuals, Dr. Robert E. Cushman, chairman of the department of government at Cornell, and Prof. Walter Gellhorn of the Law School, Columbia University, are then discussed under the heading "The sponsorship of individuals who by their writings are of a Socialist, if not Communist philosophy, dedicated to the idea of world government." <sup>6</sup>

We will not discuss these charges at length since the president of the Rockefeller Foundation, Mr. Dean Rusk, testified fully before the Cox committee, and was cross-examined, on the grants to Cornell for the civil liberties studies. <sup>7</sup> If he were given the opportunity to testify before this committee, he would not testify differently. We also wish to direct the attention of this committee to the testimony and cross-examination of Professor Gellhorn, who appeared before the Cox committee at his own request and denied under oath past or present membership in or sympathy with the Communist Party. <sup>8</sup>

In 1948, the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of \$110,000 to Cornell University for a study of the relation of civil rights to the control of subversive activities. To permit completion of this work, three additional grants were made, \$20,000 in 1950, \$6,000 in 1951, and \$3,500 in 1952. The director of the survey was Dr. Robert E. Cushman, chairman of the department of government at Cornell and formerly president (1943) of the American Political Science Association. Dr. Cushman chose his own associates, although foundation officers knew who the major ones (including Professor Gellhorn) were to be before the first grant was made.

This was not the first time that the foundation had concerned itself with the question of civil liberties. In 1944 and 1947 grants totaling \$28,000 had been made to Cornell for a study of civil liberties in wartime, headed also by Dr. Cushman. This wartime study embraced questions relating to the civil rights of enemy aliens, of conscientious objectors, and of civilians under martial law.

Dr. Cushman, director of the program, was experienced in the field of civil liberties and had (and still has) a reputation for scholarly competence and objectivity. He had been head of the department of government in one of the country's leading universities. The foundation knew that he intended to associate with him in these studies Prof. Robert Carr, department of government, Dartmouth College, formerly executive secretary of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; Miss Eleanor Bontecou, formerly an attorney with the Department of Justice and later in the War Department; and Professor Gellhorn of Columbia.

Professor Gellhorn was a well-known and distinguished professor in one of the country's leading law schools, whose colleagues held (and still hold) him in high regard, and who had been Director of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in 1939-41.

The results of the research supported by the foundation have not caused us to change our view of Dr. Cushman or his associates, including Professor Gellhorn.

Published reviews of the studies show that they have been widely regarded as scholarly and objective and as constituting a valuable

<sup>5</sup> Report of Legal Analyst, hearings, p. 900.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> Cox committee hearings, p. 514 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Cox committee hearings, p. 734 ff.

source of information on the issues involved in attaining the two important objectives of national security and civil liberty. The following studies have been published:

Security, Loyalty and Science, by Walter Gellhorn, Columbia University Law School

The Tenney Committee,<sup>9</sup> by Edward L. Barrett, Jr., University of California Law School

Un-American Activities in the State of Washington,<sup>9</sup> by Verne Countryman, Yale Law School

Loyalty and Legislative Action,<sup>9</sup> by Lawrence H. Chamberlain, Columbia University Law School

The States and Subversion,<sup>10</sup> partly written and partly edited by Walter Gellhorn

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, by Robert K. Carr, Dartmouth College

The Federal Loyalty-Security Program, by Miss Eleanor Bontecou

A summary volume bringing together the conclusions as a whole is being prepared by Dr. Cushman, and is scheduled for publication in 1954.

These studies, involving as they do a controversial subject, have been criticized by some commentators. But a much more widely held opinion is that they are useful and valuable. Unfortunately, there are some persons who would view as subversive any criticism of any phase of the executive loyalty program or of any activity of legislative committees interested in the problem. But the American tradition of concern about individual liberty is older than the Republic, as reflected, for example, in the Declaration of Independence. One of the first acts of the first Congress was to propose 12 amendments to the States, of which the States accepted 10, which made secure against Federal encroachment the right of individuals in respect of religion, freedom of speech, military service, and the use and maintenance of armies, search warrants, trial in accordance with fixed law and by judgment of juries, criminal accusation, the inflictment of punishment and the exaction of bail. Stories in the press indicate that many Members of Congress from both parties are now concerned about procedures followed by congressional investigating committees, and that new codes of procedure are under consideration.

We are sure that the proper concern for individual liberty in the American tradition evidenced by the studies of Dr. Cushman and Professor Gellhorn will not be considered an indication of Communist or Socialist sympathies.

#### COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Council on Foreign Relations, which has received substantial support from the Rockefeller Foundation, is one of the organizations criticized in the report of the committee's Legal Analyst, part II,<sup>11</sup> as biased in favor of an "internationalist" viewpoint, and as maintaining close relations with government.

The council is without doubt one of the principal nongovernmental agencies devoted to a study of our foreign affairs. In this field it has

<sup>9</sup> Condensations of these three volumes also appear as chapters in the States and Subversion.

<sup>10</sup> Chapters for this volume were also prepared by E. Houston Harsha, University of Chicago Law School, on the State of Illinois; by William B. Prendergast, assistant professor of political science, U. S. Naval Academy, on the Ober Act of the State of Maryland; and by Robert J. Mowitz, department of government, Wayne University, on the city of Detroit.

<sup>11</sup> Report of Legal Analyst, hearings, p. 884.

a distinguished record of service to the public and to the United States Government. Perhaps its major service, undertaken shortly after the outbreak of World War II, developed into the program of war and peace studies which the Legal Analyst seems to regard as in some way suspect. The fact is that it was these studies to which Secretary of State Cordell Hull referred in saying: "I hope you will go on with this important work and that you will continue to give us the benefit of research and thinking done under the council's auspices."

On pages 33 and 34 of the report the Legal Analyst sets forth the names of research secretaries of the war and peace studies who "progressed to other work related to the organization of peace and the settlement of postwar problems. \* \* \*"<sup>12</sup> The intimation seems to be that there was something sinister and evil in this relationship.

We cannot believe that the Congress will view with alarm our support of the Council on Foreign Relations, or will share the strange viewpoint of the legal analyst that the public service of a grant recipient is a ground for criticism of the foundation responsible for the grant.

#### THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

The report of the committee's legal analyst, part II, devotes considerable attention<sup>12</sup> to the Foreign Policy Association, to which from 1933 to 1950 the Rockefeller Foundation has made substantial grants, largely for the support its research and educational programs.

The report finds the Foreign Policy Association guilty of an "internationalist trend,"<sup>13</sup> said to be exemplified in certain of its Headline Books, and claims that, "in those reviewed little attention was paid to the possibility of a nationalist point of view as opposed to an internationalist one."<sup>14</sup>

The facts are that the Foreign Policy Association during the period covered by the foundation's grants has been one of the leading organizations in the country devoted to research and study in problems of international relations. Its series of Headline Books has now reached 104 titles. The legal analyst comments adversely on 4. The authors of others include James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University; Grayson Kirk, now president of Columbia University; Allen W. Dulles, now Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; and other well-known students of foreign affairs. The Rockefeller Foundation cannot claim the credit for these selections, nor is it responsible for those which have been criticized. For the reasons set forth in our principal statement, we do not censor publications resulting from our grants or control the product of research which we support.

We express full confidence in the Foreign Policy Association as an agency for public education in problems of international relations, which has become so vital since the leadership of the free world has been thrust upon the United States.

#### INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A witness has implied that the foundation's funds were used for a summer school in Moscow at which American educators were indoc-

<sup>12</sup> Report of Legal Analyst, hearings, p. 882.

<sup>13</sup> Report of Legal Analyst, hearings, p. 884.

<sup>14</sup> Report of Legal Analyst, hearings, p. 883.

trinated with communism.<sup>15</sup> Although the testimony is confused as to the exact title of the agency supposed to have sponsored the criticized summer school, it probably refers to the Institute of International Education. This organization, which is located in New York City, operates a program concerned with facilitating international student-exchange programs. It renders valuable services to colleges, universities, and Government agencies in the administration of fellowships and scholarships for foreign students and for American students going abroad. Its support comes largely from grants from a number of foundations and from Government contracts which amount to almost one-half of its annual budget.

The Rockefeller Foundation has made grants totaling \$396,505 toward the general support of the institute. Prior to 1929, grants were made by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial chiefly to enable the institute to maintain a travel and information service for American professors and students in France and Great Britain.

Our records do not show that the Rockefeller Foundation appropriated funds for the support of a summer school in Soviet Russia. We have been told that there was a summer school for foreign students in Russia in 1933 with which the institute had no relation; it seems that this summer school was repeated in 1934, with some sponsorship by the Institute of International Education, which had long served as the principal American contact for summer schools in foreign countries. In 1935, plans for repetition were frustrated by administrative inefficiency and lack of cooperation on the Russian side and the program for that year was canceled. We know of no resumption.

To the extent that the Rockefeller Foundation had contributed to the general support of the Institute of International Education, some portion of its funds can be said to have been involved in the sponsorship of the 1934 school, referred to above. Against the background of Russian war relief and business and commercial exchanges of the 1920's, diplomatic exchange beginning in 1933, and the official American policy of encouraging exchanges through the Iron Curtain until as late as 1947, we see no significance in the fact that some of our funds might have been used for such a purpose in 1934.

#### INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

Two specific questions in regard to the Rockefeller Foundation's support of the Institute of Pacific Relations have been raised by witnesses before this committee. Both points had been covered in the full, detailed statement on this subject made by the foundation's president before the Cox committee in 1952, but in the discussions before this committee neither counsel nor witnesses made any reference to that previous testimony. It should not be necessary to repeat the entire statement here. We respectfully urge, however, that before undertaking to criticize the foundation for these grants, this committee should familiarize itself with the facts by a careful review of our statement, which appears in the printed report of the hearings of the Cox committee, pages 520 to 528. This present statement will be limited to a discussion of the two matters mentioned by the committee's witnesses, with the addition of such background as seems necessary.

<sup>15</sup> Hearings, pp. 267-283.



The first question relates to the charges made against the IPR by Alfred Kohlberg. It was testified by one witness, Dr. Kenneth Colegrove, that what he couldn't understand " \* \* \* was when Alfred Kohlberg was able to get the consent of one of the very high officers in the Rockefeller Foundation, why the foundation would not make an investigation of the IPR."<sup>16</sup>

At a later point in his testimony the following exchange occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. To whom was Kohlberg's request for an investigation made, Professor?

Dr. COLEGROVE. It was made to Fred Willetts, an official of the Rockefeller Foundation, one of the outstanding men, a man of great integrity and a man of competence and scholarship. I have great respect for Fred Willetts, and he must have had a good reason for not investigating. But that reason, it seems to me, ought to be told to the American people.<sup>17</sup>

The actual facts in regard to this episode, which differ materially from Dr. Colegrove's version, were set forth in the public testimony of the president of the Rockefeller Foundation before the Cox committee, as follows:

In 1944 Alfred Kohlberg sent the foundation copies of his charges of pro-Communist bias in the IPR. The director of the social-sciences division of the foundation suggested that the charges be referred to an independent body of competent persons for hearing and determination. This proposal was accepted by Mr. Kohlberg, but rejected by the IPR. Instead, a special committee of IPR trustees reported to its board that the executive committee and responsible officers of the American council had "investigated Mr. Kohlberg's charges and found them inaccurate and irresponsible." The foundation officers would have preferred an independent appraisal of the organization's activities, I might say, not because of any views which they then held on the merits of the problem but because in their view at the time that was the proper procedure by which you could get rid of this kind of issue one way or the other.<sup>18</sup>

The "director of the social-sciences division of the foundation" referred to in this quotation was Joseph H. Willits, who is evidently the person Dr. Colegrove had in mind. As the foregoing testimony shows, there was no plan to have the foundation conduct a public investigation of the IPR, an undertaking for which the foundation was neither equipped nor qualified. Mr. Willits never gave his consent to have such an investigation undertaken by the foundation, and there was no mysterious suppression of such a proposal. On the contrary, Mr. Willits intervened with a suggestion for quite a different type of investigation which was never carried out because the proposal was not acceptable to the IPR.

The second question was raised by the testimony of Dr. David N. Rowe. It related to his understanding "that the Rockefeller Foundation was still contributing money to the IPR after 1950" when, in his opinion, grants should have been terminated.<sup>19</sup> Before turning to the facts in that regard, we call attention to the following point which the chairman of the committee developed in questioning this witness:

The CHAIRMAN. I am not sure about the year, but on up until the late forties, the IPR had an excellent standing; did it not? I am not sure what year it was, but perhaps up to the midforties.

Dr. ROWE. The IPR had excellent standing in educational circles, in governmental circles, and intellectual circles up until the late forties. That is an accurate statement.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Hearings, p. 557.

<sup>17</sup> Hearings, p. 559.

<sup>18</sup> Cox committee hearings, p. 524.

<sup>19</sup> Hearings, p. 537.

<sup>20</sup> Hearings, p. 541.

This witness testified that he had joined the IPR around 1939,<sup>21</sup> had accepted election as one of its trustees in 1947, and had continued to serve as a trustee until 1950,<sup>22</sup> when he resigned with a letter which he now feels "was probably altogether too polite."<sup>23</sup> He also testified in regard to the IPR that:

They were known all over the country as the outstanding center in the United States for Far Eastern research and study.<sup>24</sup>

The bulk of the foundation's grants to the IPR was made during a period even earlier than Dr. Rowe's trusteeship, when its prestige was fully as high as he relates.

The foundation's last appropriation for the IPR was made in 1950, payable over 2 years. The circumstances under which this action was taken were fully described in the Cox committee testimony.<sup>25</sup> A highly responsible group, under the chairmanship of Gerard Swope, former president of the General Electric Co., was undertaking to salvage the great values in the IPR program to which Dr. Rowe testified. The foundation officers made a full examination of the problem, within the means proper to an organization like ours. As the committee knows, the FBI and other Government security agencies give information only to Government departments. Four IPR trustees, who had earlier resigned because of dissatisfaction with the situation, had shortly after their resignations urged the foundation to continue its support in order to reinforce the efforts of those who were working to strengthen the organization. Confronted with the strongest recommendations for continuing support, and with no contrary advice from the agencies of Government responsible for security problems, the foundation approved the 1950 grant.

Dr. Rowe's view that the 1950 grant should not have been made seems to rest largely on hindsight, based principally on evidence brought out in the McCarran committee hearings, which did not begin until nearly a year after the making of the grant.

These hearings obviously prompted the following statement in the report of the committee's legal analyst, part II:

The Institute of Pacific Relations has been the subject of exhaustive hearings by other congressional committees in which its subversive character has been thoroughly demonstrated.<sup>26</sup>

The only exhaustive hearings on this organization known to us are those of the McCarran committee whose report was published in 1952. The foundation does not feel called upon to comment on the legal analyst's statement other than to observe that editorial comment on the McCarran committee's report was sharply divided, that the IPR has not been listed by the Attorney General as a subversive organization, and that it has not been deprived of its tax-exemption privilege by the Internal Revenue Service, a privilege which it would hardly be allowed to retain if the Internal Revenue Service agreed with the committee's legal analyst that the IPR's "subversive character has been thoroughly demonstrated."

<sup>21</sup> Hearings, p. 537.

<sup>22</sup> Hearings, p. 537.

<sup>23</sup> Hearings, p. 539.

<sup>24</sup> Hearings, p. 541.

<sup>25</sup> Cox committee hearings, p. 526 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Report of legal analyst, hearings, p. 897.

## THE KINSEY STUDIES

It is not clear from the transcript of proceedings whether or not the committee wishes us to comment upon the foundation's grants for sex research, including its support for the Kinsey group at the University of Indiana. At one point, however, the Chairman states:

\* \* \* As one member of the committee, I don't have much interest in the Kinsey report. Any interest that the committee might have in the Kinsey report arises out of whether that was a desirable undertaking for a foundation, which is quite a different matter \* \* \*.<sup>27</sup>

We wish to make the foundation's position clear, even though committee members have expressed a number of reservations about getting into the matter.

In 1931 the Rockefeller Foundation became interested in systematic support for studies in sexual physiology and behavior. This came at a time when the foundation began to concentrate its natural science interest more in the life sciences and less in the physical sciences. The latter decision, a very natural one in view of the foundation's long and large interest in medicine and public health, was primarily based on the conviction that the physical sciences had received large support and were far advanced; whereas there were great undeveloped opportunities in the life sciences to serve the welfare of mankind. Support for studies in reproductive physiology and behavior constituted an obviously necessary part of this program since the ability to reproduce is one of the elementary characteristics of living organisms.

The Rockefeller Foundation began in 1931 to make modest grants to the committee for research in problems of sex of the National Research Council (hereinafter referred to as the NRC committee), support for which had previously come from the Bureau of Social Hygiene. Foundation grants to this committee have been the following:

1931-----	\$150,000	1941-----	\$150,000
1932-----	75,000	1944-----	135,000
1933-----	65,000	1946-----	120,000
1934-----	80,000	1946-----	80,000
1935-----	75,000	1949-----	240,000
1936-----	75,000	1951-----	160,000
1937-----	200,000	1954-----	150,000

The NRC Committee, first organized in 1921, has published a summary account of its first quarter century in a volume *Twenty-Five Years of Sex Research*,<sup>28</sup> which we have supplied to your research director. A reading of it will suggest, we believe, two conclusions. First, the NRC Committee has been made up over the years of a group of our most eminent scientists in biology and medicine. Second, it has achieved an extraordinary record in opening up and developing an entire field of medical physiology.

For example, the three decades during which this program has now been in operation have seen a most encouraging growth in our knowledge of the reproductive process and in the ability of modern medicine to control its disorders and diseases. Many of the most significant advances have stemmed from the work of the NRC Committee and

<sup>27</sup> Transcript, p. 1854.

<sup>28</sup> *25 Years of Sex Research*, Aberle, S. D. and Corner, G. W., W. B. Saunders Co. (Philadelphia, 1953).

the closely related grants made directly by the foundation. Examples may be cited as follows: (1) The isolation and later synthesis of estrogen, the first ovarian hormone to be discovered; this important substance is now widely and safely used to relieve menopausal distress and discomfort and in the treatment of disordered menstruation, sterility, and retarded genital development in girls; (2) a similar identification of the testis hormone, androgen, which is similarly useful in the treatment of disordered physiology in the male; (3) recognition of several different substances from the anterior pituitary glands which are involved in body growth, sugar metabolism, milk secretion, and various disorders which apparently result from unusual stress.

Less completely attributable to the work of the NRC Committee but still importantly influenced by it was the discovery of hormones of the adrenal cortex. Increased knowledge of the interactions of the foregoing hormones in determining the normal physiology of the reproductive cycle has led to far more intelligent handling of women's diseases, problems of sterility, and the commercial breeding of fur-bearing and food-producing animals. Two notable achievements in the field of cancer have resulted from NRC Committee support: the diagnosis of cancer of the uterus by study of the cells of the vagina and the treatment of cancer of the prostate gland by the use of hormones.

Beginning about 1941, the NRC Committee became interested in the work of Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey and others at the University of Indiana in the field of human sexual behavior; between 1941 and 1946 the NRC Committee had allocated to this work \$120,100 of the total funds available to it. Beginning in 1946, the NRC Committee and the foundation discussed the needs of the Indiana study more specifically, and it was agreed that the 1946 foundation grant to the committee was to be allocated to Dr. Kinsey's group. Similarly, it was understood that the NRC Committee would allocate up to 50 percent of the grants of 1949 and 1952 for the same purpose. In addition, the foundation made one grant of \$14,000 direct to the University of Indiana for Dr. Kinsey's Institute of Sex Research.

Among the published materials issuing from the Indiana group are the widely discussed volumes *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. The aim of the studies was to contribute to the better understanding of some of the elements in a complex aspect of human behavior in which parents, doctors, ministers, teachers, legislators, social workers, penologists, and many others have a serious interest.

A thoughtful reader will understand why these books have evoked the greatest variety of both professional and popular interest, ranging from highest praise to violent condemnation. They dealt with an aspect of behavior about which comparatively little is known; to the extent that they pointed to a possible significant disparity between acknowledged mores and actual behavior, they touched upon sensitive issues. They involved complex problems of statistics and procedure, discussed at length on pages 3-97 of the second of the two volumes and by other authors in many articles elsewhere. The two studies dealt almost entirely with the physical aspects of human behavior and did not purport to speak authoritatively on the moral, legal, social, and psychological aspects which common experience would recognize as

being present. That these studies are not definitive would not need to be said to those who are professionally concerned with the problem, nor would Dr. Kinsey's group claim them to be such.

In addition to grants made to the NRC Committee for Research in Problems of Sex, the Rockefeller Foundation has made grants for studies of various aspects of sex to more than 2 dozen other university and research centers, including the National Committee on Maternal Health, Stanford University, the University of California, the University of Missouri, Yale, Columbia, Harvard, Hebrew University, McGill University, Ohio State, the University of Berlin, the University of Gottingen, the College de France, and the Universities of Pennsylvania, Rochester, Stockholm, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

An examination of this program will show that such studies are an important part of an advance on a broad front in the life sciences, taking their place alongside other foundation-supported research in physiology, psychiatry, genetics, biology, biochemistry, biophysics, marine biology, and related fields.

#### LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

One of the committee's witnesses was critical of the London School of Economics and Political Science which had benefited from foundation support.<sup>29</sup>

The facts are the following. Between 1924 and 1928 the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial made grants totaling \$1,245,000 to the London School of Economics and Political Science, a division of the University of London. Major aid from the Rockefeller Foundation began in 1931 and continued until 1935, when a 5-year tapering grant was made terminating general aid to the school, in line with the policy then adopted by the foundation of discontinuing grants for general support of social sciences at colleges and universities. Two substantial grants were made after this date, one in 1939 (\$51,250) to provide funds required as a result of the wartime emergency and one in 1949 (\$50,900) for the new Department of Sociological and Demographic Research. Several smaller grants have been made for support of particular programs of research or for support of particular scholars associated with the London School.

Foundation grants to the London School total \$873,348, most of which have been used for physical improvements, for research, and for postgraduate teaching.

The London School of Economics and Political Science is now and has been for many years one of the world's important educational and research institutions. Its faculty has included many distinguished scholars who have served their country in important posts in war and have contributed brilliantly to the increase of knowledge and understanding in peace. Its faculty, like any other university faculty, includes persons of varied shades of political opinion.

It is quite true that Sidney Webb played an important part in the founding of the London School of Economics, and that Harold Laski served on its faculty. That the school does not exist to inculcate any particular political views should be taken for granted in the case of an established university in a country with the highest traditions of free

<sup>29</sup> Hearings, p. 215; see also p. 475.

scholarship. That its roster has included such names as Lord Beveridge, Friedrich von Hayek, Lionel Robbins, Michael B. Oakeshott, Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Sir Charles Webster, A. J. Toynbee, D. W. Brogan, R. H. Tawney, Herman Finer, and many others of equal distinction attests the wide range of points of view of its leadership.

In the academic year 1953-54, the London School had a faculty of 148 and a student enrollment at 3,376, of which 898 (27 percent) had come from 29 foreign countries.

#### THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH

In view of the chairman's statement that the committee is primarily interested in the "errors" of foundations, we must assume that when the legal analyst's report, part II, calls attention to the Rockefeller Foundation's support of the National Bureau of Economic Research,<sup>30</sup> the intent is to be critical. The basis of the criticism is nowhere explicitly stated and is not easy to discover.

There is no effort to disparage the work of the national bureau—rather the contrary. The legal analyst apparently believes that the attack upon these grants is reinforced by sections of Fosdick's history of the foundation, which are quoted at some length. These sections point to the extraordinary value of the service performed by the national bureau in bringing within reach "basic, articulated, quantitative information concerning the entire economy of the Nation"; the quotations conclude with the statement that "without the national bureau our society would not be nearly so well equipped as it is for dealing with the leading economic issues of our times."

The legal analyst does not seem to challenge these statements. If the national bureau performs such a unique and invaluable service, why is the Rockefeller Foundation open to question for supporting it? We have read and reread this section of the report with increasing bewilderment, and without finding an answer which satisfies us.

The author quotes<sup>31</sup> a sentence from the foundation's annual report for 1941 (written, presumably, during the early months of 1942) reading as follows:

If we are to have a durable peace after the war, if out of the wreckage of the present a new kind of cooperative life is to be built on a global scale, the part that science and advancing knowledge will play must not be overlooked.

"In the light of this attitude," the author continues, "some of the individuals and organizations benefiting from foundation funds in the years since 1941 may seem a trifle unusual to say the least."<sup>32</sup> This is the preliminary, in part, to the citation of the national bureau. Again we ask, in what respect is such an outstanding organization an "unusual" beneficiary?

Coming back to the quotations from Fosdick, we find the statement that the "basic, articulated, quantitative information" which the national bureau has brought within reach "has influenced public policy at a dozen points."<sup>33</sup> Here we may possibly have the clue. Are we accused of using our grants to shape public policy because the data and findings of the national bureau studies are cited, as Fosdick says,

<sup>30</sup> Legal analysts report, Hearings, p. 894.

<sup>31</sup> Legal analyst's report, Hearings, p. 895.

<sup>32</sup> Legal analyst's report, Hearings, p. 896.

<sup>33</sup> Legal analyst's report, Hearings, p. 896.

in "official documents," because "They are used by businessmen, legislators, labor specialists, and academic economists,"<sup>34</sup> because "They are constantly employed in Government agencies like the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census"?<sup>35</sup>

If this is indeed the intended basis of criticism, it reveals little familiarity with the work of the national bureau. This organization is engaged, not in policy forming but primarily in factfinding. It undertakes to supply the bricks, in the form, for example, of measurements of the national income, measurements of money flows, measurements of the volume of consumer credit, which policymakers will use in developing their legislative and other structures. The best testimony to the national bureau's impartiality is found in the fact that both business organizations and labor organizations make contributions to it, not for specific studies but for general support.

It is unnecessary for us to elaborate on the work of the national bureau, because of the description of this work which will be found in the testimony before the Cox committee of William I. Myers, dean of the New York College of Agriculture at Cornell University, and a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board since 1941.<sup>36</sup>

We cannot imagine a less fruitful enterprise than to seek for error in the foundation's support of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

#### THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CLEARINGHOUSE

In the report of the legal analyst, attention has been drawn to the foundation's concern with a "durable peace" as shown in quotations from its annual reports. Its interest in the cooperative activities necessary for such peace is also mentioned. It is then stated that, in view of this concern, some of the individuals and organizations benefiting from foundation funds since 1941 "may seem a trifle unusual, to say the least \* \* \* ." The Public Administration Clearinghouse is mentioned as one such organization.<sup>37</sup>

In the light of world events during the past decades, the interest of the foundation in undertakings that may contribute to a durable peace needs no defense. The only apparent reason for the listing of the Public Administration Clearinghouse in this connection appears to be that since peace involves "cooperation" and the Public Administration Clearinghouse is an activity which obviously requires cooperation by those who participate in it and since this cooperative activity relates to the improvement of Government services, the legal analyst considers it one of the agencies whose selection for support by the foundation is considered questionable.

The Public Administration Clearinghouse was set up in 1931 to help meet the need for an interchange of administrative data and experience from one public official or agency to another, so that what happened in one place might be promptly known and perhaps utilized in another. Initial funds for its establishment and major support came from the Spelman Fund of New York, which appropriated a total of \$2,805,250 for this work. The Rockefeller Foundation made grants totaling \$14,699.

<sup>34</sup> Legal analysts's report, Hearings, p. 896.

<sup>35</sup> Legal analyst's report, Hearings, p. 896.

<sup>36</sup> Cox committee hearings, p. 123 ff.

<sup>37</sup> Report of legal analysts, Hearings, p. 895.

When the Public Administration Clearinghouse was organized, communication between city and State and between States and the Federal Government was narrowly restricted; administrators of important functions too often worked in isolation without opportunity to benefit from the experience and ideas of others engaged in like functions in other jurisdictions, or from the research and experimentation carried on in various universities and in centers of public administration research. The Public Administration Clearinghouse was established to remedy this situation, and it continues to render important public service to Government officials and agencies. It has a proud record of contributions to the improvement of standards, the exchange of ideas, and the development of stricter codes of ethics among those engaged in the various administrative functions of government. This record is ample justification for its selection as a recipient of foundation funds.

#### THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Testimony before the committee criticizes directly and by inference the relationship between the Rockefeller Foundation and the the Social Science Research Council.<sup>38</sup> It has been intimated that the Rockefeller Foundation and other large foundations have tended to dominate the Social Science Research Council;<sup>39</sup> that the council, in its turn, dominates the field of the social sciences;<sup>40</sup> that these foundations have used the council as an instrument in forwarding their "collectivist purposes";<sup>41</sup> and that by overemphasis upon the empirical method, the council has contributed to a lessened reliance on basic principles and a deterioration of moral standards.<sup>42</sup>

The Social Science Research Council is a voluntary association of scholars chosen from seven associated professional societies in the field of the social sciences and from related disciplines. It has spoken for itself and with conviction. Its objectives are aimed at the improvement of research organization and methods; facilitation of research efforts of scholars throughout the country; development of personnel; enlargement, improvement, dissemination, and preservation of materials; and the enhancement of public understanding and utilization of the social sciences.

Since these are objectives in which the Rockefeller Foundation is sympathetically interested, and since the members of the council are outstanding scholars in their own fields, the foundation has found support of the Social Science Research Council an effective means for assisting the growth of knowledge of human affairs. The council no more dominates its field than the American Law Institute dominates the practice of law. The Social Science Research Council does, of course, exert a large professional influence. But it is not the influence of the Rockefeller Foundation; it is the influence achieved by a group of leading scholars as their abilities and accomplishments are recognized and accepted in their profession.

Grants to the Social Science Research Council since its establishment have been substantial, namely, \$10,743,000. This, however, represents only 13.24 percent of the appropriations of the Rockefeller

<sup>38</sup> Hearings, pp. 45, 475; report of legal analyst, hearings, pp. 894, 898.

<sup>39</sup> Hearings, p. 471.

<sup>40</sup> Hearings, pp. 601, 617.

<sup>41</sup> Hearings, p. 46.

<sup>42</sup> Hearings, p. 47.



Foundation in the field of the social sciences. Since our total grants in this area amount to more than \$81 million, it cannot properly be said that we have delegated our responsibilities to any single organization as an "agent."

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON—FAR EASTERN STUDIES  
(TAIPING REBELLION)

We refer to this grant only because the testimony about it received by the committee illustrates the effort to build up a case against the foundations from inadequately informed sources. One of the few committee witnesses having an academic background first expressed his personal discontent with what he described as "the so-called cooperative or group method of research."<sup>43</sup> He admitted that in making this criticism he spoke for himself alone. "I certainly don't speak for my university, let alone for all of my colleagues in the university, among whom I am sure will be found many people who will disagree with much that I say."<sup>44</sup> He agreed that "there is a great divergence of opinion on these fundamental matters."<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless, this witness furnished 12 pages of testimony expounding his criticism of foundations for supporting this method of research.

Does the committee feel that the Congress should inquire into and determine the relative merits of a team approach to scholarly research as compared with an individual approach? If so, this would be going far beyond what any foundation known to us has attempted to do.

The witness who expatiated on this subject was asked by counsel for the committee to discuss a grant, "I think it was a quarter of a million dollars for a group study which seemed to be somewhat fallible."<sup>46</sup> He responded by referring to alleged "grants" by the Rockefeller Foundation which "probably came to that much" to the University of Washington for the purpose, as the witness put it, "of group research on the Taiping Rebellion,"<sup>47</sup> in China.

The fact is that the foundation made one grant, for a total of \$100,000, to the University of Washington's Far Eastern Institute, to be used over a period of 7 years for expenses of research on the Far East. While there have been other grants to the University of Washington, they were not directly connected with this group research project. The university explained that the general aim of the research program was to study Chinese society in transition, with the Taiping Rebellion as the focal point. The committee's witness agreed that "The Taiping Rebellion has long interested historians, and it is worthy of a great deal of study."<sup>48</sup>

His sole objection was his individual opposition to the group approach to the problem. The determination to make this approach was the decision of the university authorities, upon whom the foundation exercised no influence in this regard. The foundation has made many other grants to the University of Washington and to other institutions where group research was not involved. The criticism implies, therefore, that help should have been refused in this

<sup>43</sup> Hearings, p. 530.

<sup>44</sup> Hearings, p. 526.

<sup>45</sup> Hearings, p. 526.

<sup>46</sup> Hearings, p. 526.

<sup>47</sup> Hearings, p. 530.

<sup>48</sup> Hearings, p. 530.

case simply because this witness, on an admittedly personal basis, dislikes such organization of research. We submit that this grant to the University of Washington does not raise issues deserving of the committee's time.

DEAN RUSK,  
*President, the Rockefeller Foundation.*

Dated August 3, 1954.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
*County of New York, ss:*

Dean Rusk, being duly sworn, says that he is president of the Rockefeller Foundation, the organization in whose behalf the foregoing supplemental statement is made; that the foregoing supplemental statement is true to his knowledge except as to the matters occurring prior to the date (as set forth in the accompanying principal statement) of his association with said organization, which are therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and that as to those matters he believes it to be true.

DEAN RUSK.

Sworn to before me this 3d day of August 1954.

HAROLD B. LEONARD,  
*Notary Public, State of New York.*

Term expires March 30, 1955.

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF THE GENERAL  
EDUCATION BOARD, BY DEAN RUSK, PRESIDENT**

The General Education Board submits this supplemental statement to the Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations of the 83d Congress. It supplements the joint principal statement by the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board of the same date and contains the General Education Board's comments upon certain specific grants which were referred to in the public hearings or committee staff reports.

This statement is verified under oath. Attention is invited to the second paragraph on page one of the principal statement, regarding the president's personal knowledge and statements made upon information and belief.

**COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY TEACHERS COLLEGE**

Witnesses before the committee have interpreted grants made by the General Education Board, particularly grants to Teachers College, Columbia University, as evidence of an alleged intent on the part of the board to propagandize a particular philosophy of education.<sup>1</sup> This allegation is not sustained by the facts.

In 1920, Teachers College, Columbia University, received from the General Education Board a grant of \$1 million for endowment. Subsequently a number of smaller grants were made for various projects and studies at that institution, bringing the total aid received to \$1,540,397, exclusive of grants for the Lincoln School, which served as

<sup>1</sup> Hearings, pp. 253, 288, 336, 485, 690, 720, 818-819, 1497, 1603-1607.

a laboratory for the college. Grants in the amount of \$667,500<sup>2</sup> were also made by the Rockefeller Foundation, chiefly for research in child welfare and in nursing education.

In our principal statement (p. 62) we have pointed out that while the major portion of the board's funds was used to strengthen and support traditional education in long established American institutions, some 8 percent of the board's grants were made for studies and experimentation relating to improved educational methods and ways of utilizing new knowledge. Much of this assistance was in the form of endowment and support of graduate schools of education. We assume that few would question educational research as an appropriate function of graduate schools of education. The importance of strengthening and developing such schools was early recognized by our trustees, and sizable grants for educational research and endowment were made to George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, and to the schools of education at Stanford University, Harvard, Chicago, and Columbia. In this record of broadly distributed aid there is no evidence whatever that the General Education Board nurtured a particular philosophy of education. These reputable institutions would themselves deplore identification with any one educational philosophy or practice, and a review of various current theories of education would show that most of them have been represented at each of the institutions mentioned.<sup>3</sup>

We understand that a statement has been submitted to this committee by Teachers College. We believe that the committee will find in that statement evidence regarding the wide range of opinion reflected in the writings and activities of the college staff, and also that the college has had a positive program directed toward preventing the infiltration of Communist doctrine into the teaching and activities of its faculty and students.

#### *Lincoln School, Teachers College*

Mention has been made of the role of the General Education Board in the establishment of the Lincoln School at Teachers College, Columbia University.<sup>4</sup> Between 1917 and 1929 the board appropriated \$5,966,138 for the support of this school. This support was given in response to recommendations made by Mr. Abraham Flexner in his paper on "The Modern School" (a document which may still be read with interest and profit) and in the light of a growing recognition among educators that the curricula of both the elementary and secondary schools were no longer meeting satisfactorily the educational needs of great numbers of their pupils. The Lincoln School was essentially a laboratory. Through it one of the leading graduate schools of education was afforded opportunity to test educational theories that were then receiving attention from many thoughtful educators. From the beginning its history was a controversial one. Many of the theories tested there have since been discarded; some are still being studied; others are now widely accepted. The Lincoln School was closed in 1948 after the trustees of Teachers College, with the approval of the New York courts, had concluded that the purposes set

<sup>2</sup> As of June 30, 1954; the statement furnished the committee by Teachers College shows a lower figure; our figure includes foundation payments on grants made by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, prior to consolidation with the foundation, as well as a grant for nursing education.

<sup>3</sup> E. G. Judd, Hutchins, Dewey at Chicago; Cubberley, Cowley, Hanna, at Stanford; Bagley, Kandel, Kilpatrick, Counts at Teachers College, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Hearings, pp. 253-255.

forth in the board's grants for the school could thereafter be more effectively served by the establishment of an Institute of School Experimentation and the discontinuance of the private laboratory school. The board's grants originally made for the Lincoln School are now being used for this Institute of School Experimentation. Mr. Justice Botein of the New York Supreme Court in his opinion on the matter (March 20, 1947) says:

It is inconceivable that the men who planned this thrilling adventure on the frontiers of educational experimentation with the passionate deliberation of scientists would confine its potentiality for a productive future to one particular medium which might grow sterile. To analogize the unreality of such a position we need think only in terms of the present. The plaintiff [Teachers College] seems quite sanguine about the promise which the institute holds forth for fruitful experimentation. But no educator would dare present it as an immutable medium for perpetual productivity in experimentation.<sup>5</sup>

*International Institute, Teachers College*

Several references have been made in the testimony to the support given to the International Institute by "the Rockefeller interests."<sup>6</sup> It is true that the General Education Board made a grant to Teachers College in support of this institute. The institute, which was part of the college, was set up in 1923 to develop a specialized service for foreign students. It provided assistance in the form of scholarships, travel grants, and language instruction for some 3,852 students from 53 countries. At one time it served a group of more than 100 Americans on furlough from missionary colleges and other institutions abroad whose special circumstances called for something different from the regular courses in pedagogy and school administration. The staff of the institute kept in close touch with educational developments abroad, and it has to its credit many notable contributions in the field of comparative education, including the Educational Yearbook which constitutes a comprehensive international review of educational history for a decade and a half. The institute was discontinued in 1938 when many of its functions were absorbed by other divisions of the college.

*Faculty members, Teachers College*

A witness has made numerous criticisms of the writings of Prof. Harold O. Rugg and Prof. George S. Counts, both members of the faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University.<sup>7</sup> Inasmuch as no grants were made by either the Rockefeller Foundation or the General Education Board to the persons named for the books mentioned in this witness, we see no necessity for commenting on the criticisms. In our principal statement we have pointed out that it has been the consistent policy of the Rockefeller boards not to attempt to censor or modify the findings of scholars and scientists employed by institutions to which we have made grants; nor do we attempt to determine faculty appointments at these institutions.

EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

There have been many references in the testimony to the support given by the General Education Board to such educational associations as the National Education Association and the Progressive Education

<sup>5</sup> *Teachers College v. Goldstein et al.*, 70 N. Y. supp. 2d 778 (1947).

<sup>6</sup> Hearings, p. 287.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, hearings, pp. 255, 48.

Association, with the implication that through this support the board gave aid to "pro-Socialist and pro-Communist propaganda projects." "In our principal statement (pp. 63-65) we have already discussed that phase of the General Education Board's program which was especially concerned with the improvement of general education at the secondary school and junior college levels. We have shown that throughout this diversified program in which a great many institutions and many people with different points of view participated, there was no effort on the part of the Board to slant school and college curricula in a particular direction. We categorically deny that any board grants were ever made for the purpose of supporting pro-Socialist and pro-Communist propaganda projects.

Our annual reports show that large grants were made to the National Education Association and to the Progressive Education Association. When the board began its program in general education, there were three major educational organizations in this country with national membership and general concern with education at all levels. These were the American Council on Education, the National Education Association, and the Progressive Education Association. Among the other large and important groups with broad rather than specialized interests at the secondary school level were the Regional Accrediting Associations, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the latter two being part of the National Education Association. These groups were bound to have a strong influence on the future development of education, and it was natural, therefore, that the General Education Board should respond to requests from them for aid in projects concerned with the improvement of secondary education.

Any defense of the character of the organizations mentioned is properly left to the responsible representatives of those organizations. With regard to the board's grants to the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association, we make the following comments.

#### *National Education Association*

The National Education Association, which is a large professional organization of American schoolteachers and administrators chartered in 1906, received grants from the General Education Board totaling \$495,743. These grants were used for various projects, the largest one being for support of the Educational Policies Commission (\$355,979). When the commission was organized in 1935, its purposes were presented to the board as follows:

To stimulate thoughtful, realistic, long-term planning within the teaching profession on the highest possible level, looking toward continued adaptation of education to social needs.

To appraise existing conditions in education critically and to stimulate educational thinking on all levels so that desirable changes may be brought about in the purposes, procedures, and organization of education.

To consider and act upon recommendations from all sources for the improvement of education.

To make the best practices and procedures in education known throughout the country and to encourage their use everywhere.

To develop a more effective understanding and cooperation between various organized groups interested in educational improvement.

<sup>8</sup> Hearings, p. 36.

Board funds aided the commission over a period of 9 years. During this time its prestige was such that the following eminent persons were at various times members of the commission :

Dwight D. Eisenhower (then president of Columbia University)  
 James B. Conant (then president of Harvard University)  
 Edmund E. Day (then president of Cornell University)  
 Arthur H. Compton (then chancellor of Washington University)  
 George D. Stoddard (then commissioner of education for the State of New York)  
 Frederick M. Hunter (then chancellor of the University of Oregon)  
 J. B. Edmondson (then dean, School of Education, University of Michigan)  
 J. W. Studebaker (then United States Commissioner of Education)

### *Progressive Education Association*

The Progressive Education Association was an organization established in 1919 to foster a continuous improvement in educational practices. At the time when the board made its first grant to the association, its purposes were set forth as follows in a leaflet published by the association :

The association is the only organization devoted to the work of spreading knowledge of progressive education principles. Its membership, numbering over 7,000, is confined to no single group, profession, or locality. It includes administrators, teachers, and students in public and private schools and the colleges, parents and the laity generally from every State of the United States and in 20 foreign countries. It is constantly growing, widening its influence, making new contacts, assuming new obligations, engaging in new enterprises in the field of education.

The association is not committed, and never can be, to any particular method or system of education. In regard to such matters it is simply a medium through which improvements and developments worked out by various agencies can be presented to the public.<sup>9</sup>

In the 1930's the association was doubtless the most active group of educators concerned with studies looking toward the improvement of education, and it was among the first to direct attention to problems in secondary education. While its members came from both public and private schools and held a wide variety of beliefs as to what constituted educational improvement, on one thing they were agreed—that experimentation and change were necessary if American education was to keep abreast of the needs of modern life.

The Progressive Education Association worked through national commissions engaged in research and investigation of educational problems and through conferences and summer institutes. It was in the work of these several commissions that the General Education Board was interested. There were three of them with large and representative memberships. One conducted an 8-year study of the relation between school and college in which 30 schools participated; another engaged in an extensive study of the secondary school curriculum and in a study of adolescents; a third experimented with the use of new materials, such as films, in helping young people gain a better understanding of personal relationships.

A few small projects related to the studies of these commissions were also aided, and while the commissions were active the board made contributions toward the general support of the association so that it might respond to the interest aroused by studies being conducted by its commissions and coordinate their activities through its central office. A total of \$1,622,506 was made available by the board to the association.

<sup>9</sup> Pamphlet—Progressive Education—What it is, how it is promoted, why it is of interest to you (Progressive Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1934), pp. 3-4.

The major grants made to the Progressive Education Association were:

General support (8½ years)-----	\$119, 407
Commission on Relation of School and College (30 schools and a group of higher institutions participated)-----	605, 799
Commission on the Secondary School Curriculum-----	359, 965
Commission on Human Relations-----	222, 969
Service program-----	260, 298

The board's last grant for the service program of the association (a program involving summer workshops in which 14 of the major universities cooperated) was made in 1939. Meanwhile the commissions had just about finished their work. With the development of war tensions there was a rapid decline in interest in educational experimentation; the association's membership dropped off sharply; and as members entered war service there was a turnover in leadership. A final grant was made to the association in August 1943—\$1,500 to meet the expenses of a meeting of its full board of directors for the purpose of defining future policy and program. It was made clear at that time that no further assistance might be expected from the General Education Board. Sometime during 1944 the Progressive Education Association changed its name to American Education Fellowship. We understand that in 1953, after a study and revision of policy, it once more assumed its old name.

#### SOCIETY FOR CURRICULUM STUDY, BUILDING AMERICA

The charge has been made that the Building America series, which the General Education Board supported with 3 grants to the Society for Curriculum Study totaling \$51,000, made in 1935, 1936, and 1938, was propaganda showing that "The United States is a place of destitution, failure, unsound conditions" and that "sympathetic Russia is sweetness and light."<sup>10</sup>

Building America, which was developed as a new type of teaching material, was a periodical dealing with important phases of social, political, and economic life and designed principally to help secondary schools meet the need for instructional materials dealing with modern life. The magazine emphasized pictures and graphs as a means of presenting facts and suggesting problems.

The Society for Curriculum Study was a national organization of professional workers in public and private schools and in State departments of education, and of university professors who were especially interested in curriculum matters. The business of the society was conducted by an executive committee of reputable and representative educators, including at various times between 1935 and 1950 the following:

Fred C. Ayer, University of Texas  
 H. L. Caswell, Teachers College, Columbia University  
 Doak S. Campbell, George Peabody College  
 Prudence Cutright, Minneapolis Public Schools  
 Edgar Draper, University of Washington  
 Samuel Everett, Northwestern University  
 Helen Heffernan, California State Department of Education  
 O. Robert Koopman, Michigan Department of Public Instruction  
 J. Paul Leonard, Stanford University  
 Paul J. Misner, Superintendent of School, Glencoe, Ill.

<sup>10</sup> Hearings, p. 309.

J. Cecil Parker, Michigan Department of Public Instruction  
Ralph D. Russell, University of Idaho

The editorial board of *Building America* was selected by the society's executive committee and was under the chairmanship of Dr. Paul R. Hanna of Stanford University. The editorial board's statement of policy, on the basis of which the General Education Board's grant was made, indicated that the magazine would strive to present social data and problems in a fair and scientific spirit. The project clearly related to the board's program in general education which was concerned with the improvement of secondary education.

In accordance with the board's basic policies, the aid given to *Building America* was considered temporary and was expected only to give the Society for Curriculum Study an opportunity to explore and evaluate a new type of teaching material. When board support terminated in 1940, the Society for Curriculum Study<sup>11</sup> continued the development and publication of *Building America* in both magazine and book form. The article on Russia, which was severely criticized in the testimony before this committee,<sup>12</sup> was published in 1944, 4 years after board support terminated.

In summary, the board made grants for the benefit of *Building America* on the basis that the funds would be used to support a worthwhile test of new teaching material which would be presented objectively. The board had good reason to believe that the funds would be so used because of the representative and responsible educators who sponsored the project, their assurances as to the nature of the publication, and the preliminary material furnished the board. Although the board does not attempt to supervise the studies supported by its funds, as we point out in our principal statement (p. 11-13), we believe there is no ground for the charge that the *Building America* series was propaganda for communism or socialism.

DEAN RUSK,  
*President, General Education Board.*

Dated August 3, 1954.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
*County of New York, ss:*

Dean Rusk, being duly sworn, says that he is president of the General Education Board, the organization in whose behalf the foregoing supplemental statement is made; that the foregoing supplemental statement is true to his knowledge except as to the matters occurring prior to the date (as set forth in the accompanying principal statement) of his association with said organization, which are therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and that as to those matters he believes it to be true.

DEAN RUSK.

Sworn to before me this 3d day of August 1954.

[SEAL]

HAROLD B. LEONARD,  
*Notary Public.*

Term expires March 30, 1955.

<sup>11</sup> In 1942 the Society for Curriculum Study and the Department of Supervisors of the National Education Association merged to form the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association. In 1946 the name of this group was changed to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association. Upon the merger, *Building America* became a property of the department and then of the National Education Association.

<sup>12</sup> Hearings, pp. 209 et seq.



**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. CARR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, THE  
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES**

We understand that your committee is authorized and directed, among other matters, to conduct "an investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations, and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation, to determine if any of them are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which, if any, are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propoganda, or attempts to influence legislation."

It is also understood that during the public hearings which you have now terminated, your committee heard testimony derogatory to the National Education Association. From such of the testimony as we have been able to collect and examine, we assert that those derogatory statements are inconsistent, unfounded, and erroneous.

Since we may not testify before your committee in public, we are unable to learn whether any of the previous testimony is regarded by your committee as worthy of further examination. If you wish further information on any specific allegations in this previous testimony, which is not adequately provided in this memorandum, representatives of the association, upon suitable notice, will be prepared to supply such information as may be appropriate and relevant.

Therefore, in the brief statement which is hereby submitted for your record, we have not attempted to deal with previous testimony on a point-by-point basis. This testimony, insofar as we have been able to examine it, is so vague and so self-contradictory, that detailed comment seems unnecessary. We have, therefore, included in this statement a body of information about the association which we deem adequate to establish that the National Education Association of the United States has a proud record of loyalty to this country and to its ideals; that the association is controlled by its members; and that it cooperates with the public in the study and solution of educational problems.

We urge that your committee, in any report it may issue, explicitly reject any implication that the resources of the National Education Association are used in an improper manner.

**UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES**

Before presenting this brief statement, it is desirable, however, to make certain preliminary observations.

It seems obvious that in order to determine what associations and foundations, if any, are "using their resources for un-American and subversive activities," it will be necessary for the committee to identify our basic American traditions and ideals. Unless these criteria are well established in the minds of the committee and its staff, as well as in the minds of witnesses who may appear before it, testimony and inquiry would seem to be of little value.

The American tradition is a complex one with a long and splendid history. Your attention is respectfully directed to several components of this tradition which we deem to be important in the task assigned to your committee and in the work of the National Education Association.

1. One component of the American tradition is the freedom to form voluntary organizations for the promotion of all lawful purposes and for the advancement of the principles and ideals to which a group subscribes.

2. A second tradition dear to all Americans is resistance to what Jefferson called tyranny over the minds of men. In positive terms, this means the right to express opinions, even minority opinions on controversial questions, without fear of direct or indirect reprisal, and the right to revise opinions as conditions change and new circumstances come to light.

3. A third tradition basic to the American way of life, and of particular importance to your committee and to the National Education Association, is the value attached to the education of all the people. By this means, the founders of our country believed, popular government may long endure, because its citizens have learned to exercise independent and informed judgment in the direction and control of their own personal affairs and in the affairs of state.

4. There are many other elements in the rich and varied pattern of our country's tradition. At least one more such tradition should be mentioned. To state it negatively first—it is not the American ideal to be hostile to change. On the contrary, this country is great because its citizens have been free to propose and to adopt modifications in the structure of their Government, and of their other institutions. They have believed it is the right and the duty of good citizens to adapt their political and social institutions, within the broad framework of our constitutional freedoms, to meet new circumstances and conditions.

These are some of the American traditions. If loyalty to such traditions is loyalty to the United States, then the whole program of the National Education Association and of the teaching profession in this country has been, and will remain, a basic strength to our country and to her traditions.

The members of the National Education Association are proud that they have given effect to these traditions by combining their efforts to elevate their profession. They are proud of the free and voluntary nature of their association, and of its sense of responsibility to the children and youth of this country. They are proud of its ability to present the views of the teaching profession, on every appropriate occasion, to the lawgivers and statesmen who enact legislation which profoundly affects our schools.

We consider that an association which brings together citizens voluntarily for a lawful purpose, which encourages freedom of thought and expression, which promotes the education of all the people, and which leaves the door open to change and growth, is essentially in accordance with the American tradition. Conversely, of course, we believe that efforts to impede this process, to impair the efficiency of our voluntary organizations, to hamper and circumscribe their work, to cast doubts upon the propriety of free discussion, to narrow and impoverish the education of the people, or to deny the possibility of all modifications in our social arrangements, are profoundly un-American and hostile to the best traditions of our country.

## SOME FACTS ABOUT THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The remainder of this statement about the National Education Association of the United States will include condensed facts on the following:

1. Purpose, history, and records.
2. Membership.
3. Organization and officers.
4. Foundation grants to the agencies of the association.
5. Cooperation with other agencies.
6. International activities.
7. State and local responsibility for public education.
8. Public participation in the formation of public-school policy.

*1. Purpose, history, and records*

The National Education Association is an independent, voluntary, nongovernmental organization. In the briefest possible terms, the association may be said to support the following ideas: That educational opportunity is the right of every American child; that sound education is essential to the safety, happiness, and progress of the United States; that our decentralized school system is a valuable part of the American tradition; that the preservation of freedom in this Nation depends on a citizenry which has been educated to know, to appreciate, to understand, and to defend the American heritage.

The ramifications of this general point of view can be traced in detail in the platform and resolutions of the association, which are filed as exhibit A.

With such premises, the association is strongly opposed to all forms and philosophies of Government which deny freedom or ignore the worth of each individual human being.

The National Education Association was organized August 26, 1857, at Philadelphia, Pa. It was incorporated by the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1906.

The act of incorporation clearly states the purpose of the organization:

To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching, and to promote the cause of education in the United States.

The act of incorporation also provides for the establishment of departments, and for the framework within which the members of the association administer and control its affairs.

The association as a matter of regular procedure makes available full reports of its meetings, reports, and financial transactions. These reports and proceedings are published annually and are widely distributed. Its reports to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as a tax-exempt organization, are also a matter of public record.

*2. Membership.*

On May 31, 1954, the National Education Association had enrolled 561,708 members. This number amounts to approximately half of the total number of persons engaged in teaching in the public elementary and secondary schools.

The members of the National Education Association live and work in nearly every city, town, village, and hamlet in this country.

The bylaws, a copy of which is attached as exhibit B, state in detail the conditions and classes of membership in the association. They also provide that—

No person shall be admitted or continued in membership in the National Education Association, who advocates or who is a member of the Communist Party of the United States or of any organization that advocates changing the form of government of the United States by any means not provided for by the Constitution of the United States.

Most of the members of the National Education Association teach in the public elementary and secondary schools as employees of the Nation's 60,000 local school boards. The membership includes kindergarten teachers, teachers in the elementary and secondary schools, professors in colleges and universities, principals, deans, college presidents, school superintendents, and all other professional workers in education.

Within the association there are many different civic and professional opinions. Individually, the members of the National Education Association belong not only to all communities, all States, and all levels of educational effort, but also to all the major churches, civic bodies, and political parties. However, the National Education Association itself is not affiliated with any of the political, economic, or religious groups within the United States. The independent professional status of their association is greatly cherished and respected by its members.

### *3. Organization and officers*

From June 27 to July 2, 1954, the National Education Association held its 92d annual convention in New York City. The representative assembly included 4,970 delegates. They represented all the State and Territorial affiliates, and most of the 5,000 affiliated local education associations. These delegates selected their own officers, evaluated reports, scrutinized their association's budget for the next year, studied their professional needs and problems, and developed the official policy of the association.

The affiliated units, both State and local, which send their delegates to this policy-forming agency are autonomous. The policies that guide the National Education Association are established by these representatives of responsible teacher-citizens from coast to coast.

The decisions of the representative assembly are binding. They are carried out by the executive committee and the board of directors. Every member of the executive committee must stand for reelection every 2 years. A member of the board of directors is elected for a 3-year term by his colleagues in his own State. The executive secretary and his staff work under the direct supervision of the executive committee and the board of directors. All elections are by secret ballot.

Roughly, two-thirds of all delegates are classroom teachers. Others hold administrative or other nonteaching educational positions. On the average, each delegate represents about 113 members of the organization. The NEA representative assembly is extremely well attended. Proposed resolutions and other policy-forming decisions are vigorously debated and frequently amended. The budget is reviewed, line by line, on the request of even a single delegate.

With the exception of certain former presidents of the association, who were elected prior to July 1, 1937, there are no permanent officers whatever in the National Education Association. The surviving life directors now number only 12.

A full account of the origin, purpose, functions, and programs of each committee, commission, division, department, or other unit of the National Education Association, is published annually in the NEA handbook. The NEA handbook, like the annual proceedings, is published and is available for public reference in all important libraries. A copy is filed with this report as exhibit C.

The charter and bylaws provide for the departments in the National Education Association. There are currently 29 of these departments. Their scope is defined in terms of subjects of instruction or of some other special aspect of educational service. Each department, except in a few routine respects, is autonomous. Most of the departments have their own dues-paying members. Every department has its own constitution and its own separate, elected, policymaking board, responsible to the members of that department.

In short, the National Education Association is a highly decentralized body of educational workers.

In 1950, the association adopted a code of principles on the extent to which association policy may be expressed by subordinate units. Relevant sections of this code are Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 15. They are quoted below:

No. 6. *No NEA unit action, becomes association policy without official action.*—No action or pronouncement of any NEA unit is binding upon the NEA until it has been approved by the representative assembly or, during intervals between meetings of the representative assembly, by the executive committee.

No. 7. *Freedom within general policy.*—Units of the NEA are free, within their respective fields of work, to publish conclusions upon any matter where no general NEA policy has been established.

No. 8. *Adherence to official NEA policies.*—(a) Committees and commissions: When the NEA decides upon an official policy through action or resolution of the representative assembly, through its charter and bylaws, or through its platform, then every committee and commission must adhere to that policy as long as it is the policy of the association.

(b) Departments: Departments of the association, before adopting policies, should consider the question of possible differences with official NEA policy. All NEA units should seek at all times to present a united front.

No. 15. *Authority to speak for the association or its units.*—Only the National Education Association, through its own duly-authorized bodies or agents, can speak for the association on matters of policy. The same principle applies to the departments, commissions, and committees of the NEA; only the unit itself or its own duly-authorized officers or committees can speak for the unit. For this reason, no cooperative council, committee, or other agency in which the association or a unit of the association is a member is authorized to speak for or represent the National Education Association or any of its units unless written authorization covering the specific matter involved has been granted.

#### 4. *Foundation grants to agencies of the association*

Approximately 90 percent of the National Education Association revenues come from the dues of its individual members. Most of the remaining 10 percent comes from such incidental sources as sale of publications, exhibits, and advertising. Grants from foundations have been even less important as a source of revenue for the association. In the rare instances where units of the association have been awarded such grants, the award and its purposes and results have been publicized.

By provision of the charter granted by Congress, the National Education Association must annually report to the United States Commissioner of Education, stating the property held by the corporation, and the disposition of the income thereof during the preceding year. In practice, a very much more complete report than this is filed with the Commissioner of Education, showing in detail the entire financial operation of the association, as well as of its committees, commissions, and departments.

A study has been made, covering the past 11 years, of all gifts, grants, and foundation awards to the association and its subordinate units. The value of such gifts, grants, and awards, in the 11 years, totals slightly over \$2,500,000. Over \$750,000 of this amount was given to the NEA by thousands of its own members in small, individual gifts to the war and peace fund and to the overseas fund. These funds were used to finance the special wartime services of the association and, after the war, to assist teachers in war devastated countries. The overseas fund continues at present to provide material assistance to teachers in the Republic of Korea.

The total grants by the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Foundation, during the 11-year period, have been less than \$400,000. The association has received 13 times as much income from such minor sources as the sale of publications and advertising space in its magazine as it did from these foundations.

#### *5. Cooperation with other agencies*

The association has a standing policy of active cooperation with responsible civic and professional groups. It maintains joint committees, for example, with the American Legion, the American Medical Association, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Magazine Publishers Association. It invests a substantial part of its resources in endeavoring to discover what the American people expect of their schools, and in turn to interpret the needs of the schools to the American people.

For 8 years the National Education Association has cooperated with the United States Department of Justice in the annual Conference on Citizenship. The ninth such conference will be held in Washington on September 15-17, 1954.

In 1950, the NEA helped to organize the All-American Conference to Combat Communism. It has sent representatives to the meetings and participated in other ways. Other groups in this conference include the American Legion, Lions International, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, and many other national organizations.

The above are merely examples of the many kinds of cooperation which the NEA, as a matter of policy, extends to other groups.

#### *6. International activities*

The National Education association has endeavored to support the policies of the United States Government regarding good will to people of other lands, and regarding the success of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The association has cooperated with the United States Government, and with private agencies, in facilitating the exchange of teachers and students with friendly, foreign countries. It has promoted the establishment of a democratic international teachers organization.

Through the generosity of its individual members, the association has sent about one-half million dollars' worth of clothing, school supplies, food, book, and medical supplies, to overseas teachers who were victims of aggression and war devastation.

In its relations with current international issues, the association has been guided by the following policy which is quoted from the NEA platform and resolutions:

As a measure of defense against our most potent threat, our American schools must teach about communism and all forms of totalitarianism, including the practices and principles of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party in the United States. Teaching about communism does not mean advocacy of communism. Such advocacy should not be permitted in American schools.

The association is opposed by longstanding policy to the employment of members of the Communist Party in the schools of the United States.

The international governmental agency most closely allied to the work of the NEA is UNESCO. This organization was established after both Houses of Congress unanimously approved resolutions introduced by Senator Fulbright, the late Senator Taft, and by Senator (then Representative) Karl Mundt, in favor of international cooperation in this area.

#### *7. State and local responsibility for public education*

The control of public education is the responsibility of the States and localities. The policy of the National Education Association is unequivocal on this point. A glance at the NEA platform and resolutions will show this clearly.

As a professional association, the National Education Association does not possess the authority to instruct its members with respect to curriculum or content of teaching, or to issue any kind of directives on such matters. It has never issued such directives.

The policies, suggestions, and recommendations offered by the National Education Association derive their strength from the reasoning and evidence which lies back of them. They may be adopted or rejected by individual members of the profession, or by individual members of the association, or by local or State school systems as seems best to those who do have such responsibility.

#### *8. Public participation in the formation of public school policy*

The National Education Association is committed to the principle that the people of each local community, in each State, and throughout the Nation should participate actively in the formation of public school policy. The association has encouraged the growth of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. It has cooperated actively with the National School Boards Association. It has supplied material to, and welcomed the creation of, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. The association does not advocate that the teaching profession should have exclusive authority with respect to public school policy. It recognizes that public interest in these matters is great, and has a legitimate channel of expression.

The best safeguard for our free, democratic schools, is the kind of wide understanding and broad public participation which the association has consistently advocated.

The association is proud of the record it has maintained. Approval has been extended to its work by the highest military and civil lead-

ers of our country. For example: In 1950 President Truman wrote to the national conference which the NEA sponsors jointly with the Department of Justice:

You are making a magnificent contribution to the general welfare of the Nation. As long as patriotic citizens of every faith and creed, group and interest, gather in harmony and in unity to discuss the problems of the hour, we need have no fear of ideologies inimical to our precious democratic way of life.

And in 1952, President Eisenhower wrote:

The significant contribution of the National Education Association to the Nation's children and youth, and its excellent service to the teaching profession, is well known.

The members and officers of the National Education Association believe that their professional association merits recognition and commendation from these national leaders. They are proud to affirm that the teaching profession is devoted and will remain devoted to the development of freemen.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
*City of Washington, ss:*

William G. Carr, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the executive secretary of the National Education Association of the United States and am familiar with the objects, purposes, and operations of the association.

2. I have prepared the foregoing statement under the direction and in cooperation with the executive committee of the association and declare that it is true and correct with respect to those matters stated upon personal knowledge; and that with respect to matters not stated upon personal knowledge, it is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

WILLIAM G. CARR.

Sworn to before me this 9th day of August 1954.

[SEAL]

MARY E. WIBEL,  
*Notary Public.*

My commission expires November 1, 1955.

#### STAFF REPORT ON AMERICAN LABOR EDUCATION SERVICE, INC.

This memorandum is submitted for the purpose of setting forth some of the activities of American Labor Education Service, Inc., which bear on that part of the scope of this committee's investigation directed to the question of whether certain foundations "are using their resources \* \* \* for political purposes, propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation" (H. Res. 217).

The American Labor Education Service, Inc. (hereinafter simply referred to as "ALES") is a tax-exempt foundation, listed on page 9 of the 1952 Supplement to the Cumulative List of Organizations (contributions to which are deductible) published by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the United States Treasury Department. According to United States Citizens in World Affairs, a directory of non-governmental organizations published by the Foreign Policy Association in 1953, ALES has 10 full-time staff members at headquarters and in the field. The same booklet reports that ALES is a mem-



ber of the International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations and that its objectives in international affairs are "to cooperate with the labor movement in intensifying education in the field of international affairs; to stimulate the interest of leaders in international affairs; and to encourage the study of such issues within the groups and unions."

A perusal of ALES annual reports and conference programs reveals that "intensifying education" is very closely related to, if not identical with, propaganda and political action. Moreover, the background of ALES staff members, together with the list of personnel participating in ALES conferences, suggest an interlocking directorate of individuals and groups who have been associated with militant socialism, and even, in some cases, with Communist fronts.

For instance, as set forth in exhibit 1 annexed hereto, Eleanor C. Anderson (also known as Mrs. Sherwood Anderson) listed in the ALES annual report for 1953 as its treasurer and a member of its board of directors, was cited 10 times in the Dies committee hearings and 20 times in the appendix IX of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; Max Lerner, its former treasurer and member of the board of directors, was cited 20 times by the Dies committee and 31 times in appendix IX; J. Raymond Walsh, a director and vice chairman up until at least 1948, was cited 22 times by the Un-American committee; and 12 times in appendix IX; Edward C. Lindeman, a director until his death in 1953, was cited 8 times by the Dies committee and 19 times in appendix IX.

The American Labor Education Service sponsors an Annual Washington's Birthday Workers' Education Conference. According to page 1 of an ALES invitation to one of these affairs, dated February 25-26, 1950, this general conference for leaders, teachers, and others professionally interested in workers' education "was started at Brookwood Labor College in 1924 under the auspices of Local 189 of the AFT" (American Federation of Teachers). (In 1928, the A. F. of L., with one dissenting vote, issued a ban against Brookwood Labor College as "an incubator of Communists." (See New York Times, Nov. 29, 1928, p. 12.)

Under letter of October 2, 1946, ALES invited its members to attend a conference in Milwaukee, stating, among other things:

*"The topic for this year's discussion is a timely one 'How Can Worker's Education Advance Labor's Economic and Political Objectives'.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*"At the dinner, we shall consider methods labor must use when collective bargaining does not work, especially methods of dealing with the Government."* [Italics ours.]

The agenda for the 1947 ALES Midwest Workers' Education Conference (weekend of November 1-2 at Hotel Moraine, Highland Park, Ill.) notes the following discussion groups on the subject of Defining and Advancing Labor's Objectives in 1947-48: A. *Collective Bargaining Under New Federal and State Legislation*; B. *Labor's Community Relations*; C. *How to Maintain Union Strength in the Face of Inflation and Depression*; D. *Political Action for Labor* [Italics by ALES.]

Workshops on Education, according to the same agenda, included these topics: "F. *Developing Radio Program*; G. *Utilization of the*

*Press; H. Political Action Techniques; J. Improving Farmer-Labor Relations.*" [Italics by ALES.] These are the kind of workshops that would be appropriate for a gathering of politicians; they do not suggest the ordinary seminar.

An ALES letter, dated January 30, 1948, which announces the annual conference for that year, reads in part:

This year special emphasis will be placed on workshops for the discussion of practical problems of current interest to those working in the field. \* \* \*

Six technical workshops are scheduled from 2 to 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, the topics for which will be: how to integrate educational work in the unions, the use of sociodrama in the training of shop stewards, specific curriculum and content needs for labor education activities, practical methods for developing labor's interest as consumers, techniques for more effective farmer-labor cooperation, and advances recently made in the use of audiovisual aids. The first three workshops listed on the enclosed program will be open to all those engaged in any form of workers' education. The second three will be open to those who carry on labor education in unions. \* \* \*

On Sunday morning a panel of experts will discuss methods and materials which will implement labor's foreign policy. \* \* \*

Developing farmer-labor cooperation and "implementing labor's foreign policy" might be characterized as education for labor in order to obtain political objectives, rather than education of labor.

An ALES letter, dated June 4, 1948, asking for financial aid from friends reads in part:

Two trends in American life make workers' education an issue of paramount importance. One is the attempt to eliminate racial discrimination in trade unions and the other is the Taft-Hartley labor bill and what it symbolizes. \* \* \*

Certainly, the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill indicates among other things, the need for an intensive "push" in labor education. The American Labor Education Service is equipped to furnish this "push," equipped in every way save one, namely adequate budget. I am writing, therefore, to ALES friends, who realize the strategic role which organized labor must play in our democratic struggle, asking for continued financial help. \* \* \*

"Pushing" against the Taft-Hartley bill—and soliciting funds for such a "push"—would seem to be activities related to lobbying and, therefore, not tax exempt.

The tentative program of the ALES Midwest Workers' Education Conference, November 13-14, 1948, in Milwaukee, Wis., noted that the keynote session would be "The union's responsibility in forwarding democracy in the world scene today." Workshops dealt with the problem of "How can workers' education stimulate democratic participation \* \* \* through legislative activity, through winning community understanding and more effective participation in community organization, through political activity and farmer-labor cooperation." The dinner meeting on Saturday evening was concerned with the "Development of program of the Economic Cooperation Administration and labor's responsibility for supporting it."

An ALES conference at the New School for Social Research, held February 25-26, 1950, discussed The Contribution of Labor in Rebuilding Democratic Society and the Role of Workers' Education in Political Action. (See p. 2 of ALES Agenda that date.) It was noted that a "panel discussion will cover the urgency of participation in political action by labor, and the reevaluation of education in relation to political action."

It seems clear that a significant portion of the ALES program is devoted to planning and promoting political action. It appears to be especially active in recruiting mass labor support for a private

brand of interventionist foreign policy, the U. N. and its various agencies, foreign aid, and the concept of worldwide social and economic security. Some of the money for "discussion programs in international affairs for labor-union representatives" has been granted to ALES by a subsidiary of the Ford Foundation, the Fund for Adult Education. On page 34 of the fund's report of its grants from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, it is noted that ALES had been granted a total of \$190,000 of which \$95,000 was still unpaid.

It is admittedly difficult to draw the line between discussion programs which are truly "educational" and those which are designed to proselytize for a particular viewpoint. But it would be safe to say that no one can accuse the ALES of leaning over backward to present both sides of the "great debate" on foreign policy.

Here is an extract from the 1953 Annual Report of the ALES (p. 9) which described an ALES-CIO World Affairs Institute, a 2-week affair at Haven Hill Lodge, north of Detroit, Mich.:

The study program will be developed around these topics: World Population and Food; the U. N. and Its Specialized Agencies; the Economics of Foreign Trade; Comparative Labor Movements; the Role of the CIO in World Affairs; How Foreign Policy Is Made. Throughout the course there will be consideration of how attitudes are formed and of educational methods for local work. Among those who will serve as faculty and discussion leaders will be: Isidor Lubin, former United States Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the U. N.; Victor Reuther, assistant to Walter Reuther, president of the CIO; James Calderwood, associate professor of economics at Ohio State University (now on leave); Stanley H. Ruttenberg, CIO director of education and research; and Paul Nitze, former Chief of the Policy Planning Board in the State Department. These will be supplemented by staff and officials from the United States Labor Department, the ILO, and UNESCO; delegates from foreign countries, including Sweden, Germany, Haiti, Tunisia, the Philippines, and New Zealand; trade union leaders with experience in Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East.

ALES also runs a Philadelphia center for leadership training in world affairs. On page 6 of the 1953 annual report it is noted:

A variety of techniques are used: discussion groups, classes, institutes, conferences, film discussion, planning sessions, board and committee meetings, membership meetings. It is true here, as in all parts of the ALES international project, that the study of world affairs has covered many topics including, for example, foreign trade, economic aid, labor movements abroad, and world economic conditions.

During the period of the Philadelphia project, the study groups on the U. N. and the U. N. trips have increased in number and have proved effective in broadening international outlook and sense of responsibility. Preparations for the trips include always a review of the general purposes of the U. N., the issues under discussion, the foreign policy of this country and its position on current U. N. issues, and a briefing or film about the nation whose delegates the group is to meet. The work of special agencies always is emphasized, particularly the Social and Economic Council, the Trusteeship Council, and UNICEF. There always is keen interest in underdeveloped countries.

ALES sponsors a number of short, regional conferences throughout the year. In 1952 it organized a Second Annual North Dakota Conference of Farmers and Workers. Delegates from unions, farm organizations, and cooperatives discussed goals and methods of economic action by organized farmers and organized workers (p. 7, 1953 annual report).

According to the same annual report (p. 7) :

Discussion moved from everyday problems of farmers and workers—the effects of price supports, the need for organization, opportunities for joint farmer-labor action—to such questions as the needs of underdeveloped countries, the importance of foreign trade, and the relationships between foreign aid and military purposes.

Other excerpts from the 1953 annual report which indicate the nature and scope of the ALES activity include these :

Since the curriculum and study programs relate to the many-sided interests of adult workers with special reference to their economic and social outlook, ALES also has cooperative relationships with many types of educational, governmental, and community agencies (p. 14).

In its work with organizations outside the labor movement, ALES serves as a bridge between labor education organizations and many community and educational bodies (p. 14).

It goes without saying that the ALES international project has worked in many ways with community and governmental organizations chiefly concerned with world affairs and foreign policy (p. 14).

Cooperative relationships of great educational value to the ALES program have been developed with members of the Secretariat and the delegations at the United Nations (p. 14).

On the local level, ALES works constantly with such organizations as the American Association for the United Nations \* \* \* (p. 14).

\* \* \* the entire ALES program may be described as leadership training, since it is planned for those who carry responsibilities within the labor movement—union officers, committee chairmen, shop stewards, delegates, and others (p. 14).

As a national agency giving service to a great variety of groups concerned with labor education in this country, it has become the *accepted function of ALES* to carry extensive responsibilities for interpreting labor education to friends, critics, and the uninformed (p. 13). [Italics ours.]

Cooperation also is extended to student bodies and to social and community agencies. Board and staff members of ALES serve on the committees of these organizations \* \* \* (p. 13).

In recent years, ALES has given special attention to areas of work where the labor movement believes that, *through education, responsible action might be strengthened* (p. 1). [Italics ours.]

Our work with foreign trade unionists has included helping to plan programs ; to make contacts ; and to utilize the skills of unionists from 33 \* \* \* widely scattered countries \* \* \*. Among the visitors have been experienced labor educators, teachers, in labor schools, officers of trade unions, and government department and adult education personnel concerned in labor education (p. 1).

In carrying out its exchange activities, ALES cooperates with various organizations, among them the Institute of International Education, UNESCO, the National Social Welfare Assembly \* \* \* (p. 1).

ALES \* \* \* itself sponsors foreign trade union visitors \* \* \* ALES extends opportunities to American workers to study abroad \* \* \* (p. 2).

The ALES director and certain members of the board now serve as members of the National Selection Committee on Workers' and Adult Education ; of the American Selection Committee for Ruskin College Scholarships (both of the Institute of International Education) ; and of the Advisory Selection Committee for Workers' Education of the Conference Board of the Associated Research Council's Committee on International Exchange of Persons (p. 2).

With every passing year it becomes more urgent for white-collar workers to face their economic realities and to establish their rightful place in the labor movement \* \* \*. This is the challenge that White Collar Workshops sets out to meet through its unique resident labor school planned to serve these workers \* \* \* (p. 11).

White Collar Workshops this year planned a shorter school—1 week—where intensive work could be carried on, focused on a common concern. The emphasis throughout the week was on how white-collar workers themselves, as citizens and trade unionists, can make themselves felt in the local and national scene (p. 12).

The study program included an analysis of the factors affecting the business cycle, with special reference to the current situation ; the economics of collective bargaining ; *the legislative and political scene in Washington ; with special em-*

*phasis on legislative and community action carried on by organized labor; and discussions of the significance and the social attitudes of white-collar workers. There was also a series of workshops, highlighted by a stimulating panel on organizing and strengthening white-collar unions in which union staff members, experienced in handling the problems of white-collar workers, participated (p. 12). [Italics ours.]*

By its own admission, therefore, ALES is in the center of a network of educational groups, many of whose activities border on propaganda and political action. ALES is in a position to make its impact felt on a wide front by virtue of its staffing of interlocking directorates. It feels that a legitimate function is to convince white-collar workers that they should join in economic and political action with unionists. It outlines the legislative terrain in Washington and trains troops for the battle.

It would appear that ALES relates education to action favored by the labor movement. It interprets the meaning of education to the general public. It staffs the committees of student groups and social agencies. It provides the funds for a two-way transmission belt that carries American trade unionists to Socialist Europe and brings Socialist leaders here. It serves as a bridge between many governmental agencies and community groups interested in world affairs. It trains the leadership of the labor movement, and that leadership, of course, has a great responsibility for planning and implementing political action.

In 1938, ALES published for sale a 45-page pamphlet entitled "Annotated List of Pamphlet Material for Workers Classes." While this pamphlet is now 16 years old, it should be noted that it contains a foreword by Eleanor G. Coit, the then and now director of ALES. In addition, the sections on The Labor Movement, Labor Economics, English and On Methods and Materials were prepared by Orlie Pell, who is still listed on the ALES staff as the publications and research associate. In reading ALES' own description of the contents of some of the books which it recommends for use in workers' classes and in also considering the organizations which sponsored the publication of such books, one seriously questions how education is served and rather asks oneself why tax exempt moneys should be used to further class hatred, social unrest, and economic warfare. One of the books recommended is entitled "Toward a Farmer-Labor Party" written by Harry W. Laidler, and published by the League for Industrial Democracy, of which he is the executive director. As stated by ALES, this book contains:

A brief analysis of the problems confronting an Independent Farmer-Labor Party in America, and an account of past and present developments in that direction. Labor party movements in Minnesota, Wisconsin, New York, Illinois, Detroit, Pennsylvania, California, and Oregon included.

On the question of regulating labor unions, the recommended book is *Should Labor Unions be Regulated?* by Hubert Herring and Harold O. Hatcher, published by the Council for Social Action. Arguments for and against compulsory incorporation of trade unions are contained in this volume "with conclusion in favor of the negative" as described by ALES.

Another book entitled "Shall Strikes Be Outlawed?" by Joel Seidman, and published by the League for Industrial Democracy, deals with "discussion of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes, its dan-

gers to workers in countries where labor is politically weak, and experiments in compulsory arbitration here and abroad."

Another book published by the League for Industrial Democracy and written by Carl Raushenbush is entitled "Fordism", and is recommended by ALES as being "useful for workers' classes in showing concretely some of the methods used to combat organization among workers, and some of the influences a large company can have on the surrounding community."

The ALES pamphlet also contains a bibliography of labor plays, some of which deserve special mention. For instance, two plays sponsored by the Highlander Folk School (referred to in appendix IX as a revolutionary theater organization) are Gumbo where racial and antiunion discrimination is depicted and Labor Spy which "shows methods used by antiunion detective agency to 'hook' an innocent worker into being a labor spy."

Many plays are recommended which were sponsored by the Brookwood Labor College, on which comment has already been made. For instance, there is the play Step which is described as a "mass recitation on psychology of unemployed", and Uncle Sam Wants You, the message of which is "a reminder of what recruiting posters really ask for. Excellent for trained speech chorus."

Under the sponsorship of Southern Summer School, we find other labor plays depicting "standing in line before a closed bank" in Bank Run, and "plight of unemployed and hungry southern millworkers in Job-Huntin'", and "Southern mill strikers around a fire on a picket line at night. Effective use of real strike songs," in On The Picket Line.

Then there are found additional plays about labor and organization as Black Pit by Albert Maltz (cited by House of Representatives on October 24, 1947, for contempt of Congress) which ALES describes as follows:

A miner, framed because of union activity, after coming out of jail, attempts to find work but is blacklisted everywhere because of union record. Is driven to accept position as stool pigeon. Requires convincing use of Slavic dialect and intelligent direction.

A play which has been particularly marked "recommended" by ALES is Rehearsal by Albert Maltz, which revolves around the following situation:

During a rehearsal of a stirring mass chant on the Detroit auto strike, one actress finally succeeds in playing the part with almost too much realism. Excellent drama; one rich emotional part.

Also winning the highly recommended award is Waiting for Lefty by Clifford Odets, described as: "One of the best plays for labor and leftwing groups. Realistic treatment of strikes, rackets, and stool pigeons. Requires intelligent directing."

Also recommended is The Maker of Swords by Sterling Olmsted, described as follows:

Fantasy laid in imaginary country. A maker of swords has become fabulously rich through selling his product and then stirring up international hatred to the point of war. Caught and convicted of his crimes, he is condemned to die but cleverly plants the seeds of mistrust in the hearts of his keepers, two brother princes, who in their turn declare war against each other, and each secretly orders more swords from the swordmaker. Play ends on ironic note, with no solution offered.

Classified under the category "fantasy and satire" is a play, *Blocks*, by Mollie Day Thatcher, and sponsored by Vassar Experimental Theater, which is:

A powerful satire in which Green Worker and Tan Worker symbolize all the masses forced unwillingly to war, while the Green Man and the Tan Man symbolize all the leaders, generals, and capitalists making war without engaging in it.

Finally, ALES refers to two plays from Soviet Russia, one being *Bread* by Vladimir Kirshom, and described as "the best known and most significant Soviet play of the gigantic effort to change the life and economic organization of the Russian peasantry."

In 1942, ALES published and distributed a pamphlet entitled "Songs Useful for Workers' Groups," which is hoped "would be helpful to groups of workers who want to sing together."

Among the song collections listed in said pamphlet was the following:

Rebel Song Book, compiled and edited by Samuel H. Friedman; music editor, Dorothy Bachman. Rand School Press, 7 East 15th St., New York. Paper. 92 pages. 50 cents.

"87 Socialist and Labor Songs," including a number of revolutionary songs translated from the Russian German, Finnish, Italian, and so on. Also, union and organizing songs, IWW and strike songs. In most cases the text is set to old familiar melodies, but there is also some stirring original music by Hanns Eisler, Herman Epstein, Liebich, and others. The songs are well adapted for mass singing in unison, with moderately easy accompaniments.

Certainly the question arises whether a tax-exempt fund should be used to further the sale and use of a rebel song book which contains among other things organizing songs, IWW and strike songs, many of which are set to the "stirring original music by Hanns Eisler."

ALES distributes a reprint of a symposium on *Some Trends in Adult Education*, originally published in the November 1952 issue of *Adult Education*, an organ of the Adult Education Association of the United States of America. Eleanor G. Coit, director, and Orlie A. H. Pell, education and research associate of ALES, took part in the symposium.

It was pointed out by the two ALES participants that labor education is no longer a frill but "well on the way to being considered an integral part of the process of building a strong, effective labor movement." The reasons why labor education is changing from a utilitarian approach, with emphasis on techniques, to the kind of education appropriate for successful political action were clearly pointed out:

As our lives in the 20th century become more complex and interdependent, unions are finding themselves concerned with a wider range of problems. Less and less is collective bargaining with the employer a fully adequate answer to their needs; price levels that affect their standard of living, the housing conditions under which they live, the effects of the cold war, *the atmosphere of loyalty oaths and suspicion—these problems can be met only with action on the community, national and international scenes* (p. 2). (Italics ours.)

Consequently labor education has increased the scope of its responsibility. The study program for example, of the 1952 union summer institutes held in all parts of the country, includes among their areas of work such fields as international affairs (including point 4), wage stabilization, community services, human relations, political action, public relations, and civic rights \* \* \* (p. 2).

One of the outstanding developments of recent years has been the increased involvement in international affairs on the part of labor leaders (p. 2).

ALES staff members would seem to be preoccupied with the absolute necessity of promoting worldwide labor action.

As we look to the future, we see, perhaps, an intensification of the trend already apparent. A sober, responsible labor movement, aware of its increasing responsibilities in a world at crisis, turning to its educational arm for help in meeting its responsibilities; seeking to understand the problems faced on the community, the national, and above all, the international levels. Here may lie the direction of growth during the coming years \* \* \* so that the labor movement may take the lead in the development of insight and action that will be worldwide in scope (p. 3).

Irvine L. H. Kerrison, chairman, labor program, Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, took part in the same symposium. Here is his concept of "successful" labor education at the university level, as set forth in the reprint circulated by ALES:

Institutions of higher learning now achieving the greatest success in workers' education \* \* \* believe that effective workers' education helps the worker become a better individual, a contributing member of his union group, and a participating citizen in his community. They base all their work with unions on three operating principles:

- (1) Every activity planned jointly by the union and the university.
- (2) Every activity designed to deal with individual problems of union groups requesting service.
- (3) Close cooperation with the labor movement maintained through union advisory committee members and regular consultation with National, regional, and State union education directors \* \* \*

University officials, in these troubled times, are fond of extolling academic freedom and the right of scholars to teach the facts without fear or favor, pressure or censorship. Yet, in the field of labor education, it would seem that union leaders exercise the right of veto and the privilege of constant consultation. Mr. Kerrison, the author of this concept of controlled education, then asserts that:

\* \* \* organized labor is one of the few bulwarks, and perhaps strongest of the few, against a violent dropping of the Iron Curtain on modern civilization (pp. 4-5).

Larry Rogin, vice-chairman and a director of ALES, and a director of the education department, Textile Workers Union of America, also participated at the symposium and emphasized the point that the purpose of labor "education" is to make a good union man:

To the extent that the educational needs and desires of workers are more widely met, the workers will become more effective trade unionists and better citizens of their country and of the world (p. 6).

Mr. Rogin raises another question which may be central to labor education:

Finally, in these days of Taft-Hartley and McCarthy and Zell, will the educator stand up for the right to deal with controversial subjects honestly and without fear? From how many subjects will he beg off, saying, "This is a job for the union?" (p. 6).

Another project of the ALES is the holding of conferences which promote Farmer-Labor Understanding—And Action (the title of a reprint from the Journal of Educational Sociology, February, 1952, which is currently circulated by ALES). The author noted that some of the following were points agreed upon by a joint committee at the 1951 Northwest Farmers' and Workers' Education Conference:

The official publications of people's organizations such as labor unions, cooperatives, and farmer organizations are important instruments for translating the common agreements of educational conferences into better rank-and-file under-



standing \* \* \* In recent years nearly all labor papers have protected the working farm families from legislative attack (by powerful exploiting interests) on their price-support program by showing urban consumers that working farmers get a very small percentage of the dollar paid by the consumer for food and clothing (p. 5).

Cooperative publications and Farmers Union papers have carried the story to farmers about the very small percentage of the price of farm machinery and supplies which goes to the worker in the form of wages. These same publications have informed farmers of the basic threat, not only to organized labor but to organized farmers, in such legislation as the Taft-Hartley Act (p. 5).

As an example of substantial "interlock" it might be pointer out that the vice chairman of the American Labor Education Service, Mark Starr, has also been a chairman of the board of the League for Industrial Democracy. Further, he is the director of education for the ILGWU and a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. He has been appointed to responsible policy positions in the field of education: as labor consultant to the Office of War Administration; as a member of the American delegation to establish UNESCO; as a labor education consultant to American military government in Japan; as a member of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education during the period 1945-47.

Mr. Starr is also listed as chairman of the board of the Public Affairs Committee which publishes a great many pamphlets on significant topics of the day. In view of his prominence in the field of education and his position as a key link in the interlocking directorate of certain groups whose activities border on propaganda and political action, it is perhaps desirable to examine his philosophy of education in some detail. Following are excerpts from *Labor Looks at Education* by Mark Starr, published by the League for Industrial Democracy in 1947:

Later they (the poor) read Marx and Veblen, to name only two of the most effective intellectual commandos who utilized their own college training as bombs to blast away the intellectual girders supporting the modern economic system. Inevitably such individuals are rejected as heretics because the ideas which they espouse do not support things as they are (p. 4).

This passage is characteristic of Mark Starr and his associates in ALES who regard education as a weapon which should be used to destroy the foundations of the present social order. Certainly he had in mind the use of education as a weapon in what Socialists love to refer to as the class struggle when he wrote:

The labor movement cannot rest content until there are 30 million people organized in the trade unions of the United States. This means that workers' education should keep in mind the conversion of the community to labor's point of view.

(See Mark Starr's article entitled "Worker's Education, 1900-1940," published in May-June 1940 issue of the *Workmen's Circle Call*).

Note in the following passage Mr. Starr's contempt for the dispassionate search after truth. To him, education is propaganda—there is no distinction.

Some educators endeavor to satisfy their consciences by suggesting that education with an aim is propaganda and that true education deals only in immutable, unalterable, fundamental truths, as if abstract ideals could be isolated from their daily changing content. After all, there is only a relative distinction between education and propaganda. Your education is always propaganda to the other fellow (p. 5).

A new philosophy of education is striving to be born—a planned community to replace the jerry-built dwellings produced by the haphazard efforts of the past (p. 10).

The "planned community" of thought is the lever which can help build the cooperative commonwealth whose highest ideal is "group-think." The "haphazard, jerry-built dwellings of the past" housed Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Milton, Dante, Chaucer, Tolstoy, Newton, Darwin, Emerson, Edison, Locke, Hume, Kent, Luther, and a handful of others whose contributions to civilization should not be overlooked in the new passion for the intellectual collective.

Mr. Starr, whose own projects have been heavily subsidized by the Ford Foundation's fund for adult education, has a few words to say about foundations and their work. He leaves no doubt that the business of education is to change society.

One factor in influencing the relation of colleges and universities to labor and to the type of education which would facilitate necessary social changes by consent, is the role of the foundations. Educational activity in the United States cannot be fully studied without evaluating the effects of the foundations thereon (p. 11).

But colleges too often have to go cap in hand and exploit personal contacts with the uncrowned kings and agents of philanthropy \* \* \*. There are, of course, some foundations which delouse effectively the millions accumulated by monopolies and dynastic fortunes; but if one could choose a way for the long-time support of education, it would be done by community intelligence rather than the caprice of the big shots of big business who wish to perpetuate their names in a spectacular fashion, a process which may not in all cases coincide with the real educational activity of the college (p. 12).

Mr. Starr constantly reverts to the premise of "progressive" education—that the school should build a new social order.

Our frame of reference needs revision. Can the school help us to meet the changed world? Perverted and misused in the past, education can be a cure for many social ills and labor can help to make it so. Labor's consistent support of education in the past and its role as the largest organized unit of parents gives it the right to speak in constructive criticism (p. 14).

Mr. Starr defines "workers' education" in a way which suggests that it is almost equivalent to "political action."

At its best, workers' education serves simultaneously as a discipline, a directive, and a dynamic force to labor organizations. It emphasizes the study of group problems to the end of group action for their solution (p. 22).

The CIO department of education and research undertakes extensive activity in public relations among religious, educational, and civic groups in addition to education for its own membership. Its activity heads up politically into the political action committee \* \* \* over 500 labor papers, and other publications ranging from first readers, colored comics, striking posters, and lively leaflets to ponderous tomes of union history and research use the printed word as an agency for education and propaganda (p. 23).

Mr. Starr urges that the public schools be used to sell the concept of the closed shop:

Permit me to make some specific suggestions on what schools and textbooks should say about trade unionism:

(1) They should give an explanation of the "closed shop" and the "union shop" to show that they are no more tyrannical or unfair than our system of public taxation under which the individual cannot escape his contribution to the public revenues from which he benefits \* \* \* (p. 37).

(2) The school and the textbook should be at pains to describe the actual functions of trade unions in improving the wages, hours, working conditions \* \* \*

Teachers in high schools and elsewhere should be able to see behind the headlines of newspapers which report strikes on page 1 and their settlement on page 20, if at all. They should be able to understand the "lusty immaturity" of unions originating in the New Deal decade, which had to fight bitterly to keep alive in previous years \* \* \* (p. 38).

(3) Textbooks—should also let the facts of experience speak concerning the results of technological unemployment—and also the effects of the centralization of power in the hands of the banks and the big corporations, with the resulting dangers of monopoly prices as well as unemployment.

(4) The textbooks and the school should also examine carefully the role played by the middleman and the speculator, who often escape the censure which falls on high wages as an alleged cause of high prices (p. 39).

Finally, it would appear that political science and civics classes are to indoctrinate students with the notion that labor unions and their leaders have a monopoly on patriotism, while Congress, business, and everybody else are selfish.

Teachers should currently help their students to see the real factors behind the industrial unrest and strikes of 1946, namely, the strain of overwork and the accumulated grievances unexpressed, for patriotic reasons, in wartime; the disappointment of the unions because Congress failed to act in \* \* \* securing full employment; and the indignation against \* \* \* huge wartime profits (pp. 41-42).

Another important member of the ALES board of directors was Hilda W. Smith, who, like Starr, has played an important role in labor movements. She has been referred to on pages 565 and 703 of the Dies committee report as an endorser of Brookwood Labor College, which was finally disavowed by the A. F. of L. because of its communistic activities. Hilda Smith also served as a member of the advisory committee of Commonwealth College of Mena, Ark. (cited in Attorney General's list) which was finally closed by the State legislature because of its questionable practices. She is also listed in volume 10, page 6404, of the House committee report on Un-American activities, and a member of American League for Peace and Democracy, which was branded as a Communist-front organization by the Government.

We respectfully submit that the activities of ALES, spearheaded as they have been by such dynamic persons as Mark Starr and Hilda W. Smith, raise a serious question whether they have not gone far beyond the ordinary field of education, and is actually engaged in political propaganda.

Submitted herewith, with the request that they be deemed part of the record, are the following documents issued or published by ALES:

1. Invitation for conference on February 25-26, 1950.
2. Letter to members, October 2, 1946.
3. Invitation for conference on November 1-2, 1947.
4. Letter to members, January 30, 1948.
5. Letter to members, June 4, 1948.
6. Tentative program for conference on November 13-14, 1948.
7. Annual report, 1953.
8. Annotated list of pamphlet material for workers' classes.
9. Pamphlet entitled "Songs Useful for Workers' Groups."

## EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS

## ELEANOR COPENHAVER ANDERSON OR MRS. SHERWOOD ANDERSON

## DIES COMMITTEE

(Listed as Eleanor Copenhaver)

	Page
Brookwood College (endorser).....	565, 703
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (executive committee).....	568

(Listed as Mrs. Sherwood Anderson)

National Citizens' Political Action Committee (member).....	10298
Shown as having belonged to one organization which the Attorney General has characterized as subversive or Communist.....	10301
American League Against War and Fascism.....	10304
Shown as having been connected with a Communist front for farmers, consumers, unemployed, and social and economic legislation.....	10341
Shown as having been connected with two Communist fronts on war, peace, and foreign relations.....	10345
Shown as having been connected with a Communist front for youth and education.....	10346
Shown as having been connected with a Communist front in the miscellaneous field.....	10347
Shown with a total of five front organizations (listed above).....	10348

## TESTIMONY OF WALTER S. STEELE REGARDING COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES—HEARINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, JULY 21, 1947

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship—call to a conference on women of the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. in the postwar world, held on November 18, 1944 (sponsor).....	83
(Listed as Eleanor Copenhaver)	

## APPENDIX IX

American Friends of Spanish Democracy (executive committee).....	380
American League Against War and Fascism (national executive committee).....	416
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.....	1176
National Committee for People's Rights.....	1179
National Religion and Labor Foundation.....	1304
Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio (committee member).....	1375
Student Congress Against War (national committee).....	1620
(Listed as Elinore Copenhaver)	
Committee To Aid the Striking Fleischer Artists.....	1774
(Listed as Mrs. Sherwood Anderson)	
National Citizens' Political Action Committee.....	263
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (sponsor).....	323, 334
International Women's Congress Against War and Fascism.....	848
The League of Women's Shoppers, Inc. (sponsor).....	1009
National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax (sponsor).....	1168
People's Institute of Applied Religion.....	1463
(Listed as Eleanor C. Anderson)	
People's Institute of Applied Religion.....	1470
(Listed as Eleanor Copenhaver Anderson)	
Conference on Constitutional Liberties (sponsor).....	653
Consumers National Federation (sponsor).....	659
Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo (representative individual).....	670
Council for Pan American Democracy (sponsor).....	675
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (sponsor).....	1228

## EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS—Continued

## MAX LERNER

## DIES COMMITTEE

	Page
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (committee)-----	568
National Citizens' Political Action Committee, Max Lerner, author, editor, PM, New York-----	10299
Shown as having been connected with six organizations which the Attorney General has characterized as subversive and Communist-----	10301
American League for Peace and Democracy-----	10304
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, Communist Party, statements defending-----	10305
League of American Writers, Michigan Civil Rights Federation, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties-----	10306

## NEW MASSES

"* * * Max Lerner, one of the editors of the newspaper, PM, and also a radio broadcaster for Sante Cream Cheese, has a total of 26 affiliations, covering every category listed here"-----	10332
Shown as connected with two Communist fronts dealing with racial, refugee, and alien questions-----	10340
Shown as connected with four Communist fronts for defense, support, or honoring of avowed Communists-----	10341
Shown as connected with two Communist fronts for farmers, consumers, unemployed, and social and economic legislation-----	10342
Shown as connected with three Communist fronts for legal defense and civil rights. Also shown as connected with two Communist fronts for pro- fessional groups-----	10343
Shown as connected with three Communist fronts on the Spanish Civil War-----	10344
Shown as connected with three Communist fronts for support or praise of the Soviet Union. Also shown as connected with two Communist fronts on war, peace, and foreign relations-----	10345
Shown as connected with two Communist fronts for youth and education-----	10346
Shown as connected with one Communist magazine, book or other litera- ture. Also shown as connected with two miscellaneous Communist fronts-----	10347

## APPENDIX IX

National Citizens' Political Action Committee-----	265
Allied Voters Against Coudert (sponsor)-----	316
American Committee for Anti-Nazi German Seaman-----	319
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, signatory to petition to discontinue the Dies committee "Max Lerner, professor, Williams College"-----	322
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born:	
Guest of honor-----	347
Sponsor-----	350
American Friends of the Soviet Union-----	379
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (sponsor)-----	380-382
American Investors Union, Inc. (sponsor), "Max Lerner, professor of political science, Williams College"-----	388
American League for Peace and Democracy (signatory)-----	392, 411
Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union (signatory), project of the American Friends of the Soviet Union-----	461, 467, 771
Russian War Relief, Inc.-----	476
American Youth Congress (endorser), "Max Lerner, editor, the Nation"-----	548
Appeal for Pardon of German Communist (Robert Stamm) (signatory)-----	571
Ben Leider Memorial Fund (committee member)-----	585
Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, "Dr. Max Lerner, Williams College"-----	599
Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder, "Prof. Max Lerner, Williams College"-----	619, 621

## EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS—Continued

	Page
Communist Party, statement defending "Max Lerner, Massachusetts" . . .	649
Consumers National Federation (sponsor) . . . . .	659
Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo (representative individual) .	668
Conference for Pan American Democracy (sponsor) . . . . .	673
Frontier Films (advisory board) . . . . .	732
Michigan Civil Rights Federation (speaker) . . . . .	1058-1059
Supporters of Anti-Nazi Seamen (sponsor) . . . . .	1152
National Emergency Conference (signatory) . . . . .	1206
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (board of sponsors) . . . . .	1210
Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio (committee member) . . . . .	1375
Open Letter to American Liberals (signatory) "Max Lerner, editor, The Nation" . . . . .	1379
Open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union (signatory) "Prof. Max Lerner, Professor of Government, Williams College" . . . . .	1384
Prestes defense (signatory) "Max Lerner, editor, The Nation" . . . . .	1474
Soviet Russia Today, a party-line publication (contributor) . . . . .	1603

## J. RAYMOND WALSH

Twentieth Century Fund, Committee on Cartels and Monopoly

## DIES COMMITTEE

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT E. STRIPLING, CHIEF INVESTIGATOR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

- "\* \* \* Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the largest contributors, according to the tabulation filed with the Clerk of the House, are officials of the Political Action Committee themselves. For instance, J. Raymond Walsh, who is research director of the organization, contributed \$4,750. . . . . 10231
- "Mr. MATTHEWS. \* \* \* here is the name of James H. McGill, who contributed \$2,000. Mr. McGill, according to Sidney Hillman's list presented to the campaign expenditures committee, is a manufacturer in Valparaiso, Ind. In the early postwar days of World War I, two men who are now members of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, one of whom is McGill, signed a contract with the Russian Red Cross, stating in the contract that it was done because of prejudice against the Communist regime in Russia . . . . . 10232
- "Mr. McGill was one of the signers of this particular contract. His organization, the American subsidiary, began to raise funds for the relief of the destitute in Russia, but according to the record, at the time, the organization immediately degenerated into a political propaganda machine, and Mr. McGill and one other who will be named tomorrow, who signed that contract, were associated with an organization which put out the statement: 'We will milk the American bourgeoisie in order to destroy it.' That is in the record of some 25 years ago.
- "Mr. THOMAS. How much did he contribute?
- "Mr. MATTHEWS. \$2,000.
- "Mr. THOMAS. Anyone else.
- "Mr. Matthews. J. Raymond Walsh has quite a Communist record. He contributed \$4,750."
- "Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman would it be agreeable to make this list of contributors a part of the record? . . . . . 10233
- "Mr. COSTELLO. Yes; I think that should be in the record.
- "Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee Individual contributions account—Loans, July 23-Sept. 9, 1944.
- "J. Raymond Walsh, New York, N. Y., \$4,750.

## EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS—Continued

STATEMENT OF J. B. MATTHEWS, RESEARCH DIRECTOR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

	Page
National Citizens' Political Action Committee.....	10300
"Mr. MATTHEWS * * * I offer a list of the 25 organizations (which the Attorney General has characterized as subversive and Communist), followed by a list of the 82 individuals, who have been affiliated with them * * * J. Raymond Walsh, 2.....	10302
League of American Writers, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.....	10306
J. Raymond Walsh is listed as having been connected with one Communist front dealing with racial, refugee, and alien questions.....	10340
J. Raymond Walsh is listed as having been connected with three Communist fronts for legal defense and civil rights.....	10343
J. Raymond Walsh is listed as having been connected with one Communist front for professional groups.....	
J. Raymond Walsh is listed as having been connected with one Communist front for support or praise of the Soviet Union.....	10345
J. Raymond Walsh is listed as having been connected with one Communist front on war, peace, and foreign relations.....	
J. Raymond Walsh is listed as having been connected with one Communist front for youth and education.....	10346
J. Raymond Walsh is shown with a total of eight citations.....	10349

## APPENDIX IX

National Citizens' Political Action Committee.....	266
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (sponsor).....	340, 354
American Council on Soviet Relations (signatory of open letter to the United States urging a declaration of war on the Finnish Government in the interests of speedy victory by the United Nations over Nazi Germany and its Fascist allies).....	370
American Student Union.....	514
Council for Pan-American Democracy (executive committee).....	672, 674
Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance (chairman of open forum meeting).....	915, 921
League of American Writers.....	967, 978
Statement in defense of the Bill of Rights (signatory).....	1126
National Emergency Conference (signatory).....	1205, 1207
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (executive committee).....	1209, 1210
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.....	1222
Open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union (signatory).....	1381, 1384

## APPENDIX V

Open letter calling for greater unity of antifascist forces and strengthening of the front against aggression through closer cooperation with the Soviet Union (signatory).....	1681
---	------

## TESTIMONY OF WALTER S. STEELE, JULY 21, 1947

"A World Armenian Congress was held in New York City in May 1947. In attendance were delegates representing 3½ million Armenians in 26 countries. The Congress condemned the Truman doctrines in foreign affairs. Speakers included S. Edwin Smith of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, John Roy Carlson, and J. Raymond Walsh of Friends of Democracy".....	135
"Frank Kingdon and Jo Davidson were selected cochairmen of Progressive Citizens of America, each having previously served as cochairman of two of the major merging groups. Both have extensive front backgrounds. Herman Shumlin, who has a record-breaking background of front activities, was elected secretary. Michael M. Nisselson, with some 12 Red-front affiliations, was chosen treasurer. Executive vice chairmen are C. B. Baldwin and Hannah Dornier. Both have participated in Red-front activities in the past. Vice chairmen are * * * J. Raymond Walsh".....	148

## EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS—Continued

	Page
“As an example of the manner in which Red frontiers operate through Progressive Citizens of America, I call attention to the 22 simultaneous public protest meetings held in New York City earlier this year in an attempt to ‘stop antilabor legislation.’ The meetings were under the auspices of the movement. Speakers at these meetings included Norman Corwin, Dorothy Parker, Olin Downes, William S. Gailmor, Elinor S. Gimbel, Frank Kingdon, Canada Lee, Lillian Hellman, Dwight Bradley, Dean Dixon, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Goodwin Watson, Alfred Stern, and J. Raymond Walsh”-----	149
REPORT ON SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE (JUNE 12, 1947)	
“J. Raymond Walsh, a frank apologist for the Communist line, according to Prof. John H. Childs of Columbia University, speaking for the Southern Conference in Washington, flayed President Truman’s foreign policy in Greece and Turkey”-----	10
J. Raymond Walsh is shown being affiliated with statement defending Communist Party, December 14, 1939; American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; National Federation for Civil Liberties; and American Committee for Soviet Relations-----	15
REVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL CONFERENCE FOR WORLD PEACE ARRANGED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE ARTS, SCIENCES AND PROFESSIONS (H. REPT 1954-APRIL 19, 1949)	
“The Win-the-Peace Conference (Congress) was expanded into the movement behind the candidacy of Henry A. Wallace for President, which crystallized into the Progressive Citizens of America and the Progressive Party-----	8, 9
“From its inception this movement had the active approval and support of Moscow and the Communist Party of the United States. Among the sponsors of the New York Cultural Conference were the following Wallace supporters * * * J. Raymond Walsh”-----	8, 9
“A tabulation of the numerous Communist-front affiliations of the sponsors of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace shows the following interesting figures: 49 have been affiliated with from 11 to 20 Communist-front organizations, and include * * * J. Raymond Walsh”-----	17, 18
American Slav Congress-----	22
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy-----	24
National Citizens Political Action Committee-----	31
Progressive Citizens of America-----	33
Southern Conference for Human Welfare-----	34
The Panel Room (forum), 13 Astor Place, New York City-----	36
Support of Soviet Union, miscellaneous-----	49
Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (sponsor)-----	60
REPORT ON THE AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS AND ASSOCIATED ORGANIZATIONS (H. REPT. 1951-JUNE 26, 1949)	
“Money-raising activities in behalf of Communist Yugoslavia were placed in the hands of two outstanding leaders of the American Slav Congress, Namely Louis Adamic and Zlatko Balokovic * * *-----	77-78
“The campaign was actively supported by the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A. * * *-----	
“Simultaneously it received the approval and support of the following unions, then controlled by the Communists * * *. It was further endorsed by the following individuals with long records of affiliation with Communist front organizations: J. Raymond Walsh * * *.”-----	
American Slav Congress (dinner chairman)-----	106, 107



EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS—Continued

REPORT OF THE COMMUNIST "PEACE" OFFENSIVE

	Page
Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace (sponsor)-----	106
"A tabulation of the numerous Communist-front affiliations of the sponsors of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace shows the following interesting figures: 49 have been affiliated with from 11 to 20 Communist-front organizations, and include * * * J. Raymond Walsh."-----	107
EDUARD C. LINDEMAN	
DIES COMMITTEE	
Friends of the Soviet Union in the United States (national committee)---	376
Mr. MATTHEWS. * * * Mr. Goff, can you identify the members of the managing board and of the editorial board listed in Champion as members of the Young Communist League?-----	5605-5606
Mr. GOFF. I can identify the managing board. I can identify Francis Franklin. As to the editorial board, right offhand, I cannot say, but I can identify, of the contributing group, Edward Strong, James Wechsler, Angelo Herndon, Abbot Simon, Al Levitt, and there may be some others. On the advisory committee, they have some other people who are not Communists.	
Mr. MATTHEWS. The advisory editors are also listed there, and that is a pretty fair indication—	
The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Read the list of advisory editors.	
Mr. MATTHEWS. The names listed are as follows: Senator Lynn J. Frazier, Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman, Prof. Jerome Davis, Oswald Garrison Villard, Frank Palmer, William Ziegner, C. Hartley Grattan, John R. Tunis, Kenneth M. Gould, Harry Elmer Barnes, Rose Terlin, and Robert Morss Lovett.	
Mr. THOMAS. You mentioned a man named Lindeman. What are his initials?	
Mr. MATTHEWS. Eduard C. Lindeman.	
Mr. THOMAS. Before you get away from that in the record, I think we should know something about Mr. Lindeman, or what his activities are. Do you mind bringing that up now, or will you do that a little later?	
The CHAIRMAN. Does the witness know?	
Mr. THOMAS. I am asking Mr. Matthews.	
Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not testifying now.	
Mr. THOMAS. Will you bring that up later?	
Mr. MATTHEWS. Subsequently Mr. Lindeman will be identified as on an important committee of the national organization.	
(Listed as E. C. Lindeman)	
Brookwood College (endorser)-----	565, 703
"* * * In this exhibit, I also call the attention of the committee to the record contained therein of Dr. Harold Rugge, a member of the advisory committee of the Progressive Education Association, as shown in their publication which is in evidence.	2452
"Other members of the organization, as shown in that magazine are Mr. Arthur E. Morgan, Mr. Alvin Johnson, Mr. E. C. Lindeman, and Mr. Carleton Washburne, all of whom are listed in the Red Network as radical professors. * * *"	
American Committee for Struggle Against War (national committee)-----	6233
Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism (national executive committee)-----	Appendix, vol. 10, xxvij
(Listed as Edward C. Lindeman)	
American Youth Congress, Edward C. Lindeman, New York School of Social Work-----	875
(Listed as Dr. Edward Lindeman)	
"As further evidence of the communistic character of the IPA" (Inter-Professional Association), "there have been taken at random a record of a few of the speakers who appeared at the meetings of this organization.	1996

## EXHIBIT 1—CITATIONS—Continued

Page

"Dr. Edward Lindeman, national director of the WPA recreation project and contribution editor of the Communist weekly, New Republic \* \* \*"

## APPENDIX IX

American Committee for Anti-Nazi Literature (sponsor).....	322
American Council on Soviet Relations (member).....	365
American Investors Union, Inc. (sponsor).....	388
American League for Peace and Democracy (sponsor).....	396
American Committee for Struggle Against War.....	409
American Society for Cultural Relations With Russia (U. S. S. R.) (book committee).....	473
American Youth Congress:	
National advisory committee.....	535, 537
Panel member.....	543
Signatory.....	551
Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder (signatory).....	623
Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo (representative individual).....	669
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (sponsor).....	776
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (sponsor).....	941
League of American Writers.....	977
League for Mutual Aid (advisory committee).....	982
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.....	1215
New York State Conference on National Unity.....	1370
Champion of Youth (party-line publication)—advisory editor.....	1447
Social Workers Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (national committee).....	1577

REPORT OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE ON THE  
SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE—JUNE 12, 1947

Member, New York executive board.....	15
Other fronts also shown: Support or defense of individual Communists—Browder. Organizations defending Communists; Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, New York Conference for Inalienable Rights. Pro-Soviet relief or propaganda organizations: American Committee for Soviet Relations. Organizations defending Soviet foreign policy, American League for Peace and Democracy.	

STATEMENT FILED IN BEHALF OF THE FOREIGN POLICY  
ASSOCIATION, INC.

Part II of the report entitled summary of activities of the Carnegie Corporation, Carnegie Endowment, and Rockefeller Foundation contains certain criticisms of the Foreign Policy Association. The present statement is made in answer to these criticisms. We ask that it be filed as part of the official records of the committee.

These criticisms or allegations are in some cases explicitly stated, in others implied. They can be summarized as follows: (1) that under the guise of education it has engaged in propaganda; (2) that this propaganda takes the form of advocating an internationalist viewpoint, without attention to the "nationalist" position; (3) that its propaganda further favors a trend toward socialism and left wing viewpoints; (4) that it has employed subversive individuals; and (5) that other individuals connected with the association, although not actually subversive, have lacked objectivity and hold views which are questionable.

## I

Before answering these criticisms in detail we present the following general information concerning the association:

The Foreign Policy Association was founded in 1918 by a group of distinguished citizens who were deeply concerned over World War I and the need to create a peaceful world. First known as the League of Free Nations Association, the name was changed in 1921 to the Foreign Policy Association, and the organization was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1928. The FPA is a private membership organization financed by membership dues, contributions from individuals and corporations, grants from foundations, and proceeds from the sale of its literature and other services.

The purpose of the association, as set forth in its bylaws, is as follows:

The object of the Foreign Policy Association, Inc., is to promote community organizations for world affairs education, to provide assistance to such local organizations through a national service center and regional offices, and to advance public understanding of foreign policy problems through national programs and publications of a nonpartisan character based upon the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy.

The FPA publishes material on current issues in world affairs attempting always to present a balanced view. The masthead of the foreign policy bulletin carries the statement:

The Foreign Policy Association contributes to public understanding by presenting a cross-section of views on world affairs. The association as an organization takes no position on international issues. Any opinions expressed in its publications are those of the authors.

The association has a speaker's bureau to aid organizations interested in programs on world affairs. It has a pamphlet service, a film program service, and other services of value to local community educational groups. It maintains at the present time four regional offices to encourage the formation of additional community committees or councils concerned with American foreign policy and to provide additional service to existing group.

The first president was the Honorable James G. McDonald, subsequently the first United States Ambassador to Israel. Raymond Leslie Buell served as chief officer from 1933 to 1939, Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy from 1939 to 1946, and Brooks Emeny from 1947 to 1952. The present head is John W. Nason, formerly president of Swarthmore College. The names of the present board of directors are listed in appendix A.

## II

This statement is submitted as a reply to the criticisms or misinterpretations which appear in the report.

*(1) That under the guise of education the association has engaged in propaganda*

The distinction between propaganda and education is neither simple nor clear-cut. Both words are loosely used in modern parlance.

As used in the income tax law, propaganda means the promulgation of doctrines or views for the purpose of influencing legislation. Thus,

section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code enumerates organizations entitled to tax exemption as follows :

(6) Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundations, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation.

That this is the correct construction of the section is confirmed by the relevant provision of Income Tax Regulations 118, namely section 39.101 (6)-1(3) which states, as one of the tests which an organization seeking tax exemption must meet, the following :

(3) It must not by any substantial part of its activities attempt to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise.

There is no suggestion in the report that the Foreign Policy Association has ever attempted to influence legislation.

The report, however, is based on its own interpretation of propaganda, namely, that given by Mr. Dodd in his preliminary report as contained in the transcript for May 10, page 37 :

Propaganda—action having as its purpose the spread of a particular doctrine or a specifically identifiable system of principles and we noted that in use this word has come to infer half-truths, incomplete truths, as well as techniques of a covert nature.

This definition breaks down into two parts. The first clause is so general and inclusive as to become meaningless as a definition. According to it any intelligible set of convictions once stated becomes an act of propaganda. This is as true of teaching in support of democracy, constitutional government, free enterprise, private property, Christian morality, scientific research, technological advances, and public health as it is of international understanding and cooperation. Schools, colleges, health societies, and civic organizations of many kinds become automatically vehicles of propaganda according to the interpretation used in the present report, and the absurdity of so wide an extension of the term becomes at once obvious.

We submit that most, if not all, of our educational institutions on some issues advocate a cause or take a point of view, and that the requirement of complete neutrality on all controversial questions would be a deathblow to our whole American educational system.

Take, for example, the issue of democracy versus dictatorship. The great majority, if not all, of American colleges are run by trustees and taught by faculty who believe in democracy and who are opposed to dictatorship whether of the left or the right. Yet faculty lectures or books advocating democracy and opposing dictatorship would constitute propaganda according to the definition proposed by Mr. Dodd and used in the report.

We strongly urge that it is essential to the operation of the democratic system to give every possible freedom to the presentation of conflicting viewpoints, in the belief and hope that as a result of that process the American people will make wiser decisions than they would without benefit of such information.

The second half of the definition of propaganda referring to "half truths, incomplete truths as well as techniques of a covert nature" comes closer to the usual meaning of the word. Under that test the Foreign Policy Association is clearly not a propaganda organization.

The Foreign Policy Association in publishing information on foreign affairs makes a determined effort to avoid any half truths or incomplete truths and to present a balanced view as stated on page 2 of this statement. Particular effort is made to find exponents of varying points of view. No evidence of the use of techniques of a covert nature has been presented in the report, and it seems hardly necessary to state that the association does not indulge in such devices.

(2) *That this propaganda takes the form of advocating an internationalist viewpoint only, without attention to the "nationalist" position*

We desire to make two answers to this charge.

In the first place, the Foreign Policy Association has not exclusively presented an internationalist point of view in its publications.

As evidence we cite a few examples only. In recent issues of the Foreign Policy Bulletin Vera Micheles Dean has written articles stating and defending the arguments against further foreign aid to Europe and summarizing the current arguments against United States participation in the UN. Between February 15, 1953, and March 15, 1954, issues of the Bulletin have carried articles by Senator Watkins of Utah and Senator Malone of Nevada on tariffs and trade, by Senator Bricker of Ohio on curtailing the treaty-making power, and by Governor Lee of Utah on the United States leaving the UN.

In the second place, the Foreign Policy Association by virtue of its title and nature has been from its founding in 1918 concerned with the problems of American foreign policy. It has sought to make the American people more aware of the issues involved. It has tried to provide useful information regarding these issues. While it has presented from time to time in its publications and on its platforms views which would variously be described as isolationist, hemispheric, or "nationalist," the association has put major emphasis on international understanding, cooperation, and good will as means to the development of a peaceful and prosperous world.

(3) *That its propaganda further favors a trend toward Socialist and left-wing viewpoints*

The report gives the impression by the selection of certain statements that the Foreign Policy Association also supports a socialistic or left-wing position. The only evidence offered in support of this charge is the extensive quotation from a Headline Series booklet by Max Lerner entitled "World of Great Powers." Mr. Lerner is well known for his views on the economic, social, and political issues of our time. Many who do not agree with his position nevertheless find it provocative and stimulating. A complete analysis of FPA publications would have revealed many instances of strong support of free enterprise and private capital. The roster of public men who have written for the Bulletin and the Headline Series is sufficient to discredit charges of leftism or of deliberate emphasis on only one point of view.

(4) *That it has employed subversive individuals*

In paragraph 2 of page 63 of the report it is stated of the Headline Series booklets that:

Many were written by persons cited to be of Communist affiliation and are questionable in content.

With respect to the first half of the above quotation, while "many" are referred to, the only author of a headline series mentioned in the report as possibly being a Communist is Lawrence K. Rosinger, who was named as a party member by witnesses before the McCarran committee, but declined to answer.

Mr. Rosinger was on the staff of the FPA from July 1, 1942 (at which time the late Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy was the FPA president), until June 30, 1948. During the time of his employment no one at the FPA had any reason to think Mr. Rosinger might be a Communist. The testimony above referred to before the McCarran committee was not given until 1952, which was 4 years after he had ceased to be employed by the FPA.

Maxwell Stewart, also mentioned in the report, was a staff member of the FPA from 1931 to 1934 during which time he wrote several articles for the Foreign Policy Association reports. So far as we know, he has never been cited as a Communist.

(5) *That other individuals connected with the association, although not actually subversive, have lacked objectivity and hold views which are questionable*

Various individuals are selected from among the board, staff, and authors of the Foreign Policy Association for special mention. Included among those names are Roscoe Pound, one of the most distinguished American students of the law, dean for many years of the Harvard Law School, author of many books in the field of jurisprudence, recipient of many awards and distinctions for distinguished academic and public service. Another is Anna Lord Strauss who has had a notable career as businesswoman, editor, member of local, national, and international boards and committees, active in public service in many private organizations and governmental agencies.

Vera Micheles Dean, member of the FPA staff since 1928, is singled out for special comment of an unfavorable nature. For instance, on page 28 of the report it is stated that she "is referred to frequently in the MacCarran committee report on the Institute of Pacific Relations." Again, on page 64 a brief newspaper report of a single speech is used to describe her point of view as socialistic. In the same section a quotation is lifted from a book review in the New York Herald Tribune which read out of context might tend to support the newspaper story. It is interesting to note that the review begins:

At a time when virtually every book about Europe presents, usually with passionate urgency, some solution for the complex problems of that continent, it is refreshing to read Mrs. Dean's calm and measured discussion of Europe's place in today's world.

In the quotation from the report cited on page 7 of this statement it is alleged that "many (of the Headline Series booklets) were written by persons cited to be of Communist affiliation and are questionable in content." The first half of this allegation has been dealt with. With respect to the second half we submit that this charge evidences a point of view underlying the entire report, which is violative of the most fundamental principles of our government.

What does "questionable in content" mean? It apparently means that the book in question contained views which the author of the

report disapproved of. It is obvious from a reading of the quotations from the books of Mr. Lerner and Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, whose writing is referred to in the report as "one further illustration of the internationalist trend of the Foreign Policy Association," that there is nothing in either of them which could possibly be considered as subversive. All that "questionable in content" therefore means is that the author of the report does not agree with it.

Whether views in a book meet with the approval or disapproval of the author of the report or any Member of Congress should be, we submit, wholly irrelevant to the questions before the special committee. To adopt any other point of view would be tantamount to adopting the Soviet position, which is that no book may be published which expresses views not approved of by the Kremlin.

#### CONCLUSION

While there are a few other incidental references to the Foreign Policy Association in the report, we believe that we have dealt with the important allegations.

We submit that the evidence presented in no way justifies the charges which the report makes against the Foreign Policy Association.

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION.

By \_\_\_\_\_, *President*.

#### APPENDIX A

##### BOARD OF DIRECTORS—1954

- Mrs. George S. Auerbach, G. Fox & Co., Hartford, Conn.; residence, 1040 Prospect Avenue, Hartford, Conn.
- William H. Baldwin, 205 East 42d Street, New York 17, N. Y.; residence, New Canaan, Conn.
- Melvin Brorby, 135 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill.; residence, 1320 N. State Parkway, apartment 6B, Chicago 10, Ill.
- Mrs. Andrew Galbraith Carey, R. D. 2, Westport, Conn.
- John F. Chapman, 5 Walnut Street, Cambridge, Mass.; residence, 26 East 93d Street, New York 28, N. Y.
- Edwin F. Chinlund, 45 Gramercy Park, New York 10, N. Y.
- Edgar M. Church, in care of Lewis & MacDonald, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y.; residence, 164 East 72d Street, New York 21, N. Y.
- Ernest T. Clough, 411 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
- Brooks Emeny, 221 Elm Road, Princeton, N. J.
- Mrs. John French, the New York Times, 229 West 43d Street, New York 36, N. Y.; residence, 144 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y.
- Clayton Fritchey, National Democratic Committee, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.
- Gordon Gray, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; residence, 402 East Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.
- Mrs. Albert M. Greenfield, 6399 Drexel Road, Philadelphia 31, Pa.
- William W. Lancaster, 20 Exchange Place, New York 5, N. Y.; residence, Grand View Circle, Manhasset, N. Y.
- Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, 1021 Park Avenue, New York 28, N. Y.; summer, in care of Ausable Club, St. Huberts P. O., Essex County, N. Y.
- Edward S. Morris, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia 9, Pa.; residence, 1921 Panama Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
- John W. Nason, FPA; residence Tudor Hotel, 304 East 42d Street, New York 17, N. Y.; 530 Walnut Street, Swarthmore, Pa.
- J. Warren Nystrom, foreign policy department, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.
- George W. Perkins, 342 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.; residence, 6 East 94th Street, New York 28, N. Y.

- H. Harvey Pike, 120 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; residence 54 East 92d Street, New York 28, N. Y.
- George Roberts, 40 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; residence, 139 East 79th Street, New York 21, N. Y.
- John D. Rockefeller 3d, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y.; residence, 1 Beekman Place, New York 22, N. Y.
- Charles E. Saltzman, Henry Sears & Co., 385 Madison Ave., New York 17, N. Y.; residence, 1112 Park Avenue, New York 28, N. Y.
- Eustace Seligman, 48 Wall Street, New York 5, N. Y.; residence, 126 East 74th Street, New York 21, N. Y.
- Miss Anna Lord Strauss, 27 East 69th Street, New York 21, N. Y.; Stepney, Conn.
- Arthur E. Whittemore, 220 Devonshire Street, Boston 10, Mass.
- Robert W. Williams, Price, Waterhouse & Co., 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia 9, Pa.
- Shepherd L. Witman, Council on World Affairs, 922 Society for Savings Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio.
- James D. Zellerbach, 343 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif.; residence, 2790 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.

## HONORARY

- Paul Kellogg, 265 Henry Street, New York 2, N. Y.; summer, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y.
- Herbert L. May, the Berkshire, 21 East 52d Street, New York 22, N. Y. (apartment 1610).
- The Honorable James G. McDonald, 350 Fifth Avenue, room 5910, New York 1, N. Y.; residence, 9 Alden Place, Bronxville, N. Y.
- Miss Esther G. Ogden, 139 East 66th Street, New York 21, N. Y.
- The Honorable H. Alexander Smith, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; residence, 81 Alexander Street, Princeton, N. J.
- Mrs. Learned Hand, 142 East 65th Street, New York 21, N. Y.; summer, Lowcourt, Windsor, Vt.

I have prepared the foregoing statement and I swear that the facts stated upon personal knowledge are true and that the facts stated upon other than personal knowledge are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION,  
By JOHN W. NOON, *President*.

Subscribed and sworn to before me the 24th day of August 1954.

CARLOYN E. MARTIN,  
*Notary Public, State of New York.*

Commission expires March 30, 1955.



## EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. SPRUILLE BRADEN

APRIL 5, 1954.

HON. SPRUILLE BRADEN,  
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BRADEN: Mr. Ettinger has told me of your willingness to help us in our study and investigation of tax-exempt foundations and comparable organizations. A copy of House Resolution 217, 83d Congress, creating this committee, is attached for your information.

Your testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee suggests that your observations of trends in the conduct of foreign affairs coincides with one of our research hypotheses—namely, that our foreign policy is influenced by persons and groups operating under a veil of anonymity, but nevertheless effectively promoting ideas detrimental to the welfare of this Republic.

Specifically, we would like to know:

1. What is the influence of tax-exempt foundations on our foreign policy? (e. g., Carnegie Endowment, Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, Rhodes Scholarship Trust, etc.)

2. How do foundations operate in the field of foreign relations? (Support of pressure groups, interlocking directorates, development of literature, sponsorship of experts, frequent appointments of foundation officers by Government, etc.)

3. Is the influence of tax-exempt bodies, that are free from public control and responsibility on our foreign policy directly or via control of public opinion and propaganda media desirable?

We will appreciate your comments on these problems. I would, of course, be obliged if you would telephone me at your convenience at my New York office (Murray Hill 2-0127) and perhaps arrange for a meeting.

Very truly yours,

\_\_\_\_\_  
General Counsel.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 10, 1954.

MR. RENE A. WORMSER,  
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WORMSER: Please excuse my delay in answering your April 5 letter, as I have been absent from the city.

As I told Mr. Ettinger, presently I have not enough concrete information in my possession to be of any real assistance to you as a witness. I have the very definite feeling that a number of the foundations have been taken over by what I described in my testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, not so much by the Communists, as by State interventionists, collectivists, misguided idealists, "do-gooders" and "whatnots," and that this is one of the greatest perils confronting our country today.

Similarly, my respect for the Rockefeller Foundation in connection with its health work in such places as Colombia, in yellow fever, malaria, etc., has been severely jolted when I read that Chester Bowles has now been made a director of that institution. The reason for my concern is that only a few months ago, I heard the former Ambassador and Governor of Connecticut declaim against the Farewell Address and George Washington as typifying the evils of isolationism [sic].

Perhaps, given time, I could check up on some matters which would make my testimony more authoritative than it could possibly be now. But, in answer to your specific questions, all I could say is that I have the very definite feeling that these various foundations you mention very definitely do exercise both overt and covert influences on our foreign relations and that their influences are counter to the fundamental principles on which this Nation was founded and which have made it great.

While I feel that something should be done about this situation, I would regret to have even more Government controls, though I recognize that at times it is necessary to fight fire with fire. But I have not thought through to a conclusion in the premises.

With all best wishes,

Faithfully and cordially yours,

SPRUILLE BRADEN.

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GENERAL COUNSEL AND  
SELECTED UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Shortly after the committee began its hearings in May 1954 the general counsel wrote the following letter to professors at leading universities soliciting their comments on the operation of foundations in the social sciences:

MAY 13, 1954.

DEAR PROFESSOR ———: In connection with the current hearings of the House of Representatives committee investigating foundations, we shall consider, among other things, the criticism that the foundations and associated organizations having to do with social-science research have promoted an excess of empiricism. It has been suggested that you might be good enough to give us your reflections in that area.

Would you be good enough, therefore, at your early convenience, to give us any comments which you might be willing to offer, particularly on these points:

1. Whether there has been an unfair or undesirable preponderance of empirical research.

2. Whether this has had any unfortunate results and if so what.

3. Whether the apparent emphasis on training researchers in the empirical approach almost to the exclusion of the theoretical approach is desirable for our society.

We would appreciate any further comments of any kind which you might wish to make regarding the operation of the foundations and/or the associated research organizations in the social sciences.

We would, of course, expect to be permitted to use your comments in our record.

I would deeply appreciate an early reply.

Sincerely yours,

RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

The professors to whom it was sent were:

Prof. Theodore Abel, sociology department, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Prof. C. Arnold Anderson, department of sociology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Prof. Herbert Blumer, chairman, department of sociology and social institutions, University of California, Berkeley 4, Calif.

Prof. James H. S. Bossard, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pa.

Prof. R. E. DuWars, chairman, sociology department, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.

Prof. Charles S. Hyneman, professor of political science, Harris Hall 105, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Prof. Oliver Martin, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.

Prof. William M. McGovern, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Dr. Helmut Schoeck, visiting research fellow in sociology, Yale University, 206 Highland Avenue, West Haven, Conn.

Prof. Pitirim A. Sorokin, Harvard University, Emerson Hall, Cambridge 38, Mass.

Prof. Ludwig von Mises, 777 West End Avenue, New York 25, N. Y.

Dr. K. A. Wittfogel, Chinese history project, Low Memorial Library, Columbia University, 420 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.

Prof. Carle C. Zimmerman, department of social relations, Harvard University, Cambridge 38, Mass.

No reply was received from Professor Abel, Professor DuWars, Professor McGovern, or Professor Martin. Correspondence with the others arranged alphabetically follows:

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY,  
Lexington, May 26, 1954.

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel*,

DEAR MR. WORMSER: Your inquiry about the work of tax-exempt foundations is most difficult to answer. It will be necessary for me to write at some length in order to avoid giving you an ambiguous statement. The delay in sending you this statement has been occasioned by my taking the time to read with some care the report of the 1952 hearings on this same subject.

The following comments should be regarded as my professional judgments, not merely opinions. I am, however, expressing my own judgments and not those of my university, department, or any group of scholars to which I may belong.

In order that you may interpret my remarks, I should state that I am not connected in any way with a foundation. At one time I received a stipend from a foundation for a year of graduate study. Some years ago, also, I was an editor for a publication by a foundation. On the other hand, two applications within recent years for research grants were rejected by foundations. My knowledge of foundation-supported research is nonetheless rather extensive in that I attempt to read very widely in both my own and related scientific disciplines. I am also on the advisory editorial board of a professional journal; in that connection I read a considerable number of manuscripts, including some that do not receive publication.

It is not within the scope of questions raised by your letter for me to consider the problem of registration or other methods of insuring that foundations conform to the stipulations implied in their tax-exempt status. A clear distinction between foundations engaged in partisan propaganda or mere tax-evasion and those engaged in research is obviously necessary. So far as my limited acquaintance or that of my colleagues extends, the foundations devoted to the sponsoring of research and learned studies have an excellent record.

It would seem to be clearly imperative that no effort should be made to influence by governmental means the manner in which foundations carry out their support of scholarly work. It would seem prudent to leave the balance between various kinds of research to be decided by the foundations and the learned disciplines. Too many efforts are being made today to control science because one or another group does not find the results of research palatable.

In judging the work of scientists it is too often forgotten that any research in either the physical or the social sciences has practical implications. Such research will inevitably affect adversely the prestige or the prosperity of some groups, agencies, or interests in the Nation. Thus, for example, to demonstrate that one metal is superior to another for some engineering use favors the manufacturers of that metal and injures the interests of the makers of competing metals. In a world of change where we can exist and prosper only with the aid of research, such effects are inevitable, and indeed desirable. To have judged research by whether its results were congenial to the buggy industry would have stifled the automobile industry.

I should like to comment particularly on the relationship of what you have called the "empirical approach" to the "theoretical approach." Insofar as we are hopeful that the American way of life may be safeguarded by scholarly research and study, we must recognize that it is impossible to have too many empirical facts. The reason for this situation is simply stated. It is easy to draw up the blueprint for an ideal society; there have been thousands of such utopias in human history. But to improve actual societies has proven more difficult. That our society has manifested a high degree of freedom and progress is demonstrated by facts. It is empirical fact also that demonstrates the wide gap between utopian blueprints of communism and communism in practice. Facts are the most convincing answer to any who may be swayed by communistic propaganda.

A democratic society cannot be preserved without freedom of inquiry. Freedom of inquiry is the only road to truth. For any body of men to use power or the regulative agencies to constrict the field of scientific study would be to imitate the worst features of Soviet society. The future welfare of American

society cannot be assured without freedom of research into facts—facts about our social organization as well as about our natural resources. Whoever would limit the search for facts in our civilization stands self-convicted of special pleading. The answer to inadequate facts is more facts.

Critics of the social sciences forget that social scientists are responsible scholars. The ethical code of science is a strict disciplinarian. We social scientists spend a large part of our time—and the professional journals devote a large portion of their space—to debating the merits of one type of facts or method for obtaining the facts against the merits of other methods. We constantly weigh the importance of particular facts against the analytical concepts or theories by which we organize those facts into generalizations that will accurately portray the structure of society. Theories and facts are siamese twins. The best searchers for facts are usually also the best organizers of facts into sound theories and vice versa. Fact and theory are constantly at play, one upon the other. Every reputable social scientist strives constantly to balance and integrate those two facets of scientific work.

An enticing theory can be developed while stretched out in an easy chair; all that is needed is pencil and paper. But of the thousands of theories, however conscientiously conceived, only a handful will prove valid when subjected to the crucible of facts. Unfortunately, to obtain facts requires money. Knowledge is the most expensive commodity in the world. Few professors have private wealth to underwrite their research. Few colleges or universities have money to support more than a meager research program. The uniquely sustaining service of foundations in America has been to provide the money for this indispensable purpose.

If one reads the prefaces of current books or the footnotes of technical articles, whether they be reports of empirical research or works devoted primarily to theory, he must be impressed with the large proportion of contemporary scholarly work that has received subsidy from some foundation. Unless we are to turn almost exclusively to the Government for such aid—and this would entail results more deplorable than any charge that can be brought against the foundations—scholarship will wither without foundation assistance.

At one time I was an editor for a publication by the Social Science Research Council. In that publication an effort was made to integrate theory and research. At no time during the work was any influence brought to bear by the sponsoring foundation. I read most of the publications by this council. To me they balance very sagely the needs for fact gathering and the need for integrating theory. Most of the major foundations, at least, so far as I can observe or hear, are similarly scrupulous and farsighted.

More than anything else, the foundations desire the good opinion of the world of scholars. Scholars are the first to censure loaded or biased work. They are the first to condemn poor work. They are constantly scrutinizing the operations of the foundations. There is no surer path to professional fame than to have one's name associated with an acceptable theory and no easier path than to demonstrate that some grand project has been bumbled.

By its very nature, science is a self-correcting activity. No other human agency—except a free enterprise economy—has a mechanism for correcting error built into its very structure.

Every study, whether or not subsidized by a foundation, has defects. But we have to apply the test of prudential judgment to the work of foundations as we do to that of any other group in Government or private life. And by that test, in my judgment, it can be shown that only a small portion of foundation-supported research studies have been biased or poorly conducted.

To answer your specific questions categorically, on the understanding that these categoric comments will not be used without the foregoing discussion, I would make these statements:

1. There has not been an unfair or undesirable preponderance of empirical research. What the social sciences need is enormously more money for the collection of facts, and for the testing of theories by facts.

2. The only unfortunate result has been the all too slow accumulation of facts. The more rapidly we can accumulate reliable facts, the more rapid will be the codification of sound theory and reliable principles of human behavior—for the use of our political representatives or other responsible individuals and organizations.

3. There has not been, in my judgment, a disproportionate emphasis in training researchers in the empirical approach. To refer to my own year of training by courtesy of a foundation, I was enabled to attend one of our best uni-

versities specifically to obtain a better grounding in theory. Innumerable other individuals have been similarly assisted. The experience of a close friend with a current committee supported by a foundation leads me to conclude that once more a strong emphasis is laid upon adequate theory to guide the collection of facts with which to develop better theory. Theories by themselves cost little but sound theory must rest on valid facts, which are enormously expensive.

If I may judge by news items in the *New York Times* during recent days, the purposes being expressed through your inquiry are not only multiple but perhaps contradictory. It seems to me to be imperative that research work be judged by those who are trained in scientific methods. It is to be hoped that the conclusions of the committee may be praised in later years principally for having encouraged the launching of new foundations devoted to the advancement of human knowledge.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have the opportunity of contributing my judgments on this important question. I should be happy to extend my remarks in a further communication, or in person, at your pleasure.

Sincerely yours,

C. ARNOLD ANDERSON.

JUNE 7, 1954.

Prof. C. ARNOLD ANDERSON,

*Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.*

DEAR PROFESSOR ANDERSON: Many thanks for your letter of May 25, which I have read with great interest. I wish I had time to answer it in considerable detail, but the pressure of work prevents.

I would like to suggest, however, that the accounts in the newspapers cannot give you any fair understanding of the objectives of our inquiry, or of the limitations which the committee has put upon itself. It stands unanimously behind the theory of free inquiry, whereas the newspapers have rather broadly given the impression that ours is an attempt at censorship.

There is, of course, one factor of possible "censorship" involved. The tax law itself proscribes certain areas of activity (principally subversion and political propaganda). After all, these are tax-free funds with which we are concerned and, thus, public trusts. The public is entrusted to be protected against having tax-free money used for things against the public interest. Outside of this element of what might be called (but unfairly) "censorship," foundations are free to do as they choose.

Far from being against free inquiry, we are concerned with the validity of frequent criticism that the major foundations which operate in some close association through intermediate organizations, etc., have virtually exercised a form of censorship themselves. This consists of supporting primarily certain approaches in research in the social sciences to the virtual exclusion of the opposites. As research in the social sciences in the United States is now almost entirely foundation supported (except for that financed by the Government itself—and this, in turn, seems under the control or direction of organizations and individuals financed by the foundations) it seems to us necessary to inquire whether this criticism is justified. There should obviously be free competition in matters of the intellect as well as in business.

Nor is there any validity to any newspaper suggestions that this inquiry is directed against foundations as such. The committee is unanimous in its appreciation of the desirability of foundations. Its interest is in discovering what abuses may exist, to the end of doing what it can to make these organizations even more socially desirable than they now are. It may well be that the disclosure of criticisms and the airing of abuses may help the foundations to increase their acceptability and utility.

May I thank you again for taking the trouble to answer my letter in detail.

Sincerely,

RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

WHARTON SCHOOL OF FINANCE AND COMMERCE,  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,

*Philadelphia 4, June 1, 1954.*

HON. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

DEAR MR. WORMSER: To answer your letter of May 13, I must first attempt to qualify, and then to disqualify, myself as a witness.

First, as to qualifications. I have been a professor of sociology now for 44 years. This includes services at the University of Pennsylvania, the University

of California at Berkeley, and Yale University. In the course of this period, I have written, wholly or in part, and edited, wholly or in part, more than 30 volumes and contributed about 75 articles to scientific journals. Research activities include the direction of two nationwide surveys and the development of several volumes of research papers. Since 1938, I have devoted myself largely to the development of research studies in the field of child behavior.

As to disqualifying myself, I am indicating the reasonable suspicion that I may be prejudiced, in that I have never been able to obtain a single grant from any research foundation or organization. On the other hand, I have a number of times asked for, and I have always been granted promptly, research moneys from the faculty committee of my university. I have also obtained, without a single refusal, money for research purposes from people of means who are familiar with my work.

As a lifelong student of social problems and policies, I am impressed with the great difficulties and grave responsibilities of administering large amounts of money for research or any other social purpose. Naturally, this makes me hesitant to criticize those persons who are charged with these responsibilities. I am willing, however, to express a viewpoint, in the hope that it may in some slight way contribute to the formation of sound judgments.

For some years, I have regarded with increasing apprehension the development of what I have called the comptometer school of research in social science. By this I mean the gathering of detailed social data and their manipulation by all the available statistical techniques. Not that I am objecting to such methods—my reluctance rather lies in an unwillingness to accept these as the core of research in human behavior.

My own interest lies more in the development of qualitative insights. This accords with my judgment of the nature of the life process, that it cannot be reduced to statistical formulas but that it is a richly diversified complex of relationships. The chief purpose of research for university people, most of whom are limited to working with small groups, should be weighted heavily in the direction of research in qualitative insights rather than manipulation of mass data.

I am particularly concerned with the impression which the recent emphasis upon the comptometer approach has created among younger sociologists as to what constitutes social research. The moneys and the influences of the large foundations naturally do a great deal to set the norms of professional acceptance in a given field, and it is in this respect, difficult to measure statistically but possibly of very great importance, that a distinct disservice may be done to sociological research by an undue emphasis upon any particular emphasis or methodology.

Cordially yours,

JAMES H. S. BOSSARD,  
*Professor of Sociology.*

---

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS,  
*Berkeley 4, Calif., May 21, 1954.*

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

DEAR MR. WORMSER: I am relying to your gracious inquiry of May 13 soliciting an expression of my judgment on the character of social science research fostered by foundations and associated organizations.

I have been critical and am critical of much of this research. However, questions of what is appropriate in social science research are not in the competency of congressional committees, but should be determined, properly, by the scientific professions in whose fields such issues fall. Good avenues of communications exist between the social science societies and the foundations interested in social science research. Such channels are the proper medium for the consideration of criticisms and the correction of whatever foundation policies are judged to be faulty by members of the professions. Since I am wholly unsympathetic to placing the determination of these matters in the hands of legislative groups, I am refraining from answering your points.

I trust that this letter will be entered on the records of your committee.

Respectfully yours,

HERBERT BLUMER, *Chairman.*

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,  
THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,  
Evanston, Ill., July 22, 1954.

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel*.

DEAR MR. WORMSER: I did not sooner reply to your letter of June 24 because I wanted to think over the questions you put to me. I will take them up in the order of their appearance in your letter.

1. I have always supposed that there is indeed a "close interlock or a concentration of power" between the foundations on the one hand and the so-called learned societies, such as the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, on the other hand. I have long understood that few, if any, of the learned societies have an endowment of notable size or receive current income from memberships. It is my understanding that these learned societies have depended mainly upon the foundations for the principal part of their financial support. If they did not get money out of the foundations, I don't know how they would ever be able to do anything of genuine significance. Where a learned society is dependent on foundations for money, I think it is inevitable that the men who direct the learned society will try to maintain close and friendly personal relations with the men in the foundations who decide whether they will hand over any money and how much. I have never heard from any source that the foundation people try to dictate or influence the appointment of men to positions of any character in any of the learned societies. When an important position in a learned society is to be filled, it is probable that the people who must make the choice will try to find out whether people in the foundations have respect for and confidence in the man they propose to appoint. I have been told that both the Carnegie Corp. and the Rockefeller Foundation have pretty consistently, if not in all cases, refused to make any expression on this point. But you can read men's minds; you don't always have to be told who the foundation officials have confidence in and who they don't have confidence in. I think it is a safe guess that the selection of men for high positions in learned societies is influenced by such a reading of the minds of people who are high up in the foundations. I have more than once been told by people who manage colleges and universities that "we want to find" a man for president, or dean, or department head, "who can get money out of foundations." I suppose that people who choose men for positions in learned societies are just as conscious of the need for winning or maintaining good will in the foundations.

2a. This question asks whether the relationship between foundations and learned societies has resulted in promotion of empirical research, and if so, whether that promotion has been excessive. Certainly the foundations have underwritten empirical research. I don't know to what extent their support of empirical research is due to a close relation between the men who manage the foundations and the men who manage the learned societies. One can form a judgment as to whether the promotion of empirical research is excessive only by considering other purposes for which the money is needed and might have been used. Empirical research is inquiry into factual evidence. This costs money. For several years I have been trying to make a comparative study of American State legislatures to see what we can learn in the experience of one State which will help people in other States decide whether they want to do something and what they can do to improve the legislative process at home. This means, among other things, that you have to travel about the country to talk to a lot of people who have had experience in State legislatures and who have thoughtfully observed the lawmaking process. I can tell you that it costs a lot of money to do this kind of job. The alternative to underwriting empirical study, if a foundation wants to support scholarly research, is to underwrite men who sit in the library and read books and think. These people don't need much money. So I would say that a fair balancing of empirical study in comparison with historical and speculative study requires that much more than half the money be put into empirical study. I can add to this my personal belief that what we need more than anything else in the social sciences right now is a whole lot more effort to get at the facts. Personally I don't think that either the learned societies or the foundations have been giving excessive support to empirical research.

2b. Your question inquires whether there is a general political slanting of research toward the left and whether such a slanting, if it exists, is due to a tie-up among the foundations and the learned societies. I suppose I am a middle-of-the-roader in politics; I voted for Dewey in 1948, for Dirksen in 1950, and

for Stevenson in 1952. I think that the college professors who teach in social-science departments in this country are overwhelmingly left of my position. Furthermore, I think that many of them show a near disgraceful tendency to overstate the liberal cause and deride the position of people who hold more conservative or right-wing views. I think many of these people show entirely too little respect for what I consider to be the obligations of a man who claims that he is an objective student and a scientist. But I must say that I have no evidence whatever to support a view that either the foundations or the learned societies have supported or wish to support this lack of objectivity and favoring of the left-wing position. If a foundation or learned society wants to be neutral in the matter of politics, the safest thing for it to do, in underwriting the social sciences, is to give its money for empirical research. As I said above, empirical study is search for factual evidence. In picking the thing he is going to study, the empirical researcher can choose a problem in terms of his own political beliefs. But when he is looking for and examining factual data, he is of necessity restrained from shooting the works in favor of his political views.

2c. The question asks whether there is a tendency toward monopoly and conformity, and, if so, whether this is due to a tieup between foundations and learned societies. I don't see any tendency which I think leads to monopoly, but I do think there is a piling up of foundation money for support of research in universities on the east coast. I think this is due to two things: First, the eastern universities are close to the headquarters of the older foundations and the headquarters of the learned societies. They find it easy to talk their problems over with these people. They are in a better position to make a case for what they want to do than are the rest of us who live in the South, Middle West, and far West. The second factor in favor of the East is that generally those people have smaller teaching loads, have more time to plan research and get it started, and eastern universities on the whole have more men who have actually gotten forward with research. Now the foundations and learned societies could follow a policy of trying to find and underwrite the really good men who have not had a good chance to do research. I personally think they ought to do more of this. But on the other hand, they can with good reason argue that they ought to invest their money in men who have already shown what they can and will do. I suppose they avoid criticism by doing the latter. If they put their money in men who are already going ahead with research the foundations and learned societies can say that they are not trying to remake the country or cause it to go in different directions from the way it is already going. If they go about hunting up men and underwriting men who have not yet done much research, they will be accused of trying to determine the direction in which research will go and of trying to remake the mind of the Nation to suit the people who manage the foundations and learned societies.

3. I have no evidence to cause me to think that the foundations have any wish or intention to slant research or slant the mind of the Nation toward collectivism. But I do think that an overwhelming part of the social science professors in this county lean toward collectivism. Insofar as the foundations underwrite social science professors they probably help along more men who favor collectivism than men who oppose collectivism. Furthermore, many social science college professors present their personal beliefs when they ought to be trying to do objective inquiry. Now it may be that the foundations ought to give every man a test before they give him any money, the purpose of the test being to find out whether he is really an objective scholar and not a preacher. I will not offer an opinion as to what they ought to do on this point.

I have tried to address myself to the specific questions you put. Now I will tell you about my experience with one learned society, the Social Science Research Council. For 3 years I was a member of its committee which awarded grants-in-aid for research. The top amount we were permitted to grant any man was \$1,000 for a period of 1 year. When we had more applications than we had money to satisfy we always favored the little fellow and the man who seemed to be overlooked. If a man had a salary of \$9,000 it was a rare case indeed when we gave him any money. We gave our money to the youngsters who were having trouble making a living and to men who had heavy teaching loads in colleges and universities with limited resources. The questions we asked about all applicants were these: (a) Is he an intelligent man; (b) can he actually do the job he is trying to do; (c) can we be sure he will carry this project to completion; (d) is the thing he proposes to do worth doing? We gave money for both empirical research and historical and speculative study. I never knew any member of the committee to raise the question as to whether this man is conservative or lib-



eral or to raise the question whether this project will tend to support a conservative or a liberal point of view. I can say with absolute confidence that if any member of the committee had ever raised either question he would have been smacked down promptly by other members of the committee.

Now I suppose you need to know what kind of a man I am so that you can judge whether I may be speaking honestly or trying to pull the wool over your eyes. I have already told you how I voted in the last three elections. I may add that I have insisted in conversation with my friends on this faculty that there are two sides to the McCarthy question. I have furthermore spoken in favor of McCarthy in these conversations in order to counter what I consider to be extremism and unwillingness to look at evidence on the part of the anti-McCarthyites I talk to. The consequence of this is that I hear I am a pro-McCarthy man who wants to destroy freedom of speech for the Nation and render the university incapable of functioning as a place for freemen to make objective inquiry. Finally, the total amount of money I have personally received from all foundations and learned societies for my own research is \$750.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. HYNEMAN,  
*Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University.*

---

YALE UNIVERSITY,  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY,  
*New Haven, Conn., May 17, 1954.*

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

DEAR MR. WORMSER: Your letter of May 13 was misssent and reached me with considerable delay. I shall be very glad to send you my comments on the points mentioned in your letter. However, in view of the fact that you might use my comments in your record I should like to have a few days for drafting the reply. I appreciate your interest in whatever I may be able to contribute.

Sincerely yours,

HELMUT SCHOECK, Ph. D.,  
*Visiting Research Fellow in Sociology.*

---

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
RESEARCH CENTER IN CREATIVE ALTRUISM,  
*Cambridge 38, Mass., May 18, 1954.*

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

DEAR MR. WORMSER: My brief answers to your three questions are as follows:

In regard to the first question, I can state that so far as social sciences are concerned, most of the foundations certainly favor to an excessive degree empirical research and greatly discriminate against theoretical, historical, and other forms of nonempirical research. This one-sidedness by itself would not be objectionable if (a) empirical research were not still more narrowed and reduced to either statistical research or research along the line of the so-called mathematical and mechanical models, or other imitative varieties of so-called natural science sociology; (b) if the topics investigated were of some theoretical or practical importance; and (c) if most of the favored researchers were competent social scientists. Unfortunately, in cases of overwhelming bulk of granted financial help, these three conditions were absent.

As to your second question, the results of the above kind of research (which has been prevalent for, roughly, during the last 30 years in American social sciences), with very rare exception, have been of 2 kinds: (1) the bulk of this sort of research has been perfectly fruitless and almost sterile from a theoretical or practical standpoint; (2) some of the investigations, made especially along Freudian and similar theories (or popularizing these sort of views), have been rather destructive morally and mentally for this Nation.

Third, my answer to the second question partly answers your third question, namely, that such an exceptional emphasis on training researchers along the above-mentioned lines, with almost complete exclusion of the theoretical approach, is certainly undesirable for our society, either from a purely scientific or from a practical standpoint.

These, in brief, are my answers to your questions. In giving these answers I want you to keep in mind that I am not giving them offhand and on the spur of the moment. For some 32 years I have been in the midst of American social science, particularly sociology, and correspondingly have been closely following

all the main currents in American social thought. In addition, at the present time I am completing a special volume, the title of which is somewhat self-explanatory, namely, *Fads and Delusions in Modern Sociology, Psychology, Psychiatry, and Cultural Anthropology*. In this volume which I hope to complete by the end of June or July of this year, I am critically examining exactly all the main currents of empirical research in the social sciences particularly favored by the foundations—sometimes by colleges and regularly by the United States Navy, Army, and Air Corps—spending a considerable amount of funds for this sort of research.

The final conclusions which I have reached in this volume are identical with the answers which I have given to your questions. I hope that the volume gives the necessary minimum of evidence to corroborate that my conclusions are correct. The futility of excessively favoring this sort of research particularly is well demonstrated by its sterility, in spite of the many millions of dollars, enormous amount of time and energy expended by research staffs. Almost all of the enormous mass of research along this line in the United States of America for the last 25 or 30 years has not produced either any new significant social theory or any new method, or any new technique, or any scientifically valid test, or even any limited casual uniformity. This sterility is perhaps the most convincing evidence of unwise policies of the foundations, colleges, and Army, Navy, and Air Corps research directors.

My book is going to be published by the Henry Regnery Co. I do not know exactly when it will be published, but probably in 1955; or, if it is somewhat urgently hurried, it may be published at the end of this year. I hope, anyhow, to deliver my manuscript to the publisher sometime the end of June or July. I hope, also, that when it is published this volume may be of some help to your committee.

With my best wishes.  
Sincerely yours,

PITIRIM A. SOROKIN.

---

NEW YORK 25, N. Y., May 24, 1954.

MR. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel*.

DEAR MR. WORMSER: Referring to your letter of May 13, 1954, I should like to submit the following remarks:

I have in my books and articles critically analyzed the epistemological and political prepossessions that are responsible for the scientific sterility of the present-day academic treatment of the problems of human action, in this country as well as abroad. I think that the fanatical dogmatism prevailing in many faculties and the virtual boycott of all dissenters are among the most alarming symptoms of the actual crisis of western civilization.

It is a fact that the intolerant practices of many university departments of the social sciences are lavishly financed by some rich foundations. These foundations are uncritically committed to the epistemological ideas and the political bias prevalent in the university faculties. But it was not foundations that inaugurated this tendency and converted the professors to their own tenets. It was, on the contrary, the universities that converted the foundations to their opinions. The trustees and the staffs of the foundations were convinced that the best method they could choose was to put their trust in the professors. They were deluded by the prestige that the name universities enjoyed. They adopted the professor worship current in some European countries.

In the reports of the foundations and in the public utterances of their leading functionaries one does not discover any propositions about methods and techniques of social studies that would not be stereotyped repetitions of the slogans coined by the self-styled "unorthodox" professors long before American foundations began to spend money for these studies.

My answer to each of the three questions you formulate in the second paragraph of your letter is emphatically yes. For a justification of my point of view I refer to my publications.

With kindest regards,  
Sincerely yours,

LUDWIG VON MISES.

CHINESE HISTORY PROJECT,  
 (Sponsored by University of Washington, Seattle,  
 in cooperation with Columbia University),  
 LOW MEMORIAL LIBRARY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,  
 New York 27, N. Y., June 30, 1954.

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel*.

DEAR MR. WORMSER: Thank you for your letter of June 25. I am deeply aware of the importance of the problems which it raises.

Some weeks ago, I had a stimulating conversation about these problems with a member of your staff, Dr. Karl E. Ettinger. In the course of this conversation I conveyed to him whatever ideas I have on the subject. But it became evident that his study of the matter has gone far beyond my limited insights. I, therefore, am afraid that I have no further contribution to make to your investigation.

Yours sincerely,

KARL A. WITTFOGEL.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
 DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL RELATIONS,  
 Cambridge 38, Mass., May 25, 1954.

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER, *General Counsel*.

DEAR MR. WORMSER: The matter of false and specious empirical research instigated and supported by our tax-exempt foundations is so grave that it is highly proper the Congress of the United States take up the matter. However, an analysis of it requires such detailed time that I would not even answer your letter if it were from a body less important than the United States Congress.

#### QUESTION I

The tax-exempt foundations in the United States have unfairly and undesirably emphasized empirical research to such an extent that the whole meaning of social science research has come to be ridden with sham and dubious practices.

#### QUESTION II

This has had undesirable and unfortunate results as follows:

A. It has made research grants large and expensive and few in number.

B. A special class of fund getters has grown up who spend all their time getting funds, and have little time or capacity to do original work.

C. A special class of administrators of these funds has grown up and research is dominated by the administrators rather than the persons who pursue ideas.

D. As a result the large institutions, or a few institutions with prestige, get the most of the money in large grants. Smaller institutions, or professors there, get scant encouragement in seeking out new ideas. These large grants are to big and unity percent wasted and equally brilliant Ph. D.'s, who graduated in the same classes, get no support at all. In the meantime a careful analysis of the origins of scientific men who make a mark (Ph. D.'s who finished by 1940 and were outstanding by 1945) shows that they come from these smaller institutions. Of course some argue that all the best men are at the big institutions with prestige but that is not true. Finding jobs for young Ph. D.'s puts more good over at the small institutions because there are only a very few places each year opened at the others.

E. Since social science is concentrated in a few urban institutions and bossed both at the foundations and at the institutions by "public opinion" men, prosaic and important aspects of our life (where real social science needs exist) never get studied. Illustrations among many possible, it is apparent that no institution in the United States pays great attention to the problems of our Appalachian-Ozarkian people, although institutions located in that region do get grants for extraneous things, involving cultures far away (like South America). No institution in our arid West studies the total relations of modern man to arid or semiarid conditions. A biologist will turn naturally to dirty pond water, because the "cultures" he is interested in are found there, but our human ponds do not have public opinion prestige, and are not generally studied. (These statements are not a reflection upon any of the provincial groups in America.)

F. The emphasis upon false empiricism is not only a matter of the biases of the "bosses" or administrators, the biases of the concentrated favored institutions, and the neglect of the provincial and needed problems for study, but it also has led to a malfeasance or injury in method and has harmed the growth of social science.

1. Social science is about 95-percent macroscopically, or broad-scale observational. It is not inevitably less scientific for that reason, as geology and astronomy are not less scientific than zoology or chemistry. The extreme methods of over-luscious empiricism on a few prestige problems is as ridiculous as trying to build a house with the use of a micrometer for each measurement.

2. As a result we overstudy certain aspects of a few problems and never touch the others. As a professor, well renowned for his own social science researches (which have not been supported by the big tax exempt foundations), remarked, "We research ceaselessly upon getting married, but never study what to do about the problems involved in the act over the next 40 or 50 years."

3. We have many persons who can work out correlation coefficients but no one so far has told us what they mean in "causal" analysis. Our social science is increasingly dominated by meticulous clinical procedures and becoming more and more illiterate as to logic and common observation.

4. As a result we are creating a social science merely which is the doctrine of a "cult," read only by a few other social scientists, abstruse to the point of illegibility, valueless for social direction, constantly repeating itself upon immaterial problems, and ending in an aimless existential philosophy. As a prominent European philosopher indicated clearly within the past decade, "modern social science is becoming an aspect of the existential philosophy of decadence." (This is a paraphrased quotation from Nordberto Bobbio, *Existentialism the Philosophy of Decadence*, New York, 1947 (English translation).)

#### QUESTION III

The above analysis leads me to your question 3, which is concerning the desirability of the exclusive training of researchers in the empirical approach. The situation outlined in answers to questions 1 and 2 shows that the over-emphasis upon empirical training and support lead to a division in the social scientists between those who follow abstruse theoretical "systems" and those who follow equally abstruse pointless research. Our abstruse theoretical systems have become increasingly only taxonomic (classifying a society into minute details according to one scheme or the other) and useless repetition. There is little or no integration between theory and research, because they deal with different things. As a result the empiricist has no theoretical foundation for valid conclusions.

To illustrate this, without citing names, one man gathered numerous empirical facts upon the existence and widespread use of small-scale torts within our society and came to the conclusion that torts (he did not use this word because he had only empirical training) should all be classified as crimes. Another group gathered a million facts of the same nature in regard to sex ramification and came to the conclusion that there should be no social control of sex. Both studies were, in the opinion of many thoughtful persons, extremely socially disadvantageous and misinforming and both received tax-exempt support in large sums.

As a result of this I feel that the whole emphasis in training, as dominated by our tax-exempt foundations, should be overhauled. Our research of an empirical nature is so unrelated to theory that it becomes interpreted in extraneous surface philosophies, socially harmful, and of no material meaning. (I can prove this but it would involve me into polemics, and that I consider inadvisable in a public document.)

One of the aspects, and results of this, is the general feeling that social science should have no "aim" nor "utility," but should be a "study for study's sake." "We might discover something which will be good 50 years from now," is a shibboleth of this school. Now cast back to 1900, and tell me what could have been discovered by such an activity then, which could have been valuable in the changed social conditions of today? The idea is ridiculous. Yet this feeling is most prevalent in the groups who have the easiest access to tax-exempt foundation funds. On the other hand, it is fitting with our culture that the activities of men should aim to do some "good" or create some understanding. Directly or indirectly, I imagine these foundations are created by funds from persons who are in the very high brackets of taxation, and the public, in a large sense, supports almost entirely these exaggerated empirical falsities. Now just why should the public contribute to an activity which has no social aim?

I hope these remarks and this evaluation is of use to you. The situation is more serious than most persons think. However, there are all that I care to mention in a public document.

Sincerely,

CARLE C. ZIMMERMAN.

LETTERS OF J. FRED RIPPY, PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, TO THE LATE CONGRESSMAN E. E. COX

(Referred to at pp. 60-62 of pt. 1 of these hearings)

During the course of the hearings, reference was made to letters written by Prof. J. Fred Rippy, professor of American history, the University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. The correspondence referred to follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,  
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,  
Chicago, Ill., August 4, 1951.

Hon. E. E. Cox,  
*United States House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COX: I take the liberty of writing you this note because I was born and educated in your part of the country. I hope a committee of Congress will investigate the foundations in order to determine their influence and whether the National Government should lay down some general principles regarding the manner in which their funds are distributed. Several years ago these funds were usually distributed by some of the major foundations to faculty committees of various major universities and were, in turn, distributed by the faculty committees among such members of the various university faculties as were deemed competent and reliable. More recently this policy has been changed, so that the funds are now likely to be distributed by a central committee at the headquarters of each foundation. This, in my opinion, means a dangerous concentration of power in the hands of a little group of men who either engage in favoritism or fail to secure adequate information regarding the recipients of subsidies. Distribution of funds through widely scattered university faculty committees would guard against these evils and assure a wider measure of equality of opportunity based upon relative merit.

At present and for years to come, scholars in our universities will not be able to do much research on their own because of high prices and heavy taxes. The recipients of these tax-free subsidies from the foundations will therefore have great advantages that will be denied the rest of the university staffs. The favored few will get the promotions and rise to prominence. The others will tend to sink into obscurity and have little influence in the promotion of ideas and culture. Unless the power to distribute these immense foundation funds is decentralized, the little controlling committees and those to whom they award grants and other favors will practically dominate every field of higher education in the United States. Even granting them great wisdom and patriotism, one might still complain against this injury to the great principle of equality of opportunity. But I have never been impressed by the superior wisdom of the foundation heads and executive committees. The heads tend to become arrogant; the members of the committees are, as a rule, far from the ablest scholars in this country.\* \* \*

I make these suggestions: First, examine the methods now employed in distributing these funds and the qualifications and attitudes of the heads and executive committees of the foundations; second, consider the wisdom and prudence of decentralization in the control of these tax-free funds. If you should conclude that it would be wise to force decentralization, consider the possibility of either taxing these foundations, or a number of them, out of existence or compelling them to distribute their funds annually among the best universities and permitting faculty committees in these universities to distribute these funds among the most capable members of the faculties of the recipient universities. In numbers there will be more wisdom and justice. I believe our way of life is based upon the principles of local autonomy and equality of opportunity. I strongly approve those principles and I believe you

do likewise. I should not be surprised if your proposed committee of investigation should discover that concentration of power, favoritism, and inefficient use of funds are the worst evils that may be attributed to the foundations. If they have supported any Communists, such support has probably been unintentional. A little group drawn from restricted areas cannot know the attitude and allegiance of recipients hundreds of miles away who are given grants on the basis of letters of recommendation and perhaps a brief interview. Locally chosen faculty members will know more about applicants from each university than can possibly be learned through casual letters and investigations of little groups far removed from these campuses. Those who govern this Nation and the people who pay heavier taxes because of the exemptions granted these affluent foundations have a right to lay down the general principles for the distribution of their funds and favors.

\* \* \* \* \*  
Very sincerely,

J. FRED RIPPY,  
*Professor of American History.*

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,  
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,  
*Chicago, Ill., November 8, 1952.*

Hon. E. E. Cox,  
*United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COX: Since I wrote you on August 4, 1951, Dr. Abraham Flexner, a man who has had much experience with the foundations, has published a book, entitled "Funds and Foundations," in which he expresses views similar to those contained in my letter. I call your attention to the following pages of Flexner's volume: 84, 92, 94, 124, and 125. Here Dr. Flexner denies that the foundation staffs had the capacity to pass wisely on the numerous projects and individuals for which and to which grants were made and contends that the grants should have been made to universities as contributions to their endowments for research and other purposes. The problem is clearly one of the concentration of power in hands that could not possibly be competent to perform the enormous task which the small staffs had the presumption to undertake. This, says Flexner, was both "pretentious" and "absurd." In my opinion, it was worse than that. The staffs were guilty of favoritism. The small committees who passed on the grants for projects and to individuals were dominated by small coteries connected with certain eastern universities. A Committee on Latin-American Studies, set up in the 1940's, for instance, was filled with Harvard graduates. A single professor of history on the Harvard faculty had the decisive word regarding every request for aid presented by historians.

By granting these subsidies to favorite individuals and favored ideas, the foundations contribute to inequalities in opportunity and interfere with free trade in ideas. They increase the power of favored groups to dominate our colleges and universities. Men whose power exceeds their wisdom, or men who are not guided by the principle of equality of opportunity, could become a menace. If possible, under the terms of our Federal Constitution, these foundations should either be taxed out of existence or compelled to make their grants to colleges and universities, to be distributed by faculty committees of these institutions. Even-handed justice may not prevail even then, because such justice is rarely achieved in human relations. But a greater approximation of even-handed justice will be made because these local committees will have more intimate knowledge of recipients. This, as you know, is the fundamental justification for decentralization of power, for the local autonomy which was so prominent in the thinking of our Founding Fathers.

Very sincerely,

J. FRED RIPPY.

## STATEMENTS OF INDIVIDUALS

STATEMENT BY BERNARD L. GLADIEUX, OF THE FORD FOUNDATION, JULY 8, 1954

The purpose of this statement is to place on record the facts concerning allegations made about me by Congressman Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, on July 27, 1953, in the course of a prepared statement to the House of Representatives supporting H. R. 217 which authorized the current investigation of tax-exempt foundations. Congressman Reece's statement concerning me has been incorporated in the record before this investigating committee in substantially its original form. These allegations, imprecise as they were, generally parallel certain obscure charges originally made in 1950 by Senator George W. Malone, of Nevada, concerning some of my official actions on loyalty and security matters while serving in the Department of Commerce.

I am convinced that both Congressman Reece and Senator Malone have been unwittingly misled by false and malicious innuendoes growing out of the performance of my official duties. As an officer of the Federal Government I held responsible posts of administrative control for over 10 years. It was necessary during this time that I make many decisions concerning personnel, budget, or organization matters which adversely affected the personal interests of particular employees and officials. I am satisfied that these wholly untrue allegations had their origins in such administrative situations.

My statement which follows fully and accurately answers every allegation or inference of Congressman Reece and Senator Malone. Fortunately, most of the cases and subjects discussed herein concern official actions taken by me or by my superiors in the Department of Commerce and are verifiable by reference to Government records and published congressional hearings.

## I. EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND

The Congressional Record of July 27 contains some factual inaccuracies concerning my employment experience. I will therefore summarize my background briefly.

Following graduation from Oberlin College in 1930 I was for 4 years a teacher and later principal of the American School in Japan, an institution established by United States missionary groups in Tokyo. Then, after graduate training in public administration at Syracuse University, I served during 1935-36 as executive secretary of the City Manager League of Toledo, Ohio, my hometown. Thereafter, I entered the employ of Public Administration Service of Chicago, as a governmental consultant with major assignments successively in the State governments of New York, Michigan, and Virginia, and in a number of Federal agencies. These all dealt with reorganization and efficiency projects.

My Federal Government career in a civil-service capacity began at the United States Bureau of the Budget in 1940, where I was first management consultant, then Chief of the War Organization Section. My work there included planning and setting up the new wartime agencies, examining and revising war agency budgets and working on special White House assignments. Early in 1943, I became administrative assistant to the Chairman of the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson. For a short period in 1944 and early 1945 I was associated with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration under Herbert H. Lehman.

In 1945 I became executive assistant to the Secretary of Commerce under circumstances described hereinafter. As a career officer, I remained in that post until 1950, serving under 3 successive Secretaries of Commerce--Henry A. Wallace, W. Averell Harriman, and Charles Sawyer. Here I served as staff director of operations with responsibilities for general management of the Department, including budget control, personnel administration, and reorganization work.

I resigned from the Government in November 1950, when Paul G. Huffman, newly designated president of the Ford Foundation, offered me an attractive position as one of his assistants. It involved substantially more salary than I had been receiving in the civil service and gave promise of opportunities for advancement far beyond what was possible for a career officer in Government. My decision to leave public service was taken strictly on my own initiative and was based solely on my belief that this opportunity was one that I could not afford to pass up in the best interests of my family, as well as myself.

A fuller statement by way of a detailed biography, including a list of my organization affiliations, is attached as a part of this statement.

## II. LOYALTY CLEARANCE

The statement was made by Congressman Reece that no investigation of my loyalty had "ever been requested or made" while in the Federal service. The contrary is the fact.

1. Because of the sensitive nature of my duties in both the Bureau of the Budget and the War Production Board it was necessary that I undergo special investigation for clearance purposes during the war period. I am not fully informed as to the character of these inquiries, but I believe they were extensive. At any rate, I was given the requisite clearance and in both agencies had full access to top-secret information and reports.

2. When W. Averell Harriman became Secretary of Commerce in 1946, one of his early actions was to cause a comprehensive investigation to be conducted by the FBI covering the senior officials of the Department immediately associated with him. These investigations were not initiated as the result of any allegations, but were undertaken simply as a precautionary security measure to assure full protection at the upper echelons of the Department. The results of the FBI inquiry in my case were stated in a memorandum from Secretary Harriman dated August 12, 1947, as follows:

"This memorandum is to place on record the fact that the Department's loyalty review board, after conducting an investigation at my direction, found nothing derogatory in the record of Bernard L. Gladioux which reflects adversely upon him or raises any doubt as to his loyalty. On the contrary, the investigation revealed a constant record of public service of a high order, vouched for by outstanding Government officials.

"I approve the findings of the board, said approval to be placed in Mr. Gladioux's official record."

3. By direction of the Secretary of Commerce in 1948 I served as the official representative and liaison of the Department of Commerce with the Central Intelligence Agency. In this capacity I was authorized to handle top-security information. It was necessary that I be given special clearance for this highly confidential work in which I continued until I left the Government in 1950. I assume that such clearance resulted from the usual reinvestigation concerning loyalty and security required of all those engaged in such work. My service in this capacity is attested in a letter dated November 21, 1950, from Gen. Bedell Smith, then Director of CIA, to the Secretary of Commerce on the occasion of my leaving the Department. An excerpt from his letter follows:

"I should like to take this opportunity to express my keen appreciation of the consistent and highly valuable aid which Mr. Gladioux has rendered the Central Intelligence Agency. His unflinching cooperation has been a great help in solving some of the problems which we have faced during the past 2 years."

4. In 1952 and subsequently I served in a consultant and liaison capacity with the Central Intelligence Agency involving certain highly sensitive matters. Under its security standards I am certain that this Agency would not have initiated this new relationship without further investigation and clearances which gave me access to classified information.

## III. ROLE IN LOYALTY APPEALS

Senator Malone has implied that I nullified adverse loyalty or security decisions without authority and contrary to the interests of the Government. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Here are the facts concerning my relationship to the administration of the loyalty program during my years in Commerce:

In June 1948 I was formally directed by Secretary Sawyer, in addition to my other duties, to serve as his special representative in hearing all appeals from adverse decisions of the Department's loyalty board. This appeals procedure was required by the provisions of Executive Order 9835. In fulfillment of this duty, I heard on appeal a substantial number of loyalty cases. The procedure was to consider carefully the decisions of the loyalty board against the employee, to screen and evaluate the FBI reports, to hold hearings at which the defendant and his legal counsel appeared, and then to write a formal report and recommendation to the Secretary.

Though 2 of the 3 members of our loyalty board were administrative subordinates of mine, we scrupulously observed our respective functions and proper relations in matters concerning loyalty appeals. Contrary to an inference by Senator Malone in the Lee case that I might have influenced the loyalty board's



original clearance of him I followed a fixed policy of not discussing the substance of this or any other case with loyalty board members during the time they were under adjudication.

Several months after assuming this appellate responsibility the burden of cases became so heavy, when coupled with my other duties, that I obtained the Secretary's approval for the designation of the Director of the Field Service of the Department to serve as my associate in reviewing these cases and to act as joint presiding officer with me at the formal hearings. At my request the Solicitor of the Department and the Deputy Director of Personnel, who was in charge of personnel security, also sat with me in the hearings on these cases. While the responsibility was basically mine, I counseled with these associates closely, and we invariably agreed on the recommendation to be submitted to the Secretary.

In making these recommendations on loyalty cases to the Secretary I exercised my best judgment, keeping in mind the paramount interest of Government security. It should be understood that during this period, under the terms of Executive Order 9835, an employee could be separated on disloyalty charges only if there existed "reasonable grounds" for a finding of present disloyalty. This required a more positive finding and represented a policy more favorable to the employee than the "reasonable doubt" standard which later became effective in 1951. Obviously, some cases which were favorably decided in 1949 or 1950 under the "reasonable grounds" standard might have been given an adverse decision in 1951 when the "reasonable doubt" standard was instituted.

The standards of evidence required by due process of law were in no way called for in these proceedings. Nevertheless a finding of "present disloyalty" under the "reasonable grounds" language of Executive Order 9835 necessarily required some basis in tangible and credible information clearly adverse to the defendant. This became a matter of judgment on the part of the reviewer, since there could be no precise criteria for determining the weight of the evidence normally available in connection with these cases. While governed by the provisions of Executive Order 9835, I nevertheless felt it incumbent upon me to determine questionable or borderline cases in favor of the Government—even during that period when a more positive preponderance of evidence was required for a disloyalty finding. This policy did not at the same time prevent me from dealing with these cases in a manner fair and equitable to the employees concerned. All my findings and recommendations as to these appealed loyalty cases are a matter of record, and even with the advantage of hindsight I stand by my decisions.

Regardless of final decision in the Department, all loyalty cases during the period under discussion were subject to further appeal to or audit by the President's Loyalty Review Board—the final authority. During my service in the Department of Commerce, no decision made by the Secretary pursuant to my recommendation, either for or against the loyalty of any individual, was overruled or reversed on subsequent appeal to or audit by the Loyalty Review Board.

The policy and attitude of the Department in connection with these loyalty cases were perhaps best stated by Secretary Sawyer in a hearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 21, 1950:

"In every case we have made a prompt investigation of any information which came to us that would even justify an investigation, whether it would indicate disloyalty or not. \* \* \*

"\* \* \* as far as any dereliction in pursuing disloyal persons or any willingness to defend them or protect them, there is not one word of truth in any such claim. \* \* \*"

In addition to scrupulous administration of the loyalty program, the Department, under my supervision, inaugurated its own special personnel security program in 1948. This program exceeded the requirements and standards of the loyalty program and resulted in the elimination of many dubious employees who were otherwise cleared under the official criteria established for loyalty.

#### IV. THE REMINGTON CASE

Senator Malone accused me of "violently defending" William Remington about whose loyalty case there was much public comment in the period 1948-50. Congressman Reece stated furthermore that I had engaged in "social contacts" with Remington. Both of these statements and other innuendoes about my part in this case are completely false. The facts are these:

I had nothing to do with the selection or recruitment of Remington as a staff member of the Department of Commerce in March 1948. As a matter of fact,

I met him for the first time only after his case became the subject of congressional investigation. Though we now know as a result of public disclosures that Remington was the subject of FBI information received in late 1945 linking him to an espionage ring, I did not know nor was I personally informed of this fact until some time in June 1948. I am also confident that Secretary Harriman was not alerted or otherwise informed about these suspicions and allegations during his incumbency in Commerce. In fact a check by the Department with the central investigative index maintained by the Civil Service Commission for the entire Government revealed no derogatory evidence about Remington as late as May 1948.

To my knowledge Secretary Sawyer and Under Secretary Foster were first alerted by a communication dated May 11, 1948, from Attorney General Clark to the effect that Remington was under FBI investigation on charges of espionage. Following receipt and review of this FBI report in June, Secretary Sawyer immediately placed Remington on inactive duty status. In July, after the facts became more fully known to us and pending adjudication of his loyalty case, I arranged for Remington's formal suspension from the Department of Commerce.

On August 5, 1948, as spokesman for the Department, I appeared before the Senate Investigating Committee, Senator Homer Ferguson serving as chairman, to describe the circumstances leading to this suspension and to assure the committee that we were exercising proper vigilance in such cases as soon as we were given an FBI alert. I was interrogated on this occasion as to why the Department of Commerce was not advised by the FBI or the Department of Justice that Remington had been under investigation since 1945 and could only reply that I assumed the FBI had its own reasons for keeping Remington under surveillance without general disclosure of this fact.

The matter of Remington's loyalty was never under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, and I, therefore, had no part in the decisions concerning this matter. The adjudication of this case was the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission according to the loyalty regulations existing at the time.

In the fall of 1948 the Regional Loyalty Board of the Civil Service Commission found Remington disloyal. On appeal the President's Loyalty Review Board in February 1949 overruled this adverse decision and declared there was no reasonable grounds for believing Remington disloyal. The Board thereupon ordered the Commerce Department to reinstate him in his former position and to his former status. It was my responsibility to carry out this order on behalf of the Secretary. I took the precaution of placing security restrictions on Remington and located him in a nonsensitive position in his former organization, the Office of International Trade, with duties completely unrelated to his former responsibilities. In July 1949 I took further steps to minimize his duties and reduce him in civil-service grade, since his usefulness was now greatly limited.

The Remington case illustrates the earlier difficulties and uncertainties surrounding the handling of security cases following clearance on loyalty grounds. In 1949 there was no clear legal authority and no civil-service standards or procedures for the dismissal of those considered to be of dubious security as this term is now being used. Actually, it was not until about August 1950 that the Congress enacted legislation, which had been initiated by the Department, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to effect security dismissals in his discretion and without regard to civil-service regulations. Had we been vested with such authority earlier Remington's case could have been disposed of with dispatch in 1949.

A year or more after Remington's reinstatement new derogatory information, which eventually formed the basis for his indictment, was developed on him by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I requested a transcript of this information, in a letter from me to Chairman John S. Wood dated May 5, 1950, and obtained it from the committee. After review of this new information and consideration of the entire case, Secretary Sawyer decided Remington must somehow be removed from the Government. After discussion with me, and with the Secretary's concurrence, I called Remington and his attorney into my office on May 26, 1950, and, with the Director of Personnel Operations as a witness, demanded his resignation. (The forced resignation technique was much simpler, if successful, than the slow and uncertain civil-service separation procedures in the absence of the summary dismissal authority referred to above.) Remington refused. Accordingly, I then signed and filed formal charges for his dismissal in a letter from me to him dated June 5, 1950. Thereupon, a few days later, Remington resigned from the Department.

The first time I ever met or even saw Remington or had any relationship with him was after his suspension in 1948, when he came to my office in connection with some aspect of this action. My subsequent relations were also strictly official, and I never met him outside my office. I certainly had no social contacts with him at any time or had any personal interest in his case; nor have I ever defended his character or conduct before congressional committees or otherwise. This was an involved case to handle in view of Remington's civil-service rights under the Veteran's Preference Act and his loyalty clearance by the Loyalty Review Board. It properly fell to me to handle in view of my position.

#### V. THE LEE CASE

Congressman Reece claimed that I had "social contacts" with Michael E. Lee about whose loyalty case there also was much public comment at the time. Senator Malone stated that I nullified adverse decisions regarding Lee, accused me of "violently defending" him and made other insinuations concerning my role in this matter. The record shows that these allegations are false and have no foundation in fact.

My first contact with the Lee case was to initiate the Department's original request for a full-scale FBI investigation of this employee as follows: Sometime in October 1948 I recall the Department's Chief Investigations Officer bringing to me an unidentified statement, which he had in turn received from a staff member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, citing Lee's background and raising questions as to his character and suitability. I believed this information, though sketchy, warranted inquiry and accordingly directed the investigations officer to turn it over to the FBI.

A few weeks later I received further information about Lee from a reliable private source. This information in particular, and when coupled with that received earlier, disturbed me in view of Lee's sensitive position in our Office of International Trade since it raised in my mind serious question as to his loyalty or at least his security status. Accordingly, on this occasion sometime in November 1948 on my own responsibility I directed our investigations officer to make a formal request to the FBI for a full-scale investigation. Shortly thereafter the assigned FBI agent came to see me, and I informed him of my information and its source.

This all led to the submission some months later of a comprehensive FBI report on Lee which was turned over to our loyalty board. At no time in all the subsequent consideration of Lee's case, however, did I myself have any part in adjudicating its loyalty aspects.

After the usual process of charges and hearings the Department's loyalty board in July 1949 made a favorable decision as to Lee's loyalty—a decision confirmed by the Loyalty Review Board on audit. However, while clearing him on loyalty charges the Department's board recommended that careful study be given Lee's fitness for holding a sensitive position in which he would have access to classified materials. This recommendation came to me in accordance with normal procedure. Since Secretary Sawyer was by now fully familiar with the facts concerning Lee, and in view of the nature of this particular case, I referred the matter to him. He informed me that he had decided no security restrictions should be imposed on Lee, and I so advised our personnel office in a memorandum dated August 8, 1949. I believe the Secretary again reviewed the matter of Lee's security status in February 1950 and found no reason to reverse his earlier decision.

Subsequently further information from the FBI came to the attention of the Department causing our loyalty board to file new loyalty charges against Lee in March 1950. This led to an adverse finding against Lee in September 1950. Secretary Sawyer personally assumed jurisdiction over the appeal submitted by Lee since again he alone could make a decision in a case of such public interest. In November 1950 the Secretary overruled the loyalty board and cleared Lee of disloyalty charges. The Secretary reached his own decision, and I did not advise on it this all taking place in the period when I was preparing to leave Government.

My connection with the Lee case principally dealt with the pressing of charges concerning his administrative capacity. He was a constant source of personnel problems because of his failure to exert proper direction of his staff in the Far Eastern Division, Office of International Trade. Several administrative actions were brought against Lee, the course of these paralleling the separate loyalty proceedings during 1950. After a series of charges and countercharges involving

Lee and his associates in the Office of International Trade and in consideration of all the facts in the totality of this case Secretary Sawyer came to the decision that steps must be taken to remove Lee from the Department. Accordingly, after discussion with me and with his approval, I called Lee into my office on May 26, 1950, and, with the Director of Personnel of the Department as a witness, demanded his resignation from the Department. (Here again we were handicapped in dealing with such cases by the absence of summary dismissal authority.) Lee refused to resign, he said, until he had been given loyalty clearance by the Secretary. On June 1, I again demanded Lee's resignation. When he again refused, I signed and issued formal charges on administrative grounds for his dismissal from the Federal service in a letter to him under date of June 1, 1950. I filed additional charges on July 17. The required civil service hearing on these several charges was never held, because of Lee's certified illness. These charges, however, later facilitated his forced resignation.

When Secretary Sawyer advised Lee of his final clearance on loyalty charges in November 1950, I believe that the Secretary then threatened to use his recently enacted summary dismissal powers unless Lee resigned. Having been finally cleared on loyalty grounds, he resigned at last from the Government.

I had nothing to do with Lee's entrance into Government employment and had no dealings of any kind with him until it was necessary that he see me in my office on various occasions in connection with his case. My relationships were strictly official and in line of duty. I had no personal interest in him and certainly at no time engaged in social contacts with him.

Senator Malone has repeatedly stated that I appeared before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and defended Lee in 1950. This is simply contrary to fact. I never appeared before this committee in connection with the Lee case, as the record of this particular hearing will show, and at no time before this or any other committee did I undertake to defend Lee's character or conduct.

As to Congressman Reece's reference to the fact that I never appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to answer Senator Malone's charges about me in connection with the Lee matter, I should like to point out I was never requested to appear before this committee as were some other officials of the Department of Commerce. Lee was the one being investigated by the committee under Senate Resolution 230—not I. Furthermore, Under Secretary Whitney's authoritative statement, when testifying before this committee on March 30, 1950, made the circumstances of Lee's security clearance, which were at issue, quite clear.

This was another highly complicated case in civil-service terms and much confusion surrounded its course. Many differences of opinion were expressed at different stages as between those familiar with the case. I believed then as I do now that the decision of Secretary Sawyer to separate him was justified and proper.

#### VI. RELATIONSHIPS WITH HARRY S. MAGDOFF

Congressman Reece on July 27, 1953, stated that he had been advised by a reliable and responsible source that I had engaged in social contacts not only with Remington and Lee, but also with Harry S. Magdoff, who was a subordinate staff member in the Office of Program Planning for about a year during the time I was in the Department of Commerce.

I have never at any time engaged in personal social relations with Magdoff by any stretch of that term as it is universally understood. I have searched my memory and believe the only association with Magdoff which could conceivably be twisted into alleged social contact concerns my presence on 1 or 2 occasions as an invited guest, because of my official position, at a staff luncheon held by the Office of Program Planning at which Magdoff was also present along with the other employees of this unit. I also remember noting his presence at a local group meeting of the League for Women Voters back during this period. But there was no basis of mutuality for social relationships, and I simply didn't associate with him outside the office—in fact, I didn't know him very well even there.

I had nothing to do with Magdoff's employment in the Government and did not meet him until this time (1945 or 1946). He was not under my direction and my official contacts with him in Commerce were not extensive, though I saw him in line of duty now and then. I have not seen him since Commerce days.

Subsequent to Magdoff's resignation from the Department in December 1946, information from the FBI about him came to my attention. In accordance with our established procedure, his name was flagged in our Personnel Office for purposes of blocking reemployment in the future. This was the first that I was aware of the fact that he was considered a "suspect" person. I did not know that he had been the subject of FBI inquiry and comment as early as 1945 until recent public disclosures. I am certain that neither Secretary Hariman nor Under Secretary Foster were likewise made aware of the existence of this adverse information about Magdoff until after his resignation from the Department.

#### VII. RELATIONSHIP WITH PHILIP M. HAUSER

Congressman Reece claimed that I also engaged in social contacts with Dr. Hauser and drew an unfavorable inference from this relationship. I considered Dr. Hauser, who was for 2 or 3 years Chief of the Office of Program Planning in the Office of the Secretary, a respected associate. I came to know him well in the office and had a high regard for his capabilities. I was familiar with the facts involved in his FBI report. More importantly, I was aware that he had been given full loyalty and security clearance following review by the Department's loyalty board. He enjoyed the confidence of successive Secretaries of Commerce and I likewise have had no reason at any time to question his loyalty or his security. (Incidentally, as I recall it, Dr. Hauser's case principally involved allegations concerning other members of his family as well as a matter of confused identities.)

#### VIII. RELATIONSHIP WITH HENRY A. WALLACE

Senator Malone has claimed that I was a protege of Henry A. Wallace, former Vice President. This statement, with its derogatory insinuation, has been repeated by Congressman Reece.

I have been no man's protege.

I was originally recommended to Mr. Wallace in 1945, when he became Secretary of Commerce, by Harold D. Smith, Director of the United States Bureau of the Budget. I had met Mr. Wallace a few times earlier in connection with my duties at the Budget Bureau, when I was assigned to assist in establishing the new Board of Economic Warfare of which he was Chairman. But I knew him only slightly before 1945; I had not been associated with him in the Department of Agriculture at any time.

As his executive assistant at Commerce for about a year and a half I was concerned exclusively with the internal operations of the Department and never played any part in any of Mr. Wallace's political speechmaking or other political activities. I did not approve of his 1948 campaign for the Presidency and have had practically no contact with him since 1946. On 2 or 3 occasions in that time he has phoned me to inquire as to my recollection concerning factual matters relating to his incumbency as Secretary of Commerce, and I have had 2 chance encounters with him since coming to reside in the New York area in 1951.

#### IX. CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

Reference was made in the July 27, 1953 Congressional Record to my appearance before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on February 27, 1950. This hearing was called to inquire into the policies and practices of the Department of Commerce regarding loyalty and security. As the officer in general charge of administration, including security matters, it was my function to serve as official spokesman.

I presented to the committee facts and statistics which outlined the "tough, but fair" policy we had adopted. In addition to advising them as to the substantial number of employees already released on loyalty grounds, I explained that on our own initiative we had extended the program beyond the requirements of Executive Order 9835 to provide for the designation of security risks and for dismissals on security grounds wherever this was feasible. More specifically I was able to report that as of February 21, 1950, a total of 71 Commerce employees had been dismissed or otherwise separated on loyalty or security grounds as a consequence of our departmental action following the receipt and consideration of adverse FBI information submitted pursuant to the new loyalty program.

I explained the legal and civil-service difficulties we were encountering in dealing with security cases which had been cleared on loyalty grounds and indicated that the Department needed, and was seeking, legislative authority which would

empower the Secretary to dismiss dubious employees in his discretion without reference to the usual civil-service procedures. There is reason to believe that my testimony on this occasion helped obtain this summary authority as a rider to our pending appropriation bill.

In spite of the above record of the Department, some of the committee members protested at my refusal to reveal certain information concerning individual cases and claimed I was not cooperative with them. I was obliged to explain repeatedly that I was under specific instructions from the White House, reinforced by instructions from the Secretary of Commerce, to reveal nothing but broad statistics and general policies and to refrain from comment on, or information about, specific loyalty cases. (Incidentally, President Truman's Executive order prohibiting the release of loyalty information to congressional committees has not been rescinded by President Eisenhower, and it continues in full force and effect.) The committee was adamant in its attitude, however, and insisted that I discuss specifics. Since under the terms of my instructions I could not accede to this demand, some committee members were obviously not completely satisfied.

## X

In conclusion, I wish to state that, like any other loyal American, I deeply resent these false and malicious insinuations. I am proud of my career in the public service. I have nothing to conceal. I will stand by the record of my official actions and decisions.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

*County of New York, ss:*

Bernard L. Gladieux, being duly sworn on his oath, deposes and says that he is the person who subscribed his name to the foregoing statement and that the matters and facts set forth in said statement are true.

(Signed) BERNARD L. GLADIEUX.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13th day of July 1954.

(Signed) JANICE B. LA VINE,  
*Notary Public, State of New York.*

Term expires March 30, 1955.

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT OF BERNARD L. GLADIEUX, OF THE FORD FOUNDATION,  
JULY 7, 1954

BIRTH, FAMILY, RESIDENCE

My name is Bernard Louis Gladieux. I was born April 12, 1907, in Toledo, Ohio.

My father, Victor Modest Gladieux, resides in Toledo at 724 Utah Street where, together with my mother until her recent death, they lived for almost 50 years. He is of French-Irish descent, his paternal ancestors migrating to this country from Alsace, France, about 1832. Until his retirement a few years ago, my father was employed by the City Water Department of Toledo. My mother, Anna Cook Gladieux, was of English descent and a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I married Persis Emma Skilliter, also of Toledo, in June 1930. We have 4 sons: Bernard, Jr., age 17; Russell, 14; Larry, 10; and Jay 7. My family and I now live at 3 Walworth Avenue, Scarsdale, N. Y.

EDUCATION

I attended Navarre School, a Toledo public school, through the eighth grade and was graduated from Waite High School of Toledo in 1926. In high school I participated in athletics and during my senior year was president of the student council, president of the Hi-Y Club, and a class officer. I attended and later joined Trinity Episcopal Church at this time.

In the summer of 1926, following graduation from high school, I was selected as 1 of 3 youth representatives from Ohio to attend the first world conference of YMCA's in Helsingfors, Finland.

I entered Oberlin College in the fall of 1926 and received an A. B. degree in 1930. My major course of study was American history. At Oberlin I partici-

pated in athletics and was president of the college YMCA, a member of the men's senate (student governing body), and a founder of the Outing Club. In my senior year I was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

During the summer of 1929, while still at Oberlin, I received a fellowship covering travel in Europe and study at the Zimmern School of International Studies, at Geneva, Switzerland.

In 1934, I took graduate training in public administration at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University. Later, following submission of a thesis, I was awarded a master of arts degree in public administration.

#### CAREER

##### *1930-34—American School in Japan: Teacher and principal*

Upon graduation from Oberlin in 1930, I accepted a position as teacher in the high-school department of the American School in Japan, located in Tokyo. This private school was established by United States missionary groups to educate the American and other English-speaking children of the foreign resident communities in Tokyo and Yokohama. My principal teaching assignments were American history and government, European history and physics; I also coached the school's athletic teams. Mrs. Gladieux taught in the elementary department of the school.

In 1933 I was appointed principal of the school by its board of trustees, a position that I agreed to hold for 1 year since I had already delayed my planned return to the United States. As principal I was responsible not only for academic administration, but for the business management of the institution as well.

##### *1934-35—Graduate work at Syracuse University*

Upon returning from Japan in the summer of 1934 I entered graduate school at Syracuse University intending to train for and eventually enter public service. This course of training was interrupted early in 1935, when I was invited by a group of civil leaders in Toledo to become executive secretary of the City Manager League.

##### *1935-36—City Manager League of Toledo, Ohio: Executive secretary*

This civic organization was dedicated to revamping and modernizing the municipal government of Toledo. I was responsible for planning and directing its work. The league successfully sponsored a new city charter, electing a majority of the new city council, and instituted a number of improvements in municipal management and city finances.

Upon completion of this program of municipal reform early in 1936, I returned briefly to Syracuse University in order to complete my course work in public administration.

##### *1936—Regents' education inquiry: Research associate*

In April 1936 I became research associate on the staff of the regents' inquiry into the character and cost of public education in the State of New York. Here I conducted field surveys covering the administrative organization and business management practices of 15 New York State school districts, derived and analyzed data on unit costs of education, and assisted in designing the improved budgeting, accounting, and other administrative practices recommended in the published reports of this inquiry.

##### *1936-40—Public Administration Service: Management consultant*

I had been associated with Public Administration Service during the course of the regents' inquiry and at the conclusion of this work was invited to join its permanent staff. Public Administration Service is a nonprofit corporation, with headquarters in Chicago. It provides technical consultant services on a contract basis to Federal, State, and local governments.

From December 1936 to June 1937 I assisted in preparing and executing plans for the reorganization of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, including consolidation of the functions of the temporary emergency relief administration. I was also responsible for designing a system of district offices and for preparing and presenting a budget to the Governor's office for the reorganized department.

During this same period I developed and taught a course on "The Organization and Administration of Public Education" to the graduate class in public administration at Syracuse University.

From July 1937 to March 1938 I was engaged on a project initiated by the Governor of Michigan, Frank Murphy, the purpose of which was to develop an improved system of financial administration for the State government. I was specifically concerned with formulating and installing revised budgetary procedures to control State expenditures more effectively.

I was next assigned to the Federal Social Security Board where I developed and installed revised plans of administrative organization and procedures for the Bureau of Old Age Assistance. This program included simplified administrative methods, more economical procedures for adjudicating and paying insurance benefits, and plans for decentralizing operations to the field.

As consultant to the Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, Nathan Straus, from October 1938 to February 1939, I was charged with the development and installation of a revised plan of organization for this public housing agency. I recommended a number of basic changes in both line and staff functions and upon approval of these by the Administrator, prepared the necessary implementing orders. I also supervised the preparation of special reports on financial administration and personnel practices.

I was next invited to serve as consultant to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor which was having considerable program and management trouble administering the Fair Labor Standards Act. I was able to institute several organizational and procedural changes including the development of a revised plan of regional administration. Later, when in the Bureau of the Budget, I was requested to continue my work here, under Budget Bureau auspices now, however, since the situation was of concern to the White House. Major personnel and program changes became necessary.

Harold D. Smith, newly appointed Director of the United States Bureau of the Budget arranged with Public Administration Service to use my services during the period from June 1939 to March 1940. Here I carried out a number of special assignments: (1) Served as adviser to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency in the developmental stages of this new agency; (2) supervised a survey of the organization and administration of the Bituminous Coal Division at the request of the Secretary of the Interior; (3) advised the Secretary of Labor on the continuing problems of administering the Fair Labor Standards Act.

While working in the Bureau as above, I also carried on various activities for my employer, Public Administration Service. Thus, I gave general supervision to a survey of the administration of Virginia State welfare services undertaken at the request of Governor Price. Recommendations were submitted for legislative action and for the internal organization of the department of welfare. I also developed a plan of administrative organization and formulated an operations budget for the newly established New York State Division of Housing.

#### *1940-43—United States Bureau of the Budget: Chief, War Organization Section*

In March 1940, I resigned from Public Administration Service to accept a full-time position as chief investigator with the Budget Bureau. At about the same time I filed application for open competitive civil-service examinations to qualify for budget examiner and management analyst. I was given a sufficiently high rating on these examinations to permit my appointment shortly thereafter as Chief Budget Examiner with full civil-service status.

When President Roosevelt established the National Defense Advisory Commission in June 1940, I was designated as the representative of the Budget Bureau in observing its operations, maintaining liaison between it and the Bureau and advising on management problems.

As the defense effort merged into preparation for all-out war, I was placed in charge of a special staff within the Budget Bureau into which were centered all new activities dealing with the war effort. My staff and I were responsible for planning the development and establishment of the new war agencies, submitting proposals through the Budget Director to the President. Thus during 1941 and 1942, I prepared or supervised the preparation of and cleared and negotiated the Executive orders which the President signed establishing, defining the functions of, and delegating powers to: the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Strategic Services, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Office of War Information, the Office of Defense Transportation, and others.

My group continued working with these emergency agencies after they were created by helping with their organization and staffing problems. All budget requests were reviewed, revised, and approved by my staff in the Budget Bureau.



As the war organization evolved our principal function came to be to exercise a continuous surveillance over the war agencies on behalf of the Executive Office of the President, in order that program gaps, jurisdictional conflicts, organizational and leadership breakdowns might be detected, reported, and acted upon by the Budget Director or President before serious damage was done. Programs and operations were continuously being evaluated for their contributions to the war effort. Frequently changes in personnel, program policy, and basic organization were recommended to the Budget Director for submission to the President.

During this time I was also frequently on special assignment to the White House working with Judge Samuel I. Rosenman. Judge Rosenman was then serving as special assistant to the President helping to resolve many of the difficult situations arising from the unusual pressures, tensions, and personalities of wartime Washington. I assisted him in working out proposals for the President concerning the assignment of major war powers as between competing administrators and in developing organizational plans and mechanisms for coordination of war policies at the White House level.

*1943-44—War Production Board; Administrative Assistant to Chairman*

In January 1943 I was invited by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, to become his chief administrative assistant. In this capacity I served as Mr. Nelson's principal adviser and assistant in the administration of the War Production Board.

I was directly responsible for organization planning, budget and fiscal administration, personnel management, business services, and operating procedures for the entire Board. Five divisions covering these activities were under my direction. I was also Chairman of the Administrative Council.

Much of my time at WPB was devoted to adjusting its organization to meet new program needs arising from the war particularly with regard to plans for the Normandy invasion. I was also engaged in directing an effort to streamline the agency and reduce its excessive staff. By a process of freezing recruitment, consolidating functions, reducing budgets, and generally tightening up, we were able to report to the House Appropriations Committee in April 1944 that the 1944 appropriation of approximately \$89 million had been reduced to \$69 million for fiscal 1945. In personnel terms I was able to report that the total WPB staff of 22,000 in January 1943 had been reduced to 17,500 by March 1944.

*1944-45—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration*

In August 1944 I accepted an invitation to join the staff of the newly formed United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. My first task was to make some surveys toward improving certain management and fiscal aspects of the organization. Then Herbert Lehman, Director General of UNRRA requested and urged me to serve as Deputy Director of the Bureau of Areas, which was responsible for all relief operations abroad. I was informed that the program was being seriously impaired because of poor direction of this Bureau by its Chief, Michail A. Menshikov, a Soviet national. I accepted this post with reluctance, and only because I considered it a matter of duty; then was requested to initiate and expedite the work in liberated areas of Europe and the Far East. I was able to make some progress and improvements in the situation, reporting directly to Governor Lehman on critical decisions such as the formation of country missions.

At the end of 3 months, however, I asked Governor Lehman to be relieved of this assignment since I saw no hope of achieving the degree of improvement the situation called for as long as the obstructionist and dilatory tactics of the Director of the Bureau of Areas continued. The international political situation apparently did not permit the removal of this senior representative of the Soviet Union at that time. I was permitted to withdraw in accordance with the agreement made when I originally consented to take on the task.

During most of the remainder of my time in UNRRA I served as Assistant and Acting Director of the Bureau of Finance and Administration.

*1945-50—United States Department of Commerce; Executive Assistant to the Secretary*

In March 1945 I received an offer from Henry A. Wallace, newly designated Secretary of Commerce, to serve as his Executive Assistant. I left UNRRA to accept this post for which I had been recommended by Harold D. Smith, my former chief in the Bureau of the Budget. I continued in this position under Secretaries W. Averell Harriman and Charles Sawyer until November 1950.

The following excerpt from my official position description indicates the scope of my duties during my tenure in the Department of Commerce:

"As the Secretary's principal career assistant and staff director of operations for the entire Department, the incumbent of this position provides overall direction, guidance, and coordination in the Secretary's behalf and pursuant to his general policies for all programs of the Department, to obtain optimum efficiency, economy, and effectiveness in the administration of the affairs of the Department and its constituent bureaus."

My principal effort during my 6 years in this large and diverse Department was to work toward its revived importance following the neglect of the war years and to help make it of more dynamic and efficient service to the business and industrial community. Much of my work centered around the \$1 billion annual budget: its development, approval, adjustment, and control. Budget requests and new programs were subject to my approval on behalf of the Secretary before submission to the Budget Bureau or to congressional committees.

Another activity which took considerable of my personal time was the work incident to the Hoover Commission. I was designated by the Secretary as the official liaison and representative of the Department in regard to this Commission while it was formulating its recommendations. Subsequently, during the period of implementation and installation, it was my responsibility to work out the transfers of functions and agencies and to assure their smooth integration into the Department's structure.

In addition to these duties, I was responsible for personnel management in the Department covering some 55,000 employees. With the inauguration of the loyalty program in 1948, the Secretary of Commerce designated me as his representative in hearing appeals from cases determined adversely by our Loyalty Board under Executive Order 9835. This, together with the related security program, came to demand an increasing amount of my official time. I also served as the central liaison and representative of the Department in relation to the Central Intelligence Agency.

NOTE.—During my years of service in the United States Government, I invariably and without exception received civil service efficiency ratings of "excellent" from my various superiors.

#### *1950 to date—Ford Foundation*

In November 1950 Paul G. Hoffman, newly designated president of the Ford Foundation, invited me to become associated with him as assistant to the president. I accepted, as this offered me challenging work at an attractive salary with good prospects for higher advancement than a career officer could expect in the Government. During Mr. Hoffman's incumbency I served as chief of the New York office of the foundation in which were centered the operational activities of the organization.

#### GENERAL PROFESSIONAL

Following the election of President Eisenhower in 1952 I was requested to serve as a consultant to the committee headed by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller dealing with reorganization of the Federal Government. I assisted the committee in developing its plans and in outlining some of the principal management, organization and civil-service problems which would confront the new administration (temporary assignment).

During the recent school year, in association with Prof. Arthur MacMahon, I conducted a graduate seminar on the subject American Political Institutions for the department of public law and government at Columbia University.

At Oberlin on October 31, 1953, I was awarded an alumni citation "in recognition of outstanding achievements and services which reflect honor upon Oberlin College."

My writings have all been in the field of public administration. The following articles of mine have been published:

1. "Administrative Planning in the Federal Government," *Advanced Management* 1940
2. "Top Management in the War Agencies," graduate school, Department of Agriculture, 1949
3. "Civil Service versus Merit," *Public Administration Review* 1952
4. "Civil Service at the Crossroads," *Good Government* 1953.

## MEMBERSHIPS AND AFFILIATIONS

In the political sphere I consider myself an independent. Since coming of voting age I have been registered at different times both as a Democrat and as a Republican and have contributed funds to both parties dependent on my convictions at the time.

My other affiliations have been largely limited to religious, professional, or social organizations in which I have had a direct and tangible interest.

During our 4 years residence in Japan Mrs. Gladieux and I were members of Tokyo Community Church. During our residence in Maryland, my wife and I helped establish and attended a community church—Pilgrim Lutheran Church—though we are not Lutherans ourselves. Since resident in Scarsdale, N. Y., my wife and I have joined Hitchcock Memorial Presbyterian Church.

I have searched my memory and my records going back to the 1935 period when I reestablished myself in Toledo following residence in Japan and to the very best of my knowledge and recollection, the following constitutes a comprehensive list of my organizational memberships and affiliations during this period. National Municipal League, 1936-40, approximately.

International City Manager's Association, 1936-40, approximately.

Governmental Research Association, 1936-39, approximately.

Ys Men's Club, YMCA, of Toledo, Ohio, 1935-36.

American Society of Public Administration (charter member), 1938 to date.

Group Health Association of Washington, D. C., member board of directors, 1944-47, approximately.

Kenwood Golf and Country Club, Chevy Chase, Md., 1946-50.

YMCA of Washington, D. C., 1945-47.

Advisory Council on Public Administration of the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture, 1945-46, approximately.

Potomac Appalachian Trail Club, 1946-48.

Appalachian Mountain Club, 1946-48.

Oberlin Alumni Club of Washington, D. C., president, 1946-48.

Alumni Board of Oberlin College, treasurer, 1945-48.

Board of managers of the YMCA schools of New York City, 1951 to date.

Planning committee of Board of Education of Scarsdale, New York, 1952.

Town Club of Scarsdale, New York, 1953 to date.

Men's Club of Hitchcock Memorial Church, 1951 to date.

Greenacres Association (neighborhood association in Scarsdale) 1951 to date.

Advisory council of the department of politics, Princeton University, 1953, to date.

Advisory group, Japan International Christian University, 1953 to date.

Various parent-teacher's associations.

Though it represented a completely futile exercise, I have carefully reviewed the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, as well as the broader Guide to Subversive Organizations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I can say without reservation that I am not now and never have been a member of any such listed organization, nor have I otherwise been associated or affiliated in any way therewith. I can make the same statement on behalf of my wife.

Furthermore, I should like to state for the record and under oath that I am not now nor ever have been a member of the Communist Party or any of its affiliates or sympathetic in any way with its objectives or doctrines.

Bernard L. Gladieux being duly sworn on his oath deposes and says that he is the person who subscribed his name to the foregoing biographical statement and that the matters and facts set forth in said biographical statement are true.

(Signed) BERNARD L. GLADIEUX.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13th day of July 1954.

(Signed) JANICE B. LAVINE,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

Term expires March 30, 1955.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH H. WILLITS IN REPLY TO INQUIRY OF GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS DATED AUGUST 4, 1954

My name is Joseph H. Willits. My residence address is North Greenwich Road, Armonk, N. Y. I was director of the division of social sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1939 until my retirement on June 30, 1954, in accordance with the bylaws of the foundation.

This statement is made in response to a letter which I have received from Mr. Rene A. Wormser, general counsel of the committee, dated August 4, 1954, containing the following paragraphs:

"It is my understanding that following the statements made by Mr. Kohlberg regarding the Institute of Pacific Relations you agreed, on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation, to have his charges investigated. However, at a later date you informed Mr. Kohlberg that no such investigation was to be made, explaining this seeming reversal by a statement to the effect that the Institute of Pacific Relations was undertaking an investigation of its own.

"The chairman has asked me to take this matter up with you and I would appreciate your advising me as soon as you conveniently can whether the above statement is an accurate résumé of what took place."

The above statement is not an accurate résumé of what took place.

The statement that I "agreed, on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation, to have his (Mr. Kohlberg's) charges investigated" appears to be based upon testimony given before the special committee by Dr. Kenneth Colegrove on June 8, 1954. This witness testified that he could not understand, "when Alfred Kohlberg was able to get the consent of one of the very high officers in the Rockefeller Foundation, why the foundation would not make an investigation of the IPR. \* \* \* We ought to have the whole story of why the Rockefeller Foundation failed to make the investigation in 1945" (transcript, p. 1235). The chairman later asked: "To whom was Kohlberg's request for an investigation made, Professor?" Dr. Colegrove answered:

"It was made to Fred Willetts, an official of the Rockefeller Foundation, one of the outstanding men, a man of great integrity and a man of competence and scholarship. I have great respect for Fred Willetts, and he must have had a good reason for not investigating. But that reason, it seems to me, ought to be told to the American people" (transcript, p. 1238).

The fact of the matter is that I never "agreed, on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation, to have his (Mr. Kohlberg's) charges investigated." I suggested to both parties that they jointly select an impartial committee of inquiry to hear and determine the charges, and I acted as an intermediary in trying to bring about an agreement between them on terms of reference and procedure. The attempt broke down when the IPR rejected the proposal and decided to act on its own. There was no "seeming reversal" on my part. I proffered my help to bring the parties into agreement on the terms and conditions of an independent inquiry into the charges. I continued to use my best efforts in that direction until the IPR declined to go further with my proposal. I then notified Mr. Kohlberg that the IPR (not I and not the Rockefeller Foundation) had broken off the negotiations. That is the sum and substance of this particular incident. As will be noted later, however, the Rockefeller Foundation, in coming to a decision as to whether or not further support should be given to the IPR, made through its own staff, and for its own purposes, a careful inquiry into the IPR situation.

The particular incident about which counsel for the committee inquires was the subject of testimony by both Dean Rusk, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Mr. Kohlberg during the hearings before the Cox committee in 1952. Mr. Rusk's testimony (Cox committee hearings, p. 524) is quoted, with additional comments, in the supplemental statement of the Rockefeller Foundation (verified under oath by Mr. Rusk) filed with this committee on August 3, 1954, as follows (pp. 10-11):

"The actual facts in regard to this episode, which differ materially from Dr. Colegrove's version, were set forth in the public testimony of the president of the Rockefeller Foundation before the Cox committee as follows:

"In 1944 Alfred Kohlberg sent the foundation copies of his charges of pro-Communist bias in the IPR. The director of the social-sciences division of the foundation suggested that the charges be referred to an independent body of competent persons for hearing and determination. This proposal was accepted by Mr. Kohlberg, but rejected by the IPR. Instead, a special committee of IPR

trustees reported to its board that the executive committee and responsible officers of the American council had "investigated Mr. Kohlberg's charges and found them inaccurate and irresponsible." The foundation officers would have preferred an independent appraisal of the organization's activities, I might say, not because of any views which they then held on the merits of the problem but because in their view at the time that was the proper procedure by which you could get rid of this kind of issue one way or the other."

"The 'director of the social-sciences division of the foundation' referred to in this quotation was Joseph H. Willits, who is evidently the person Dr. Colegrove had in mind. As the foregoing testimony shows, there was no plan to have the foundation conduct a public investigation of the IPR, an undertaking for which the foundation was neither equipped nor qualified. Mr. Willits never gave his 'consent' to have such an investigation undertaken by the foundation, and there was no mysterious suppression of such a proposal. On the contrary, Mr. Willits intervened with a suggestion for quite a different type of investigation which was never carried out because the proposal was not acceptable to the IPR."

In further amplification of Mr. Rusk's statements I submit the following:

Toward the end of 1944 the foundation received a copy of Mr. Kohlberg's charges against the Institute of Pacific Relations. This was followed by an interview between Mr. Kohlberg and myself in the spring of 1945, in the course of which he sought to enlist any interest or help we might appropriately give toward resolving the situation.

Although I gave Mr. Kohlberg no encouragement at the time of our interview, after further consideration, I felt that there would be no objection to an entirely unofficial personal suggestion on my part that the parties agree to refer the charges to an impartial committee of inquiry, of their own selection, for hearing and determination. This would not involve any interference or inquiry by the foundation, which would not even propose names for the committee of inquiry, much less determine its membership, and which would leave it to the parties themselves to agree upon the terms of reference and the procedure to be followed by the committee. I offered to act in the role of mediator only, and even in that role, I was a mediator, not of the issues in dispute, but of questions relating to a possible procedure for settling those issues, a procedure in which the foundation would not be a participant.

Accordingly, I sounded out both parties as to their attitude toward this proposal. Mr. Kohlberg indicated his willingness to proceed, on condition that the committee's inquiry should include both the Pacific and American Councils of the IPR, and that the committee should be free to make its inquiry and search for evidence as it wished.

The IPR was noncommittal, but I continued discussions with them on a basis which I regarded as encouraging. On July 26, 1945, in an effort to bring the matter to a head, I wrote a letter to Mr. Kohlberg, with copies to the representatives of the American and Pacific Councils of the IPR, enclosing a statement of certain points of agreement between the parties, as I understood them, and stating that when both sides were in complete agreement as to charges, terms of reference and methods of procedure I would send each a copy of the final agreement, and a meeting to decide upon the membership of the committee of inquiry should follow. This letter and the enclosure to which it refers read as follows:

[Letterhead of the Rockefeller Foundation]

JULY 26, 1945.

MR. ALFRED KOHLBERG,  
*Shorehan Hotel, Spring Lake, N. J.*

GENTLEMEN: I enclose a statement of my understanding of the points of substantial agreement reached in my separate conversations with you concerning a committee of inquiry to examine into the charges of bias in the IPR.

If this statement does not correctly state your own views, please write or telephone me the corrections you desire to have made and I shall continue my efforts as your secretary. If you approve, please write me your approval.

When both sides are in complete agreement as to charges, terms of reference, and methods of procedure I shall send each of you a copy of the final statement. An exchange of letters direct or via me accepting the statement would seem then to be in order. A meeting to decide upon the membership of the committee of inquiry would follow.

In these mediation efforts I am not functioning as an official of the Rockefeller Foundation but solely as a citizen interested to see the dispute resolved. I distinctly am not urging a committee of inquiry, but raised the question be-

cause each side had expressed sympathy for such a procedure. I am ready and glad to step out and drop the whole matter at any time, if you can find some more satisfactory alternative procedure or mediator.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. WILLITS.

Copy to Mr. Raymond Dennett; copy to Professor Corbett, whom Mr. Edward Carter has designated as representative of the Pacific Council.

Enclosure:

POINTS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALFRED KOHLBERG AND THE INSTITUTE OF  
PACIFIC RELATIONS

(The following statement represents an attempt to set down the points of agreement with respect to an impartial committee of inquiry to hear and examine the charges made by Alfred Kohlberg against the Pacific and American Councils of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This statement covers my tentative understanding of the points of agreement as to charges, terms of reference, and methods of procedure as reached in separate conversations with Alfred Kohlberg on the one hand and with Raymond Dennett of the IPR on the other.—Joseph H. Willits.)

CHARGES

Mr. Kohlberg charges an anti-Chungking, pro-Communist bias in the IPR's attitude toward China as evidenced by—

(1) Distorted and inaccurate articles on China and the Chinese Government appearing in publications of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Mr. Kohlberg charges that this attitude has changed from time to time to correspond with attitude reflected by articles appearing in Communist publications such as *The New Masses*, *The Communist*, and *The Daily Worker*.

(2) Membership of staff writers on China of the Institute of Pacific Relations (both American and Pacific Councils) at some time in the last 8 years in Communist or Communist-front organizations or employment by them.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The committee of inquiry is charged with responsibility for examining the charges of bias in the publications of IPR and rendering an opinion thereon.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

It is agreed by both parties that—

(1) The membership of the committee of inquiry shall consist of three persons, mutually agreed to by both parties.

(2) The inquiry shall embrace both the Pacific and American Councils.

(3) The committee of inquiry shall be free to determine its own procedure and search for evidence as it sees fit; and to decide also what testimony is relevant.

(4) The hearings shall not be public.

(5) Each party to the dispute shall, within reasonable limits, be free to bring such assistants and advisers to the hearings as he may wish. The committee of inquiry shall determine what constitutes "reasonable limits."

(6) Each party to the dispute binds himself (and his organization) to keep the proceedings secret and specifically to give no report of the proceedings to the press.

(7) A complete transcript of the proceeding shall be made and one copy each furnished to Mr. Kohlberg and to the IPR. Other copy or copies shall be the property of the committee of inquiry.

(8) Each party shall limit its presentation of testimony to 2 days' time.

(9) Mr. Kohlberg agrees to drop his court suit against the IPR and not again to revive it in case the committee of inquiry comes into being and reports.

(10) The expenses of the committee of inquiry shall be provided equally by the two parties to the issue.

(11) A copy of the report of the committee of inquiry shall go to each member of the American Council.

No decision was reached during August, probably because of the absence on vacation of a number of those interested in the matter.

Under date of September 6, 1945, I received the following letter from the secretary of the American Council, IPR:

[Letterhead of American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, Inc.]

SEPTEMBER 6, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH H. WILLITS,  
*Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N. Y.*

DEAR MR. WILLITS: The executive committee of the American Council of the IPR has considered your letter of July 26 in which you transmit a proposed understanding between the IPR and Mr. Alfred Kohlberg for the constitution of a committee of inquiry to examine into charges of bias in the IPR.

The committee has instructed me to inform you that it has decided not to accept the proposals which have been made, and is instead forwarding to Mr. Kohlberg, through his lawyers, an alternate proposal, to wit; an offer to mail all the members of the American Council whatever material he may wish to send regardless of whether or not it may not contain libelous material.

The reasons for the rejection of this offer and the substitution of an alternate proposal include a desire on the part of the executive committee of the American Council to conclude this matter as quickly as possible by offering Mr. Kohlberg the opportunity to present his charges to the membership, collect his proxies, and have the matter settled by the decision of the members of our own organization, who, since they represent a cross section of the American public are presumably in a position to judge intelligently on the matters at issue.

The committee was further impelled to this decision by noting that Mr. Kohlberg had continued two additional general circularizations: one an open letter to Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, and another an open letter to the trustees of this organization, under date of August 31. Both of these communications occurred during the time when we were both presumably engaged in considering the proposals which you were kind enough to suggest.

The committee has also asked me to express to you its deep appreciation of your courtesies and kind efforts to bring this matter to a conclusion. We feel indebted to you for your personal interest and kindness in this matter and I am sure that you will realize that our decision stems from a conviction that our proposed method, if Mr. Kohlberg accepts it, will be in the best interests of our organization.

With cordial best wishes,  
Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND DENNETT, *Secretary.*

This letter left me no choice, as a mediator, but to drop the proposal which for several months I had been trying to bring to fruition. Accordingly, I telephoned Mr. Kohlberg reporting the IPR's decision to him. I received in reply the following letter:

[Letterhead of Alfred Kohlberg, Inc.]

SEPTEMBER 11, 1945.

Mr. JOSEPH H. WILLITS,  
*New York 20, N. Y.*

MY DEAR MR. WILLITS: I desire to take this occasion to thank you for the time and effort spent in attempting to arrange for an impartial hearing of the charges I have preferred against the management of the Institute of Pacific Relations. In our future relations with the nations of the Pacific Basin, the institute should play an important part.

As I understood you over the telephone yesterday, the institute will take up directly with me the question of a hearing on my charges and have asked you to withdraw from a part in such arrangements. As I understand it, I will hear from the institute in due course.

Your fairness, impartiality, and patience I hope will bring about a satisfactory investigation, which will result in strengthening the institute as an organ of international good will.

Very sincerely yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

This exchange of correspondence was closed with my answer, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1945.

Mr. ALFRED KOHLBERG,  
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. KOHLBERG: Thank you for your letter of September 11. I am glad if my efforts to bring about some adjustment of the differences between yourself and the Institute of Pacific Relations have helped toward a mutually satisfactory conclusion. As you appreciate, I was merely trying to be a mediating middleman.

Perhaps I should correct one small point in your letter. The institute has not asked me to withdraw. They have merely said that they were prepared to make a direct proposal to you and in the meantime the question of a committee to hold a hearing is withdrawn. I don't know just what their proposal is. That they will make clear to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. WILLITS.

My statement that I did not "agree, on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation, to have his [Mr. Kohlberg's] charges investigated" is borne out by Mr. Kohlberg's testimony before the Cox committee. After referring to the filing of his charges and to his interview with me, Mr. Kohlberg testified:

"A little bit later in the summer of 1945, Mr. Willetts (sic) proposed that the institute and I get together and agree on a committee of three impartial persons to hear my charges and evidence, and hear the institute's side, and make a report to the institute and to the Rockefeller Foundation" (Cox committee hearings, p. 652).

Mr. Kohlberg's further testimony as to my report to him on the breakdown of my negotiations with the IPR (Cox committee hearings, p. 654) is also generally corroborative of what I have said above.

A special committee of IPR trustees later reported that the executive committee had investigated Mr. Kohlberg's charges "and found them inaccurate and irresponsible."

The fact that no investigation of Mr. Kohlberg's charges was made by a committee of inquiry such as I proposed did not mean, however, that the matter was dropped by the Rockefeller Foundation. As was fully explained in Mr. Rusk's testimony before the Cox committee (Cox committee hearings, pp. 524-526) the question of whether or not a further grant should be made to the IPR came before the foundation in 1946. As part of a very thorough inquiry into the whole IPR situation by the foundation staff, we sought the advice of, among many others, four former trustees of the American Council of the IPR who were understood to have resigned from its board because of dissatisfaction with conditions in the organization. After referring to the concern which these former trustees expressed in regard to certain aspects of the IPR's personnel and organization, Mr. Rusk correctly summed up their position in his testimony as follows:

"But the overall feeling among this group of former trustees was that the Kohlberg charges had been exaggerated, and that the most important service the Rockefeller Foundation could render was not to destroy the American Council by abruptly ending its support but, rather, to renew its grants and thereby reinforce the efforts of the group who were working to strengthen the organization in line with its original objectives."

The foundation's 1946 grants to the IPR were made only after a careful investigation by us and after obtaining the advice of such men as these who were in a position to understand conditions within the IPR. It is interesting also to note that the committee's witness, Dr. David N. Rowe, who had joined the IPR around 1939, became a member of its board of trustees in 1947, the year after these grants were made, and continued to serve as a member of its board until 1950. His testimony in support of the reputation which the IPR still enjoyed "up until the late forties" has been quoted in the Rockefeller Foundation's Supplemental Statement, dated August 3, 1954, at page 11.

JOSEPH H. WILLITS.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of New York, ss:

Sworn to before me this 9th day of August 1954.

[SEAL]

HAROLD B. LEONARD,  
Notary Public, State of New York.

Term expires March 30, 1955.



REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUBS WHICH ARE SPONSORED BY THE  
CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

(By Felix Wittmer, Ph. D., formerly associate professor of the social studies,  
New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair)

When I taught history and political science at the New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair, I was faculty adviser of the International Relations Club for a period of about 12 or 13 years, from about 1937 to 1950. This club was and is one of a network of many hundreds, if not close to a thousand college clubs, known as International Relations Clubs, all of which are sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

For most of the time when I served as faculty adviser, said club received a large amount of printed material from the Carnegie Endowment free of charge. At the beginning of each school year I had to notify the secretariat of the Carnegie Endowment regarding the number of free copies of the bulletins of the Foreign Policy Association which we required for our study groups. We were regularly supplied with various types of publications of the Foreign Policy Association, including the pamphlets known as Headline Books. In an article, Pamphlets Spread Soviet Propaganda, which appeared in the November 1952 issue of National Republic, I have analyzed the subversive character of these pamphlets.

Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean figured for many years as research director of the publications of the Foreign Policy Association. Mrs. Dean belonged among those who in 1937 signed their names in the Golden Book of American-Soviet Friendship, a memorial which appeared in the Communist-front magazine Soviet Russia Today of November 1937. According to the testimony of Walter S. Steele before the House Un-American Activities Committee on July 21, 1947, Mrs. Dean's writings figured in the Communist propaganda kit for teachers of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Mrs. Dean cooperated with the world's toughest Communist agents, such as Tsola N. Dragoicheva, of Bulgaria, and Madame Madeleine Braun, the French Communist deputy, in helping to set up the Congress of American Women, a Communist front so important in its worldwide ramifications that the House Un-American Activities Committee devoted a 114-page pamphlet to it. At one of the preliminary meetings of this Communist front Vera Micheles Dean, according to the New York Times of October 14, 1946 (p. 26), told 150 foreign and 50 American delegates to "whittle away their conceptions of national sovereignty" and to pull themselves out of the "ancient grooves of nationalism."

The Carnegie Endowment also supplied our International Relations Club with a large segment of the publications of the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose subversive character has been documented at the hearings of the McCarran committee. For a great many years the Carnegie Endowment twice a year, i. e., each semester, provided our club with about half a dozen books, free of charge. There was never any opportunity for the faculty adviser to suggest titles of conservative books which uphold the principle of competitive enterprise and individual responsibility, and which warn against close association with state-controlled nations. The Carnegie Endowment stipulated that these gift books be kept in a separate department in the college library. In the course of years our club built up a substantial IRC library comprising several shelves.

Among the books received from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace there were publications of the American Russian Institute, such as *The Soviet Union Today*. The American Russian Institute has been cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. To the best of my knowledge the authors of these gift books included such stalwarts of the Communist causes as Ruth Benedict, T. A. Bisson, Evans Clark, Corliss Lamont, Owen Lattimore, Nathaniel Pfeffer, and Alexander Worth.

At the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, which were held by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, from July 25, 1951, to June 20, 1952, T. A. Bisson, Corliss Lamont, and Owen Lattimore were identified under oath as Communists.

The late Ruth Benedict, along with Gene Weltfish, was coauthor of *Races of Mankind*, a public affairs pamphlet which was barred by the War Department following upon congressional protest. Dr. Weltfish resigned from Columbia University after she had refused to tell a congressional committee whether she was or ever had been a member of the Communist Party. Dr. Benedict has been a sponsor of American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom;

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; American Committee To Save Refugees; American Friends of the Chinese People; and the League of American Writers, all of which have been listed in the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, which was released by the House Un-American Activities Committee on May 14, 1951. According to the Communist Party publication *Daily Worker* of January 6, 1944, page 3, Dr. Benedict was a lecturer at the Jefferson School of Social Science, which Attorney General Tom Clark has cited as an "adjunct of the Communist Party."

Evans Clark, quondam director of the Twentieth Century Fund, which has supported radical, leftwing publications, along with such oldtimers of the Communist fronts as Louis Adamic, Erskine Caldwell, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Langston Hughes, Rockwell Kent, George Marshall, Maxwell S. Stewart, and Max Yergan, sponsored the Council for Pan-American Democracy, which has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark. He was also involved in the sponsorship of American Investors Union, Inc.; Committee for a Boycott Against Japanese Aggression; and Consumers' National Federation, all of which are listed in the official Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications of the House Un-American Activities Committee (82d Cong., 1st sess.). Mr. Clark also was at one time secretary to Ludwig C. K. A. Martens, the first Communist ever to be deported from our shores.

Prof. Nathaniel Peffer, of Columbia University, whose Basis for Peace in the Far East was included in the free shipments of the Carnegie Endowment, has been exposed by Ralph De Toledano, in the *Gravediggers of America*, part I (*American Mercury*, July 1951), as one of a cabal of 16 authors and book reviewers who through the media of the *New York Times Book Review*, the *New York Herald Tribune Book Section*, and the *Saturday Review of Literature* systematically praised pro-Communist books and discredited anti-Communist publications. In the *New York Times Book Review* Peffer called George Creel's valuable *Russia's Race for Asia* a foolish book. In this review he reprimanded Creel because "he fears Russia and does not like or trust the Chinese Communists."

The *Challenge of Red China*, by Guenther Stein (whom a SCAP intelligence report named as a Soviet agent) was praised by Lattimore in the *New York Herald Tribune Book Section* and by Peffer in the *New York Times Book Review*. In this eulogy of an all-out apologia of communism in the Far East, Columbia University's Nathaniel Peffer said that the leaders of the Chinese Communists "are exceptionally straightforward, simple, of unquestionable integrity."

Alexander Werth is the well-known European apologist for various Communist causes. His book, *Leningrad*, was sent as a gift to college clubs by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Many other books which the Carnegie Endowment sent to our college clubs as gifts, while not quite so outspokenly pro-Communist, were of the leftwing variety. Among these I would include Sir Bernard Pares, *Russia and Russia and the Peace*; Sumner Welles, *The World of the Four Freedoms*; and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., *Germany Is Our Problem*. I do not recall that the book gift packages of 10 to 12 publications per year ever included a single conservative or anti-Communist work.

When, in an effort to counteract the pro-Communist influence of the Carnegie Endowment I ordered some anti-Communist books for our library (including works by David J. Dallin and Freda Utley), students asked me: "Are you sure that these are trustworthy publications? If they are reliable, why is it that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has not included them in its gift packages?" (This, at least, was the meaning of the students' questions.)

While faculty advisers of the International Relations Clubs corresponded with a woman secretary of the endowment, it was understood that Dr. Howard Wilson, well-known leftwing internationalist and one of the top officials of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, was in charge of the nationwide IRC project. Dr. Wilson was a frequent speaker at radical conferences and institutes. Thus he participated in a conference of the education committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, in New York City, along with such veteran Communist fronters as Frank E. Baker, Robert S. Lynd, and Arthur Upham Pope. Another of these education conferences of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which was held at Boston, included such well-known sponsors of the Communist cause as Herbert Davis, Corliss Lamont, Prof. Dirk Struik (who has in the meantime been dismissed from Massachusetts Institute of Technology because of his membership in the Communist Party) and the Carnegie Endowment's Dr. Howard Wilson.

The annual regional conference of International Relations Clubs was the most widely heralded feature of this Carnegie Endowment project. The club of the New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair belonged to the regional group of the northeastern seaboard and Canada, which to the best of my recollection included from 125 to 150 college clubs. There must have been at least 7 or 8 similar regional conferences, in other parts of the United States.

According to the detailed reports of the student-delegates of Montclair State Teachers College, a large majority of those students who attended such conferences favored the views which came close to that of the Kremlin. Students from Catholic colleges, though in the minority, were known to challenge the pro-Soviet delegates.

For many a year I made it a point to supply speaker-delegates of our college with reading material which would counterbalance the radical tendencies of publications with which the Carnegie Endowment had provided us. As a result of such tutoring the student-delegates from Montclair Teachers College regularly clashed with the majority.

Either in 1947 or in 1948, the regional conference of the northeastern section of IRC's was held on the campus of the New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair. Our college was not the choice by vote, but substituted for another college whose facilities had become unavailable. The best our program committee could do with regard to speakers was to select known anti-Communists who were far enough to the left not to cause bedlam among the about 300 delegates who attended the 3-day conference. Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, the liberal, anti-Communist president of Brooklyn College and Prof. George S. Counts, of Columbia Teachers College, the one-time pro-Communist who had become anti-Communist, were chosen by the program committee of our college club.

It is worth mentioning that Mr. Alger Hiss, who then was president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, was forced upon our club not merely as a speaker, but as the speaker of the final meeting. Having observed the activities of Mr. Hiss in the State Department for several years, including his role at the Bretton Woods Conference and the San Francisco Conference (at which the United Nations was founded), I vigorously protested to the secretary of the Carnegie Endowment against the appearance of Mr. Hiss.

I was reminded in no uncertain terms that our club, like all the other hundreds of clubs, was under the direction of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which had for years liberally supplied it with reading material, and which contributed funds to cover the honoraria of conference speakers. My repeated protestations were overruled by the secretary of the endowment.

It turned out that a large group of enthusiastic ladies, most of whom were members of the local chapter of the United Nations Association, flocked to our campus to hear and see in person the principal American architect of the United Nations. This United Nations group has held State-accredited summer institutes on the United Nations at the New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair, for the past few years.

I might conclude in adding the personal note that soon after the IRC conference on our campus had taken place a group of radical leftwing students made successful efforts to infiltrate our International Relations Club by electing some officers who were hostile to my anti-Socialist-Communist views. As a result of systematic radical agitation in the club I resigned as its adviser. My successor was one Dr. Frank L. Clayton who had been granted a leave of absence to work at Columbia Teachers College as a member of the staff which developed the citizenship education project. The subversive and collectivist tendencies of said project were exposed by Frank Hughes in the Chicago Tribune of August 12-16, 1951. The project, according to the New York Times of April 20, 1953, page 27, during the first 4 years of its existence received \$1,367,000 from the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

*County of Essex, ss:*

I, Felix Wittmer, swear and affirm that I have read and am familiar with the contents of the foregoing report; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief, every statement of fact contained therein is true.

FELIX WITTMER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this — day of August 1954.

HELEN S. MOUNTJOY,  
Notary Public, State of New Jersey.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,  
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,  
SCHOOL OF LAW,  
New York, N. Y., September 1, 1954.

HON. CARROLL REECE,  
Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REECE: Under date of July 1, 1954, a report was made to your committee by Kathryn Casey, legal analyst, purporting to summarize some of the activities of the Rockefeller Foundation and others. I have only recently seen that document for the first time. At pages 69-71 the legal analyst's report contains references to me and my work that are erroneous. In all fairness to me they should not stand without correction. I therefore respectfully request that my attached statement should be made a part of your committee's records, and that it be included in your printed proceedings if the above references are similarly included. In this way the committee can undo some of the injury that has been done me under its authority.

You will observe that I have made my statement under oath.

So that they too may be informed of the facts, I am sending copies of this letter and the attached statement to your colleagues on the special committee, as well as to the committee's general counsel and research director.

Very truly yours,

WALTER GELLHORN,  
Professor of Law.

STATEMENT OF WALTER GELLHORN BEFORE THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 83D CONGRESS

The following statement is made for the consideration of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations of the 83d Congress. I am moved to make it because erroneous information concerning me has been given to the committee, appearing at pages 69-71 of the (mimeographed) report by Kathryn Casey, legal analyst, under date of July 1, 1954. At no time was an effort made on the committee's behalf to verify the report's contents by interviewing or interrogating me. I should like to stress that the statement I am now presenting to the committee is made upon my own initiative and, moreover, is made under solemn oath.

My name is Walter Gellhorn. I am now and for 21 years have been a professor in the Law School of Columbia University. I am a member of the bar of New York. I reside at 186 East Palisade Avenue, Englewood, N. J.

1. The central question toward which the legal analyst's attention was apparently addressed was whether I am an objective scholar and thus qualified to participate in an analysis of governmental security and loyalty programs, as part of the Cornell studies in civil liberty supported by the Rockefeller Foundation. As bearing on this question the legal analyst sets forth 5 brief paragraphs purporting to characterize or synopsise the extensive materials set forth in my 300-page book, *Security, Loyalty, and Science*. Inevitably this involves quotation out of context, incompleteness, and distortion.

A fairer impression of my volume may be derived from its evaluation by the many reviewers who appraised it in professional as well as popular publications. From the large number at hand, I shall quote only from a few by commentators who are, I am sure, well known to and much respected by this committee.

President James R. Killian, Jr., Massachusetts Institute of Technology (in *Yale Review*): "This is by all odds the best-informed, the most objective, and the most thorough study yet to appear of the effects of military secrecy and loyalty tests on scientific progress in America. \* \* \*"

Professor Jay Murphy, University of Alabama (in *Vanderbilt Law Review*): "In the most objective manner conceivable and with real scholarship, Professor Gellhorn has examined the laws and policies of the Federal Government \* \* \* Professor Gellhorn has written this book in a manner which other scholars may emulate. He has conducted exhaustive, often firsthand, studies of the places, persons, and methods involved. There is restraint in his orderly analysis. He has not destroyed without creating. The book is a real contribution \* \* \*"

President L. A. Du Bridge, California Institute of Technology (in *Standford Law Review*): "This is a desperately needed and most valuable book. In it the thoughtful American will find a cool and unbiased appraisal of the issues \* \* \* The more it [the book] can be read and understood by laymen—lawyers, newspaper editors, Congressmen, and the public at large—the greater will be our hope that we can achieve military security without unnecessary sacrifice of the democratic principles which our military power is intended to preserve."

Rear Adm. Roger W. Paine, United States Navy (retired) (in *Naval Institute Proceedings*): "Any officer of the Defense Department presently or likely to be assigned to duty where he must participate in the administration of the laws and executive orders devised to safeguard military secrecy or national security, should have this book in his background. \* \* \* The author \* \* \* is satisfactorily objective in his approach to this highly controversial problem."

Professor W. Mansfield Cooper, University of Manchester, England (in *The Political Quarterly*): "The present writer, whose interest derives not from any knowledge of science but from having met some of these problems in university administration, has found it [the book] fascinating and has laid it down with an increased faith in the American people. And it is a measure of Professor Gellhorn's achievement that, criticizing certain practices in his own country, he yet induces in a foreigner a greater respect for it."

I shall not burden this statement with further excerpts from the reviews, but I should add that in 1952 the first presentation of the Goldsmith memorial award was made to Security, Loyalty, and Science; the award is made annually "for the best article, book, or public pronouncement which contributes to the clarification of the right relations between science and politics."

These reactions to my work by recognized authorities should adequately refute any insinuation that I am not a qualified and objective scholar. It is unnecessary, however, to rest upon one book alone. My writings extend over a period of 25 years. One of my books is more widely used than any other in the teaching of administrative law in American law schools. In 1946 Harvard University awarded me its Henderson memorial prize for work done in that field. Within the years immediately past I have been invited to lecture at leading universities not only in this country, but in Great Britain, Japan, New Zealand, and Western Germany. In 1952 Amherst College conferred on me the degree of doctor of humane letters, the citation that accompanied this honor referring among other things to the "wide recognition" accorded my "judicious examination of the problem of whether and how liberty and security may be combined in the field of scientific research." In 1953, I was unanimously elected a member of the executive committee of the Association of American Law Schools. I have directed the research of the New York Law Society. The section of judicial administration of the American Bar Association, under the chairmanship of Judge Harold R. Medina, requested my direction of a study of the functioning of courts in the New York metropolitan area.

These are not the sorts of distinctions that come to a scholar whose work is infected by bias.

Moreover, in the community where most of my professional life has been lived and where there has therefore been the most sustained knowledge of all my activities, the derogatory appraisal suggested by your legal analyst is directly repudiated. Two years ago the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, widely regarded as the leading legal association of the Nation, requested me to conduct in its behalf an extensive study of the administration of laws affecting families and children. The results of that study have been supported and endorsed by the bar association, and have been praised in the editorial columns of the newspapers. They have recently been published by Dodd, Mead & Co., in a volume entitled "Children and Families in the Courts of New York City."

This record of scholarly integrity should not be impugned by uninformed comment.

2. The Legal Analyst asserts (mimeographed p. 70) that in the *Harvard Law Review* of October 1947 I published an article "specifically defending the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, exposed as a Communist organization, and violently attacking the House committee."

The actual facts demonstrate beyond question the inaccuracy of the allegations.

At the very outset of the Harvard article to which reference is made (Report on a Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 60 Harvard Law Review 1193), I stated that the author does not "propose to serve in the role of defense counsel, as it were, for the southern conference. He is not connected with the conference, has no authorization to speak for it, and has access to no special body of knowledge about its activities." And again, at the end of the article, I repeated that I "disclaimed any intent to appraise the Southern Conference for Human Welfare." These unequivocal and unmodified statements adequately show that I was not "specifically defending" the southern conference.

As for the alleged "violent attack" upon the House committee, I did no more than examine its own report in order to analyze the techniques used in that particular instance. I found—and demonstrated by precise citation of chapter and verse—that those techniques had in that case included partial and misleading quotations out of context, the repetition of unverified charges that would have been dispelled by even a cursory inquiry, the loose and damaging characterization of persons of good standing, the ignoring of relevant information that, if recorded, would have affected the opinion of fairminded men, and insensitivity to a cherished American value, the preservation of an individual's reputation against unfair attack. I did indeed severely criticize those techniques. They deserve condemnation when used by or in behalf of any committee of the Congress.

3. The Legal Analyst says (mimeographed p. 70) that I am cited as an "active leader" of the National Lawyers Guild.

The simple fact is that I have not even been a member of the National Lawyers Guild for a number of years, and that during the period of my membership I was not prominent enough in its affairs to be deemed an "active leader." I doubt that activity in the guild could properly be regarded as reprehensible, in and of itself, without reference to what the activity was; but in any event I was, on the whole, an inactive rather than an active member, and am no longer a member of any sort.

4. The Legal Analyst reports (mimeographed p. 69) that I am "listed in appendix IX, page 471, as a 'conscious propagandist and fellow traveler.'"

A word needs to be said about the appendix IX upon which this statement so directly leans.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of the Congress informs me that appendix IX, with its cumulative index, was prepared late in 1944 by a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, and fills seven volumes containing 2,166 pages. A large number of copies of the report were printed. But, continues the letter to me from the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, "When the report was brought to the attention of the full committee it was ordered restricted and the existing copies were destroyed. A number of copies were distributed by the Government Printing Office to subscribers before the distribution was cancelled by the committee."

The conclusion seems inescapable that appendix IX was found unacceptable by the very committee to which it was presented—and very possibly for the precise reason that it contained just such unsubstantiated comments as the one referred to by your staff member.

Here again the facts are quite clear. The characterization of me by some unidentified person in appendix IX is in connection with a little known travel organization, Open Road, Inc., of which I was a director in 1929-31. My sworn testimony concerning this organization was freely given before this special committee's predecessor, the Cox committee, and appears at pages 738-739 of the hearings conducted by that committee in 1952 pursuant to H. Res. 561. Suffice it now to say that I was 23 and 24 years old at the time of my association with the Open Road; that I was then a student in law school; and that I resigned from it when in 1931 I left New York to become law secretary to Supreme Court Justice Harlan Fiske Stone and, later during the Hoover administration, an attorney in the Office of the Solicitor General under Judge Thomas D. Thacher.

The Open Road, as my earlier recorded testimony shows, was a purely educational and nonpolitical organization devoted to facilitating travel abroad. Its chief sponsors were distinguished college presidents such as Farrand of Cornell, Garfield of Williams, and MacCracken of Vassar. It became defunct, some years after I had terminated my relationship with it, because wartime conditions from 1939 onward made travel impossible. As I observed before the Cox committee, "All I can say about the organization is that certainly during the years of my association with it, it had no political orientation or motivation what-

soever. \* \* \* The worst that can be said about the young people who were interested in that organization, as I was at that time, is that they entertained the perhaps naive belief that the world would be a friendlier place if its inhabitants became a little better acquainted."

This is the setting of the charge that, at the age of 23 and while busily engaged in professional studies, I was a "conscious propagandist" and "fellow-traveler" in the Open Road, Inc., immediately before becoming the confidential assistant of a Supreme Court Justice.

5. The Legal Analyst remarks (mimeographed p. 70) that on March 15, 1948, the Daily Worker quoted from an article by me concerning the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The plain fact is that I wrote an article entitled "In Defense of American Activities" upon the invitation of the American Scholar, in which it appeared in the spring of 1948. The American Scholar is a quarterly journal published by Phi Beta Kappa. Subsequent references to the article, whether by the Daily Worker or by others, are not within the author's control. Since the entire article is available in the pages of one of the most respected of all American magazines, I suggest that it be read in full. It cannot be characterized, as the staff report attempted to do, by lifting two noncontextual quotations from a notably unreliable secondary source.

6. The Legal Analyst correctly states (mimeographed p. 69) that I was at one time a national committeeman of the International Juridical Association, but wrongly implies that an impropriety lurks in that fact.

This association went out of existence some 12 years ago. It was a nonprofit organization. Throughout my connection with it of about 5 years, it was so far as I know devoted exclusively to legal research with particular emphasis upon labor law and civil liberties. Its primary function was the publication of a monthly bulletin, which appeared in 11 volumes. The bulletin, an examination of these volumes will show, was a legal periodical devoted to reporting, analyzing, and discussing decisions of the courts and administrative bodies and the actions of the executive and legislative branches of Government. It had widespread recognition as a scholarly journal and as a source of otherwise unreported legal material. Among its subscribers were the Library of the Supreme Court, the Library of the Department of Justice, 28 State supreme court libraries, various court and bar association libraries, and the libraries of every major university in the United States. My interest in the IJA was an interest in its bulletin, related to my academic duties.

7. The Legal Analyst asserts (mimeographed p. 69) that I "was a leading member of some 11 Communist fronts."

This statement is unsupported by factual specifications. It is not true. Not even a superficial inquiry was directed to me to ascertain its accuracy. I repel the allegation with indignation and with a sense of outrage that, under your committee's authority, a charge of this nature has been published.

8. The Legal Analyst describes me as "apparently actually" the director of the Cornell Studies in Civil Liberties (mimeographed p. 69) and as "coauthor of a study on States and Subversion (with William B. Prendergast, assistant professor of government at the Naval Academy), and of a study on the Tenney Committee (with Edward Barrett, Jr., professor of law, University of California \* \* \*)" (mimeographed p. 71).

Obviously there is nothing derogatory to me in these particular remarks. I set them forth here only because they reveal how easily error can creep into a report untested by the scrutiny of one who knows the facts.

The director of the Cornell studies is and was at all times Prof. Robert E. Cushman of Cornell, one of America's most distinguished political scientists. The studies were initiated under his direction before my association with the project, and they have continued under his direction long after I had completed my portion of them. I am proud to have been a part of the project, but at no time and in no manner was I either "apparently" or "actually" its director. There is not the slightest basis for a contrary statement.

As for the States and Subversion, I was coauthor not merely with Professor Prendergast, but with five others as well, and was in addition the editor of this volume. As for the Tenney Committee, I was in no sense coauthor; Professor Barrett alone deserves the credit for that able volume. I emphasize these simple facts not because they have importance in themselves, but because misstatements in matters that are so readily subject to verification tend to emphasize the unreliability of other observations as well.

In closing this statement I desire to add only this: I have held responsible posts in three national administrations; my professional career has had its share of distinctions; the university of whose faculty I have been a member for 21 years has reposed a confidence in me that is not extended to one whose probity as a man or as a scholar is suspect. Half a dozen inaccurate paragraphs in a staff report are a poor offset against the whole record of my adult life.

WALTER GELLHORN.

Dated September 1, 1954.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
County of New York, ss:

Walter Gellhorn, being duly sworn, says that he is the individual who prepared the foregoing statement and in whose behalf it is made; and that the statement is true to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

WALTER GELLHORN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of September 1954.

CECELIA SCHLESINGER.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. MORTIMER GRAVES, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

AUGUST 19, 1954.

DR. MORTIMER GRAVES,  
*American Council of Learned Societies,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DR. GRAVES: The committee had intended to ask certain questions of you about the time of your scheduled appearance before it and since, in line with the resolution of the committee, no further public hearings will be held, it becomes necessary to raise those questions through correspondence and request that your answers be furnished in affidavit form.

The particular information desired concerns the statements which have been made to the committee and which for convenience in answering, I will list seriatim below:

1. According to the biography appearing in the 1948-49 issue of *Who's Who*, you stated that you were a member of the board of directors of the American Russian Institute and chairman of the Washington Committee To Aid China. Are you now or have you been connected with either the institute or the committee, and, if so, during what period?

2. In the *Washington Post* of May 11, 1942, page 9, your name appeared as a sponsor of the Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder. Were you a sponsor of the committee?

3. Were you a sponsor of the National Council, American-Soviet Friendship?

4. Your name is listed as one of the signers of an open letter, referred to in the September 1939 issue of *Soviet Russia Today*, which urged closer cooperation with the Soviet Union. Is that a fact?

5. We are informed that in February 1941, you presided at a meeting of the Washington Committee To Aid China, at which the two principal speakers were Owen Lattimore and Frederick Vanderbilt Field. Is that a fact?

6. We are informed that following the arrest of John Stewart Service in June 1945, you were treasurer of a voluntary committee soliciting funds for his defense. Is this a fact?

7. We are informed that you have now or have had in your employ, or the employ of the American Council of Learned Societies, a man named Emanuel Larson. Is this a fact? Did Mr. Larson receive a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies?

8. Did Andrew Ross receive a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies? Are you acquainted with Mr. Ross?

9. The committee is informed that you at one time maintained files on numerous students of the Far East and on persons given grants and engaged in research as Far Eastern specialists. Is this a fact? Are these files still available and, if not, what disposition was made of them? If they are intact, the committee desires to see them.

10. Did you at any time keep a roster of the scientific and specialized personnel for the use of various Government agencies or for any other use?



11. The Reporter for April 29, 1952, contains the following statement at page 22:

"The personnel selected for Government agencies in the Far East was picked from a roster of 'Experts' made up by the Council of Learned Societies under the direction of Mortimer Graves."

Is this an accurate statement? If so, please attach a list of the persons named by you in this list.

12. Are you acquainted with any of the following individuals?

William Walter Remington  
George Shaw Wheeler  
Maurice Halperin  
Luke I. Wilson  
Mary Jane Keeney  
Owen Lattimore  
Robert Selberstein  
Antoli Gromov  
Harriet Moore (Gelfan)  
Joseph Fels Barnes  
Kathleen Barnes.

13. You are shown as a vice chairman and trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations in Who's Who from 1942 to 1948. Please name the persons, directly or indirectly, concerned with the institute with whom you had contact with regard to the activities of the institute, or with regard to Far Eastern matters.

14. Was your connection with the institute terminated by resignation or by expiration of a specific term of office? If the resignation was at the suggestion of some other party, please identify fully. If the resignation was your own decision, please give the reasons therefor.

As I stated in the opening paragraph of this letter, your answers should be either in affidavit form or should have the same attestation clause which was requested in connection with the statement you filed with the committee earlier. I shall appreciate it if you will submit an original and five copies of this affidavit.

Sincerely yours,

RENE A. WORMSER, *General Counsel.*

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES,  
Washington 6, D. C., November 1, 1954.

Mr. RENÉ A. WORMSER,  
*General Counsel, Select Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. WORMSER: I am enclosing the master of the replies to the questions which you have asked of me; the copies which you requested will be sent you as soon as they come from the machines. The lists of persons requested, and mentioned on page 10 of my replies, will reach you at the same time.

I regret what may seem to you a delay in submitting these materials, but the exigencies of a full-time job and the fact that I could not recall the details of these minor episodes of years ago in an active life made impossible an earlier reply which might be useful.

Sincerely yours,

MORTIMER GRAVES,  
*Executive Director.*

REPLIES BY MORTIMER GRAVES TO QUESTIONS IN THE LETTER OF RENÉ A. WORMSER OF AUGUST 23, 1954

1. According to the biography appearing in the 1948-49 issue of Who's Who, you stated that you were a member of the board of directors of the American Russian Institute and chairman of the Washington Committee To Aid China. Are you now or have you been connected with either the institute or the committee and, if so, during what period?

1. (a) The American Russian Institute of New York was founded in the early 1930's and continued until 1950. I was a member of the board of directors of the institute from about 1938 until its dissolution, during which time the principal purpose of the institute was the establishment and maintenance of a library

of contemporary Russian materials in various scholarly fields for the use of American students of Soviet affairs.

During the time I was a director of the institute I did not attend directors' meetings, since they were held in New York, while I was kept by my work in Washington for the most part. I was notified of forthcoming meetings and of the subjects to be discussed at them. Whenever items on the agenda were of special professional interest to me, in that they concerned the humanities, I transmitted my views in writing to the board.

Sometime after the issuance of the President's loyalty order in 1947, it was rumored that the institute was listed on the Attorney General's list of "subversive" organizations, and after discussion among the directors, the then chairman of the board, Mr. Ernest Ropes, formerly of the Russian Division of the Department of Commerce, consulted Attorney General Tom Clark about the matter. Thereafter, Mr. Ropes informed the directors that he had received a written assurance from the Attorney General that the institute was not listed. I am under the impression that this entire episode arose because of confusion between the American Russian Institute of New York with which I was associated, and the American Russian Institute of San Francisco which was in no way connected with the New York organization.

In the late 1940's Columbia University established a Russian Institute which began to collect published materials about Soviet Russia. In my opinion this accomplished the main task of the American Russian Institute much more effectively than that organization could do. As a consequence of this my interest in the American Russian Institute declined and I requested several times that I not be reelected to the board. My requests were ignored and I continued to be reelected in absentia until the dissolution of the organization.

(b) The Washington Committee for Aid to China was a local group in the District of Columbia which protested and carried on agitation against the shipment of oil, scrap iron, and other strategic materials to Japan as a part of an attempt to influence the Government of the United States, in the years prior to World War II, in support of Chiang Kai-shek and the Government of China and against the Japanese Government which was at war with Chiang. The wisdom of the course supported by the committee was fully confirmed by later events.

The committee was founded in 1938. I became associated with it in early 1939 and was its chairman from late in that year until the committee dissolved about the time of the outbreak of World War II. The declaration of war eliminated the need for the committee and, so far as I know, it has had no subsequent existence. At any rate, I have had no subsequent connection with it.

The operations of this committee were carried on through meetings, some large and some small, which were addressed by persons with special experience or knowledge of Far Eastern affairs and who were generally sympathetic to the committee program outlined above. Among those who addressed meetings of the committee were Congressman Judd, then recently returned from service as a medical missionary in China, former Ambassador William Dodd, Paul Yu Pin, the Roman Catholic Bishop of China, Mr. Owen Lattimore, Mr. Frederick V. Field, Mr. Evans Carlson, and others. I have no present recollection of any of the dates of the meetings at which these individuals spoke.

2. In the Washington Post of May 11, 1942, page 9, your name appeared as a sponsor of the Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder. Were you a sponsor of the committee?

2. On or about May 11, 1942, I was requested to and did sign an appeal to the President of the United States to grant clemency to Earl Browder, who was then serving a 4-year prison sentence which I and others thought was excessive for a minor violation of the passport laws. Beyond signing the appeal with knowledge that it was to be used as the basis of a newspaper advertisement, I had no connection by way of sponsorship or membership with any such committee.

3. Were you a sponsor of the National Council, American-Soviet Friendship?

3. I cannot now recollect whether or not I was ever a sponsor of the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship. As I recall, this council was organized in the early 1930's, shortly after our Government recognized the Soviet Union, with the purpose of making a sincere effort to see whether normal cultural relations were possible with that country. At that time, I was sympathetic with that goal, which was indeed the declared policy of the United States Government.

4. Your name is listed as one of the signers of an open letter, referred to in the September 1939 issue of Soviet Russia Today, which urged closer cooperation with the Soviet Union. Is that a fact?

4. Toward the end of the summer of 1939, I signed a letter urging closer cooperation between the Western democracies and the Soviet Union as a means of combating the menace of Hitler and Japan. Although most of the public attention given to this letter has been in connection with the reference to it in the September 1939 issue of Soviet Russia Today, the letter was signed by me well before the announcement of the Hitler-Stalin pact of August 21, 1939, and, according to testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952, the letter in question was first released to the public on August 14, 1939.

5. We are informed that in February 1941, you presided at a meeting of the Washington Committee To Aid China, at which the two principal speakers were Owen Lattimore and Frederick Vanderbilt Field. Is that a fact?

5. See paragraph 1 (b).

6. We are informed that following the arrest of John Stewart Service in June 1945, you were treasurer of a voluntary committee soliciting funds for his defense. Is this a fact?

6. In June 1945, Mr. Service and five other individuals were publicly accused of unauthorized use of classified material in connection with the magazine Amerasia. On the day that this news was released I happened to be at lunch with a group of people interested in China who knew Mr. Service more or less well. All of us believed him to be innocent of any unlawful activity, a belief supported by his ultimate complete clearance. In the course of our luncheon conversation, it was suggested that Mr. Service would need funds for the conduct of his defense. In the informal discussion that followed, each of the people at luncheon agreed to contribute \$50 and to speak to others in an effort to accumulate a fund of perhaps \$1,000 to be turned over to Mr. Service for this purpose. For some reason it was suggested that the money should be forwarded to Mr. Service through me. The luncheon, so far as I know, was not called or arranged with this purpose in mind.

Thereafter several checks were mailed to me. I made a contribution of \$50 from my own pocket but did not solicit any one else. When the sum amounted to \$500, I turned it over to Mr. Service. Later an additional sum came in of perhaps \$200 or \$250 which I offered to Mr. Service but which he refused to accept. The money was returned to the donors.

7. We are informed that you have now or have had in your employ, or the employ of the American Council of Learned Societies, a man named Emanuel Larson. Is this a fact? Did Mr. Larson receive a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies?

7. Mr. Emanuel Larsen was 1 of 22 individuals to whom the American Council of Learned Societies granted study aids to attend a summer session on far eastern studies inaugurated by Columbia University from June 8 to August 16, 1935. The total amount divided among the 22 students was \$1,200. From September 1 to November 30, 1935, Mr. Larson worked at the Library of Congress in the center for Far Eastern studies. His activities were in connection with a project carried out by the Library of Congress, but sponsored in its early stages by the council. The project was the preparation of a biographical dictionary of the eminent Chinese of the Ching Dynasty which was subsequently published by the Library of Congress and printed by the Government Printing Office. As a part of its sponsorship of this project the council made grants to a number of those working on it, among them Mr. Larsen, who received a stipend of \$400 from the council on this account.

From June through October 1945, Mr. Larsen worked temporarily on an hourly basis in the office of the council for its committee on far eastern studies. He was paid at the rate of \$1 per hour and his total remuneration for this period, according to the council's records, came to \$650.

At no other time has Mr. Larson been employed by the council or has he received any council funds by way of fellowship or other grant in aid.

8. Did Andrew Ross receive a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies? Are you acquainted with Mr. Ross?

8. Mr. Andrew Ross never received any grant from the council, nor am I able to place him in any way.

It occurred to me that the object of the committee's interest might be Mr. Andrew Roth and I caused the council's files to be searched in regard to him.

I find that the council never awarded any grant to Mr. Andrew Roth. Our records show that in 1940-41 he made application for a \$200 grant which was rejected.

9. The committee is informed that you at one time maintained files on numerous students of the Far East on persons given grants and engaged in research as Far Eastern specialists.

- (a) Is this true?
- (b) Are these files still in existence?
- (c) If not, what disposition was made of them, at what time?
- (d) If they are still in existence the committee desires to see them.

9. The statement submitted to your committee by the council on July 21, 1954, under the heading "The Problem of Highly Trained and Specialized Personnel" (p. 10 of the mimeographed statement) describes the nature and character of the information on Far Eastern specialists which in the past was contained in the council files. For the period from about 1935 to the middle of the war these were by far the best files in existence on the professional qualifications of persons in academic life with special competence on Far Eastern subjects. Of course, since the council's interest is mainly in academic fields, these files were deficient with regard to persons outside the academic sphere—businessmen, missionaries, diplomats and the like—with Far Eastern training and experience.

During the war a national roster of scientific and specialized personnel was developed by the Federal Government. In addition the Ethnogeographic Board, located in the Smithsonian Institution and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, prepared a list of area specialists for use of various Government departments. Much of the material which had been in the council files was included in these compilations which supplied the need for complete and centralized information about such personnel more effectively than the more or less haphazard activity of the council. As a result the council files gradually disintegrated and got out of date during the wartime period. After the war, the council made some effort to rejuvenate them, but it was generally unsuccessful. A remnant of these files still remains in the council's office. They have always been open to any organization, including Government agencies, looking for people with special competence in the area covered by the files. Consequently the committee is free to examine what is left of them at any time.

Information with respect to the council's activities in this field since 1949 is contained in paragraph 10 below.

10. (a) Did you at any time keep a roster of scientific and specialized personnel for the use of any other Government agency in any other area or for any other use?
- (b) Are such files still in existence?
  - (c) If not, what disposition was made of them, at what time?
  - (d) If they are still in existence the committee desires to see them.

10. Prior to 1949, the council, from time to time, for specific and limited purposes related to its own activities, gathered information about the professional qualifications of persons with special competence in such fields as Byzantine studies, slavic studies, American studies, musicology, Indic studies, near eastern studies, and the like. These collections were of only temporary value, and are no longer in existence.

Since 1949 we have collected information of this kind in connection with the national registration in the humanities and social sciences. The character of that registration and the work on it is described fully in the statement submitted by the council to the committee on July 21, 1954, both under the heading, "The Problem of Highly Trained and Specialized Personnel," and on pages 17 and 18 of the mimeographed version of the statement. The committee is at liberty to examine the files, in which such information is recorded on IBM cards.

11. (a) If such a roster was maintained, what use was made of it?
- (b) To what Government agencies were names suggested?
  - (c) Were names suggested to any other agencies, or to individuals? If so, please name all such agencies or individuals.
  - (d) Who compiled such lists?
  - (e) Were they requested by someone outside the Council of Learned Societies? If so, please explain fully the circumstances.
  - (f) If the names were suggested spontaneously by the council without prior request by the person or agency to whom given, how was the decision to do so arrived at by the council?

(g) Was it the decision of an individual? If so, identify such individual fully.

(h) If by action of the council, explain the circumstances fully.

Please send to the committee, in triplicate, all lists prepared by the council, identifying fully those listed, and indicating to whom sent and at what date.

The general purposes served by the national registration of the humanities and social sciences and the council's practices in regard to requests for information about personnel contained in the registration is described in the council's statement to the committee of July 21, 1954.

The registration has been open to the inspection of Government agencies or any other employer. The Division of Exchange of Persons of the Department of State and the Division of External Research of the Department of State have made use of the information contained in the registration in this way: viz., members of these divisions visited the council's offices and the workings of the filing system were explained to them. These representatives went through the files themselves and made their own selections of names for them. Officers of the council were neither concerned with nor consulted about the use that was made of these names, if any. The only information of this character supplied by the council to the Department of the Army related to one historian, and was given as illustrative of the type of information available in the national registration upon request.

The following private agencies have received information from the registration on or about the dates indicated in regard to the types of specialized personnel indicated below.

June 1954: Johns Hopkins University, instructor of French literature.

June 1954: Reed College, Instructor of philosophy.

May 1954: University of Minnesota, teacher of Scandinavian history.

April 1954: Lewis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation, director for St. Paul Council of Arts and Sciences.

January 1954: Rice Institute, instructor of modern European history.

November 1953: University of Rochester, senior economist, international economics.

March 1953: Board on Overseas Training and Research (Ford Foundation), political scientists with experience in Turkey, Iran, India, and southeast Asia.

In each of these cases the council was requested to supply the information. It was compiled under the supervision of Mr. J. F. Wellemeyer, Jr., staff adviser on personnel studies, on the basis of IBM cards containing in code the responses to questionnaire submitted by persons with specialized training. The names of persons as to whom information was submitted to the foregoing groups are attached in triplicate as requested.

The council is a member of the Conference Board Committee on International Exchange of Persons, which participates in the selection of recipients of Fulbright awards. In this connection the registration has been used on several occasions to develop lists of persons for the use of the council's representative on the conference board committee.

12. The Reporter for April 29, 1952, contains the following statement at page 22:

"The personnel selected for Government agencies in the Far East was picked from a roster of 'experts' made up by the Council of Learned Societies under the direction of Mortimer Graves."

Is this an accurate statement?

12. The full text of the quotation to which you refer is as follows:

"[Mr. Kohlberg's] thesis, a simple one, he has summed up substantially as follows, to the student previously quoted:

"There is a great conspiracy aimed at the destruction of the United States. Its method is to say "Europe first" in order to throw away Asia, then to do something about Asia only after it is too late, thus throwing away Europe as well. (Kohlberg does not appear to consider that the Asia Firsters could, with equal justice, be accused of the same strategy in reverse.) Recruiting for the great conspiracy has been going on for years. Its main tools are Communist ideology and heavy bribes; \$20 million a year is spent on buying members and operating the ring, says Mr. Kohlberg with conviction. During the Second World War the great conspiracy worked to deliver Asia to Russia. The personnel selected for Government agencies in the Far East was picked from a roster of "experts" made up by the Council of Learned Societies under the direction of Mortimer Graves."

I need not point out that the statement you quoted is not asserted by the Reporter magazine to be a fact; it is asserted to be Mr. Alfred Kohlberg's version of the facts. I have no firsthand knowledge as to how the personnel for Government agencies in the Far East was selected, hence I cannot vouch for the truth or falsity of the statement quoted. My belief is that it is nonsense.

13. Are you acquainted with any of the following individuals?

William Walter Remington  
 George Shaw Wheeler  
 Maurice Halperin  
 Luke I. Wilson  
 Mary Jane Keeney  
 Owen Lattimore  
 Robert Selberstein  
 Antoli Gromov  
 Harriet Moore (Gelfan)  
 Joseph Fels Barnes  
 Kathleen Barnes

13. I never met William Walter Remington.

A George Wheeler (middle name unknown) was active in the Washington Committee for Aid to China in 1939-41 (see paragraph 1 (b)), and I knew him in that connection. I would not recognize him if I met him on the street today.

In 1945 or 1946 a committee on world area studies was set up by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. I was a member of that committee as was Mr. Maurice Halperin. I attended only one meeting of the committee and at that meeting I met Mr. Halperin. I have not seen him since and I would not recognize him if I met him on the street today.

I have never met Mr. Luke I. Wilson. While I was in the Near East in 1948-49, a Washington real-estate agency (Gilliat of Georgetown) rented my house to a Mrs. Luke Wilson. I met her only once, upon my return, as she was taking the last of her belongings from my house. I do not know whether her husband lived with her in the house, or, indeed, whether she had one or not at the time. At any rate, I never met him.

I have met Mrs. Mary Jane Keeney, perhaps 3 or 4 times at gatherings concerned with the Far East. Most of these meetings were from 10 to a dozen years ago, and the last such meeting was at least 6 or 7 years ago. I do not think I would recognize her if I met her on the street today.

I first met Owen Lattimore many years ago when we were brought together by our common interest in matters connected with the Far East. As he is one of the most eminent scholars concerned with the Far East, it was inevitable that I should meet Mr. Lattimore very early in the course of my own work for the council in stimulating interest in Far Eastern studies in American institutions of higher learning. Drawn together by this common interest, we became close friends and have remained so for perhaps 25 years.

I have never heard of Robert Selberstein or Antoli Gromov.

I met Harriet Moore, Joseph F. Barnes, and Kathleen Barnes several times from 10 to 12 years ago. The meetings were in connection with my duties as trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations and were of the character described in paragraph 14 below. I have not seen any of these persons since my term as trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations expired in 1948.

14. You are shown as vice chairman and trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations in Who's Who from 1942 to 1948. Please name the persons, directly or indirectly, concerned with the institute with whom you had contact with regard to the activities of the institute, or with regard to policy or recommendations in Far Eastern matters.

14. I was a vice chairman and trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations from 1942 to 1948. The activities of the institute were primarily directed toward the fields of economics, politics, and social sciences in the Far East. I considered my function on the board to be that of stimulating greater interest on the part of the institute in the Far Eastern cultural activities and the humanities with which the council is principally concerned, as explained in the statement filed with your committee on July 21, 1954. So far as I know, I was appointed trustee of the institute for this reason and was regarded in this light by my fellow trustees and by the staff of the institute. When I had occasion to discuss the question of institute activity and policies along the lines described above I did so with my fellow trustees and with members of the staff of the organization, principally Mr. E. C. Carter and Mr. William L. Holland.

15. Was your connection with the institute terminated by resignation or by expiration of a specific term of office? If the resignation was at the suggestion of some other party please identify fully. If the resignation was your own decision, please give the reasons therefor.

15. When my term of office expired I requested that I not be renominated. I did this because I think one ought not to occupy a post of this character for more than 4 or 5 years. I am still a dues-paying member of the American Institute of Pacific Relations.

## VERIFICATION

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
City of Washington, ss:

I, Mortimer Graves, swear and affirm that I am executive director of the American Council of Learned Societies; that I have read and am familiar with the contents of the foregoing statement; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief every statement of fact contained therein is true.

MORTIMER GRAVES,  
Executive Director, American Council of Learned Societies.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of November 1954. My commission expires November 1, 1955.

MARY E. NOBEL, Notary Public.

List of individuals sent to institutions which requested information from the National Registration of the Humanities and Social Sciences—Received from Mr. Graves Nov. 15, 1954

## RICE INSTITUTE

Name	Position	Institutional affiliation
Bishop, Wm. Rowley, Jr.	Assistant professor, history	Albright College, Reading, Pa.
Crapster, Basil Long	Instructor in history	Gettysburg College.
Edwards, Marvin Louis	Lecturer in history	Columbia University.
Free, Henry John, Jr.	Graduate instructor, history	Northwestern University.
Gossman, Norbert Joseph	Instructor in history	State University of Iowa
Motlow John D.	do.	Sacramento State College.
Raymond, Harold Bradford	Instructor in history (September 1948-September 1951).	University of Delaware.
Shane, Theodore King	Teaching fellow, European history, 1950-51.	Indiana University.
Umseheid, Arthur George	Professor of history	Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.
Wilbur, Wm. Cuttino, Jr.	Instructor in history	Muhlenberg College.

## BOARD ON OVERSEAS TRAINING AND RESEARCH (FORD FOUNDATION)

Arens, Herman J. A. C.	Bigelow teaching fellow	University of Chicago.
Austin, Eduardo D. S.	Fellowship of J. H. Whitney Foundation (to July 1952).	Georgetown University.
Banani, Amin	Research assistant	Hoover Institute, Stanford University.
Beck, George T.	International economist	Department of Commerce.
Boushy, Theodore F.	Professor of history	Wayland College, Plainview, Tex.
Carroll (Rev.) Thos. D.	Professor of Chinese history	Chinese Language School, Manila, Philippine Islands.
Cherry, H. Dicken	Principal	Hartsville School, Hartsville, Ind.
Dean, Vera Michele	Research director and editor	Foreign Policy Association, New York City.
Easton, Stewart C.	Instructor in history	City College of New York.
Fletcher, Arnold Charles	Lecturer in history	University of Southern California.
Freeman, Edwin Ruthven	Intelligence research analyst	Department of State.
Gerth, Donald Rogers	Psychological warfare officer	U. S. Air Force.
Ghosh, Suprakas	Editor and head, India unit	Department of State, International Broadcasting Division, New York City.
Goldner, Werner Ernst	Lecture assistant	Stanford University.
Haddad, Jamal	Information specialist, radio script-writer.	Department of State, Voice of America, New York City.
Halla, Philip J.	Policy report officer	Department of State.
Harding, Clifford H.	Instructor	Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hart, Henry C.	Assistant professor, public administrator.	University of Wisconsin.
Hatami, Abolghassen J.	Personnel officer and administrative officer.	United Nations.

*List of individuals sent to institutions which requested information from the National Registration of the Humanities and Social Sciences—Received from Mr. Graves Nov. 15, 1954—Continued*

BOARD ON OVERSEAS TRAINING AND RESEARCH (FORD FOUNDATION)—Con.

Name	Position	Institutional affiliation
Heinrichs, Waldo Huntley	Professor	Middlebury College.
Hitti, Philip K	Professor of Semitic literature	Princeton University.
Hurewitz, Jacob C	Lecturer in Middle East political history and government.	Columbia University.
Kahin, George McT	Assistant professor of government, executive director, southeast Asia program.	Cornell University.
Kattenburg, Paul M	Intelligence research specialist, southeast Asia.	Department of State.
Kazemzadeh, Firuz	Publishing Branch	Department of State, New York.
Lacin, Mahmut N	Associate professor	Drake University.
Laurie, Arthur Bruce		
Leiden, Carl	Assistant professor of political science.	Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.
Lencowski, George	Visiting professor of political science.	University of California.
Liebesny, Herbert J	Research analyst	Department of State.
McDougall, Archibald		
McFerren, Darel D	Associate professor of history and social science.	Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr.
Martin, Leslie John	Assistant director	International Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
Mill, Edward W	2d secretary, American Embassy, Manila, and American Consul, Indonesia.	U. S. Foreign Service, Department of State, Manila, Philippine Islands, and Surabaya, Indonesia.
Mohan, Pearey	Political affairs officer	United Nations.
Ogden, David L	O. and M. examiner	Sacramento Signal Depot, U. S. Army, Sacramento, Calif.
Pincus, John A	Project officer	Department of State.
Robinson, Richard Dunlop	Foreign observer	Institute of Current World Affairs, New York City.
Russell, James Earl	Associate professor of education	Teachers College, Columbia University.
Rustow, Dankwart A	Faculty fellowship (Ford Foundation, to August 1952).	Oglethorpe University.
Shuck, Luther Edward, Jr	Visiting professor of political science (grantee Smith-Mundt Act).	Korea, Philippine Islands, and Indonesia.
Shah, Hiru Chhotalal	Moderator, International Radio Roundtable, WHOM.	University radio station, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Stevens, Harry R	Assistant professor	Duke University.
Stubbs, Roy Manning	Intelligence research analyst	Department of State.
Talbot, Phillips	Executive director	American universities field staff, New York.
Thomas, Steven Alexander	Manager, Foreign Exchange Fund of Indonesia (to 1949).	De Javasche Bank, Djakarta, Indonesia.
Vandenbosch, Amry	Professor of political science	University of Kentucky.
Whitelaw, Wm. Menzies	Professor of history	American International College, Springfield, Mass.
Wolf, Charles, Jr	Economist, Far East Program Division.	Economic Cooperation Administration.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Basch, Antonin	Chief Economist, Asia Division	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
Beecroft, Eric Armour	Loan officer	Do.
Blaser, Arthur Frederick, Jr	Economist	Office of International Finance, U. S. Treasury Department.
Casaday, Lauren W	Director, bureau of business research	University of Arizona.
Chudson, Walter A	Principal officer, economics	United Nations.
Condliffe, John Bell	Professor of economics	University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Ellis, Howard S	do.	Do.
Ellsworth, Paul Theo	Special adviser	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
Franck, Peter Goswyn	Visiting associate professor and director of research	Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
Furth, J. Herbert	Chief, Central and Eastern European Section.	Federal Reserve Bank, Washington, D. C.
Gilmore, Eugene Allen, Jr	Foreign Service officer, class II	Department of State.
Hayes, Samuel Perkins, Jr	Chief, United States special technical and economic mission to Indonesia.	Mutual Security Agency, Djakarta, Indonesia.
Kriz, Miroslav A	Economist	Federal Reserve Bank of New York.
Luthringer, George F	Director, Latin American, Middle and Far Eastern Department.	International Monetary Fund.
Malenbaum, Wilfred	Chief, Investment and Economic Development Staff.	Department of State.



*List of individuals sent to institutions which requested information from the National Registration of the Humanities and Social Sciences—Received from Mr. Graves Nov. 15, 1954—Continued*

## UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER—Continued

Name	Position	Institutional affiliation
Nurske, Ragner.....	Professor of economics.....	Columbia University.
Patterson, Gardner.....	Director of international finance section and associate professor of economics.	Princeton University.
Radius, Walter A.....	Director, Office of Transport and Communications.	Department of State.
Sture, Ernest.....	Assistant Director, European and North American Department.	International Monetary Fund.
Van Sant, Edward R.....	International economist.....	Department of Defense.
Staley, Alvah Eugene.....	Senior economist.....	Stanford University.
Vernon, Raymond.....	Deputy Director, Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy.	Department of State.
Williams, Wilbur Laurent...	Chief, Steel Section, Export Supply Branch.	Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.
Woodley, W. John R.....	Economist.....	International Monetary Fund.
Wu, Yuan-li.....	Research economist.....	Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, Calif.

## UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Ander, Oscar Fritiof.....	Professor of history.....	Augustus College, Rock Island, Ill.
Anderson, Albin Theodore...	Assistant professor of history.....	University of Nebraska.
Bowman, Francis J. E.....	Professor of history.....	University of Southern California.
Clausen, Clarence Arthur...	Cultural attaché, American Embassy, Stockholm.	Department of State.
Falnes, Oscar J.....	Associate professor of history.....	New York University.
Hovde, Bryn J.....	Visiting professor of Scandinavian area studies.	University of Wisconsin (1951-52).
Lindgren, Raymond E.....	Associate professor of history.....	Vanderbilt University.
Schodt, Eddie W.....	Acting Branch Chief for Northern European Branch in OIR.	Department of State.
Scott, Franklin Daniel.....	Professor of history.....	Northwestern University.
Sorensen, Roland A.....	Visiting professor of history.....	Delaware State College, Dover, Del.
Wuorinen, John Henry.....	Professor of history.....	Columbia University.

## LOUIS W. AND MAUDE HILL FAMILY FOUNDATION

Bach, Otto Karl.....	Lecturer, art history.....	Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colo.
Faulkner, Ray Nelson.....	Director, art gallery and museum; executive head, department of art and archaeology; associate dean, School of Humanities and Sciences.	Stanford University.
Frankenstein, Alfred V.....	Music and art critic.....	San Francisco Chronicle.
Kwiat, Joseph J.....	Assistant professor of English and general studies.	University of Minnesota.
Phillips, John Marshall....	Director, art gallery; curator, American art.	Yale University.
Rathbone, Perry I.....	Director.....	City Art Museum, St. Louis, Mo.
Smith, John B.....	Dean.....	Kansas City Art Institute.
Stout, George Leslie.....	Director.....	Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, Mass.

## THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Bates, Blanchard W.....	Assistant professor of French.....	Princeton University.
Bowen, Willis Herbert.....	Associate professor of French.....	University of Oklahoma.
Brown, Harcourt.....	Professor of French language and literature.	Brown University.
Burgess, Robert M.....	Assistant professor of French.....	Montana State University.
Cosentini, John Walter.....	Associate professor of French.....	St. John's University, Brooklyn.
Crisafulli, Alessandro S.....	do.....	The Catholic University of America.
Frame, Donald Murdoch.....	do.....	Columbia University.
Gravit, Francis West.....	do.....	Indiana University.
Hassell, James Woodrow, Jr.....	do.....	University of South Carolina.
Miller, William Marlon.....	Professor of Romance languages.....	Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Morrisette, Bruce A.....	Associate professor of romance languages.	Washington University, St. Louis.
Oliver, Alfred Richard.....	Assistant professor of French and German.	Washington and Jefferson College.
Seeber, Edward D.....	Professor of French.....	Indiana University.
Smiley, Joseph Royall.....	do.....	University of Illinois.
Taylor, Cecil Grady.....	Professor of French; dean, College of Arts and Sciences.	Louisiana State University.

List of individuals sent to institutions which requested information from the National Registration of the Humanities and Social Sciences—Received from Mr. Graves Nov. 15, 1954—Continued

## THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY—Continued

Name	Position	Institutional affiliation
Wadsworth, Philip Adrian	Intelligence officer (1952)	U. S. Navy, Washington.
Weinberg, Bernard	Professor of romance languages	Northwestern University.
Wiley, William Leon	Professor of French	University of North Carolina.

## REED COLLEGE

Chambers, Lawson P.	Professor (emeritus) of philosophy	Washington University, St. Louis.
Clapp, James Gordon	Assistant professor of philosophy	Hunter College, New York City.
Clark, Gordon H.	Professor of philosophy	Butler University, Indianapolis.
Cleve, Felix M.	Unemployed in 1952	
DeBoer, Jesse	Associate professor of philosophy	University of Kentucky.
Evans, Melbourne G.	Instructor in philosophy	Syracuse University (1948-51).
Foss, Martin	Lecturer in philosophy	Haverford College.
Gerhard, Wm. Arthur	Professor of philosophy	Brooklyn College.
Hakmon, Frances B.		Briarcliffe Junior College.
Jones, Wm. Thomas	Professor of philosophy	Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.
Kaufmann, Walter A.	Assistant professor of philosophy	Princeton University.
Levinson, Ronald B.		University of Maine.
Matson, Wallace Irving	Assistant professor of philosophy	University of Washington, Seattle.
O'Neil, Charles Joseph	Professor of philosophy	Marquette University, Milwaukee.
Reither, Wm. Harry	Assistant professor of philosophy	Ohio State University.
Schrader, George A., Jr.	do	Yale University.
Stine, Russell Warren	Professor of philosophy	Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

## STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM G. BRAY, OF INDIANA, REGARDING THE NATIONAL HOME LIBRARY FOUNDATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Honorable William G. Bray, Representative of the Seventh District of Indiana, presented the following statement relative to the National Home Library Foundation of Washington, D. C., by means of which, Congressman Bray stated, with the use of Government loans, rental fees paid by the Federal Government, and of tax exemptions, huge profits were diverted from public philanthropy to the enrichment of private interests and/or individuals.

Congressman Bray stated that his interest in the National Home Library Foundation stemmed from a constituent, Frances Sinclair, of Sullivan, Ind. Until her recent serious illness, Miss Sinclair was prominent in the field of employee counseling in nationally and internationally known retail organizations, notably Marshall Field & Co. and Julius Garfinckel & Co.; and she was a financial "angel" as well as one of the original sponsors and promoters of the National Home Library Foundation.

In brief, the history of this foundation is as follows:

The late Sherman Mittell, of Washington, D. C., was active in 1933 and later years in furnishing educational material to the Civilian Conservation Corps and, subsequently, to the armed services until his death in 1942. He became interested in providing for juvenile and adult education on a community level through public and private libraries, and conceived the idea of establishing a foundation for that purpose. This became the National Home Library Foundation, which has numbered among its trustees such eminent citizens as Justice Felix Frankfurter, former Gov. Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana. Miss Sinclair was extremely interested in the project from its inception, and contributed liberally of her personal funds to underwrite many of the vital expenses, as well as a vast amount of her own time and energy to its development.

The Mount Vernon Trust Co., a Washington bank, was in financial difficulties in the early thirties, as were so many other banks in that period. Its largest depositor was the International Association of Machinists of which the late Emmett C. Davison was general secretary-treasurer. Mr. Davison, with the aid of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, succeeded in salvaging assets and converting the bank into a mortgage company under the name of the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co.

At that time, there was a scarcity of office space in the city of Washington, and the Federal Government, among others, was urgently in need of space. Mr. Mittell owned an option on valuable property which was ideal for that purpose, at the corner of Connecticut and Rhode Island Avenues NW., but lacked the funds to finance the same. By combining the assets of the closed bank (Mount Vernon Trust Co., later Mount Vernon Mortgage Co.) and the real-estate holdings of the National Home Library Foundation set up by Mr. Mittell, and obtaining financing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the present Longfellow Building was erected on the site in question. Prior to the construction of the building, and prior to RFC's financing, a commitment had been obtained whereby the Federal Government (General Services Administration) would lease all of the office space for a period of years, at mutually agreed upon rentals; and, in fact, the architectural plans for the building were drawn specifically to accommodate the peculiar needs of the Federal agency that would occupy it.

Mount Vernon Mortgage Co.'s contribution consisted of its pledged assets of \$750,000 held by RFC against notes for \$600,000, which sum had been reduced by Mount Vernon, by repayment, to \$250,000.

The Longfellow Building Corp. was set up with 2,000 shares of no-par common stock, of which National Home Library Foundation received 1,200 shares, or 60 percent, and the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co. the balance of 800 shares, or 40 percent. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation held all of the preferred stock as security for its loan. In the intervening years the entire RFC indebtedness has been repaid, the preferred stock retired, and the ownership of the Longfellow Building now reposes entirely in the common stock, with an estimated current cash value of \$2,500,000. (See *U. S. A. v. Mount Vernon Mortgage Co.*, now pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil No. 4848-51; trial judge, Hon. Burnita S. Matthews.)

Founder and Director Mittell, of the National Home Library Foundation, lacking ready cash, used shares of the Longfellow Building Corp. common stock (of which he was owner, through the foundation) to meet pressing obligations of the foundation for salaries, expenses, fees, etc., in connection with the building operations, which reduced his holdings from 60 to 51 percent of the total common stock. Needing further funds, Mr. Mittell borrowed some \$23,000 from his partners in the building project, the Mount Vernon Mortgage Corp., against which he pledged his 51 percent of the common shares of nominal value at that time in view of the still outstanding and prior preferred stock pledged to RFC.

After Mr. Mittell's death in 1942, his widow, now Mrs. Fanny Sessions Mittell Caminita, then trustee of the foundation, transferred title to all of the assets of the foundation (Mr. Mittell's remaining 923 shares of common stock in Longfellow Building Corp.) to the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co., allegedly in settlement of Mr. Mittell's indebtedness.

Through these transactions, Mount Vernon Mortgage Co. was able to acquire complete ownership of the total assets of the National Home Library Foundation, to pocket all of the profits that had accrued to the foundation, and, in effect, to liquidate the foundation and its philanthropic purposes.

Subsequently, in 1945, the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co. restored to Mrs. Mittell Caminita 100 shares of the foundation's Longfellow Building Corp. common stock (valued at \$1,000-plus per share) and, as revealed by testimony in Civil Action 4848-51—*U. S. A. v. Mount Vernon*—previously referred to, Mrs. Caminita burned all of the records of the foundation.

In the interim, as further revealed by the testimony in the pending lawsuit, the Internal Revenue Bureau has recovered in excess of \$50,000 in income taxes, and would have collected additional sums except for the statute of limitations; and the General Services Administration, in revising its rent formula for the Longfellow Building space, has likewise recovered approximately another \$50,000. Testimony of these facts was obtained in hearing of the pending lawsuit from officials of the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co. itself.

During the period from 1942 to 1945, the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co. was also the defendant in other lawsuits in connection with the Longfellow Building Corp., filed against it by several component units of the American Federation of Labor, including the late Mr. Davison's union, the International Association of Machinists, which recovered large sums of money in out-of-court settlements.

The current lawsuit, filed against the Mount Vernon Mortgage Co. by the United States of America, asks for the rescission of all of the transactions by which Mount Vernon acquired complete control and ownership of the Longfellow Building, less the 100 shares now in the possession of Mrs. Caminita, and for the

appointment of successor trustees to operate the foundation and administer its rightful funds for the purposes for which it was established, i. e., for the benefit of the American people.

The pending suit exposes, for the first time, the real issues involved, and has received widespread newspaper publicity. The Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations is in possession of full information, but feels that this condensed revelation of the salient facts may be useful in uncovering other instances in which, by the same or by entirely different means, tax-exempt funds or profits, or both, might have been or could be manipulated for the benefit of private purses, to the loss not only of the intended and rightful beneficiaries—the American people—but to the loss of the Federal Treasury in income and other taxes. It is, therefore, the committee's recommendation that this matter be further investigated through appropriate committees or commissions—perhaps permanent—or through executive departments who have heretofore failed to realize the significant and widespread influence of foundations on the national economy.

The case of the National Home Library Foundation is also peculiarly timely because the Congress is now engaged in a lend-lease office-building program similar in some respects to the Longfellow Building project, and the Congress may wish to set up additional safeguards.

# APPENDIX

## BIBLIOGRAPHY ON EDUCATIONAL AND CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

### BOOKS AND DOCUMENTS

- A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust. A report of its work, for the five years, 1946 through 1950. Washington, 1951. 49 p. (not catalogued)
- American foundations and their fields. [V. 1]—1931—New York, Twentieth Century Fund, Inc. [1931]—35; Raymond Rich Associates, 1939—  
AS911.A2A6
- Andrews, Frank. Corporation giving. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1952. 361 p. HV95.A76
- . Philanthropic giving. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1950. 318 p. HV91.A47
- Anthony, Alfred W. Changing conditions in public giving. New York, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1929. 139 p. HV41.C63
- Ayres, Leonard P. Seven great foundations. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1911. 79 p. LC 243.A8
- Casey, William J. Tax planning for foundations and charitable giving, by William J. Casey, J. K. Lasser [and] Walter Lord. [Roslyn, N. Y.] Business Reports [1953] 234 p. (not catalogued)
- . Use of the foundation in your estate planning. New York University 6th Annual Institute on Federal Taxation, 1947. Albany, Matthew-Bender, 1948. p. 98-107. HJ2360.I63
- Chambers, Merritt M. Charters of philanthropies; a study of selected trust instruments, charters, bylaws, and court decisions. New York, 1948. 247 p. HV88.C45
- Charles Hayden Foundation. To the ultimate benefit of mankind; the story of the Charles Hayden Foundation. 71 p. (not catalogued)
- Clague, Ewan. Charitable trusts. Philadelphia, 1935. 138 p. ([Joint Committee on Research of the Community Council of Philadelphia and the Pennsylvania School of Social Work] Publication No. 10) HV99.P5C63
- Coffman, Harold C. American foundations: a study of their role in the child welfare movement. New York, Association Press, 1936. 213 p. HV741.C54
- Commission on Financing Higher Education. Higher education and American business. New York [1952] 37 p. LB2336.C6
- Coon, Horace. Money to burn; what great American philanthropic foundations do with their money. New York, Longmans, Green, 1938. 352 p. HV97.A3C6 1938
- Dillard, James H., *and others*. Twenty-year report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1932. 127 p. LC243.P5
- Edward W. Hazen Foundation. The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1925-1950. New Haven, 1951. 59 p. (not catalogued)
- Elliott, Edward D. *and* M. M. Chambers. Charters of philanthropies: a study of the charters of twenty-nine American philanthropic foundations. New York, 1939. 744 p. HV97.A3.E55
- Faris, Ellsworth, *and others*. Intelligent philanthropy. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930. 322 p. HV40.F3
- Flexner, Abraham. Funds and foundations. New York, Harper, 1952. 146 p. AS911.A2F6
- Ford Foundation. Report of the study for the Ford Foundation on policy and program, November, 1949. Detroit, 1949. 139 p. AS911.F6A446
- Fosdick, Raymond B. The story of the Rockefeller Foundation. New York, Harper, 1952. 336 p. HV97.R6F6

- The Fund For Adult Education. *Pasadena, California*. The challenge of life-time learning. [Pasadena, 1953?] 40 p. (not catalogued)
- Glenn, John M., and others. Russell Sage Foundation, 1907-1946. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1947. 2 v. HV97.R8.G55
- Golden Rule Foundation. Constructive philanthropy: an historical sketch, a review, and an interpretation of the Golden Rule Foundation. [New York, 1941?] HV97.G56A5 1941
- Goldthorpe, John H. Higher education, philanthropy and federal tax exemption. Washington, American Council on Education, 1944. 40 p. L13.A384 no. 7
- Hanover, *New York*. The fine arts in philanthropy. New York, Dept. of Philanthropic Information, Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co. [1937] 61 p. N6505.H27
- Harrison, Shelby M. and Frank Andrews. American Foundations for social welfare. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1946. 249 p. AS911.A2H3
- Hollis, Ernest V. Philanthropic foundations and higher education. New York, Columbia University Press, 1938. 365 p. LC243.H6 1938 a
- Howard Heinz Endowment. A report of its work, to December 31, 1950. 1951. 40 p. (not catalogued)
- Jenkins, Edward C. Philanthropy in America. New York, Association Press, 1950. 183 p. HV91.J4
- Jenks, Thomas E. The use and misuse of Sec. 101 (6). New York University 7th Annual Institute on Federal Taxation, 1948. Albany, Matthew Bender, 1949. p. 1051-1062. HJ2360.J63
- Josephson, Emanuel Mann. Rockefeller, "internationalist," the man who misrules the world. New York, Chedney Press [1952] 448 p. E744.R65J6
- Keppel, Frederick P. The foundation: its place in American life. New York, Macmillan, 1930. 113 p. AS911.A2K4
- . Philanthropy and learning. New York, Columbia University Press, 1936. 175 p. LA7.K4
- Kiplinger Washington agency. Tax exempt foundations, 1951. 4 p. (The Kiplinger tax letter) HC101.K5
- Lasser, Jacob K. How tax laws make giving to charity easy, a check list of federal tax aids for the solicitor and the giver. New York, Funk and Wagnalls [1948] 106 p. Law library
- Leavell, Ullin W. Philanthropy in Negro education. Nashville, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930. 188 p. LC2801.L37 1930
- Lester, Robert M. Forty years of Carnegie giving. New York, Scribner's, 1941. 186 p. AS911.C3L4
- . A thirty-year catalog of grants. New York, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1942. 147 p. AS911.C3L42
- Lindeman, Eduard C. Wealth and culture: a study of one hundred foundations and community trusts during the decade 1921-1930. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1936. 135 p. AS911.A2L5
- National Planning Association. The manual of corporate giving, by Beardsley Ruml. Washington, 1952. 415 p. HV95.N38
- Ogg, Frederic A. Foundations and endowments in relation to research. New York, Century, 1928. p. 323-361. AZ105.A6
- Orton, William A. Endowments and foundations. Encyclopaedia of the social sciences. New York, Macmillan, 1931. v. 5: 531-537. H41.E6
- Rockefeller Foundation. Directory of fellowship awards for the years 1917-1950. With an introd. by Chester I. Barnard. New York [1951]. 286 p. LB2338.R6
- Russell Sage Foundation. American foundations for social welfare. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1938. 66 p. HV97.R8A5 1938
- Sattgast, Charles R. The administration of college and university endowments. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940. 125 p. (contributions to education, no. 808) LB2336.S3 1940 a
- Savage, Howard J. Fruit of an impulse; forty-five years of the Carnegie Foundation, 1905-1950. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1953. 407 p. LC243.C35S3
- Scudder, Stevens and Clark. Survey of university and college endowment funds [Prepared by the] Institutional Department. New York [1937] LB2336.S35
- Taylor, Eleanor K. Public accountability, of foundations and charitable trusts. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1953. 231 p. (not catalogued)

- Tilt, James T. Legal incidents to the investment of the corporate funds of charitable corporations organized under the laws of the State of New York, with comparative analysis of decisional and statutory law in other jurisdictions of the United States. [ ] 1952. 82 l. Law library
- U. S. Congress. House. *Committee on Ways and Means*. Hearings, revenue revision, 1947-1948. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1948  
HJ2377.A2  
Hearings, revenue revision of 1950. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print Off., 1950  
HJ2377.A3 1950
- Senate. *Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*. Investigation of closing of Nashua, N. H., mills and operations of Textron, Inc. Hearings. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1948-49. 2 v.  
HD9940.U4A55
- U. S. Congress. Senate. *Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*. Investigation of closing of Nashua, N. H., mills and operations of Textron, Inc. Report. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1949. 32 p.  
HD9859.T4U5 1949
- House. *Select Committee to Investigate Foundations and Other Organizations*. Final report. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1953. 15 p. (82d Cong., 2d sess. House report no. 2514)  
AS911.A2U52 1953
- Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Other Organizations*. Final report. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1953. 15 p. (82d Cong., 2d sess. House report no. 2514)  
AS911.A2U52 1953
- Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations*. Tax-exempt foundations. Hearings before the Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations. House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, second session on H. R. 561 . . . Nov. 18 . . . 25, Dec. 2 . . . 30, 1952. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1953 792 p.  
AS911.A2U5
- Office of Internal Revenue. Cumulative list of organizations contributions to which are deductible . . . Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1950. 331 p. Law library
- Viking Fund. The first ten years, 1941-1951: including a report on the Fund's activities, for the year ended January 31, 1951. , 1951. 202 p.  
(not catalogued)
- Werner, Morris R. Julius Rosenwald. New York, Harper, 1939. 381 p.  
HV28.R6W4
- World almanac and book of facts for 1953. New York, New York World Telegram and Sun, 1953. p. 573-576. AY67.N5W7
- The Yearbook of Philanthropy, 1940—Presenting information and statistics covering American philanthropy since the year 1920. New York, Inter-River Press [1940-  
HV88.Y4

## ARTICLES

- Anderson, H. A. Ford millions for education: fund for the advancement of education and fund for adult education. School review (Chicago ) v. 59, Sept. 1951: 316-320. L11.S55
- Andrews, Frank E. The business of giving. Atlantic (Boston) v. 191, Feb. 1953: 63-66. AP2.A8
- Foundations, a modern Maecenas. Publishers' weekly (New York v. 151, March 8, 1947: 1464-1468. Z1219.P98
- New challenges for our foundations. New York Times magazine (New York) April 3, 1949: 16
- Andrews, Frank. New trends in corporate giving. Social work journal (New York), v. 33, Oct. 1952: 172-176, 204. HV1.S647
- Philanthropy's venture capital. Educational record (Garden City, N. Y.), v. 32, Oct. 1950: 361-370. L11.E46
- Aydelotte, Frank. Educational foundations with reference to international fellowships. School and society (New York), v. 22, Dec. 26, 1925: 799-803. L11.S36
- Baker, Lawrence G. Community trusts—the new look in charitable giving. State bar journal of California (San Francisco), v. 26, May-June 1951: 177-181. Law library
- Bendiner, R. Report on the Ford Foundation. New York Times magazine (New York), Feb. 1, 1953: 12-13.

- Blackwell, Thomas E. The charitable corporation and the charitable trust. Washington University Law quarterly (St. Louis), v. 24, Dec. 1938: 1-45  
Law library
- Bleicken, Gerhard D. Corporate contributions to charities: the modern rule. American Bar Association journal (Chicago), v. 38, Dec. 1952: 999-1002, 1059-1060.  
Law library
- Bliven, Bruce. Ford's new venture. New republic (Washington), April 9, 1951: 13-14.  
AP2.N624
- Brown, Robert C. The new restrictions on charitable exemptions and deductions for federal tax purposes. University of Pittsburg law review (Pittsburgh), v. 13, Summer 1952: 623-646.  
Law library
- Burke, Earl. The Giannini Foundation: how income from a \$1,000,000 trust will be spent for specialized banking training, other worthy purposes. Burroughs clearing house (Detroit), Jan. 1953: 31.  
HG1501.B9
- But it's not easy to give money away. Business week (New York), Jan. 12, 1952: 66-70.  
HF5001.B89
- Carnegie Corporation investment saga. Business week (New York), Mar. 8, 1947: 62-66.  
HF5001.B89
- Charitable trusts for political purposes. Virginia law review (Charlottesville), v. 37, Nov. 1951: 988-1000.  
Law library
- Chodorov, Frank. Bribery by tax exemption. Human events (Washington), v. 9, Sept. 17, 1952.  
D410.H8
- Clarke, C. M. The Ford Foundation-Arkansas experiment. Journal of teacher education (Washington), v. 3, Dec. 1952: 260-264.  
LB1705.N7
- Company gifts: all time high. U. S. news and world report (Washington), v. 32, Jan. 18, 1952: 56-58.  
JK1.U65
- Company gifts: bars go down. U. S. news and world report (Washington), v. 35, Nov. 13, 1953: 104-107.  
JK1.U65
- Cooper, James W. Charitable community trusts, with special reference to New Haven Foundation. Connecticut bar journal (Bridgeport), v. 25, March 1951: 17-29.  
Law library
- Cox, Eugene E. Investigation of certain educational and philanthropic foundations. Congressional record (Washington), 82d Cong., 1st. sess., v. 97: A4833-A4834.  
J11.R5, v. 97
- Davis, Malcolm. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Journeys behind the news (Denver), v. 12, Sept. 20, 1950: 317-320.  
D414.D4
- Duling, G. Harold. Approach to foundations. Association of American Colleges bulletin (Lancaster, Pa.), v. 39, May 1953: 329-336.  
LB2301.A5
- Dutton, William S. The Rockefeller foundation story: "Our mightiest ghost." Collier's (New York), April 28, 1951: 18-19+. May 5, 1951: 22-23+. May 12, 1951: 24-25+. May 19, 1951: 28-29+.  
AP2.C65
- Eaton, Berrien C. Charitable foundations and related matters under the 1950 revenue act. Virginia law review (Charlottesville), v. 37, Jan. 1951: 1-54, v. 37, Feb. 1951: 253-296.  
Law library
- . Charitable foundations tax avoidance and business expediency. Virginia law review (Charlottesville), v. 35, Nov. 1949: 809-861.  
Law library
- . Use of charitable foundations for avoidance of taxes. Virginia law review (Charlottesville), v. 34, Feb. 1948: 182-209.  
Law library
- Edwards, Joel: \$500,000,000 grubstaker. New York herald tribune, Feb. 1, 1953, sec. 7: 13. [Concerns Bernard Gladieux]
- Embree, Edwin R. The business of giving money away. Harper's magazine (New York), v. 161, Aug. 1930: 320-329.  
AP2.H3
- . Timid billions. Harper's magazine (New York), v. 198, March 1949: 28-37.  
AP2.H3
- Faust, C. H. Role of the foundation in education. Saturday review (New York), v. 35, Sept. 13, 1952: 13-14+.  
Z1219.S25
- Finkelstein, Maurice. Tax exempt charitable corporations: Revenue act of 1950. Michigan law review (Ann Arbor), v. 50, Jan. 1952: 427-434.  
Law library
- Flexner, Abraham. Private fortunes and public future. Atlantic monthly (Boston), v. 156, Aug. 1935: 215-224.  
AP2.A8
- Ford Foundation. Fifteen million dollars to study peace. Business week (New York), Oct. 7, 1950: 30-32+  
HF5001.B89
- . Social service review (Chicago), v. 26, March 1952: 90-92.  
HV1.S6
- Foundations for health. American journal of public health (New York), v. 43, Feb. 1953: 224-225.  
RA421.A41



- Foundations on trial. Social service review (Chicago), v. 27, March 1953: 89-90. HV1.S6
- Fulton, William. Let's look at our foundations. American Legion magazine (Indianapolis), v. 53, Aug. 1952: 22-23, 42+. D570.A1A32
- Glenn, John M. The Russell Sage Foundation: forty years of social work leadership. Compass (New York), Jan. 1948: 14-18. HV1.S647
- Grubstakers. Time (Chicago), v. 60, Dec. 22, 1952: 33-39. AP2.T37
- Haines, Aubrey B. A half-billion for humanity: nature and work of the Ford Foundation. America (New York), v. 90, Nov. 14, 1953: 169-171. BX801.A5
- Harrison, S. M. Foundations and public service. American journal of economics and sociology (New York), v. 9, Oct. 1949: 107-115. H1.A48
- Heilbroner, Robert L. The fabulous Ford Foundation. Harper's magazine (New York), v. 203, Dec. 1951: 25-32. AP2.H3
- High, Stanley. Design for giving. Saturday evening post (Phila.), v. 213, Aug. 10, 1940: 12-13, 53+. AP2.S2
- Hollis, Ernest V. Evolution of the philanthropic foundation. Educational record (Garden City, N. Y.), v. 20, Oct. 1939: 575-588. L11.E46
- How to have your own foundation. Fortune (New York), v. 36, Aug. 1947: 108-109+. HF5001.F7
- Hutchins, Clayton D. Planning foundation programs. School life (Washington), v. 35, Dec. 1952: 46-47. L11.S445
- Kandel, I. L. Educational foundations and progress. School and society (Lancaster, Pa.), v. 76, July 26, 1952: 59. L11.S36
- Kandel, I. L. Educational foundations and the quality of higher education. School and society (Lancaster, Pa.), v. 77, Feb. 14, 1953: 105-106. L11.S36
- . Those subversive foundations. School and society (Lancaster, Pa.), v. 74, Oct. 1951: 91-92. L11.S36
- Keatley, V. B. They work to give millions away. Coronet (New York), v. 30, Oct. 1951: 133-136. AP2.C767
- Keppel, Frederick P. Opportunities and dangers of educational foundations. School and society (New York), v. 22, Dec. 26, 1925: 793-799. L11.S36
- . Philanthropic foundations. Science (Washington), n. c., v. 92, Dec. 20, 1940: 581-583. Q1.S35
- Laprade, William T. Funds and foundations: a neglected phase. American Association of University Professors bulletin (Washington), v. 38, Winter 1952-53: 559-576. LB2301.A3
- Lasser, J. K. Why do so many businessmen start foundations? Dun's review (New York), Feb. 1949: 15-17, 35+. HF1.D8
- and W. J. Casey. The family foundation. Dun's review (New York), Aug. 1951: 22-23+. HF1.D8
- Latham, Franklin C. Charitable organizations and federal taxation. Western Reserve law review (Cleveland), v. 3, Dec. 1951: 99-138. Law library
- . Private charitable foundations: income tax and policy implications. University of Pennsylvania law review (Philadelphia), April 1950: 617-653. Law library
- Lucas, Scott W. Income-tax deductions for donations to allegedly subversive groups. Congressional record (Washington), 80th Cong., 2d sess., v. 94: A826-827. J11.R5 v. 94
- Lundborg, Louis B. American business and the independent college: the future supply of human resources. Vital speeches (Washington), v. 19, May 1, 1953: 445-448. PN6121.V5
- McDaniel, Joseph M. The Ford Foundation. Fortnightly (London) no. 1027, n. s., July 1952: 47-52. AP4.F7
- Melch, Holmes. Philanthropy uninhibited: the Ford Foundation. Reporter (New York), v. 8, Mar. 17, 1953: 22-26. D839.R385
- Melcher, F. G. Foundations and their support of scholarly publishing. Publisher's weekly (New York), v. 162, Nov. 29, 1952: 2169. Z1219.P98
- Men of the Ford Foundation. Fortune (New York), v. 44, Dec. 1951: 116-117. HF5001.F7
- Mezerik, A. G. Foundation racket. New republic (New York) v. 122, Jan. 30, 1950: 11-13. Correction. v. 122, March 6, 1952: 4. AP2.N624
- Miller, James R. He's got to give away \$25,000,000 a year. This week magazine (New York), Sept. 2, 1951: 5, 10-11. [Concerns Paul Hoffman]. AP2.T326
- The Modern philanthropic foundation: a critique and a proposal. Yale law journal (New Haven), Feb. 1950: 477-509. Law library

- Moe, H. A. Power of freedom. *Pacific spectator* (Stanford, Cal.), v. 5, autumn 1951: 435-448. AP2.P176
- Morphet, Edgar L. The foundation program and public school finance. *State Government* (Chicago), v. 25, Sept. 1952: 192-196, 215-16. JK2403.S7
- Nabrit, S. M. Carnegie grants-in-aid program. *Phylon* (Atlanta), v. 10, no. 4, 1949: 389-391. E185.5.P5
- Now the foundations. *Nation* (New York), v. 174, May 17, 1952: 465-466. AP2.N2
- Paepoke, Walter P. The fruits of philanthropy. *Saturday review* (New York), v. 36, Apr. 4, 1953: 13-14, 66. Z1219.S25
- Patch, Buel W. Tax exempt foundations. *Editorial research reports* (Washington), v. 1, Jan. 5, 1949: 3-20. H35.E35
- Peattie, Donald Culross. Grubstaking the best folks: the Guggenheim Foundation's way. *Survey graphic* (New York), v. 28, Aug. 1939: 508-510. HV1.S82
- Pollard, John A. Corporation support of higher education. *Harvard business review* (Boston), v. 30, Sept./Oct. 1952: 111-126. HF5001.H3
- Fritchett, Henry S. The use and abuse of endowments. *Atlantic monthly* (Boston), v. 144, Oct. 1929: 517-524. AP2.A8
- Ragan, Philip H. Industrial foundations and community progress. *Harvard business review* (Boston), v. 30, Nov.-Dec. 1952: 69-83. HF5001.H3
- Reece, B. Carroll. Tax-exempt foundations. Statement in the House of Representatives of the United States, Apr. 23, 1953. *Congressional Record* [daily ed.] (Washington), v. 99, Apr. 23, 1953: 3776-3777.
- Report on foundations. Higher education (Washington), v. 9, Apr. 15, 1953: 189-191. Government Publications Reading Room
- Rockefeller, Winthrop. Philanthropy faces a change. *American Mercury* (New York), v. 76, Feb. 1953: 29-33. AP2.A37
- The role of the foundation in education. *Saturday review* (New York), v. 35, Sept. 13, 1952: 13-14, 45. Z1219.S25
- Rosenwald, Julius. Principles of giving. *Atlantic monthly*. (Boston), v. 143, May 1929: 599-606. AP2.A8
- Ross, Milton. A primer on charitable foundations and the estate tax. *Taxes* (Chicago), v. 27, Feb. 1949: 117-123. HJ2360.T4
- Russell Sage Foundation. Social service review (Chicago), v. 23, June 1949: 247-248. HY1.S6
- Scott, Austin W. Trusts for charitable and benevolent purposes. *Harvard Law review* (Cambridge), v. 58, 1945: 548-572. Law library
- Scott, Hugh. . . . the greatest of these is charity. *Philadelphia Inquirer* magazine (Philadelphia), April 13, 1952: 10-11, 47.
- Select Committee To Study Tax Exemption of Certain Foundations and Organizations. *Congressional record* (Washington), 82d Cong., 2d sess., v. 98: 3491-3504.
- Seybold, Geneva. Company giving through foundations. *Conference Board management record* (New York), v. 14, Jan. 1952: 2-5, 35-37. HD4802.C6
- Seyfert, W. C. Role of foundation in public affairs. *School review* (Chicago), v. 57, May 1949: 251-252. L11.S55
- Sides, Virginia V. National Science Foundation fellowship program. Higher education (Washington), v. 9, Nov. 15, 1952: 67-69. Government Publications Reading Room
- Sligh, Charles R., Jr. Industry support for our colleges—moral and financial. *Association of American Colleges bulletin* (Lancaster, Pa.), v. 39, May 1953: 317-28. LB2301.A5
- Sloan, H. S. Role of the foundations in postwar planning. *School and society* (Lancaster, Pa.), v. 59, March 4, 1944: 166-167. L11.S36
- Sloan experiment in applied economics. *National Education Association journal* (Washington), v. 36, Jan. 1947: 14-17; v. 36, Feb. 1947: 88-91; v. 36, March 1947: 202-205; v. 36, Apr. 1947: 296-298. L11.N15
- . . . So they gave the \$500,000,000 away. *Changing times* (Washington), Feb. 1952: 40-42. HC101.C47
- Taylor, Eleanor K. The public accountability of charitable trusts and foundations: historical definition of the problem in the United States. *Social service review* (Chicago), v. 25, Sept. 1951: 299-319. HV1.S6
- Text of the Trustees of the Ford Foundation's plans to aid world welfare. *New York times*, Sept. 27, 1950: 20.
- Untory activities probe. *New republic* (New York), v. 129, Aug 10, 1953: 3. AP2.N624

- Velie, L. How to give money away. Collier's (New York), v. 122, Dec. 25, 1948: 50+ AP2.C65
- Welch, Holmes. Philanthropy uninhibited: the Ford Foundation. Reporter (New York), March 17, 1953: 22-26. D839.R385
- Widener, Alice. Who's running the Ford Foundation? American Mercury (New York), v. 76, June 1953: 3-7. AP2.A37
- Wiley, Alexander. News releases by American Heritage Foundation. Extension of remarks of the Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, in the Senate of the United States, May 18, 1953. Congressional record [daily ed.] (Washington), 83d Cong., 1st sess., v. 99, May 18, 1953: A2846-A2848.
- Winterich, J. Q. How science aids the golden rule. Nation's business (Washington), v. 36, Nov. 1948: 50-52. HF1.N4
- Wooster, J. W., Jr. Current trends and developments in the investment practices of endowments and pension funds. Law and contemporary problems (Durham, N. C.), v. 17, winter 1952: 162-171. Law library

## PERIODICALS PUBLISHED BY FOUNDATIONS

[This listing does not include annual reports nor monographic series]

- Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Inc.:  
 Bulletin A. P. New York, May 1940. H62.A1A57  
 Grants-in-aid authorized, publications released and financial statement. New York, 1940. H62.A1A58
- Alma Egan Hyatt Foundation:  
 Aethiopica: revue philologique. New York, April 1933. PJ9001.A42  
 Egyptian religion. New York, 1933. BL2441.A1E4
- Carl Shurz Memorial Foundation:  
 American-German review. Philadelphia, 1934. E183.S.8G3A6
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace:  
 Bulletin bibliographique de documentation internationale contemporaine. Paris, 1929. Z7136.B936  
 L'Esprit international: the international mind. Paris, Jan. 1, 1927. JC362.A1E8  
 Experience in international administration. Washington, 1943 JX1906.A29  
 Fortnightly summary of international events. New York. D410.F75  
 International conciliation. New York, 1907. JX1907.A8  
 United Nations studies. New York, 1947. JX1977.A1U57
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:  
 Review of legal education in the United States and Canada. New York, 1926/27. LC1141.C3
- Cranbrook Institute of Science:  
 Cranbrook Institute of Science newsletter. Bloomfield Hills, Mich., 1931. Q11.C955
- Edward W. Hazen Foundation:  
 The Hazen pamphlets. Haddam, Conn., 1942(?). AC901.H34
- Ford Foundation:  
 Financial statements. Detroit. AS911.F6A44
- Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Washington:  
 American perspectives: a monthly analysis. Washington, April 1947. E744.A537
- Milbank Memorial Fund:  
 Milbank Memorial Fund quarterly. New York, 1923. HV97.M6A32
- Rockefeller Foundation:  
 Methods and problems of medical education. New York, 1924-1930. 17 v. R735.R6
- Russell Sage Foundation:  
 Social work yearbook. New York, 1929. HV35.S6
- Woodrow Wilson Foundation:  
 United Nations news. Washington (?). January 1946.

Periodical Reading Room

✕



TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

TO

INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H. RES. 217

---

STAFF REPORT NO. 1

CAPITAL VALUES AND GROWTH OF CHARITABLE  
FOUNDATIONS

(Page numbers are from printed hearings)

T. M. McNiece, Assistant Director of Research



Printed for the use of the committee

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1954

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS**

**B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee, *Chairman***

**JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan**

**WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio**

**ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts**

**GRACIE PFOST, Idaho**

**RENE A. WORMSER, *General Counsel***

**KATHRYN CASEY, *Legal Analyst***

**NORMAN DODD, *Research Director***

**ARNOLD KOCH, *Associate Counsel***

**JOHN MARSHALL, Jr., *Chief Clerk***

**THOMAS MCNIECE, *Assistant Research Director***

## CAPITAL VALUES AND GROWTH OF CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

It is apparent from the Cox committee hearings and from the available literature on the subject that there is relatively little information from which the magnitude and growth of charitable foundations can be judged.

It seems rather illogical to devote serious and extended consideration to this complex problem without having some idea of the number, size, and characteristic of these charitable organizations that must exert such a great influence on our social and economic life.

The Russell Sage Foundation has published some excellent studies in which the actual data available have been limited to a relatively small number of foundations.

The Cox committee reported that it had sent questionnaires to more than 1,500 organizations. Based on the record in the files, there was a return from approximately 70 percent of these organizations. These returns have provided the basis for the analysis in this report.

The Internal Revenue Bureau every 4 years publishes a list of tax-exempt organizations in the United States. In the intermediate 2-year period a supplement is published. The latest major list is revised to June 30, 1950, and the supplement to June 30, 1952. These are the latest lists available at the present time and it will be some time after midyear of this year before a new list is available. It so happens that there is quite a close agreement between these publication dates just mentioned and the effective dates of the questionnaires from the Cox committee. A large number of them were as of December 31, 1951, and a small number at the end of some fiscal period prior to 1952.

Analysis of this Internal Revenue Bureau list indicates that as of this period there were approximately 38,000 tax-exempt organizations in the United States. A sampling of the pages in an attempt to identify foundations included in this list indicated that there may be an approximate total of 6,300 out of the 38,000 organizations that might be called foundations. We believe that we are within close limits of accuracy if we state that there are between 6,000 and 7,000 foundations in existence as of this period.

## ACCURACY OF DATA AND DERIVED ESTIMATES

It should be realized that the ensuing tabulations cannot be accurate from the standpoint of good accounting standards. A large proportion of the small foundations is not endowed but derives its capital from recurring contributions. Some endowments are reported at book value and others at market value. These must be accepted as reported. It is believed that the greater part of the total value is based on market value. In the case of foundations with capital of \$10 million and over, essentially all are endowed.

The questionnaires included in the analysis are of two types: the large and form A as described by the Cox committee. Of the total of 952 included in the financial summaries, 65 cover foundations with capital in excess of \$10 million and 887 of less than \$10 million capital. Approximately 150 of the form A questionnaires were excluded from the financial summaries because information on capital, income, or both were omitted from the answers returned. These were included, however, in the numerical growth data.

In the tabulations of capital, endowment capital and current contributory capital are added to obtain total values.

## ESTIMATED TOTAL VALUES

Data from 46 of the large foundations as included in this tabulation were covered by the large questionnaires. These are the big-name foundations and were specifically and individually selected as such by the Cox committee. The total values applying to this group were included without change in the grand totals.

Nineteen foundations with capital in excess of \$10 million were included in the tabulations with the 887 that are under \$10 million because nearly all of these were included with a form A questionnaire. This makes 906 questionnaires included in the form A group and these are considered to be about 15 percent of the total remaining foundations in the Bureau of Internal Revenue list as previously mentioned.

For this reason, the actual values in this group of 906 were multiplied by 6.66 to arrive at a total capital value of the foundations estimated to be in the Internal Revenue Bureau tax-exempt list. This estimate is considered to be on the conservative side and in any event sufficiently accurate as a good indication of growth trends and total values involved.

## FINANCIAL CLASSIFICATION OF FOUNDATIONS

The financial classification of the foundations made in accordance with the foregoing remarks is shown in table I. The first 3 columns show the actual results derived from the questionnaires, the last 2 show the estimated total values for each size classification listed. The values shown in the last 2 columns are 6.66 times their respective values in the 2 prior columns except for the 46 large ones and the resulting grand total as previously mentioned.

TABLE I

[In thousands of dollars]

Endowment classification, <sup>1</sup> Form A questionnaires	Number of foundations	Total endowment <sup>1</sup>	Total income	Adjusted endowment <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted income
Less than \$50,000.....	379	6,198	5,510	41,277	36,698
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	99	7,076	1,895	47,248	12,622
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	125	19,348	5,389	128,855	35,889
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	87	29,107	5,430	193,850	36,162
\$500,000 to \$749,999.....	34	20,604	3,355	137,221	22,343
\$750,000 to \$999,999.....	30	25,365	4,133	168,933	27,526
\$1,000,000 to \$9,999,999.....	133	388,368	43,509	2,586,530	289,769
\$10,000,000 and over.....	19	304,882	17,667	2,029,405	117,660
Total, Form A.....	906	800,948	86,888	5,333,319	578,669
Large questionnaires.....	46	2,129,746	96,062	2,129,746	96,062
Grand total.....	952	2,930,694	182,950	7,463,065	674,731
Total, \$10,000,000 and over.....	65	2,434,623	113,729	4,159,141	213,722

<sup>1</sup> "Endowment classification" includes endowments as well as contributions to nonendowed or "contributory" foundations that were on hand as of end of calendar or fiscal year 1951.

Adjusted data include total endowment and income reported on Form A questionnaires multiplied by 6.66 because the 906 questionnaires included in the summary are estimated to be 15 percent of those included in the tax-exempt list.

It will be noted that the estimated total capital for the foundations is nearly \$7.5 billion and total annual income nearly \$675 million. Both of these figures will be subject to considerable variation from year to year, in part because of the proportion of "contributory" foundations in the smaller groups and because of varying earnings between good years and bad.

The proportions or percentages of foundations, their capital and their income in each capital classification as well as the percentage of income to capital in each class are shown in table II.

TABLE II.—Percentage distribution

Endowment classification, Form A questionnaires	Percent of total number	Percent of adjusted endowment	Percent of adjusted income	Income as percent of capital
Less than \$50,000.....	39.8	0.5	5.4	89.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	10.4	.7	1.9	26.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	13.2	1.7	5.3	27.8
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	9.1	2.6	5.4	18.7
\$500,000 to \$749,999.....	3.6	1.8	3.3	16.2
\$750,000 to \$999,999.....	3.1	2.3	4.1	16.3
\$1,000,000 to \$9,999,999.....	14.0	34.7	43.0	11.5
\$10,000,000 and over.....	2.0	27.2	17.4	5.8
Total, Form A.....	95.2	71.5	85.8	10.8
Large questionnaires.....	4.8	28.5	14.2	4.5
Grand total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	9.0
Total, \$10,000,000 and over.....	6.8	55.7	31.6	5.1



It is of interest to note that the foundations of less than \$50,000 capital are shown to comprise about 40 percent of the total foundations, 0.5 percent of the capital and 5.4 percent of the income with a ratio of income to capital of 89.2 percent. These strange ratios result from the fact that these small foundations are largely of the nonendowed or contributory type and receive frequent contributions of cash from creators and friends. Since much of their income is currently expended the ratio of income to capital is very high.

At the other extreme are the large foundations of capital of \$10 million and over. These account for 7 percent of the number, 56 percent of the endowment, and 32 percent of the income. Some cash contributions are occasionally received by these and their ratio of income to endowment is about 5 percent.

An interesting feature of this table is that the ratio of income to capital decreases quite steadily as the capital classification increases as would be expected from the foregoing remarks. This decrease is evident in the last column of table I.

The great increase in foundations created in the decade of 1940-49 is featured by the large percentage of small foundations which in turn and as previously stated are composed of a higher percentage of nonendowed or contributory foundations. Based on the answers to the Cox committee questionnaires, the following comparative figures apply:

Nonendowed foundations created:	Percent of total
Decade 1930-39.....	12.5
Decade 1940-49.....	27.5

## CHARACTERISTIC DATA ON LARGE FOUNDATIONS

Table III which follows shows data applying to the 65 foundations whose capital is \$10 million and over:

TABLE III

Number of foundations.....	65
Original capital <sup>1</sup> .....	\$590,752,000
1951 capital <sup>1</sup> .....	\$2,434,628,000
Ratio 1951 capital to original capital.....	4.1
Average annual total income, 1946 to 1951, inclusive.....	\$113,729,000
Ratio annual income to 1951 capital.....	4.7
Cash on hand, 1951.....	\$40,559,000
Cash, percent of income.....	35.7
Perpetual capital life.....	\$1,120,202,000
Limited capital life.....	\$99,777,000
Conditional capital life.....	\$1,214,749,000
Percent perpetual capital life.....	46.0
Percent limited capital life.....	4.1
Percent conditional capital life.....	49.9
Number of corporations.....	46
Number of trusts.....	17
Number of associations.....	2
Number of operating foundations.....	19
Number of nonoperating foundations.....	26
Number of combination foundations.....	20
Average capital per foundation.....	\$37,400,000
Average income per foundation.....	\$1,740,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes capital of endowed and nonendowed foundations.

This table calls for little comment. The slight discrepancy between the figures of 5.1 percent in table II and 4.7 percent in table III for earnings as percent of capital is explained by the larger percentage of "adjusted" earnings estimated for the 19 large foundations included in Form A group as compared with the 46 in the large group.

As previously outlined, contributions to the nonendowed organizations are considered as income and unexpended funds largely constitute the capital in lieu of securities in the portfolios of endowed organizations. This results in a higher ratio of income to capital than prevails in the endowed organizations.

It is also of interest to note the relative proportions of foundation capital included in the perpetual, limited and conditional life classifications.

## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

The endowments of large foundations with definitely limited life comprise only about 4 percent of the total endowments of this large foundation group while the perpetual and conditional groups have 46 percent and 50 percent respectively of the totals. There seems to be very little tendency for the trustees of the conditional life group seriously to reduce their endowments. This might naturally be expected.

The numerical data show the number of foundations created each year and the financial data show the values of the endowments reported for 1951 for the foundations created each year. The accumulated endowments at 1951 values are also shown. The values just described are shown in chart I. There is no appreciable increase or decrease shown in the trend of endowment values added since 1900. The trend is essentially horizontal for these large foundations.

## GROWTH OF LARGE FOUNDATIONS

The rate of growth both numerically and in capital values of these large foundations during the last 50 years is shown in table IV.

TABLE IV.—*Foundations with capital \$10 million and over (includes only those reporting on questionnaires)*


[In thousands of dollars]

Year created	Number created	1951 endowment	1951 accumulated endowment	Year created	Number created	1951 endowment	1951 accumulated endowment
1900				1926	4	\$52,911	\$1,134,103
1901				1927	4	56,814	1,190,917
1902				1928	1	30,239	1,221,156
1903				1929	1	11,699	1,232,855
1904				1930	4	125,369	1,358,224
1905	1	\$11,769		1931	1	12,000	1,370,224
1906	1	10,856	\$22,625	1932	1	15,605	1,385,829
1907	1	16,376	39,001	1933	0		1,385,829
1908	1	13,173	52,174	1934	3	54,383	1,440,212
1909	2	26,662	78,836	1935	0		1,440,212
1910	0		78,836	1936	4	548,409	1,988,621
1911	1	160,897	239,733	1937	2	66,981	2,055,602
1912	1	10,545	250,278	1938	2	57,292	2,112,894
1913	2	335,126	585,404	1939	0		2,112,894
1914	1	17,118	602,522	1940	2	29,334	2,142,228
1915	0		602,522	1941	3	55,120	2,197,348
1916	0		602,522	1942	0		2,197,348
1917	2	28,391	630,913	1943	0		2,197,348
1918	1	81,170	712,083	1944	2		2,197,348
1919	1	44,762	756,845	1945	2	27,201	2,224,639
1920	1	16,673	773,518	1946	1	14,080	2,238,719
1921	1	13,703	787,221	1947	1	14,507	2,253,226
1922	0		787,221	1948	3	154,387	2,407,613
1923	3	41,868	829,089	1949	1	16,817	2,424,430
1924	2	210,418	1,039,507	1950	0		2,424,430
1925	2	41,685	1,081,192	1951	1	10,300	2,434,730
				Total	65		2,434,730

The influence of some of the large foundations of 1951, but shown in the year of their origin, is apparent on the chart. These are shown in the following table:

TABLE V

Foundation	Year founded	Original endowment	1951 endowment
Carnegie Corp.....	1911	\$25,000	\$161
Rockefeller.....	1913	100,000	323
Commonwealth.....	1918	10,000	81
Kresge.....	1924	1,300	79
Duke.....	1924	40,000	131
Kellogg.....	1930	22,000	51
Ford.....	1936	25,000	503
Hayden.....	1937	17,000	52
Pew.....	1948	46,000	105



## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS


## NUMERICAL GROWTH OF 1,097 FOUNDATIONS

The Cox Committee files contained about 1,100 questionnaires. We have classified these numerically according to the year of their origin. The numerical growth of these regardless of type or size is shown for each year since 1900 and the accumulated increase year by year in table VI. These data are also shown in graphic form on chart II. The numerical-growth trend shown in table VI and on chart II is of course confined to the Cox Committee list. It should be reasonably indicative of the growth trend of the whole group of foundations on the tax-exempt list.

TABLE VI

	Number	Accumulated number		Number	Accumulated number
Prior to 1900.....	9		1926.....	7	102
1900.....	0	9	1927.....	14	116
1901.....	0	9	1928.....	10	126
1902.....	0	9	1929.....	20	146
1903.....	1	10	1930.....	10	156
1904.....	0	10	1931.....	6	162
1905.....	1	11	1932.....	9	171
1906.....	1	12	1933.....	2	173
1907.....	1	13	1934.....	7	180
1908.....	3	16	1935.....	10	190
1909.....	3	19	1936.....	14	204
1910.....	1	20	1937.....	17	221
1911.....	3	23	1938.....	20	241
1912.....	3	26	1939.....	16	257
1913.....	2	28	1940.....	25	282
1914.....	2	30	1941.....	30	312
1915.....	5	35	1942.....	27	339
1916.....	3	38	1943.....	76	415
1917.....	4	42	1944.....	123	538
1918.....	6	48	1945.....	206	744
1919.....	7	55	1946.....	116	860
1920.....	4	59	1947.....	132	992
1921.....	6	65	1948.....	70	1,062
1922.....	4	69	1949.....	24	1,086
1923.....	11	80	1950.....	8	1,094
1924.....	7	87	1951.....	3	1,097
1925.....	8	95			

The high peak centering in 1945 is composed preponderantly of the smaller foundations and is apparently a byproduct of a change in the tax laws and of a profitable period in the American economy. Due to the sharp decline from 1945, the trend of the accumulated increase curve has flattened considerably since 1948.



*Comparative data on cash and income, supplement to capital values and growth of charitable foundations*

	Founded in—	Average income, 1946-51	Cash, 1951	Cash, percent of average income	Average income, percent of 1951 endowment
		Thou- sands	Thou- sands		
Altman Foundation.....	1913	\$498	\$825	165.0	4.0
M. D. Anderson Foundation.....	1936	1,231	424	34.0	5.4
Avalon Foundation.....	1940	687	470	6.9	3.9
Hall Brothers Foundation.....	1926	232	975	420.0	3.7
Louis D. Beaumont Foundation.....	1949	701	416	59.0	4.2
Buhl Foundation.....	1927	581	315	54.0	4.4
Carnegie Corp. of New York.....	1911	5,941	425	7.0	3.7
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.....	1910	646	117	18.0	4.7
Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of teaching.....	1906	1,998			15.6
Carnegie Institution.....	1926	989	109	11.0	9.2
A. C. Carter Foundation.....	1945	1,734	570	33.0	14.4
Cullen Foundation.....	1947	1,171	760	65.0	22.2
The Commonwealth Fund.....	1918	1,996	1,235	62.0	2.4
Danforth Foundation.....	1927	865	23	26.2	7.8
Donner Foundation.....	1945	697	403	57.9	4.6
Duke Endowment.....	1924	4,913	816	17.0	3.7
El Pomar Foundation.....	1937	507	169	33.0	3.5
Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation.....	1929	417	226	54.0	3.6
Samuel S. Fels Fund.....	1936	248	332	134.0	2.1
The Field Foundation.....	1940	696	449	64.0	5.9
Max C. Fleischman Foundation.....	1951	9	1	11.0	.1
Ford Foundation.....	1936	29,061	2,580	9.0	5.8
Henry Clay Frick Educational Commission.....	1909	62	307	495.0	2.6
Firestone Foundation.....	1947	57	1,575	2,765.0	2.2
General Education Board.....	1903	520	798	152.0	10.5
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children.....	1923	315	241	76.4	2.9
J. Simon Guggenheim Foundation.....	1925	1,083	461	43.0	3.6
Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation.....	1937	108	84	73.0	2.7
John A. Hartford Foundation.....	1929	88	702	798.0	5.8
Charles Hayden Foundation.....	1937	1,746	800	46.0	3.3
Louis and Maud Hill Family Foundation.....	1934	334	(?)	(?)	2.7
Eugene Higgins Scientific Trust.....	1948	1,000	(?)	(?)	2.9
Houston Endowment.....	1937	1,622	435	27.0	52.5
Godfrey M. Hyams Trust.....	1921	601	480	80.0	4.4
Institute for Advanced Study.....	1930	687	374	41.5	3.5
James Foundation of New York.....	1941	2,130	3,388	159.0	6.8
Juilliard Musical Foundation.....	1920	519	390	75.0	3.1
Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.....	1948	13	83	639.0	.1
W. K. Kellogg Foundation.....	1930	3,253	356	11.0	6.4
Kresge Foundation.....	1924	4,776	1,094	24.0	6.0
Kate Macy Ladd Fund.....	1946	440	249	57.0	3.1
E. D. Libbey Trust.....	1925	565	51	9.0	3.6
Lilly Endowment.....	1937	1,462	826	56.0	5.4
John and Mary Markle Foundation.....	1927	728	2	0.3	4.2
Josiah Macy Foundation.....	1930	378	65	17.0	1.9
A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.....	1930	1,763	644	37.0	5.2
Mellon Institute of Industrial Research.....	1927	3,568	274	7.7	23.7
R. K. Mellon Foundation.....	1947	482	250	51.8	3.3
Millbank Memorial Fund.....	1905	601	841	140.0	5.2
William H. Minor Foundation.....	1923	1,052	87	8.0	3.4
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.....	1926	420	1,552	370.0	2.9
William Rockhill Nelson Trust.....	1926	633	77	12.0	5.3
New York Foundation.....	1909	465	719	154.0	3.6
Old Dominion Foundation.....	1941	689	301	45.0	5.0
Olin Foundation.....	1936	978	2,650	271.0	3.2
Permanent Charity Fund.....	1917	367	181	49.3	3.6
Pew Memorial Foundation.....	1946	4,125	487	12.0	3.9
Z. S. Reynolds Foundation.....	1936	376	9	2.5	3.3
Rockefeller Foundation.....	1913	11,364	6,535	58.0	3.5
Rosenberg Foundation.....	1935	196	424	216.0	2.7
Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation.....	1941	200	1	0.6	1.0
Russell Sage Foundation.....	1907	542	381	70.0	3.3
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.....	1934	1,329	1,747	132.0	4.5
Surdna Foundation.....	1917	756	558	74.0	4.2
Twentieth Century.....	1919	457	657	144.0	4.6
Estate of Harry C. Trexler.....	1934	433	242	558.0	3.4
William C. Whitney Foundation.....	1936	75	10	13.0	5.0
William Volker Charities.....	1932	1,027	1,032	100.0	6.6

It is believed that the data portrayed in this report, while not of provable accuracy, are sufficiently representative of actual conditions to provide reasonable guidance in appraising the magnitude of the problems involved. This should assist in the consideration of any suggestions that may seem advisable for possible legislative action.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

TO

INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H. RES. 217

---

STAFF REPORT NO. 2

RELATIONS BETWEEN FOUNDATIONS AND  
EDUCATION AND BETWEEN FOUNDATIONS  
AND GOVERNMENT

(Page numbers are from printed hearings)

May 1954



Printed for the use of the committee

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1954

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS**

**B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee, *Chairman***

**JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan**

**WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio**

**ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts**

**GRACIE FOST, Idaho**

**RENE A. WORMSER, *General Counsel***

**KATHRYN CASEY, *Legal Analyst***

**NORMAN DODD, *Research Director***

**ARNOLD KOCH, *Associate Counsel***

**JOHN MARSHALL, Jr., *Chief Clerk***

**THOMAS MCNIECE, *Assistant Research Director***



**STATEMENT OF THOMAS M. McNIECE, ASSISTANT RESEARCH  
DIRECTOR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT  
FOUNDATIONS**

**PREFATORY STATEMENT**

Mr. McNIECE. From the jungle of semantics various people may derive different interpretations from the same statement. In the simplest terms possible, we wish to say that in this report, regardless of other interpretations, we intend to draw no conclusions, but rather to portray such available facts as we have been able to gather on this complex subject. This report covers but one phase of the larger work that is being done.

Furthermore, we are not criticizing change as such. Rather does the evidence which will be offered seem to show that the pattern is one of evolving collectivism, the ultimate aim of several varieties of political thought with different names and a common objective.

To explain our reference to a common objective, we wish to quote from the sources indicated a number of statements on this subject.

Report of the Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities, filed in New York State, 1920. I believe that was known as the Lusk committee.

In the report here presented the committee seeks to give a clear, unbiased statement and history of the purposes and objects, tactics and methods, of the various forces now at work in the United States . . . which are seeking to undermine and destroy, not only the government under which we live, but also the very structure of American society;

. . . In the section of this report dealing with American conditions, the committee has attempted to describe in detail the various organizations masquerading as political parties, giving the principles and objects for which they stand, as well as methods and tactics they employ in order to bring about the social revolution.

In every instance the committee has relied upon the so-called party or organization's own statements with respect to these matters . . .

Those (organizations) representing the Socialist point of view are the Socialist Party of America, the Communist Party of America, the Communist Labor Party, and the Socialist Labor Party. Each of these groups claim to be the most modern and aggressive body representing Marxian theories.

A study of their platforms and official pronouncements shows that they do not differ fundamentally in their objectives . . .

These organizations differ but slightly in the means advocated to bring about the social revolution . . . they differ slightly in the matter of emphasis . . .

League for Industrial Democracy: Definition of "Democracy", New Frontiers, Vol. IV, No. 4, June 1936:

The fight for democracy is at one and the same time also a fight for socialism, democracy, to be sure, rests on liberty, but its substance is equality . . .

But finally, equality is social equality. All political institutions of democracy are perverted by private property in the means of production. Personal, legal, political equality—they all can be fully realized only when private property is abolished, when men have an equal control over property.

Democratic Socialism by Roger Payne and George W. Hartman, 1948, page 77.

These men are English authors.

In the socialist society of the future there will be two things in which it will be fundamentally different from the present society. One of these is collective ownership of the means of production and distribution; the other is a complete democracy under which the political, economic, social and international life will be complete democratized.

The Socialist Call (official organ of the Socialist Party), April 1954, page 5:

Socialists regard the capitalist system of private property relations, with its complex, disputable, sometimes unfathomable inner economic laws and relationships, as a wall that stands between humanity and its goals in economic affairs, between man and his bread and peace of mind.

#### THE INTRODUCTION

On page A1161 of the appendix of the Congressional Record of February 15, 1954, there appears the copy of an article by Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics at Harvard University. This article is entitled, "The Old Deal," and appeared originally in the magazine *Progressive* in the issue of December 1953. We are quoting the first paragraph of this article:

In the 20 years between 1933 and 1953 the politicians, college professors, and lawyers, with a little help from business, wrought a revolution in the economic policies of the United States. They repudiated *laissez-faire*. They saw the simple fact that if capitalism were to survive, Government must take some responsibility for developing the Nation's resources, putting a floor under spending, achieving a more equitable distribution of income, and protecting the weak against the strong. The price of continuing the free society was to be limited intervention by Government.

Stepping backward for a span of 9 years, we wish to submit another quotation, this time from the issue of October 15, 1943, of the magazine *Frontiers of Democracy*, the successor to an earlier one to which reference will be made later and which was called "Social Frontier," Dr. Harold Rugg of Teachers College, Columbia University, was the editor of the latter magazine and the author of the article from which this excerpt is made.

Thirteen months will elapse between the publication of this issue of *Frontiers* and the national election of 1944. In those months the American people must make one of the great decisions in their history. They will elect the President and the Congress that will make the peace and that will carry on the national productive system in the transition years. The decisions made by that Government, in collaboration with the British and Russian Governments, will set the mold of political and economic life for a generation to come. \* \* \* We have suddenly come out upon a new frontier and must chart a new course. It is a psychological frontier, an unmarked wilderness of competing desires and possessions, of property ownerships and power complexes. On such a frontier wisdom is the supreme need, rather than technological efficiency and physical strength in which our people are so competent.

We are strong enough but are we wise enough? We shall soon see for the testing moment is now. Our measure will be taken in these 13 months. The test is whether enough of our people—perhaps a compact minority of 10 million will be enough—can grasp the established fact that, in company with other industrializing peoples, we are living in a worldwide social revolution.

We propose to offer evidence which seems to indicate that this "revolution" has been promoted. Included within this supporting evidence will be documented records that will show how the flow of money, men, and ideas combined to promote this so-called revolution just mentioned.

The money in large part came from the foundations. Men and ideas in a great measure came from the intellectual groups or societies supported by this money and found their way into the powerful agencies of education and Government. Here in these pivotal centers were combined the professors, the politicians, and the lawyers mentioned a moment ago.

Foundations, education, and Government form a triangle of influences, natural under the circumstances and certainly without criticism in itself as long as the three entities exist and the liaison is not abused or misused in the furtherance of questionable activities.

#### THE ORGANIZATION CHART

The nature of these threefold relationships can be most clearly and quickly illustrated by reference to the chart prepared for the purpose and entitled, "Relationships Between Foundations, Education, and Government." Let it be emphasized again that there is no element of criticism or condemnation to be inferred from this chart. It is what is commonly considered as a functional organization chart, and its purpose is to display graphically what it is difficult to describe, to see and to understand by verbal description only.

As previously suggested, the chart is basically in the form of a triangle with appended rectangles to indicate the functional activities in their relationship to each other. At the apex we have placed the foundations. At the lateral or base angles, on the left and right, respectively, are the educational and governmental members of the triad. Suspended from the rectangle representing the foundations are those representing the intellectual groups which are dependent to a large extent upon the foundations for their support.

The relationships between and among these organized intellectual groups are far more complex than is indicated on the chart. Some of these organizations have many constituent member groups. The American Council of Learned Societies has 24 constituent societies, the Social Science Research Council 7, the American Council on Education 79 constituent members, 64 associate members, and 954 institutional members. In numbers and interlocking combinations they are too numerous and complex to picture on this chart.

Mr. KOCH. May I suggest that this chart he refers to should be deemed in evidence and part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN. I so understood.

Mr. KOCH. Go ahead.

Mr. HAYS. Where will it be inserted, not that it makes any difference. Will it be at the end of his statement or at the middle?

Mr. KOCH. I should think right here where he is talking about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the caption "Organization Chart."


Mr. MCNIECE. I would think that would be the natural place for it.

Mr. KOCH. Go ahead.

Mr. MCNIECE. These types of intellectual societies may be considered as clearing houses or perhaps as wholesalers of money received from foundations inasmuch as they are frequently the recipients of relatively large grants which they often distribute in subdivided amounts to member groups and individuals.

For illustrative purposes, the following four societies are listed: American Council of Learned Societies, including the American His-

# INTER-RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FOUNDATIONS, EDUCATION AND GOVERNMENT



SOURCE: House of Representatives.  
Special Committee to Investigate  
Tax Exempt Foundations.  
May 1954

torical Association, Social Science Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, American Council on Education.

The four shown on the chart are enough to illustrate the relationship of such societies to the governmental and the other educational units shown on the chart. Furthermore, credit or appreciation has been expressed by both educational and governmental circles for aid received from each of these four organizations.

Below the rectangle representing education appear the various branches of the educational effort. To avoid undue complexity, no attempt has been made here or at any other points on the chart to portray any but the principal areas of operation. Under the governmental function a few divisions of activity are shown. These are confined to the executive branches of Government where the greatest changes have occurred.

#### INTERPRETATION OF THE CHART

The lines connecting the various rectangles on the chart symbolize the paths followed in the flow or interchange of money, men, and ideas as previously mentioned. The focal point of contacts between these connecting lines and the rectangles are lettered somewhat in the manner used in textbooks of geometry and trigonometry in order to facilitate identification and reference in describing the existing relationships. Finally, this chart as a whole will be useful in locating the areas in which we have found evidence of questionable procedure against what we deem to be public interest.

Leaving the chart for a few moments, we shall refer to certain information derived from the record of the Cox committee hearing.

#### INFORMATION FROM THE COX COMMITTEE HEARING

Reference to the record shows that definite orders were issued in Soviet circles to infiltrate "all strata of western public opinion" in an effort to accomplish two objectives: one, to penetrate and utilize intellectual circles for the benefit of the Soviet cause and two, to gain access to foundation funds to cover the cost of such effort. Testimony of Messrs. Bogolepov and Malkin described firsthand knowledge of these instructions. Testimony of Mr. Louis Budenz confirmed this, even to listing the names of committee members appointed to accomplish this objective. Testimony of Mr. Manning Johnson added further confirmation of these facts and in addition provided the names of certain individuals who had succeeded in penetrating or receiving grants from several of the foundations.

Evidence of actual Communist entry into foundation organizations is supplied in the Cox committee record. This testimony involves at least seven foundations, namely, the Marshall Field Foundation, the Garland Fund, the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, the Heckscher Foundation, the Robert Marshall Foundation, the Rosenwald Fund, and the Phelps Stokes Fund.

Mr. HAYS. Could I interrupt there?

Mr. McNIECE. Certainly.

Mr. HAYS. I don't want to make a habit of this, because I agreed not to. I want to know if those are the only foundations that the staff found any evidence of Communist infiltration?

Mr. McNIECE. That is the only ones I found. I may have overlooked some in the mass, but it was not intentional.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, you did not find any in the Big Four or Big Three?

Mr. McNIECE. No. I think there was some varying testimony on that which will come out later.

The tax-exempt status of the Robert Marshall Foundation was revoked by the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Rosenwald Fund, which was one of limited life, was liquidated in 1948 in accordance with the date specified by the founder.

Reference to the Cox committee record shows that some 95 individuals and organizations with leftist records or affiliations admittedly received grants from some of our foundations. These were divided as follows:

Rockefeller Foundation, 26  
 Carnegie Corporation, 35  
 Russell Sage Foundation, 1  
 Wm. C. Whitney Foundation, 7  
 Marshall Field Foundation, 6  
 John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, 5  
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 15

A total of 95.

It should be clearly understood that there is no significance to be attached to the numerical differences or comparisons in the foregoing list. There are too many variables involved to warrant any conclusions whatever on relative performance among the foundations listed. Among these are the differing number of grants made and the varying opportunities for thorough search or screening of the records involved.

This list does not include all the grants of this character that were made. At this time we are not concerned with the question as to whether or not the foundations knew or could have found out about the questionable affiliations of these grantees before the grants were made. The fact is, the funds were given to these people. This is the important point of interest to us. These grants were made to professors, authors, lecturers, educational groups, and so forth, and all virtually without exception were included within educational circles. It should be obvious that with the passage of time, the activity of this many people and organizations dedicated to spreading the word in the educational field, would have an influence all out of measurable proportion to the relative value and number of grants. This influence is increasing and will continue to increase unless it is checked.

#### PERSONNEL AND ADVISORY SERVICES FROM HIGH LEVEL

During the last 20 years and especially in the last decade, the Government has made increasing demands upon the educational world for assistance from academic groups or societies. As will be brought out later in the documented records, it is from these centralized and interlocking educational groups that much of the influence which we question has arisen.

To indicate the magnitude of these sources of influence a few matters of record may be mentioned.

The National Planning Board requested aid from the Social Science Research Council in compiling a section of one of their planning reports. A committee from the Social Science Research Council actually prepared this section of the report. The creation of this committee for the purpose is described in the annual report for the Social Science Research Council for 1933-34. The National Planning Board rendered a final report for 1933-34. On page 54 of this report is the following caption: "The Aid Which the Social Sciences Have Rendered and Can Render to National Planning, June 1934."

Immediately below this is the phrase:

Memorandum prepared for the National Planning Board by a committee of the Social Science Research Council.

In 1950, the Russell Sage Foundation published a booklet entitled, "Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services." On page 5 of this report is the following statement to which we have added some italic:

This pamphlet has been written because the Federal Government has become the outstanding employer of social scientists and consumer of social science materials in the conduct of practical affairs. *Expenditures of the Federal Government for social science research projects, either under direct governmental auspices or under contract with private agencies, and for personnel in administrative capacities having command of social science knowledge, far exceed the amount given by all the philanthropic foundations for similar purposes.*

Further evidence of the importance placed on this source of aid in governmental operations is offered in the following extracts from the annual reports of the Rockefeller Foundation wherein they refer to the granting of a total of \$65,000 to facilitate planning for adequate supply of personnel qualified for "high level work" in public affairs and education.

On page 313 of the 1949 annual report, the following statement appears:

American Council of Learned Societies Personnel in Humanities. Careful planning to assure a steady supply of people qualified for high-level work is needed in public affairs as well as in education and institutional research. Considerations of national welfare have led a number of governmental agencies to ask how many specialists of particular kinds now exist, how they can be located and whether they are now being replaced or increased in number.

Another reference appears on page 412 of the annual report for 1951. It follows herewith:

American Council of Learned Societies—Personnel in the Humanities. During the last several years extensive studies have been made of the demands for and the possible supply in the United States of personnel with unusual academic training. Because of the importance of having the humanities adequately represented in such studies, the Rockefeller Foundation in 1949 made a grant of \$31,000 to the American Council of Learned Societies to permit the addition to its staff of Mr. J. F. Wellemeier, Jr., as staff adviser on personnel studies. In view of the effective work done by the staff adviser, the Rockefeller Foundation in 1951 made an additional 2-year grant of \$34,000 for continuation of this activity.

In the foregoing record from the annual report of the Rockefeller Foundation for 1949 is the very clear statement of the need for an adequate supply of personnel sufficiently qualified in the humanities for public affairs, education and institutional research. In itself

there should be no criticism of this objective. It does, however, seem to confirm that much of the influence which we are discussing comes from highly centralized sources. This naturally increases the opportunity to effectuate highly coordinated plans in all affected areas of activities and functions. Any criticism that arises should be directed to the final product or end result of this liaison. If such end results are harmful or opposed to the public interest all who have participated in the development of the situation should share the responsibility, and especially if such activities and their support are continued.

Inasmuch as the term "public interest" will be used in this report from time to time, it will be well to define it in the sense that it is used in this section of the report of the staff committee. The same conception of the public interest is used in the economic section of the staff's report. Public interest is difficult to define but for the purpose of this study, we can probably do no better than to refer to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States wherein it is stated that the Constitution is established—

in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. McNiece, right there, maybe we ought to mark that passage, because I think the "promote the general welfare" clause is going to be a pretty debatable thing when we get into it.

Mr. McNIECE. I think so.

Mr. HAYS. You don't have a staff definition of that?

Mr. McNIECE. Of public welfare?

Mr. HAYS. Of general welfare.

Mr. McNIECE. I think it encompasses a great many activities which will come out later perhaps outside the pale of enumerated powers.

The last three words in the foregoing quotation impose a responsibility for the future upon us of the present. Later, as we approach the lower right-hand angle, we will have occasion to introduce formally the report on economics and the public interest. It will be tied up especially with the rectangle indicated as "social planning."

We would now like to offer the supplement, which is very brief, entitled, "Supplement to the Initial Staff Report on Relationship Between Foundations and Education."

The ensuing financial data will give some idea of the great amount of funds and their distribution made available in the educational field by a few of the larger foundations.

The statement is by no means complete. In fact it contains the contributions of only six of the larger foundations where the specific beneficiaries are named.

These six are as follows :

The Carnegie Corporation of New York  
 The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.  
 The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching  
 The Rockefeller Foundation  
 The General Education Board  
 The Ford Foundation (two instances only)

Great benefit has unquestionably resulted to all mankind from the contributions of these and other foundations and there is no intention to gainsay or minimize this or to detract from the credit due the foundations for these benefits.



What this investigation does seem to indicate is that many small grants have found their way into questionable hands and many large ones in points of concentrated use have been devoted to purposes that are promoting a departure from the fundamental concepts of education and government under our Constitution. That this may be recognized by those engaged in such activities is indicated by the frequent references in their own literature to the "age of transition" through which we are passing, and the responsibility that must be assumed by educators in leading the way. No one in full possession of his faculties should oppose change for the better but change for the sake of change alone may prove to be a dangerous delusion.

The following record has been summarized from the annual reports of the foundations previously named:

Associations receiving grants	Period	Amount
American Council on Education.....	1920-52	\$8, 119, 700
American Historical Association.....	1923-52	574, 800
American Council of Learned Societies.....	1924-52	5, 113, 800
Council on Foreign Relations.....	1923-52	3, 064, 800
Foreign Policy Association.....	1933-51	1, 938, 000
Institute of International Education.....	1929-52	2, 081, 100
Institute of Pacific Relations.....	1929-52	3, 843, 600
National Academy of Sciences (including National Research Council).....	1915-52	20, 715, 800
National Education Association.....	1916-52	1, 229, 000
Progressive Education Association.....	1932-43	4, 257, 800
Social Science Research Council.....	1925-52	11, 747, 600
Total.....		80, 686, 000

NOTE.—The foregoing grants follow the lines AD, thence CB on the chart.

Specific university grants	Period	Amount
London School of Economics.....	1929-52	\$4, 105, 600
Teachers College—Columbia University.....	1923-52	8, 398, 176
Lincoln School—Columbia University.....	1917-52	6, 821, 100

NOTE.—The foregoing grants follow the line AB on chart.

Grants by the Rockefeller Foundation (derived from a consolidated report of the Rockefeller Foundations) and the General Education Board combined to universities and including only the totals to the ten largest beneficiaries of each of the two foundations in each State of the United States:

	Period	Amount
To universities.....	1902-51	\$256, 553, 493
Total fellowship grants.....	1902-51	33, 789, 569
Total.....		290, 343, 026

According to our compilations, the Carnegie Corp. has contributed to all educational purposes, from 1911 to 1950, approximately \$25,300,000.

(These grants follow the line AB on the chart.)

These data are representative of the conditions which they disclose. It has been difficult to assemble these figures in the manner shown in

the time available. If there are any errors in the compilation, we firmly believe that they minimize the contributions.

#### A PRODUCT OF FOUNDATION SUPPORT

On the organization chart previously discussed, the American Council of Learned Societies is the first group listed under the "Clearing House" designation. One of the constituent societies of this Council is the American Historical Society and it is separately shown as such because it has a most prominent role in our investigation. Under this association was formed a Commission on Social Studies. Its plans and objectives can be most fairly stated by quoting from the official report of the association. The following statement appears on page 47 of the annual report of this association:

The study advocated is to comprise a collection of general statistical information, the determination of specific objectives, the organization of content, in the light of these objectives for teaching purposes, the methods of instruction and testing and of the preparation of teachers. An extensive personnel and 5 years of work were required by this plan. Means for its execution are now being sought.

The idea just expressed originated in a report in 1926 by a Committee of History and Other Studies in the Schools.

The "means" for the execution of the plan were supplied by the Carnegie Corp. In a series of six annual grants extending from 1928 to 1933, inclusive, this foundation supplied a total sum of \$340,000 to the American Historical Association for the use of the Commission on Social Studies formed to carry out the recommendations of the Committee on History and Other Studies in the Schools.

As finally completed, the report of this committee was published in 16 separate sections. The 16th and final volume of the report was published by Scribners in May 1934. It is entitled, "Report of the Commission on the Social Studies—Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission."

It is with this final volume of conclusions and recommendations that the staff committee is concerned. It covers a tremendous field of recommendation and application actively in process as of this day. Support for this latter statement will be introduced later.

Much of this last volume is devoted to recommendations of technical moment covering content and teaching technique. These are not pertinent to our problem. Those which do apply to our study of the case are quoted hereafter under the subheadings and paragraph numbers as they appear in the book (pp. 16-20).

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL STUDIES

8. Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living, drives of technology and science, pressures of changing thought and policy, and disrupting impacts of social disaster there is a notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of ever wider measures of planning and control.

9. Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.

10. As to the specific form which this "collectivism," this integration and interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence at hand is by no means clear or unequivocal. It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property or it may entail the preservation of pri-

vate property, extended and distributed among the masses. Most likely, it will issue from a process of experimentation and will represent a composite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear. Almost certainly it will involve a larger measure of compulsory as well as voluntary cooperation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to the individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative. In any event the commission is convinced by its interpretation of available empirical data that the actually integrating economy of the present day is the forerunner of a consciously integrated society in which individual economic actions and individual property rights will be altered and abridged.

11. The emerging age is particularly an age of transition. It is marked by numerous and severe tensions arising out of the conflict between the actual trend toward integrated economy and society, on the one side, and the traditional practices, dispositions, ideas, and institutional arrangements inherited from the passing age of individualism, on the other. In all the recommendations that follow the transitional character of the present epoch is recognized.

12. Underlying and illustrative of these tensions are privation in the midst of plenty, violations of fiduciary trust, gross inequalities in income and wealth, widespread racketeering and banditry, wasteful use of natural resources, unbalanced distribution and organization of labor and leisure, the harnessing of science to individualism in business enterprise, the artificiality of political boundaries and divisions, the subjection of public welfare to the egoism of private interests, the maladjustment of production and consumption, persistent tendencies toward economic instability, disproportionate growth of debt and property claims in relation to production, deliberate destruction of goods and withdrawal of efficiency from production, accelerating tempo of panics, crises, and depressions attended by ever-wider destruction of capital and demoralization of labor, struggles among nations for markets and raw materials leading to international conflicts and wars.

13. If historical knowledge is any guide, these tensions, accompanied by oscillations in popular opinion, public policy, and the fortunes of the struggle for power, will continue until some approximate adjustment is made between social thought, social practice, and economic realities, or until society, exhausted by the conflict and at the end of its spiritual and inventive resources, sinks back into a more primitive order of economy and life. Such is the long-run view of social development in general, and of American life in particular, which must form the background for any educational program designed to prepare either children or adults for their coming trials, opportunities, and responsibilities.

Page 19:

#### D. CHOICES DEEMED POSSIBLE AND DESIRABLE

1. Within the limits of the broad trend toward social integration the possible forms of economic and political life are many and varied, involving wide differences in modes of distributing wealth, income, and cultural opportunity, embracing various conceptions of the State and of the rights, duties, and privileges of the ordinary citizen, and representing the most diverse ideals concerning the relations of sexes, classes, religions, nations, and races \* \* \*

#### THE REDISTRIBUTION OF POWER

1. If the teacher is to achieve these conditions of improved status and thus free the school from the domination of special interests and convert it into a truly enlightening force in society, there must be a redistribution of power in the general conduct of education—the board of education will have to be made more representative, the administration of the school will have to be conceived more broadly and the teaching profession as a whole will have to organize, develop a theory of its social function and create certain instrumentalities indispensable to the realization of its aims.

2. The ordinary board of education in the United States, with the exception of the rural district board, is composed for the most part of business and professional men; the ordinary rural district board is composed almost altogether of landholders. In the former case the board is not fully representative of the supporting population and thus tends to impose upon the school the social ideas

of a special class; in both instances its membership is apt to be peculiarly rooted in the economic individualism of the 19th century.

3. If the board of education is to support a school program conceived in terms of the general welfare and adjusted to the needs of an epoch marked by transition to some form of socialized economy, it should include in its membership adequate representation of points of view other than those of private business.

4. With the expansion of education and the growth of large school systems, involving the coordination of the efforts of tens, hundreds and even thousands of professional workers and the expenditure of vast sums of money on grounds, buildings and equipment, the function of administration has become increasingly important and indispensable.

Page 145:

APPENDIX A—NEXT STEPS

1. The commission has, for reasons already given, rejected the idea that there is one unequivocal body of subject matter, one unequivocal organization of materials, and one unequivocal method of teaching which, when combined, will guarantee the realization in instruction of the broad purposes set forth above. It was not instructed to provide a detailed syllabus and set of textbooks to be imposed on the school system of the country. Had it been so instructed it would have found the mandate incompatible with its fundamental conclusion that the frame of reference is the primary consideration and that many methods of organizing materials and teaching are possible and desirable within the accepted frame.

2. However, the commission is mindful of the proper and practical question: What are the next steps? It indicates, therefore, the lines along which attacks can and will be made on the problem of applying its conclusions with respect to instruction in the social sciences.

3. As often repeated, the first step is to awaken and consolidate leadership around the philosophy and purpose of education herein expounded—leadership among administrators, teachers, boards of trustees, college and normal school presidents—thinkers and workers in every field of education and the social sciences. Signs of such an awakening and consolidation of leadership are already abundantly evident: in the resolutions on instruction in the social sciences adopted in 1933 by the department of superintendence of the National Education Association at Minneapolis and by the association itself at Chicago; in the activities of the United States Commissioner of Education during the past few years; and in almost every local or national meeting of representatives of the teaching profession.

4. The American Historical Association, in cooperation with the National Council on the Social Studies, has arranged to take over *The Historical Outlook*<sup>1</sup> (a journal for social-science teachers), has appointed a board of editors chosen in part from the members of this commission, and has selected for the post of managing editor, W. G. Kimmel, who has been associated with this commission as executive secretary for 5 years and is thoroughly conversant with its work and its conclusions. The purpose of the *Outlook* under the new management will be to supply current materials, to encourage experimentation in the organization of materials, to stimulate thought and experimentation among teachers and schools, to report projects and results of experimentation, and generally to furnish as rapidly as possible various programs of instruction organized within the frame of reference outlined by the commission.

5. The writers of textbooks may be expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference and new writers in the field of the social sciences will undoubtedly attack the central problem here conceived, bringing varied talents and methods and arts to bear upon it. Thus the evil effects of any stereotype may be avoided.

6. Makers of programs in the social sciences in cities, towns, and States may be expected to evaluate the findings and conclusions of this report and to recast existing syllabi and schemes of instruction in accordance with their judgment respecting the new situation.

7. If the findings and conclusions of this commission are really pertinent to the educational requirements of the age, then colleges and universities offering courses of instruction for teachers will review their current programs and provide for prospective teachers courses of instruction in general harmony with the commission's frame of reference.

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter to be called *The Social Studies*.

8. The same may be said of special institutions for the training of teachers. It is not too much to expect in the near future a decided shift in emphasis from the mechanics and techniques of methodology to the content and function of courses in the social sciences, thus guaranteeing a supply of teachers more competent to carry out the philosophy and purpose here presented.

9. A similar transfer of emphasis may be expected in the field of educational journalism, resulting in a consideration, criticism, and application of the fundamental philosophy of education formulated in this volume.

10. If the present report aids in bringing about a persistent concentration of thought on the central issues, findings, and conclusions of the commission, it will help to clear up the confusion now so prevalent in the educational world and give direction to powers now wasted in formalistic debates on methods and techniques.

11. In fine, the commission has felt bound, by the terms of its instructions and the nature of the subject entrusted to its consideration, to provide a frame of reference for the orientation of philosophy and purpose in education, rather than a bill of minute specifications for guidance. In so doing, it is convinced that unless the spirit is understood and appreciated any formulation of the latter will hamper rather than facilitate the fulfillment of the commission's offering.

It would seem that the nature of these conclusions and recommendations is expressed with sufficient clarity and force to need no further interpretation from us. It will be important, however, to show how these ideas have been put into operation and are in operation today as far as it has proven possible of accomplishment. It is our plan through the introduction of documented evidence from various authoritative sources to show how these recommendations have been channeled through the activities in education and government. While the trails criss-cross and are somewhat devious we shall try as far as is feasible to analyze the trend in education first and to follow with a similar effort in government.

Before undertaking this, it should be of interest to quote from the record to show the appraisal by the Carnegie Corp. itself of the product for which they had granted the considerable sum of \$340,000. We find no word of criticism or dissent in the following statement which appears on page 28 of the annual report of the president and the treasurer of the Carnegie Corp. of New York for 1933-34.

The conclusions and recommendations of the commission on the social studies appointed by the American Historical Association appeared in May, 1934. That the findings were not unanimously supported within the commission itself, and that they are already the subject of vigorous debate outside it, does not detract from their importance, and both the educational world and the public at large owe a debt of gratitude both to the association for having sponsored this important and timely study in a field of peculiar difficulty, and to the distinguished men and women who served upon the commission. The complete report of the committee will comprise 16 volumes, a list of which will be found in the appendix, page 67.

A somewhat different and more descriptive appraisal of this report is offered by Dr. Ernest Victor Hollis, in his book entitled, "Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education." Dr. Hollis is Chief of College Administration in the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

The following statement is quoted from page 61 of this book:

Today they (the foundations) have a vital part in practically every type of progressive educational experiment under way in America. Possibly there has been no more radical and forward-looking study of the American scene than is presented in the sixteen-volume report of the Social Studies Commission of the American Historical Association which was begun in 1927 and very recently completed. The report demands a radical change in many of the major premises underlying our social, economic, and cultural life.

Another comment of interest regarding this report is quoted from "The Turning of the Tides", part II, by Paul W. Shafer, Member of Congress, page 30.<sup>2</sup> This was published in 1953.

A strategic wedge was driven in 1934 following the conclusions and recommendations of the American Historical Association's commission on social studies.

Its point of entry was adroitly chosen. The commission proposed to consolidate the traditional high school subjects of geography, economics, sociology, political science, civics and history, into a single category designated as the social studies. Here was the most strategic of all teaching areas for the advancement of a particular philosophy.

Success in enlisting teachers in this field in the cause of a new social order would have an influence out of all proportion to the number of teachers involved.

What this all meant was summed up by Prof. Harold J. Laski, philosopher of British socialism. He stated:

"At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America."

#### EVALUATION OF THE EVIDENCE

Before undertaking a more detailed analysis of the influences working in the educational world, we wish to say emphatically and to have it understood clearly that our evidence is not directed toward nor does it indict our large educational staff, the hundreds of thousands of teachers and supervisors whose merit and loyalty are beyond all question. Let no one overlook this.

We are differentiating between this widely distributed educational staff and the top level centers of influence in which educational plans and policies are formulated.

There is in every operating unit, be it factory, office, union, council, or association a method or fashion of work that is determined by policies originating at the top. Were it not so, the organization would soon disintegrate. So it is in the world of education and government.

Perhaps, as this pertains to the field of education, the principle and its application can be well illustrated by quotation from some observations by the Ford Foundation. These quotations, as will be noted, emphasize the importance of concentrated effort for maximum results.

From the Fund for Advancement of Education, annual report 1951-52, page 6:

In an effort to be useful at too many points in the whole system of education it could easily fall into what an early officer of the Rockefeller Foundation called "scatteration giving" and thus fail to be of any real value to education anywhere. *Given limited resources, selection was inevitable. Given a desire to be of maximum usefulness, concentration was essential.*

Referring to a survey on military education (p. 24):

This survey made clear that the effectiveness of educational work in any military location depends very largely on the degree of importance which the commanding officer attaches to it and the interest and competence of the officers conducting it. It seemed clear, therefore, that the preparation of officers to assume responsibility for education in the military services was *the key to effectiveness of orientation programs. The fund plans, therefore upon request from the Office of Defense, to support pilot projects for introducing into the programs of ROTC units substantial preparation for leadership in the kind of education appropriate in the military forces of a democracy.*

<sup>2</sup> See also Congressional Record, March 21, 1952.

From the report on the Behavioral Sciences Division of the Ford Foundation—June 1953 (p. 24) :

Accepting the diagnosis of a leading figure in the field—that “*training of a moderate number of first-rate people is in the present juncture far more urgent than that of a large number of merely competent people.*” The division took as a first step the development of plans for what came to be known as the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

Page 28 :

In sum, then, the Foundation's hope and expectation is significantly to advance the behavioral sciences—to *get farther faster*—through the temporary *concentration at one place* of the ablest scholars and the most promising younger people studying together in the most effective way that the state of the field now permits.

(Note.—All emphasis supplied.)

While we have noticed other references of similar nature and import in various places, there should be sufficient to support our view that the pattern is determined at the top. It is also obvious on slight consideration that in education as in government, the most effective megaphones and channels of communication are centralized in the same places. These thoughts should be kept in mind in the evaluation of the evidence as it will be presented.

There is another point for consideration that bears upon the excerpts which will be quoted later. Criticism is frequently made about distortion of meaning by lifting such quotations from context. This is sometimes true. In this case a consistent effort has been made to avoid such distortion and we believe we have succeeded. In any event full reference as to source is given and anyone who wishes to criticize may have access to the complete text if he wishes to be right before he comments. Furthermore, the confirming similarities of so many quotations from various sources should clearly mark the paths they follow.

Attention should be called to still another significant factor in this situation. It is the fact that most of the information submitted in these quotations appears and is available only in professional publications whose circulation is largely confined to those engaged in these professions. This results naturally in two things: One, the coordinated effectiveness within the professional groups is increased; two, relatively few of the citizenry outside these professional circles have any means of knowing what is developing and therefore of organizing any protest against it. In fact much of the meaning of some articles would be obscure to the average citizen because of the subtle approach and highly technical vocabulary.

This closely channeled flow of information should also be a concern of the trustees of the foundations. Men of unquestioned competence and integrity must often be selected as trustees for their proficiency and prestige in their chosen lines of work. They have little time in their busy lives for studious attention to the developments in the highly professional fields bearing little direct relation to their own responsibilities. If this be true, the problem posed should be searched for a solution.

THE AGE OF TRANSITION—LAISSEZ FAIRE IS CLOSING

In proceeding with an analysis of the application of the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies as

they specifically pertain to education, we wish to call attention to the emphasis given to the alleged transitional character of the present period. In addition to the previous quotations, the following excerpts also tend to confirm these views.

Page 647:

A dying *laissez faire* must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners" must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership.

That is from *Education for the New America*, by Williard E. Givens, in the proceedings of the 72d annual meeting of the National Education Association.

Mr. Givens was executive secretary of the National Education Association from 1935 to 1952. At the 79th annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators held February 14-19, 1953, at Atlantic City, N. J., the annual American education award was presented to Mr. Givens, "whose many contributions to the field of education are without parallel."

Page 125:

The days of little-restricted *laissez faire*, the days when government was looked upon as a necessary evil—these have gone for a long time, perhaps forever, although in the mutations of time one never knows what forms may recur.

"On the Agenda of Democracy," by C. E. Merriam, vice chairman, National Resources Planning Board, Harvard University Press, 1941.

#### EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE AGE OF TRANSITION

We find that the responsibilities of the leaders and teachers in the world of education are especially emphasized during this age of transition, as demonstrated in the final report, 16th volume, of the Commission on Social Studies as previously quoted on page 15.

In the midforties, the President appointed a Commission on Higher Education. Their conclusions and recommendations were reported in a series of six pamphlets in December 1947. Mr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, was chairman of this Commission.

In the Commission's reports they gave credit to the following organizations for aid received: American Council of Learned Societies, American Council on Education, National Research Council, Social Science Research Council, American Association of University Professors, and Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities.

The following quotations are taken from the pages indicated in volume I of the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education:

Page 6:

Education: Perhaps its most important role is to serve as an instrument of social transition, and its responsibilities are defined in terms of the kind of civilization society hopes to build.

Page 84:

Higher education must be alert to anticipate new social and economic needs, and to keep its programs of professional training in step with the requirements of a changing and expanding cultural, social, and economic order.



Page 85:

Social forces have modified and are continuing to modify at an increasingly rapid rate, the context within which graduate schools must function, and readjustments of a fundamental nature are urgently necessary if these university units are not to block rather than advance the progress of education—and, through education, of the Nation.

With all the emphasis placed upon this age of transition and education's important part in it as typified by the foregoing quotations, and since we are deluged with the idea that change itself is progress, a note of interest is struck by another thought. It is that perhaps this agitation for and about change is only a temporary means to a different end—one of unchanging stability when certain objectives are reached.

As far in the past as 1918, the *Intercollegiate Socialist* for October-November 1918 published an article entitled, "The Minimum of Education," by Ellen Hayes. The ensuing quotation is the opening paragraph in that article:

Assuming the surplus wealth secured to the public for social purposes, how can a fraction of it be used educationally to promote and stabilize the common good; and to this end, what is the irreducible minimum of education which must be guaranteed to every member of the national commonwealth?

Volume I of the *Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education* also includes additional interesting comments:

Page 6:

The efforts of individual institutions, local communities, the several states, the educational foundations and associations, the Federal Government will be more effective if they are directed toward the same general ends.

Page 16:

#### PREPARATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

In speed of transportation and communication and in economic interdependence, the nations of the globe are already one world; the task is to secure recognition and acceptance of this oneness in the thinking of the people, as that the concept of one world may be realized psychologically, socially and in good time politically.

It is this task in particular that challenges our scholars and teachers to lead the way toward a new way of thinking.

Page 20:

There is an urgent need for a program for world citizenship that can be made a part of every person's general education.

Page 21:

It will take social science and social engineering to solve the problems of human relations. Our people must learn to respect the need for special knowledge and technical training in this field as they have come to defer to the expert in physics, chemistry, medicine, and other sciences.

Page 22:

The colleges and universities, the philanthropic foundations, and the Federal Government should not be tempted by the prestige of natural science and its immediately tangible results into giving it a disproportionate emphasis in research budgets or in teaching programs. It is the peculiar responsibility of the colleges to train personnel and inaugurate extensive programs of research in social science and technology. To the extent that they have neglected this function in the past, they should concentrate upon it in the decades just ahead.

Page 23:

Colleges must accelerate the normal slow rate of social change which the educational system reflects; we need to find ways quickly of making the under-

standing and vision of our most farsighted and sensitive citizens the common possession of all our people.

Pages 38 and 39 :

Educational programs everywhere should be aimed at undermining and eventually eliminating the attitudes that are responsible for discrimination and segregation—at creating instead attitudes that will make education freely available to all.

Page 91 :

The detached, perceptive scholar, is still sorely needed—in increasing numbers and in all disciplines. But if higher education is to discharge its social obligations, scholars also are needed who have a passionate concern for human betterment, for the improvement of social conditions, and of relations among men. We need men in education who can apply at the point of social action what the social scientist has discovered regarding the laws of human behavior.

Page 92 :

It will be a little short of tragic if provision for social research is not included in the program of Federal support and organization planned under a National Science Foundation. Certainly the destiny of mankind today rests as much with the social sciences as with the natural sciences.

One of the members of the President's Commission on Higher Education was Horace M. Kallen who for years has been active in the educational field.

In the issue of *Progressive Education* for January–February, 1934, in an article called, *Can We Be Saved by Indoctrination?* Mr. Kallen says on the pages noted :

Page 55 :

I find, within the babel of plans and plots against the evils of our times, one only which does not merely repeat the past but varies from it. This is a proposal that the country's pedagogues shall undertake to establish themselves as the country's saviors. It appears in two pamphlets. The first is a challenge to teachers entitled, "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" Its author is George Counts. The second is, "A Call to the Teachers of the Nation."

Page 56 :

With an imagination unparalleled among the saviors of civilization, with a faith stronger than every doubt and an earnestness overruling all irony, Mr. Counts suggests that the Great Revolution might be better accomplished and the Great Happiness more quickly established if the teachers rather than the proletarians seized power.

Having taken power, the teachers must use it to attain the "central purpose" of realizing the "American Dream." They must operate education as the instrument of social regeneration. This consists of inculcating right doctrine.

The milder Call says :

Teachers cannot evade the responsibility of participating actively in the task of reconstituting the democratic tradition and of thus working positively toward a new society.

The references to Mr. George Counts in the foregoing excerpts naturally bring to mind Teachers College of Columbia University and its group of contemporary professors, John Dewey, W. H. Kilpatrick, George Counts, and Harold Rugg, all identified actively for many years with educational organizations and activities of one form or another.

One of the students who graduated from Teachers College is Norman Woelfel. After attending State Normal School in Buffalo, N. Y., he entered Teachers College of Columbia University where he received his bachelor of science degree in 1923, his master of arts in 1924. After further work in study and teaching at other institutions including Johns Hopkins, he returned to Teachers College and in 1933, at the mature age of 38 years, received his degree of doctor of philosophy. His doctoral dissertation was entitled: "A critical review of the social attitudes of 17 leaders in American education."

At this point we wish to make it emphatically clear that we know of no grants from any foundation in the prosecution of this work. Other connections will be reviewed later that identify Mr. Woelfel with educational activities in a similar field.

This doctoral thesis, of which a copy is on file in the Congressional Library, was published as a book by the Columbia University Press under the title, "Molders of the American Mind." At least three printings were made which indicates a good circulation. It is based upon a review of social attitudes of 17 leaders in American education. The following excerpts are taken from the pages indicated.

The dedicatory page:

To the teachers of America, active sharers in the building of attitudes, may they collectively choose a destiny which honors only productive labor and promotes the ascendancy of the common man over the forces that make possible an economy of plenty.

Page 10:

The younger generation is on its own and the last thing that would interest modern youth is the salvaging of the Christian tradition. The environmental controls which technologists have achieved, and the operations by means of which workers earn their livelihood, need no aid or sanction from God nor any blessing from the church.

Page 26:

The influence which may prove most effective in promoting the demise of private business as the dominant force in American economic life is the modern racketeer. His activities are constantly in the spotlight of public attention, and the logic upon which he pursues them is the logic of competitive business. He carries the main principles of the business life to their logical extreme and demonstrates their essential absurdity. Like the businessman he is interested in gain, and like the businessman he believes in doing the least to get the most, in buying cheap and selling dear. Like the businessman he believes in attaining a monopoly by cornering the market whenever possible. The chief difference between the racketeer and the businessman is that the businessman's pursuits have about them an air of respectability given by customary usage and established law. He may pursue them in the open, advertise them in the public press and over the radio, whereas the racketeer must work undercover.

Page 240:

In the minds of the men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions and of capitalistic profit economy.

From the vantage point of the present study, the following objectives for educators are suggested. They, in no sense, purport to be all-comprehensive or final. They do, however, lay claim to be along the line of much needed strategy if educational workers are to play any important part in the society which is building in America.

1. The maturing of personal viewpoint by reading and discussion, by scrutiny of contemporary civilization, and by self-examination.

2. A continuing effort to clarify the vision of an educator's function in American civilization. In what degree does he carry the responsibility for controlled social evolution? To what extent is he more than a mere public servant engaged in carrying out orders issued by executives?

3. The blotting out of the "brass halo" which teachers have long suffered under. This means a will not to be affected by the slushy epithets of public apologists for existing social institutions and a will to assist youth constantly towards ready discernment of apologetics in any form.

4. Immersion into the budding native culture by steady enlargement and cultivation of professional and nonprofessional cultural opportunities available in the social environment. This is really the highest obligation of an intelligent teacher, because the value of any form of specialized professional endeavor can be gaged only by reference to the extent and depth of the individual's participation in, and appreciation of, existing social life.

5. Active participation by educators and teachers in various organizations of the lay public agitating for social reforms whose realization would be in harmony with evolving ideals of American society.

6. The thoroughgoing renovation of existing professional organizations of educators so that in aim and principle they shall be intelligently militant in criticism of all vested interests in society and similarly militant in support of evolving modern standards of value in all fields of human interest.

7. Amalgamation of existing professional educational organizations for the purpose of united action on all questions of broad social import at anytime before the public anywhere in the land.

8. Promotion of the spiritual solidarity of all classes of intellectuals in the interest of enlightening and possibly of guiding inevitable future mass movements within the population.

9. Active participation of individual educators and of professional organizations of educators in the gradually crystallizing public effort to create out of prevailing chaos and confusion in economic, political, spiritual, ethical, and artistic realms a culture which is under no continuing obligations to past American or foreign cultural pattern.

10. A teacher-training program conceived in the light of the changing aims and functions of education in contemporary America. This implies the critical re-examination of all established precedents in teacher-training organization.

11. A system of school administration constructed under the guidance of experimental social philosophy with the major aim of meeting the professional needs of teachers. This implies relegating the elaborate administrative technology modeled after business practice and capitalistic finance to the background where it may be drawn upon when needed in reconstruction programs.

12. The attitude of creative inquiry to be clearly recognized as essential in all people of the teaching profession. The trained specialists and the elaborate scientific technology of educational research, as conceived at present, to be made available as supplementary service agencies in the solution of the actual problems of teaching.

13. The incorporation of graduate and undergraduate schools of education into a general plan of public education, so that their resources in experts and in experimental facilities may be used effectively in continuing educational reconstruction.

14. A program of public elementary and secondary education organized in the interest of collective ideals and emphasizing the attainment of economic equality as fundamental to the detailed determination of more broadly cultural aims.

15. Centralized organization in public education to an extent which will not only guarantee provision of the most valid knowledge together with adequate facilities for incorporating it into educational practice in every local community throughout the country, but promote as well the construction of attitudes, in the populace, conducive to enlightened reconstruction of social institutions.

16. A program of public vocational, professional, and higher education integrally organized in terms of a social order wherein all natural resources and the entire industrial structure is controlled by governmental agencies and operated for the equal benefit of all. This portends educational planning in terms of broadly cultural and creative motives and the final disappearance of programs of education based upon the motive of individual monetary success.

17. Gradual amalgamation of all cultural forces in community life, including industry, radio, motion pictures, newspapers, libraries, art galleries and museums, the theater, the opera, musical organizations, book publication, and the school itself into an educational program as wide and as continuous as life.

18. Such autonomy for every classroom teacher, from the nursery school through the university as accords with true artistic integrity. This implies that teachers shall be answerable for their professional conduct to their own professional organizations which, in turn, shall be fully responsible to the public.

19. The abolition of the present supervisory system in public education and its replacement by higher professional qualifications for teachers and by public teacher service bureaus equipped to continue on a voluntary basis the in-service education of teachers.

20. Gradual abolition of specified grades, subjects, textbooks, testing, and promotion schemes as conceived under the present administrative-supervisory set-up in public education. The development of a series of flexible organizational schemes and teaching programs by local faculties under the guidance and sanction of professional associations and of the lay public.

21. Domination of all specific teaching aims for an indefinite period by the general aim of rendering the attitudes of all normal individuals toward all the problems of life sufficiently tentative to allow for growth and change.

22. Determination of all directly functional teaching aims in and during the educational process by reference to the needs and possibilities of pupils as determined by professionally qualified and socially conscious teachers.

The value of these extended excerpts might be questioned in this case were it not for the fact that so many of the suggestions conveyed in the foregoing paragraphs have their counterparts on the other side of the triangle in the field of governmental planning for the Nation.

In the January-February issue of the magazine, *Progressive Education* in 1934, there appeared an article called "The Educator, The New Deal, and Revolution," by Normal Woelfel. On the pages noted, the following statements appeared in this article.

Page 11:

The call now is for the utmost capitalization of the discontent manifest among teachers for the benefit of revolutionary social goals. This means that all available energies of radically inclined leaders within the profession should be directed toward the building of a united radical front. Warm collectivistic sentiment and intelligent vision, propagated in clever and undisturbing manner by a few individual leaders, no longer suits the occasion.

I would like to pause to call attention again to the phrase "in clever and undisturbing manner by a few individual leaders, no longer suits the occasion."

Page 12:

If we wish the intelligent utilization of the marvelous natural resources and the superb productive machinery which America possesses, for all of the people, with common privileges, and an equal chance to all for the realization of exclusively human potentialities—that is possible, although we must not blindly shrink from the fact that it may require some use of force against those at present privileged.

I wish to state here that these quotations just given, as previously said, are from the magazine *Progressive Education*, a publication of the Progressive Education Association which has received at least \$4,258,000 from the foundations.

In October of 1934, the first issue of a new magazine appeared, entitled, "The Social Frontier." It was described as "A Journal of Educational Criticism and Reconstruction." George S. Counts was the editor and Mordecai Grossman and Norman Woelfel were the associate editors.

The first pages were devoted to editorials which were unsigned. There follows hereafter a copy of the material appearing on the cover page and after that excerpts from the editorials named on the pages noted.

Quoting the cover page we have :

THE SOCIAL FRONTIER—A JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL CRITICISM AND  
RECONSTRUCTION

1776

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (the Declaration of Independence).

1934

The age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and a new age of collectivism is emerging (Report of the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association).

In this issue: John Dewey, Charles A. Beard, Henry P. Fairchild, Sidney Hook, Goodwin Watson.

Volume I—October 1934—No. I—\$2 a year

Now quoting from page 3, Orientation :

In a word, for the American people, the age of individualism in economy is closing and an age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch.

Page 5, Educating for Tomorrow :

To enable the school to participate in raising the level of American life the educational profession must win meaningful academic freedom, not merely the freedom for individuals to teach this or that, but the freedom of the teaching profession to utilize education in shaping the society of tomorrow.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. McNiece, I have a question right there. Does that magazine still exist?

Mr. McNIECE. It ran for quite awhile, and the name of the association itself was changed subsequent to this. Then I was informed only yesterday, and I haven't had time to look it up, it was converted back to its original name. So far as the continuation of the magazine itself is concerned, I would have to check that.

Mr. HAYS. Well, if you have time during the lunch hour, would you check that?

The reason I interrupted you, I wanted you to do that for this afternoon.

Mr. McNIECE. We will try to do that.

Now, on page 7, there is an editorial called The Ives Law:

On August 10, 1934, Governor Lehman of New York signed the Ives bill. \* \* \* According to the provisions of the law, every professor, instructor, or teacher employed in any school, college, or university in the State must subscribe to the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of New York, and that I will faithfully discharge, according to the best of my ability, the duties of the position to which I am now assigned."

The reaction of teachers to such a governmental measure is naturally one of resentment.

Page 8, The Ives Law:

There is grave danger that the new law will have the effects desired by its sponsors, not however, because of any restrictions inherent in the oath itself but rather because of the traditional timidity and ignorance of teachers. Yet forward-looking members of the profession can find in this oath a direct mandate for broad participation in the alteration of the now existing pattern of American society.

Quoting again from Educating for Tomorrow, page 7:

The task of enlarging the role of education in shaping the future of our collective life cannot be accomplished by individual educators nor by individual institutions. It is a task for an organized profession as a whole. It is a task which the NEA might make its central project.

Page 7, Educating for Tomorrow:

We submit to the membership of the NEA that its role in the life of the nation would be greatly enhanced if it identified itself with an ideal of social living which alone can bring the social crisis to a happy resolution—a collectivistic and classless society. We further submit that the effectiveness of the NEA would be greatly increased if instead of looking for defenders of education among the ranks of conservative groups, it would identify itself with the underprivileged classes who are the real beneficiaries of public education and who can find their adjustment only in a radically democratic social order.

It is interesting to note that Norman Woelfel, then an associate editor of the Social Frontier, who is now professor of education at Ohio State University, is now actively participating in the activities of the National Education Association.

Mr. HAYS. Just a moment, you say you are talking about Woelfel now?

Mr. McNIECE. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. And he is at Ohio State and he is a member of the NEA, too?

Mr. McNIECE. According to the NEA booklet.

Mr. HAYS. How subversive can you get?

Mr. McNIECE. One of the departments of NEA is the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. This Association recently issued its yearbook for 1953 under the title "Forces Affect-

ing American Education." Professor Woelfel was a member of the supervising committee responsible for the creation of this work.

Under the caption Culture Affecting Education the following statements appear, and this is in 1953 :

Page 27 :

Teachers in our schools have an immediate responsibility to their students and to the community at large to rethink their programs in terms of the necessity of social adaptation to changing technology.

Page 27 :

We began our government with the rule of law—the Constitution. The federal judicial system has become its special guardian. Over the years there has been a gradual modification of the principle of property rights and of public welfare.

An illustration of a fundamental transition which is affecting our lives is the modification of the old concept of the common law. The common law in America, which is merely English law built up through decisions of the courts, has been individualistic. It has stressed protection of property and freedom of contract. Where the welfare of society has been concerned, the common law has been assumed to be sufficient to effect this through the individual. The rationale has been liberty rather than either equality or fraternity.

This trend toward a balance between the welfare of the individual and the welfare of society is in conflict with earlier assumptions. It is a trend which we cannot ignore. It presents fundamental problems for education in modern society.

Pages 36-37 :

There are tensions and overt conflicts in our present society over the functions and methods of education. Men who are established at the pinnacle of success in the typical American conception can and sometimes do find themselves more interested in shaping society according to their own wishes, through the public schools, than in conforming to society's newer demands for free intelligence. The very power of their positions makes them formidable foes of any conception of education for all the people that is in conflict with their special convictions.

Through the strength of our success patterns it is quite possible for men whose lives are wholly unrelated to the process of education to come to power and to assume the role of determining what should be taught and how it should be taught. The professional educator whose business it is to know both the process and the method is not always a match for such opposition. But we should not forget that many other men, who are also at the pinnacle of success, are the firmest defenders of the public schools and the method of intelligence. In recent years, the public schools have received excellent support from just such persons. Throughout the years, such men have established foundations for the advancement of education and culture.

Directly or indirectly, the NEA is identified with an interesting situation involving an article recently published by *Look* magazine. In this issue of this magazine of March 9, 1954, an article by Robert M. Hutchins was published under the title "Are Our Teachers Afraid to Teach?" The opening statements in this article are as follows :

Education is impossible in many parts of the United States today because free inquiry and free discussion are impossible. In these communities, the teacher of economics, history or political science cannot teach. Even the teacher of literature must be careful. Didn't a member of Indiana's Text Book Commission call Robin Hood subversive?

The National Education Association studied no less than 522 school systems, covering every section of the United States, and came to the conclusion that American teachers today are reluctant to consider "controversial issues."



This article and the statement quoted above were of interest to us. A letter was therefore written to the NEA asking for information about the report on the 522 school systems. The letter in reply to our request is quoted herewith, together with our letter which preceded it.

MARCH 19, 1954.

Mr. FRANK W. HUBBARD,

*Director of Research, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HUBBARD: In an article in Look magazine of March 9, 1954, Mr. Robert M. Hutchins refers to a survey made by your association.

He reports that this survey came to the conclusion that teachers of economics, history and political sciences in 522 school systems, covering every section of the United States, are reluctant to consider controversial issues in their teaching.

This statement suggests the possibility of a serious handicap to education. We want to evaluate your report so that we may learn the nature of the fears to which Mr. Hutchins refers in this article.

Your report will offer us a welcome contribution to our understanding of the nature of the services rendered by your tax exempt organization to education.

With thanks for your attention,

Very truly yours,

NORMAN DODD,  
*Research Director.*

I will now quote the reply:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,  
*Washington 6, D. C., March 24, 1954.*

Mr. NORMAN DODD,

*Research Director, Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations, House of Representatives,  
Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. DODD: In reply to your letter of March 19, I am sending you a copy of the report prepared by the NEA research division in June 1953 for the NEA committee on tenure and academic freedom. This report has never been printed or issued in any form other than the enclosed typewritten form.

So far as I know Mr. Hutchins did not have a copy of this typed memorandum, altho he may have borrowed one from someone who received a copy. A few typewritten copies have been sent to members of the committee on tenure and academic freedom and to a few other individuals who have written asking for copies. It is possible that Mr. Hutchins drew his information from the newspaper stories which were issued from Miami Beach during the summer of 1953 as a result of a press conference on this report. At any rate, I am not sure that Mr. Hutchins' conclusions would be exactly those of the NEA research division or of the NEA committee on tenure and academic freedom.

Cordially yours,

FRANK W. HUBBARD,  
*Director, Research Division.*

Inference from this letter seems reasonably clear. Careful reading by the staff failed to disclose any basis for the conclusion reached by Mr. Hutchins.

Regardless of the letter quoted, the NEA had many reprints of this article. The mere existence of these reprints suggests that they must have been intended for distribution to interested parties. Whether or not they have been or are being distributed, we do not know.

We also wonder how many educators would support the concluding line of Dr. Hutchins' article:

No country ever needed education more than ours does today.

Before beginning a discussion of the relationships between foundations and government, it should be understood by all that we realize that we are entering the sensitive area of political controversy. One reason for mentioning this at this time is that we wish it to be understood that we are limiting our analysis of the conditions as we shall describe them, first to documented statements from the sources quoted and second, in the economics section of the report to statistical information available in the Government's own publications.

The economic facts seem to substantiate the conclusion that many of the proposals advanced by the planners and deemed experimental by some and questionable by others have been put into practice and are a part of our everyday lives as we are now living them. Congressional appropriations and governmental expenditures indicate this. While these facts seem to speak for themselves, there are certain interpretations which we shall make especially with reference to future conditions if we choose to continue these collectivistic ventures.

In these conclusions we are taking no partisan political position, nor do we wish to encourage or support any other attitude than this.

Our interest in these problems as they affect the state of the Nation and its future far exceeds our interest in any form of political preferment.

Now, this section of the manuscript report is headed, "Relationships Between Foundations and Government." It is particularly concerned with the national and social planning.

Before proceeding with the submission of evidence bearing upon the relationships between foundations and government, we wish to make some comments by way of background as they pertain to national and social planning by government.

Three things should be obvious to anyone reasonably familiar with the interlocking complexities of our production, distribution, service, and financial problems in our economy:

(1) The successful correlation of all these activities would require the complete control of all phases of our economic endeavors. Price control, for example, cannot be effectively maintained without rigorous control of material supply and costs, wages, transportation, and all other elements entering into final costs.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that these reports are very long, and if Mr. McNiece is going to read all of them today, that is about all we are going to get done. I have read them. I have some questions I would like to ask about them. I would like to just have them put in the record as is, and then go on with the questioning. I think it would save a lot of time.

Mr. KOCH. He was just going to read the shorter one.

Mr. HAYS. Is he going to read the typewritten introduction of this?

Mr. KOCH. No.

Mr. McNIECE. I had expected to take selective manuscript reading. It would be dull and deadly, and I would say completely impossible to convey to anyone the message involved in that great series of, I think, 20 statistical tables. I could not hope to do that by reading. I had not expected to do that.

Mr. KOCH. You intended to read only the mimeographed statement?

Mr. McNIECE. Yes, and certain conclusions and introduction material from the Economic Report.

The CHAIRMAN. This is 19 pages.

Mr. McNIECE. That is all.

Mrs. PFOST. There is a lot of single spacing and tightly written pages.

The CHAIRMAN. The quotations are single spaced. Had you expected to read the quotations in full?

Mr. McNIECE. I had intended to read the quotations in full. It is immaterial to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't you continue with the shorter form? The other material is to be inserted in the record.

Mr. McNIECE. That is right. There are certain things in these quotations that I think from my point of view are very important from the standpoint of Mr. Hays' questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. HAYS. I have about 8 or 10 questions to this document, and I was wondering if you have any objection in order to prevent the disorganized thing we have had in the past, and going some other day, you could read them and answer all of my questions before noon? Would you have any objection if I stopped you at the bottom of page 2 and asked a question right there while it is fresh in mind?

The CHAIRMAN. What he had in mind, as I understood a while ago, in the remainder of this brief form might be the basis for answers. I have not read these quotations. I would rather like to hear them, if I might, before the questioning. I think we would have time before noon to conclude this and have the questioning also before noon, which I would like to do.

Mr. McNIECE. Yes, we could.

The CHAIRMAN. For my own information, I would rather like to have it.

Mr. McNIECE. It is very vital, Mr. Reece, to the questions which Mr. Hays very properly asked. I would like at least to present those that bear upon this idea of, let us say, a concentrated corps of influence. It is involved here to a certain extent. It is involved in one of the very first questions Mr. Hays asked me this morning. So I think it would be better if we could at least go this far with it.

Mr. HAYS. Read this whole thing?

Mr. McNIECE. Yes, it is not going to take very long.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. McNIECE. Otherwise, shortages, surpluses, and bottlenecks would bob up continuously and everywhere.

(2) With the complexity due to the literally millions of points or junctures where difficulties may arise, no man or centralized group of men possess the knowledge or judgment that will equal the integrated judgment of thousands of experienced men applied at the points where and when troubles first develop.

At the time when increased complexity of national and international affairs seem to make more governmental planning and control necessary, the Government is actually becoming less and less able to exercise rational and competent control over the multiplicity of details essential to good planning. To be even superficially effective, it must be completely autocratic.

(3) Even though such centralized planning were physically possible, the net results would be a smaller and smaller percentage of goods and services produced that would be available for those who produce them. This would result from the increasing cost of the

governmental agencies and bureaus necessary to devise and maintain control. Of course this would have to be met by increasing taxation. That is the experience in Russia and it has been developing here for some years as will be shown in the staff's economic report.

From the beginning, the Socialist programs have called for national ownership and planning of productive facilities.

Such references are frequent and clear. Perhaps the following quotation from Engels, friend and contemporary of Marx, may illustrate the point.

The planless production of capitalist society capitulates before the planned production of the invading Socialist society.

To emphasize the reiteration of this concept by a responsible body of men in our own times and country, we may again refer to a paragraph from the report of the Commission on Social Studies. After 5 years of deliberation they say (American Historical Association, Committee on Social Studies, p. 16):

Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living, drives of technology and science, pressures of changing thought and policy, and disrupting impacts of economic disaster, there is a notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of ever wider measures of planning and control.

In what way has this expression of belief found its way into our governmental activities?

In 1933, the National Planning Board was formed. How did it look upon its task and what seem to be its final objectives? These may be indicated in part by the following extracts from its final report for 1933-34—National Planning Board, final report 1933-34, page 11:

State and interstate planning is a lusty infant but the work is only beginning. Advisory economic councils may be regarded as instrumentalities for stimulating a coordinated view of national life and for developing mental attitudes favorable to the principle of national planning.

Page 60:

Finally, mention should be made of the fact that there are three great national councils which contribute to research in the social sciences. The Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, and the Social Science Research Council are important factors in the development of research and add their activities to the body of scientific material available in any program of national planning.

The Council of Learned Societies has promoted historical and general social research.

The American Council on Education has recently sponsored an inquiry into the relation of Federal, State, and local governments to the conduct of public education. It has served as the organizing center for studies of materials of instruction and problems of educational administration. It represents the educational organizations of the country and is active in promoting research in its special field.

The Social Science Research Council, a committee of which prepared this memorandum, is an organization engaged in planning research. It is true that its object has not been to make social plans, but rather to plan research in the social field. A decade of thought on planning activities through its committees, distributed widely over the social sciences, has given it an experience, a background with regard to the idea of planning, that should be of value if it were called on to aid in national planning. Furthermore, the members of the Social Science Research Council, its staff, and the members of its committees are perhaps more familiar than the members of any other organization with the personnel in the social sciences, with the research interests of social scientists, and

with the experience and capabilities of social science research workers in the United States. The members of the council are familiar with the different bureaus of research. The council has been concerned chiefly with the determination of the groups and persons with whom special types of research should be placed. For this purpose it has set up committees, organized commissions, promoted research, and sponsored the development of various research agencies and interests. With its pivotal position among the social sciences, it could undoubtedly render valuable aid if called on to do so, in the formidable task of national planning.

Page 66:

It was after the Civil War that American economic life came to be dominated by the philosophy of laissez faire and by the doctrines of rugged individualism. But the economic and social evils of the period resulted in the development of new planning attitudes tending to emphasize especially public control and regulation.

Page 67:

Summing up the developments of these 125 years, one may say that insofar as the subject here considered is concerned, they are important because they left us a fourfold heritage:

First, to think in terms of an institutional framework which may be fashioned in accordance with prepared plans;

Second, a tendency to achieve results by compromise in which different lines and policies are more or less reconciled;

Third, a tendency to stress in theory the part played in economic life by individualism, while at the same time having recourse in practice to governmental aid and to collective action when necessary; and

Fourth, a continued social control applied to special areas of economic life.

Page 71:

Such was the note already heard in America when during 1928-29 came the first intimations of the 5-year plan, and the Western World began to be interested in the work and methods of the Gosplan in Moscow. The Russian experience was not embodied in any concrete way in American thinking, but it stimulated the idea that we need to develop in an American plan out of our American background.

The National Planning Board after furnishing its report in 1934 was discontinued.

The National Resources Committee was in existence from 1934 to 1939.

In 1939, the National Resources Planning Board was constituted, in part with the same personnel. After a few years of deliberation, it rendered its final report, from which the following verbatim and continuous extract is quoted from page 3:

The National Resources Planning Board believes that it should be the declared policy of the United States Government to promote and maintain a high level of national production and consumption by all appropriate measures necessary for this purpose. The Board further believes that it should be the declared policy of the United States Government.

To underwrite full employment for the employables;

To guarantee a job for every man released from the Armed Forces and the war industries at the close of the war, with fair pay and working conditions;

To guarantee and, when necessary, underwrite:

Equal access to security,

Equal access to education for all,

Equal access to health and nutrition for all, and

Wholesome housing conditions for all.

This policy grows directly out of the Board's statement concerning which the President has said:

"All of the free peoples must plan, work, and fight together for the maintenance and development of our freedoms and rights."

## THE FOUR FREEDOMS

Freedom of speech and expression, freedom to worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear : and

## A NEW BILL OF RIGHTS

1. The right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years;
2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service.

Mr. HAYS. Would you mind identifying where this came from?

Mr. MCNIECE. Yes, sir. This is the final report of the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. HAYS. All right.

Mr. MCNIECE (reading) :

3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care;
4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment, and accident;
5. The right to live in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies;
6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police;
7. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness; and
8. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact;
9. The right to rest, recreation, and adventure, the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization.

Plans for this purpose are supported and explained in this report. The previous publications of the Board, including National Resources Development Report for 1942, transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 14, 1942, and a series of pamphlets (After Defense—What? After the War—Full Employment, Postwar Planning, etc.), also provide background for this proposal.

The plans just mentioned are incorporated in a series of points under the following captions:

Page 13: A. Plans for Private Enterprise.

Page 13: B. Plans for Finance and Fiscal Policies.

Page 13: C. Plans for Improvement of Physical Facilities.

Page 16: D. Essential Safeguards of Democracy.

Under a caption, "Plans for Services and Security" are extensive recommendations under the descriptive headings which follow:

Pages 16-17:

- A. Plans for Development of Service Activities.
  1. Equal access to education.
  2. Health, nutrition, and medical care.
- B. Plans for Underwriting Employment
- C. Plans for Social Security

Still another basic caption appears as follows:

Pages 60-66: Equal Access to Health:

- I. Elimination of All Preventable Diseases and Disabilities.
- II. Assurance of Proper Nutrition for All Our People.
- III. Assurance of Adequate Health and Medical Care for All.
- IV. Economical and Efficient Organization of Health Services.

A statement of authorship of the section on Equal Access to Health says that it was prepared under the direction of Assistant Director Thomas C. Blaisdell, by Dr. Eveline M. Burns, of the Board's staff. Dr. Burns is a graduate of the London School of Economics, which has received grants from the Rockefeller Foundation totaling \$4,105,600.

The discussion and detailed recommendations in this final report of the National Resources Planning Board are far too lengthy to be incorporated in this study. Certainly, some of them seem reasonable from the standpoint of our former governmental procedure but others are sufficiently novel to warrant mention herein in order to clarify the underlying objectives in the fields mentioned.

#### PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES<sup>1</sup>

We recommend for consideration: With private enterprise, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or possibly one or several Federal Development Corporations and subsidiaries providing for participation of both public and private investment and representation in management—particularly for urban redevelopment, housing, transport terminal reorganization, and energy development. Government should assist these joint efforts through such measures as:

(1) Government authority to clear obsolescent plant of various kinds, as, for instance, we have done in the past through condemnation of unsanitary dwellings, to remove the menace to health and competition with other or better housing.

(2) Governmental authority to assemble properties for reorganization and redevelopment—perhaps along the lines of previous grants of the power of eminent domain to canal and railroad companies for the acquisition of rights-of way.

#### HEALTH, NUTRITION, AND MEDICAL CARE

Assurance of adequate medical and health care for all, regardless of place of residence or income status and on a basis that is consistent with the self respect of the recipient, through:

(1) Federal appropriations to aid States and localities in developing a system of regional and local hospitals and health centers covering all parts of the country:

(2) Assurance of an adequate and well-distributed supply of physicians, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel.

#### PLANS FOR UNDERWRITING EMPLOYMENT

To guarantee the right to a job, activities in the provision of physical facilities and service activities should be supplemented by:

(1) Formal acceptance by the Federal Government of responsibility for insuring jobs at decent pay to all those able to work regardless of whether or not they can pass a means test;

(2) The preparation of plans and programs, in addition to those recommended under public works (II-B-3), for all kinds of socially useful work other than construction, arranged according to the variety of abilities and location of persons seeking employment.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> From final report, NRPB, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

## Page 17:

## PLANS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Reorganization of the unemployment compensation laws to provide broadened coverage, more nearly adequate payments, incorporating benefits to dependents, payments of benefits for at least 26 weeks, and replacement of present Federal-State system by a wholly Federal administrative organization and a single national fund.

Creation of an adequate general public assistance system through Federal financial aid for general relief available to the States on an equalizing basis and accompanied by Federal standards.

Strengthening of the special public assistance programs to provide more adequately for those in need, and a redistribution of Federal aid to correspond to differences in needs and financial capacity among the States.

## Page 69:

## EQUAL ACCESS TO EDUCATION

That equal access to general and specialized education be made available to all youth of college and university age, according to their abilities and the needs of society.

## Page 70:

That adequate provision be made for the part-time education of adults through expansion of services such as correspondence and class study, forums, educational broadcasting, and libraries and museums.

## Page 71:

That camp facilities be made available for all youth above the lower elementary grades, with work experience provided as a part of camp life.

## Page 72:

That the services of the United States Office of Education and State departments of education be expanded and developed to provide adequate research facilities and educational leadership to the Nation.

## Page 73:

That inequality of the tax burden for education within and among the States be reduced through the distribution of State and Federal funds on the basis of need.

The quotations from the reports of the National Planning Board and the National Resources Planning Board should suffice to show how they have followed the lead of the Commission on Social Studies and how completely they have embraced virtually all phases of our economic life including education.

It will be of interest and significance to trace the progress of one who was undoubtedly a leader in the evolution of this influence as it has been set forth. In this case, we refer to Mr. Charles E. Merriam and in so doing we wish to have it thoroughly understood that we are casting no aspersions on his name or memory.

The following statement regarding the origin of the Social Science Research Council is found in the annual report of that organization for 1928-29.



From page 39, appendix A:

In 1921, the American Political Science Association appointed a Committee on Political Research, with Prof. Charles F. Merriam as chairman. The purpose of this committee was to scrutinize the scope and method of research in the field of government in order to obtain a clearer view of the actual situation and to offer constructive suggestions.

In a preliminary report in December 1922, the following statement appeared:

That a sounder empirical method of research had to be achieved in political science if it were to assist in the development of a scientific political control. Quoting further the report said:

As one of its major recommendations, the committee urged "the establishment of a Social Science Research Council consisting of two members each from economics, sociology, political science, and history, for the purpose of:

"(a) The development of research in the social studies.

"(b) The establishment of a central clearing house for projects of social investigation.

"(c) The encouragement of the establishment of institutes for social-science study, with funds adequate for the execution of various research projects and publications, in the various fields of science."

The Social Science Research Council was formed in 1923 and incorporated in 1924. Charles E. Merriam served as its president from 1924 to 1927. He was president of the American Political Science Association during 1924 and 1925, a member of the Hoover Commission on Social Trends and of the President's Commission on Administrative Management from 1933 to 1943.

In 1926, a Committee of the American Historical Association made a preliminary study and recommendation on the subject of social studies in the schools. Mr. Merriam was a member of this committee and later of the final commission on social studies whose report of May 1934 we have discussed at length.

In spite of his retention of membership, he with 3 others out of the Committee of 14 members failed to sign the final report. Since no dissenting report or advices are recorded, we can only guess at the reason. In fairness to Mr. Merriam and from an examination of some of his later writings on other matters, we are led to believe that he was sufficiently opposed to the extreme revolutionary plans of Marxism to disassociate himself from the more radical conclusions in this report.

Be that as it may, he retained his interest and activity in national planning to the last. Following his connections with the American Political Science Association, the Social Science Research Council, and the American Historical Association, he was a member of the National Planning Board in 1933-34; the National Resources Committee 1934-39; the National Resources Planning Board 1939-43; the President's Committee on Administrative Management 1933-43 and the United States Loyalty Review Board 1947-48.

Mr. Merriam is the author of a book published in 1941 by the Harvard University Press, entitled "On the Agenda of Democracy." This book is composed of a series of lectures delivered by the author.

The opening statement in the introduction follows (p. xiii) :

Foremost on the agenda of democracy is the reconsideration of the program in the light of modern conditions. The old world is gone and will not return. We face a new era, which searches all creeds, all forms, all programs of action, and spares none. Reason and science have made basic changes that demand readjustment at many points. \* \* \*

One of the chief tasks confronting democracy is the development of a program adequate to meet the changes of our time. \* \* \*

Mr. Merriam defines planning as follows (p. 77) :

Planning is an organized effort to utilize social intelligence in the determination of national policies.

The ensuing extracts from the pages indicated throw additional light on Mr. Merriam's views (pp. 86-87) :

From the organizational point of view the NRPB (National Resources Planning Board) is part of the Executive Office of the President. This includes the White House Office, the Bureau of the Budget, the National Resources Planning Board, the Office of Government Reports, the Liaison Office for Personnel Management, and the Office for Emergency Management. With the reference to other Federal agencies outside of overhead management, the Board has endeavored to encourage planning activities in the various departments of the Government. There is now a Planning Division, specifically so-called, in the Department of Agriculture.

There is one in the making (provided Congress gives an appropriation) in the Federal Works Agency; there is a general committee in the Department of the Interior which is not called a planning committee but which may serve the same purpose, and there are Planning Divisions in the War Department and in the Navy Department. There are similar enterprises not labeled "planning" but doing much the same work in a variety of other agencies, as, for example, in the Treasury, in Commerce, in the Federal Reserve Board, and in other independent agencies. The Board has endeavored to make a special connection with Federal agencies through its various technical committees, dealing with particular topics assigned by the President. These committees usually have representatives of several Federal agencies, as, for example, the Committee on Long-Range Work and Relief Policies.

The Board (National Resources Planning Board) has also dealt with private agencies interested in planning. The most notable example is its Science Committee. Here groups were brought together that never came together before, namely, the National Academy of Sciences, the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the American Council on Education with its 27 constituent organizations. The members of the science committee are designated by these four groups. These scientists have undertaken with the United States Government some very important studies, notably the study of population, the study of the social implications of technology, and the study of research as a national asset—research in the National Government, in private industry, and ultimately in the various local governments.

Pages 110-11 :

As a student of planning, I see the possibility of adapting our national resources to our national needs in peace as well as in war, in the development of national productivity and higher standards of living as a part of the same program. This is the bill of rights in modern terms.

Page 113 :

It will be important to have a shelf of public work and projects ready for use, if there is need, available to combat any wide tendency toward general unemployment.

In another book called the *New Democracy and the New Despotism*, Mr. Merriam states (pp. 58-59) :

Out of the field of science and education emerged the body of inquiry, experiment, and reflection known as social sciences. The developing range of knowledge regarding the principles and techniques of social behavior tended to increase human confidence in conscious social control. The tendency was not merely to accept the environment as given, but to understand it, then to devise appropriate methods and techniques for the guidance of social forces.

Page 148 :

My own preference is for a national planning board appointed by the Executive and responsible to him, serving on an indeterminate tenure. Such an organization might act as a long-time planning agency for the coordination of various plans among departments or bureaus and for the elaboration of further lines of long-time national policy in the larger sense of the term.

All in all, the long record of Mr. Merriam in his participation in the general field of the social sciences and in the governmental operations, and the quoted excerpts from his writings should serve to identify him thoroughly with the policies and practices, the effects of which are shown in the staff's report on economics and the public interest.

To emphasize the importance of the parts played by the specialists from the field of education, it may be said that the staff has lists of some of these consultants and advisers that total as follows: Department of State, 42; Department of Defense, 169.

Before taking up the report on economics and the public interest, it will be well to take a moment or two to close the triangle of relationships among foundations, education and Government by reference to the United States Office of Education. It is the official center of contact between the Government itself and the outside educational world.

In table 7 of the Economic Report, it is shown that from 1945 to 1952 inclusive, the Federal Government has expended the total sum of \$14,405,000,000 on education in its various forms. Much, if not all, of this is under the jurisdiction of the United States Office of Education.

As part of this vast project, the Office itself issues many good booklets on various phases of education and collects many valuable statistics on cost, attendance, and other matters of interest in this domain. Among the booklets issued by this agency are a few which may be mentioned and identified.

They are :

The U. N. Declaration of Human Rights: A handbook for teachers, Federal Security Agency, Bulletin 1951, No. 12, Office of Education.

How Children Learn About Human Rights: Place of subjects series, Bulletin 1951, No. 9, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education.

Higher Education in France: A handbook of information concerning curricula available in each institution, Bulletin 1952, No. 6, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education.

Education in Haiti: Bulletin 1948, No. 1, Federal Security Agency, United States Office of Education.

This brief reference is purely factual and without appraisal or comment.

It is made only as a matter of information for the consideration of the committee when it considers the problems involved.

This is the conclusion of the report.

The CHAIRMAN. You are including the other parts in the record?

Mr. McNIECE. Yes, the economics report is separate and I had hoped if the time were available we might read certain parts of that, but include the whole thing for the record, avoiding the complications and confusion and time involved in reading a lot of statistics which are of value only for study.

The CHAIRMAN. The Rockefeller Foundation has given a total in excess of \$4 million to the London School of Economics?

Mr. McNIECE. That is right, according to the record, as we have compiled it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a lot of money. And the London School of Economics is generally recognized as being liberal, with liberal in quotations?

Mr. McNIECE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Or by some people referred to as leftist. Having attended the London School of Economics for a time, that accounts for my leftist leanings.

Mr. HAYS. I would say by the process we are going here that makes you subversive. I don't really think you are, but you could certainly imply that from some of the things. I am glad you brought that up, because I had read this before, and I have listened carefully, and you have put your finger on the only thing in this whole document that has anything to do with foundations, that reference on page 9. The rest is just airing somebody's political views.

Mr. McNIECE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No. The National Resources Planning Board, the way it was set up, it did tie into the foundation funds, did it not?

Mr. McNIECE. Certainly, through the American Historical Association, the Social Science Research Council, the American Council on Education, the aid of all of which is acknowledged in the official reports of the National Resources Planning Board. It is stipulated by them. That is a definite hookup with the foundations.

Mr. HAYS. You say yourself they suggest that; is that bad?

Mr. McNIECE. They have not the power of Congress to authorize its adoption. They have gone as far as they can.

Mr. HAYS. Now, you are getting some place. In other words, none of this has any validity or authority unless Congress decides to implement it.

Mr. McNIECE. I have suggested here in the preliminary statement that the appropriations by Congress and the record of governmental expenditures follow very closely the line of recommendations which I just finished reading.

Mr. HAYS. Are you saying that Congress has a bunch of nitwits and dupes or just-been subversive, or what?

Mr. McNIECE. No; I am not saying any such thing, and it should not be inferred from any remark I have made.

The CHAIRMAN. My knowledge is just to the contrary.

Mr. HAYS. You seem to indicate that Congress was pushed into this by the statement you just made, that their appropriations paralleled this and these people influenced them.

Mr. McNIECE. Inferences are free to those who make them. I have only stated the facts. I am making no inference beyond the statement of facts.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

34

SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
TO  
INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
H. RES. 217

---

STAFF REPORT NO. 3  
ECONOMICS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Page numbers are from printed hearings)

May 1954

Prepared by Thomas M. McNiece, Assistant Research Director



Printed for the use of the committee

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1954

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS**

**B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee, *Chairman***

**JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan**

**WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio**

**ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts**

**GRACIE PFOST, Idaho**

**RENE A. WORMSER, *General Counsel***

**KATHRYN CASEY, *Legal Analyst***

**NORMAN DODD, *Research Director***

**ARNOLD KOCH, *Associate Counsel***

**JOHN MARSHALL, JR., *Chief Clerk***

**THOMAS MCNIECE, *Assistant Research Director***

## PREFACE

Over the past 50 years sweeping changes have occurred in this country in the functions and activities of the Federal Government. Some of these changes are to be expected as a result of increasing population, industrial, and commercial growth and our greater participation in world affairs.

By no means have all of the changes resulted from the foregoing causes. On the contrary other deviations have occurred which are totally unrelated to changing requirements of Government and which in fact have not been considered as functions of Government under our Constitution and its enumerated powers.

Among these is the increasing participation of the Federal Government in education, slum clearance, nutrition and health, power generation, subsidization of agriculture, scientific research, wage control, mortgage insurance, and other activities. Most if not all of these were politically conceived and depression born. They represent new ventures in our Federal Government's activities.

Most, if not all of these newer activities of Government are recommended in one place or another in publications of socially minded committees of Government and of reports by various educational groups, social science and others, supported by foundation grants.

They are so foreign to the conception of our Government of enumerated powers as we have known it under the Constitution, that the departure has been referred to as a "revolution" by one of its proponents who will be quoted later. While the groundwork for these changes has been underway for a long time, the real acceleration of progress toward these objectives began about 20 years ago. Since then, the movement has grown apace with little or no sign of slowing down.

The word "revolution" is commonly associated with a physical conflict or development of some sort accompanied by publicity that marks its progress one way or another. Not all revolutions are accomplished in this manner.

The lower the social stratum in which a revolution originates, the noisier it is likely to be. On the contrary a revolution planned in higher circles by some segment of people at policymaking levels may be very far advanced toward successful accomplishment before the general public is aware of it.

A plan may be formulated with some objective in mind, agreement reached, organization effected, and action begun initially with a minimum of publicity. Such a program has been in progress in this country for years. Originally, the thought of such a revolutionary change was probably confined to very few people—the organizers of the movement. With the passage of time and under the influence of the growing emphasis on the so-called social sciences, the Federal Government began to push forward into areas of activity formerly occupied by State and local government and private enterprise.

As an indication of this trend, a statement may be quoted from regional planning, a report issued by the National Resources Committee in June 1938. "More than 70 Federal agencies have found regional organization necessary and there are over 108 different ways in which the country has been organized for the efficient administration of Federal services."

Arrangements of this type facilitate the gradual expansion of governmental action and control through executive directives as distinguished from specific legislative authorization.

Much of this planning was done with the aid of social scientists in Government employ and of outside individuals or groups with similar ideas and objectives. Many of these were directly or indirectly connected with educational organizations who have and still are receiving very substantial aid from the large foundations.

Some of these activities were undertaken under the guise of temporary aid during depression but they have been continued on an increasing scale as will be shown in the ensuing report.

Evidence indicates that a relatively large percentage of foundation giving was originally in the form of grants to endowment funds of educational institutions. There has been a sizable shift in later years from grants for endowment to grants for specific purposes or objectives but still through educational channels.

As far as the economic influence on Government is concerned, the results were manifested first through the planning agencies. The recommendations made by these groups finally evolved into more or less routine matters in which Congress is now asked to approve each year a series of appropriations to cover the cost. These various classes of expenditures are listed and discussed in the

ensuing report. Charts are included at the end. In a number of cases, trends are shown for the greater part of this century.

It should be understood that not everyone who has assisted in furthering these objectives is guilty of conscious participation in questionable action. Those who have studied these developments know that many well-meaning people have been drawn into the activities without knowledge of understanding of the final objectives. A well-organized central core of administrators with a large number of uninformed followers is standard practice in such organized effort.

## ECONOMICS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

### INTRODUCTION

This report is made for the purpose of showing the nature and increasing costs of governmental participation in economic and welfare activities of the Nation. These were formerly considered as foreign to the responsibilities, particularly of the Federal Government.

The nature of these recent activities is briefly described and data shown in tables 1 to 8. The results are shown annually in these tables since 1948 in order to indicate the generally increasing trends in recent years.

Tables 9 to 16 and charts 1 to 12, together with the accompanying data sheets from which the charts are constructed, afford some measure, both volumetric and financial, of the effect these activities have had on national debt, taxes, and personal income of the people.

Finally, the conclusion is drawn that the financial integrity of the Nation will be jeopardized by a continuation of the policies which may be ineffective in the end as far as their stated objectives are concerned.

### INDEX OF TABLES

- Table 1. New permanent housing units started in nonfarm areas.
- Table 2. Federal contracts awards for new construction.
- Table 3. Federal food programs.
- Table 4. Federal expenditures for promotion of public health.
- Table 5. Federal expenditures for social security and health.
- Table 6. Federal expenditures for vocational education.
- Table 7. Federal educational expenditures.
- Table 8. Federal funds allotted for education for school year 1951.
- Table 9. Government civilian employees per 1,000 United States population.
- Table 10. Government civilian employees versus other civilian employees.
- Table 11. Departments and agencies in the executive branch.
- Table 12. Ordinary Federal receipts and expenditures.
- Table 13. Comparative increases in taxes and population—excluding social security taxes.
- Table 14. National income versus total Federal, State and local taxes.
- Table 15. National income and national debt per family.
- Table 16. Comparative debt and income per family.
- Table 17. Gross national product and national debt.
- Table 18. Gross national product, Federal debt and disposable personal income.
- Table 19. Percentage of gross national product—Personal versus governmental purchases.
- Table 20. Price decline 8 years after war.

### REVOLUTION

In the 20 years between 1933 and 1953, the politicians, college professors, and lawyers, with little help from business, wrought a revolution in the economic policies of the United States. *They repudiated laissez-faire. They saw the simple fact that if capitalism were to survive, Government must take some responsibility for developing the Nation's resources, putting a floor under spending, achieving a more equitable distribution of income and protecting the weak against the strong.* The price of continuing the free society was to be limited intervention by Government. [Italics added.]

The foregoing statement is the opening paragraph in an article by a Harvard professor (Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics, Harvard University in the Progressive, December 1953) as printed in a recent issue of a magazine and as included in the appendix of the Congressional Record of February 15, 1954.



It is a very broad and emphatic statement. Numerically, the "politicians, college professors, and lawyers" comprise a very minute percentage of the total population of the country—a minute percentage of the people who, under the Constitution are responsible for effecting "revolutionary" changes in governmental practice. Certainly these changes as enumerated have never been submitted to nor ratified as such by the people or their duly elected representatives.

Revolution accomplished: How then could a departure so drastic as to be called a "revolution" be accomplished?

Normally a revolution is not accomplished without a considerable measure of publicity attained through fuss and fireworks that attend such efforts. In the absence of such developments, it could only be achieved through carefully coordinated effort by a relatively small group centered at policy making levels.

In connection with this latter thought, it is interesting to compare the statement quoted in the first paragraph with the five points for Federal action enumerated shortly hereafter.

Evidence of such changes in Federal policy, their direction and effect will be submitted later, but it will be first in order to mention that the Federal Government is a government of enumerated powers. Certainly the powers enumerated do not mention the "development of the Nation's resources, putting a floor under spending, achieving a more equitable distribution of income and protecting the weak against the strong." Neither has the Government itself prior to the period mentioned in the opening paragraph, assumed such rights and responsibilities.

These and other changes which have been effected are revolutionary. They have been accomplished not openly but indirectly and without the full knowledge and understanding of the people most affected.

Subversion: In fact, the methods used suggest a form of subversion. Subversion may be defined as the act of changing or overthrowing such things as the form or purpose of government, religion, or morality by concealed or insidious methods that tend to undermine its supports or weaken its foundations.

Public interest: It may be said by the proponents of such procedure that it is warranted by the "public interest." Public interest is difficult to define but for the purpose of this study, we can probably do no better than to refer to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States wherein it is stated that the Constitution is established—

"in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The last three words in the foregoing quotation impose a responsibility for the future upon us of the present. A risk for the future is implicit in some of the measures advanced for the advantage of the present and such measures may be said to be subversive, un-American and contrary to the public interest. To subvert or circumvent the Constitution or to change authorized procedure under its provisions by other than the methods established by the Constitution itself may with certainty be called un-American. The Constitution is not a static or dead document. It has been amended with reasonable frequency and can always be modified if a real need for change develops.

Methods of procedure: Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr., formerly Assistant Secretary of State and one of the active proponents of increased governmental participation in economic life made the suggestion that the Federal Government supply cash or credit for the following purposes after World War II (The New Philosophy of Public Debt by Harold G. Moulton, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.).

- (1) An urban reconstruction program.
- (2) A program of public works along conventional lines.
- (3) A program of rehousing on a very large scale.
- (4) A program of nutrition for about 40 percent of our population.
- (5) A program of public health.

Progress toward objectives: It will be informative to record a few measures of progress toward the objectives that focus so sharply on paternalism and socialism in government.

This Nation has attained a standard of living that is higher and more widely distributed than that reached by any other nation in history. It has been accomplished in a very short span of years as compared with the lives of other nations and it is still increasing. Impatience and envy unrestrained may conceivably wreck the future for the sake of the present. The possibilities of this are indicated in factual evidence of today. The public interest will not be served thereby.

(1) An urban reconstruction program: (e) A program of rehousing on a very elaborate scale: It is difficult to differentiate clearly between items 1 and 3 and such data as are available will pertain largely to both.

TABLE 1.—*New permanent housing units started in nonfarm areas publicly owned*<sup>1</sup>

Period	Number	
	Total	Average per year
1935-39.....	87,000	17,400
1940-44.....	224,800	44,960
1945-49.....	67,000	13,400
1950-52.....	173,500	57,833
Total.....	532,300	30,000

<sup>1</sup> Data from Supplement to Economic Indicators.

Data are not available on the total value involved in this increasing scale of public construction. Neither do the available data indicate the division of cost between local, State, and Federal Governments.

On February 27, 1954, the Housing and Home Finance Agency reported that there were 154 slum clearance projects underway in January 1954 compared with 99 at the beginning of 1953. This is an increase of 56 percent in number during the year.<sup>1</sup>

These tabular statements should be sufficient to indicate planned action in conformity with the suggestions involved in items 1 and 3. There are no data available that show any such Federal activities prior to 1935.

(2) A program of public works along conventional lines: The following table shows the value of Federal contracts awarded for new construction. It is not possible from the information available to determine the real proportion of cost furnished by the Federal Government. The fact that the work is covered by Federal contracts suggests that Federal participation is an important percentage of the total which also includes whatever proportion is furnished by owners, whoever they may be.

TABLE 2.—*Federal contract awards for new construction*<sup>1</sup>

1935.....	\$1,478,073,000	1949.....	\$2,174,203,000
1940.....	2,316,467,000	1950.....	2,805,214,000
1945.....	1,092,181,000	1951.....	4,201,939,000
1948.....	1,906,466,000	1952.....	4,420,908,000

Regardless of the degree of Federal participation in this work, the rising trend, even in years of high economic output, is obvious.

A less pronounced trend but a large volume of expenditure is shown in the following data.

*Federal expenditures for public works*<sup>1</sup>

1952 (actual).....	\$3,116,000,000
1953 (estimate).....	3,419,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953.

These data are sufficient to indicate the possibility, if not probability, of spending for public works on a grandiose scale. The fact that such spending would be accelerated when economic activity and governmental income are low would mean drastic increases in public debt which is now at extreme and dangerous levels. It is significant that the debt has not been reduced but is increasing even at the continuing high level of tax collections.

It is also well to remember that the cost of public works does not cease with the completion of the works. On the contrary, increased and continuing costs are sustained for operation and maintenance of the additional facilities. This is not to condemn or disapprove of reasonable and required expenditures to meet the normally growing needs of our increasing population.

<sup>1</sup> New York Times, Feb. 28, 1954.

(4) A program of nutrition: The suggestion for a Federal program of nutrition implied that about 40 percent of our population should be the beneficiaries of such a plan. It is scarcely conceivable that any such proportion of our people are or have been undernourished.

The Federal Government since 1936 has been participating in food distribution to institutions and welfare cases as well as to school-lunch programs. From 1936 to 1952, inclusive, the cost of these programs has been as follows:

TABLE 3.—Federal food program<sup>1</sup>

Institutional and welfare cases (direct distribution)-----	\$306,090,000
School-lunch programs (direct distribution)-----	290,330,000
School-lunch programs (indemnity plan)-----	498,909,000
<b>Total</b> -----	<b>1,095,329,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953.

(5) A program of public health: It was announced by the United States Public Health Service that in October 1952, the one-thousandth hospital had been completed under the Hospital and Construction Act. Since 1946, the Federal Government has contributed \$500 million to this program. The Health Service announced that it had 800 additional projects underway or planned as of 1952. State and local governments have contributed about twice as much toward this work as the Federal Government.

The record of Federal budgetary expenditures for promotion of public health shows the following expenditures for the years indicated.

TABLE 4

1945-----	\$186,000,000	1950-----	242,000,000
1946-----	173,000,000	1951-----	304,000,000
1947-----	146,000,000	1952-----	328,000,000
1948-----	139,000,000		
1949-----	171,000,000	<b>Total</b> -----	<b>1,689,000,000</b>

At intervals, agitation is repeatedly renewed on the subject of publicly financed medical care.

Benefits under the various forms of social insurance and public assistance programs are increasing rapidly from year to year. Total payments made by Federal and State Governments are indicated herewith.

TABLE 5.—Federal expenditures for social security and health<sup>1</sup> (excluding expenditures from promotion of public health as previously shown)

1945-----	\$802,000,000	1949-----	1,672,000,000
1946-----	821,000,000	1950-----	1,900,000,000
1947-----	1,117,000,000	1951-----	1,992,000,000
1948-----	1,667,000,000	1952-----	2,163,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953 (p. 343).

Education: A program of Federal contributions to education was not included in the five classifications just previously discussed. Such participation has occurred and in some groups in rapidly increasing amounts.

Federal aid in vocational education includes expenditures in agricultural trade and industrial pursuits and in home economics and to some extent has been granted over a period of 30 years or more. The following totals apply to the years indicated:

TABLE 6.—Federal expenditures for vocational education<sup>1</sup>

1936-----	\$9,749,000	1948-----	26,200,000
1940-----	20,004,000	1950-----	26,623,000
1944-----	19,958,000	1951-----	26,685,000

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953 (p. 135).

Two other classes of educational expenditures are made by the Federal Government, one the large payments for the education of veterans which is now decreasing and the other much small but increasing expenditures for general education and research. These data are shown herewith:

TABLE 7.—Federal educational expenditures<sup>1</sup>

[In millions]

	Veterans' education	General purpose	Total
1945.....		\$158	\$158
1946.....	\$351	85	436
1947.....	2,122	66	2,188
1948.....	2,506	65	2,571
1949.....	2,703	75	2,778
1950.....	2,596	123	2,719
1951.....	1,943	115	2,058
1952.....	1,326	171	1,497
Total .....	13,547	858	14,405

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953 (p. 343).

Under the limitations of the law, the cost of veterans' education should continue to decline rapidly. If another war should ensue and the GI bill of rights be taken as a precedent, the cost of veterans' education would become a tremendous economic burden on the country. The former bill was passed without any consideration of the capacity of the educational system to absorb the greatly increased number of students. Chaotic conditions due to crowding existed in many educational institutions.

Still another form of tabulation of educational funds made available by the Federal Government is of interest. It pertains to funds allotted for 1951 and includes those made available to agricultural experiment stations and Cooperative Agricultural Extensions Service.

TABLE 8.—Federal funds allotted for education for school year 1951<sup>1</sup>

Administered by:	
Federal Security Agency.....	\$171,720,000
Department of Agriculture.....	161,658,000
Veterans' Administration.....	2,120,216,000
Other .....	97,049,000
Total .....	2,550,643,000

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953 (p. 137).

The trend of Federal educational expenditures, aside from those made for veterans' education is unquestionably upward. That further increases are urged, especially by those in the educational field, is illustrated by the following extract from the discussion by Alvin H. Hansen, Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University, before the meeting of the joint committee of the Senate and House on the President's economic report. This meeting was held on February 18, 1954. The quotation follows:

"There is no recognition of the fact, well known to everyone who has studied State and local finance, that the poorer States which contain nearly half of our children fall far short of decent educational standards; yet they spend more on education in relation to total income of their citizens than do the wealthier States. For this situation there is no solution except Federal Aid."

General comments: The foregoing evidence and discussion have been presented in an effort to show why the statement of revolution accomplished seems to be supported by the facts. That a continuation of the policies is probable seems apparent from the statistical trends as presented.

Quite regardless of the real propriety of this great and revolutionary departure from our former constitutional principles of government, a serious question must be raised about its effect on the future life of the Nation. Most of these new Federal objectives of expenditure have hitherto been accepted as lying within the province of the State and local governments. It is of course absurd to assume that aside from the printing press, the Federal Government has access to any greater supply of funds than exists within the States themselves. And yet greater funds are necessary when the Federal Government embarks upon all of these security and welfare activities. Each new or increased channel of

expenditure calls for additional bureaucratic control without any diminution of similar control by State and local governments. In fact, as will be shown the very conditions of distribution imposed by the Federal Government are apparently causing some similar increases in State and local governmental costs.

The tremendously high level of taxes and debt and the pressure for still higher debt limits and greater expenditures should convince any thoughtful and understanding people that danger is in the offing, that the public interest is not being well served, but on the contrary is being placed in jeopardy. Our obligation to posterity is apparently submerged in our sea of current self-interest.

The following discussion, with the aid of data and charts will show in both physical and financial terms the increasing burdens imposed on the populace by these governmental policies originating during the past twenty years.

**Civilian employees in Government:** The ensuing table shows the drastic increases in governmental civilian employees that have occurred since 1930. The peak was encountered in 1945 from which time there was a gradual reduction to 1948. Note the level of stability attained in 1948, 1949, and 1950 at 280 percent of the 1930 figure.

TABLE 9.—*Government civilian employee per 1,000 United States population*

	Federal	State and local	Total	Percentage of 1929		
				Federal	State and local	Total
1930.....	5.0	21.3	26.3	102	102	102
1940.....	8.2	24.3	32.5	168	117	127
1945.....	25.5	22.4	46.8	520	108	182
1948.....	14.1	25.8	39.9	288	124	155
1949.....	14.1	26.5	40.6	288	127	158
1950.....	13.8	27.1	40.9	282	130	159
1951.....	16.0	26.7	42.7	327	128	165
1952.....	16.6	26.9	43.5	339	129	169
1953.....	16.2	27.2	43.4	331	131	169

Note that Federal civilian employees are now over three times as numerous in proportion to the total population as they were in 1929 while State and local employees are about one-third greater. For government as a whole, the civilian employees per capita of total population have increased nearly 70 percent over those of 1929.

These trends are shown graphically on charts 1 and 2 and the supporting data as they exist for the period from 1900 to 1953 on the accompanying data sheet 1.

Because governmental employees have no part in the production of economic goods and on the contrary must be supported by those who do, it will be informative to show the comparison between governmental civilian employees and the nongovernmental labor force. This comparison is shown in table 10 herewith:

TABLE 10.—*Government civilian employees versus other civilian employees*

	Total government	Other than government	Government civilian employees per 100 other employees	
			Actual	Percent of 1929
	<i>Millions</i>	<i>Millions</i>		
1930.....	3.15	46.1	6.7	100
1940.....	4.19	51.4	8.2	122
1945.....	5.97	47.9	12.5	187
1950.....	5.99	57.1	10.5	157
1951.....	6.37	56.5	11.3	169
1952.....	6.63	56.4	11.8	176
1953.....	6.67	56.7	11.8	176

These data show that as of 1953 there were virtually 12 Government employees for every 100 other workers, excluding all military forces. The increase since 1930 has been 76 percent. From the economic standpoint a parasitic load of 12 employees for every 100 others is quite a burden to bear.

The military forces of the United States have purposely been omitted from consideration in the two foregoing tables. It is of interest to note, however, that the inclusion of these military forces for the years 1951 and 1952 respectively would show 16.7 and 18.2 total governmental employees that must be supported by each 100 other workers in the United States. Indeed a heavy load.

Trends for all years from 1929 to 1953 are shown on chart 3 and in the accompanying data sheet 2.

It should be noted that the trends for the years 1948-53 shown on charts 1, 2, and 3 are continuations of the upward trends which began in the early 1930's and show no indication of change. Here in physical rather than financial terms is evidence of the "revolution" mentioned in the beginning of this report. This observation will be confirmed by still another instance of expansion measured by the increase in the number of departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government. These data apply only to major groups and not to their recognized subdivisions or components.

TABLE 11.—*Departments and agencies in the executive branch*

1926.....	31	1930.....	37	1952.....	69
1927.....	31	1940.....	47	1953.....	69
1928.....	31	1950.....	61		
1929.....	31	1951.....	69		

The data which follow will measure the increased operations in financial terms.

Federal receipts and expenditures: The ensuing as well as the foregoing data are shown upon a per capita basis rather than in totals only as it is to be expected that total expenditures and taxes will normally rise as the population increases. An increase on a per capita basis calls for analysis and explanation.

In the following table a comparison is shown on both a total and a per capita basis between Federal receipts and expenditures. The term "receipts" naturally includes income from all forms of taxation including income, capital gains, excises, customs, etc.

TABLE 12.—*Ordinary Federal receipts and expenditures*

	In billions		Revenue per capita	Expenditures per capita
	Revenue	Expenditures		
1930.....	\$4. 178	\$3. 440	\$33. 90	\$27. 95
1940.....	5. 265	9. 183	40. 00	69. 60
1945.....	44. 762	98. 703	320. 50	706. 80
1948.....	42. 211	33. 791	288. 00	231. 00
1949.....	38. 246	40. 057	256. 50	268. 20
1950.....	37. 045	40. 167	245. 00	265. 00
1951.....	48. 143	44. 633	311. 80	289. 00
1952.....	62. 129	66. 145	396. 00	421. 00
1953.....	65. 218	74. 607	410. 00	466. 50

These data in per capital trends since 1900 are shown graphically on chart 4. As in the prior tables, there is no evidence of a declining trend in the actual data.

Federal, State, and local taxes: Further light is thrown on tax trends by comparing increases in population and taxes since 1930. This information is given in table 13.

TABLE 13.—Comparative increases in taxes and population excluding social security taxes<sup>1</sup>

[In millions]

	Population	Federal taxes	State and local taxes	Percentage of 1929		
				Population	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
1930.....	123.1	\$3,517	\$6,798	101.2	105.1	105.7
1940.....	131.8	4,921	7,997	108.5	147.6	124.4
1945.....	139.6	40,989	9,193	115.0	1,228.0	143.0
1948.....	146.6	37,636	13,342	120.7	1,129.0	207.5
1949.....	149.1	35,590	14,790	122.1	1,066.0	230.0
1950.....	151.1	34,955	15,914	124.4	1,049.0	247.5
1951.....	154.4	45,984	17,554	127.0	1,378.0	273.0
1952.....	157.0	59,535	-----	129.1	1,785.0	-----
1953.....	159.7	62,656	-----	131.3	1,878.0	-----

<sup>1</sup> Except portion used for administrative social security costs.

Maximum activity in the Korean war occurred in 1952 and in World War II in 1945. Despite the relatively smaller operation represented by the Korean war, Federal taxes in 1952 were 45 percent greater than in 1945. In the meantime the Federal debt has not been decreased but is rising and pressure for higher debt limit has not been removed. The reasons for some of this great increase have been indicated in the prior tables.

Annual data including those shown in table 13 for the period from 1916 to 1951 are given in data sheet 3 and are shown graphically on chart 5. The striking comparison between the increases of Federal taxation and of State and local taxation and of both in comparison with the increase of population justifies some comment on the difference. Obviously State and local taxation by 1951 had increased 173 percent since 1929 while population has increased but 54 percent.

Federal taxation in the same time has increased 1,278 percent or nearly 13 times with no decrease in Federal debt and strong prospects of further increase. The postwar trend merely continues that established before World War II, although it is of course higher than it would have been had the war not occurred.

On the other hand tables 9 and 10 and charts 1, 2 and 3 indicate conclusively that civilian employees in Government show an increasing trend, particularly in the Federal Government since the early thirties. This measure is quite independent of continuing financial increases due to costs introduced by war.

It seems natural to assume that real "welfare" needs should be most apparent in the localities where they exist and that State and local taxes would show a responsive trend. The fact that such "on-the-spot" trends are but a fraction of the Federal trends may indicate the correctness of the early statement that the revolution "could only be achieved through carefully coordinated effort by a relatively small group centered at policy making levels," a group possibly composed of "politicians, college professors and lawyers" as quoted in the first paragraph. The comparison also warrants the inference that local control of spending and taxes is more effective than remote control which impairs both knowledge and understanding.

Taxes as a percentage of national income: It will be of informative value to show the trend of taxes as a percentage of national income which provides the fund out of which taxes must be paid. The following table for the years shown will indicate such percentage and the trend.

TABLE 14.—National income versus total Federal, State, and local taxes in billions by calendar years

	National income	Total taxes	Taxes as percent of income
1929.....	\$87.4	\$10.80	11.8
1930.....	75.0	9.77	13.0
1940.....	81.3	16.95	20.9
1945.....	182.7	52.52	28.7
1948.....	223.5	58.10	26.0
1949.....	216.3	54.93	25.4
1950.....	250.6	67.75	28.2
1951.....	278.4	84.56	30.4

Taxes as a percent of national income increased from 11.8 in 1929 to 30.4 in 1951. In other words, the tax bite took 18.6 cents or 158 percent more out of the income dollar in 1951 than it did in 1929, a prosperous though shaky year. This is another illustration of the effect on private income caused by the expanding activities of Government.

Government debt and national income: It might be expected that the increasing percentage of national income that is taken in taxes would result in some reduction of the national debt. It is now 8½ years since the close of World War II. Taxes have been increasing but so has the debt which is now pushing through its legal ceiling. The difficulty in visualizing the relationships between debt, income, and population when all are changing makes it advisable to express income and debt in terms of the population. This has been done in the following table wherein both are expressed in terms of the family as a unit because it has more personal significance than a per capita basis.

TABLE 15.—National income and national debt per family

	National income (billions)	Number families (millions)	National income per family	Federal debt per family
1929.....	\$87.4	29.40	\$2,972	\$576
1930.....	75.0	29.90	2,510	542
1940.....	81.3	34.95	2,325	1,230
1945.....	182.7	37.50	4,870	6,900
1948.....	223.5	40.72	5,490	6,200
1949.....	216.3	42.11	5,140	6,000
1950.....	240.6	43.47	5,530	5,930
1951.....	278.4	44.56	6,250	5,750
1952.....	291.6	45.46	6,415	5,700
1953 <sup>1</sup> .....	306.0	47.50	6,440	5,600

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

National income per family increased 250 percent in current dollars while the Federal debt per family increased 855 percent.

The foregoing data in decennial terms from 1900 to 1930 and in annual terms from 1929 to 1953 are shown on data sheet 6 and income and debt per family on chart 7.

The amount of debt overhanging a nation has a tremendous influence on that nation's solvency and therefore its stability under impact caused either by economic depression or additional forced expenditures to relieve depression or to prosecute another war. It has been stated many times that we as a Nation were in a vulnerable debt or credit condition when the collapse began in 1929. It will therefore be interesting to compare the conditions of 1929 with those of the present and of the time intervening.



Again, the comparisons will be upon a per-family basis and will show the changes in total private debt including corporate debt and total public debt compared with national income per family. The data follow in the next table:

TABLE 16.—*Comparative debt and income per family*

	Private debt	Total public and private debt	National income per family
1929.....	\$5,500	\$6,500	\$2,972
1930.....	5,380	6,400	2,510
1940.....	3,700	5,460	2,325
1945.....	3,755	10,860	4,870
1948.....	4,975	10,690	5,490
1949.....	4,985	10,600	5,140
1950.....	5,670	11,180	5,530
1951.....	6,230	11,650	6,250

While the total debt per family has nearly doubled, national income has somewhat more than kept pace with it. The disturbing factor from the standpoint of Federal financial stability is the fact that in the interval from 1929 to 1951, the Federal proportion of the total debt has increased from 15 to 46.5 percent.

The foregoing data in annual terms from 1929 to 1951 are given in data sheet 7 while the trends of private debt and total debt are shown on chart 8.

Gross national product: It is contended by some that internal Federal debt is of little importance and that no attempt should be made to place a ceiling upon it. Rather is it argued that an increase in public debt will be a needed stimulant to keep national production in step with our expanding population. It has also been argued as a part of this philosophy that the only safeguarding thing to watch is the ratio between national debt and gross national product and that the ratio now existing will provide a safe guide in such control. It will be of value to examine these factors in the light of these claims.

Gross national product may be defined as the total value of all goods and services produced in a period of time and usually valued in terms of current prices. It does not include allowances for capital consumption such as depletion, depreciation, and certain other adjustments. Efforts have been made to compute the value of gross national product at intervals over many years past. Gross national product has been tabulated for each year since 1929. The comparative data on gross national product and national debt are shown in table 17.

TABLE 17.—*Gross national product and national debt values in billions*

	Gross national product at current prices	Federal debt	Gross national product at 1929 prices <sup>1</sup>
1929.....	\$103.8	\$16.9	\$103.8
1930.....	90.9	16.2	93.4
1940.....	101.4	48.5	124.0
1945.....	215.2	259.1	205.0
1948.....	259.0	252.4	184.6
1949.....	258.2	252.8	186.0
1950.....	286.8	257.4	205.2
1951.....	329.8	255.3	217.0
1952.....	348.0	259.2	223.5
1953.....	* 366.0	266.1	234.0

<sup>1</sup> Consumer's prices.<sup>2</sup> Estimated.

At current prices, gross national product increased 252 percent between 1929 and 1953 but at constant prices the increase was 125 percent. In the same interval Federal debt increased 1475 percent in current prices. It is this increase in Federal debt which in this recent philosophy is of no practical significance. The measure of control under this theory is the ratio between debt and gross national product.

Data in the foregoing table are shown from 1900 to date in data sheet 8—trend values only for 1900 to 1920. This information is shown in chart form on Chart 9. The dotted line shows what gross national product would have been at constant prices, in this case at consumers' prices of 1929, a year of high-level production. The lightly shaded area between the adjusted and unadjusted values after 1943 shows the inflationary spread due to postwar rising prices or in other words to the increased cost of living. A still greater area of inflation must be expected if the dollar is weakened by increasing Federal expenditures and debt.

Ratio of Federal debt to gross national product: Since, as has been previously mentioned, the ratio between Federal debt and gross national product has been suggested as an effective measure of control in the prevention of excessive debt, it will be well to observe the values of this ratio for a period of time embracing widely varying conditions in our national economy.

It will also be informative to show the effect of these policies of great Federal expenditure and high taxes on citizens' personal income after taxes as it relates to gross national product. This latter division of income is known as disposable personal income and together with its ratio to gross national product is shown in the following table:

TABLE 18.—Gross national product, Federal debt and disposable personal income

[Values in billions of current dollars]

	National product	Federal debt	Disposable personal income	Percent Federal debt, gross national product	Percent disposable personal income, gross national product
1929.....	\$103.8	\$16.9	\$82.5	16.3	79.4
1930.....	90.9	16.2	73.7	17.8	81.0
1940.....	101.4	48.5	75.7	47.8	74.7
1945.....	215.2	259.1	151.1	120.5	70.2
1948.....	259.0	262.4	188.4	97.5	72.7
1949.....	258.2	252.8	187.2	97.9	72.5
1950.....	286.8	257.4	205.8	89.8	76.7
1951.....	329.8	255.3	225.0	77.5	68.2
1952.....	348.0	259.2	235.0	74.5	67.5
1953 <sup>1</sup> .....	366.0	266.1	250.0	72.7	68.3

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

It is apparent from the data that Federal debt increased from 16 percent of gross national product in 1929 to 73 percent in 1953. In the same period the citizens' share of their own income available for their own purposes declined from 79 to 68 percent of gross national product. This declining percentage of gross national product left to the consumer himself will be particularly noticeable when business volume declines to a more nearly normal level. This sacrifice has been made without any reduction in the total debt level. This is due largely to the Federal Government's increasing participation in what might be termed extracurricular activities based upon the conception of government defined in the Constitution and previously followed during our unprecedented rise in economic status.

The data in table 18 are shown in extended form since 1900 in data sheet 9 and on chart 10. The chart clearly indicates the tremendous change that has occurred in this ratio between Federal debt and gross national product. From 1900 to 1916 there was a steady decline in the ratio which averaged only 4.4 percent for the period. This means that the citizen was realizing a larger and larger percentage of his earnings for his own needs and desires.

The effect of debt arising in World War I is apparent in the increased ratio, but following the peak in 1921 there was a gradual decline to 16.3 percent in 1929 when the upward climb began again. Beginning in 1948, 3 years after the

end of World War II and 2 years before the Korean war, the Federal debt again began to climb.

The decline in ratio since 1948 is caused entirely by the abnormally high output of economic goods in terms of both volume and price and not by a decline in the debt level. This distinction is important. Gross national product is the arithmetical product of price multiplied by physical volume. Physical volume lately has been abnormally high because extensive military rearmament has been underway since World War II, not only for ourselves but for other nations.

Physical volume was also increased by certain relief measures and military aid for other countries and production to meet domestic demand deferred by World War II. In addition, prices have risen 49 percent since 1945. The point to be emphasized is that the physical volume of output for the period since 1940 has been abnormally high due to production for war and its waste and for demand deferred from wartime. Without another war we cannot hope to maintain this physical output regardless of what happens to prices and it should not be considered a function of Government to try it.

Disposable personal income: The citizen's reduced share of his own personal income as a percentage of the goods and services he creates is also portrayed on chart 10. The declining trend shown in table 18 is clearly defined on the chart. The trend was even more sharply downward prior to 1943 when wartime output increased greatly and to be continued, as previously mentioned, by renewed abnormal production for military purposes and deferred civilian demand.

The larger the share of production and its value absorbed by Government, the less the citizen has for his own choice of expenditures. The following data are taken from the Economic Report of the President for 1954.

TABLE 19.—Percentage of gross national product, personal versus governmental purchases

Year	Personal consumption expenditure	Total Government purchases
	Percent	Percent
1930.....	78.0	10.1
1947.....	71.0	12.3
1948.....	68.7	14.1
1949.....	69.9	16.9
1950.....	67.9	14.6
1951.....	63.1	19.1
1952.....	62.7	22.3
1953 <sup>1</sup> .....	62.6	22.7

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

Here indeed in the declining share of his own output that is allotted to him is one result of the revolution at work.

The extraordinary expenditures of Government beginning in the early thirties are continuing with increasing volume.

Changes in post war policies: Changes in governmental policy with respect to expanding participation in and control of our economic activities has been repeatedly emphasized in this study. Further light on these policies and their effect may be shown by reference to the long-term history of prices in this country. On chart 11, the trend of wholesale commodity prices<sup>2</sup> in terms of 1910-14 as 100 percent are charted. Two outstanding features of this long-term trend are obvious at once:

1. The great price peaks that occur as a result of war.
2. Even in annual terms there is no such thing as price stability or normal prices.

A glance at the chart and consideration of the continuous change in the price level should suggest the impossibility of price stabilization by the Government. Complete regulation of all things economic within the country and complete insulation from all influences from without would be essential. Manifestly this is impossible. The payment of subsidy, as in agriculture, is to admit the impossibility of price control and to continue subsidy is to encourage excess production and high governmental expenditure with its evil results.

<sup>2</sup> Data for 1800-1933 from Gold and Prices by Warren and Pearson. Data for 1934 to date derived from Statistics by U. S. Department of Labor.

Without war the great price peaks with their resultant periods of chaos would not occur. With war, they may be temporarily distorted or deferred but the effects of abnormal war conditions cannot be permanently averted. One of the unavoidable features of war is that the cost must be paid in full in one way or another. There is no relief from this.

The great price recessions following the War of 1812, the Civil War, and World War I are typical of those which have occurred throughout history in other countries after major wars. It has now been over 8 years since hostilities ceased in World War II. Within 8 years following the close of hostilities in the prior wars mentioned, price declines from the peak values were as follows:

TABLE 20.—Price declines 8 years after war

	Percent
War of 1812.....	42
Civil War.....	33
World War I.....	35
World War II.....	3.7

The depreciation of the dollar in terms of gold in 1934 would prevent an ultimate decline of prices to the low levels following earlier wars. The closer price control in effect during World War II retarded the price increase and the advent of the Korean war has helped to sustain if not to increase the latest price peak.

Present policy seems to be to prevent any such decline as we have sustained after past wars. Painful and disturbing as they were, these past declines at least resulted in paying much of the cost of the war in money of approximately the same value as that which was borrowed for its prosecution, and that except for the duration of the price peaks, those who depended upon fixed income for their living expenses were not permanently deprived of much of their purchasing power.

The new economic and debt policies seem to be designed in an effort to maintain productive activity and prices at or near the present plateau. The deluge of complaints that flow forth when a small decline from the recent peak occurs seems to indicate an unwillingness and lack of courage to face the responsibilities for our actions. This tendency is not limited to any one class or group in our citizenry. This softening of character is probably to be expected as a result of the protective and paternalistic attitude and activities assumed by Government in recent years. This may be due largely to an increased emphasis on expediency rather than to a lessening of integrity, or it may be due to both. Be that as it may, the continuation of the new philosophy will mean the retention of high-debt levels, high governmental expenses, and a high cost of living. It is important not only to balance the Federal budget but to balance it at a lower level of cost. There is no margin of safety in the advent of a serious depression or of a new war.

This is a most important point from the standpoint of public interest. In the event of a depression, Government income will drop far more rapidly than the volume of business declines. Government expenses will not decline but will increase greatly if they "remain a significant sustaining factor in the economy" as stated in the President's Economic Report. This means additional deficit financing of large magnitude and therefore increasing public debt to unmanageable proportions.

The possibility of this coming to pass is indicated by the National Resources Planning Board in a pamphlet of its issue under the title, "Full Employment Security—Building America." The Board asks:

1. What policies should determine the proportion of required Government outlay which should be met by taxation and by borrowing?

2. What special methods of financing, such as non-interest-bearing notes, might be used?

What are the non-interest-bearing notes to which reference is made? This is merely a euphonious term for paper money, a product of the printing press. But this paper money is also a debt of the nation. The various denominations of paper money are non-interest-bearing demand notes, payable by the Government to the holders on demand by them. The phraseology on the notes indicates this and the Supreme Court has so held:

In the case of *Bank v. Supervisors* (7 Wall., 31), Chief Justice Chase says: "But on the other hand it is equally clear that these notes are obligations of the United States. Their name imports obligations. Every one of them expresses upon its face an engagement of the Nation to pay the bearer a certain sum. The dollar note is an engagement to pay a dollar, and the dollar intended is the

coined dollar of the United States, a certain quantity in weight and fineness of gold or silver, authenticated as such by the stamp of the Government. No other dollars had before been recognized by the legislation of the National Government as lawful money."

And in 12 Wallace, 560, Justice Bradley says:

"No one supposes that these Government certificates are never to be paid; that the day of specie payments is never to return. And it matters not in what form they are issues ----- Through whatever changes they pass, their ultimate destiny is to be paid."

In commenting upon these decisions Senator John Sherman said in the Senate of the United States:

"Thus then, it is settled that this note is not a dollar but a debt due."

Aside from the fact that paper money outstanding is strictly speaking a debt of the Nation, the importance of the non-interest-bearing note question raised by the National Resources Planning Board lies in the threat of greatly increased supply of paper money. The effect of such action if taken will be a renewed stimulation of drastic inflation with all its evil results.

Based upon the most reliable data available<sup>3</sup> our margin of national solvency is rather small. According to these figures the total debt of all forms, public and private, in the United States was 86.5 percent of the total wealth, public and private, in the country in 1944. Since 1944, prices have risen due to inflation, generally from 40 to 50 percent.

In terms of current prices, this raises the value of national wealth. For this reason and because the total debt of the country, public and private, increased only about one-third as much as prices, the ratio of debt to wealth as of 1948 had dropped to 63 percent. While later data are not available, the comparative increases in prices and debt by the end of 1951 lead to the conclusion that this ratio of debt to wealth may be somewhat higher at the present time. In 1929, the debt-wealth ratio was 51 percent. In the interval from 1929 to 1948 the ratio of Federal debt to national income (from which debt is paid) increased from 4 to 32 percent. The influence of public debt on the integrity of money values is far greater than the influence of private debt can possibly be.

If income goes down and debt goes up there will be a double adverse leverage on the debt situation as measured by the ability to pay. If increased Federal expenditures fail to work in stemming the depression, the situation will be loaded with inflationary dynamite to the permanent detriment of all of us. The present high level of prices is quite a springboard from which to take off.

Industrial production in the United States: Industrial activity is of overwhelming importance in the economic life of the Nation. On chart 12 is shown in graphic form a measure of this activity year by year since 1900. The smooth line marked "calculated normal trend" was computed from two long series of data and is based on the period from 1898 through 1940. The rising trend is based on the increase in population from 1900 through 1953 and the annual rise in productivity due to increased efficiency from 1898 to 1941. With this trend as a starting point, the data made available monthly by the Cleveland Trust Co. were used to compute the total production as shown. The Cleveland Trust Co. is in no way responsible for the index values of total production as shown on the chart. The dotted line shows the corresponding index as published by the Federal Reserve Board.

Except for the war years, the agreement between these two series is close. The disagreement during the war period is possibly due to the inclusion by the Federal Reserve Board of certain labor-hour data in computing physical output—a method not followed by the Cleveland Trust Co.

The long-sustained upward progression in our productivity is a testimonial to the industry and technical ability of our people. The increasing output in terms of both efficiency and volume is the only source of our high and continued rise in standard of living. It shows no abatement. The temporary interruptions we call depressions are deviations from trends and are to be expected until we recognize their causes and if possible counteract them.

The significant part of the long-term trend at this time is from 1940 to date. Since 1940, industrial output has been accelerated far beyond normal peacetime requirements by the wasteful consumption and demand created by war. This was followed by a resurgence of civilian demand composed of new and deferred replacement needs. Before this was satisfied new military preparations were resumed and the Korean war began.

<sup>3</sup> See vol. 14 of Studies in Income and Wealth by National Bureau of Economic Research, 1951.

Only with the stoppage of hostilities in that area has demand begun to slacken although it is still fortified by continued production of munitions for war, some of which we still supply to other countries. This sustained abnormal production is evident on chart 12. Some of the more optimistic interpretations of these characteristics are inclined to consider that we have embarked upon a new and steeper trend to be traced from the beginning of recovery in the thirties to the present time.

Obviously, the assumption that this is a normal trend discounts completely the abnormally low starting point at the bottom of the depression and the causes for the sustained bulge previously mentioned. It also assumes an increase in productive efficiency that is not warranted by the facts. For years, the annual increase due to improving productivity has been approximately 3 percent.

An increase to 3.5 percent would mean an overall improvement of 17 percent in productivity accomplished almost overnight. During the wartime portion of this period great numbers of unskilled employees were engaged in productive work and many overtime hours were also utilized. Both of these factors reduce output per employee hour. Furthermore, the increasing practice of sharing the work and of limitations of output by labor unions have tended to offset what would otherwise mean further gains in productivity.

The reason for the discussion of this point is the emphasis placed on the conclusion that the level of output since 1940 is abnormal unless we assume that war and preparation for war are normal and that the great deferred demand for housing, clothing, automobiles, and other articles was nonexistent.

For the Government to attempt to offset a return to normal peacetime levels of output is to force a return to deficit financing on such a scale as to endanger seriously the present value of the dollar. Then would follow further increases in the cost of living and to the extent that it would occur, a further repudiation of public debt.

Conclusions: The 20-year record of expanding Federal expenditures for housing, slum clearance, public works, nutrition, public health, social security, education, and agricultural support clearly outlines the course of Federal procedure. The great and increasing expenditures for the purposes just listed have been made not in a period of declining output or depression, but simultaneously with and in further stimulation of the greatest output in our history. This undue and unwise stimulation, when output was already high, will make a return to normal conditions additionally hard to bear or to prevent if Federal expenditure is used for this purpose. The designation of "welfare state" seems to be well earned under the developments of recent years. Perhaps the philosophy behind it might be summarized in a remark made by Justice William O. Douglas in a speech made in Los Angeles in February 1949.

The sound direction of the countermovement to communism in the democracies—is the creation of the human welfare state—the great political invention of the 20th century."

Of course, this is not an invention of the 20th century. It was, for example, practiced by ancient Greece and Rome to their great disadvantage.

It would seem to be countering communism by surrendering to it, wherein the state assumes the ascendancy over the individual and the responsibility for his personal welfare and security. It would seem more courageous and forthright for the Government to cease the cultivation of clamoring minorities, for those minorities to stop demanding special favor in their behalf and for the Nation as a whole to maintain its integrity by its willingness to pay the cost of its deeds and misdeeds. Public interest many times requires the suppression of self-interest and under our Constitution requires the maintenance of the Nation intact for posterity.

Early in this study, there were listed the five channels of increased Federal expenditure which the proponents of the welfare activities of Government suggested. In tables 1 to 8 are listed the growing expenditures of the Government under these classifications. The viewpoint that these activities are not in accordance with our constitutional provisions is supported in principle by the following opinions of the Supreme Court Justices quoted:

"There can be no lawful tax which is not laid for a public purpose." (Justice Miller, 20 Wallace 655; 1874); and again:

"Tax—as used in the Constitution, signifies an exaction for the support of the Government. The word has never been thought to connote expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another." (Justice Roberts, *United States v. Butler* (297 US; 1936).)

It is the departure from these long-standing principles that in a large measure is the "revolution" which its proponents are announcing and endorsing.

Power travels with money. It is not feasible for the Federal Government to assume the responsibility for collecting or printing money and for doling it out to State and local governments and their citizens without imposing the conditions upon which it will be spent. Thus by indirection Federal power will grow and insidiously penetrate the areas reserved by the Constitution to the States and their citizens.

Former Supreme Court Justice and Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, now Governor of South Carolina has said:

We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell, but if some of the new programs should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

The increasing confiscation of income through the power to tax, confirms the thought expressed by Mr. Byrnes. We are on the road and it runs downhill. The evidence is strong.

Abraham Lincoln once expressed his convictions on this relationship in the following words:

"The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the states, and especially the right of each state to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to the balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend."

The conviction persists that the increasing welfare activities in which the Federal Government has been engaged for 20 years can only come to some such end as previously suggested if they are continued. It also seems certain that heavy Federal expenditures to counteract a depression will prove ineffective. Those important industries whose decline leads us into a depression are the ones whose expansion should take us out of it.

An increase in road building will not put idle automobile mechanics back to work, nor will a rash of public building construction or alleviation of mortgage terms send unemployed textile workers back to their spindles and looms. Proposed governmental measures will not be successful because they do not strike at the causes of the trouble they seek to cure. After all, these same things were tried in the long depression of the thirties without success. Pump priming did not pay.

There is no thought or conclusion to be derived from this study that Government has no responsibility in meeting the extraordinary conditions imposed by crises due to financial or other causes. In the "arsenal of weapons" as mentioned in the Economic Report of the President are certain responsibilities and procedures available for use as the need may develop. Undoubtedly, the most important of these, implicit even if not specifically mentioned, is the maintenance of the integrity and value of our money and of our credit system. The ventures into "revolutionary" and socialistic fields of expenditure and especially in expanding volume to stem a depression will be hazardous to and in conflict with this major responsibility.

These two conceptions are completely antagonistic especially because our tax and debt levels are so high as to leave little or no margin of financial safety. Our recurring "crises" have been utilized in accelerating the progress of the "revolution" which we are undergoing. A further depreciation of our currency value would provide opportunity for additional acceleration in the same direction.

In *The New Philosophy of Public Debt*, Mr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, says:

"The preservation of fiscal stability is indispensable to the maintenance of monetary stability \* \* \*. It is indispensable to the prevention of inflation with its distorting effects on the price and wage structure, and thus to the maintenance of social and political stability."

As someone has said, "What the government gives away, it takes away," and this is true even if it comes from the printing presses.

Perhaps this study can be closed in no better manner than to quote from a statement<sup>4</sup> by Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower while president of Columbia University:

"I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us."

<sup>4</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, in letter to Ralph W. Gwinn, dated Columbia University, New York, June 7, 1949, in opposition to a general Federal-aid-to-education program. (Congressional Record, 81st Cong., 1st sess., vol. 95, p. 14, p. A3690.)

## INDEX OF CHARTS

- Chart 1. Government civilian employees per 1,000 United States population.  
 Chart 2. Index of Government civilian employees.  
 Chart 3. Total civilian employees of Government—Federal, State, and local.  
 Chart 4. Federal receipts and expenditures per capita.  
 Chart 5. Population compared with Federal, State, and local tax receipts.  
 Chart 6. Federal, State, and local taxes—cents per dollar of national income.  
 Chart 7. United States Federal debt per family versus national income per family.  
 Chart 8. Total debt per family versus private debt per family.  
 Chart 9. Gross national product versus gross national debt.  
 Chart 10. Gross national debt and disposable personal income.  
 Chart 11. United States wholesale commodity prices in currency.  
 Chart 12. Industrial production in the United States.

## DATA SHEET 1, CHART 1


*Government civilian employees*

	Federal employees per 1,000 population	State and local employees per 1,000 population	Total Government employees per 1,000 population	Federal	State and local	Total
1901						
1902	3.3					
1903						
1904	3.7					
1905						
1906	4.2					
1907						
1908	4.1					
1909						
1910	4.1					
1911						
1912	4.0					
1913						
1914	4.6					
1915						
1916	4.6					
1917						
1918	4.3					
1919						
1920	8.8					
1921						
1922	6.5					
1923	5.5					
1924	5.1					
1925	4.9					
1926	4.9					
1927	4.9					
1928	4.8					
1929	4.7					
1930	4.8	20.8	25.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
1931	4.9	21.3	26.3	102.0	102.4	102.3
1932	5.0	21.8	26.8	102.0	104.8	104.2
1933	5.0	21.4	26.4	102.0	102.8	102.7
1934	5.0	20.6	25.6	102.0	99.1	99.4
1935	5.7	20.9	26.6	116.4	100.5	103.5
1936	6.4	21.4	27.8	130.6	102.8	108.1
1937	7.0	23.3	30.0	142.9	112.0	116.6
1938	7.0	22.7	29.7	142.9	109.1	115.5
1939	6.9	23.5	30.4	141.0	112.9	117.5
1940	7.4	23.6	31.0	151.0	113.4	120.6
1941	8.2	24.3	32.5	167.5	116.8	126.6
1942	10.8	24.9	35.7	220.5	119.6	138.9
1943	16.6	24.3	40.9	339.0	116.8	159.1
1944	23.2	23.2	46.4	473.5	111.5	180.5
1945	24.2	22.6	46.8	494.0	108.6	182.0
1946	25.5	22.4	46.8	520.0	107.6	182.0
1947	19.1	23.7	42.8	390.0	113.9	166.5
1948	15.0	25.0	40.0	306.2	120.1	155.6
1949	14.1	25.8	39.9	288.0	124.0	155.2
1950	14.1	26.5	40.6	288.0	127.4	168.0
1951	13.8	27.1	40.9	281.8	130.2	159.1
1952	16.0	26.7	42.7	326.5	128.3	165.2
1953	16.6	26.9	43.5	339.0	129.3	169.2
1953	16.2	27.2	43.4	330.8	130.7	168.8

NOTE.—Indexes, 1929=100. Not charted.

Source: Data on governmental employment from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953. Federal employment, table 404, p. 379, State and local employment, table 424, p. 393.






## DATA SHEET 2, CHART 2 AND CHART 3


*Government civilian employees compared with other civilian employees*

	In millions			Government employees per 100 other employees	Percent of 1929
	Total civilian labor force	Total civilian Government employees	Labor force other than Government		
1929.....	49.2	3.7	46.1	6.7	100.0
1930.....	49.8	3.1	46.7	6.7	100.0
1931.....	50.4	3.3	47.1	6.9	103.0
1932.....	51.0	3.2	47.8	6.3	94.0
1933.....	51.6	3.2	48.4	6.5	97.0
1934.....	52.2	3.3	48.9	6.7	100.0
1935.....	52.9	3.5	49.4	7.0	104.5
1936.....	53.4	3.7	49.7	7.4	110.4
1937.....	54.0	3.7	50.3	7.5	111.9
1938.....	54.6	3.9	50.7	7.6	113.4
1939.....	55.2	4.0	51.2	7.8	116.4
1940.....	55.6	4.2	51.4	8.2	122.4
1941.....	55.9	4.6	51.3	9.0	134.3
1942.....	56.4	5.4	51.0	10.6	158.1
1943.....	55.5	6.0	49.5	12.2	182.0
1944.....	54.6	6.0	48.6	12.4	185.0
1945.....	53.9	6.0	47.9	12.5	186.5
1946.....	57.5	5.6	51.9	10.8	176.0
1947.....	60.2	5.5	54.7	10.0	149.2
1948.....	61.4	5.6	55.8	10.1	150.7
1949.....	62.1	5.8	56.3	10.4	155.2
1950.....	63.1	6.0	57.1	10.5	156.6
1951.....	62.9	6.4	56.5	11.3	168.6
1952.....	63.0	6.6	56.4	11.8	176.0
1953.....	63.4	6.7	56.7	11.8	176.0

Source: Total civilian and Government civilian employees from Economic Report of the President, 1954. Total civilian labor force, table G16, p. 184. Total Government civilian labor force, table G21, p. 189.



[The body of the page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]



## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

## DATA SHEET 3, CHART 4

## Ordinary receipts and expenditures

Year	Population	Total Federal		Total Federal revenue per capita	Total Federal expenditures per capita
		revenue	expenditures		
	<i>Millions</i>	<i>Billions</i>	<i>Billions</i>		
1900.....	76.0	\$0.567	\$0.521	\$7.46	\$6.87
1901.....	77.4	.588	.525	7.60	6.79
1902.....	79.2	.562	.485	7.10	6.12
1903.....	80.7	.562	.517	6.96	6.45
1904.....	82.3	.541	.584	6.57	7.10
1905.....	84.0	.544	.567	6.48	6.75
1906.....	85.5	.595	.570	6.96	6.66
1907.....	87.2	.666	.579	7.54	6.64
1908.....	88.8	.692	.659	6.78	7.42
1909.....	90.3	.604	.694	6.70	7.09
1910.....	92.0	.676	.694	7.35	7.54
1911.....	93.4	.702	.691	7.52	7.40
1912.....	95.0	.693	.690	7.30	7.27
1913.....	96.5	.724	.725	7.50	7.51
1914.....	98.1	.735	.735	7.49	7.50
1915.....	99.6	.698	.761	7.01	7.64
1916.....	101.2	.783	.742	7.74	7.35
1917.....	102.8	1.124	2.086	11.04	19.88
1918.....	104.3	4.180	13.792	40.00	132.10
1919.....	105.8	4.654	18.962	46.20	179.20
1920.....	107.2	6.704	6.142	62.50	57.30
1921.....	108.8	5.584	4.469	51.35	41.00
1922.....	110.4	4.103	3.196	37.20	28.95
1923.....	111.9	3.847	3.245	34.35	29.00
1924.....	113.5	3.884	2.946	34.20	25.95
1925.....	115.0	3.607	2.464	31.35	21.40
1926.....	116.6	3.908	3.030	33.50	25.84
1927.....	118.2	4.128	3.002	34.90	25.39
1928.....	119.8	4.038	3.071	33.70	25.33
1929.....	121.6	4.036	3.322	33.20	27.30
1930.....	123.1	4.178	3.440	33.90	27.95
1931.....	124.0	3.176	3.577	25.60	28.81
1932.....	124.8	1.924	4.659	15.40	37.30
1933.....	125.6	2.021	4.623	16.10	36.80
1934.....	126.4	3.064	6.694	24.25	52.90
1935.....	127.3	3.730	6.521	20.30	51.12
1936.....	128.1	4.068	8.493	31.71	66.30
1937.....	128.8	4.979	7.756	38.63	60.20
1938.....	129.8	5.762	6.938	44.40	53.40
1939.....	130.9	6.103	8.966	39.00	68.50
1940.....	131.8	5.265	9.183	40.00	69.60
1941.....	133.2	7.227	13.387	54.30	100.40
1942.....	134.7	12.696	34.187	94.30	253.80
1943.....	136.5	22.201	79.622	162.60	583.50
1944.....	138.1	43.892	95.315	317.70	690.00
1945.....	139.6	44.762	98.703	320.50	706.80
1946.....	141.2	40.027	60.703	283.50	430.00
1947.....	143.4	40.043	39.289	279.00	274.00
1948.....	146.6	42.211	33.791	288.00	231.00
1949.....	149.1	38.246	40.057	256.50	268.20
1950.....	151.1	37.045	40.167	245.00	265.00
1951.....	154.4	48.143	44.633	311.80	289.00
1952.....	157.0	62.129	66.145	396.00	421.00
1953.....	159.7	65.218	74.607	410.00	466.50

1930-35 Economic Almanac (1953-54) of the N. I. C. B., p. 517.


1936-52 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953, p. 337.

Expenditure data 1900-29 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1930, p. 172.

1930-35 Economic Almanac (1953-54) of the N. I. C. B.

1935-52 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1953, p. 340.

Source: Revenue data 1900-29 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1929 p. 172.




## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

## DATA SHEET 4, CHART 5

Year	Population	Federal taxes	State and local taxes	1929=100		State and local tax index
				Population index	Federal tax index	
	<i>Millions</i>	<i>Millions</i>	<i>Millions</i>			
1916.....	101.2	\$708	\$1,935	83.2	21.2	30.1
1917.....	102.8	1,015	1,923	84.6	30.8	29.9
1918.....	104.3	3,352	2,309	85.8	100.5	35.9
1919.....	105.8	4,482	2,923	87.0	134.5	45.5
1920.....	107.2	5,689	3,476	88.2	170.6	54.0
1921.....	108.8	4,917	3,895	89.5	147.5	60.6
1922.....	110.4	3,554	4,015	90.8	106.6	62.4
1923.....	111.9	3,052	4,202	92.0	91.4	65.4
1924.....	113.5	3,207	4,619	93.4	96.1	71.8
1925.....	115.0	2,974	4,918	95.0	89.1	76.5
1926.....	116.6	3,215	5,398	95.9	96.4	83.9
1927.....	118.2	3,345	5,722	97.2	100.3	89.0
1928.....	119.8	3,201	6,148	98.5	96.0	95.6
1929.....	121.6	3,337	6,431	100.0	100.0	100.0
1930.....	123.1	3,517	6,798	101.2	105.4	105.7
1931.....	124.0	2,739	6,583	102.2	82.0	102.4
1932.....	124.8	1,813	6,358	102.7	54.3	98.8
1933.....	125.6	1,805	5,715	103.4	54.1	88.9
1934.....	126.4	2,910	5,881	104.0	87.2	91.5
1935.....	127.3	3,557	6,185	104.8	106.6	96.2
1936.....	128.1	3,856	6,659	105.4	115.5	103.5
1937.....	128.8	4,771	7,421	106.0	143.1	115.5
1938.....	129.8	5,452	7,684	106.9	163.5	119.5
1939.....	130.9	4,813	7,638	107.6	144.4	118.7
1940.....	131.8	4,921	7,997	108.5	147.6	124.4
1941.....	133.2	6,889	8,315	109.5	206.7	129.3
1942.....	134.7	12,964	8,527	110.9	389.0	132.6
1943.....	136.5	21,087	8,653	112.4	632.0	134.6
1944.....	138.1	40,339	8,875	113.6	1,210.0	138.0
1945.....	139.6	40,989	9,193	115.0	1,228.0	143.0
1946.....	141.2	36,285	10,094	116.3	1,088.0	157.0
1947.....	143.4	35,132	11,554	117.9	1,054.0	179.7
1948.....	146.6	37,636	13,342	120.7	1,129.0	207.5
1949.....	149.1	35,590	14,790	122.1	1,056.0	230.0
1950.....	151.1	34,955	15,914	124.4	1,049.0	247.5
1951.....	154.4	45,984	17,554	127.0	1,378.0	273.0
1952.....	157.0	59,535	-----	129.1	1,785.0	-----
1953.....	159.7	62,656	-----	131.3	1,878.0	-----

Source: Tax revenue data from p. 516, Economic Almanac 1953-54, National Industrial Conference Board. Excludes social security taxes except that portion used for administration of social security system





## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS


## DATA SHEET 5, CHART 6

*National income and tax receipts*

Tax receipts, calendar years--	National income, billions	Total, billions	Total per- cent of income	Tax receipts, calendar years--	National income, billions	Total, billions	Total per- cent of income
1929.....	\$87.4	\$10.30	11.8	1941.....	\$103.8	\$24.36	23.5
1930.....	75.0	9.77	13.0	1942.....	137.1	31.95	23.3
1931.....	58.9	8.54	14.5	1943.....	169.7	48.51	23.6
1932.....	41.7	8.00	17.0	1944.....	183.8	50.59	27.5
1933.....	39.6	8.54	21.6	1945.....	182.7	52.52	28.7
1934.....	48.6	9.08	19.9	1946.....	180.3	50.37	27.9
1935.....	56.8	10.59	18.7	1947.....	198.7	56.39	28.4
1936.....	64.7	12.14	18.8	1948.....	223.5	58.10	26.0
1937.....	73.6	14.57	19.8	1949.....	216.3	54.93	25.4
1938.....	67.4	14.20	21.1	1950.....	240.6	67.75	28.2
1939.....	72.5	14.58	20.1	1951.....	278.4	84.56	30.4
1940.....	81.3	16.95	20.9	1952.....	291.6	-----	-----

Source: National income, table G-7, Economic Report of the President, 1954.

Tax receipts, Department of Commerce via Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 1952-53, by the Tax Foundation. Table 90, p. 116.




## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

DATA SHEET 6, CHART 7

	National income, billions	Number of families, millions	National income per family	Federal debt per family	Difference, income over debt
1900.....	\$16.2	15.96	\$1,015	\$84	\$931
1910.....	28.2	20.26	1,392	57	1,335
1920.....	74.2	24.35	3,045	1,000	2,045
1929.....	87.4	29.40	2,972	576	1,396
1930.....	75.0	29.90	2,510	542	1,968
1931.....	58.9	31.24	1,885	538	1,347
1932.....	41.7	31.67	1,317	615	702
1933.....	39.6	32.16	1,232	702	530
1934.....	48.6	32.56	1,493	831	662
1935.....	56.8	33.09	1,718	868	850
1936.....	64.7	33.55	1,928	1,006	922
1937.....	73.6	34.00	2,164	1,072	1,092
1938.....	67.4	34.52	1,952	1,076	876
1939.....	72.5	35.60	2,035	1,185	900
1940.....	81.3	34.95	2,325	1,230	1,095
1941.....	103.8	35.85	2,895	1,365	1,530
1942.....	137.1	36.45	3,760	1,990	1,770
1943.....	169.7	36.88	4,600	3,710	890
1944.....	183.8	37.10	4,950	5,420	-470
1945.....	182.7	37.50	4,870	6,900	-2,030
1946.....	180.3	38.18	3,725	7,006	-3,281
1947.....	198.7	39.14	5,007	6,600	-1,593
1948.....	223.5	40.72	5,490	6,200	-710
1949.....	216.3	42.11	5,140	6,000	-860
1950.....	240.6	43.47	5,530	5,930	-400
1951.....	278.4	44.56	6,250	5,750	500
1952.....	291.6	45.46	6,415	5,700	715
1953.....	<sup>1</sup> 306.0	47.50	6,440	5,600	840

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.


Source: Income data, 1900, 1910, 1920, estimated based on NBER data in "National Productivity Since 1869."  
1929-52, the Economic Report of the President, 1954, table G-7.  
Number of families based on United States census data.



## DATA SHEET 7, CHART 8

	Total debt, pri- vate and public, billions	Private debt, billions	Number of families, millions	Private debt per family	Total debt per family	National income per family
1929.....	\$191.1	\$161.5	29.40	\$5,500	\$6,500	\$2,972
1930.....	191.4	160.8	29.90	5,380	6,400	2,510
1931.....	182.6	148.6	31.21	4,760	5,850	1,885
1932.....	175.7	137.8	31.67	4,350	5,550	1,317
1933.....	169.7	128.8	32.16	4,000	5,280	1,232
1934.....	172.6	126.3	32.56	3,880	5,300	1,493
1935.....	175.9	125.4	33.09	3,790	5,320	1,718
1936.....	181.4	127.5	33.55	3,900	5,400	1,928
1937.....	183.3	127.9	34.00	3,760	5,390	2,164
1938.....	180.8	121.3	34.52	3,600	5,240	1,952
1939.....	181.5	125.5	35.60	3,530	5,180	2,035
1940.....	190.8	129.6	34.95	3,700	5,460	2,325
1941.....	212.6	140.4	35.85	3,915	5,930	2,895
1942.....	260.7	143.2	36.45	3,930	7,150	3,760
1943.....	314.3	145.0	36.88	3,935	8,530	4,600
1944.....	371.6	145.7	37.16	3,930	10,020	4,950
1945.....	407.3	140.8	37.50	3,755	10,860	4,870
1946.....	398.8	155.5	38.18	4,070	10,450	3,725
1947.....	419.5	181.8	39.14	4,650	10,720	5,007
1948.....	435.3	202.6	40.72	4,975	10,690	5,490
1949.....	446.7	210.0	42.11	4,985	10,600	5,140
1950.....	485.8	246.4	43.47	5,670	11,180	5,530
1951.....	519.2	277.2	44.56	6,230	11,650	6,250

Source: Data on debt from Economic Almanac, National Industrial Conference Board, 1953-54, p. 122.  
Data on income derived from table G7, President's Economic Report, 1954, and Census Bureau data on families.



## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

## DATA SHEET 8, CHART 9


	Gross national product, billions	Federal debt, billions	Gross national product at 1929 consumer price, billions		Gross national product, billions	Federal debt, billions	Gross national product at 1929 consumer price, billions
1900 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$16.9	\$1.26	-----	1927.....	89.6	\$18.51	\$88.6
1901 <sup>1</sup> .....	18.1	1.22	-----	1928.....	91.3	17.60	91.2
1902 <sup>1</sup> .....	19.2	1.18	-----	1929.....	103.8	16.90	103.8
1903 <sup>1</sup> .....	20.5	1.16	-----	1930.....	90.9	16.20	93.4
1904 <sup>1</sup> .....	21.6	1.14	-----	1931.....	75.9	16.80	85.6
1905 <sup>1</sup> .....	23.0	1.13	-----	1932.....	58.3	19.50	73.2
1906 <sup>1</sup> .....	24.5	1.14	-----	1933.....	55.8	22.50	74.0
1907 <sup>1</sup> .....	26.0	1.15	-----	1934.....	64.9	27.70	83.0
1908 <sup>1</sup> .....	27.5	1.18	-----	1935.....	72.2	32.80	90.2
1909.....	28.8	1.15	-----	1936.....	82.5	38.50	102.0
1910 <sup>1</sup> .....	31.1	1.15	-----	1937.....	90.2	41.10	107.8
1911 <sup>1</sup> .....	33.4	1.15	-----	1938.....	84.7	42.00	102.9
1912 <sup>1</sup> .....	35.7	1.19	-----	1939.....	91.3	45.90	112.5
1913 <sup>1</sup> .....	38.0	1.19	\$65.7	1940.....	101.4	48.50	124.0
1914.....	40.1	1.19	68.4	1941.....	126.4	55.30	147.3
1915 <sup>1</sup> .....	47.0	1.19	79.4	1942.....	161.6	77.00	169.8
1916 <sup>1</sup> .....	53.9	1.23	84.7	1943.....	194.3	140.80	192.5
1917 <sup>1</sup> .....	60.6	2.98	81.0	1944.....	213.7	202.60	208.1
1918 <sup>1</sup> .....	67.5	12.24	76.9	1945.....	215.2	259.10	205.0
1919.....	74.2	25.48	73.4	1946.....	211.1	269.00	185.5
1920.....	85.6	24.30	73.1	1947.....	273.3	258.40	179.0
1921.....	67.7	24.00	65.0	1948.....	259.0	252.40	184.6
1922.....	68.4	23.00	70.0	1949.....	258.2	252.80	186.0
1923.....	80.4	22.35	80.7	1950.....	286.8	257.40	205.2
1924.....	80.9	21.25	81.2	1951.....	329.8	255.30	217.0
1925.....	95.0	20.52	83.1	1952.....	348.0	259.20	223.5
1926.....	91.1	19.64	88.3	1953 <sup>2</sup> .....	366.0	266.10	234.0

<sup>1</sup> Estimated from data shown for 1899, 1904, 1909, 1914, and 1919 as indicated below.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate based in data for 9 months and subsequent production data.

Source: Gross national product 1900-28, national product since 1869—NBER, pp. 119, 151. Federal debt, 1900-28, Statistical Abstract of United States, 1930, p. 214. Federal debt, 1929-52, Economic Indicators Supplement 1953. Personal Disposable Income, 1929-50, National Income, 1951 edition, table 3, p. 151.






## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

## DATA SHEET 9, CHART 10

	Percent Federal debt G. N. P.	Dispos- able per- sonal income, billions	Percent D. I. P. G. N. P.		Percent Federal debt G. N. P.	Dispos- able per- sonal income, billions	Percent D. I. P. G. N. P.
1900.....	7.46			1927.....	20.7		
1901.....	6.74			1928.....	19.3		
1902.....	6.14			1929.....	16.3	\$82.5	74.9
1903.....	5.66			1930.....	17.8	73.7	81.0
1904.....	5.27			1931.....	22.1	63.0	83.0
1905.....	4.92			1932.....	33.5	47.8	82.0
1906.....	4.66			1933.....	40.3	45.2	80.8
1907.....	4.42			1934.....	42.7	51.6	79.5
1908.....	4.29			1935.....	45.5	58.0	80.4
1909.....	4.00			1936.....	46.7	66.1	80.2
1910.....	3.70			1937.....	45.6	71.1	78.8
1911.....	3.46			1938.....	49.6	65.5	77.3
1912.....	3.33			1939.....	50.3	70.2	76.8
1913.....	3.13			1940.....	47.8	75.7	74.7
1914.....	2.97			1941.....	43.8	92.0	72.8
1915.....	2.53			1942.....	47.6	116.7	72.2
1916.....	2.28			1943.....	72.4	132.4	68.2
1917.....	4.92			1944.....	94.0	147.0	68.8
1918.....	18.1			1945.....	120.5	151.1	70.2
1919.....	34.3			1946.....	127.8	158.9	75.2
1920.....	28.4			1947.....	110.8	169.5	72.7
1921.....	35.4			1948.....	97.5	188.4	72.7
1922.....	33.6			1949.....	97.9	187.2	72.7
1923.....	27.8			1950.....	89.8	205.8	76.2
1924.....	26.3			1951.....	77.5	225.0	68.5
1925.....	24.2			1952.....	74.5	235.0	67.3
1926.....	21.5			1953.....	1 72.7	1 250.0	1 68.5

<sup>1</sup> Estimate based on data for 9 months and subsequent production data.

Source: Gross national product, 1900-28, national product since 1869, NBFR, pp. 119, 151. Federal debt 1900-28, Statistical Abstract of United States, 1930, p. 214. Federal debt 1929-52, Economic Indicators Supplement, 1953. Personal Disposable Income, 1929-50, National Income, 1951 edition, table 3, p. 151.








## DATA SHEET 10, CHART 12

## Industrial production (physical volume)

	Cleveland Trust index, percent of normal	Normal trend, 1935-39=100	Total production, <sup>1</sup> 1935-39=100	New series F. R. B. data, 1935-39=100		Cleveland Trust index, percent of normal	Normal trend, 1935-39=100	Total production, <sup>1</sup> 1935-39=100	New series F. R. B. data, 1935-39=100
1900.....	103	32.7	33.7	-----	1927.....	104	87.2	90.7	94
1901.....	103	34.2	35.2	-----	1928.....	106	90.0	95.4	98
1902.....	103	35.7	36.8	-----	1929.....	110	92.8	102.0	109
1903.....	101	37.2	37.6	-----	1930.....	87	95.6	83.2	91
1904.....	96	38.8	37.2	-----	1931.....	73	98.3	71.7	74
1905.....	108	40.4	43.6	-----	1932.....	57	100.5	57.3	57
1906.....	110	42.1	46.3	-----	1933.....	68	102.8	70.0	69
1907.....	106	43.8	46.5	-----	1934.....	68	105.1	71.5	74
1908.....	86	45.6	39.2	-----	1935.....	77	107.6	82.9	87
1909.....	102	47.3	48.3	-----	1936.....	89	110.0	97.9	104
1910.....	101	49.2	49.7	-----	1937.....	93	112.5	104.6	113
1911.....	94	51.0	47.9	-----	1938.....	71	115.4	82.0	89
1912.....	104	52.9	55.0	-----	1939.....	88	117.9	103.7	107
1913.....	105	54.8	57.6	-----	1940.....	102	120.6	123.0	124
1914.....	95	56.8	54.0	-----	1941.....	127	123.8	157.3	161
1915.....	109	58.8	58.8	-----	1942.....	132	127.4	168.2	196
1916.....	114	61.0	69.5	-----	1943.....	138	131.0	180.7	235
1917.....	112	63.2	70.8	-----	1944.....	134	134.5	180.2	231
1918.....	107	65.4	70.0	-----	1945.....	123	138.5	170.4	198
1919.....	100	67.5	67.5	72	1946.....	114	141.8	161.7	167
1920.....	102	69.4	70.8	76	1947.....	126	146.0	184.6	185
1921.....	76	72.2	54.8	57	1948.....	131	151.9	198.0	193
1922.....	93	74.4	69.2	72	1949.....	115	155.6	179.6	180
1923.....	112	77.0	86.2	87	1950.....	133	161.0	214.5	207
1924.....	100	79.4	79.4	82	1951.....	139	165.7	230.0	222
1925.....	107	82.0	87.8	91	1952.....	139	172.5	225.0	239
1926.....	108	84.4	91.2	94	1953 <sup>1</sup> .....	138	177.4	* 245.4	* 248

<sup>1</sup> Derived from monthly data published by the Cleveland Trust Co. and independently calculated normal trend.

\* Estimated.







TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

6

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

TO

INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H. RES. 217

---

STAFF REPORT NO. 4

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

OF

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE

ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL

PEACE

---

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

THE ROCKEFELLER GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD

(Page numbers are from printed hearings)

Part I—June 9, 1954

Part II—July 9, 1954

Prepared by Kathryn Casey, Legal Analyst

Printed for the use of the committee

---

UNITED STATES

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1954

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS**

**B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee, *Chairman***

**JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan**

**WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio**

**ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts**

**GRACIE PFOST, Idaho**

**RENE A. WORMSER, *General Counsel***

**KATHRYN CASEY, *Legal Analyst***

**NORMAN DODD, *Research Director***

**ARNOLD KOCH, *Associate Counsel***

**JOHN MARSHALL, JR., *Chief Clerk***

**THOMAS McNIECE, *Assistant Research Director***

---

---

**TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS**

**STAFF REPORT NO. 4**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

One of the objectives of the staff, as mentioned in Mr. Dodd's report, was to determine whether there was a common denominator, as it were, in relation to foundation purposes. A collateral objective was to determine, if possible, whether the activities of foundations might fall into certain definite classifications.

Upon examination of the material available in the Cox committee files it was apparent that it was insufficient<sup>1</sup> to support a firm conclusion on this point; as were the various reference books available on foundations and their activities. After further study and discussion as to both the quickest and the most efficient method of securing sufficient information, it was decided to examine the activities of the first<sup>2</sup> major<sup>3</sup> foundations, to determine whether their activities could be classified, on the theory that such an examination would also serve the dual purpose of providing a guide for study of other foundations. With size of endowment and date organized as criteria, the selection of the agencies created by Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller were quite obvious choices, as will be seen by a glance at the following chronological list:

Carnegie Institute (of Pittsburgh), 1896.  
 Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, 1901.  
 Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1902.  
 Rockefeller General Education Board, 1903.  
 Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, 1904.  
 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1905.  
 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1910.  
 Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1911.  
 The Rockefeller Foundation, 1918.  
 The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1918.<sup>4</sup>

As a practical matter, the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh, the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission were eliminated as objects of study in relation to their fields of activity, because their purposes were so clearly specified and their activities confined thereto.

On the theory that the document itself is the best evidence, the logical source of the best information was the records of the foundations themselves, as contained in their annual reports and similar publication. When it proved difficult to obtain these reports from the Library of Congress<sup>5</sup> recourse was had to the foundations themselves.

In the case of the two Rockefeller agencies—the foundation and the General Education Board—the president, Mr. Dean Rusk, upon request responded immediately and loaned to the committee copies of the annual reports of each of these organizations.

In the case of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace a request was made to permit studies of their records from the date of organization, to which Dr. Johnson, the president, agreed without hesitation, and every cooperation was extended in placing the records, minutes of meetings, and confidential reports at the committee's disposal. In the time available, it was not possible to cover in detail all the material available for those years, but extensive notes were made

<sup>1</sup> Not only as to details, but also because it covered only the years 1936-51, inclusive.

<sup>2</sup> In point of time.

<sup>3</sup> In size of assets.

<sup>4</sup> Its activities were merged with those of the Rockefeller Foundation, 1928.

<sup>5</sup> Since only 1 copy was available for circulation, the other being for reference.

and verbatim quotations extracted; Mr. Perkins, of the Carnegie Corporation had equally cooperated but, subsequently on special request, the Library of Congress permitted the reference copies of the year-books of the Corporation, the foundation and the endowment to be withdrawn from the Library for use at the committee's offices.

In addition to these reports, the books and articles, including biographical material, available on both Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Carnegie and their foundations, were consulted and studied.<sup>6</sup>

Based on these studies, and according to the records of the foundations themselves, it was concluded that their activities had been carried on in a handful of major areas, namely:

- I. Education.
- II. International affairs, including international law.
- III. Politics (in the sense that politics is the science of civil government.)
- IV. Public affairs.
- V. Propaganda.
- VI. Economics.

While some of these fields overlapped to a certain degree, that fact does not affect the validity of the technique of analysis, nor the statement of summation.

## I. EDUCATION

### GENERAL PURPOSE

Part I of this summary is devoted to answering three questions:

1. Have these foundations carried on activities in the field of education?

- (a) At elementary level?
- (b) At secondary level?
- (c) At college and university level?

2. What have these activities been (at each of the levels noted)?

3. Did such activities have any evident or traceable effects in the educational field?

Secondly, once the answers to these questions are determined, what is their relationship (if any) to education, in the light of the constitutional and historic attitudes with regard to it in this country?

The activities relating to questions 1 and 2 will be summarized separately by foundation, for the entire period of its existence, in section 1. However, since the activities of all these organizations are parallel—at least in part—the effects of all in the educational field, and their relationship (if any) to the constitutional and historic viewpoint will be summarized and compared in section 2.

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Of the Carnegie and Rockefeller organizations only one—the General Education Board of Rockefeller<sup>1</sup>—from its outset has operated exclusively in the field of education, in the sense of a relationship to institutions of learning, teaching, and so forth. In the sense that all

<sup>6</sup> Bibliography: Life of Andrew Carnegie (2 vols.), V. J. Hendrick; Forty years of Carnegie Giving, R. M. Lester; 30 Year Catalogue of Grants, R. M. Lester; Fruit of an Impulse, Howard J. Savage; Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education, Ernest Victor Hollis; The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, Raymond Fosdick; History of the Standard Oil Co., Tarbell; American Foundations—Their Fields, 20th Century Fund; Philanthropy and Learning, Frederick P. Keppel; Public Benefactions of Andrew Carnegie, Carnegie Corp.; The Foundation, Frederick P. Keppel.

<sup>1</sup> Terminated operations at end of 1953.

knowledge developed pertains to education, of course, then the term "education" becomes practically all-inclusive of every activity not only of foundations, but of industry and government as well. However, in the former sense—which is the sense in which it is used here—Carnegie Corp., Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Rockefeller Foundation are dedicated by their charters to purposes directly or indirectly related to what might be called the advancement of education.

In the case of the foundation,<sup>2</sup> originally intended as a means of providing "retiring allowances" for professors, it is now its primary purpose. The corporation<sup>3</sup> and the endowment<sup>4</sup> have it as one of a multiplicity of purposes. Because this is particularly true of the endowment, and because its activities are so closely interrelated that agency's activities will be summarized as a unit when other categories of foundation activities are covered.

One further fact should be noted because it is a matter which time did not permit complete resolving. In the case of the corporation, and the foundation, there is a considerable overlapping of funds, and it is difficult at times to determine the extent to which the funds mentioned in the foundation's financial reports are duplicates of funds mentioned in the corporation's report. To a certain extent this is true also in regard to the endowment. Thus, while every effort will be made in this report to differentiate clearly between the amounts of money, it may be that sums reported in the foundation and the endowment records are duplications of sums reported in the Carnegie record.

Inasmuch as the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board do not seem to have the interlocking relationships found in the Carnegie organizations it is not believed that the same possibility of duplication exists in regard to those two organizations.

However, perhaps in an excess of caution, where doubt arose, the item was not included so that whatever error has occurred has been on the side of lower totals rather than higher.

#### BACKGROUND <sup>5</sup> MATERIAL FROM REFERENCE WORKS

Before proceeding to an analysis of information taken from the annual reports of each of the foundations to be summarized, a brief review of the activities in the field of education by these major contributors may prove helpful and also serve as a basis for evaluation.

Dr. Ernest Victor Hollis in his book *Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education*, published in 1938, covers not only the background and organization of foundations, but also the specific activities of foundations in the field of education. While most of his references are to higher education, portions of his work involve secondary education indirectly, as will be seen later. Although published in 1938, which makes many of the statistics of Dr. Hollis' book somewhat outdated, it is still regarded as an excellent reference.

<sup>2</sup> This term will be used throughout to designate the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

<sup>3</sup> This term will be used throughout to designate the Carnegie Corp.

<sup>4</sup> This term will be used throughout to designate the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

<sup>5</sup> See bibliography, p. 669.

According to Dr. Ernest Victor Hollis<sup>6</sup> "unfavorable public estimate of the elder John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie made it inexpedient in 1905 for their newly created philanthropic foundations to attempt any direct reforms in higher education." The subject was approached indirectly through general and noncontroversial purposes, nearly all foundation grants made before 1920 being for such purposes.

Dr. Hollis writes:

Far-reaching college reform was carefully embedded in many of these non-controversial grants. It was so skillfully done that few of the grants are directly chargeable to the ultimate reforms they sought to effect. For instance, there is little obvious connection between giving a pension to a college professor or giving a sum to the general endowment of his college, and reforming the entrance requirements, the financial practices, and the scholastic standards of his institution. This situation makes it necessary to present qualitative influence without immediately showing the quantitative grant that made the influence possible.<sup>7</sup>

#### REMEDIES FOR EDUCATIONAL CHAOS

The first efforts of the foundations to influence the development of higher education, according to Dr. Hollis, were directed toward a differentiation and coordination of the levels of education, which he stated "approached chaos" around 1902-5.

It is not proposed to discuss whether the conditions existing in the educational system at that time were chaotic or inefficient; nor is it intended to deny that the foundation and the General Education Board were sincere in their belief that the system should be improved. It is true, however, that neither of these organizations announced to the public their intention to reform the educational system. On the contrary, the board asserted on many occasions that it was determined not to interfere with the institutions, nor direct their policies.<sup>8</sup> The president of the foundation, in writing of the early activities of the foundation, admitted that originally even the founder, Andrew Carnegie, was not aware of any intention other than the commendable one of awarding a free pension, and in 1935 Mr. Pritchett accepted the fully responsibility for inculcating the reform idea in the pension awards.

Moreover, it is not intended to evaluate the merits of the objective and references are cited merely as indications of the intention and attitude of the two foundations which first entered this educational field. Additional references taken from the reports of the individual foundations will be included in later sections of this part, dealing with the individual foundation activity in education.

Dr. Hollis takes a very practical view of the manner in which foundations approached the situation and the logical conclusion to be drawn, when he writes:

As a condition of awarding a pension to a college professor what could be more plausible than the necessity for defining a college? Both the logic of the situation and the desire for the money caused colleges to seek the scrutiny of the foundation. By this indirection the foundation was being importuned to do what President Pritchett most wished, and what he probably could not

<sup>6</sup> Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 127.

<sup>8</sup> See sections on Foundation and Board.

have accomplished by any amount of direct grants. With pensions as the inducement the Carnegie plan for improving the colleges was explicit and avowed; the scholastic, financial, and control standards that were demanded for affiliation guaranteed that the institution would be a real college. Despite its protestations to the contrary, the General Education Board sought to effect the same reforms. I used grants to capital outlay and to general endowment as the inducement and its leadership was canny enough not to print or use an inflexible set of standards. The college seeking assistance was judged in terms of its promise within the local area. The board "made a thorough study" of the institutions calling themselves colleges and from this factual survey came to a conclusion similar to that of the Carnegie Foundation as to what should be done. Each foundation decided to organize and lead a superior system of colleges and universities as a demonstration to the rest of the country. Their purposes were almost identical, though their methods of work were radically different, as were also their attitudes toward church-controlled colleges. The actions of the Carnegie Foundation were the more open and therefore will enter more fully into this narrative. But this circumstance should not obscure the fact that the General Education Board program sought similar goals and was just as assiduously conducted.<sup>9</sup>

Dr. Hollis goes on to say that, using this as a basis [eligibility for a Carnegie pension], the specific requirements were established as to what constituted a "college," and these requirements were later agreed to in principle at a conference, sponsored by the foundations of all agencies interested in improving college entrance requirements.

Dr. Hollis, in comparing the policies of the foundation and the General Education Board, refers to the former's standards as an "all or none" dictum which "was happily absent in the more flexible, less explicit plans of the General Education Board for improving colleges."<sup>10</sup>

Dr. Hollis referred to the setting up of means for improving college entrance requirements which grew out of the indictment of the so-called mechanical credits which were congesting the colleges with inadequately prepared students and again notes the contribution of the foundation when he states:

At every stage of this complex kaleidoscopic problem, the philanthropic foundations interested in higher education have been alined with the progressive educators who are seeking such changes as those described as taking part at the University of Chicago. \* \* \* In addition to cash, the above organizations and the Carnegie Foundation furnished the highly valuable services of professional staff members.

Psychological examinations, comprehensive achievement tests, cumulative permanent record forms, and related admission devices had to be planned and perfected before much actual progress could be made in improving the certificate plan of admission by units. The best professional and technical abilities of the universities and nonteaching research agencies were given to the construction of these instruments. Columbia, Chicago, and Stanford Universities were the centers in which most of this research was done, but other universities made notable contributions. The American Council on Education provided the general administrative and supervisory direction necessary to coordinate such a large cooperative undertaking. The philanthropic foundations provided \$1,212,450 of the sum necessary for the work.

The six regional accrediting associations have jointly and severally been granted \$150,000 as a supplement to other resources, for studies looking toward the formulation and application of qualitative standards for accrediting high schools and colleges. The north Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has alone received foundation grants totaling \$115,000. This sum has been devoted to developing standards for judging the effectiveness of the 285 institutions of higher education in the upper Mississippi Basin. It is expected that the research will aid in a determination and statement of the aims, purposes, and general philosophy of secondary and higher education. Aided by a foundation grant of \$25,000, the Committee of Twenty-one, representing the six

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 129-130.

<sup>10</sup> See sections on Carnegie Foundation and Rockefeller General Education Board.



regional accrediting associations of the United States, is conducting a study of accrediting that is focused on the secondary school. It has undertaken the formulation of standards for accrediting high schools, and the outlining of procedures for their application and adaptation by the regional associations. Several of the regional associations are individually undertaking minor studies aimed at the solution of parts of the general problem. Educational and foundation officials are united in the determination of supplement or supplant quantitative accrediting with qualitative measures for admission to and progress through high school and college.<sup>11</sup>

According to Dr. Hollis, the method of the General Education Board was preferable in many respects, particularly in that it was more tolerant than the foundation of which he states: "The limitation of funds, and the conception of the trust itself, as well as the philosophy of its first president, tended to maintain a rigid pattern of action."<sup>12</sup>

He points out that the board, while it had a regard for high entrance requirements, did not insist that colleges "conform to preconceived general standards, regardless of actual local conditions."<sup>13</sup>

It recognized that the difference in educational, financial, and social conditions in various parts of the country made it impossible, even in medical education, to achieve complete uniformity all at once, and that to force the issue might merely result in changing the terms rather than in fact raising standards. It was Dr. Hollis' opinion that the failure to follow such a policy was "The basic cause for the early bickering, strife, and only partial success of the foundation's college admission efforts."

Much dissension has arisen over the use of the so-called unit and in later years the Carnegie Foundation was to vigorously attempt to disassociate itself from it. In that connection it should be noted for the record that the foundation and the board did not invent the unit as a device for measuring progress through secondary schools but they did contribute to securing its more effective enforcement. They therefore share with the schools the responsibility for introducing it into secondary education although its retention past its usefulness may be charged to the schools through their accrediting associations.

Both the foundation and the board were in agreement that the chief offenders against standards were the various Protestant religious denominations,<sup>14</sup> and both agreed that there should be concentration of effort in a few colleges which would have the effect of eliminating the weak colleges through lack of finances and other causes. However, the methods selected by the foundation and the general education board differed materially.

The bylaws of the foundation provided that no institution could share in its pension fund if it remained under the control of a religious group. The foundation also required that all affiliated institutions have a 4-year curriculum and at least 6 full professors. (This automatically established the size of the liberal arts colleges, namely, six departments);<sup>15</sup> and required a minimum endowment or in the case of State universities, an annual income.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 144-146.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 133-134.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138.

<sup>15</sup> After 1921 this was increased to 8.

The board approaches the problem by "systematic and helpful corroboration with the religious denominations, which took the form of direct support of the stronger of such colleges."<sup>16</sup>

Both the foundation and the board had concluded that by withholding funds from "the weak and tottering or superfluous colleges," as they were referred to, these institutions would die a natural death, consolidate or perhaps even coordinate with institutions selected by the foundations as pivotal institutions. However, he adds, the results have not borne out that conclusion—the Office of Education Directory listing some 2,000 institutions of higher education in this country.

Moreover, according to Dr. Hollis, the waste, duplication and lack of articulation are still evident, and according to Dr. Hollis were as bad after the first World War as those facing the foundation at the turn of the century.

\* \* \* Accompanying this dissatisfaction with organization was an even greater disapproval of the traditional content of the courses and their organization into curricula. The manner of being admitted to and guided through these offerings was reopened for further study. In short, after 1918 there was a new start in efforts to resolve the confusion existing in American higher education, and the philanthropic foundations influenced most of these undertakings.

After the war the philanthropic foundations entered into a more satisfying relation with higher education. They were no longer forced to seek change by indirection; rather, they directly concentrated their grants and influence to remedy some of the more glaring deficiencies that had been revealed by the war. A more favorable public attitude toward philanthropic trusts made their new approach possible. They now directly cooperated with the professional forces of higher education in a new attack on the problems of organization to assure institutional operation that would be more effective in modern life.

By 1920 about 90 percent of all college admissions were by the certification of 15 or more variously required units of the type of credit described by Learned. Under this system inadequately prepared students were congesting the colleges. At the same time the system hampered the effectiveness of the high school in serving the much larger group of students who would not enter college. Those college and foundation officials who subscribed to Learned's indictment of mechanical credits began to pool their money and talents to provide means for improving college entrance devices, and this soon led to more fundamental studies of the relations of secondary to higher education.

In addition to what may be termed "direct" activities, i. e., funds granted to institutions themselves, or for projects in the teaching or educational field all of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations made direct contributions of funds to the following organizations:

Adult Education <sup>17</sup>  
 American Council on Education  
 Cooperative Test Service  
 Educational Records Bureau  
 Institute of International Education  
 London School of Economics  
 National Education Association  
 Progressive Education Association.

Because of the effect of several universities on education, foundations' grants to these institutions have been tabulated. The institutions are:

Columbia University  
 Columbia University Teachers College  
 University of Chicago  
 Lincoln School.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 138-140.

<sup>17</sup> Including grants to American Association for Adult Education.

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK—THE  
CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT  
OF TEACHING

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

ESTABLISHMENT, PURPOSES, ASSETS

The Carnegie Corporation of New York was the last of the philanthropic agencies created by Andrew Carnegie, and he served as its president until his death 8 years later in 1919. It was established "to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding" among the people of the United States and the British Dominions. Of its \$135,336,869 endowment, \$12 million is applicable to enterprises in the British Dominions and Colonies, at the discretion of the trustees. As of 1951 the assets of the corporation were \$175,890,810.<sup>1</sup>

The corporation is managed by a board of 15 trustees, 4 of whom are ex officio, 3 are presidents also of other Carnegie funds, and the president of the corporation.

GENERAL POLICY

The corporation makes grants chiefly to universities, colleges, and other organizations which the trustees believe can contribute to "the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding," and devotes its entire annual income (except that necessary for administrative purposes) to such grants. Its officers do not attempt to keep in active touch with programs, nor plan nor direct projects, full responsibility being assigned to the recipient.

Question 1. From 1911 to 1952, inclusive, the last year for which the annual report is available, the corporation made funds available to:

	<i>Appropriations</i>
Universities, colleges, and schools in the United States <sup>1</sup> -----	\$56, 838, 274
For adult education <sup>2</sup> -----	3, 012, 875
American Council on Education-----	1, 012, 875
Columbia University-----	2, 687, 265
Cooperative Test Service, Educational Records Bureau, Graduate Record, College Entrance Examination Board-----	90, 924
Institute of International Education-----	2, 366, 326
National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools-----	750, 000
National Education Association-----	261, 500
Progressive Education Association <sup>3</sup> -----	76, 485
Teachers College-----	3, 727, 650
University of Chicago-----	2, 419, 450
Total-----	73, 243, 624

<sup>1</sup> Does not include Columbia University Teachers College or University of Chicago.

<sup>2</sup> Including grants to the American Association for Adult Education.

<sup>3</sup> Now called American Education Fellowship.

Funds were given to other organizations, such as the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, whose activities were less directly related to education, but time did not permit exploring them in detail. A brief description of the type of activity carried on by the

<sup>1</sup> Basic Facts About Carnegie Corporation of New York and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, published by the corporation in August 1952.

American Council on Education, the National Education Association, and the Progressive Education Association is given in section 2 of this summary.

Prior to 1930 the major grants of the corporation were for library buildings, laboratories, endowment of liberal arts colleges, development of such colleges through endowment, endowment of medical schools at universities, and endowment, buildings, and support of Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Question 2. All quotations are from the annual reports, and in order to avoid undue length, a few have been selected from many of a similar nature. They appear in the annual reports under the heading of "General Education," unless otherwise indicated.

*1937 report*

Page 20:

The field of general education, even within the limits of scholarly inquiry is too broad for any single foundation to cover, and, fortunately, more than one foundation is now active therein. The present activities of the corporation, working in close cooperation with the Carnegie Foundation, are the following: tests and measurements and records; comparative education, notably in the study of examinations; professional education, particularly in its relation to professional practice and to supply and demand in personnel; the relation of research to professional education, especially in the graduate school; new developments of undergraduate instruction, supported chiefly by direct grants to institutions; and the maintenance of what may be called educational clearing-houses, as in Australia and New Zealand. \* \* \*

Page 21:

\* \* \* Meanwhile, the problems of professional standards in general, the relations of the professions to one another and to other branches of education, the needs of the public and the degree to which these are being met, have all been comparatively neglected. The corporation has had opportunity to study these questions rather closely in connection with training for librarianship, but its interest includes all professions, large and small, as well as what may be called emerging professions, that is, callings which are gradually assuming a professional status. It is the writer's belief that there is a definite need today to build up a body of doctrine which will be based on reality and not on tradition. \* \* \*

Pages 21, 22:

This general situation opens opportunities to foundations for activities of the greatest usefulness, but, unless the programs themselves are carefully organized and rigidly limited in scope, there is a real danger lest they tend to draw the foundation itself outside its proper sphere of action. It is essential not only that the foundation be insured completeness of relevant data for its study, but also that it be freed from any compulsion to press for action as a means of justifying its conclusions. While it may advise frankly concerning changes, when its advice is sought, it should never agitate for reforms or use its money or influence as a means to a political end.

*1938 report*

Pages 31, 32, 33: According to the report, on the basis of the general purpose of each of the grants made in the period since 1933-34 for educational studies, they might be divided as follows:

To understand the student.....	\$50, 300
To improve teaching.....	83, 100
To show what is being done.....	129, 350
To inform as to educational policy and organization.....	51, 000
To find out what the students learn.....	191, 500
Various other purposes.....	35, 600
Total.....	540, 850

The longest unbroken series of grants of this character made by the corporation has been voted to the Institute of Educational Research of Teachers College, Columbia University, and it should be of interest to summarize the results of cooperation with a small group of workers under distinguished leadership. In the 16 years from July 1, 1922, the researches in psychology and education at Teachers College under the direction of Dr. E. L. Thorndike have been supported by grants from the Carnegie Corp., totaling approximately \$325,000. The findings are reported in nine books or monographs already published (without cost to the corporation), and nearly a hundred scientific articles, doctoral dissertations, and special reports.

Nor must it be overlooked that, since science advances as a whole, the work of gathering data which others may use, repeating experiments, adding here and there to what others have proved, may in the long run be more valuable than even such striking direct contributions.

#### *1942 report*

Pages 14, 15: In the 1942 report the corporation lists as its three major grants those made to the University Center in Atlanta, the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, and the New York University in New York.

Referring to the Atlanta enterprise (\$150,000), it is noted that far greater grants had been given to it by the General Education Board. Its purpose is stated to be:

\* \* \* a long-planned integration of the work of the several institutions of college grade in that area under terms which will give Atlanta the advantage of a modern university without requiring the constituent colleges to sacrifice their identities. \* \* \*

The grant to New York University (\$100,000) was made with the understanding that the fund would be used for current purposes rather than for endowment.

Pages 16, 17—The report then continues:

Two grants totaling \$65,000 were made to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for continuation of cooperative work with a selected list of graduate and undergraduate schools in developing criteria for admission and in providing a basis for judgment as to ability of those already admitted to candidacy for degrees. A more detailed statement on these studies will appear in the 1942 report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Additional grants totaling \$21,000 were also made to the foundation for two programs undertaken in cooperation with the American Council on Education. Another grant of \$10,000 was voted for the formulation of special tests to be used in selecting the persons to be trained under the defense-training program of the United States Office of Education.

As was recorded in last year's report, one of the largest grants voted in 1940-41 made possible the establishment of the Institute of Adult Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. It is a pleasure to report that the institute is rapidly defining a useful role for itself, and that the American Association for Adult Education, now maintained entirely from membership fees, increased its dues-paying constituency during a year when most voluntary professional associations were suffering a decline in membership.

\* \* \* \* \*

Among the adult education programs initiated with corporation support in prewar days, none has proved more timely than that of the Council on Foreign Relations. The regional committees organized in 12 strategic cities across the country have met regularly for discussion of international problems and have joined in producing an interesting summary of these discussions under the title of *Some Regional Views on Our Foreign Policy, 1941*. An appropriation of \$24,000 was voted for the continuation of this program.

In the United States it need no longer be argued that provision for the education of adults is quite as properly a responsibility of the Government as is education at other age levels. The war, indeed, has offered dramatic evidence of the social cost of not affording such opportunities, and the numerous training programs which have been improvised under pressure during the past 2 years

may be expected to continue, with suitable changes and improvements, into peace times. \* \* \*

Question 3. The excerpts from the annual reports given above, as well as the quotations from Dr. Hollis' book, are pertinent to this question also. No attempt will be made to include all the statements in the year books of the corporation. Moreover, it is believed that 1 or 2 in addition to those already given will suffice.

According to Dr. Hollis<sup>2</sup> the foundations are exercising the initiative accorded them to spend most of their money on exploratory work that seems only remotely connected with improving college education on the theory that research must first be done in general education in order to efficiently accomplish college reorganization.

1952 report

Page 14:

One of the developments which has produced the most lively debate in educational circles has been the widespread movement to reinvigorate the ideals embodied in the term "liberal education." The goal is rather widely accepted, but there is substantial difference of opinion as to how to achieve it. The general educationists offer a variety of curricular reforms. Advocates of the Great Books press their claims for the wisdom of the past. Humanists decry the shift of interest from certain disciplines to certain other disciplines. Our colleges are literally awash with formulae for salvation; all of which is healthy and part of the process of getting things done in a democratic, heterogeneous, and always vigorously assertive society.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* President Conant and his coworkers at Harvard have provided leadership in this direction with their efforts to develop a new approach to the teaching of science as a general education course. During the current year the corporation made a grant to Harvard for the continuation of this work.

The social sciences also have a significant role to play. Serious men cannot accept the view of those humanists who rhapsodize over Platonic generalizations about society but resent the efforts of the modern social scientist to test these generalizations. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Developments such as the new American studies program at Barnard College (see p. 19) and the courses in Asiatic civilization at Columbia University (see p. 21) would be impossible without vigorous participation, indeed, vigorous leadership, on the part of the humanistic fields. But there is nothing in the humanistic fields which offers a guaranty of salvation. They too have turned out narrow technicians when they might have been turning out educated men. They too have often ignored the central concerns of liberal education.

#### SUMMATION

Based on the foregoing, it can be assumed:

Carnegie Corp. contributed large sums of money to projects which can reasonably be considered "in the educational field" as shown by their activities during the past 40 years.<sup>3</sup>

	<i>In millions</i>
1911-20:	
For library buildings, laboratories, or endowment in liberal arts colleges .....	\$3.5
For development of liberal arts colleges chiefly through endowment.....	2.8
1931-40:	
For research, study, publication; grants-in-aid to individuals.....	.5
For development of women's colleges chiefly through endowment.....	1.5
For development of fine arts and music in academic institutions.....	2.8
For adult education projects.....	4.0

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> Basic Facts About Carnegie Corporation of New York and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, p. 11.

1941-50:

For area studies in universities.....	3.0
For research by faculty members; grants-in-aid.....	2.5
For education in American citizenship and history.....	2.0
For improvement of educational testing.....	1.2
For training in social science.....	3.0
For research in social sciences.....	2.0
For studies to improve education.....	4.0
For graduate education in the South.....	1.2
For education in international affairs.....	4.0
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>38.0</b>

This total does not include grants:

	<i>In millions</i>
To Carnegie Institute of Technology.....	\$24.3
For development of schools of medicine.....	10.0
For support of dental research and education.....	1.3
For educational projects and for development of educational institutions outside the United States.....	4.0
For development of college libraries and librarianships; library schools or library interests.....	8.8
For free pensions for college and university professors.....	21.5
For others: such as Church Peace Union, Red Cross, etc.....	3.0
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>72.7</b>
<b>Grand total</b> .....	<b>110.7</b>

As mentioned previously, the corporation has contributed \$1,237,711 to the work of the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association, and the American Council on Education, and their combined activities affect education at all levels.

In the early years of the activities of each of these organizations, the amount contributed by the corporation was undoubtedly a sizable portion of the funds available to each of them.

**CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING  
ESTABLISHMENT, PURPOSES**

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, created by Andrew Carnegie in 1905, was the third of the philanthropic agencies he endowed and like the others has its own funds, trustees, administrative offices, and conducts its own affairs.

Fifteen years before when he was appointed a trustee of Cornell University, Mr. Carnegie had been shocked to find that college teachers were "paid only about as much as office clerks." In the summer of 1904 while on his annual visit to Scotland, he renewed an association with Henry S. Pritchett, a member of Theodore Roosevelt's Cabinet and president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and from that meeting grew the establishment of a fund to provide pensions for professors in American universities.

There have been two distinctly different phases of the foundation's activities:

1. Activities designed—

to provide retiring pension without regard to race, sex, creed, or color, for the teachers of universities, colleges, and technical schools—

within those institutions—

who, by reason of long and meritorious service, \* \* \* shall be deemed by the board of directors to be entitled to the assistance and aid of this corporation

or who by reason of old age or disability, may be prevented from continuing in the active work of their profession; to provide for the care and maintenance of the widows and families of the said teachers; to make benefactions to charitable and educational institutions, and generally to promote the cause of science and education \* \* \*<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Activities designed—

(b) In general, to do and perform all things necessary to encourage, uphold, and dignify the profession of the teacher and the cause of higher education within the United States, the Dominion of Canada, and Newfoundland aforesaid, and to promote the objects of the foundation, with full power, however, to the trustees hereinafter appointed and their successors from time to time to modify the conditions and regulations under which the work shall be carried on, so as to secure the application of funds in the manner best adapted to the conditions of the time.<sup>2</sup>

Until 1913 the foundation confined its activities to the first phase, partly at least because the attitude of the founder was somewhat different than that of its president, Henry Pritchett. The difference is indicated in an exchange of correspondence between the two. Mr. Pritchett apparently was imbued with the idea of coordinating colleges and universities into a more cohesive group.<sup>3</sup> In December 1905, he suggested as a name, "The Carnegie Foundation for Education," and wrote Mr. Carnegie:

While the primary purpose \* \* \* is the formulation of a pension system, our charter enables us to undertake any sort of educational work for colleges and universities \* \* \* it may well happen in the future that our activities may cover a far greater range with respect to education.

The name did not strike the founder favorably:

The Carnegie Foundation for Education does not strike me favorably. "Foundation" seems superfluous. "Carnegie Professional Pension Fund" or "Carnegie Educational Pension Fund" seems to me better. It might be well, I think, for you to ask suggestions for the name from the (directors) \* \* \* I don't think that you should disguise the fact that it is first and foremost a pension fund. The closer union it may bring about is incidental, though important.

Dr. Pritchett, still president in 1916, indirectly confirms this:<sup>4</sup>

The development of a pension system along sound lines is the most direct duty of the trustees, a responsibility all the more important because the pension problem, while a living problem in every State and Province of the United States and Canada, is still involved in confusion.

### AS THE FOUNDATION VIEWED IT 20 YEARS LATER

The 1923 report includes the following paragraphs on page 20:

The relation of the foundation to educational development and the studies which it has carried on with respect to various current problems in education have occupied a large part of the activities of the officers and of the staff of the foundations. These studies, which have been published in 16 bulletins, have concerned themselves not only with special problems such as those of medical education, of legal education, and of engineering education, but also with the underlying fundamental questions of education which relate to good teaching, to the content of the curriculum, and to the cost of public education. The establishment of the American Law Institute during the present year, by one of the most distinguished groups of judges, lawyers, and law teachers ever brought together, is directly related to the studies on legal education which the founda-

<sup>1</sup> New York State Charter, granted May 8, 1905, surrendered when congressional charter granted.

<sup>2</sup> Sec. 2 (b) of congressional charter, granted March 10, 1906. Sec. 2 (a) contains in slightly different language original provision as to pensions.

<sup>3</sup> Fruit of an Impulse, p. 56.

<sup>4</sup> 11th Annual Report, 1916, p. 17.



tion has carried out through its division of educational inquiry. Experience seems to indicate that an agency such as the foundation, standing apart from the immediate institutional life and having no constituency of its own, can do its greatest service by enlisting in such studies the most able students in different institutions, and that out of the contact brought about in such groups between teachers, administrators, and school systems, members of the staff of the foundation, and others there is reached a degree of knowledge and of judgment with regard to these problems which commands a larger respect and attention than can be had from the isolated statement of any one individual.

Outside of the direct activities involved in the study and establishment of pension systems and in the educational inquiries and reports that have been made, the officers of the foundation have necessarily been involved in a number of educational relations of a temporary character having to do with the inauguration and operation of the educational organizations of the country, such as the College Entrance Examination Board, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, and the various other organizations of those involved in the work of teaching or organization of education.

It has thus come about that during the 18 years of its history, the foundation, while pursuing in the main two specific lines of activity—the one having to do with pensions and pension systems, the other having to do with educational studies, has nevertheless, by the very fact of these activities, been involved in greater or less degree with all those complex relations in education which arise by reason of the relationships between the schools of a nation, and the various bodies that have to do with education. The foundation has sought, during these years to be hospitably minded toward any agency in education that cared for its cooperation.

According to Dr. Savage,<sup>5</sup> Dr. Pritchett's "pet idea" was realized by Carnegie's grant to the foundation for establishment of a division of educational inquiry, and credits "Pritchett's patient persistence."

Dr. Hollis quotes Dr. Pritchett as saying:<sup>6</sup>

I put forward the suggestion, that while the primary purpose of Mr. Carnegie's gift was the establishment of a pension system there would be involved in the administration of this gift a scrutiny of education which would not only be desirable in the granting of pensions, but would go far to resolve the confusion that then existed in American higher education. There was no general requirement of admission to college. Many institutions that were colleges in name, were really high schools, and many universities were scarcely more than modest colleges. I suggested the notion that in the administration of this agency, some criterion would have to be introduced as to what constituted a college.

#### ASSETS

The foundation received from its founder and the corporation \$32,700,000.<sup>7</sup> Its affairs are managed by a board of 25 trustees and according to the report for 1951 had assets of \$12,874,718.84.

In the 1939 report of the foundation appears the following:

The cooperative arrangement between Carnegie Cooperative of New York and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching respecting projects in the field of higher education has now been in effect for about 15 years. Its success has been unqualified. A series of 148 grants totaling \$1,449,393 have been made by the corporation for 85 projects, of which 14, involving 34 grants, have been carried on in the offices of the foundation, and 71 projects involving \$1,087,350 in 114 grants have been carried on under the auspices of 41 other educational institutions or bodies. To these the foundation has allocated and transmitted the funds provided by the corporation. On account of 3 projects which could not be carried out as planned, \$25,000 was returned to Carnegie Corporation of New York through the foundation. The total of projects effective over the past 15 years is therefore 82.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 109; Annual Report for 1913, pp. 21-22.

<sup>6</sup> Annual Report for 1935, p. 129.

<sup>7</sup> Basic Facts, p. 13.

## GENERAL POLICY

In the distribution of pensions, the foundation set up standards which must be met by institutions in order to be eligible for pension awards—designating those who met the requirements as “accepted” and others as “not accepted.”<sup>8</sup>

While as outlined earlier the foundation’s activities began as a pension award system for college and university professors, this was shortly used as a springboard into secondary education with the explanation that:

1. It was necessary to define a college in order to grant the pension.
2. In order to define a college it was necessary to establish standards of admission and of college work.
3. If standards of admission were to be established it was necessary to prescribe the courses of study in secondary schools which would fit the student for the college—as defined.

The purposes of the foundation set out in its charter<sup>9</sup> clearly place this agency among those whose sole or primary purpose is of an educational nature, as evidenced by excerpts from its annual reports.

From 1905 to 1951, inclusive, the last year for which complete records are available, the foundation made appropriations to:

Universities, colleges, and schools in the United States.....	\$62,763,560
American Council on Education.....	90,550
Cooperative Test Service, Educational Records Bureau, Graduate Record, College Entrance Examination Board.....	2,850,000
National Education Association <sup>10</sup> .....	115,000
Progressive Education Association <sup>11</sup> .....	92,000
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>68,011,110</b>

The foundation, like the corporation, gave funds to the organizations mentioned previously whose activities were also of an educational nature.<sup>12</sup>

Question 1 and question 2. It would be difficult to draw a line of distinction between the quotations applicable to each of these questions, and for that reason both questions will be covered together.

All quotations are from the foundation’s annual reports unless otherwise indicated, and are only a few of the many similar quotations which might have been chosen, but which have been omitted because to include them would be merely repetitious.

Even after establishment of the division of educational inquiry in 1913<sup>13</sup> the greater portion of foundation funds were appropriated for pensions, or matters directly pertaining thereto, as shown by the following summary of grants from 1905–51:<sup>14</sup>

Retiring allowances and widow’s pensions.....	\$59,298,459.42
Support of Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.....	513,465.37
Grants to colleges to initiate pension plans.....	775,678.79
Pension studies.....	30,012.87
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>60,617,616.45</b>

<sup>8</sup> Later changed to “associated” and “nonassociated.”

<sup>9</sup> See pp. 26–27.

<sup>10</sup> Although the foundation appropriated funds to NEA (either its own or the corporation’s) Mr. Pritchett himself was strongly opposed to the association’s lobbying activities for a National Department of Education (annual report for 1933).

<sup>11</sup> See footnote 3, p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> See p. 17.

<sup>13</sup> By grant of \$1,250,000 from corporation. Total grants of the corporation were \$32.7 millions.

<sup>14</sup> Basic Facts, *ibid.*, p. 14.

Studies in education (by the division)-----	2, 115, 265. 68
Merger of testing agencies-----	750, 000. 00
Publications-----	45, 632. 18
Cooperative educational studies and research administered but not directed by foundation-----	1, 161, 990. 34
Southern colleges: To stimulate undergraduate teaching-----	873, 775. 54
Total-----	4, 203, 963. 74

However, this does not mean that the foundation's activities affected only pensions. Even as early as 1907<sup>15</sup> it was becoming more and more a factor in determining not only what constituted a college, but what type of organization was best for conducting a college, including such matters as the size of the board of trustees, whether or not the president of the college should also be president of the board, and the extent to which alumni should have a government of the institution. The report, referring to fears expressed that "a great gift like this in the hands of a limited number of men might prove a centralized power which would hinder rather than aid the progress of education," discounted such a possibility because the trustees were "in the main college and university presidents who have come up through the profession of teacher, and who are not likely to lose touch with needs and aspirations of teachers."<sup>16</sup>

#### 1911 report

Page 46—The report deplored the fact that:

\* \* \* lack of supervision, both on the part of the General Government, and to a large extent, on the part of the State governments, has resulted not only in an extraordinarily large number of institutions bearing the name college or university, but it has resulted also in the fact that these institutions have become involved in local rivalries, so they represent in very small measure national ideas on national purposes \* \* \*

The first "inquiry" of the new division, which expanded rapidly, was into the training of teachers and the standards of medical and other professional schools. From the first, emphasis was put on coordination between colleges and universities, between these units and secondary education, and between both and elementary education. The "individualism," "class feeling," and "competition" of educational literature was deplored as was the fact that universities were critical of colleges, that State supported and privately endowed institutions viewed each other with suspicion; and relations existing between colleges and secondary schools, and between liberal and vocational education were referred to as "armed neutrality and open hostility."

Before long, there was to come the recommendation that since educational foundations were conspicuous illustrations of educational cooperation, educational institutions could do no less. The school system is referred to as:

\* \* \* an elaborate hierarchical device that undertakes through successive gradations of textbook makers, superintendents, principals, and supervisors to isolate and prepare each modicum of knowledge and skill so that it may safely be entrusted to the humble teacher at the bottom, who is drilled for a few weeks only, if at all, in directions for administering it ultimately to the child. Meanwhile, superintendents and school boards publicly measure their success by numbers enrolled, by buildings and material equipment added, and by multiplied kinds of schooling introduced; and the people are taught to accept this as educa-

<sup>15</sup> 2d annual report of the president and treasurer, 1907, pp. 54-55.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 63.

tion. Such perversions are ample comment on the thoughtlessness of our formula. Where is the school system that by enlightened and fearless propaganda has convinced its public that education consists first of all in the superior quality and skill of its individual teachers, and is otherwise meaningless?

Qualitative education, as contrasted with the present dependence upon estimates by bulk and housing, signifies a complete transformation in the character and status of the teaching profession. Such a transformation once properly accomplished, the other necessary modifications will inevitably take care of themselves. America, with its hundred millions of people, needs upward of three-quarters of a million men and women to represent her with the childhood and youth of the Nation in a deliberate and thorough educative process. If wars are to cease and democracy is permanently to hold the field, it will be a democracy with sufficient wisdom to confide this, its most responsible task, to its most competent citizens, and to prepare them thoroughly for its safe discharge. Genuine education, in a sense consistent with any honest vision of its meaning, can proceed only through immediate contact with keen minds fully informed and persuaded of what the rising generation may become, and dedicated to such achievement. Persons so equipped will in general not be had unless the distinguished rewards and opportunities of life are attainable through teaching careers. Moreover, these careers must not be mere avenues of promotion, as in notable cases today, but must constitute and be recognized as opportunities for achievement in themselves. Any other course means simply to exploit the future in the interest of the present by abandoning its control to second-rate minds. Plato's provision that the head of the state be the director of education expresses the unavoidable perspective in a completed democracy.

Marked changes must ensue in our present system of schooling if we undertake to carry out an honest interpretation of our avowed aim of "universal education" by making it not only universal but also education. In the first place our elementary and secondary school systems must be thoroughly integrated into one homogeneous and indivisible unit—a varied but coherent 12-year career for mind and body, whereby, as a youth, each citizen may acquire a certificate of the health, intelligence, and character that underlie a successful society \* \* \*

Dr. Hollis<sup>17</sup> comments on the foundation's activities and policies 30 years later:

The foundation had had a real battle to enforce entrance standards in the relatively homogeneous endowed liberal arts colleges concentrated in the East. With the decision to admit State universities to the benefits of the Carnegie pension system it was faced with the problem of applying on a nationwide scale what was in fact a regional accrediting standard for a group of superior institutions. Educational, financial, and social conditions in this larger territory were so uneven that many of the university officials in the South and Middle West urged a flexibility in Carnegie standards in keeping with the realities the colleges faced. After considerable study of the problem the foundation on considerations of "logical consistency" (and possibly financial expediency), decided to leave the rules a Procrustean bed for all affiliated institutions. The foundation was not constructively interested in how a college might reach eligibility, but it did advise the State universities not to raise their standards faster than the high school could meet them, even if that meant delay in securing pensions. Apparently the attitude was that growth could be stimulated by extending the hope of future affiliation.

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Considerable attention was given to the place of both the elementary and secondary schools in the educational picture. However, there is indication that after 15 years of effort the foundation itself questioned some of the results.

#### *1923 report*

Pages 78, 83: Commenting that after the schools became free from the hard-and-fixed curriculum and new studies intended to broaden student opportunities were added, the report adds that the resulting overexpansion was not entirely advantageous. As an example, it was

<sup>17</sup> Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education, p. 133.

pointed out that the organization and quantity of subjects had displaced individual contact, relegating to an inferior position the fundamental truth that education does not consist in the amount of information absorbed but rather in the ability to think clearly and to apply the information accumulated to one's everyday life.

It would, therefore, seem to be fundamental that the elementary school should accept clearly its own limitations. It should make sure that the teaching which is common to all children is done with a sharp discipline of exact requirement, but that a very large part of what is meant to be of cultural value shall be through exercises not followed by examinations, but having as their spring of influence the contact with cultivated and inspiring personalities.

Under this regime the elementary-school curriculum would be greatly simplified.

In the second place, while we must in a democracy proceed upon the assumption that every child is entitled to the fundamentals of an education in the elementary school, we must frankly recognize that a large proportion of the children of the Nation have neither the desire nor the intellectual ability to complete the work of a secondary school with profit to themselves. In no nation in the world is there a task comparable to that of the American teacher in the secondary schools, patiently and devotedly toiling to bring through to graduation multitudes of pupils who have neither the desire nor the ability for intellectual work. The high school should no longer be the refuge for mediocrity that we have made it.

This involves no discrimination against any class or group in the body politic. The stupid or indifferent child is just as likely to be the son of the well-to-do as the son of the day laborer. Teachers are coerced by parents, by school directors, by all the influences that can be brought to bear, to keep in their classes numbers of students whose happiness and usefulness are to be found elsewhere.

Again read without relation to other foundation activities, and without linking with other organizations whose work it supported, this, this too is a reasonable statement of a condition which might need study in order to advance teaching. However, in view of the results attributable to these other organizations in the installation of "uniform standards and curriculum in the public schools," the foundation's statements here and elsewhere in its reports cannot be studied alone.

One of the present conditions, for example, which is undoubtedly attributable to the philosophy reflected in this quotation is the 100-percent promotion rule which exists in many communities, and to which serious objections have been raised.

#### EUROPEAN INFLUENCE—PRUSSIAN, FRENCH, ENGLISH

At this point it should be noted that throughout the foundation's reports the references are too numerous to mention—there are comparisons between education in this country and education in Europe, always to the detriment of the United States.<sup>18</sup>

The foundation began its exchange of secondary school teachers with Prussia in 1908 and the report for 1909 expressed the hope that more secondary schools and those in charge of them would begin to appreciate the benefits to be had from this exchange.<sup>19</sup> This report, and those for succeeding years, stressed the advantages of incorporating into the American secondary school, the same principles found in Prussian schools with the object of raising the quality of teach-

<sup>18</sup> Annual reports for 1910 (pp. 35-39); 1911 (pp. 36-38); 1913 (pp. 57-59); 1924 (pp. 111, 116), and others.

<sup>19</sup> Annual report for 1909, pp. 46-48.

ing and education in the United States to a level comparable to that of Prussia.

#### SECONDARY LEVEL

In addition to cooperation and financial assistance to the National Education Association and the Cooperative Test Service, the foundation itself carried on work in this field. Again, there are numerous examples which might be cited from the reports, but only one or two will be included here.

#### *1924 report*

Page 107 et seq.: Pointing out that the secondary school is the determining factor in the educational structure, the report goes on to state that through its entrance requirements the college dominates the educational program of the high school, yet at the same time there is an unsatisfactory situation as far as the colleges and professional schools are concerned, because of:

\*\*\* a growing army of high-school graduates who lack the qualities of intellectual training which would fit them for fruitful college study. They have indeed complied with the formal college requirements for admission, but they have not learned to use their minds. A large number of the unfit are eliminated in their freshman year, a process neither wholesome for the college nor just to those thus summarily dismissed.

The report recommends as a remedy:

The college can take the first great step by a sweeping change in its entrance requirements. Instead of requiring a dozen subjects and accepting a passing mark on all of them, it must test on a few fundamental subjects on which it will demand a very high order of performance and accept the work of the secondary school in all other subjects. To accept a passing mark of 60 percent has proved demoralizing alike to high school and college, to teacher, and to pupil. In fundamental subjects a high order of performance must be secured. This condition complied with, the college can leave the secondary school free to educate in its own way.

Here again it should be noted that no evaluation is made of this objective, the particular means taken to achieve it; nor is it pertinent whether the results have been good or bad.

In 1928 the foundation began its study of the relations of secondary and higher education in Pennsylvania. This study continued for several years with funds supplied by or through<sup>20</sup> the foundation (\$365,091.36), and formed the basis not only for studies of a similar nature both in this country and abroad, but in the publication of a number of pamphlets; and its recommendations have since been put into effect.<sup>21</sup>

#### *1929 report*

Page 85:

To meet the need for a suitable record a new form was devised and is now published by the American Council on Education. On this record a student's ratings in high school and college are presented graphically and comparatively over a period of years so that his particular mental pattern appears at a glance together with the tendencies of his intellectual development. Space is given for standard test and achievement ratings of whatever nature, and provision is made for appropriate personal data on the same comparative and chronological basis, thus presenting an integrated history of a student's educational growth with the pertinent details.

<sup>20</sup> From the corporation.

<sup>21</sup> The most notable example is probably this suggested form which was recommended by the Progressive Education Association for use in the schools.

## COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LEVEL

There can be no doubt that the foundation carried on many activities at this level, not the least of which were those in connection with its pension fund. One of the expressed hopes of the founder and others was that by this method (removal of financial worries) retirement would be accelerated, and new blood brought into this part of the educational process.

Another example is the experimental program of grants-in-aid to instructional staffs in colleges and universities of the Southeastern States which became operative during 1946-47. The organization of this program was based on 4 strategically located centers, each composed of 1 university group and at least 5 neighboring undergraduate colleges. Each center received annually \$15,000 from the foundation, which it matched with \$5,000 of its own funds.

*1946-47*

Page 24: The purpose of the program as stated in the report, is to advance graduate instruction—

\* \* \* to vitalize it; to improve its quality; to help focus attention in college and university alike on the need of improving the general quality of undergraduate teaching. That is the general aim. The choice of ways by which one might seek to achieve this general aim is wide, but, as far as this experimental program is concerned, there has been selected and agreed upon as eminently appropriate, one single way. That particular way is the encouragement of faculty members to carry on research and creative activities in fields in which they are interested and competent. The underlying theory is simple: It is that a teacher actively engaged on a scholarly research or creative project of his own choosing has more than a fair chance of maintaining an intellectual activity which directly and indirectly serves to raise his scholarly self-respect and to make him a more effective teacher. The primary interest of the program, then, is in the teacher and his research, not in the institution and its administrative and curricular problems and physical resources.

The foundation appropriated \$700,000 for this program<sup>22</sup> for a 5-year period, 1946-51.

Graduate testing program, cooperative test service, merger-national testing service: A related activity of the foundation has been the graduate testing program, carried out primarily with funds from the corporation with small additions from the foundation itself.

*1944-45 report*

Page 13:

\* \* \* In 1929, when the foundation was in the midst of an examination study of secondary and higher education in the State of Pennsylvania, the General Education Board made a grant of half a million dollars to establish an organization for experimental service in the construction and use of educational examinations. This impressive gift, routed through the American Council on Education, was intended for the use of its committee on measurement and guidance which had long been active in studying personnel problems under the direction of the late Herbert E. Hawkes, then dean of Columbia College. There was thus set up an agency known as the Cooperative Test Service which for many years under the wise and vigorous leadership of Dr. Ben D. Wood promoted the construction and use of excellent educational examinations in many fields. One of its notable achievements, developed shortly before the war, was the institution of a common qualifying examination for teachers which has been sponsored by the superintendents of a large number of the most important American cities. This test and the graduate record examination possess many features in common.

<sup>22</sup> Funds furnished by the corporation.

With the outbreak and early progress of the war the active functioning of this agency fell into abeyance although its resources continued to accumulate. Its recent revival under a reorganized committee of control was inevitable in view of the indispensable part which objective measurement has played in the educational preparation of the Armed Forces and appears destined to retain in postwar institutional activities.

With the revived Cooperative Test Service the graduate record office has become closely affiliated in the broader matters of policy. Since February 1945, Dr. Kenneth W. Vaughn, the associate director of the Graduate Record Office, has also held the corresponding position with the Cooperative Test Service. This mutual relationship has contributed much to effect a common understanding between the two organizations and to coordinate their efforts in a common cause.

#### *1946-47 report*

Page 33: The following year there is further reference to this subject which culminated in the merger of the testing agencies in 1947.<sup>23</sup>

\* \* \* In the main, this report directed attention to the compelling advantages to American education of such a unification and to the principles on which a national nonprofit agency might be organized. The committee in the final paragraph of its report indicated that its primary concern, in this phase of its work, had been with the principles involved, and that no attention was given to the practical problems of the several organizations whose cooperation was essential to the plan. It expressed the hope that its preliminary report would stimulate the fullest possible discussion of the practical means of arriving at the objective.

In the spirit of this statement the committee recommended the establishment of a new organization to be known as the Cooperative Educational Testing Commission. It recommended further that the College Entrance Examination Board, the Educational Records Bureau, the Cooperative Test Service, and National Committee on Teachers Examinations of the American Council and the Graduate Record Office of the Carnegie Foundation, join in the creation of this commission, and that in addition to assets contributed by these constituent agencies not less than \$750,000 be provided by foundation grants.

While the report mentions serious objections raised by representations of the two largest agencies concerned, namely, the American Council on Education and the College Board, it does not state what the objections were, but added that there was no disagreement as to the need for a central agency, or as to its purposes.

#### MERGER OF TESTING SERVICES, 1947 REPORT

##### Page 40:

On December 19, 1947, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York granted a charter to Educational Testing Service and thus enabled it to begin operations January 1, 1948. Besides the final grant of three-quarters of a million dollars from Carnegie Corporation of New York, there were added to the resources of the new Service approximately \$450,000 from the College Entrance Examination Board and the American Council on Education. The initial capital assets of Educational Testing Service therefore reached about \$1,200,000.

Three trustees ex officio served in perpetuity: the president of the American Council on Education, the chairman of the College Entrance Examination Board, and the president of the Carnegie Foundation. The board consists of from 9 to 25 trustees.

#### THE CARNEGIE UNIT

From the beginning the reports placed increasing emphasis on the desirability of "coordinating" all schools throughout the United

<sup>23</sup> 1947-48 report, p. 40.



States, and the setting up of so-called units which became known as Carnegie units.

Dr. Savage,<sup>24</sup> tracing the influence of Dr. Pritchett in the expansion of the foundation's activities into other than pension fields refers to it as a "useful quantitative device"; and the earliest known reference in the public records of the foundation is in 1906. Undoubtedly the foundation worked assiduously for its acceptance, and was successful. When attacks began (as far back as 1909),<sup>25</sup> the foundation replied that it was not standardizing, but merely working for uniformity in entrance examinations, and later<sup>26</sup> that the use of the unit as originally conceived and early promulgated did not tend to injure the educational process, but it was the abuse at a later date by which "the individual student was broken on the wheel of a mechanical device." The foundation's attitude was: "What it has done is to make clear the standards of the colleges themselves, and to throw the light of publicity on the deviations from the standards they themselves have set up."<sup>27</sup>

#### *1947-48 report*

Page 29: This report contains a detailed account of the origin, use, and merits of the "unit" which Dr. Savage closes with the following statement:

Such in outline is the history of one aspect of American higher education in which the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had an important part. The foundation did not invent the term "unit," nor its definition. In a time of educational confusion such as the country was not again to see until 1945 Dr. Pritchett, for the foundation, used it as one instrument in an endeavor to bring order out of chaos.

The fact that the Carnegie Foundation appears to have been the first philanthropic enterprise professedly to award grants upon carefully considered appraisal of the American college, and, in connection with that appraisal, to use the unit, as invented and defined by others, is probably what led a considerable part of the academic world loosely to prefix to the word "unit" the name "Carnegie." At any rate, the foundation has long considered the implications of the phrase to be unmerited.

#### SUMMATION

From 1905 to June 30, 1953,<sup>28</sup> the foundation spent \$62,763,560 in retiring allowances and approximately \$5 million on studies and research in education.

Like its sister agency, the corporation, the foundation has contributed to the work of the National Education Association the Progressive Education Association, and the American Council on Education, as well as to such programs as the Cooperative Test Service, the Graduate Record Service, and the College Entrance Examination Board. While the amounts contributed to these organizations were not as substantial as those of the corporation, nevertheless we can assume that their activities and the results thereof were acceptable to the foundation.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>25</sup> It was asserted that the "unit" was mechanical, tended to work against a true evaluation of the individual, and that in pressing for it the foundation was attempting to impose standards of its own making on American higher education.

<sup>26</sup> Annual report for 1947-48, p. 26.

<sup>27</sup> Annual report for 1909, p. 181.

<sup>28</sup> 48th annual report, 1952-53, p. 44.

<sup>29</sup> See sec. 2 for a description of the activities of each of these organizations.

## THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION—GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD

### INTRODUCTION

The first of four philanthropic agencies created by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., was the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in 1901; the second was the General Education Board, limited to the promotion of education within the United States and its Territories, established in 1903; the Rockefeller Foundation, 1913; and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial established in 1918 in memory of his wife. His total gifts to each of these were:<sup>30</sup>

The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.....	\$60, 673, 409. 45
General Education Board.....	129, 209, 167. 10
The Rockefeller Foundation.....	182, 851, 480. 90
The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.....	73, 985, 313. 77
Total.....	446, 719, 371. 22

NOTE.—In 1928 the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial was consolidated with the Rockefeller Foundation, with the exception of 1 or 2 specialized functions, which did not fit into the foundation's program and which were transferred to a new organization called the Spelman Fund of New York along with \$10 million to carry on its work. This fund has since been liquidated, as has the General Education Board (on Dec. 31, 1953, when all its funds were entirely distributed).

One other agency in this field—the International Education Board, to which he gave \$20,050,947.50—was created by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in 1923, because of the charter limitations of the General Education Board. At this point it should be noted that the total of half a billion dollars represented by the total of all Mr. Rockefeller's gifts, is not the grand total of expenditures by his various agencies—it is merely the principal to which must be added approximately the same amount in income, which these agencies have also distributed, or yet have to distribute.

### REARRANGEMENT OF ACTIVITIES

The General Education Board carried on activities in the field of education from 1902 to the end of 1953, but the Rockefeller Foundation itself did not become active in the field of education for some years after it was established, except to the extent that its work in the medical, health, and agricultural fields may be considered educational.

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial operated only during the decade 1918–28, and the International Education Board was in existence from 1923–38.

#### *1928–29 report*

Pages 3–6: In the board's report that year, referring to the various Rockefeller agencies, is stated that it was becoming evident that the line between the activities of each was not clearly marked, resulting in doubts on the part of the public as to the respective fields, and a duplication of time and expense in the presentation of the same projects to two or more of the boards. A committee was appointed to study the situation and to decide how the work might be carried on in closer and more clearly defined cooperative relations. It recommended that a new corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, be created, into which would be merged the former Rockefeller Foundation and the Laura

<sup>30</sup> Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, Raymond B. Fosdick, p. ix.

Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. A further recommendation was extension of the scope of the new foundation to embrace as a major function—

the advancement of knowledge in—

- (1) the medical sciences,
- (2) the natural science (taking over the program in foreign countries of the International Education Board),
- (3) the social sciences (formerly carried on by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial), and
- (4) the humanities;

and the appointment of a director and staff for each of these fields.

The final recommendation was division of the field of education in the United States between the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, along definitely determined lines. The net result of this was to create two Rockefeller agencies: The Rockefeller Foundation, a broad and general operation; and the General Education Board with activities limited to the promotion of education in the United States.

According to this, "education" would fall into the orbit of the board and "research" into that of the foundation. In the case of an undertaking which embraces both objectives, the deciding factor was the principal one, if the motive was education then it was a board activity—if research a foundation activity.

The board from that time dealt chiefly with institutions rather than with learned societies or research agencies. Also, it did not sponsor individual research projects after that time except in educational psychology and the educational processes that fell within its designated fields. Thus, the exclusive activities of the board after that related chiefly to college education, public education and the processes of education, the application of art to industry, and aid in accounting methods and administration.

That year also the board withdraw from the field of medical education because it felt that its part in the endeavor had been completed. During the period 1913 to June 20, 1929, the board had contributed a total of \$87,154,319.33 to universities and colleges for whites, and \$18,191,328.39 to colleges and schools for Negroes, exclusive of any projects carried on in such institutions with board funds.

## THE ROCKEFELLER GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD

### ESTABLISHMENT, PURPOSES, ASSETS

Since the board<sup>31</sup> was the first of the Rockefeller philanthropic trusts in the field of education, its activities will be summarized first.

As in the case of the Carnegie agencies no attempt will be made to evaluate the merits of this agency or the Rockefeller Foundation, and this section of the summary like the other sections will be devoted to ascertaining whether it is possible to find answers to the questions raised in the opening statement.

However, it should be noted that when Mr. Rockefeller gave the \$1 million to the board in 1902, he referred to the fact that the immediate work of the board would be in studying the needs and aiding to promote the educational interests of the people of the Southern

<sup>31</sup> The General Education Board will be designated throughout this section as the board.

States, and during the early portion of its life, it was in these areas that the board's activities were concentrated. It should also be noted that the first permanent endowment, in 1905, amounting to \$10 million was expressly designed to furnish an income—

to be distributed to, or used for the benefit of, such institutions of learning at such times, in such amounts, for such purposes, and under such conditions or employed in such ways as the board may deem best adapted to promote a comprehensive system of higher education in the United States.<sup>32</sup>

This limitation does not appear in the charter of the board<sup>33</sup> and it was later removed by Mr. Rockefeller in subsequent letters of gift.

Management of the board's affairs was in the board of trustees, consisting of not less than 9 nor more than 17 in number, elected for a 3-year term. In following out its purpose it gave grants toward the support of educational institutions, agencies, and projects, as well as individual fellowships.

Although the board was created in 1902, the first published report was in 1914 and it contains the following introductory note:<sup>34</sup>

This volume gives an account of the activities of the General Education Board from its foundation in 1902 up to June 30, 1914. The board has made annual reports to the United States Department of the Interior and these have been regularly printed in the reports of the Department; but no further report has been hitherto issued, because, as the board's work was felt to be experimental in character, premature statements respecting the scope and outcome of its efforts were to be avoided. After something more than a decade, tangible results have begun to appear and to their description and consideration the following pages are devoted. Henceforth, statements will be issued annually, and from time to time, a more critical discussion like the present report will be published.

In view of Mr. Rockefeller's deep interest in the South and southern education, particularly elementary, the board at once set to work to acquire a thorough knowledge of conditions in the Southern States and surveys were made, State by State, culminating in a conference of county superintendents in each State. These studies covered the organization of the public-school system, its finances, the number and character of school buildings, the number, training, and pay of public schoolteachers, private and public secondary schools, institutions for the higher education of women, schools for the training of teachers, and schools, both public and private, for the education of Negroes.

#### *1902-14 report*

Page 13: In a section entitled "Policy of the General Education Board," the report states:

But the studies just referred to did more than supply facts. For out of them a conclusion of far-reaching importance soon emerged. They convinced the board that no fund, however large, could, by direct gifts, contribute a system of public schools; that even if it were possible to develop a system of public schools by private gifts, it would be a positive disservice. The best thing in connection with public-school education is the doing of it. The public school must represent community ideals, community initiative, and community support, even to the point of sacrifice. The General Education Board could be helpful only by respecting this fundamental truth. It therefore felt its way cautiously, conscious of the difficulty, complexity, and delicacy of the situation.

As a statement of policy this language leaves nothing to be desired and as referred to previously, in this respect the avowed intentions of

<sup>32</sup> Letter of gift, June 30, 1905.

<sup>33</sup> Act of Congress, January 12, 1903.

<sup>34</sup> P. XV, annual report, 1902-14.

the Rockefeller agencies were at variance with the avowed intentions of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Question 1 and question 2. It is difficult, if not impossible, without duplication to completely separate the quotations pertaining to these two questions. For that reason and because they have equal validity in providing answers to both questions, no attempt will be made to distinguish between them.

Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations are from the annual reports of the board, with the year and page as noted. Because the activities of the board which relate to these questions are so varied and also because they fall into certain more or less distinct topics they have been subdivided.

#### ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

##### *1902-14 report*

Pages 80, 81, 83: There is a certain amount of overlapping between these two levels of education, and for that reason no dogmatic distinction has been made. Because it saw deficiencies in secondary education in the South, the board approached the problem by selecting a person or persons whose business it was to inform, cultivate, and guide professional, public, and legislative opinions. Believing there was need in every State for trained specialists in the field of secondary education, it felt this individual should also "skillfully and tactfully marshal all available forces for the purpose of securing concerted action calculated in time to realize a secondary school system." Aware of the lack of funds in the hands of the State departments of education, or the State universities themselves, the General Education Board then entered the picture and stated its willingness—

to make appropriations to the several State universities for the salaried and traveling expenses of a professor of secondary education whose main and principal work shall be to ascertain where the conditions are favorable for the establishment of public high schools not in existence; to visit such places and to endeavor to organize in such places public high schools in accordance with the laws of the State; to endeavor to create in such communities a public sentiment that shall permanently sustain such high schools, and to place the high schools under such local leadership as shall give them intelligent and wise direction, and he and the university shall exercise a fostering care over such institutions.

While stating that the board did not attempt either to indicate or to dictate the lines along which the individuals should exert themselves; it describes their activities in the following terms:

In addition, the professors of secondary education were high-school evangelists traveling well-nigh incessantly from county to county, returning from time to time to the State university to do their teaching, or to the State capitol to confer with the State superintendent. Wherever they went, they addressed the people, the local school authorities, the county court, teachers, businessmen and business organizations, county and State conferences, etc. They sought almost any sort of opportunity in order to score a point. Law or no law, they urged their hearers to make voluntary efforts toward a county high school, if a start had not yet been made; to add a grade or a teacher to a school already started; to repair the building or to provide a new one; to consolidate weak district schools into a larger one adequate to town or county needs. Nor did they merely expose defects, tender advice, and employ exhortations; they not only urged the policy, but nursed a situation. By correspondence they kept in touch with places already visited; from time to time they returned, to renew pressure or to recognize achievement. \* \* \*

During the 10-year period the board contributed \$24,862 in 12 Southern States.

*1915-16 report*

Page 39: The board held meetings those years on the question of "needed reforms in elementary and secondary education," one outgrowth of which were the Occasional Papers 2 and 3. However, the Board was again quick to state that it was interested only in facilitating the trial of "promising educational experiments under proper conditions."

*1918-19 report*

Page 41: The board continued to make sums available to the State universities for a professor of secondary education and also made funds available for departments of secondary education. These professors of secondary education were urged and encouraged to work on the high-school curriculum and organization as well as the improvement of teachers in actual service and the administration and effect of State subsidies and Federal grants, and it was around this time that the subject of "public education" was included as a section of the annual report.

Throughout its history the board divided its activities, devoting a section to white colleges and universities, and a section to Negro education.

*1923-24 report*

Page 29: The board states it was becoming increasingly clear that the professors of secondary education had substantially achieved the purposes for which they were originally supported.

That same report, in referring to the improvement in the State departments of education in the Southern States, announced that it had decided that the need was for trained men and women in the field and with that object in mind it had appropriated in 1922, \$50,000 to provide scholarships for persons occupying important posts and increased the sum to \$80,000 during the year just closed.

The colleges most frequently selected were:

George Peabody College for Teachers  
 University of Chicago  
 Teachers College, Columbia University  
 Columbia University  
 Cornell University  
 University of Wisconsin  
 Harvard University  
 University of California  
 Hampton University

GENERAL EDUCATION INCLUDING TESTING AND ACCREDITING PROJECTS

The board began what it referred to as a general education program in 1933 and it continued for about 5 or 6 years. It was during this period that much of the work of the various testing and accrediting agencies was being done, and for that reason much of the comment in the reports is on that subject.

*1933-34 annual report*

Page 4: In this report there is the following statement:

From 1929 to 1932 the board gave its support to several projects for the improvement of school and college relationships and for the intensive development

of quality in college education \* \* \*. Through aid to institutions and to educational commissions, there were studies made of the accrediting, examining, and teaching procedures in force at a number of representative institutions and within large areas of the country. At a few places controlled experiments were carried on by the college administrative officers and staff having the responsibility of selecting students and of organizing courses of study for both schools and colleges \* \* \*.

*1933-34 annual report*

Page 5: Referring to the critics of educational practice and their request for new purposes rather than for further modification in existing routine, the report states:

It was pointed out that too little has been done to discover a form of education universally useful to man in society today; that by formal or informal methods every individual should be made familiar with the forces that he will encounter in daily living; and that apart from special preparation for earning a livelihood, he should be made ready for continuous participation in the responsibilities and satisfactions of life to the extent of his individual ability.

The purposes of a general education for individual and social usefulness can be stated, they believe, in a way that will have meaning for adults as well as for younger students; the adaptation of methods for its attainment will then be practicable through the processes of formal and informal studies. From such considerations the board reached the conclusion that assistance through the further definition and development of general education through appropriate agencies should be one of the purposes of its new program.

This is included at this time in view of the grants made later by the board to other organizations and for types of projects.

BUILDING AMERICA

*1935-36 annual report*

Page 8: The report contains the following, under a subheading "Reorganization of Subject Matter Fields—Society for Curriculum Study 'Building America'":

In the spring of 1935, a new monthly periodical was launched by the Society for Curriculum Study with the assistance of funds provided by the General Education Board. The magazine represents an attempt on the part of the society to meet a long-felt need in secondary education for visual as well as factual study of contemporary problems of our social, political, and economic life. A characteristic feature of the publication lies in its emphasis upon pictures and graphs as a means of presenting facts and indicating problems. Housing, Men and Machines, Transportation, Health, Power, Recreation, and Youth Faces the World are among the issues already published. Throughout the various types of curriculum, ranging from instruction in subject matter to the newer types organized around basic functions or major interests of society, Building America studies are now being used in valuable organized visual aids and as useful units of study. A further appropriation of \$30,000 over a 3-year period was made this year by the board with a view to developing the magazine to a point where it will be self-supporting.

*1935-36 annual report*

Pages 11, 12, 13:

The various educational accrediting associations of this country are in position to play a significant role in the reorganization of secondary education. For some time now, they have recognized that important modifications in standards and procedures for accrediting are imperative and a cooperative attack on the problem has been organized by a joint committee of 21 members representing the several associations \* \* \*.

\$116,000 over a 2-year period has been made by the board to the American Council on Education.

*1936-37 report*

Pages 60-67: Grants were made that year in support of work by organizations and institutions in the following types of activities:

General planning of educational reorganization: Taking stock of the situation, discussion, and agreement upon the purposes of general education, and planning for such reorganization of general education as is necessary to make it attain these purposes.

Experimentation with the curriculum and evaluation of the results of such experimentations.

Preparation of new instructional materials and experimentation with new methods of teaching: This includes experimentation with new instruments of education such as film and radio.

Recruiting, selection, and education of teachers: This includes the education of teachers already in service as well as work with prospective teachers.

Study of youth: This includes studies of the special needs of various racial and economic groups as well as studies of the needs of all young people for normal physical, intellectual, and personal developments.

Again the organizations selected were the Progressive Education Association, the National Education Association Department of Secondary School Principals, and the American Council on Education as well as the National Council of Parent Education, the American Youth Committee, and Teachers College of Columbia University.

*1936-37 annual report*

Pages 63-65: Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, director for general education, made some interesting comments in this report. After describing the evolution of the high school from the traditional function of preparing a small selective group for positions in business and industries and another for institutions of higher learning to the education of the mass of youth for more effective living. He states:

The kind of reorganization that the secondary schools must undergo is determined by social change in two different ways. As just indicated, social change has brought young people of the most diverse capacities and interests into the secondary schools which must develop a program to meet their needs. In addition, social change is making new demands upon all people for understanding human nature and society \* \* \* for social change has made it necessary to discard to a large extent old ways of living, many of which could be managed by instinct, habit, tradition, and sheer untrained power \* \* \* While we do not need to develop new physical organs and adapt old ones to the new life, we do need to develop new ways of living and to modify old ones. In this process a reorganized program of general education can play an important part.

\* \* \* one of the most significant things about the actions of educators and educational organizations in this connection is their concern for making a reorganized general education serve to help young people develop a loyalty to democratic ways of living and a confidence in democratic methods of solving social problems.

He goes on to state that both the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association feel responsible for saying in definite terms what they believe the ideals of democracy to be and how education should be organized to lead to the realization of these ideals.

These comments are particularly significant in the light of the activities of the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association under what they term "democracy."

*1937-38 annual report*

Pages 66-69: Dr. Havighurst, after pointing out some of the deficiencies of the high school insofar as the mass of young people were concerned, because the curriculum was geared to the requirements of



the minority, pointed out that while the board could not commit itself to any one approach to these problems, it did extend assistance to a number of responsible and representative organizations with the idea of formulating what, in their opinion, are the underlying purposes of a general education for young people and following that to recommend a series of changes calculated to make "the systematic care and education of youth serve these purposes better."

The board gave as its reasons for selecting the American Council on Education, the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association, and the regents of the University of the State of New York the fact that "no truly representative canvass of existing knowledge and points of view on the problems of youth could have been made without the participation of these groups."

While Dr. Havighurst felt that the unanimity of these groups in recommending a thoroughgoing reorganization of general education at secondary levels was remarkable such unanimity would actually appear to be only the logical result of the close cooperation and joint projects of these groups and others, including Columbia University and Teachers College.

The board went on to give grants to those organizations which it considered to be factfinding and deliberative and these were the same groups which had done the preliminary studies.

In his report, Dr. Havighurst made the following comments on the work of the American Historical Association, after referring to the various deliberative committee reports which had been effective in shaping American public education during the years roughly of the board's operations:

The present decade has produced several committees whose reports may be ranked with those of previous decades. Four years ago the commission on social studies of the American Historical Association published an important series of books dealing with the teaching of social studies in the schools. The committee on orientation of secondary education (a committee of the Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association) has produced two reports—one on the Issue of Secondary Education and the other on the Functions of Secondary Education. The Federal Government's Advisory Committee on Education is now issuing a series of statements on its various inquiries. To these documents may now be added reports coming from several groups which have received aid from the General Education Board.

He goes on to discuss the reports of the regents' inquiry as to the character and cost of education in New York and those of the American Youth Commission.<sup>35</sup>

One of the most important results was the issuance of three major statements on educational policy by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association entitled "The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy," Charles A. Beard; the "Structure of Education in American Democracy," by George D. Strayer; and "The Purposes of Education in American Democracy," by William G. Carr, secretary of the National Education Association.

*1938-39 annual report*

Pages 87-93: Referring to the board's program in the fields of general education through the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, the Educational Policies Commission

<sup>35</sup> How Fare American Youth? Homer P. Rainey; Secondary Education for Youth in America. Harl Douglass; Youth Tell Their Story, Howard M. Bell.

of the National Education Association and the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum of the Progressive Education Association and the inquiry staff of the New York State Board of Regents (reporting that much of the work had been completed or was nearing completion) Dr. Havighurst continues: "And is now serving not only as a basis for changes in the curricula of many secondary schools but as an incentive to experimentation with a variety of procedures for the care and education of young people."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 93: Dr. Havighurst, referring to the activities of the board states:

Aid to experiments with the curricula of secondary schools and junior colleges and evaluation of the results of such experiments has been an important part of the board's work in general education. Grants for work in this area have included such undertakings as the Progressive Education Association's 8-year experimental study of the 30 schools, the American Council on Education's Cooperative College Study, and the Michigan Secondary School Curriculum Study \* \* \*. The interest was continued by appropriations that year including a continuation of the National Education Association civic education project, one of the major objectives of which was the improvement of civic education in the United States with particular stress on the importance of developing in young people an intelligent, appreciative, and active loyalty to democracy.

*1940 annual report*

Page 4: A total of some \$8,500,000 had been appropriated, the effects of which, the report states, it was too early to judge. But the report continues:

But it can be said with considerable assurance that the studies and experiments which have been aided by the board under its program in general education have made significant contribution toward a better understanding of the problems of youth in an age of rapid social change \* \* \*. Undoubtedly, projects aided by the board had stimulated a widespread interest in the development of ways for improving the care and education of young people; they have built up a new and much-needed body of organized psychological, physiological, and social knowledge about youth; and they have set in motion systematic planning on the part of institutions and national organizations for a continuing consideration of problems involved in the preparation of youth for the democratic way of life.

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 76: Dr. Havighurst once again devoted a special section of his report to discussing the program in child growth and development which the board had been supporting since 1933, continuing the interests evidenced by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. From 1933 to the close of 1940, \$1,032,888 had been appropriated for studies of adolescents; \$519,543 for studies of infancy, and \$173,000 for fellowships, conferences, and special studies. In 1940 the board removed the earmarkings of the various sums which prior to that time had been segregated for different phases of the board's programs and that year, 1940, also marked the end of the general education program which began in 1933.

*1949 report*

Page 34: Referring to the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, the report states:

Among the most promising projects for rehabilitating the public schools was that begun during the year by the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, New York. This laymen's commission was established upon the advice of a number of leading educators, and under the chairmanship of Mr. Roy E.

Larsen and is arousing latent grassroots interests in the improvement of public education. By means of studies, conferences, printed materials, addresses and publicity the committee intends to bring about community participation in behalf of better school administration, better instruction and more generous support for local educational needs. In publicizing examples of good school and community practices, the Commission hopes to assist thousands of communities in their efforts to build stronger schools. This is the first laymen's attempt to deal with this important educational problem. Toward expenses of its first year, the board appropriated \$50,000.

*1950 annual report*

Page 45: The following year, reporting on this commission the report states: "The Commission has stimulated group action by example rather than by direction." Good practices have been publicized, conferences and study groups have been encouraged, and in response 973 local citizens' committees have been set up across the country to deal with local school problems. The report goes on to state that regional offices have been established and subcommittees set up, and the board appropriated \$75,000 for use over the next 2 years.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

*1902-14 report*

Pages 142, 143, 148:

The three main features of the policy of the general education board in dealing with higher education may therefore be expressed as follows:

- (1) Preference for centers of wealth and population as the pivots of the system;
- (2) Systematic and helpful cooperation with religious denominations;
- (3) Concentration of gifts in the form of endowments.

The board tentatively decided that an efficient college should enjoy an income from endowment covering from 40 to 60 percent of its annual expenditures and from these and subsequent reports it would appear that grants from the board were held out as an incentive to institutions to put themselves in this financial position. This procedure is in no wise unusual and was contingent upon the institution itself raising matching or greater sums. And again, no criticism is made of this approach, that such grants were in education fields, and selected educational fields and somewhat too, selected educational institutions, is only pertinent in relation to this question.

Another item which the board refers to as safeguarding the property of the institutions was to give special attention to the business methods of the institutions to whom grants were made and on this point the report states: "\* \* \* The board was indeed bound to exercise as much care in the distribution of its income as in making investment of its principal. For this reason, the business management of colleges applying for contributions has been carefully scrutinized with a view to suggesting such improvements as might be advisable." From this it is reasonable to assume the board at least to a degree decided upon what were efficient methods.

The board itself admits that its grants were in the nature of incentive grants, and of this there can be no doubt, and at this stage in its operations the board also freely admitted that many years would have to elapse before the main task in which the board was assisting could even be approximately completed, but it felt that the board's gift served an indispensable purpose as leverage.

Until 1915 the board's activities were grouped into the following divisions:

- (1) Appropriations for colleges and universities
- (2) Medical education
- (3) Education in the Southern States, including white rural schools, Negro rural schools, and secondary education.
- (4) Farm demonstrations
- (5) Educational research

In the following years the title selected was somewhat different, but the fields of activity remained practically the same, with professional education becoming a section around 1920.

#### LINCOLN SCHOOL

##### *1916-17 report*

Pages 48-49: This report contains the first mention of the grants made to Lincoln School, and the board states that this is an example of the service that can be performed in "support of educational experiments." It goes on to state that the Teachers College of Columbia University had requested the board to provide the funds needed to conduct a school which endeavored "to organize a liberal curriculum out of so-called modern subjects." The report compared this to its work in the farm demonstrating program and added: "In addition to its primary and essential task—that of endeavoring experimentally to construct another type of education—the Lincoln School will, in the judgment of its promoters, assist in developing a critical attitude throughout the field of education."

##### *1924-25 report*

Page 21: The board decided that year that the Lincoln School had a permanent function to perform and it made initial appropriation of \$500,000 to Teachers College toward endowment. Referring to its activities later,<sup>36</sup> the board states: "During recent years the appropriations of the board to colleges and universities have been mainly directed to the development of graduate activities." And declaring that a fine line cannot be drawn, it continues: "The board is now looking to the development of graduate instruction and research."

##### *1925-26 annual report*

Pages 36-37: In reporting its appropriation of \$500,000 toward the endowment of Lincoln School, at the discretion of Teachers College, the board quotes from the annual report of Dr. Russell, dean of Teachers College, as follows:

Eight years ago, with the support of the general education board, we established the Lincoln School for the purpose of experimenting with the materials of instruction and methods of teaching suitable to a modern school. The success of the undertaking has exceeded all expectations from the standpoint both of a school and of an experiment station.

#### SUMMATION

Based on the foregoing:

1. The board contributed large sums of money to projects in the educational field.
2. In the course of its activities the board has made grants to the American Council on Education, National Education Association, and

<sup>36</sup> 1927-28 annual report.

the Progressive Education Association and others in the following amounts:

Universities, colleges, and schools in the United States-----	\$257,157, 581
For adult education-----	50, 000
American Council on Education-----	4, 841, 005
Columbia University <sup>1</sup> -----	(7, 607, 525)
Cooperative test service, Education Records Bureau, graduate record, college entrance examination board-----	3, 483, 000
Lincoln School of Teachers College <sup>1</sup> -----	(6, 821, 104)
National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools-----	150, 000
National Education Association-----	978, 312
Progressive Education Association-----	4, 090, 796
Teachers College <sup>1</sup> -----	(11, 576, 012)
University of Chicago <sup>1</sup> -----	(118, 225, 000)
Total-----	270, 750, 694

<sup>1</sup>Grants to these institutions are included in amount shown for universities, colleges, and schools.

### THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

#### ESTABLISHMENT, PURPOSES, ASSETS

As mentioned in the section dealing with the board, the foundation was the last agency created by Mr. Rockefeller which is still in existence. The amounts and dates of his gifts to the foundation<sup>37</sup> were:

1913-----	\$34, 430, 430. 54
1914-----	65, 569, 919. 46
1917-----	25, 765, 506. 00
1917-----	5, 500, 000. 00
1918-----	1, 000, 000. 00
1919-----	50, 438, 768. 50
1926-----	37, 000. 00
1927-----	109, 856. 40
Subtotal-----	182, 851, 480. 90
1929 <sup>38</sup> -----	182, 851, 480. 00
Total-----	<sup>39</sup> 241, 608, 359. 74

The foundation's affairs are under the direction of a board of 21 trustees, elected for 3 years, and its charter<sup>40</sup> states as its purpose "To promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." As of December 31, 1952, its assets were \$167,890,851.75 and its income for that year was \$16,893,519. Both principal and income may be spent.

According to the information filed with the Cox committee<sup>41</sup> by the foundation, its expenditures from May 22, 1913, to December 31, 1952,<sup>42</sup> were:

For land, buildings, and fixed equipment-----	\$48, 232, 370
For endowment and capital funds-----	70, 003, 956
For current support of institutions, agencies, projects, and fellowships-----	340, 101, 279
Total-----	458, 337, 605

For 15 years after its creation the foundation placed its major emphasis on public health and medical education, although a division

<sup>37</sup> This term will be used in this section to refer to the Rockefeller Foundation.

<sup>38</sup> Funds from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

<sup>39</sup> Annual report for 1952 gives \$316,220,394 as received from donors.

<sup>40</sup> Incorporated by special act of New York State Legislature, 1913.

<sup>41</sup> And incorporated in annual report for 1952, latest available.

<sup>42</sup> Does not include expenditures of Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial prior to consolidation.

of studies had assigned to it several miscellaneous interests, including the training of nurses, aid to dispensaries, human aspects of biology, and anthropology. In time its programs and those of the other Rockefeller agencies began to overlap, and in 1928 after an extended study a plan was evolved whereby all programs of the four Rockefeller boards relating to the advance of human knowledge<sup>43</sup> would be concentrated in the foundation.

The expenditures of the foundation from 1913 to December 31, 1952, in fields of major interest were:

Appropriations for the social sciences, humanities, medicine and public health, and natural sciences and agriculture have been excluded.<sup>44</sup>

While the foundation as mentioned has disclaimed any credit for results, we can assume that their contributions would not have continued had there not been some measure of approval of the activities and the results. Here again, since the foundation is an operating agency only in the field of public health and agriculture, the results of the agencies selected for contributions are pertinent, and particularly insofar as there have been traceable and evident effects in the educational field as the result of the agencies' activities, they are attributable to the foundation itself.

The work of the agencies aided by the foundation have already been described briefly elsewhere, with the exception of the Institute of International Education, which is quite evidently in the field of education, and that description will not be repeated here. It is sufficient to state that the results of their activities are apparent.

Public health and medical sciences-----	\$227, 981, 638
Natural sciences and agriculture-----	43, 335, 198
Social sciences-----	<sup>45</sup> 63, 775, 805
Humanities-----	26,816,321
<b>Total-----</b>	<b>361,908,962</b>

The foundation, as well as the board,<sup>46</sup> sought to influence higher education largely through the universities and the associations of learned societies, but no attempt will be made to cover the contributions of the foundation or the board to the latter group of organizations. According to Dr. Hollis,<sup>46</sup> the foundation profited by the experience of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (whose methods in this field have been discussed earlier) and thus avoided much of the criticism that was directed at that agency. Perhaps another reason was that the foundation came into being after a decade of public awareness, but it should be noted that at its inception the foundation was subjected to severe attack when it applied for a congressional charter, and (although the board had been granted one in 1903) so great was the opposition that the matter was dropped.

For whatever reason, the annual reports of the foundation are much less outspoken in their evaluation of their activities and merely state in narrative and statistical terms the grants made each year. How-

<sup>43</sup> Later expanded to include the dissemination and application of knowledge.

<sup>44</sup> Any overlapping is very slight and does not affect the validity of these figures.

<sup>45</sup> Does not include \$55,339,816 disbursed by Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial prior to consolidation in 1929.

<sup>46</sup> This term will be used throughout this section to refer to the Rockefeller General Education Board.

<sup>47</sup> Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education.

ever, a glance at these grants over the years will substantiate the statement that the foundation has been active in the field of education throughout its existence and in some specialized aspects (such as teacher training and the like) it has been particularly active since the early thirties.

Moreover, this is confirmed by the extensive answers of the foundation's Cox committee questionnaire (sec. E).<sup>48</sup> In the preliminary comment to that section there is a statement of the policy of the foundation which can be summed up in the last sentence: "We are ready to state what we have done, but much of the assessment of its worth must be left to others."

#### *1948 annual report*

Page 7: Within recent years there has been a brief statement which conveys the foundation's own estimates:

The chartered purpose of the foundation with its wide scope and its absence of preconceived or specialized interests has in a quite informal and undersigned manner caused the foundation to become one of the crossroads of the scientific, educational, and scholarly world.

#### SUMMATION

In addition to its direct grants to colleges and universities, the foundation appropriated the following sums from 1929-52:

Universities, colleges, and schools in the United States <sup>1</sup> (estimated) .....	\$335,000,000
For adult education.....	3,435,500
American Council on Education.....	1,235,600
Columbia University (1929-52).....	33,300,000
Institute of International Education.....	1,406,405
London School of Economics.....	4,105,592
National Education Association.....	31,900
Teachers College.....	1,750,893
University of Chicago.....	<sup>2</sup> 60,087,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>440,352,890</b>

<sup>1</sup> Does not include appropriations made to Chicago University, Columbia University, Teachers College, or the London School of Economics.

<sup>2</sup> Includes grants of \$35 million by John D. Rockefeller, Sr.

While the greater portion of its expenditures have been in the field of university and college education, it has also contributed to the work of the American Council on Education, the National Education Association, and the Progressive Education Association (as shown by the foregoing table), and also to adult education generally.

Question 3. It is apparent that each of the Carnegie and Rockefeller agencies referred to have carried on activities at all levels of education, either as an operating agency or through its choice of institutions and other organizations.

Among the organizations selected have been: The American Council on Education, the National Education Association, and the Progressive Education Association, the Institute of International Education and the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.

<sup>48</sup> P. 79 of Rockefeller Answers to Questionnaires.

The American Council on Education is in the nature of a coordinating agency between the Government and educational institutions and organizations, but also carried on projects which affect education at all levels.

The National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association concentrate on primary and secondary schools.

The Cooperative Test Service, the Educational Records Bureau, and the Graduate Record and College Entrance Examination affect education at all levels.

The Institute of International Education carries on its activities in secondary schools and at college and university levels.

There is considerable evidence that the efforts of the first three of these organizations, to a greater or lesser degree, have resulted in standardization of methods, both as to teaching (including testing and training of teachers) and administrative practices in the field of education.

Even those not in the educational field recognize that today there is, in effect, a national set of standards of education, curricula, and methods of teaching prevailing throughout the United States. As a practical matter, the net result of this is nothing more nor less than a system of education which is uniform throughout the country. Moreover, in the case of the National Education Association, one of its goals for the "united teaching profession in 1951-57," is stated on page 13 of the National Education Association Handbook for 1953-54 to be:

A strong, adequately staffed State department of education in each State and a more adequate Federal education agency.

\* \* \* \* \*

Equalization and expansion of educational opportunity including needed State and national financing.

The Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations mentioned have contributed \$20,249,947 to these four agencies (or almost 9 percent of the total of all their grants in this field of activity);<sup>49</sup> and since the support has continued up to now it indicates approval and sponsorship of the activities of these agencies and their results.

Among the institutions selected have been: Chicago University, Columbia University (including Teachers College) and the Institute of International Education, and the London School of Economics.

These institutions have received contributions amounting to \$194,100,589, or approximately 22 percent of the total grants to all universities, colleges, and schools, including the amount contributed to pension funds by the Carnegie foundations. If the pension funds are excluded, then the contributions represent 27 percent of the funds given universities, colleges, and schools.

<sup>49</sup> Excluding grants to universities, colleges, and schools.



In addition, with the exception of the Rockefeller Foundation, all contributed to the various testing and accrediting agencies which were finally merged into the Educational Testing Service (aided also by grants from these foundations).

The amount and distribution of the appropriations are summarized in the tabulation following:

[In millions of dollars]

	Carnegie		Rockefeller		Total
	Corporation	Foundation	Board	Foundation	
Universities, colleges, and schools in the United States.....	56.838	62.764	257.158	335.000	711.760
Adult education.....	3.013		.050	3.436	6.499
American Council on Education.....	1.013	.092	4.841	1.236	7.182
Columbia University.....	2.687		7.608	33.300	43.595
Cooperative Test Service, Educational Records Bureau, Graduate Record, College Entrance Examination Board.....	.091	2.850	3.483		6.424
Institute of International Education.....	2.366			1.406	3.872
National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.....	.750		.150		1.000
National Education Association.....	.262	.115	.979	.032	1.388
Progressive Education Association.....	.076	.092	4.091		4.259
Teachers College.....	3.728		11.576	1.750	17.054
University of Chicago.....	2.420		118.225	60.087	180.732
Lincoln School of Teachers College.....			6.821		6.821
London School of Economics.....				4.106	4.106
Total.....					994.492

The quotations already given from the various reports relate also to this question regarding the effects of foundation activities in education, and therefore only 1 or 2 additional references will be included.

Probably the most recent self-evaluation by one of this group is that contained in the 1952 Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, at page 14:

*1952 report*

Page 14:

One of the developments which has produced the most lively debate in educational circles has been the widespread movement to reinvigorate the ideals embodied in the term "liberal education." The goal is rather widely accepted, but there is substantial difference of opinion as to how to achieve it. The general educationists offer a variety of curricular reforms. Advocates of the great books press their claims for the wisdom of the past. Humanists decry the shift of interest from certain disciplines to certain other disciplines. Our colleges are literally awash with formulae for salvation; all of which is healthy and part of the process of getting things done in a democratic, heterogeneous, and always vigorously assertive society.

\* \* \* President Conant and his coworkers at Harvard have provided leadership in this direction with their efforts to develop a new approach to the teaching of science as a general education course. During the current year the corporation made a grant to Harvard for the continuation of this work.

The social sciences also have a significant role to play. Serious men cannot accept the view of those humanists who rhapsodize over platonic generalizations about society but resent the efforts of the modern social scientist to test these generalizations \* \* \*.

\* \* \* Developments such as the new American studies program at Barnard College (see p. 19) and the courses in Asiatic civilization at Columbia University (see p. 21) would be impossible without vigorous participation, indeed, vigorous leadership, on the part of the humanistic fields. But there is nothing in the humanistic fields which offers a guaranty of salvation. They, too, have turned out narrow technicians when they might have been turning out education men. They, too, have often ignored the central concerns of liberal education.

A statement on this point made in the early years of its existence is found on page 87 of the 1902-14 Report of the General Education Board under the heading "Favorable Legislation":

It can fairly be said that in framing and putting through this legislation, the high-school representatives supported by the General Education Board have in every instance taken a leading part. They would, however, be the first to refuse any undue credit. The organizations already mentioned—the Peabody Board, the Southern Education Board, and the Conference for Education in the South—had greatly stimulated the demand for adequate and orderly educational facilities; in every State, local bodies and organizations, State and local officials were working along one line or another to arouse educational interest.

The section concludes with results in terms of increased schools, buildings, and so forth, and the amounts appropriated by individual States for new and improved buildings.

In a later report of the board (1939-40, p. 22) in a section entitled "How Have the General Education Board's Activities Been Related to These Happenings?" there is the following paragraphs:

Board-aided projects have been associated with nearly all the changes described above. It is obvious, however, that these changes have been called forth by the broad social changes of the times, not by the educators, not by educational foundations. If educational changes are well adapted to the broad social changes of the times, they find a place and are incorporated in the continuing social processes.

However, based on the records of the board itself, no other projects which might possibly have resulted in "changes"<sup>50</sup> were selected except those board-aided projects.

The board, in appraising its contributions to the American Council on Education's Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards (1947-48 report, p. 113), wrote:

Under an earlier program of the General Education Board appropriations were made to the American Council on Education for the study of standards for the secondary schools. The regional accrediting associations for whom the study was undertaken were interested in developing methods of evaluation that would take account of significant qualitative factors, so that less reliance would need to be placed on the purely quantitative criteria in the evaluation of secondary schools. The study committee worked out and tested new criteria and procedures and published its conclusions in four volumes: *How To Evaluate a Secondary School*, *Evaluative Criteria*, *Educational Temperatures*, and a *General Report*. The committee anticipated that these materials and procedures would need review and revision about every 10 years.

<sup>50</sup> That is, those such as the Eight-Year Study, the Study of Secondary School Curriculum, and the Cooperative Study of General Education.

Since 1938, almost 25 percent of the secondary schools of the country have used the new procedures. In the Southern and Middlewestern States, especially, criteria have been widely used and found helpful in raising the general level of secondary education. Meanwhile, further educational research, experience with war-training programs, and changing relations between secondary schools and colleges have made a general revision of the criteria desirable. The accrediting associations have requested such a revision. An appropriation of \$24,500 was made to the American Council on Education for use by a joint committee of the accrediting associations toward the cost of revising the materials and procedures developed in the earlier investigation.

While it is quite true that at the present time \$1 billion is not particularly impressive when compared with endowments and Government spending in related fields such as research and the like, two things should be borne in mind. First, at the time the foundations first began making grants to institutions and agencies, they were the biggest and only contributors on that scale in the country. Second, all have had the same policy of giving grants to inaugurate a particular type of project or organization, withdrawing financial aid when it has become self-supporting or aroused the financial interest of other individuals or groups. Dr. Hollis,<sup>51</sup> writing about this phase of foundation giving, states (excerpt from chapter 1, introduction, *Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education*, by Ernest Victor Hollis):

Although foundations are important for the volume of money they distribute to cultural undertakings, the essential nature of their influence is not in the aggregate of their contributions. Rather it lies in the fact that the grants may be large enough to provide the essential supplement necessary for foundations to hold the balance of power. In the 1924 fund-raising campaign of 68 leading universities there is an illustration of the powerful influence that foundations may exert even when the amount they contribute is only a small percentage of the total. They contributed only 18.1 percent of the funds raised, but they were reputed to have exerted a dominant influence on the purposes and plans of the campaigns through being the largest single donors. The average size of grants from foundations were \$376,322.76 as compared to an average of \$5,902.75 from individuals who gave \$1,000 or more. About 3.4 percent of the individual givers contributed 59.3 percent of the total fund but because the average of their gifts were not large enough to be considered an essential supplement, they were reputed to have exerted a negligible influence in the policies and programs of these 68 colleges. If such vital and strategic potential powers are a possibility in foundation activities, it should be known whether these new social institutions are committed to a philosophy of social and cultural values in keeping with the needs of a rapidly changing social order.

Dr. Hollis discusses the matter of foundation influence in education at some length, and according to him foundations have influenced higher education notably and increasingly "toward supporting social and cultural ideas and institutions that contribute to a rapidly changing civilization \* \* \* the chief contribution of the foundations (being) in accelerating the rate of acceptance of the ideas they chose to promote."

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 3-4.

In his opinion the foundations had been "exercising the initiative accorded them to spend most of their money on exploratory work that seems only remotely connected with improving college education" \* \* \* "on the theory that research must first be done in general education if valid college reorganization is to be accomplished."

He asks the question, "To what extent and in what direction has higher education in the United States been influenced by the philosophy, the administration, the activities, and the money of philanthropic foundations?"<sup>52</sup>

In reply he writes:

In order to answer one must consider not only the degree of educational control or dominance that is exercised by the foundations, but also whether their activities indicate progressive participation in a living culture that looks toward the future, or whether they indicate a static or even reactionary tendency that attempts to maintain the existing social order. While categorical answers cannot be given, enough evidence has been introduced to remove discussion from the realm of biased assertion or mere conjecture.

To the question, "To what extent and in what direction has American higher education been influenced by philanthropic foundations?"<sup>53</sup>

To what extent and in what direction has American higher education been influenced by philanthropic foundations? An answer to the original question may now be ventured. This study concludes that the extent is roughly \$680 million and the direction increasingly toward supporting social and cultural ideas and institutions that contribute to a rapidly changing civilization. Foundations at the start were dissatisfied with existing higher education and they have promoted programs that have, for the most part, been in advance of those prevailing in the institutions with which they have worked. To a large extent these ideas were originated by frontier thinkers within the professions; the chief contribution of the foundations has been in accelerating the rate of acceptance of the ideas they chose to promote.

In contending that these ideas have been closer to the "growing edge" of American culture than were the university practices they proposed to supplant, no claim is made that wiser choices could not have been made or that there has not been occasional overemphasis of foundation-supported ideas, resulting in dislocations and gaps in an ideally conceived pattern of progressive higher education. This study has often been critical of individual ideas, policies, and persons, and has illustrated the foundations' frequent lack of social awareness, their failure to anticipate educational trends, and the presence of unavoidable human fallibility in their official leadership.

The question then arises whether or not the activities of these foundations in the field of education are in harmony with the constitutional provisions with regard to education.

#### VIEWED IN RELATION TO THE CONSTITUTION

"Education" is not directly referred to in the Constitution, nor in any of the amendments. Under the taxing power as well as the prohibition against discrimination, there have been cases in which the question of educational opportunity or facilities was involved—that is, in decisions as to the constitutionality of State statutes.

There is a long line of cases in which the scope and effect of the 10th amendment have been precisely delineated. It is well estab-

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 282.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., pp. 294-295.

lished that the reservation contained in that amendment can only be interpreted to mean that, in effect, the rights of sovereignty which the respective States possessed before the adoption of the Constitution, and which they did not specifically relinquish by that document, are expressly reserved to the individual States. It was drafted because the framers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights were well aware that under the pressure of either "emergency" or "general welfare" the National Government might attempt to assume powers that had not been granted. They were determined to leave no opening for such an assumption, and thus, if further powers seemed necessary in the future, they could only be provided for by amendment in the manner set out in the Constitution.

At times it is erroneously stated that the 10th amendment provides for a distribution of power between the United States and the States—actually, properly stated, it is a reservation of power of the States. This is readily understood when one recognizes that each of the States (Colonies) was actually an autonomous political entity, prior to the ratification of the Constitution. As such each has all the sovereign powers (within its territorial limits) enjoyed by any foreign nation, including unlimited jurisdiction over all persons and things.


Within its own borders, education, at every level of instruction, is the sole province of each of the 48 States. This extends to the curriculum, textbooks, teachers, and methods of instruction, as well as standards of proficiency for both the student and the graduate.

The foundations, it is true, have taken the position that any standards they may have set have been in order to qualify for grants of their funds—but, in their own words, they have had in view achieving a uniformity and conformity of education and educational standards throughout the country.

Each State has by statute prescribed the methods where changes affecting its educational system shall be made, and in the case of drastic changes the usual practice is to present the matter to the electorate for its decision. From the records it is apparent that the foundations did not follow the statutory provisions of the States relating to education—and apparently it never occurred to any of them to consult the authorities concerning those of their "educational" activities which fell within the purview of State regulation. At any rate, at no time did the individual States themselves (either through an elected official or the electorate) have an opportunity to approve or disapprove the changes brought about by foundation funds.

From a practical standpoint—and again it is emphasized regardless of their merits—the changes have occurred; now it is more difficult to determine what the decision of the individual States would have been then had they been consulted, particularly because many of them (invaded as it were through the back door) have been "conditioned" to the invasion, and would probably not display the same vigorous opposition to the intrusion as might have been expected and forthcoming when this encroachment on State powers first began.

KATHRYN CASEY,  
*Legal Analyst.*



# TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1954

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS,  
*Washington, D. C.*

Pursuant to resolution of the committee on July 2, 1954, at the instruction of the chairman, the balance of the staff report prepared by Kathryn Casey, legal analyst, on the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, was incorporated in the record of proceedings.

(The report follows:)

## SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF CARNEGIE CORP. OF NEW YORK, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE, THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

### PREFACE

Comments made following presentation of the first part of this summary of the activities of the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropic trusts indicate a rather widespread misconception among foundation executives both as to the purpose of chronicling their activities in certain fields, and also as to the requirements of House Resolution 217—under which this and all other staff reports have been prepared.

While varying somewhat in phraseology and manner of persentation, the theme of these comments was essentially the same, namely: Why has the staff disregarded the many "good things attributable to the foundations?"

The best—and the only answer—is that the work of the staff, including both research and the preparation of reports, has been carried out in the light of the language in the enabling resolution by which the committee

\* \* \* authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of educational and philanthropic foundations \* \* \* to determine if (they) are using their resources for purposes other than (those) \* \* \* for which they were established, and especially \* \* \* for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.

There is no distinction here as between so-called good or bad activities of the foundations—nor is there a direction to scrutinize the activities of foundations generally and report on them—only an admonition pinpointed toward specified types of activities.

It has been with that in mind that reports and statements of the Carnegie and Rockefeller organizations have been carefully studied, as well as books written about them.

It has been with that in mind that the summary of their activities has been prepared.

## II

At the same time that Carnegie and Rockefeller agencies were concentrating on the "chaotic condition" of education in the United States (discussed in I), organizations bearing the same family names were focusing attention on other types of conditions which in the opinion of the trustees required improvement. While these so-called problems covered such varied fields as public health, malaria in Africa, and exchange of professors and students of international law, there was an indirect relationship between them, and also between them and education: namely, all of them were on the periphery—if not directly in the center—of international relations and governmental activities.

That both the foundation and the endowment did carry on activities which would directly or indirectly affect legislation is borne out by their own statements, as found in their annual reports.

That they both engaged in propaganda—as that word is defined in the dictionary, without regard to whether it is for good or bad ends—is also confirmed by the same source.

That both had as a project forming public opinion and supplying information to the United States Government to achieve certain objectives, including an internationalist point of view, there can be no doubt.

None of these results is inherent in the purposes of either of these organizations.

Attached to this are abstracts from the yearly reports of both organizations (identified as Exhibit—Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Exhibit—Rockefeller Foundation and arranged chronologically), to which reference will be made from time to time in support of statements as to the type of activity carried out by the endowment, and occasionally short material of this nature will be incorporated into the summary. This method has been chosen because it will materially shorten the text of the summary itself, and still give the members of the committee the benefit of having before them statements made by both the endowment and the foundation.

As in part I, this portion of the summary of activities is concerned only with stating what was done by the Carnegie and Rockefeller agencies, the time of such activity, and the results, if any.

### *Purposes*

The endowment by its charter was created to:

\* \* \* promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States; to advance the cause of peace among nations; to hasten the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy; to encourage and promote methods for the peaceful settlement of international differences and for the increase of international understanding and concord; and to aid in the development of international law, and the acceptance of all nations of the principles underlying such law.

To accomplish its objectives the endowment had three divisions, each having distinct fields of activity, particularly when originally established, but as will be seen some of their operations have become somewhat interwoven.

The primary objective of the division of international law was the development of it, a general agreement—accepted by all nations—as



to its rules, accompanied by establishment of better understanding of international rights and duties, and a better sense of international justice.

The division of economics and history had its program outlined at a conference at Berne which laid out a plan of investigation to reveal the causes and results of war. Many of the topics bear a rather close resemblance to effects now found in the national life.

The purposes for which the division of intercourse and education was instituted were the diffusion of information, and education of public opinion regarding, not only the causes, nature, cultivation of friendly feelings between people of different countries and effects of war, but also means for its prevention; maintenance, promotion, and assistance of organizations considered to be necessary or useful for such purposes. It was first referred to as the division of propaganda<sup>1</sup>—a name changed at the time it was formally established.

This division from the beginning expended much more money than did the other two divisions, or the office of the secretary.

Compared with the activities of the other two divisions in these early years those of the division of economics and history were fairly routine, although with the outbreak of the First World War it was to start on what developed into some 30 volumes of the economic history of that war. While some of the economic measures which were covered in that history and in other phases of the divisions were significant in the light of the types of controls which were established in this country during the Second World War, it is really with the work of the other two divisions that this summary will primarily concern itself, since their activities were more often in the international relations, propaganda, political, and government relations areas.

The Rockefeller Foundation has a much more general and more inclusive purpose: "To promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." There is scarcely any lawful activity which would not come within that classification, and undoubtedly some proscribed by various statutes in this country might conceivably still be construed as for the "well-being of mankind" elsewhere.

Before 1929, as mentioned in the earlier portion of this summary, the Rockefeller Foundation confined its activities primarily to the fields of medical education and public health, with some attention being given to agriculture. Except in the sense that activities in each of these fields were carried on outside of the United States, they had relatively nothing to do with "international relations," but in the light of later activities of the foundation in connection with "one-world" theories of government and planning on a global scale there seems little doubt that there is at least a causative connection.

The activities of the foundation are now (and have been for some time) carried on by four divisions: Division of medicine and public health, division of natural sciences and agriculture, division of social sciences (including a section entitled international relations), and division of humanities.

It is impossible to discuss the activities of the endowment and the foundation entirely by subject headings, because one merges into the other, and therefore they will be discussed in relation to the following: International relations, governmental relations, political activities, and propaganda.

<sup>1</sup> Finch History.

As mentioned earlier, the primary interests of these organizations were in divergent areas, but from 1929 the activities of both the endowment and the foundation were along more or less parallel lines—although again the descriptive phraseology of the endowment is usually much more direct than that of the foundation as will be seen by quotations from annual reports of each organization.

Because of the characteristic similarity, graphically illustrated by the chart at the end of this summary, the activities of both organizations from 1929 on will be discussed together. However, since the endowment's program began prior to that time, details of it will be included first.

#### *Endowment activities—1911-29*

The endowment was dedicated to achieving world peace and in doing that it utilized every method it deemed appropriate and effective. One method chosen was international law—and it immediately set about to establish a coordinated national system of instruction throughout the country in that subject. The 1930 yearbook, page 108, refers to a meeting of international law and international relations professors who met “in conference in order to discuss and to agree upon the best methods to reach and educate the youth—primarily of the United States—in the principles of international law and the basis of foreign relations.”

In addition to international law, another method selected by the endowment as a means of achieving international amity, was what throughout the years is referred to in such terms as “education of public opinion,” “development of the international mind,” “enlightenment of public opinion,” and “stimulation of public education.” This last phrase it may be noted was used by Alger Hiss in his Recommendations of the President, pages 16 and 17 of the 1947 yearbook, in which he also recommended “most earnestly” that the endowment's program for the period ahead be constructed “primarily for the support and assistance of the United Nations.” At times these phrases were coupled with “diffusing information” or “dissemination of information” but more frequently they were not. This part of the endowment's work was not confined to the United States—it also selected material to be distributed abroad through various means, and circulated foreign pamphlets on various subjects in this country.

There is little doubt that the endowment regarded its work as educational and as fostering world peace—and there is equally little doubt that the work was in the international relations field, and consistently of a propaganda nature. For example, as far back as June 1917 it cooperated with the Academy of Political Science on a National Conference on Foreign Relations of the United States, the stated purpose being “to organize a campaign of education among the people of the United States on the international situation then existing.”

Again in 1926 the endowment sponsored a conference on international problems and relations—the aim being to “create and diffuse in the United States a wider knowledge of the facts and a broader and more sympathetic interest in international problems and relations.” Several of the topics assume significance in the light of later events—“International cooperation in public health and social welfare” and “Economic adjustments.”

Viewed in the light of what the endowment did then and later in its campaign of education, and "to create and diffuse \* \* \* a wider knowledge" as well as the agencies it chose to carry them out, these early ventures seem rather significant.

Throughout the years the reports cover such subjects as international relations clubs, international mind alcoves, international relations centers, international economic cooperation, exchange professors, international visits, and the like. Its relationship with the American Association of International Conciliation continued until 1924 when its activities were merged with those of the division. According to Dr. Finch that organization was selected by Dr. Butler as "the chief propaganda agency of the division" (p. 446 of Finch History).

The endowment was really just getting started when the First World War raised serious obstacles to its work abroad. However, before that event it had selected as "agencies of propaganda" (a name later discarded) various of the peace societies, in which Mr. Carnegie had been intensely interested.

However, some projects of importance were underway. The division of international law had surveyed the situation existing with regard to the teaching of that subject in colleges and universities in the United States, and by the time war broke out in 1914 compiled a tabulation showing the professors, instructors, and lecturers on international law and related subjects during the collegiate year 1911-12.

The immediate result of this was placing the subject of fostering "the study of international law" on the agenda of the American Society of International Law in 1914, at the request of the endowment.

From that beginning grew the great influence of the endowment in this field's increased facilities for the study of international law, uniform instruction differentiation between undergraduate and graduate instructions, and inclusion of a host of "related" subjects. According to the Carnegie Endowment History by Dr. Finch, a check by the division on the effects of its efforts showed the material increase both in number of hours and the enlargement of classes which he estimates as 45 percent from 1911 to 1922, and a still further increase by 1928. He also mentioned that in 1928 there were six former holders of the endowment's international law fellowships teaching in foreign universities (p. 319 of the Finch History).

#### *Fellowships in international law*

At the recommendation of the American Society of International Law (made December 1916) the endowment established fellowships for the study of international law and related subjects. There were 5 awarded annually to graduate students holding the equivalent of a bachelor's degree and 5 to teachers of international law or related subjects with 1 year of previous teaching experience.

A total of 212 fellowships were awarded from 1917 to 1936 (about one-sixth being renewals), of which 128 were to students and 84 to teachers. Dr. Finch states that while complete records are not available, information in the files and in Who's Who as well as personal contacts show that two-thirds entered the teaching profession and he then continues (pp. 323 et seq.):

As the years went by, most of these teachers improved their positions. Some became senior professors or heads of departments. Three became university

presidents: Colgate W. Darden, Jr., is president of the University of Virginia; Norman A. M. MacKenzie became president of the University of New Brunswick and later of the University of British Columbia; Henry M. Wriston, after serving as president of Lawrence College, is now president of Brown University;<sup>2</sup> Bessie C. Randolph became president of Hollins College, Virginia, and Bernice Brown (Cronkrite) is dean of Radcliffe College. Frederick S. Dunn, of Johns Hopkins University, is now director of the Yale Institute of International Studies. Two former fellows were elected to the United States Congress, Charles West, of Ohio, and Colgate W. Darden, of Virginia. Mr. Darden then served as Governor of Virginia before he accepted the presidency of the university of his State.

Leadership has been assumed by former international law fellows in the organization and direction of community and regional centers in different areas of the country for the promotion of international understanding and cooperation in international organization. Keener C. Frazer, professor of political science of the University of North Carolina, became director of the Southern Council on International Relations. J. Eugene Harley, professor of political science at the University of Southern California, became director for the Center for International Understanding at Los Angeles, and chairman of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace in the southern California region; Charles E. Martin, professor of international law and head of the department of political science of the University of Washington, is chairman of the Institute of Public Affairs of Seattle, and of the Northwest Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Brooks Emeny, of Cleveland, Ohio, was director of foreign affairs council of that city, and then became president of the Foreign Policy Association in New York. Another former endowment fellow, Vera Micheles (Dean) is the director of research of the same organization.

Some 16 former fellows are now in the service of the Department of State occupying positions of varying responsibilities. The most outstanding of this group is Philip C. Jessup, now Ambassador-at-Large, and representing the Government of the United States in the United Nations and other important international conferences attempting to restore peace to the world. At least two former endowment fellows who entered the military service were appointed to responsible positions requiring a knowledge of international law. Hardy C. Dillard, of the University of Virginia, was director of studies of the United States Army's School of Military Government located at that university, and later occupied the same position at the National War College in Washington. Charles Fairman, of Stanford University, was Chief of the International Law Division of the Office of Theater Judge Advocate in the European Theater of Operations. Several former endowment fellows were selected by the Government to go on cultural and educational missions to the occupied areas, and two of them served as consultants to General MacArthur in Tokyo (Claude A. Buss of the University of Southern California, and Kenneth W. Colegrove of Northwestern University). A former endowment fellow, Francis O. Wilcox, is chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, assisted by another former fellow Thorsten Kalijarvi.

Of special interest is the career of John H. Spencer, of Harvard, after studying under a fellowship. He was appointed legal adviser to Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia before World War II. He returned to the United States and served in the State Department and United States Navy while the Italian Army occupied that country, and then returned to his former post in Addis Ababa at the urgent request of the Emperor, supported by the Department of State. John R. Humphrey, an international law fellow from McGill University, Montreal, became Director of the Division on Human Rights of the United Nations Secretariat.

He concludes with this statement:

The immediate objective, namely, to provide an adequate number of teachers competent to give instruction in international law and related subjects, and thus to aid colleges and universities in extending and improving the teaching of these subjects, was demonstrably achieved. From this selective educational group have emerged leaders of opinion as well as of action in the conduct of international relations directed toward the goal for which the endowment was founded.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Wriston was elected a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1943. He is also a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and of the World Peace Foundation. He holds membership in several learned societies, is a former president of the Association of American Colleges and president of the Association of American Universities.

At the same time, the division of intercourse and education was setting out on a policy stated by Dr. Butler to be:

To lay little stress upon those aspects of peace propaganda that are primarily rhetorical and feeling in character, but rather to organize throughout the world centers of influence and constructive policy that may be used in the years to come as the foundation upon which to erect a superstructure of international confidence and good will and therefore of peace.

In view of the division's activities later in behalf of the League of Nations and the United Nations, this has a somewhat prophetic ring.

Compared with the activities of the other divisions, the activities of the division of intercourse and education were much more varied, and the yearbooks contain innumerable references to its activities which indicate that they were more concentrated in the fields covered by this summary.

One of the very first actions of the division in 1911 was the appointment of special correspondents throughout the world to report on conditions in their respective countries and on public opinion here regarding international problems between their governments and other nations. When, in the opinion of the division, it was proper, extracts were given to the American press. The decision of which to give and which to withhold was entirely within the discretion of the division, and that undoubtedly meant Dr. Butler. In view of his intense desire to achieve peace, and his equally firm conviction that an international organization could best accomplish that, it is entirely conceivable that his judgment as to the material to be released might be influenced by his own convictions and desires—and this would be equally true in the case of any human being.

The correspondents also made the endowment's work known in their countries through the press, interviews and speeches, and officially represented it at undertakings of international cooperation and understanding.

This system was discontinued in 1930 because by that time the division had established—

such a network of worldwide connections involving continuous correspondence as to make it no longer necessary to employ the services of special correspondents.

Just after the war started in 1914, the division engaged prominent persons to lecture before colleges, chambers of commerce, clubs, and similar audiences on the subject of past and present history as it related to current international problems. Among the speakers were David Starr Jordan, Hamilton Wright Mabie, and George W. Kirchwey. Dr. Butler instructions as to the endowment's purpose in sponsoring these lectures were,

This work is to educate and enlighten public opinion and not to carry on a special propaganda in reference to the unhappy conditions which now prevail throughout a large part of the world. It is highly important that purely contentious questions be avoided so far as possible and that attention be fixed on those underlying principles of international conduct, of international law, and of international organization which must be agreed upon and enforced if peaceful civilization is to continue (letter to Dean Frederick P. Keppel, May 28, 1915-16 yearbook, p. 67).

#### *International mind alcoves*

These were described in the yearbook of the endowment and typical references are given in the exhibit. Following the entry of the United States into World War I a systematic purchase and distribution of books and pamphlets dealing with international relations generally

and the causes and effects of war, as well as the possible terms of peace, was begun by the division of intercourse and education. Dr. Butler is generally credited with coining the phrase "international mind" and from the time the distribution to libraries was begun they were known as "international mind alcoves" and so referred to in the annual reports.

The endowment has described the books selected and distributed by it as "authoritative and unbiased books of a type suitable to interest the general reader dealing with the daily life, customs and history of other countries." In that connection, among the books distributed to these alcoves and to the international relations clubs (and international relations centers) are those referred to in a memorandum which forms an exhibit to this summary, and is entitled "Exhibit—Carnegie, Books Distributed." The endowment has contributed \$804,000 to this activity. Dr. Colegrove's comments on some of these volumes indicate there was only one viewpoint presented—that of the one world internationalist—and books written from a strictly nationalist point of view were not included.

#### *International relations clubs and conferences*

These clubs in the United States were in part, an outgrowth of groups of European students organized by the World Peace Foundation, and known as Corda Fratres. The endowment at the request of the World Peace Foundation contributed to the Eighth International Congress of Students, and the following year (1914) the division of intercourse and education began to actively organize what it described as International Polity Clubs in colleges and universities throughout the country, for the purpose of stimulation of interest in international problems in the United States. The name was changed in 1919 to International Relations Clubs, and while interest diminished for a few years after World War I, the clubs began a steady annual increase before too long, which has been sustained to the present time.

About 1924 the first conference was organized of a federation of clubs in the Southern States, which became known as the Southeast International Relations Clubs Conference. The idea quickly spread and a dozen such regional centers were formed. (From 1921 until 1946 the endowment contributed \$450,425 toward this program.)

Here again the purpose of the endowment is stated (International Relations Club Handbook, 1926) to be:

to educate and enlighten public opinion. It is not to support any single view as to how best to treat the conditions which now prevail throughout the world, but to fix the attention of students on those underlying principles of international conduct, of international law, and of international organization which must be agreed upon and applied if peaceful civilization is to continue.

However, mere statement of purpose as frequently pointed out by the Bureau of Internal Revenue is not sufficient—the activities must follow the purpose; and those of the endowment do not bear out its statement "not to support any single view." Throughout its reports, by the books it has distributed, by the agencies it has used for various projects, by the endowment graduates which have found their places in Government—the endowment has put forward only one side of the question, that of an international organization for peace. It has not sponsored projects advocating other means.

The endowment's evaluation of these clubs is contained in frequent references in its reports, only one of which is included in the Exhibit—Carnegie, that from the yearbook for 1943, pages 37–38.

Dr. Johnson in response to a letter requesting information as to the formation and activities of these clubs, wrote the committee on April 29, 1954, and both the request and the reply are included in Exhibit—Carnegie.

These clubs were formed in 1914 and have operated for 40 years in colleges, universities, and high schools. In 1938 according to Dr. Johnson there were 1,103 clubs: 265 in high schools and 685 in colleges and universities throughout the United States; with 11 scattered in the Philippines, Hawaii, Alaska, Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico; 24 in the United Kingdom, 34 in 14 Latin American countries, 22 in China, 9 in Japan, 2 in Korea; and the remaining 51 in Canada, Egypt, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Siam, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Syria, and India.

Dr. Johnson's concluding statement that "a contribution was made to a better understanding of the responsibilities which our country now bears as a world power" is quite understandable under the circumstances. Some of the other aspects of these clubs will be discussed in connection with the Foreign Policy Association.

#### *Visiting Carnegie professors*

In addition to the exchange professors of the division of international law the division of intercourse and education in 1927 initiated its own plan of exchange professors. It was inaugurated by sending abroad the directors of the other two divisions as visiting professors that year, Dr. James Scott Brown going to lecture at universities in Latin America and Spain, and Dr. James T. Shotwell being sent to Berlin. The other prominent Americans closely identified with this field who went abroad to represent the endowment were Dr. David P. Barrows, former president of the University of California, and an elected trustee of the endowment in 1931; and Dr. Henry Suzzalli, former president of the University of Washington at Seattle and chairman of the board of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The exchange professors were not restricted to international law and political science, but included professors of public law, history, and other subjects.

The endowment also arranged for European tours for newspaper editors, and a reciprocal tour of the United States for a group from Europe.

#### *Political activities*

In addition to these projects already described, the endowment quite early in its career (1913–14) had a brush with the United States Senate regarding Senator Root's statements on the floor of the Senate during the controversy over exemption of American coastwise vessels from payment of Panama Canal tolls.

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was directed to investigate the charge that "a lobby is maintained to influence legislation pending in the Senate." (Pt. 62, March 13, 1914, pp. 4770–4808.) Apparently, there had been some question as to whether the exceedingly widespread distribution of the Senator's speeches by the endowment had been at

Government expense. In his history, Dr. Finch discussing the incident says:

There was little real need for any outside investigation of the work of the endowment. From the beginning the trustees regarded themselves as the administrators of a quasi-public trust fund. Complete accounts of all activities and of expenditures detailed as much as practicable within reasonable printed limits, were published annually in the yearbook beginning with 1911. In it were given the names of the trustees, officers and membership of committees, and the full texts of the reports of the executive committee, the Secretary, the treasurer, and of the directors of the three divisions. Summaries were published in the yearbook of the meetings of the board of trustees, with the texts of their resolutions and the amount and general purposes of their appropriations. Lists with bibliographical data were added of all endowment publications up to that time. The yearbook was obtainable free of charge upon application. It had a regular mailing list of 5,000 to 10,000 addresses, which included all the important newspaper offices in the United States and many in foreign countries.

The endowment also actively advocated passage of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation, adherence to the Anglo-American agreements and carried on various other activities of a political nature, as the extracts from their annual reports confirm.

After World War I the endowment's trustees seemed to have been divided in their ideas on how best to begin anew their efforts to build a peaceful world. Some members of the board were still of the opinion that international law, arbitration treaties and the like offered the greatest hope, while others looked to an "international organization" of nations, as the best means to accomplish this objective.

The matter was resolved, officially at least, by the endowment putting its strength behind the League of Nations or failing that, adherence to the World Court. Here again, the attitude and activities of the endowment can be readily ascertained by reference to the exhibit in which only a few of the many such statements have been included.

Early in its career the endowment began the close working arrangements with the Federal Government which have continued down to the present time. Immediately after the United States entered World War I the trustees passed a resolution offering to the Government "the services of its division of international law, its personnel and equipment for dealing with the pressure of international business incident to the war."

The Secretary of State first asked that the division translate and publish the complete text of the proceedings of the two Hague Conferences and preliminary copies were made available to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace at Paris in 1918. The division also aided in the preparatory work for the peace conference, and the material for the use of the American delegation was selected (at a cost of \$30,000 paid by the endowment) by a committee of three appointed by the Secretary of State—the director of the division of international law, the Solicitor of the Department, Lester H. Woolsey, and a special assistant in the Department, David Hunter Miller. Much of the material was the work of regular division personnel and all manuscripts were edited by it.

The director of the division of international law was one of the two principal legal advisers of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, the assistant director, Dr. Finch, was assistant legal adviser, as were the chief division assistant, Henry G. Crocker, and Prof. Amos S. Hershey (who was added to the professional staff to aid in the work



for the State Department); and George D. Gregory accompanied the American group as secretarial-assistant translator.

The endowment also took part in the conference on the limitation of armament and pacific relations in 1921-22, Elihu Root then president of the endowment being one of the official United States delegates and James Brown Scott, director of the division of international law, one of the legal advisers.

Here again, the endowment offered the Secretary of State its cooperation, which was accepted and a few weeks later Secretary of State Hughes suggested that the endowment issue a series of pamphlets on the principal problems coming before the Conference.

President Root reporting to the board on April 21, 1922 said:

I really do not know how the far-eastern work of the late Conference Upon the Limitation of Armament could have been done without McMurray's book which had just a few months before been published by the endowment. The whole process of ranging the nine nations represented in the Conference upon a basis of agreement for the treatment of Chinese questions so as to facilitate the heroic efforts of the Chinese people to develop an effective and stable self-government would have been exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, if we had not had those two big volumes published by the endowment upon our tables for access at any moment. We were continually referring to them and the members could turn to such a page and find such a treaty and such an agreement and have the real facts readily accessible.

When the Rockefeller Foundation turned to the social sciences and the humanities as the means to advance the "well-being" of humanity, the section entitled "Social Sciences" in the annual report was set up under the following headings, which remained unchanged until 1935:

General Social Science Projects: Cooperative Undertakings.  
 Research in Fundamental Disciplines.  
 Interracial and International Studies.  
 Current Social Studies.  
 Research in the Field of Public Administration.  
 Fundamental Research and Promotion of Certain Types of Organization.  
 Fellowships in the Social Sciences.

The report states that the arrangement was for the purpose of "simplification and in order to emphasize the purpose for which appropriations have been made."

In the decade 1929-38 the foundation's grants to social-science projects amounted to \$31.4 millions and grants were made to such agencies as the Brookings Institution, the Social Science Research Council, the National Research Council, the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in this country as well as a dozen or more in other countries, and the Fiscal Committee of the League of Nations.

The original plunge of the foundation into the field of social science was at the instigation of Beardsley Ruml, according to Raymond Fosdick (*The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, p. 194), who in 1922 was appointed director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial when consolidation of that organization with the foundation was already being considered. During the 7 years, 1922-29 the memorial operated under Ruml's guidance it concentrated on the field of social sciences and spent \$41 million. Referring to the work of the memorial Dr. Fosdick writes:

He (Ruml) always insisted that his job was with social scientists, rather than with social science. The sums which, under his leadership, were used to stimulate

scientific investigation were perhaps not large in comparison with aggregate expenditures for social sciences, but they represented a new margin of resources, and they were employed dramatically at a strategic moment. Chancellor Hutchins of the University of Chicago, speaking in 1929, summed up the verdict in words which a longer perspective will probably not overrule: "The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, in its brief but brilliant career, did more than any other agency to promote the social sciences in the United States."

Dr. Ruml was the head of the memorial for all but the first 4 years of its existence.

Since the foundation absorbed the memorial's program and carries on all its activities relating to government and international relations under the heading of social sciences, these comments by Dr. Fosdick and Dr. Hutchins have equal applicability to the work of the foundation in these fields.

There is ample evidence from the foundation's yearbooks that it carried on activities in the field of government of a political and propaganda nature, as well as in the field of international relations, and examples of this will be found in the "Exhibit—Rockefeller." Included in that exhibit also are the statement of Mr. Chester I. Barnard in the Cox committee hearings, page 563, speaking of his work as "the consultant of the State Department \* \* \* on different things from time to time," and quotations from Dr. Fosdick's book on the foundation.

In 1935 the foundation's activities again were reorganized, and that year the section "Social Sciences" begins: "In 1935 the foundation program in the social sciences were reorganized along new lines with emphasis upon certain definite fields of interest."

Major changes were termination of financial aid to general institutional research in the social sciences here and abroad, elimination of grants for "the promotion of basic economic research," for community organization and planning (unless within the scope of one of the new fields of interest), cultural anthropology, and schools of social work.

From then on the foundation was to concentrate on three areas of study: Social security, international relations, and public administration.

Subsequent statements made by the foundation concerning its work in each of these fields will be discussed in the concluding portions of this summary.

The same year that the foundation publicly announced that its activities in the field of social science would be confined to international relations and relations with government, the endowment was engaged in a project related to both which exemplifies the methods frequently used by the endowment in attempting to achieve world peace. This project was the calling of an unofficial conference in March of 1935 to consider possible steps to promote trade and reduction of unemployment, stabilization of national monetary systems, and better organization of the family of nations to give security and strengthen the foundations on which international peace must rest.

From this grew the reorganization of the National Peace Conference, composed of 32 newly organized city and State peace councils, with its committees of experts appointed to supply factual data and analyses of international affairs. Among the commissions were ones on economics and peace, national defense, the world community, and the Far East.

Of particular interest is the fact that the director of the League of Nations Association, Clark M. Eichelberger, later to occupy the same position with the Association for the United Nations, was placed in charge of the endowment's educational program. Dr. Finch's comment on this indicates the extensive nature of Dr. Eichelberger's contacts through this assignment.

\*\*\* He traveled extensively throughout the United States developing contacts which resulted in the adoption of programs within numerous organizations, some not hitherto reached by the endowment. Among them were: United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service through its county and home-demonstration agents and discussion specialists in the field; extension services of State agricultural colleges; American Farm Bureau Federation and Associated Women of the Federation; National Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America; Junior Farmers Union; 4-H Clubs; National Grange; informal community forums and Federal forums sponsored by the United States Bureau of Education; classes and forums conducted by the Works Progress Administration; adult education; workers' education and labor unions; churches, women's clubs, university groups, Rotary, and other service clubs. Leadership-training conferences were established for the training of organizational representatives from which the best qualified were selected for discussion leaders. Literature was prepared by the division and supplied for use in discussion programs. Basic pamphlet material of the Department of State was also used. The radio played an important part. Local stations were supplied with electrical transcriptions of addresses on world economic problems.

Dr. Finch has another comment as to the methods used in carrying on this "educational program":

The educational program did not necessarily start with the subject of international relations as such, but with topics which would help the membership of these groups to recognize and analyze the economic, social, and educational problems within their own organizations and communities, and to understand the factors, local, national, and international which create these problems; to discover to what extent each economic group could contribute toward the solution of their common problems, and to what extent solutions of local problems were dependent upon national and international relations; to know and use the sources of information on public and international problems.

The National Peace Conference extended this "educational" work in 1938 by undertaking "an educational campaign for world economic cooperation," using *Peaceful Change—Alternative to War*, published by the Foreign Policy Association, as the basic handbook. According to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler (1938 yearbook, p. 48) this campaign was undertaken to emphasize the importance of putting into effect the recommendations of the joint committee of the endowment and the International Chamber of Commerce, and had two phases. The first, from September 1937 to March 1938, was on education in the fundamentals of world economic cooperation followed by a nationwide conference scheduled for March 1938 in Washington, D. C., to appraise the campaign up to that time, "to consider recommendations of practical policy prepared by a committee of experts under the direction of Prof. Eugene Staley, and to formulate conclusions on specific Government policies." The second phase was another campaign of education from March 1938 to January 1939.

It is apparent merely from reading the Rockefeller Foundation's list of its "fields of interest" that in all probability it would frequently contribute to the identical project and the identical organization, receiving contributions from the endowment. This is exactly what happened, and while in the amount of time available it is not possible to itemize the projects, it is possible to select typical examples from the agencies to which it contributed.

As a matter of fact, the endowment and the foundation concentrated their grants among the same agencies in practically every case. Moreover, as it will become apparent, at times a joint activity (in the sense that both contributed funds to a particular project or organization) was related to both Government and to international relations. Several of such organizations aided by both organizations will be discussed separately because they are particularly pertinent to the relations of the foundations to both Government and international relations.

#### *Institute of International Education*

This was one of the first agencies to receive contributions from the foundation when it enlarged its sphere of activity to include the social sciences, and it has continued to make grants every year since then.

The institution was authorized by the executive committee of the endowment at Dr. Butler's instigation in 1919, as an integral part of the Division of Intercourse and Education for the—

purpose of fostering and promoting closer international relations and understanding between the people of the United States and other countries, to act as a clearinghouse of information and advice on such matters and to systematize the exchange of visits of teachers and students between colleges and universities of the United States and those of foreign countries.

It arranged itineraries and lecture tours for visiting professors and circuted the visiting professors among the colleges and universities of the United States, including visits to the International Relations Clubs.

In Department of State publication 2137, page 9, entitled "The Cultural Cooperation Program, 1938-43," there is the following statement as to the place the institute came to occupy in international education:

The Institute of International Education in New York, a private organization, began after the First World War to persuade universities in the United States and in Europe to offer full scholarships (tuition, board, and lodging) for exchange students. More than 100 universities in the United States and a similar number in Europe cooperated. The institute reported that during the period 1920-38 approximately 2,500 foreign students were brought to the United States under this plan, and 2,357 American students were placed in foreign universities. The cash value of scholarships given by American universities to this group of foreign students was \$1,970,000, and the scholarships to American students abroad were valued at \$917,000. This plan is especially significant because it won support from so large a number of private institutions, each of which was willing to invest its own funds in the exchange of students.

The endowment also continued its contributions to this institute—funds from both organizations amounting to approximately \$5 million.

#### *Foreign Policy Association*

This organization received grants from the endowment, and, in addition, many of its pamphlets were distributed to the International Mind Alcoves and the International Relations Clubs.

In that connection, one of the persons whose books were distributed by the endowment was Vera Michele Dean, who is referred to later in this summary. Mrs. Dean was given an international law scholarship by the endowment in 1925-26.

The Rockefeller Foundation between 1934 and 1945 (when it made a tapering grant of \$200,000) contributed \$625,000 to the research, publication and educational activities of the Foreign Policy Association. In 1950, when it terminated aid to the association, the foundation in its annual report indicated that its reason for doing so was that it was operating largely on a stable and self-supporting basis. However, in 1952 the Adult Education Fund of the Ford Foundation gave \$335,000 to the association.

The Rockefeller Foundation in addition to contributing funds to the Foreign Policy Association has referred to the Headline Series in its annual reports, and, while not fulsome in praise, there is no doubt that the foundation approved of them—the 1950 annual report (exhibit — Rockefeller) refers to these books as the “popular Headline Books,” with details on problems of importance to Americans and to the world.

Dr. Johnson, after describing the International Relations Clubs (exhibit — Carnegie) adds that these clubs have now become associated with the Foreign Policy Association. In that connection, the McCarran committee hearings contain frequent references to the interlocking association of that organization with the Institute of Pacific Relations, and includes, among other exhibits, No. 1247, which discussed the Headline book, *Russia at War*, and refers to the good job performed by the Foreign Policy Association of promoting Mrs. Dean's pamphlet, through the regular channels.

Time has not permitted extensive inspection of the volumes published by the Foreign Policy Association, but Vera Michele Dean who was the research director of the Foreign Policy Association and editor of its research publications is referred to frequently in the McCarran committee reports on the Institute of Pacific Relations. She is the author of *Russia—Menace or Promise?* one of the Headline Series, as well as the *United States and Russia* (1948).

While the Association refers to itself as a nonprofit American organization founded to carry on research and educational activities to aid in the understanding and constructive development of American foreign policy which does not seek to promote any one point of view toward international affairs, this statement is somewhat equivocal both in view of the nature of its publications, and also because in those reviewed little attention was paid to the possibility of a nationalist point of view as opposed to an internationalist one.

Another of the Headline Series, *World of Great Powers*, by Max Lerner (1947), contains the following language:

There are undoubtedly valuable elements in the capitalist economic organizations. The economic techniques of the future are likely to be an amalgam of the techniques of American business management with those of Government ownership, control, and regulation. For the peoples of the world, whatever their philosophies, are moving toward similar methods of making their economic system work.

If democracy is to survive, it too must move toward socialism—a socialism guarded by the political controls of a State that maintains the tradition of intellectual consent and the freedom of political opposition. And the imperatives of survival are stronger than the winds of capitalist doctrine.

This is an arduous road for democracy to travel, and it may not succeed. But it is the only principle that can organize the restless energies of the world's peoples. \* \* \*

Mr. Lerner's attitude insofar as Russia is concerned is indicated by this language on pages 34 and 35, after stating that both Russia and the United States merely want world peace and security:

The successive layers of fear and suspicion on both sides can be stripped away only when both show a creativeness in approaching each other halfway. This would mean, for America, reopening the question of granting Russia a loan or credits for the purchasing of machines and machine tools. These the Soviet Union sorely needs for peacetime production and for lifting the terribly low standards of living of the Russian people. For Russia it would mean a commitment to return to the world economic and trade councils from which it withdrew after Bretton Woods.

Moving from the economic to the political level, it would mean a willingness on America's part to grant greater United Nations control of Japan and the former Japanese island bases in the Pacific, and on Russia's part to be less truculent about her sphere of influence in eastern Europe. Given such economic and political agreements, a meeting of minds would become possible on the international control of atomic energy, which is the central question both of disarmament and peace.

One further illustration of the internationalist trend of the Foreign Policy Association will be found in another Headline Series volume, *Freedom's Charter, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, by Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, which deals with the covenants on human rights without referring to the criticisms made of their possible effects on the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the entire tone of the pamphlet is one of praise for the universal declaration. By a technique frequently found in pamphlets which are pro-United Nations and its activities, Dr. Nolde obliquely places those who disagree with the universal declaration—for whatever reason—in a category with the Soviet Union who also object to certain phases, for example: "Soviet emphasis on state sovereignty appeared in other contexts, also. Many delegates contended that the universal protection of man's rights will require a measurable yielding of national sovereignty. As previously pointed out, the U. S. S. R. took radical exception to this contention."

Up to the time this summary was written no book or pamphlet of a contrary point of view (published by the association) has been found—which raises the question of a comparison between the theory expressed by the association not to seek to promote any one point of view and of the type of books and pamphlets it sponsors and publishes.

#### *Council on Foreign Relations*

Here again the two organizations—the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation—have been substantial contributors to the work of an agency in the international field. And again, as in the case of the Foreign Policy Association, it is evident from the publications of the council that its approach is not an unbiased one.

The Council has published studies by the following:

Public Opinion and Foreign Policy—Lester Markel and others.

International Security—Philip C. Jessup.

World Economy in Transition and Raw Materials in Peace and War—Eugene Staley.

The Challenge to Isolation, 1937-40—William L. Langer and S. Y. Everett Gleason.

Dr. Langer was later selected by the Council and the foundation to prepare a history of American foreign policy from 1939 to 1946, which has been stated to be a one-sided interpretation rather than an objec-

tive history of American foreign policy. No grants have since been made (so far as can be ascertained from their records) by either the Council or the foundation for preparation of a contrary evaluation of this subject—and neither organization supported the volume by Professor Tansill published a year or so ago, which gives the other side of the picture.

It is interesting to note that shortly after World War II exploded in September 1939, representatives of the Council visited the Department of State to offer its assistance on the problems the conflict had created and offered to undertake work in certain fields, without formal assignment of responsibility on one side or restriction of independent action on the other. A tentative outline was prepared for four groups of experts to undertake research on: Security and Armaments Problems, Economic and Financial Problems, Political Problems, and Territorial Problems. These came to be known as the War and Peace Studies, and were financed by the Rockefeller Foundation under the Council's committee on studies.

About February 1941, the informal character of the relationship between the State Department and the Council ceased. The Department established a Division of Special Research composed of Economic, Political, Territorial, and Security Sections, and engaged the secretaries who had been serving with the Council groups to participate in the work of the new Division.

Following that, in 1942, a fifth group was added to the War and Peace Studies, called the Peace Aims Group. This group had been carrying on discussions regarding the claims of different European nations, the relation of such claims to each other as well as to the current foreign policy of the United States, and their relationship to eventual postwar settlements.<sup>3</sup> The State Department particularly commended the work of this last group. That same year the relationship between the council and the Department became even more close—the Department appointed Isaiah Bowman and James T. Shotwell as members of its newly organized "Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policies." In addition to their association with the Council of Foreign Relations both had also been associated with Carnegie organizations.

Particular interest attaches to this activity on the part of the council. First of all, the action of the council in offering its services closely parallels the action of the Carnegie endowment in both the First and Second World Wars, and in view of Mr. Shotwell's background it seems likely that it was somewhat a case of taking a leaf from the same book.

The second reason is because the research secretaries of the War and Peace studies of the council progressed to other work related to the organization of peace and the settlement of postwar problems:

Philip E. Mosely, research secretary of the Territorial group, accompanied Secretary Hull to Moscow in 1943, when representatives of Great Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, and China issued the Moscow Declaration, the text of which had been prepared previously in the Committee on Postwar Foreign Policies. Mr. Mosely later became political adviser to the American member of the

<sup>3</sup> The endowment had conducted a similar study before World War I.

European Advisory Commission in London, and more recently has been with the Russian Institute of Columbia University.

Walter R. Sharp, research secretary of the Political group, served as Secretary General of the United Nations Food Conference at Quebec in 1945.

Grayson Kirk, research secretary of the Security group, was among the experts at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and was executive officer of commission III at the San Francisco Conference.

Dwight E. Lee, research secretary of the Peace Aims group, was assistant secretary of committee I, commission III at the San Francisco Conference.

The outside experts also reappeared in other work :

Dr. Isaiah Bowman was a member of the United States delegation at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, special adviser to the Secretary of State, member of the Department's Policy Committee, and adviser to the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference.

Hamilton Fish Armstrong served as adviser to the American Ambassador in London in 1944, with the personal rank of minister, also as special adviser to the Secretary of State, and as adviser to the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference.

Walter H. Mallory, secretary of the Steering Committee which directed the War and Peace Studies, was a member of the Allied Mission to Observe the Elections in Greece, with the personal rank of minister, a mission which grew out of the Yalta agreement to assist liberated countries to achieve democratic regimes responsive to the wishes of their people.

This does not include any of the several dozen members of these council groups who were called into the Government in wartime capacities not connected with formulation of postwar policies. Nor is any implication intended that pressure was brought to secure placement of any of these individuals in particular posts. It is self-evident, however, that the research secretaries as well as the others referred to later attained positions of influence in relation to the foreign policy of the United States, and were instrumental in formulation of the United Nations Organization.

During its operations the War and Peace Studies project held 362 meetings and prepared and sent to the State Department close to 700 documents, which were distributed to all appropriate officers, and also reached other departments and agencies of the Government, since representatives of many such agencies were informal members of council groups. With a few exceptions these documents are now in the council library and available for study.

The endowment also had direct association during this period with the State Department, in addition to its association through the work of the council just described, through its Division of International Law. This association arose following Pearl Harbor in 1941, when the endowment offered and the Department accepted the services of that Division, thus again establishing an informal basis of cooperation.

At that time Philip Jessup, who was director of the division of international law from 1940 to 1943, resigned to devote his entire time to Government service.

Following several exploratory conferences to determine what could be learned from the experience of the League of Nations, the division



“established relations with many highly qualified and experienced experts making it possible to plan and arrange for the preparation of \* \* \* series of studies on international organization and administration. \* \* \*”

The first was International Law of the Future, Postulates, Principles, and Proposals. It was followed by:

International Tribunals, Past and Future  
 The International Secretariat: A Great Experiment in International Administration  
 Guide to the Practice of International Conferences  
 League of Nations and National Minorities  
 The Economic and Financial Organization of the League of Nations  
 Immunities and Privileges of International Officials  
 International Drug Control  
 Mandates, Dependencies, and Trusteeship  
 The Customs Union Issue

The 1944 yearbook, pages 67-70 of the report of the director of the division of international law, in a section devoted to the work program of the division, refers to this statement of the International Law of the Future, a second part containing “Principles,” and a third part containing “Proposals,” and in the extract from this yearbook (complete text is included in “Exhibit—Carnegie”) there are these statements:

\* \* \* In line with the Moscow Declaration, the Postulates envisage a “general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.” The principles are offered as a draft of a declaration which might be officially promulgated as the basis of the international law of the future. The proposals for international organization are not offered as a draft of a treaty but as suggestions for implementing the principles.

The following year, 1945, the yearbook has the following statement, page 84:

It is apparent from a reading of the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization adopted at Dumbarton Oaks that their drafting was influenced to some extent by the contents of the Statement of the International Law of the Future which was published and given widespread distribution on March 27, 1944.

(Moreover, while the endowment makes no reference to them, there is great similarity also to the proposals for international cooperation drafted many years earlier, in which the endowment participated both financially and through its personnel.)

According to Dr. Finch these documents were published “having in mind” the objectives Mr. Churchill expressed in February 1945, namely, that the former League of Nations would be replaced by a far stronger body but which—

will embody much of the structure and the characteristics of its predecessor. All the work that was done in the past, all the experience that has been gathered by the working of the League of Nations, will not be cast away.

Dr. Finch’s further comments (p. 435) are:

Advance copies of all but the last of the studies were made available to officials of the United States and other governments in Washington. They were in constant use at the conference of jurists held in Washington to revise the statute of the International Court of Justice, at the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Conference, the Interim Commission of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference and at the series of meetings held by the United Nations in London, including the Preparatory Commission, the General Assembly, and the Security Council, as well as the meeting of foreign ministers held in the same city. The limited advance editions printed for these purposes were inad-

quate to meet the demand. The division also prepared special memoranda under great pressure for use in connection with some of the foregoing conferences.

The portions of Dr. Finch's History quoted earlier on pages 9, 10, and 11, tell the story of former fellowship holders who have entered various fields, including Government service, but there were others who went from the endowment to places in public life:

James T. Shotwell, who was director of the division of economics and history for many years, was also chairman of the international research committee of the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations; and while attending a conference of the institute in 1929 delivered a number of addresses on American foreign policy and problems in international organizations. In 1930 he became director of research in international affairs of the social science research council and many of the publications in which his division took an interest originated in research in Europe arranged for him by that organization. Among these were:

International Organization in European Air Transport—Lawrence C. Tomb  
 Maritime Trade of Western United States—Elliott G. Mears  
 Turkey at the Straits—Dr. Shotwell and Francis Deak  
 Poland and Russia—Dr. Shotwell and Max M. Laserson

Dr. Shotwell was chairman of an unofficial national commission of the United States to cooperate with the Committee of the League of Nations on Intellectual Cooperation, and he later accepted membership on the State Department's Advisory Committee on Cultural Relations (1942-44).

Dr. Finch, referring to the invitation extended to Dr. Shotwell to serve on the Advisory Committee on Postwar Policy, goes on:

\* \* \* He was later appointed by the endowment its consultant to the American delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, April 25 to June 26, 1945. These official duties placed Dr. Shotwell in a position of advantage from which to formulate the changing program and direct with the greatest effectiveness the operations of the commission to study the organization of peace.

The associate consultant was Dr. Finch himself, then director of the division of international law.

Professor John B. Condliffe, associate director of the division of economics and history (Berkeley branch office) edited a series of pamphlets dealing with tariffs and agriculture. They covered, in addition to a general study of protection for farm products, cotton, dairy products, wheat, corn, the hog industry, and sugar; and were circulated to all county agricultural agents throughout the country and were officially supplied by the Department of Agriculture to every director of agricultural extension work in the United States.

Ben M. Cherrington, who was elected trustee of the endowment in 1943, was the first Chief of the Division of Cultural Relations of the State Department, serving until 1940. Before that he was director of the Social Science Research Council and professor of international relations at the University of Denver.

Upon leaving the State Department he became chancellor of the university where he remained until 1946, when he became a member of the national committee of the United States for the United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization. Dr. Cherrington was an associate consultant of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

Philip C. Jessup was another endowment contribution to the field of public service. His first assignment was in the Department of State,

as Assistant Solicitor in 1924-25, followed by his service as legal assistant to Elihu Root, in 1929 at the Committee of Jurists on the Revision of the Court Statutes, called by the League of Nations Council. Dr. Jessup was assistant professor of international law at Columbia University and later became Mr. Root's biographer. He was elected a trustee of the endowment in 1937, succeeded Dr. James Brown Scott as director of the division of international law in 1940 and 1943 resigned because of the pressure of Government work during the war.

He was Assistant Secretary General of UNRRA and attached to the Bretton Woods Conference in 1943-44; assistant on judicial organizations at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, where he helped to revise the statutes of the Permanent Court of International Justice to the present form in the United Nations Charter. He was also secretary of a national world court committee, organized in New York, of which two trustees of the endowment were also members.

The list of such individuals is long—and to include all the names would merely lengthen this summary to no particular purpose. Henry Wriston, Eugene Staley, Isaiah Bowman, John W. Davis, Quincy Wright, John Foster Dulles, Robert A. Taft, and others—either during their association with the endowment or at some other time—also were in the public service.

#### *United Nations*

Both the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation aided this cause. In the case of the endowment it was a natural outgrowth of its deep interest in the League of Nations and the World Court, and its disappointment when the United States failed to join the League, intensified its activities in connection with the United Nations.

The close association between the endowment and the State Department, even before World War II actually enveloped this country, has been discussed, and it is apparent that the idea of achieving peace through a world government arrangement was still the goal of the endowment as indicated by the character of its representatives and the nature of their activities.

While Dr. Jessup was director of the division of international law, it undertook an investigation of the numerous inter-American subsidiary congresses and commissions which are part of the pan-American system and as a result amassed a considerable amount of incidental and extraneous information of a technical and administrative character concerning the composition and functioning of permanent international bureaus and commissions. In collaboration with the public administration committee of the Social Science Research Council, Dr. Jessup began a study of this subject and the project later broadened to include not only official administrations and agencies established by American governments, but private international organizations operating in specialized fields, special emphasis being given to the structural and administrative aspects of these organizations.

The work covered approximately 114 organizations, supplied the names and addresses of each organization along with a brief account of its history, purpose, internal administrative structure, membership, finance, publications, and activities, and was intended primarily to

serve government officials and officers of international administration, students, teachers, and finally the public.

At this point it is appropriate to say something about the Commission To Study the Organization of the Peace, which while not a part of the endowment's direct program was treated as work through another agency to which the endowment was willing to grant financial support. The policy of the endowment in such instances is discussed in the concluding portion of this summary.

The commission in actuality was merely a continuation of the National Peace Conference referred to on pages 880 and 881. It came into being under that name in 1939, under the aegis of Dr. Shotwell and Clark M. Eichelberger—guiding lights of the peace conference—and immediately began organization of regional commissions and monthly discussion meetings.

It too had an "educational program," carried to rural communities, and furnished to press services, editors, educational writers, columnists, and commentators.

On June 6, 1941, the commission issued a document entitled "Statement of American Proposals for a New World Order."

In February 1942, this was augmented by "The Transitional Period."

A year later, 1943, the commission followed these with a statement dealing with steps that should be taken during the war to organize for the transition period.

Between then and 1944 these were added:

General Statement and Fundamentals

Part I—Security and World Organization

Part II—The Economic Organization of Welfare

Part III—The International Safeguard of Human Rights

A recapitulation of the principles laid down was issued after Dumbarton Oaks, entitled: "The General International Organization—Its Framework and Functions."

According to Dr. Finch (p. 248):

During the following Dumbarton Oaks Conference the commission kept the work of the conference before the public and organized an educational program in behalf of its proposals. It also directed its studies to subjects inadequately covered by or omitted from the proposals, such as human rights, trusteeship, and economic and social cooperation. Separate committees were set up on each of these subjects and their studies and conclusions were later published.

At the San Francisco Conference the commission was able to promote its objectives through many of its officers and members who were connected with the Conference in an official or consultant capacity. Following the signature and ratification of the charter and the establishment of the United Nations, the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace planned its studies and educational program with two purposes in view: Making the United Nations more effective by implementation and interpretation, and making it the foundation of the foreign policy of the United States.

The commission became the research affiliate for the American Association for the United Nations, with joint offices and interlocking officers in New York. It is estimated by Dr. Shotwell in his annual report of March 27, 1945, to the endowment that over 600,000 copies of the commission's reports had been distributed and distribution of over 3¼ million pieces of its popular material numbers.

In "Exhibit—Carnegie" statements taken from the endowment's yearbooks trace the steps taken by the endowment to advance the cause of the United Nations. The 1944 volume tells of the conferences attended by former officials of the League of Nations, as well as by government officials, and says the third "will be of interest to a much wider group, including not only officials but educators and others

deeply concerned with the need of adequate training for the staffs of many international agencies which are either in process of formation or are contemplated for the postwar period." The first of these conferences was held in August 1942—less than 9 months after Pearl Harbor—and the last was held in August 1943—2 years before the San Francisco Conference.

That same yearbook describes the activities of the endowment as having placed it "\* \* \*" in a peculiarly strategic position to cooperate with official agencies preparing to undertake international functions" and states that while the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations was engaged in preparing for the organizing conference of UNRRA it "\* \* \*" frequently called upon the division to assist by various means in these preparations."

The endowment supplied special memoranda to the conference, as well as copies of its various publications relating to international organization and administration. The special memoranda covered such subjects as International Conferences and Their Technique, Precedents for Relations Between International Organizations and Nonmember States, and the like.

The following year, 1945, the work of the Commission To Study the Organization of the Peace was again referred to (pp. 112-114) and a quotation concerning it has been included in "Exhibit—Carnegie."

The endowment had two other projects which fall into the international field—the International Economic Handbook and Commercial and Tariff History and Research in International Economics by Federal Agencies. The latter disclosed the extent to which the Government of the United States engaged in the study of economic questions and the resources of economic information at its disposal.

It also cooperated with the International Chamber of Commerce and Thomas J. Watson, a trustee of the endowment, was chairman of a committee established in 1939 by the chamber called a committee for international economic reconstruction. Dr. Finch described one of the first projects of the committee (p. 243) as "a program of public adult education in this country." Later the committee was renamed the committee on international economic policy and set about enlisting 54 leaders of national, business, industrial, education, and religious groups. These included Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich, President Nicholas Murray Butler, Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Mr. Leon Fraser, Mr. Clark H. Minor, Mr. Robert L. Gulick, Jr., Eric A. Johnston, Robert M. Gaylord, Paul G. Hoffman, Eliot Wadsworth, A. L. M. Wiggins, J. Clifford Folger, E. P. Thomas, and Fred I. Kent.

According to the yearbook, a public-relations committee was organized and professional news services were employed to reach American grassroots, in order to secure the widest possible distribution of the pamphlets produced by the committee, among which were:

- World Trade and Employment, by the advisory committee on economics to the committee on international economic policy.
- The International Economic Outlook, by J. B. Condliffe, associate director, division of economics and history, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Industrial Property in Europe, by Antonin Basch, department of economics, Columbia University.
- Price Control in the Postwar Period, by Norman S. Buchanan, professor of economics, University of California.
- Economic Relations With the U. S. S. R., by Alexander Gerschenkron, International Section, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

A Commercial Policy for the United Nations, by Percy W. Bidwell, director of studies, Council on Foreign Relations.  
 International Double Taxation, by Paul Deperon, secretary of the Fiscal Committee, League of Nations.  
 Discriminations and Preferences in International Trade, by Howard P. Whidden, economist, Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.  
 Principles of Exchange Stabilization, by J. B. Condliffe.  
 International Commodity Agreements, by Joseph S. Davis, director of the food research institute, Stanford University.  
 Import Capacity of the United States, by J. B. Condliffe and R. L. Gulick.  
 World Production and Consumption of Food, by Karl Brandt, Stanford University.  
 International Cartels, by A. Basch.  
 Export Policy, by Robert L. Gulick, economist, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.  
 The Relation Between International Commercial Policy and High Level Employment, by Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University.

Thousands of copies of the committee's pamphlets on international economic problems were distributed to business executives, agricultural leaders, diplomatic representatives, students, Government officials, servicemen, Members of Congress, and to congressional committees. A special project in this field was the work done at the time the reciprocal trade-agreements program came before Congress for renewal, when special literature in support of the program was prepared and distributed by the endowment.

The Rockefeller Foundation was working shoulder to shoulder with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in furthering "agencies devoted to studies, to teaching, to service to government and to public and expert education" on the assumption that while "it is not possible to guaranty peace \* \* \* the way to work toward it is to strengthen the 'infinity of threads that bind peace together.'" It selected many of the same agencies which had been chosen by the endowment for studies and related activities. In the international-relations field grants went to agencies which conduct research and education designed to strengthen the foundations for a more enlightened public opinion and more consistent public policies (1946 annual report).

This same foundation report (p. 40) mentions the appropriation to the Institute of Pacific Relations of \$233,000, much of whose work "is related to the training of personnel, the stimulation of language study, and the conduct of research on problems of the Far East. It is part of the pattern by which, from many different directions and points of view, efforts are being made to bring the West and East into closer understanding."

Two years earlier, the 1944 report of the foundation said: "China is the oldest interest of the Rockefeller Foundation," and it has spent more money in that country than in any other country except the United States. In addition to direct grants to China and Chinese projects of various sorts, the foundation also contributed to the Institute of Pacific Relations, including the American institute.

In that connection, it is interesting to note that 7 years before (1937 report, pp. 57-58) the foundation deplored the events of the previous year in China which "have virtually destroyed this proud ambition, in which the foundation was participating." The report praised the work accomplished up to that time by the Chinese National Government in their attempts "to make over a medieval society in terms of modern knowledge" but was somewhat pessimistic as to the oppor-

tunity "to pick up the pieces of this broken program at some later date."

From 1937 until 1950 the grants of the foundation to the Institute of Pacific Relations were \$945,000, compared with \$793,800 during the years prior to that (from 1929 to 1936, inclusive).

The Institute of Pacific Relations has been the subject of exhaustive hearings by other congressional committees, and mention is made of this particular comment only because as recently as 1952 (if financial contributions are one criterion) the foundation apparently considered the institute an agency "designed to strengthen the foundations for a more enlightened public opinion and more consistent public policies."

A section entitled "Conference on American Foreign Policy" in the 1916 endowment yearbook (pp. 24-25) begins: "To assist in informing public opinion concerning the foreign policy of the United States, the endowment sponsored a conference at Washington \* \* \*." Some 80 national organizations sent 125 representatives to hear from James F. Byrnes, then Secretary of State; Clair Wilcox, Director of the Office of International Trade Policy; Gov. Herbert Lehman; Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State; Alger Hiss, Secretary General of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco; and William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs.

From then on the endowment bent every effort to "reach public opinion" and particularly people not reached by any organization "since they have not been interested to join, and who do not realize that they too constitute public opinion and have to assume their responsibilities as citizens not only of the United States but of the world." This phraseology is strikingly similar to that found in the Handbook on International Understanding of the National Education Association.

It does not appear whether the foundation contributed to the Commission to Study the Organization of the Peace, but the annual reports refer to studies carried on by Brookings Institution, the Russian institute of Columbia University's School of International Affairs, the Institute of International Studies at Yale, all "aimed at the single target of world peace" (Dr. Fosdick's Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, p. 219).

In 1945 it aided in the publication of the reports and discussions of the various committees of the San Francisco United Nations Conference because "with respect to many crucial issues the really significant material is not the formal language of the articles of the charter, but the interpretation contained in the reports and discussions \* \* \*."

It also contributed to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe which in 1949 began a study of long-run trends in European economy, covering the period 1913-50 (1951 annual report, pp. 355-356).

This, the final part of the summary of activities of Carnegie and Rockefeller agencies, has been devoted to substantiating the statements made in its opening paragraphs; namely, that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation had—

Admittedly engaged in activities which would "directly or indirectly" affect legislation;

Admittedly engaged in "propaganda" in the sense defined by Mr. Dodd in his preliminary report;

Admittedly engaged in activities designed to "form public opinion" and "supply information" to the United States Government, calculated to achieve a certain objective, as for example, "an international viewpoint."

Quotations on each of these points, taken from the yearbooks of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and from the annual reports of the Rockefeller Foundation, as well as from other sources, have been referred to and are attached in separate exhibits.

Because of the method of reporting used by the endowment, it is frequently difficult to distinguish specific projects and organizations in its financial statements—disbursements in most instances being reported merely by divisions. In addition, the corporation worked closely with the endowment on certain types of projects, and also made lump-sum grants to the endowment.

An analysis of grants by these two Carnegie agencies and by the Rockefeller Foundation is shown below.

Because it is frequently stated by these foundations as well as others that the purpose of their grants is to serve as a catalytic force in getting a project underway, or provide support to an organization until it is well established, the period during which the foundation contributed funds to a particular organization is shown under the grants made.

Grantee organization	Carnegie		Rockefeller		Total contribution
	Corporation	Endowment	Foundation	Spelman fund	
			(\$169,000 General Education Board)		
American Council of Learned Societies (1924).....	\$901,850 (1924-52)	\$11,500 (1940-44)	\$11,069,770 (1925-52)	\$30,000	\$12,182,120
American Historical Association (1884).....	384,000 (1926-35)		190,830 (1925-37)	55,000	629,830
Brookings Institution (1916).....	2,493,624 (1922-50)	4,000 (1951-52)	1,848,500 (1924-52)	3,211,250	7,557,374
Council on Foreign Relations (1921).....	1,826,824 (1921-52)	12,000 (1937-42)	1,170,700 (1927-52)	150,000	3,189,524
Foreign Policy Association (1918).....	204,000 (1938-51)	16,000 (1934-40)	900,000 (1933-50)		3,189,524
Institute of International Education (1919).....	2,073,013 (1922-52)	200,000 (1941)	1,406,405 (1928-52)	240,000	3,847,148
Institute of Pacific Relations (1925).....	390,000 (1936-47)	184,000 (1927-41)	1,885,400 (1925-50)	165,000	2,449,400
National Academies of Science.....	5,406,500		110,000		5,516,500
National Research Council (1916).....	3,059,180 (1920-52)		11,555,500 (1922-52)	447,900	15,062,580
National Bureau of Economic Research (1920).....	848,503 (1924-52)		6,647,500 (1931-52)	125,000	7,621,003
New School for Social Research (1919).....	95,000 (1940)		208,100 (1940-44)		300,100
Public Administration Clearing House (1931).....	58,182 (1931-52)		10,740 (1931-52)	8,058,000	8,126,922
Royal Institute of International Affairs.....	244,100 (1938-51)		906,580 (1938-52)		1,150,680
Social Science Research Council.....	2,014,275		8,470,250	4,044,000	14,528,525
Encyclopedia of Social Science.....	269,124		600,000	100,000	969,124

<sup>1</sup> International relations clubs, regional centers, etc.



The projects for which these grants were made—in addition to those made for general support—covered such projects as:

A Handbook for Latin American Studies  
 Developing a training center for far eastern studies at the Congressional Library  
 (both by the American Council of Learned Societies)  
 Study of major aspects of Government finance for defense (by the National  
 Bureau of Economic Research)  
 Study of problems relating to training of leaders among free peoples (by the  
 Council on Foreign Relations)  
 Research on American foreign policy  
 Foreign relations  
 Political implications of the economic development of industrialized areas (all  
 by the Council on Foreign Relations)  
 Support of experimental educational program, publicizing the conflicting issues  
 of economic nationalism and internationalism.  
 Program for development of community centers of international education  
 (Foreign Policy Association)

Another statement frequently made by foundations, including both the endowment and the foundation—particularly when the actions of benefiting organizations or individuals arouse criticism—is that as a matter of policy no attempt is or should be made to supervise, direct or control organizations or individuals to whom these tax-exempt funds are given, because to do so would restrict the productivity of the grantees, and (it is inferred) be an attack on academic freedom. This attitude of objectivity, however, is at variance with other statements also found in the records of both the endowment and foundation.

In describing the administration of his division (Intercourse and Education) Dr. Butler's report in the 1928 year book (p. 38) states that, in addition to other work—

a large part of the activity of the division is devoted to the carrying out of specific, definite, and well-considered projects of demonstrated timeliness \* \* \* those in which the work is directed and supervised from the headquarters of the division and those which are carried out by the organizations or individuals to whom allotments are made from time to time. \* \* \* *It is not the policy of the division to grant subventions continuing from year to year to organizations or undertakings not directly responsible to the administration of the division itself.* \* \* \* [Italics supplied.]

This statement—included in its entirety in the exhibit of quotations from endowment records—is susceptible to only one interpretation: Unless a project, whether carried on by a particular organization or by a particular individual or group of individuals is under the direct supervision of the Division of Intercourse and Education, and reports thereon are satisfactory to that division, continued support will not be forthcoming from the endowment.

As mentioned earlier, the foundation does not use quite as dogmatic language in its reports, yet from its statements the same contradictory attitude is discerned, particularly when related to the activities and organizations to which it has continuously granted funds.

There is nothing ambiguous about the warning on page 9 of the 1941 annual report of the foundation:

If we are to have a durable peace after the war, if out of the wreckage of the present a new kind of cooperative life is to be built on a global scale, the part that science and advancing knowledge will play must not be overlooked.

This statement appears in the report for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1941—not quite 4 weeks after Pearl Harbor—yet there can be no doubt that, as far as the foundation was concerned, only “a cooperative life \* \* \* on a global scale” could insure a “durable peace.”

In the light of this attitude some of the individuals and organizations benefiting from foundation funds in the years since 1941 may seem a trifle unusual to say the least, particularly when a few pages further on, page 12, the report follows up this warning with:

A score of inviting areas for this kind of cooperation deserve exploration. Means must be found by which the boundless abundance of the world can be translated into a more equitable standard of living. Minimum standards of food, clothing, and shelter should be established. The new science of nutrition, slowly coming to maturity, should be expanded on a worldwide scale.

It is only natural to wonder about the agencies selected to work in these inviting areas to build “a cooperative life on a global scale.”

Among those to which the foundation gave funds were agencies also selected by the endowment to be directly responsible to the administration of its divisions, and some of these are sketched briefly now in relation to these declared policies.

The Public Administration Clearinghouse, the creation and financing of which Dr. Fosdick (page 206) calls “the great contribution of the Spelman Fund,” is also a grantee of the foundation.

Composed of 21 organizations of public officials representing functional operations of Government (such as welfare, finance, public works, and personnel) the clearinghouse is designed to keep public officials in touch with “the results of administrative experience and research in their respective fields” which he describes as having resulted in “wide consequences” which “have influenced the upgrading of Government services at many technical points—in the improvement of budgetary and personnel systems, for example, and the reform of State and local tax structures.”

The National Bureau of Economic Research, again quoting from Dr. Fosdick’s book, page 233, has brought within reach—

\* \* \* basic, articulated, quantitative information concerning the entire economy of the Nation. This information has influenced public policy at a dozen points. It was one of the chief tools in planning our war production programs in the Second World War and in determining what weights our economy could sustain. It underlies our analyses of Federal budgeting and tax proposals and projects like the Marshall plan. This same type of research has now spread to other countries, so that international comparison of the total net product and distribution of the economy of individual nations is increasingly possible.

After stating with some pride that the books and other publications of this organization “influence to an increasing degree the policies and decisions of governmental and business bodies”—page 213—Dr. Fosdick in the following chapter—page 232 stresses that its—

\* \* \* publications do not gather dust on library shelves. Its findings are cited in scientific and professional journals, treatises, and official documents. They are used by businessmen, legislators, labor specialists, and academic economists. They have been mentioned in Supreme Court decisions. They are constantly employed in Government agencies like the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census. Increasing use is being made of them by practicing economists in business, by editorial writers in the daily press, and by economic journalists in this country and abroad. Practically all of the current textbooks in either general economics or dealing with specific economic problems draw a great deal of their material from the publications of the Bureau or from data available in its files. It can be truly said that without the National Bureau

our society would not be nearly so well equipped as it is for dealing with the leading economic issues of our times.

The Institute of Pacific Relations has been the subject of exhaustive hearings by other congressional committees in which its subversive character has been thoroughly demonstrated.

The Foreign Policy Association has been discussed at length in the narrative portions of this report and reference has been made to Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean's citation in appendix IX. Also active in this association have been: Roscoe Pound, Stephen P. Duggan, Maxwell Stewart and his wife, Marguarite Ann Stewart (educational secretary in the association's department of popular education), Lawrence K. Rosinger, writer for the headline series, Stuart Chase, Alexander W. Allport (membership secretary of the association); Anna Lord Strauss, Philip E. Mosely, and Brooks Emeny (members of the editorial advisory committee), and Blaire Bolles and Delia Goetz, director and assistant director of the Washington bureau of the association.

The Council on Foreign Relations has also been discussed in detail, and while additional information could be included on specific activities it would be merely cumulative.

Two brief excerpts from the 1936 annual report of the foundation are, however, of particular pertinence in relation to the question of influencing governmental activity:

The program in social security has two central interests: (1) The improvement of the statistical record of structural and cyclical change and sharper identification of the causal factors involved; and (2) the analysis and adaptation of social measures designed to mitigate individual suffering due to unemployment which may be a result of economic change, or due to illness, accident, and old age, which are ordinary hazards of human life. The underlying assumption of this twofold program\* is that economic and social changes are to an appreciable extent manmade and hence controllable, and that, pending adequate understanding of the causes of disruptive change, the individual must be protected in the interest of political and social stability. \* \* \* The ameliorative aspect of the program is at present concerned with questions centering upon the social insurances and relief in the United States.

The program in public administration is designed to bridge the gap that exists between practical administrators in the Government service and scholars in the universities in the field of the social sciences. Aid had been given to the Social Science Research Council's committee on public administration, which itself sponsors research upon key problems of public administration, \* \* \* The foundation supports a number of such research enterprises together with a variety of projects designed to recruit and train a higher type of personnel for career service in the Government.

The objectives of the program in international relations are the promotion of understanding of, and greater intelligence in regard to, world problems among larger sections of the public, and the creation of more competent technical staffs attached to official or nonofficial organizations dealing with international affairs. The greater part of foundation interest is in enterprises concerned with the study of international problems for the purpose of informing and guiding public opinion. Three types of organizations are receiving foundation support: (1) Those like Chatham House in England and the Foreign Policy Association in the United States, which carry on the two functions of study and dissemination with almost equal emphasis; (2) those concerned primarily with research and the creation of personnel for technical and advisory service in connection with international problems; and, (3) those which focus upon coordinated research undertakings and periodic conferences with international representation, as the Institute of Pacific Relations and the International Studies Conference. (Pp. 230, 231, 232.)

\* The foundation's twofold program in social security.

The Social Science Research Council, which sponsored the 4-volume Study of the American Soldier, as well as a project entitled "Study of American Public Library." This actually deals with the public library inquiry, a project relating to educational films and their distribution that has been received with considerable criticism.

Moreover, the council's committee on government (through a special committee on civil rights) was selected to "encourage and aid competent scholars to record and analyze the management of civil liberties during the war and immediate postwar period" (Foundation Annual Report for 1944, p. 202). Prof. Robert E. Cushman of Cornell was chairman of the special committee, and in the 1948 annual report his assignment is referred to as a "factual examination of the civil-liberties issues" caused by "the actions taken to eliminate subversive individuals from Government service." "Rigid loyalty requirements" and "the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities" are among the problems to be studied "to reconcile, if possible, the claims of national security and civil liberty." Practically the first official act of Dr. Cushman as chairman was to place Dr. Walter Gellhorn in charge of the project for all practical purposes.

Based on their own records the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Rockefeller Foundation, have—

1. Contributed substantial sums of money to some or all of the organizations described in this and other portions of this summary.

2. Have or should have been aware that the stated purpose of many of the projects of these organizations has been to achieve certain objectives in the fields of international relations, foreign policy, and government.

There has been a singular lack of objectivity and a decided bias toward a socialized welfare state in the proposals of these organizations, and every effort has been made by them to advance the philosophy of "one world" to the complete disregard of comparable effort on behalf of a more nationalistic viewpoint.

3. Not only made grants to these organizations for general support, but have made specific grants for projects described in the preceding numbered paragraph.

The foundation has contributed \$63,415,478 since 1929 to projects which it classifies as in the field of social science, while grants it considers as in the field of the humanities total \$33,292,842 during the same period.<sup>5</sup>

The endowment, since it was organized, has expended approximately \$20 million, divided as follows: Division of intercourse and education, \$12.1 million; division of international law, \$4.8 million; division of economics and history, \$3.1 million.

Certainly, in justice to the endowment and the foundation it would be unfair to say that the amount of money so expended by them during the period described did not have some effect—at some point—on some matters. To accept the statement that there were no effects—or only coincidental ones—from such expenditures would indicate mental astigmatism at the very least, and would in a sense seem to accuse these foundations and their trustees of a somewhat careless, if not actually wasteful, attitude toward the funds entrusted to their care,

<sup>5</sup> Through 1952.

when (as is undeniable) the foundations continued to select the same or similar organizations, continued to make grants for the same or similar projects presented by such organizations, and continued to make grants to the same or similar individuals.

In addition, the reports of both the endowment and the foundation contain statements indicating both felt there were definite results from their activities as well as the activities of organizations to whom grants were made.

The 1934 yearbook of the endowment has one of these on page 22:

\* \* \* A review of the activities of the endowment since the World War, carried on separately through three main divisions, but operating as a unit in behalf of the great ideal of its founder, seems to justify the observation that the endowment is becoming an unofficial instrument of international policy, taking up here and there the ends and threads of international problems and questions which the Governments find it difficult to handle, and through private initiative reaching conclusions which are not of a formal nature but which unofficially find their way into the policies of governments.

Similar sentiments are expressed a decade later in the 1945 yearbook, page 28:

A reading of this report will make it plain that every part of the United States and every element of its population have been reached by the endowment's work. The result may be seen in the recorded attitude of public opinion which makes it certain that the American Government will be strongly supported in the accomplishment of its effort to offer guidance and commanding influence to the establishment of a world organization for protection of international peace and preservation of resultant prosperity.

The foundation, when it reorganized in 1929 to extend its work to include the social sciences, apparently anticipated some recognizable results (p. 258 of its annual report):

From research in the social sciences there should result modifications in governmental organization, in business practices, in social activities of all kinds which may further general well-being. As numerous functions of great significance are being assumed by governmental bodies through Federal, State, county, and municipal organization, the development of effective techniques becomes a necessity. Research which is closely tied up with practical activities is expected to furnish the basis of sound governmental policy.

There is no indication of a change of opinion in 1940, when describing its support of the National Institute of Public Affairs' "experimental program of recruiting and training personnel for the Federal services," the foundation reports (pp. 273-274 of annual report),<sup>6</sup> "the program has involved the annual placement of approximately 50 graduate students preparing for public-service careers, in agencies of the Federal Government for a year of practical apprenticeship" and adds with evident satisfaction that "60 percent of its 'interns' are now in the Federal service; several are in State and local or other government services, and a number are continuing graduate study."

Two years later the section dealing with the public administration committee begins:

The agencies through which society will seek to meet its diverse problems are multiform, and total effort, whether for defense or for the postwar world, will receive its primary direction through the agency of government \* \* \*.

Referring to its support of this committee during the preceding 7 years, the report gives the major studies of the committee, and ends with this paragraph:<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Entire extract included in exhibit.

<sup>7</sup> Entire extract included in exhibit.

More recently the committee has focused its resources and attention mainly on planning and stimulating rather than on executing research. A broadening of the program to include the field of government, with public administration as one sector, is now contemplated. Such a program would deal less with the mechanics of administration than with the development of sound bases for policy determination and more effective relations in the expanding governmental structure.

It is only commonsense, moreover, to conclude that, since the endowment and the foundation as a means of accomplishing their purposes had deliberately chosen certain organizations consistently as "agents," the trustees of those foundations would be entirely aware of the activities of the organizations selected, as well as the views expressed by their executives. Assuming such awareness—no contrary attitude being demonstrated—it could be concluded further that the results of such activities—whatever their nature—were not only acceptable in themselves to the trustees but were regarded by them as the proper means to accomplish the declared purposes of the foundations.

It is appropriate, therefore, to examine some of the results, among which have been:

#### *The Headline Books of the Foreign Policy Association*

Many were written by persons cited to be of Communist or Communist front affiliation and are questionable in content. They have been distributed widely and are used as reference works throughout the educational system of this country.

#### *The Cornell studies*

This project is under the direction of two individuals (described further on) who can scarcely be considered sufficiently impartial to insure a "factual examination" or an "objective finding."

#### *Development of a "post-war policy"*

The means selected was an extragovernmental committee, many of whose members later held posts in governmental agencies concerned with economic and other problems, as well as those concerned with foreign policy.

The sponsorship of individuals who by their writings are of a Socialist, if not Communist philosophy, dedicated to the idea of world government.

Among the individuals sponsored have been:

#### *Eugene Staley*

He is the author of *War and the Private Investor*, in which he recommended a "World Investment Commission" which along other suggestions presented bears a striking resemblance to the World Bank and present monetary policies of the world, including the United States.

He is also the author of *World Economy in Transition*, a report prepared under the auspices of the American Co-ordinating Committee for International Studies,<sup>8</sup> under the sponsorship of the Council on Foreign Relations, and financed by a Carnegie grant. The book expounds the theory that modern technology requires its materials from an international market, makes use of internationally discovered scientific information, and itself is international in viewpoint. According to Mr. Staley, we have a "planetary economy," and to reach the goal

<sup>8</sup> Mrs. Dean was a member of this committee at the time.

of international social welfare, the international division of labor requires a free flow of goods.

*Vera Micheles Dean*

Reference has already been made to Mrs. Dean who, according to the New York Times a few years ago, made a "plea for socialism" to 600 alumnae at Vassar College, saying our quarrel with communism must not be over its ends but over its methods; and urging a foreign policy backing Socialist programs.

Speaking of her book Europe and the U. S. in the book review section of the New York Herald Tribune of May 7, 1950, Harry Baehr, an editorial writer for that paper, wrote: "In other words, she considers it possible that the world may not be divided on sharp ideological lines but that there may yet be at least economic exchanges which will temper the world struggle and by reducing the disparity in standards of living between Eastern and Western Europe gradually abolish the conditions which foster communism and maintain it as a dangerous inhumane tyranny in those nations which now profess the Stalinist creed."

*Mr. and Mrs. Maxwell Stewart (Marguerite Ann Stewart)*

According to the 1947 California Report (p. 314) both of these people taught at the Moscow Institute in Russia. He praised "Soviet marriage and morals," and has been connected with tourist parties to the U. S. S. R., under Soviet auspices. He urged recognition of the Soviet Union, was a member of the editorial board of Soviet Russia Today, and endorsed the Hitler-Stalin pact.

*Lawrence K. Rosinger*

He declined to answer when asked by the McCarran committee whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party, after being named as a party member by a witness before that committee. He was a writer of the Headline Series of the Foreign Policy Association, among his contributions being "Forging a New China," "The Occupation of Japan," and "The Philippines—Problems of Independence." In February 1952—after he had refused to answer the question of the McCarran committee—he joined the staff of the Rhodes School.

*Dr. Robert Cushman*

Chairman of the special committee on civil rights of the Social Science Research Council's committee on government, Dr. Cushman's career before his association with the Cornell studies would indicate a rather one-sided viewpoint on civil rights. Prior to 1944, when the first Rockefeller Foundation grant was made to this project, Dr. Cushman had written occasional pamphlets (edited by Maxwell S. Stewart) for the public affairs committee, for example—

One written in 1936 suggested constitutional amendments to limit the powers of the Supreme Court (following its adverse decision on the New York minimum wage law), or else a delegation of specific powers to Congress to obtain passage of New Deal legislation;

One written in 1942 favored the "modernization" at that time achieved by the "new" Court after Roosevelt's appointees had been added;

A third written in 1940 recommended the writings of George Seldes and Arthur Garfield Hays, as well as publications of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Between 1944 and 1947 when the second grant was made by the foundation, Dr. Cushman wrote another pamphlet for the public affairs committee (in 1946), which was along the line of views expressed by the Commission on the Freedom of the Press.

In 1948, the year the foundation made a grant of \$110,000 to the project, Dr. Cushman again contributed a public affairs committee pamphlet, *New Threats to American Freedom*, specifically concerned with the anti-Communist drive. Because the abridgment of the civil liberties of any group (apparently even those of Communists in his opinion) endangers all civil liberties, Dr. Cushman argued, patriotic and loyal Americans cannot permit such a thing to happen, particularly since the difficulty of defining "communism" menaces the civil liberties of all liberals and progressives. He pilloried the House Un-American Activities Committee, and labeled the Mundt-Nixon bill and the Smith Act as threats to civil liberty.

In January 1947, in a paper presented to the American Academy of Political Science, Dr. Cushman characterized as "nonsense" the theory of guilt by association ("good boys may associate with bad boys to do good"). Also nonsense, according to Dr. Cushman, is designating as a fellow traveler, one who—

Joined organizations in which "there turn out to be some Communists,"

Signed petitions supporting policies "also supported by Communists,"

Sympathized with the Spanish Republicans, "some of whom were Communists,"

Professed a strong admiration of Russian culture and achievements.

More than a year later, in October 1948, he presented a dissertation on the repercussions of foreign affairs on the American tradition of civil liberties, included in the proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. There is little difference between this and the preceding paper, except that he used the technique of presenting supposedly the opinions of others, always unnamed. He repeated that "critics of the program" believe loyalty tests violate due process; requiring clearances for atomic scientists, "he has been told," impairs the quality of their work and leads to resignations; "many have said" that the House Un-American Activities Committee is politically minded—treats cases in the press—fails to define "un-American" and "subversive."

Concluding, he stated as his own belief that there is need for "an objective study" to avoid "heavy inroads" into traditional civil liberty. As mentioned, this was the year the foundation gave the largest grant—\$110,000.

In the 1951 annals of the American Academy of Political Science, Dr. Cushman referred to the work of congressional investigating committees as similar to a "bill of attainder," and again unhesitatingly defined a "Communist front" as an "organization in which there turn out to be some Communists." He "found" that social and humanitarian causes are weakened by guilt by association theories, because



people fear to support such causes lest later Communists also be found supporting them; national security also is weakened because the "ordinary citizen" is confused by the idea of guilt by association. Non-governmental antisubversive measures were also criticized—he referred particularly to the dismissal of Jean Muir by General Foods—and in Dr. Cushman's opinion, "it is hard to find any evidence that loyalty oaths of any kind serve any useful purpose beyond the purging of the emotions of those who set them up."

*Walter Gellhorn, of Columbia University*

A second collaborator in the Cornell studies, Walter Gellhorn, is apparently actually their director, and the author of a major volume in the studies, *Security, Loyalty, and Science*.

Dr. Walter Gellhorn is listed in appendix IX, page 471, as a "conscious propagandist and fellow traveler," and is in a group including Fields, Barnes, Jerome Davis, and Maxwell S. Stewart.

He was a leading member of some 11 Communist fronts.

He was a national committeeman of the International Juridical Association, whose constitution declares:

Present-day America offers the example of a country discarding the traditions of liberty and freedom, and substituting legislative, administrative, and judicial tyranny.

The American section's purpose is—

To help establish in this country and throughout the world social and legislative justice.

He is cited as an "active leader" of the National Lawyers Guild.

Appearing before the House committee in 1943, he denied the International Juridical Association and several other fronts with which he had been associated were communistic, had extreme difficulty remembering just what documents he might have signed, including a declaration of the National Lawyers Guild and a cablegram protesting Brazil's detention of an agent of the Communist international, a man named Ewert.

Dr. Gellhorn (Harvard Law Review of October 1947) prepared a Report on a Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, specifically defending the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, exposed as a Communist organization, and violently attacking the House committee. His book for the Cornell studies indicates Dr. Gellhorn had not changed his opinion either of the southern conference or the House committee.

The Daily Worker, March 15, 1948, under a heading "Gellhorn Raps 'Un-American,'" quoted from an article by Dr. Gellhorn (American Scholar—Spring 1948), in which he likened the House Un-American Activities Committee to a "thought control" program, and declared, "More important than any procedural reform, however, is conscious opposition to the House committee's bullying."

Dr. Gellhorn begins *Security, Loyalty and Science*, by expressing his fear that strict security regulations "would immobilize our own scientific resources to such an extent that future development might be stifled while more alert nations overtook and surpassed us." In spite of a lack of reciprocity on the part of others, Dr. Gellhorn believes that the fruit of our work should be fully published and not restricted, even if, as he offhandedly puts it, there is "no neat balance between the

outgoing of our information and intake \* \* \*” which in his opinion may “\* \* \* be entirely irrelevant.”

His theme is that security regulations and loyalty programs are useless and dangerous. He cites particularly category B of the Atomic Energy Commission, covering “undesirables”—those having sympathetic interests or associations with subversive ideas, friends, relatives, or organizations. Like Dr. Cushman, Dr. Gellhorn found it even “more alarming” that nongovernmental agencies are increasingly requiring clearances; he dismissed the House Un-American Activities Committee as indulging in repetition and exaggeration and added that they are responsible for scientists refusing to work for the Government. He belittled the Attorney General’s list, its designations to him to have no pattern, and he questioned the reliability of the confidential information frequently used.

He concluded that the loyalty program originated in anti-New Deal politics (beginning with the Dies committee in 1938), that it is ineffective against “the furtive, the corrupt, the conspiratorial,” and “the country will be stronger for discovering that the restraints of the present loyalty program exceed the needs of national preservation.”

Denial of AEC fellowships to Communists is unwarranted, in Dr. Gellhorn’s opinion, and he quoted approvingly statements of others that deplored the atmosphere of distrust and suspicion; thought loyalty checking brought into being a “police state” and the use of methods “far more dangerous than the small risk of having an occasional Communist on the fellowship rolls.”

As evidence that security files are misleading anyway, Dr. Gellhorn cited the fact that the Army in 1949 classified as “unemployable” Gordon R. Clapp of TVA, Professor Counts, and Roger Baldwin.

Dr. Gellhorn is also responsible for other books in this project. He is coauthor of a study on States and subversion (with William B. Prendergast, assistant professor of government at the Naval Academy), and of a study on the Tenney committee (with Edward Barrett, Jr., professor of law, University of California, who stated, “I am particularly grateful to Walter Gellhorn of Columbia University for his constant advice and suggestions and for his careful reading of the manuscript in two of its preliminary versions”).

These statements of Dr. Cushman and Dr. Gellhorn both prior to and after their association with the Cornell studies cannot be considered as those of “unbiased” and “objective” individuals. Dr. Gellhorn’s appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1943 was a matter of record. It is difficult if not far-fetched to believe that no inkling of these matters reached either the Social Science Research Council or the Rockefeller Foundation—before or after the grants were made by the foundation. Yet as far as can be ascertained neither organization has had anything but praise for the studies, and the personnel associated with it.

These then are some of the organizations selected by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, and the Rockefeller Foundation:

To promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States and the British Dominions.

To promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States; to advance the cause of peace among nations; to hasten the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy; to encourage and promote methods for the peaceful settlement of international

differences and for the increase of international understanding and concord; and to aid in the development of international law and the acceptance by all nations of the principles underlying such law.

To promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world.

These then are among the individuals—directly or indirectly—designated by these Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations as those not only best qualified to accomplish the noble purposes set out in their respective charters, but also those most likely to do so.

These are a few of the individuals who have gained prominence and whose reputation has been built up by the sponsorship and employment of foundations—either directly or through organizations receiving foundation funds to carry out projects approved if not selected by them.

No indication appears in the annual reports of these tax-exempt organizations—certainly not in those made available to the public—that the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, or the Rockefeller Foundation has disavowed the individuals, the organizations, or the results thereof, except in a few isolated instances reported in the Cox committee hearings.

Nor is there any indication that any one of these tax-exempt organizations has taken any measures—either before or after the Cox committee hearings—to insure that organizations as well as individuals receiving their funds in the future will use such funds to make studies which are in fact objective, not only with regard to the material considered, but also as to personnel; studies which will faithfully present facts on both sides of the issue or theory—particularly when it is of a controversial character. Nor have any measures been taken to prevent two equally improper uses of tax-exempt funds: first, under the guise of “informing public opinion”—propagandizing for a particular political philosophy or viewpoint; and second, again under the cloak of “supplying information to the Government”—presenting only information upholding a particular philosophy, or viewpoint, and which if accepted will tend to influence Government officials more and more toward socialistic solutions of current problems.

If any such precautions have been taken then discussion and decision as to them does not appear in the published reports, nor has any publicity been given to the fact.

KATHRYN CASEY,  
*Legal Analyst.*

JULY 1, 1954.

EXHIBIT—PART II. CARNEGIE

EXCERPTS FROM THE YEARBOOKS OF THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND MATERIAL TAKEN FROM OTHER SOURCES FROM 1911-1952

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1916 Yearbook:)

Page 33: “\* \* \* The publications of the endowment may be divided generally into two classes: first, those of a propagandist nature, which the general public is not expected to purchase but which the endowment desires to have widely read.”

\* \* \* \* \*  
Page 34: “\* \* \* There are several other phases of the subject of the proper distribution of the endowment’s publications which the Secretary believes should receive further consideration.

"The proposed charter of the endowment places upon an equal footing with its scientific work the education of public opinion and the dissemination of information. This is the proper light in which to view this branch of the work; unless the results of its efforts are read, appreciated, and utilized, the time, energy, funds of the endowment will be wasted. The problem therefore is deserving of the same serious thought as the problems of scientific work, which have heretofore received the chief consideration, but which now appear to be fairly solved.

"In speaking generally of educating public opinion and diffusing information, the trustees no doubt had in mind two distinct classes of people:

"(1) Those who are already of their own accord interested in the subjects which come within the scope of the endowment;

"(2) Those not now interested but who may be and should be made to take an interest in the work."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### EDUCATIONAL WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

Page 71: "That very important portion of the educational work carried on in the United States, which is conducted through the American Association for International Conciliation, has already been described.

"In addition to this the Division of Intercourse and Education has directly conducted work of an educational character of three kinds—publicity through the newspaper press, lectures, and preparation and distribution of material for use in schools and by writers of school textbooks.

#### *Publicity*

"With a view to spreading an interest in international affairs and a new knowledge of them among the people of the United States, articles on subjects of international interest based on interviews with men of prominence in public and business life have been prepared and offered to a large list of newspapers throughout the country on a business basis. The opinion has been expressed by a number of editors and conductors of newspapers that these articles have been of the highest value and have exerted a large influence on public opinion."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1917 Yearbook.)

#### DIVISION OF INTERCOURSE AND EDUCATION

Page 53: "The continuance of the world war which broke out on August 1, 1914, has caused the Division of Intercourse and Education to confine its activities to two fields. The first includes the information and education of public opinion in the United States as to those underlying principles of national policy and national conduct that are most likely to promote an international peace which rests upon a foundation of justice and human liberty. The second includes those activities which have as their purpose the bringing of the peoples of the several American republics more closely together in thought and in feeling. \* \* \*"

\* \* \* \* \*

#### EDUCATIONAL WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

Page 72: "In addition to the highly important educational work conducted for the division by the American Association for International Conciliation, two methods of reaching and instructing public opinion in the United States have been followed: publicity on international affairs through newspapers, and the preparation and distribution of material for schools and writers of school textbooks."

#### *Publicity*

"Syndicated articles mainly consisting of interviews with leaders of opinion in both American and European countries have been furnished to the newspapers on a commercial basis. These articles have not always been directly concerned with questions of international peace, but have furnished unusually valuable information on the public opinion, the political life, and the intellectual development of many nations. Their main object has been to increase in the United

States the amount and accuracy of knowledge of other countries and of their peoples. It is believed that the best foundation for international friendship and international justice is to be found in a thorough knowledge of our neighbors and a true appreciation of their institutions and their life."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### CONCLUSION

Page 82: "It is probable that the greatest war in all history is approaching its end. At this moment no one can predict just when or how this end will come, but there are plain signs to indicate that a crisis has been reached beyond which human power and human resources cannot long hold out. It will be the special privilege and the unexampled opportunity of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to take active part in the work of international organization which must closely follow on the conclusion of the war. For that task this division is making itself ready by study, by conferences, and by persistent effort to prepare public opinion to give support to those far-reaching projects based on sound principle which if carried into effect will do all that present human power can to prevent a recurrence of the present unprecedented calamity."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1918 Yearbook, p. 65:)

#### DIVISION OF INTERCOURSE AND EDUCATION

"The instruction of public opinion in this and other countries, the sympathetic cooperation with established effective agencies for the spread of accurate knowledge of international relations and international policies, and the cementing of those personal and national friendships which the war with all its separations has so greatly multiplied, have solely occupied the attention of the division. To these purposes its resources have been exclusively devoted."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1920 Yearbook, p. 62:)

#### EDUCATIONAL WORK

"A wide distribution of books, pamphlets, and periodicals has been made from the offices of the division, with the definite aim of informing public opinion on questions of international significance, and the educational activity of the policy clubs, together with the limited but important work in summer schools, have proved an effective means of developing the international mind."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1923 Yearbook, p. 58, division of intercourse and education:)

"It is the established policy of the division to try to keep important personalities in various lands informed as to influential expressions of opinion on foreign affairs made in this country. With this end in view a list of the names and addresses of over 500 persons eminent in their own countries is maintained at the division headquarters. This year the list has been extended to include representatives of Germany and Austria. Among the expressions of American opinion circulated by the division during the period under review were: *Shall Our Government Cancel the War Loans to the Allies?* by Justice John H. Clarke; *The State of Our National Finances*, by Edwin R. A. Seligman; *Intelligence and Politics*, by James T. Shotwell; *Toward Higher Ground*, by Nicholas Murray Butler; and *What of Germany, France, and England?* by Herbert Bayard Swope. That such pamphlets are carefully read and discussed in this country, it is the judgment of the division that it is of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of representative personalities in other lands to be read and discussed by them. The division assumes no responsibility for the contents of any books or articles so circulated save such as appear authoritatively over its own name \* \* \*." [Italics supplied.]

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1925 Yearbook, division of intercourse and education, pp. 49-50:)

"In respect of the general problem of international peace, public opinion is now almost everywhere persistently in advance of the action of governments. Only in rare cases do existing governments fully represent and reflect either the noblest ambitions or the highest interests of their own people in the discussions which are going forward throughout the world. \* \* \*

"Few proposals could be more futile than that merely to outlaw war. Such outlawry would only last until human passion broke down its fragile barrier. The neutrality of Belgium was amply protected by international law, and the invasion of the territory of that country on August 4, 1914, was definitely and distinctly outlawed. Nevertheless it took place. Precisely the same thing will happen in the future, no matter what the provisions of international law may be, if the springs of personal and national conduct remain unchanged. Forms do not control facts. Laws must reflect, but cannot compel public opinion \* \* \*." If such laws are to be truly effective, they must be not enforced but obeyed. They are only obeyed, and they only will be obeyed, when they reflect the overwhelming public opinion of those whom they directly affect. Once more, therefore, the path of progress leads to the door of conduct, both personal and national.

"It is beyond the limits of practical education or practical statesmanship to convince public opinion that there is not, and never can be, any cause for which men should be ready to lay down their lives if need be. The history of human liberty and the story of the making of free governments offer too many illustrations to the contrary. What is practicable is so to instruct, to guide, and to form public opinion that it will insist upon such national conduct and such public expressions on the part of representatives of governments as will promote international understanding and international cooperation, as well as reduce to a minimum those incidents, those policies, and those outgivings, whether on the platform, on the floor of parliaments, or in the press, that constantly erect such effective and distressing obstacles to the progress of international concord and cooperation."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 52: "Underneath and behind all these undertakings there remains the task to instruct and to enlighten public opinion so that *it may not only guide but compel the action of governments and public officers in the direction of constructive progress*. There must be present the moral conviction that a peace which rests upon liberty and justice is an ideal so lofty that no effort and no sacrifice may properly be spared in the task of securing its accomplishment. When this stage is reached it will not be necessary formally to limit armaments; they will atrophy from neglect and disuse.

"It is from precisely this point of view that the work of the division of intercourse and education has, from the beginning, dealt with the problem of international peace. The division has studiously refrained from mere sentimental expressions, and from participation in those futile acts which repel much more than they attract the support of right-minded men and women. The division has devoted itself for 15 years, and it will continue to devote itself, to the development among men and nations of the international mind. 'The international mind is nothing else than that habit of thinking of foreign relations and business, and that habit of dealing with them, which regard the several nations of the civilized world as friendly and cooperating equals in aiding the progress of civilization, in developing commerce and industry, and in spreading enlightenment and culture throughout the world.'" [Italic supplied.]

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1928 Yearbook, p. 38, division of intercourse and education:)

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE DIVISION IN THE UNITED STATES

"In addition to this stated work a large part of the activity of the division is devoted to *the carrying out of specific, definite, and well-considered projects of demonstrated timeliness*, such as those to be described in the following pages. These projects might be subdivided to include, on the one hand, those in which the work is directed and supervised from the headquarters of the division and those which are carried out by the organizations or individuals to whom allotments are made from time to time. For instance, not only was the European trip of editorial writers planned by and details arranged from the division offices, but two members of the staff, the assistant to the director, and the division assistant accompanied the party for the entire trip and were in charge of all administrative

details. The correspondence and careful arrangements necessary in connection with the work of the visiting Carnegie professors of international relations are also done from the division offices. On the other hand, when an allotment is made by the executive committee to such organizations as the Interparliamentary Union, the Institute of Pacific Relations, or Dunford House Association, the work is administered by these organizations who report to the division upon the work when completed. As has already been said, these allotments are always made in support of definite projects. It is not the policy of the division to grant subventions continuing from year to year to organizations or undertakings not directly responsible to the administration of the division itself. \* \* \* [Italic supplied.]

(Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1930 Yearbook, p. 108:)

"\* \* \* But it is not enough to have academies of this kind. The youth of each country should be instructed in international duties as well as in international rights in the colleges and universities of the nations at large. Therefore it is that the professors of international law and of international relations in the colleges and universities of the United States have met in conference in order to discuss and to agree upon the best methods to reach and to educate the youth—primarily of the United States—in the principles of international law and the bases of foreign relations. There have been four meetings: The first in 1914, the second in 1925, the third in 1928, and the fourth in 1929."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Yearbook, 1934:)

Page 22: "\* \* \* The attitude of the endowment toward applications from other organizations was fully explained in the secretary's report 2 years ago, where it was stated that 'The attitude of the endowment with reference to its support of other organizations in the same field presented a difficult question during the first half of the endowment's existence, but its experience has resulted in the definite policy of applying the revenue at its disposal to work carried on with the approval of its trustees and under the direct supervision of its own officers or agents.' What could not be undertaken during the earlier years of the endowment's existence, because of the war and its aftermath, so soon as the echoes of the war had died away was vigorously undertaken. A worldwide organization has been built up at a minimum of administrative cost, through which the endowment is in contact with the public opinion of nearly every land. The endowment is consequently not a money-granting, but an operating, body, and it operates through its own agencies either directly or through those which become substantially its own through their spirit and method of cooperation."

\* \* \* \* \*  
 Page 22: A review of the activities of the endowment since the world war, carried on separately through three main divisions, but operating as a unit in behalf of the great ideal of its founder, seems to justify the observation that the endowment is becoming an unofficial instrument of international policy, taking up here and there the ends and threads of international problems and questions which the governments find it difficult to handle, and through private initiative reaching conclusions which are not of a formal nature but which unofficially find their way into the policies of governments."

\* \* \* \* \*  
 DIVISION OF INTERCOURSE AND EDUCATION

Page 44: "\* \* \* If the world is to return, and without delay, to the path of progress, it must be given leadership which is not only national but international. It must find minds and voices which can see the whole world and its problems, and not merely those of one neighborhood since important problems which are purely national have almost ceased to exist."

\* \* \* \* \*  
 REPORT OF DIVISION OF INTERCOURSE AND EDUCATION

Page 47: "The work of the division during the year shows definite progress along the path of constructive work for the education of public opinion throughout the world. This advance could not have been accomplished had it not been for the efficient and well ordered work of the central office where cost of over-

head is reduced to a minimum and where the staff, in full conformity with the NRA regulations, is faithfully carrying on its tasks."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 53: "While in the broadest sense all the work of the division is educational there are certain items which fall definitely under this head in making a report on the year's work. They have all been carried on with a view to the general enlightenment of public opinion and to encourage further study along international lines rather than as definite and continuing projects, such as those to be described later, which are an integral part of the work of the division."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 96: "It is plain from what has been written that the year has been one of constant study and vigorous work despite the fact that the world atmosphere has been distinctly discouraging. That economic nationalism which is still running riot and which is the greatest obstacle to the reestablishment of prosperity and genuine peace has been at its height during the past 12 months. If it now shows signs of growing weaker it is because its huge cost is beginning to be understood. It is only by such education of public opinion as that in which the division of intercourse and education is so largely engaged that this violently reactionary movement can be checked and there be substituted for it such international understanding, international cooperation, and international action as the needs and ideals of this present-day world so imperatively demand."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1937 Yearbook:)

Page 180: "\* \* \* The major portion of the present work of the division of intercourse and education is devoted to educating public opinion in the significance of this forward-facing and constructive program for international cooperation.

"What I want to point out to the newer trustees is that what has been going on for 18 years is the result of most careful study and reflection, a result of consultation with leaders of opinion in every land, and is justifying itself not in any quick action by governments, but in the very obvious growth of public opinion."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 182: "As to the work of the division of international law, that is a business of instruction, a business of education, a business not to make all members of a democracy international lawyers, but to put everywhere possible the material by means of which the leaders of opinion in all communities may know what are the real rights and duties of their country, so that it may be possible for the people who do not study and are not competent to understand, to get a source of intelligent and dispassionate information. And that process has been going on steadily.

"We had one very important illustration of the advantage of it during the past year. I really do not know how the Far-Eastern work of the late Conference upon the Limitation of Armament could have been done without MacMurray's book which had just a few months before been published by the endowment. The whole process of ranging the nine nations represented in the conference upon a basis of agreement for the treatment of Chinese questions so as to facilitate the heroic efforts of the Chinese people to develop an effective and stable self-government would have been exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, if we had not had those two big volumes published by the endowment upon our tables for access at any moment. We were continually referring to them and the members could turn to such a page and find such a treaty and such an agreement and have the real facts readily accessible. If the tentative arrangement towards helping the Chinese in their struggle works out, as I think it will, the publication of those books, at the time when they were published, will be worth to the world all the money that has been spent on the division of international law from the beginning. There were a dozen other books to which we continually referred."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1941 Yearbook, Report of the Division of Economics and History, p. 117:)

"\* \* \* All history shows, however, that these appeals to man's higher nature have had no permanent effect except where substitutes for war have been found



which could be used effectively in the settlement of disputes. The peace movement of the twentieth century owed whatever real strength it might have possessed to the fact that for the first time it concentrated upon this constructive aspect of the problem. Unfortunately, however, this method of approach was too new to be fully understood, with the resultant failures culminating in the present war. The events of the last 5 years, since Japan tested the peace machinery in the Far East, and then Italy and Germany followed its example in Africa and Europe, have clearly shown that if civilization is to survive somehow or other the peace machinery must be brought back into operation. The problem which confronted the makers of the League of Nations has again become a vital issue. The increasing awareness of this fact, not only here but in Great Britain and in the Dominions of the Commonwealth, is evidenced by the growth of a considerable number of bodies for research and discussion. Of one of these, the *Commission to Study the Organization of Peace*, the Director of this division was chairman, although in a purely personal capacity. Mention is made here of this effort because of the light which it throws upon the nature of the problem itself. It would be hard to find a greater contrast than between the background of the thinking of today and that of the vague and uncertain beginnings of similar discussions in 1917. The experiences of the League of Nations has after all taught us much, its failures equally with its successes. The most surprising feature, however, is the record of the International Labor Organization in the field of social welfare, a unique and wholly new experiment in international legislation. *It is this kind of planning for a new world order on a cooperative basis which furnishes the constructive program of the peace movement at the present time. It is therefore important to ensure the preparation of careful and thoughtful monographs in the various fields covered by these surveys in order to prevent a recurrence of the superficiality which marked so much of the peace movement of the 1920's. It is here that the division of economics and history continues to offer the contribution of specific objectives and definite studies such as those indicated below.* [Italics supplied.]

---

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1942 Yearbook:)

DIVISION OF INTERCOURSE AND EDUCATION

Page 27: "The aims which the division pursues and which it urges constantly and steadily upon public opinion in the United States, in the Latin American democracies and in the British Commonwealth of Nations are definite and authoritative. They are three in number.

"The first is the formal proposal for world organization to promote peace made by the Government of the United States in 1910. This was contained in the joint resolution passed by the Congress without a dissenting vote in either the Senate or the House of Representatives and signed by President Taft on June 25, 1910."

---

Page 28: "The second is the statement of principles adopted by the international conference held in London at Chatham House on March 5-7, 1935. This conference, called by the Carnegie Endowment, remains the outstanding international conference of recent years."

---

Page 29: "The third is the important Atlantic Charter as declared by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the Government of Great Britain on August 14, 1941, which may be regarded as an endorsement of, and a supplement to, the principles proposed by the conference held at Chatham House."

---

Page 30: "It is these three declarations of policies and aims which are the subject of the worldwide work of the division of intercourse and education. They are the outgrowth of war conditions and of the threat of war. They are constructive, simply stated and easy to understand. As rapidly as other nations are set free to receive instruction and information in support of this three-fold program, that instruction and information will be forthcoming. The war may last for an indefinite time or it may, through economic exhaustion, come to

an end earlier than many anticipate. In either case, the division of intercourse and education is prepared to carry on in the spirit of Mr. Carnegie's ideal and of his specific counsel."

---

Page 91: "The division likewise cooperates with various Government offices and with international organizations. Thus during the past year it has aided the Department of State in editing the many papers submitted to the ninth section (on international law, public law, and jurisprudence) of the Eighth American Scientific Congress. Such cooperation is appropriate because officers of the division served as chairman and secretary, respectively, of section IX, and the division's staff acted as the section's secretariat. Cooperative relations are also maintained with the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and with other Government agencies. Of a somewhat similar nature are the relations maintained with such international organizations as the Pan American Union and the Inter-American Bar Association. The assistance thus rendered to organizations official and unofficial, often requires the expenditure of much time, but it should be added that the relationship is not infrequently of mutual benefit since the division is often in a position, as a result thereof to obtain data which might not otherwise be readily accessible to it."

\* \* \* \* \*

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1943 Yearbook.)

Pages 29-30: "The policies which were put in operation a quarter of a century ago, with the approval of more than 200 of the leading statesmen and intellectual leaders of the whole world, have proved to be most satisfactory and most important. Literally millions of human beings have been led to read together and to discuss the facts and the forces which constitute international relations and which make for peace of the country. Thousands of groups in the United States and hundreds of groups in other lands gather regularly to discuss the books that are provided by the endowment and to hear the lectures which are offered by visiting Carnegie professors.

"The work of the division has carefully avoided the merely sentimental or that sensational propoganda for peace which is all too common. It has based its work, and will continue to do so, upon the intellectual forces which alone can guide the world in the establishment of new and constructive policies of international cooperation to make another war such as now rages practically impossible."

---

Page 36: "Preparation of Programs for Secondary Schools: Special inquiry into the needs of secondary schools in the field of international relations study, under the direction of Professor Erling M. Hunt, of Teachers College, Columbia University, was carried on in cooperation with the *Commission to Study the Organization of Peace*. A group of New York City high school teachers took part in a summer working conference for a week. They planned and drafted an 80-page booklet which included reading and study suggestions for the use of senior high school students entitled *Toward Greater Freedom: Problems of War and Peace*. This has been published and distributed by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

"The School of Education of Stanford University, California, was assisted by the division in bringing together, in July, a group of high school teachers and administrators from schools in the Pacific Coast and Mountain States. The group devoted 2 weeks to intensive analysis of war issues and postwar problems as they affect the curriculum and the individual teacher. As a result a report, *Education for War and Peace*, embodying the findings of the groups and intended as a pamphlet for immediate use in schools, has been published by the Stanford University Press." [Italics supplied.]

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 37-38: "Any doubts which might have been entertained as to the value of the International Relations Club work in colleges and universities, during the long years in which the endowment has been operating, must have been completely dispelled by the magnificent response that has come from both faculty advisers and students during this period of disruption and confusion caused by the present worldwide catastrophe. Each of the 12 regional conferences was carried through during the calendar year 1942. This is the more remarkable since difficulties have increased rather than lessened as the war progresses. Almost every letter

received at the opening of the academic year announced that faculty advisors were leaving their respective campuses to serve in the armed forces or to support in advisory capacity Government defense projects, but even when called away summarily these faculty members have found time to appoint successors and to write a heartening letter as to the importance of carrying on. The drain upon the student body through induction into the Army has been overwhelming. In many of the colleges students are using their spare time in local war industries or in defense work if they have not actually left college, and most of the studies have been directed along engineering and other lines closely connected with the war effort. But even the boys who know that within a few weeks they will be in a military camp have tried to learn the deeper causes of the war through continued attendance at the club meetings, and at many of the conferences uniforms have been in evidence, worn by ex-club members who have been granted permission to attend. In fact, the clubs have continued with more enthusiasm and vigor than ever before.

---

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944 Yearbook, pp. 70-74:)

"Many problems of international organization and administration are confronting the United Nations authorities, and problems of that nature will assume far greater importance as the war draws to an end and postwar activities undergo the large-scale development now anticipated. Foreseeing such a trend, the division has given much attention to this field during the past 2 years.

"There is, of course, no international civil service to evolve formal rules, practices, and precedents for future guidance in international administration; and although there has been encouraging progress in methods of international organization, those methods are not as yet beyond the trial-and-error stage. Moreover, the literature in these fields is extremely inadequate. Yet valuable experience has been acquired in both administration and organization, especially by the Secretariat of the League of Nations, the International Labor Office, and other international agencies, some of which have functioned successfully over a considerable period of years. This experience however, is contained partly in unpublished records and, to an even greater extent, in the memories of those who have served in the organizations in question; and it is therefore not available for the guidance of the many officials and agencies now actively concerned in planning and setting up the machinery for future international cooperation.

"With a view to making available the most important features of such experience, the division has held a series of conferences which have been attended by officials and former officials of the League of Nations and of other international bodies, and in some instances by government officials and others especially interested in the fields of the conferences. The first of these meetings, held in New York on August 30, 1942, was of an exploratory nature, its chief purpose being to determine what particular aspects of the experience of the League of Nations Secretariat might be further studied and recorded in usable form. At the end of the following January a second conference was held at Washington, which was devoted specifically to a survey of experience in international administration. And some 6 months later, on August 21-22 of last year, a third conference was held in Washington to discuss the problem of training for international administration. The proceedings of the first two conferences were issued in confidential mimeographed editions and given a restricted distribution, chiefly among government agencies and their personnel. The proceedings of the third conference, however, will be of interest to a much wider group, including not only officials but educators and others deeply concerned with the need of adequate training for the staffs of many international agencies which are either in process of formation or are contemplated for the postwar period. For this reason, the proceedings of the third conference have been carefully edited and supplemented with documentary materials, and printed for a wider distribution."

\* \* \* \* \*

"As a result of the conferences and related activities, as well as of the studies made by its staff, the division has established useful relations with many highly qualified and experienced experts, and this in turn has made it possible to plan and arrange for the preparation of a series of studies by a number of these experts on international organization and administration. The studies, more fully described below, record both experience and precedents in the fields in question and constitute a rich source of information which, in the main, has hitherto been inaccessible.

"These activities of the division have placed it in a peculiarly strategic position to cooperate with official agencies preparing to undertake important international functions. At the outset, such agencies are, of course, confronted with problems of organization and administration, and it is a matter of urgent necessity for them to obtain materials which will assist them in meeting these problems. It is a source of great satisfaction to the director that the division has been in a position to supply such materials. Without attempting to list these instances of cooperation in detail, mention should be made here of a few examples by way of illustration.

"For some months, the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations (OFRRO) was engaged in preparations for the organizing conference of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) held at Atlantic City, November 10 to December 1, and it frequently called upon the division to assist by various means in these preparations. Thus, in August, the division was able to arrange to have several officials of the League of Nations come to Washington to take part in discussions of plans for the administrative budget of the new organizations. In a letter to the endowment former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, then director of OFRRO and recently chosen director of UNRRA, wrote expressing his 'great appreciation for the very real contribution which you and the Carnegie endowment made to our preparations for a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization.'

"Members of the staff of OFRRO were early supplied by the division with the materials assembled as the result of the several conferences on international organization and administration above mentioned. As the date of the conference in Atlantic City approached, the division received numerous additional and more urgent requests for assistance from OFRRO. In compliance with these requests, several special memoranda were prepared under great pressure for use in connection with the UNRRA conference. These dealt with the following subjects:

"International Conferences and Their Technique

"Precedents for Relations Between International Organizations and Nonmember States

"Status of Observers at International Conferences

"Secunding by International Organizations and from National Services to International Agencies

"The Creation, Composition, and Functioning of Standing Committees of UNRRA

"The appreciation with which these contributions from the division were received can hardly be overstated. As an illustration, mention may be made of a personal note of November 17 received by the director from Dr. Philip C. Jessup, a member of the endowment's board of trustees, and then serving as Assistant Chief of the Secretariat of UNRRA. After describing one of the documents as having proved 'most helpful in the solution of some troublesome problems'; and expressing amazement that it had been possible to supply 'so thoughtful and so complete a document under such enormous pressure of time,' Dr. Jessup referred to other materials supplied by the division as being 'also very much appreciated,' and added: 'I think the endowment is certainly entitled to congratulate itself upon the contribution it has made to the smooth functioning of international organizations which, to a large extent, must be the mechanical means of developing international peace.'

"It should be added that, in addition to these special memoranda, the division supplied several copies of its various publications relating to international organization and administration to the library of the conference at Atlantic City. Shortly after the conference met, an urgent request was received from the American delegation at Atlantic City for additional copies of these publications, to be sent to the conference by special courier. The division was, of course, glad to meet this request. Of a somewhat different nature were the numerous urgent inquiries for specific information received from officials connected with the conference. These inquiries dealt with such topics as relations of former enemy governments after the last war with the American Relief Commission, diplomatic immunities of members of international organizations, and staff regulations of such organizations. In each instance, the division was able either to supply the information requested, or to indicate the best source from which it could be obtained.

"Similarly, though to a somewhat lesser degree, the division has cooperated with the recently created Interim Commission of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture. Copies of the endowment's publications on international organization and administration were supplied to the Commission; the

director and other members of the division staff have conferred with the executive secretary of the Commission on problems relating to the constitution, organization, and staffing of the newly created body; and the division has supplied the Secretariat with data on inter-American agencies dealing with problems in the fields of food and agriculture.

"In addition to such special inquiries, the division receives from day to day, often by telephone, requests for information from government offices on technical subjects in the international field. Although these are too numerous to list here, it may be said that they are answered as fully as possible and as promptly as is consistent with scrupulous accuracy. The assistance rendered by the division has not been limited, however, to American and international agencies. It maintains cordial and often mutually helpful relations with the diplomatic missions in Washington and frequently supplies them with published materials and other data.

"These studies, mentioned on a previous page, are in fact competently written monographs. Because of the urgent demand for such materials, they are being issued in preliminary form in small mimeographed editions. It is the Director's belief, however, that they have much more than a transitory value, and that as soon as is practicable some of them should be published in revised and permanent form. The following list comprises the studies already issued in mimeographed form:

"Memorandum on the Composition, Procedure, and Functions of the Committees of the League of Nations

"International Conferences and Their Technique—a handbook

"International Drug Control, a Study of International Administration by and through the League of Nations

"The League of Nations and National Minorities, an Experiment

"The following studies are now being prepared and will be published during the coming year:

"The Situs of International Organization

"Diplomatic Immunities and Privileges of Agents and Staff Members of the International Organization

"Relations Between International Organizations and Nonmember States

"The Participation of Observers in International Conferences

"The Economic and Financial Organization of the League of Nations

"The League of Nations' Mandates System

"The League of Nations' Secretariat

"Financing of International Administration

"The names of the authors of these studies are being withheld for the present. They are all, however, present or former officials competent from actual experience to deal with the subjects involved." [Italics supplied.]

\* \* \* \* \*

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945 Yearbook:)

#### THE LIBRARY AND INFORMATION BUREAU

Page 25: "The work of the library has continued along the same general lines described in previous reports. In accordance with the policy adopted in 1942, governmental agencies were given precedence in the use of the library's materials. In addition, its resources have been used by numerous foreign embassies and legations and by the participants of such international meetings as those at Dumbarton Oaks. Scholars, press representatives, professors, and international, national, and local organizations have also been served.

"The ever-increasing discussion of the peace to follow the present war has brought renewed demands for information on the subject. The endowment's library is known in Washington for its wealth of material on peace and international organization and for its services in making these materials available. As a result, library staff members have spent an increasingly large proportion of their time in reference work with visitors. At the same time, due to the accelerated publication program in the Division of International Law, reference work for the endowment staff has been tremendously increased."

Page 30: "The proposals of statesmen and of public leaders for United Nations organization and the formation of general opinion on these plans have been the basis of growing action during the past year in the extension of the division's work. Both by continuous contact with central groups operating programs of study in the main regions of the country and by collaboration with local institutes and councils, this important interest has been pursued. The announce-

ment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals heightened its significance in the last quarter of the year and gave immediate political reality to it as an issue facing our people.

"The development of centers in many part of the country, for organizations associated with the endowment, has been described in preceding reports. The brief summary of their expanding activities which can be given here demonstrates that, although the programs and methods of the various centers differ, there is agreement as to their fundamental purpose: to educate public opinion in regard to the underlying principles essential to security after the war and to welfare throughout the world."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 103: "As this report goes to press, the interest of the civilized world centers upon the United Nations Conference on International Organization meeting at San Francisco on April 25. As this event promises to be the culmination of much in the program of planning and policy advocated repeatedly in the annual reports of this division and in its work and that of its director in affiliated organizations, it is fitting to comment upon it and the nature of the peace settlement at the end of the Second World War, of which it is so important a part. Therefore, without in any way attempting to anticipate what may or may not be done at the San Francisco Conference, it seems not only valid but necessary to link it up with the outlook and activities of the Endowment.

"During the past 5 years, both within the program of the division itself and in connection with the research work for the International Chamber of Commerce and the *Commission To Study the Organization of Peace*, the director has been engaged upon a comprehensive series of studies dealing with postwar economic policies and international organization \* \* \*.

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 105-106: "The provision of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for the erection of an Economic and Social Council under the Assembly, a provision unfortunately absent from the Covenant of the League of Nations, has not yet received anything like the attention which it deserves. Naturally the provisions for security take the precedence in all discussions of the plan for world organization, but in the long run the provision for the economic organization is more important, if the security organization succeeds in the establishment of peace for even a generation. The advancement of science will ultimately outlaw war, if it has not already done so, but creates vast new problems in the field of economic relationships.

"This inescapable conclusion is now widely shaded by thoughtful people, but its application in practical politics is by no means assured in the most enlightened countries. Here, therefore, is the area of international relations in which the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace should continue to concentrate. The affiliation with the International Chamber of Commerce should be strengthened through the Committee on International Economic Policy. At the same time the interplay of all these forces making for peace and international understanding is translated into concrete form by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace with which this division of the endowment has also been closely associated.

"It is, however, fitting and proper now to record the fact that the director of the division was consultant in the State Department for a year and a half during all of the earlier phases of the planning of the General International Organization agreed upon at the Moscow Conference and finally developed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The plans of the small subcommittee on postwar organization, meeting under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary, Mr. Sumner Wells, of which the director was a member, have remained basic throughout the period of negotiation. The director was also a member of the Security Committee, the agenda of which covered, among other things, the problem of armaments, and the Legal Committee, concerned with American participation in an International Court of Justice, and other problems of international law. More important, from the standpoint of practical politics was the political committee in which some members of the technical committees sat in conference with some of the leading Senators and Congressmen under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State. These formal discussions, which were held almost every week for several months, have borne good results in strengthening the relations between the executive and legislative branches of the Government with reference to the postwar settlement. It goes without saying that Secretary Hull, aware from long experience of the need of cooperation between the State Department and Congress, did not

by any means limit his contacts to these formal meetings. Nevertheless, they were of real importance in the clarification of policy.

"In the field of cultural relations, the director resigned his chairmanship of the National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation, an office which he had held by virtue of his membership of the Organization of International Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations. At a conference of representatives of the various national committees of the Latin-American countries held in Washington, he was elected member of a small international committee created to give effect to the resolution of the Havana Conference of 1941. Progress of the war, however, has interrupted this development and the organizing committee is happily faced with a new and much more developed plan for post-war organization in cultural relations under the auspices of the State Department, than the advisory committee of which the director was a member until its dissolution."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### PUBLICATIONS

Page 112: " \* \* \* General International Organization: This is a statement prepared by the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace which summarized the conclusions of past reports and recast them with reference to the plans then under consideration for the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. It is gratifying to note the many points of this statement which parallel the proposals of that conference. Upon the conclusion of the conference, the commission issued a statement to the press which was commented upon in a letter to the director by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., then Under Secretary of State, as follows: 'The statement is another indication of the notable service in working for an objective and scientific approach to the problems of international organization which has marked the publications of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace in the past.'"

\* \* \* \* \*

#### EDUCATION

Page 114: "When the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were made public, the commission called together the heads of 75 national organizations to discuss a wide-spread educational program to bring the proposals before the American public. These groups have been meeting regularly in New York City, discussing both publications and education techniques. Representatives from the Department of State have been attending the meetings.

"The commission has cooperated also in the regional conferences at which representatives of the State Department have met with organizational leaders in off-the-record discussion of the proposals. Meetings were held in Portland, Salt Lake City, Detroit, Salina, Dallas, St. Paul, and Atlanta. Large public conferences on the proposals were held in New York City and other key centers, the meetings being arranged by the commission's regional offices. In addition, the commission continued its regular educational program, working with other national organizations, schools and colleges, labor, farm, and business groups, and concentrating considerable attention on rural areas and small towns.

"Special institute meetings were held in cooperation with the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches in Dallas, Tex.; LaFayette College, Pa.; Miami and Winter Park, Fla.; Chicago, Ill. The regional commissions have held other public conferences and institutes throughout the year."

The series of lectures which the commission has been sponsoring at the New School for Social Research has now covered a considerable number of problems of postwar international organization, dealing with labor, cultural relations, mandates, plebiscites, the World Court, public health, minorities, moving of populations, human rights, international education, and an analysis of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The lecturers included Clark M. Eichelberger, Prof. Carter Goodrich, Dr. Walter Kotschnig, Prof. Oscar I. Janowsky, Prof. Quincy Wright, Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, Dr. Frank L. Lorimer, Mr. Beryl Harold Levy, Dr. Hans Simons, Dr. Sarah Wambaugh, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, and the director of the division.

Over 600,000 copies of the commission's reports have been distributed and the distribution of its popular material numbers 3¼ million pieces. A number of basic pamphlets were published in 1944, including a guide to community activity and discussion entitled, "The Peace We Want"; a third revision of a high-school pamphlet, Toward Greater Freedom; a revised edition of a farm pamphlet, Win-

ning the War on the Spiritual Front; a picture book of full-page illustrations by the artist, Harry Sternberg, of the commission's statement of fundamentals, a project undertaken with the cooperation of the Committee on Art in American Education and Society; an analysis and comment on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, prepared by Clark M. Eichelberger. In 3 months 50,000 copies of this pamphlet were distributed, it being used by many groups as a basic text. A third printing is now being made.

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Yearbook 1946:)  
Pages 24-25:

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

"The endowment was invited by the Secretary of State to send representatives to serve as consultants to the American delegation at the United Nations Conference on International Organizations held at San Francisco, April 25-June 26, 1945, at which the charter of the United Nations was drafted and signed. In response to this invitation, the endowment was represented at the conference by *Dr. James T. Shotwell*, director of the division of economics and history, who served as a consultant, and *Mr. George A. Finch*, secretary of the endowment and director of its division of international law, who served as associate consultant. A number of other trustees were present at the conference in an official or consultative capacity. *Mr. John Foster Dulles* was an official adviser to the American delegation, and *Mr. Philip C. Jessup* was a technical expert on judicial organization. Endowment trustees representing other organizations were *Messrs. David P. Barrows, W. W. Chapin, Ben M. Cherrington, and Harper Sibley. Mr. Malcom W. Davis*, associate director of the division of intercourse and education, was the executive officer of the first commission of the conference."

\* \* \* \* \*

CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

"To assist in informing public opinion concerning the foreign policy of the United States, the endowment sponsored a conference at Washington on November 26-27, 1945, of representatives of national organizations who took part in a discussion program with officers of the Department of State concerning America's Commitments for Peace. The secretary of the endowment acted as its representative in carrying out the details of the conference. Eighty national organizations accepted the endowment's invitation and were represented by its 125 delegates. The conference was greeted in person by Secretary of State *James F. Byrnes*. There were four sessions. The first was devoted to World Trade and Peace. The official statement on the subject was made by *Mr. Clair Wilcox*, director of the Office of International Trade Policy. The second session dealt with Relief and Rehabilitation. Governor *Herbert H. Lehman*, Director General of UNRRA, laid the facts of the situation before the conference.

"At the third session, Hon. *Dean Acheson*, Under Secretary of State, explained the official policies toward Germany and Japan. At the concluding session, *Mr. Alger Hiss*, Secretary General of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, made a progress report of the United Nations Organization. Following the presentation of the leading address or paper at each session, a panel of experts from the Government offices chiefly concerned answered questions propounded by the assembled representatives of the national organizations. At a luncheon tendered by the endowment at the close of the conference, Hon. *William Benton*, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of public affairs, explained the International Information Program of the Department of State. Letters of commendation have been received from many of the national representatives who were in attendance, and a letter expressing appreciation of the cooperation of the endowment was sent by Secretary of State *Byrnes* to President Butler under date of December 7." [Italics supplied.]

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 45: "As a result of the continued educational program which the Minnesota United Nations Committee at St. Paul has conducted for the division throughout the year, there is reason to believe that public sentiment in Minnesota is favorably inclined toward the United Nations Organization and other



forms of international cooperation. This is shown by an inspection of editorial comment in the State."

\* \* \* \* \*

#### SURVEY OF PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Pages 38-39: "Following the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the number of nations required to put it into effect, and in furtherance of a suggestion originally made by a trustee of the endowment for a survey of peace organizations as to their functions and effectiveness in reaching public opinion in the United States, the division sent out inquiries to national organizations as to what they were doing to bring to the attention of their members the commitment of the United States to the United Nations. 'Peace' organizations as such form only part of the program for reaching public opinion in the United States. A questionnaire was forwarded to 150 organizations in October, of which 29 were 'peace' organizations, and the division was gratified to receive answers from 100 of them.

"The report, compiled from this survey by Miss Cathrine Borger, of the division staff, showed that practically every organization engaged in popular education of various types, regardless of particular field—scholastic education, citizenship education, religious, service clubs, women's organizations, youth, business, farm, labor, specialized interests—is devoting some part of its programs to making its membership aware of the commitment of the United States to the United Nations.

"Among the suggestions received as to methods which should be emphasized in developing popular knowledge of international organization were the need of preparing single illustrated booklets, more use of motion pictures and radio, forums and discussion groups, as well as development of suitable publications for schools and colleges. Education of young people was mentioned by a number of organizations. Six organizations maintained that personal contacts and leadership provided the most effective method, and another stressed the need for dividing efforts between raising the general level of 'where people are' and working with interested groups willing to join in concerted activities. Of major importance were those stressing the necessity of developing material showing what the United Nations Organization cannot do as well as what it can do, and of full publicity for every activity of the United Nations, and more especially for the activities of the United States and its delegates.

"The greatest lack in public education with regard to the American commitment concerns people who are not reached by any organization, since they have not been interested to join, and do not realize that they too constitute public opinion and have to assume their responsibilities as citizens not only of the United States but of the world. The Carnegie Endowment, as an institution seeking neither members nor maintenance by dues and contributions, is in a position both to work with other organizations and also to respond to this need of primary education."

Pages 50-52:

#### WORK THROUGH RADIO AND MOTION PICTURES

"During the past year Beyond Victory has been presented each week under the combined auspices of the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation and the endowment, over nearly a hundred stations in all parts of the United States and Canada. This nationally known series of programs, now well into its third year, has established itself with an audience of discriminating listeners throughout the country as offering interest and authoritative comment or many phases of postwar adjustment.

"In the spring of 1945 a special group of programs centered around the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations. Two members of the American delegation, *Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve* and the former Governor of Minnesota, *Harold E. Stassen*, spoke of the general issues which the conference faced. *Dr. James T. Shotwell* and *Dr. Raymond Fosdick* contrasted the San Francisco conference with the Paris Conference of 1919. The problem of security was discussed by *Dr. Quincy Wright*, and colonial issues by *Dr. Arthur W. Holcombe* and others. The Charter of the United Nations was discussed by the executive officers of the four commissions at San Francisco: *Mr. Malcom W. Davis*, executive officer of the First Commission, spoke on the People Write a

World Charter; Mr. Huntington Gilchrist, executive officer of the Second Commission, on The Charter—Jobs for All; Prof. Grayson Kirk, executive officer of the Third Commission, on The Security Council—How It Works; and Prof. Norman J. Pabelford, executive officer of the Fourth Commission, on The Charter and International Justice. The essential purpose in this group of programs was to clarify the development of the charter in the conference at San Francisco and to explain the functions and powers provided by its sections, for security and welfare.

\* \* \* \* \*

"During the past year many libraries in the United States have asked to be put on a special list to receive copies of Beyond Victory scripts every week. About 50 libraries in all parts of the country are now receiving this weekly service, and many have applied for its renewal for another year. Occasional Beyond Victory scripts appear on the reading tables of nearly a hundred additional libraries which request them from time to time. They are also sent to several leading universities and a substantial number of secondary schools in the United States. In addition, shipments of transcriptions of Beyond Victory broadcasts were forwarded to Army camps and hospitals in the United States, averaging from 10 to 12 in each shipment, and to the Marianas, Saipan, and the Guadalcanal commands and the European theater. Many letters of appreciation have been received from officers telling how these records were used in orientation programs and convalescent wards, and describing the favorable reaction and resulting value. A letter from the Finney General Hospital, Thomasville, Ga., says in part, 'Your selection of subject matter seems to be just what we have been looking for in our orientation program, and I wish to compliment you on the wide selection available on postwar activities.' The transcriptions were also used by the Office of War Information up to the time that organization was dissolved."

#### THE ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AGREEMENT

Page 111: "The executive committee concluded that many goals of the committee were at stake in the proposed Anglo-America financial agreement. It was therefore decided to publish an objective statement concerning the British loan.

"Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler wrote the foreword to the resulting brochure, *Fifteen Facts on the Proposed British Loan*, which was edited by Robert L. Gulick, Jr. There was a first edition of 200,000 copies, and a second of 100,000 is now being printed. Hon. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, has this to say about the Fifteen Facts: "Permit me to congratulate you on an excellent job which I am sure will be most helpful in placing the loan before the public in proper perspective." Margaret A. Hickey, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., writes in similar vein: 'In my opinion this is excellent material, presented in a fashion which simplifies and clarifies the principal points involved in the legislation now pending before Congress.'

"The board of directors agreed, without dissent, to sponsor a campaign of public education relating to the agreement. A special committee was formed under the chairmanship of Hon. Charles S. Dewey, former Congressman from Illinois, and a vice president of the Chase National Bank. Other members of this committee include: Robert W. Coyne, National Field Director, War Finance Division, United States Treasury; Ted R. Gamble, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Eric A. Johnston, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; Philip D. Reed, chairman of the United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce; Anna Lord Strauss, president, National League of Women Voters; and Robert L. Gulick, Jr."

(Source: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1947 Yearbook.)  
Pages 16-17:

#### RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRESIDENT

\* \* \* \* \*

"Among the special circumstances favorable to an expansion of the endowment's own direct activities, the most significant is the establishment of the United Nations with its headquarters in New York and with the United States

as its leading and most influential members. The United States was the chief architect of the United Nations and is its chief support. The opportunity for an endowed American institution having the objectives, tradition, and prestige of the endowment to support and serve the United Nations is very great. No other agency appears to be so favorably situated as is the endowment for the undertaking of such a program. So far as we have been able to ascertain, no other agency is contemplating the undertaking of such a program. Consequently, I recommend most earnestly that the endowment construct its program for the period that lies ahead primarily for the support and assistance of the United Nations.

"I would suggest that this program be conceived of as having two objectives. First, it should be widely educational in order to encourage public understanding and support of the United Nations at home and abroad. Second, it should aid in the adoption of wise policies both by our own Government in its capacity as a member of the United Nations and by the United Nations organization as a whole.

"The number and importance of decisions in the field of foreign relations with which the United States will be faced during the next few years are of such magnitude that the widest possible stimulation of public education in this field is of major and pressing importance. In furthering its educational objectives the endowment should utilize its existing resources, such as the International Relations Clubs in the colleges, and *International Conciliation*, and should strengthen its relationships with existing agencies interested in the field of foreign affairs. These relationships should include close collaboration with other organizations principally engaged in the study of foreign affairs, such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the developing university centers of international studies, and local community groups interested in foreign affairs of which the Cleveland Council on World Affairs and the projected World Affairs Council in San Francisco are examples.

"Of particular importance is the unusual opportunity of reaching large segments of the population by establishing relations of a rather novel sort with the large national organizations which today are desirous of supplying their members with objective information on public affairs, including international issues. These organizations—designed to serve, respectively, the broad interests of business, church, women's, farm, labor, veterans', educational, and other large groups of our citizens—are not equipped to set up foreign policy research staffs of their own. The endowment should supply these organizations with basic information about the United Nations and should assist them both in selecting topics of interest to their members and in presenting those topics so as to be most readily understood by their members. We should urge the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations to supply similar service on other topics of international significance.

"Exploration should also be made by the endowment as to the possibilities of increasing the effectiveness of the radio and motion pictures in public education on world affairs." [Italics supplied.]

---

(Source: Staley, Eugene, *War and the Private Investor*, Doubleday, 1935, pt. III: *Towards a Policy*, ch. 18, *Alternate Courses of Action*, pp. 470-471.)

"The search for the underlying causes of international investment friction has revealed that capital investment is a form of contact peculiarly apt to occasion conflict, while the existing institutions for the adjustment of these conflicts are not only inadequate but are fundamentally ill-adapted to the task. The defectiveness of the institutions of adjustment arises largely from the fact that the areas of political loyalty and political organization on which they are based, are smaller than the area of conflict-producing contact, which today includes practically the whole world. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

"With these general considerations in mind we now turn our attention to the appraisal of various policies which have been practiced or which may be suggested in connection with the problem of reducing the political friction connected with international private investment. These policies may be grouped according to their basic characteristics under three general headings, and will be so discussed: (1) mere anti-imperialism, (2) national supervision of investments abroad, (3) denationalization and mondial<sup>1</sup> supervision of international investments. \* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of this special term will be explained later.

(Pt. III: Towards a Policy, ch. 19: Specific Suggestions:)

A WORLD INVESTMENT COMMISSION

Pages 498-499: "The functions which might be discharged by a world commission on permanent economic contracts between nations are plentiful and important enough to justify the creation of such an agency. The World Investment Commission, if we may give it that name, should begin the development of that effective supervision by the world community which must gradually undermine national diplomatic protection and render denationalization of investments possible."

Pages 500-501: "How would the World Investment Commission operate? It should have the following powers and duties:

"To register international loan agreements and concessions; to make their terms public; to regulate their terms in certain respects.

"To collect continuous and accurate information respecting international investment operations and all their ramifications and effects—social and political as well as economic.

"To call general conferences on a world or regional basis, or conferences of certain industries (e. g., concession holders, consumers, and states granting concessions in the oil industry). These conferences would consider problems raised by international capital migration, and out of them something akin to world investment legislation might emerge.

"To cooperate with the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, the International Labor Organization, commissions on codification of international law, and other international agencies whose work has a bearing on the setting of standards for protection of capital-importing regions against ruthless exploitation.

"To examine and report on the financial condition of borrowing states<sup>1</sup> and private enterprises; to make observations on the political and social implications of specific capital transactions.

"To call attention to any conditions likely to intensify international investment conflicts or to occasion political friction over investments and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

"To endeavor to conciliate disputes, calling conferences of lenders and borrowers for this purpose, mediating, arbitrating, seeking to work out compromises, employing the services of disinterested experts to provide full social and economic information on the basis of which equitable adjustments might be sought.

"To make a public report of its findings where a party to a dispute before the Commission refuses to come to an agreement which in the opinion of disinterested conciliators is just and reasonable.

"To publicly advise, after hearings, against further provision of capital to a state or corporation which has failed to observe a contract obligation without just cause. This would presumably make the flotation of loans difficult anywhere in the world for such a state or corporation. Here is one of the 'sanctions' which would enable the Commission to take over the function (now exercised by national diplomatic protection) of protecting investors abroad—that is, of guaranteeing minimum standards of fair treatment for the investment interests of aliens in all countries. If organized on a worldwide basis, this sanction would be sufficient in many cases to accomplish more in the way of protection than is now usually accomplished by diplomatic protection. At the same time, it would tend to remove investment protection as a pretext for national aggression and remedy other defects of the system of national diplomatic protection.

"To refer legal questions to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to the World Commercial Court (suggested below) for an advisory opinion or final settlement.

"To cooperate with regional organizations like the Pan American Union in the establishment of regional subcommissions for handling investment problems that affect mainly one part of the world."

Page 504: "This proposal would obviously involve the creation of an international corporation law, probably through an international treaty to be framed and adopted under the auspices of the League of Nations. \* \* \*"

<sup>1</sup> The Commission would probably deal with State loans as well as with the private investments upon which the discussions of this volume have been focused.

## A WORLD INVESTMENT BANK

Page 509: "As a means of filtering out the national interest in world capital movements and thereby promoting the dual process of denationalization and mondial supervision, a World Investment Bank might perform useful functions. Such a bank would sell its bonds to governments or to private investors and invest the funds so raised in long-term construction projects, such as railways in South America and China, airways over the world, canals, harbor works, international river improvements, and the like. \* \* \*"

Pages 512-513: "A useful contribution to the denationalization of international investment (and also trade) relationships would therefore be made by the development of a world 'consular service' for the provision of detailed economic information and the encouragement of world commerce. Such a service could best be built on the foundation already laid by the excellent work of the League of Nations and the International Labor Organization in the field of economic information. \* \* \*"

Pages 515-516: "The League of Nations: It is worthy of note that practically all the specific measures proposed in this chapter for dealing with the political problems raised by international investments depend in some fashion upon the presence of a world political organization. If the League of Nations did not exist it would be necessary to create it, or something like it, before investment problems could be attacked with any hope of success. The League should be supported, strengthened, and developed. Its legislative powers should be increased and its authority enlarged. Just as the loose league of sovereign States first established under the Articles of Confederation developed into the Federal Government of the United States of America, so the League of Nations must be developed from a confederation of sovereign states into a federal world government. Of course the United States, which has such a large stake in the orderly supervision of international investment relationships, should actively encourage this process. An essential step is entry into the League. \* \* \*"

Pages 517-518: "International civic training: It is all too evident that the measures and devices proposed in this chapter can never succeed, cannot even be tried, unless there is a sufficient sense of world citizenship among the different peoples of the earth and among their leaders. Such a sense of world citizenship may be stimulated by a rational appreciation of the worldwide interdependence of economic, social, and political life, but to be politically effective the emotions must also be touched and loyalties to new supranational symbols must be developed. Can such loyalties be achieved short of an international working-class revolution, or can they be achieved by such a revolution? That is one of the most fundamental questions affecting the future form of social life on this planet. The development of international attitudes in the schools, world intellectual cooperation, adult education on the interdependence of the modern world, celebration of the heroes common to all mankind—all these things, and many more at first sight quite unrelated to international investments, have an important bearing on the specific problem of investment friction.<sup>3</sup> \* \* \*"

## EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUBS

APRIL 20, 1954.

Mr. JOSEPH E. JOHNSON,  
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,  
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: My contacts with you and the other member of the endowment staff were so pleasant that it is with a keen sense of disappointment that I now resign myself to writing for certain information instead of visiting you in person. However, it is becoming increasingly evident that our activities will require me to spend all my time here.

In the confidential reports, as well as the yearbooks, there are references to "international polity clubs" which were, as I recall, established by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in colleges and universities, starting back in the early days of your organization. However, as you know time

<sup>3</sup> Consult Charles E. Merriam, *The Making of Citizens* (Chicago, 1931), pp. 310-318, 348, 356.

did not permit me to read all the material you made available to me, and there are gaps in my notes on this item. Would you, therefore, have someone on your staff answer the following questions:

1. Were these clubs an outgrowth of or connected in any way with the American Association for International Conciliation, the Institute of International Education, or any other organizations? (And if so, how did this come about?)

2. Were they a development from the "international mind" alcoves?

In the back of my mind there is a vague recollection that during a conversation with Dr. Avirett he mentioned that these clubs resulted in organization of the Foreign Policy Association or the Council on Foreign Relations. If I am correct, how did this develop and when?

3. How many such clubs were there in 1938 and how many are there today, if they still exist? If they no longer exist, is that due to positive dissolution as an activity of the endowment, or due merely to student and faculty disinterest or to some other factors?

4. I gather that each year books were sent by the endowment to each of these clubs. Were these volumes sent without charge, at cost, or at a discount?

5. Were all books selected for distribution in any 1 year sent to all the clubs? If not, what secondary method of selection was employed, such as the size of the college or university, or the club membership?

6. How did these clubs come into being at the college or university—in other words, did the endowment either by suggestion to the faculty or one of its members, or through other methods foster the formation of such clubs?

7. Were lists of books available periodically sent to the colleges and universities, from which the club or faculty adviser made a selection? Or were books automatically distributed at intervals throughout the year to all institutions?

I hope this will not place an undue burden on your staff—but since I cannot foresee a time when a visit to your office might be possible I shall appreciate very much your sending the information as soon as it is convenient.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN CASEY,  
*Legal Analyst.*

---

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE,  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
NEW YORK, N. Y., April 29, 1954.

Miss KATHRYN CASEY,  
131 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS CASEY: I, too, regret that you, yourself, could not come to see us again. In any event, here is the information on the International Relations Clubs which you requested in your letter of April 22. For your convenience, the numbers correspond to those of the questions asked in the letter.

1. The first student groups in colleges and universities for the serious study and objective discussion of international affairs—known as international policy clubs—were organized in the autumn of 1914 under the direction of the American Association for International Conciliation which, in turn derived financial support from the Carnegie Endowment. In the fall of 1920 when direction of the clubs was transferred to the Institute of International Education (organized largely under the leadership of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler with substantial financial support from the endowment), the name of the clubs was the endowment in 1924, and the clubs were taken over by the endowment which changed to international relations clubs. The institute became independent of the endowment in 1924, and the clubs were taken over by the endowment which continued actively in charge of them until the spring of 1951. At this time the Association of International Relations Clubs, established in 1948, assumed supervision of the club program under a grant-in-aid from the endowment. Although no longer actively directing the club work, the endowment maintained a relationship with it through having a representative on the association's executive board.

2. The clubs were in no way a "development" from the international mind alcoves, which were an entirely separate phase of the endowment's program.

At no time in the past have the clubs had any organizational connection with the Foreign Policy Association, the Council on Foreign Relations, or any other organization except those indicated under "1."

3. In 1938 there were 1,103 clubs as follows: 265 in high schools in the United States; 685 in colleges and universities in continental United States; 7 in the Philippines; 1 each in Hawaii, Alaska, Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico; 24 in the United Kingdom; 34 in 14 Latin American countries; 22 in China; 9 in Japan; 2 in Korea; and the remaining 51 in foreign countries including Canada, Egypt, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Siam, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Syria, and India.

In January, 1948, the National Education Association in Washington assumed leadership for the high school clubs. Information regarding them since then may be obtained from the association.

In 1954 (April 26) there are 476 clubs in colleges and universities in continental United States; 1 in Hawaii, and 28 in foreign countries including Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Egypt, India, Japan, Pakistan, Philippine Islands, and Thailand, making a total of 505.

4. The materials sent to the International Relations clubs in high schools, colleges, and universities were a gift from the endowment, with the understanding that they would be kept together as a special IRC collection, in the library or elsewhere, readily accessible to the club members.

5. All clubs—large or small, in universities and junior and 4-year colleges, in the United States and foreign countries—received the same books in English with the exception of some of the groups in Latin American countries which were sent Spanish translations of some of the English publications or original Spanish publications. Cooperation with the Latin American clubs was discontinued during the academic year 1947-48. Pamphlets and mimeographed materials, less specialized and better suited to the age level, were sent to the high school clubs.

6. Although the endowment never had a field worker as such to stimulate interest in the club movement, it maintained a competent "secretariat" in its offices which carried on correspondence with the clubs, offering encouragement to both club members and faculty advisers in carrying on the work, as well as advice when sought, and suggestions for vitalizing club programs. It cooperated closely with the host clubs in the 12—in 1948 increased to 14—regions throughout the country where annual conferences were held, by helping to set up the programs, furnishing speakers, and arranging for an endowment representative to be in attendance at each conference. In the early 1930's letters were sent at the beginning of the academic year to faculty members at a few selected institutions, informing them of the club work and its advantages. The clubs increased to such an extent in number, however, that this procedure soon became unnecessary. A great deal of the credit for this growth must be given to the continued interest of students and faculty members alike, who, upon transferring to a campus without a club, proceeded to organize a new one or reactivate a former one, and also to the establishment of clubs by students and/or faculty people who were told about the work by enthusiastic members or advisers of clubs on other campuses. On receiving an inquiry about the work, the endowment furnished materials descriptive of the club program and suggestions for organizing a club. The principal requirements for affiliation with the endowment were that the group would meet regularly with a faculty adviser for the study and discussion of world affairs from an unprejudiced and objective point of view and that the books should be kept together as a permanent collection. Upon notification that a club had completed its organization, it was placed upon the mailing list to receive all club materials.

7. Two installments of books were automatically distributed to the clubs each academic year. The books were initially selected by a member of the endowment staff and then submitted for approval to a committee of which Dr. Butler was chairman. In the first semester the books were sent to clubs which notified the endowment that they were functioning and ready to receive them, and in the second semester only to the clubs which had formally acknowledged receipt of the first, or fall, installment. The distribution of books was discontinued entirely in the spring of 1947.

In this connection, you will be interested to know that the Association of International Relations Clubs has just concluded its Seventh Annual Conference. At the final business session on April 23, the association voted to affiliate with the Foreign Policy Association, which is better equipped than the endowment to aid them in planning their programs for objective study of international problems. At the same time the association passed a resolution thanking the endowment for past services. It was with very real regret that the endowment came to the end of a long chapter, in which we like to think that a

contribution was made to the better understanding of the responsibilities which our country now bears as a world power.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. JOHNSON.

---

MEMORANDUM

JUNE 30, 1954.

Subject: Books distributed by Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Since it was impossible to check every volume distributed by the endowment through the international mind alcoves or through the international relations clubs and centers, a random sampling by year mentioned in the yearbooks was taken. When Dr. Kenneth Colegrove was in Washington, D. C., to attend the hearings before the committee, he was asked to look over the books distributed in the following years: 1918, 1926, 1928, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1943, 1944, 1947.

The authors and books for those years are given below. Those on which Dr. Colegrove commented are in italics.

---

1918 Yearbook, page 86 ("distributed principally to college libraries and International Polity Clubs"):

C. R. Ashbee: American League To Enforce Peace  
 E. W. Clement: Constitutional Imperialism in Japan  
 Cosmos: The Basis of Durable Peace  
 Robert Goldsmith: A League To Enforce Peace  
 J. A. Hobson: The New Protectionism  
 Roland Hugins: The Possible Peace  
*Harold J. Laski: Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty—"Opposed to the 'national interest'; inclines toward extreme left"*  
 Ramsay Muir: Nationalism and Internationalism  
 Henry F. Munro, Ellery C. Stowell: International Cases  
 H. H. Powers: The Things Men Fight For  
 Bertrand Russell: Why Men Fight  
 Walter E. Weyl: American World Policies

---

1926 Yearbook, page 56 ("distributed principally to college libraries and International Polity Clubs"):

Carlton J. H. Hayes: A Political and Social History of Modern Europe  
 (2 vols.)  
 Prof. Schille Viallate: Economic Imperialism  
 George Matthew Dutcher: The Political Awakening of the East  
*Raymond Leslie Buel: International Relations—"Globalist"*

---

1931 Yearbook, page 67:

Butler, Nicholas Murray: The Path to Peace  
 Eberlein, Marks, and Wallis: Down the Tiber and Up to Rome  
 Ellis, M. H.: Express to Hindustan  
 Keenleyside, Hugh L.: Canada and the United States  
 Larson, Frans August: Larson, Duke of Mongolia  
 Olden, Rudolf: Stresemann  
 Patrick, Mary Mills: Under Five Sultans  
 Phillips, Henry A.: Meet the Germans  
*Read, Elizabeth F.: International Law and International Relations—"Rather leftist"*  
 Redfield, Robert: Tepoztlan (Mexico)  
 de la Rue, Sidney: Land of the Pepper Bird (Liberia)  
 Russell, Phillips: Red Tiger (Mexico)  
 Ryhd, Hanna: Land of the Sun-God (Egypt)  
 Sassoon, Sir Philip: The Third Route  
 Sheng-Cheng: A Son of China  
 Street, C. J. C.: Thomas Masaryk of Czechoslovakia  
 Waldrom, Webb: Blue Glamor (the Mediterranean)



- 1932 Yearbook, pages 75, 80:
- Akeley, Delia J.: Jungle Portraits  
 Buck, Pearl S.: *The Good Earth*—"Slightly leftist"  
 Chase, Stuart: Mexico—"Mildly left"  
 Colum, Padraic: Cross Roads in Ireland  
 Forbes, Rosita: Conflict  
 Hindus, Maurice: *Humanity Uprooted*—"Marxian slant"  
 Ilin, M.: New Russia's Primer  
 McBride, Robert M.: Romantic Czechoslovakia  
 McMullen, Laura W.: *Building the World Society*—"Globalist"  
 Morton, H. V.: In Search of Scotland  
 Ross, Sir. E. Denison: The Persians  
 Strong, Anna Louise: *The Road to the Grey Pamir*—"Well Known Communist"  
 Van Dyke, John C.: In Egypt  
 Wagner, Ellasue: Korea  
 Wortham, N. E.: Mustapha Kemal of Turkey  
 Andrews, Fanny Fern: The Holy Land Under Mandate  
 Arendtz, Herman F.: The Way Out of Depression  
 Bratt, K. A.: That Next War?  
 de Madariga, Salvadore: *Disarmament*—"Ultra globalist and aimed at sub-  
 mergence of 'national interest'"  
 Harper, Samuel G.: Making Bolsheviks  
 Hudson, Manley O.: The World Court  
 Ilin, U.: New Russia's Primer  
 League of Nations: Ten Years of World Cooperation  
 Lefebure, Victor: Scientific Disarmament  
 MacNair, Harley F.: China in Revolution  
 Mitchell, N. P.: Land Problems and Policies in the African Mandates of the  
 British Commonwealth  
 Moulton, H. G.: Japan: An Economic and Financial Appraisal

- 1933 Yearbook, pages 77, 80:
- Angell, Norman: *The Unseen Assassins*—"Globalist"  
 Casey, Robert J.: Baghdad and Points East  
 Cohen-Portheim, Paul: England, the Unknown Isle  
 Desmond, Alice Curtis: Far Horizons  
 Hedin, Sven: Across the Gobi Desert  
 Hudson, Manley O.: Progress in International Organization  
 Jones, Amy Heminway: An Amiable Adventure  
 Mackall, Lawton: Portugal for Two  
 Monson, Ronald A.: Across Africa on Foot  
 Morton, H. V.: In Search of Ireland, In Search of Wales  
 Patterson, Ernest Minor: *America: World Leader or World Led?*—"Globalist"  
 Phillips, Henry Albert: Meet the Japanese  
 Raiguel and Huff: This Is Russia  
 Thomas, Valentine: Young Europe  
 Tsurumi, Yusuke: The Mother  
 Angell, Sir Norman: *The Unseen Assassins*  
 Clark, Grover: Economic Rivalries in China  
 Cory, Ellen: Compulsory Arbitration  
 Escher, Franklin: Modern Foreign Exchange  
 Morley, Felix: The Society of Nations  
 Morse and MacNair: Far Eastern International Relations  
 Moulton and Pasvolksy: War Debts and World Prosperity  
 Saiter, Sir Arthur: *Recovery, the Second Effort*—"Globalist"  
 Patterson, Ernest Minor: *America—World Leader or World Led?*  
 Ware, Edith E.: *Business and Politics in the Far East*—"Doubtful"

1938 Yearbook, page 55: "This material is directed in some instances only to the trustees of the endowment, in other cases to a wider though limited circle of those directly connected with the endowment and in still other cases to a comprehensive list of those interested in international questions \* \* \* Among the books so distributed may be cited: \* \* \*

- James T. Shotwell: *On the Abyss*—"Globalist"  
 William T. Stone and Clark M. Eichelberger: *Peaceful Change*—"Globalist and leftist. Regarding W. T. Stone, see the report of the McCarran subcommittee. Stone was closely associated with Edward Carter of I. P. R."

1938 Yearbook, page 62:

Dulles, Allen W., and Armstrong, Hamilton Fish: Can We be Neutral?  
 Dunn, Frederick Sherwood: Peaceful Change  
 Florinsky, Michael T.: Fascism and National Socialism  
 Horrabin, J. F.: An Atlas of the Empire  
 Lichtenberger, Henri: The Third Reich  
 Miller, Spencer, Jr.: What the I. L. O. Means to America  
 Peers, E. Allison: The Spanish Tragedy  
 Staley, Eugene: Raw Materials in Peace and War  
*Salter, Sir Arthur: World Trade and Its Future—"Globalist"*  
 Vinacke, Harold M.: A History of the Far East in Modern Times  
 Willert, Sir Arthur and others: The Empire in the World

1939 Yearbook, page 62:

Angell, Norman: The Defense of the Empire  
*Angell, Norman: Peace with the Dictators?—"Globalist"*  
 Butler, Nicholas Murray: The Family of Nations  
 Davies, E. C.: A Wayfarer in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania  
 Fergusson, Erna: Venezuela  
 Fry, Varian: War in China  
 Hamilton, Alexander, and others: The Federalist  
 Jackson, Joseph Henry: Notes on a Drum  
 Lewis, Elizabeth Foreman: Portraits from a Chinese Scroll  
 Loewenstein, Prince Hubertus Zu: Conquest of the Past  
 Lyons, Eugene: Assignment in Utopia  
 MacManus, Seumas: The Rocky Road to Dublin  
 Miller, M. S. and J. L.: Cruising the Mediterranean  
 Parmer, Charles B.: West Indian Odyssey  
 Roberts, Stephen H.: The House That Hitler Built  
 Sterne, Emma Gelders: European Summer  
*Streit, Clarence K.: Union Now—"Globalist and submersion of national interest. Fallacious in his analogy of Union of American States in 1781 with world federation"*  
 Strode, Hudson: South by Thunderbird

1941 Yearbook, page 54:

Benes, Eduard: Democracy Today and Tomorrow  
 Bisson, T. A.: American Policy in the Far East, 1931-19—"Pro-Communist"  
 Butler, Nicholas Murray: Why War?  
*Dulles, Allen W., and Armstrong, Hamilton Fish: Can America Stay Neutral?—"Ultraglobalists"*  
 Florinsky, Michael T.: Toward an Understanding of the U. S. S. R.  
 Ford, Guy Stanton (editor): Dictatorship in the Modern World  
 Lippmann, Walter: Some Notes on War and Peace  
 Marriott, Sir John A. R.: Commonwealth or Anarchy?  
*Patterson, Ernest Minor: Economic Bases of Peace*  
 Saerchinger, Cesar: The Way Out of War  
*Shotwell, James T.: What Germany Forgot*  
 Viton, Albert: Great Britain, an Empire in Transition

1939 Yearbook, page 39: "Among leftist speakers sent to conferences by the Carnegie Endowment were Vera Micheles Dean and Dr. Eugene Staley. Mrs. Dean and Max Lerner also were included in the 1941 list."

1944 Yearbook, page 103:

*Hunt, Dr. Erling (Teachers College): Citizens for a New World, yearbook of Commission for Organization of Peace—"Ultraglobalist"*

1944 Yearbook, page 48:

*Clark, Evans (editor): Wartime Facts and Postwar Problems: A Study and Discussion Manual*  
 Committee on Africa: Africa  
 Duffett, W. E., Hicks, A. R. and Parkin, G. R.: India Today  
 Hambro, C. J.: How to Win the Peace

Hornbeck, Stanley K.: The United States and the Far East  
 Inman, Samuel Guy: Latin America: Its Place in World Life  
 Kohn, Hans: World Order in Historical Perspective  
 MacIver, R. M.: *Toward an Abiding Peace—“Extremely globalist and careless of the American ‘national interest’”*  
 Mowat, R. B. and Slosson, Preston: History of the English-Speaking Peoples  
 Pares, Sir Bernard: Russia  
 Peffer, Nathaniel: *A Basis for Peace in the Far East*  
 Reves, Emery: A Democratic Manifesto  
 Stenbridge, Jasper H., An Atlas of the U. S. S. R.  
 Thomas, Elbert D.: Thomas Jefferson: World Citizen  
 Welles, Sumner: The world of the Four Freedoms

---

1944 Yearbook, page 52:  
 Broderick, Alan H.: North Africa  
 Chiang Kai-shek, Generalissimo: All We Are and All We Have  
 Chiang Kai-shek, Madame: We Chinese Women  
 Follett, Helen: Islands on Guard  
 Gatti, Allen and Attilio: Here is Africa  
 Goodell, Jane: They Sent Me to Iceland  
 Hambro, C. J.: How to Win the Peace  
 Henley, Constance Jordan: Grandmother Drives South  
 Hutchison, Bruce: The Unkonwn Country  
 Lanks, Herbert C.: Pan American Highway through South America  
 Lattimore, Owen: *America and Asia—“Subtle propoganda along Communist line. Lattimore cited in McCarran subcommittee report as part of Communist cell in the Institute of Pacific Relations”*  
 Maisel, Albert Q.: Africa: Facts and Forecasts  
 Massock, Richard G.: Italy from Within  
 Pares, Sir Bernard: Russia  
 Peffer, Nathaniel: *Basis for Peace in the Far East—“Leftist. See McCarran subcommittee report”*  
 Representatives of the United Nations: The People's Peace  
 Welles, Sumner: The World of the Four Freedoms

---

1947 Yearbook, pages 48, 51:  
*The Soviet Union Today, An Outline Study: American Russian Institute—“Favorable to U. S. S. R.”*  
 The United Nations Economic and Social Council: Herman Finer.  
 America and the New World: The Merrick lectures, 1945.  
 Perpetual Peace: Immanuel Kant.  
 Political Handbook of the World, 1946: Walter H. Mallory, editor.  
 Germany Is Our Problem: Henry Morgenthau, Jr.  
 The Atomic Age Opens: Editors of pocket books.  
 America's Stake in Britain's Future: George Soule.  
 Peoples Speaking to Peoples: Llewellyn White and Robert D. Leigh.  
 The United Nations in the Making: Basic Documents: World Peace Foundation.  
*The Soviet Union Today: American Russian Institute*  
 The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Ruth Benedict.  
 The World Today: Nicholas Murray Butler.  
 Sun Yat-sen: Stephen Chen and Robert Payne.  
*Britain: Partner for Peace: Percy E. Corbett—“Extremely globalist”*  
 The United Nations Economic and Social Council: Herman Finer.  
 Brazil: An Interpretation: Gilberto Freyre.  
 Greece: A. W. Gomme.  
 Our Son, Pablo: Alvin and Darley Gordon.  
 France, Short History: Albert Guerard.  
 Iran: William S. Haas.  
 And the Bravest of These: Katharine Roberts.  
 New Zealand: Phillip L. Soljak.  
 Peace Atlas of Europe: Samuel van Valkenburg.  
 The Story of the Dutch East Indies: Bernard H. M. Vlekke.  
 The French Canadian Outlook: Mason Wade.  
 Originally it had been intended to have others in addition to Dr. Colegrove make notations on these and other books distributed by the Carnegie Endowment

for International Peace, either through the International Mind Alcoves, the international relations clubs and centers, or other means. However, up to this time, it has not been possible to proceed with this particular project.

KATHRYN CASEY,  
*Legal Analyst.*

EXHIBIT—PART II. ROCKEFELLER

EXCERPTS FROM ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION AND MATERIAL TAKEN FROM OTHER SOURCES FROM 1929 TO 1952

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1932 annual report, pp. 274-275:)

ECONOMIC PLANNING AND CONTROL

"Events of the past 3 years have made strikingly evident the tremendous social losses occasioned by the ups and downs of modern business enterprise. Much physical suffering, illness, mental disorder, family disintegration, crime, and political and social instability trace their origin to economic causes. In a time of depression, when enterprise is halted and millions of the unemployed are unable to command the necessities of life, the question is insistently heard, Why does this distressing situation arise in a country where raw materials exist in plenty, where technological equipment is of the best, and where workers are eager to apply their productive capacities? The opportunity and need for scientific attack on the problem of economic maladjustment are unmistakable. The foundation views this field as highly important and well adapted to research.

"For several years various studies and organizations concerned with economic stabilization have been supported. It is believed that a more complete knowledge of the working of our present economic system—e. g., of conditions as revealed by realistic, statistical studies of unemployment; the characteristics, methods, and hazards of specified industrial enterprises; the complex forces operating in a competitive society in a number of specific situations—must supply the necessary basis for planning an effective economic organization."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1936 annual report, pp. 55-56:)

"\* \* \* As one reviews the history of the men and women who, over the last 20 years, have received fellowships from the foundation, the record appears most gratifying. Today, they are occupying positions of importance and distinction in nearly every country of the world. They are on university faculties; they are connected with research laboratories; they hold strategic governmental positions; they are carrying on significant and productive work in wide fields of knowledge. Some of them, indeed, have gained outstanding recognition, such as the award of the Nobel prize. It would be idle to assume, of course, that their leadership and their contribution to scientific thought are the results solely of their fellowship experience. Doubtless, many of them would have gained eminence without this experience, or would have obtained the experience in other ways. But it is a satisfaction to record the subsequent success of highly promising men and women, picked largely from the younger generation, to whom the foundation is proud to have been of some assistance."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1937 annual report, pp. 57-58:)

THE DEBACLE IN CHINA

"Last year, in the Review, the following sentence appeared: 'China today stands on the threshold of a renaissance. The Chinese National Government, together with many provincial and county authorities and private organizations, are attempting to make over a medieval society in terms of modern knowledge.'

"This proud ambition, in which the foundation was participating, has been virtually destroyed by the events of the last 6 months. The program was primarily a program of rural reconstruction and public health. It was rooted in promising Chinese institutions like Nankai University in Tientsin, and the National Central University and the National Agricultural Research Bureau, both in Nanking. It was promoting studies in subjects like animal husbandry and agriculture; it was carrying on broadly based field experiments; and it was training men and women for administrative posts in rural and public health work.

"Nankai University was completely destroyed last July. The universities and institutions in Nanking, where they are not too badly damaged, are serving today as army barracks. The field units in mass education and public health are so completely scattered that it is practically impossible to locate them. The work, the devotion, the resources, the strategic plans of Chinese leaders for a better China, have disappeared in an almost unprecedented cataclysm of violence.

"At the moment there is nothing further to report. The foundation still maintains its office in Shanghai. Whether there will be an opportunity to pick up the pieces of this broken program at some later date, no one can foretell."

---

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1940 annual report, pp. 273-277:)

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

"The foundation continued its support of the national institute's experimental program of recruiting and training personnel for the Federal services by a grant of \$105,000 for the 3-year period from October 1, 1941. For the past 5 years, the program has involved the annual placement of approximately 50 graduate students preparing for public service careers, in agencies of the Federal Government for a year of practical apprenticeship. The institute also serves as a clearinghouse of information and as a liaison agency in matters relating to this recruitment and training program. Sixty percent of its "internes" are now in the Federal service; several are in State and local or other government services, and a number are continuing graduate study.

"The institute hopes to continue its program directed toward developing a more effective means of recruitment of persons for Government service, especially for its influence in improving the relations between the Federal authorities and the educational institutions of the country."

---

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1941 annual report,)  
Pages 230-231:

INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS

*"Council on Foreign Relations"*

"Each study group consists of specialists in designated areas in the various problems to be dealt with. The program permits the continuous examination of events related to problems of special interests of this country, and the assembly and interpretation of research material. Each group works under the leadership of a rapporteur. A steering committee composed of the rapporteurs and the leading officers of the council is responsible for the general planning, the coordination of the activities of the groups, and the interchange of material and points of view.

"More than 250 memoranda on special subjects had been prepared before the end of 1941. These had been furnished to the Government services charged with handling the various questions discussed. Many representatives of these services had also participated in the discussion of the study groups."

*"Foreign Policy Association"*

"The former project is concerned primarily with the organization of educational work in relation to world problems, collaboration with colleges, schools, forums, women's clubs, youth groups, labor programs, agricultural clubs, etc. Its purpose is the preparation and distribution of educational material in the field of international affairs and the encouragement of discussion of such material. A special series of 'Headline Books,' published since 1935, is one aspect of the publication program. At least 15 titles have been added to the list over the past 3 years. Study materials which supplement these books are used by various groups throughout the country. Several of the 'Headline Books' have been translated into Spanish and distributed in South America.

"It is hoped to establish effective bases of cooperation with leading national organizations serving the cause of public education in the United States, and with Government agencies actively concerned with increasing general knowledge and understanding of problems of American foreign policy.

"In view of the current world situation, the Foreign Policy Association will concentrate its research during the coming year in three main fields: (1) Developments in the occupied countries of Europe; (2) political and economic trends in Latin America; and (3) problems of postwar reconstruction.

"In addition to its research activities, the association furnishes speakers to educational public policy organizations, arranges luncheon discussions, and conducts a series of broadcasts now distributed through 70 stations. Its Washington bureau collects firsthand information on current issues of American foreign policy. The association also maintain a Latin American Information Service, which published until the end of 1941 its biweekly Pan American News, furnishing background material on political and economic trends in Latin American countries."

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 233-234:

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

*"Yale University*

"The institute, founded in 1935, had the following objectives: To promote basic research in international relations with particular attention to studies designed to clarify American foreign policy; to develop a broad and well-rounded program of education and training in international relations on both the undergraduate and graduate level; to evolve procedures of coordination and integration among the various social sciences in the analysis of international problems; and to aid in the postdoctoral training of younger scholars in the general field of international relations.

"The research program of the institute included many projects centering around problems of American foreign policy, but designed also to interpret the role of power in international affairs, and the relation of national policies to military policies and principles of grand strategy.

"Four major studies have been published and several others are nearing completion. Certain of the projects are being carried on in conjunction with Government departments. Among the specific subjects proposed for study are: Problems of national defense; United States and the future order of Europe; hemispheric unity; the geographic basis of foreign policy; and inter-American trade relations.

"The program of education has been closely coordinated with the research program. The projected program for the next few years will not represent any substantial change in policy. A combined social science approach will stress analytical rather than historical methods."

---

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, annual report for 1942.)  
Pages 179-180:

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

*"Social Science Research Council*

"Washington personnel office. Even before the United States entered the war, a vital need was felt in Washington for an agency to promote more effective utilization of social scientists. In the stress of the prewar emergency the National Government had recruited many thousands of persons trained in the social sciences; later, of course, the demand greatly increased.

"It was foreseen that unless the recruitment policies were integrated and wisely administered severe shortages would result and skilled talent would be squandered.

"After a careful study of the problem the Social Science Research Council set up an office in Washington to work in cooperation with Government agencies on three tasks: (1) Consulting with Government agencies on policies and methods of recruitment; (2) advising with individuals who wished to contribute their talents where they could be utilized most effectively; and (3) consulting with university officials regarding the temporary release of members of their faculties.

"The Council already had joined with other national scientific councils in promoting the roster of scientific and specialized personnel, but responsible officials felt that this was not enough. Now, the office which has been set up in Washington provides a place to which persons may turn for extragovernmental advice concerning social science problems. Similar services had earlier been provided for engineers and specialists in the various field of medical and natural sciences."

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 181-182:

*"Public Administration Committee"*

"The agencies through which society will seek to meet its diverse problems are multiform, and total effort, whether for defense or for the postwar world, will receive its primary direction through the agency of Government. For the past 7 years the foundation has supported the activities of the public administration committee, whose original objectives were to capture and record and lay the basis for the appraisal of measures initiated in the United States for grappling with the consequences of the worldwide social and technological changes that were taking place. The end objective was, if possible, to add to the store of principles of administration so that administrators who must make decisions might profit by recent and current experience.

"The committee formulated a series of major studies of two general types: (1) Administrative problems of new and emerging governmental activities; and (2) appraisal and review of significant developments in administration of the last 3 decades.

"More recently the committee has focused its resources and attention mainly on planning and stimulating rather than on executing research. A broadening of the program to include the field of government, with public administration as one sector is now contemplated. Such a program would deal less with the mechanics of administration than with the development of sound bases of policy determination and more effective relationships in the expanding governmental structure."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1943 annual report, pp. 178-179.)

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

*"Council on Foreign Relations"*

"The war and peace studies project of the council was organized shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in 1939 for the purpose of furnishing such scholarly contributions to the work of the Government as an unofficial agency can make in wartime. Studies have centered around five main fields: strategy and armaments, economics and finance, political questions, territorial questions, and the peace aims of European nations. Since the inception of the project 541 memoranda have been sent to Washington dealing with subjects selected by both the council and the Government. The research is carried on by the study group method and the membership of these groups includes persons especially qualified by training and experience, both in Government service and out, as well as members of the council's research staff. The foundation has appropriated \$60,800 for the continuation of these studies in 1944. The interest which has been shown in these studies has led the council to arrange during the coming year for a wider distribution of various memoranda based on some of them, both inside the Government and to selected individuals in private organizations."

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 186-187: "The grants in international relations were for the support of agencies devoted to studies, to teaching, to service to Government and to public and expert education. Collectively these grants assume that it is not possible to guarantee peace but that the way to work toward it is to strengthen 'the infinity of threads that bind peace together.' To that end the foundation made grants for the support of studies and related activities of the following institutions: Foreign Policy Association, Royal Institute of International Affairs (London), Swedish Institute of International Affairs (Stockholm), and the economic, financial, and transit department of the League of Nations. The importance to peace of our relations with, and an understanding of, Russia was reflected in two grants to Columbia University for the Russian institute of its School of International Affairs. The sum of \$60,000 was appropriated to the Council on Foreign Relations for the continuation of its war and peace studies. A special grant of \$152,000 was made to the Royal Institute of International Affairs for a history of the war and the peace settlement. The Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton received \$40,000 for a study of the problems of international civil aviation. Fifteen thousand dollars was granted to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to aid in the development of a course in international relations for engineers."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1945 annual report, pp. 188-189:)

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

*"Columbia University School of International Affairs, Russian institute"*

"Increased efficiency and rapidity of transportation and communication have ended for this country the possibility of isolation, either as a physical fact or as a national policy. Those responsible for the management of the interests of the United States, whether in governmental or nongovernmental capacities, will of necessity be increasingly concerned with the institutions, mores and policies of other nations and peoples. There must therefore be developed with the United States a body of men and women with a broad understanding of international affairs who have in addition training as functional or regional specialists. Only a body of men and women so trained will provide a reservoir from which experts capable of handling the increasingly complex and intricate problems of international affairs can be drawn.

"For some time Columbia University has been exploring the desirability of establishing at the university a school of international affairs. The recommendation that such a school be created was made in 1945 and included the proposal for establishment of six institutes designed to develop special knowledge and understanding of certain of the so-called power and problem areas of the world. It is planned to assemble in these institutes groups of outstanding scholars who have specialized in specific geographical areas. The university suggests that a British Commonwealth institute, a French institute, a German institute, a Russian institute, an East Asian institute, and an institute of Latin American affairs be created. The Rockefeller Foundation has made a 5-year grant of \$250,000 to Columbia University toward the development of a Russian institute."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1945 annual report, p. 199:)

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE, NEW YORK

"One of the elements vital to the future success of world cooperation is the immediate accessibility of the huge documentation of the United Nations conference in San Francisco, which, by an almost unprecedented action of the conference, was made available for prompt public examination and study. With respect to many crucial issues the really significant material is not the formal language of the articles of the Charter, but the interpretation contained in the reports and discussions of the various committees. The conference, however, had no means of publishing this material. The secretariat which staffed the conference ceased to exist at the closing of the conference. The new secretariat is dealing with the future rather than with the past. The United Nations Information Office, therefore, with the consent of the authorities of the conference, is publishing the official document of the conference in cooperation with the Library of Congress."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1946 annual report:)

Pages 8-9: "The challenge of the future is to make this world one world—a world truly free to engage in common and constructive intellectual efforts that will serve the welfare of mankind everywhere."

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 32-33: *"International relations:*

"The grants in this field went to agencies which conduct research and education designed to strengthen the foundations for a more enlightened public opinion and more consistent public policies. \* \* \*"

"\* \* \* This parallels the grant of \$152,000 made in 1945 to the Royal Institute to enable Arnold Toynbee to write a history of international relations from 1939 to 1949. An appropriation of \$300,000 was made to the food research institute of Stanford University for the preparation, in collaboration with experts from many countries, of a history and appraisal of the world's experience in handling food and agriculture during World War II. Another grant was for the purpose of assisting the United Nations information office to reproduce the documentation of the first General Assembly and Preparatory Commission of the United Nations. The Brookings Institution was given a fund which will enable Dr. Leo Pasvolosky, who was special assistant to the Secretary of State for International Organization and Security Affairs, to analyze the background of the development of the



United Nations organization and to initiate studies and educational conferences on the problems that are emerging in the functioning of our new international machinery. \* \* \*

Page 40: "In this connection, mention might be made of the appropriations, voted in 1946, through the foundation's division of the social sciences, of \$233,000 to the Institute of Pacific Relations, \$60,000 of which went to the American Council and \$173,000 to the Pacific Council. Much of the work of this organization is related to the training of personnel, the stimulation of language study and the conduct of research on problems of the Far East. It is part of the pattern by which, from many different directions and points of view, efforts are being made to bring the West and the East into closer understanding."

Pages 182-183:

#### INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

##### *"The Brookings Institution"*

"The developing foreign policies of the United States as one of the major powers sharing world leadership are to be appraised under the new international-relations program of the Brookings Institution. Each of the studies is an integral part of a research plan geared to those international-relations problems with which the United States either is, or will be, concerned. This problem approach is intended to aid in formulating enlightened public opinion in training specialists in international affairs, and in aiding governmental agencies dealing with foreign relations. An annual seminar will endeavor to train specialists and aid teachers of international relations. A 1-year grant of \$75,000 was made by the foundation in support of this program.

"Two annual surveys will be published. One of these will examine American foreign policies, but with particular attention to the problems directly ahead and to the factors likely to determine their solution. The second survey will consider the foreign policies of other nations, especially the major powers, and how these are being harmonized through the United Nations and its related agencies.

"Five major studies are in progress: The United Nations Charter and its effect on the powers, duties, and functions of the U. N.; the foreign policy objectives of the five major powers; the general effectiveness of international organizations and conferences as methods of diplomacy; present-day factors making for economic war or for economic peace in international relations; and changes in international security concepts resulting from technological and strategic developments.

"Dr. Leo Pasvolsky, who has been in Government service since 1934, has now returned to the Brookings Institution as director of these studies."

Pages 190-191:

##### *"Institute of Pacific Relations"*

"The Institute of Pacific Relations, an unofficial international organization with a number of constituent national bodies or councils, aims to increase knowledge of economic, social, cultural, and political problems of the Pacific area. Training personnel, stimulating language teaching as well as curriculum attention to the Far East in general, and publishing research studies, are the institute's chief means of spreading knowledge. The distribution of educational materials to secondary schools and to the Armed Forces increased significantly during the past several years."

Pages 192-193:

##### *United Nations Information Office, New York*

"The importance of preventing possible serious misinterpretations of actions of international bodies due to unavailability of actual documents on transactions was recognized when the foundation early in 1946 appropriated \$16,177 to the United Nations Information Office, New York, toward the cost of reproducing the documentation of the Preparatory Commission in London and of the sessions of the First General Assembly of the United Nations Organization. Preparatory Commission documents were microfilmed in London and the film flown daily from the Interim Organization to the United Nations office in New York and reproduced here by photo-offset within 24 hours of their arrival. Fifty or sixty copies were sent to the Department of State and to key libraries throughout the country.

One thousand other copies were distributed to interested libraries, institutions, and societies, and an additional number provided for editorial writers, news commentators, and others. This appropriation was an emergency measure to permit the reproduction of these documents and their distribution as promptly as possible."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1947 annual report, pp. 39-41, 43-44:)

#### APPROACHES TO PEACE

"Work which looks toward more adequate analysis and understanding of the issues in international relations continued to hold an important place in the grants made by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1947 in the field of the social sciences."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Meanwhile we cannot neglect the direct approach to the overwhelming crisis of our generation, and for its part the foundation has contributed substantial sums over the last decade to organizations and projects that are concerned with the issues of international relations. This policy was, of course, continued in 1947. For example, the sum of \$225,000 was given to Brookings Institution in support of its broad program of research and education in the field of foreign policy. This program, under the leadership of Dr. Leo Pasvolksky, involves, among other objectives, five basic studies:

- "(1) Origin and Interpretation of the United Nations Charter.
- "(2) Foreign Policy Objectives of the Major Powers.
- "(3) Influences Making for Economic War or Economic Peace in International Relations.
- "(4) New Concepts of International Security.
- "(5) International Organizations and Conferences as New Methods of Diplomacy.

"In addition, Brookings Institution, as part of its program in the training of specialists, has planned an annual 2-week seminar for about 100 teachers of international relations.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Still another appropriation—in the amount of \$75,000—was given for the creation of senior fellowships at the Russian institute of the School of International Affairs at Columbia University. The Russian institute, toward whose creation in 1945 the foundation contributed \$250,000, is without doubt the leading graduate school in the United States in the field of Russian studies. In addition to the Russian language, its basic curriculum provides: (1) A broad background and training in 5 disciplines (history, economy, law and government, international relations, and the social and ideological aspects of literature) as applied to Russia; (2) an intensive research training in one of these 5 disciplines elected by the student; and (3) fundamental graduate training in the broader aspects of this elected discipline.

"The senior fellowships will make it possible to bring to the institute for advanced training some of those persons who are now conducting instruction in Russian subjects in other universities, thus enabling them to broaden their equipment and develop their effectiveness in Russian research.

"Other grants by the foundation in 1947 in this general field of international relations include the following:

"(1) The Royal Institute of International Affairs (\$50,625)—a supplement to an earlier grant toward Prof. Arnold J. Toynbee's study of the history of the war and of the peace settlement.

"(2) Commission of the Churches on International Affairs (\$15,000)—for preparations for conferences on the role of churches in international relations.

"(3) Johns Hopkins University (\$37,400)—for a study of the trends and forces which affect the United States in its international relations.

"(4) Netherlands Institute of International Affairs (\$25,000)—for a broadly based European conference on the economic and cultural aspects of the German problem.

"(5) Council on Foreign Relations (\$60,000)—for general support.

\* \* \* \* \*

## THE HUMANITIES IN SPACE

\* \* \* \* \*

"The range and variety of grants of this type made during 1947 may be briefly indicated. The American Council of Learned Societies received \$12,000 for the work of its committee on Near Eastern studies, \$25,000 for the translation into English of important Russian works, and \$100,000 to augment the supply of materials needed for teaching and research on Slavic studies; the University of Pennsylvania, \$60,000 for the development of studies of modern India; the University of Washington, \$150,000 for studies of the Far East; Yale University, \$25,000 toward the support of a group of advanced students of the Far East; the University of California, \$30,000 to develop intensive instruction in Slavic and Far Eastern languages, and \$100,000 for the development of junior personnel in Slavic studies; Columbia University, \$25,000, likewise for Slavic studies; Indiana University, \$27,500 for the development of studies of Eastern Europe, principally Finland and Hungary."

Pages 189-190:

## THE FUNCTIONING OF AMERICAN POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

*"Pacific Coast Board of Inter-Governmental Relations"*

"The foundation gave its support in 1947 to a pioneering educational experiment in intergovernmental relationships at the working level. On the Pacific coast the Governors of Washington, Oregon, and California, the chairman of the 3 State Leagues of Cities and State Associations of County Commissioners, and the coast regional chiefs of 11 Federal agencies, have created a Board of Inter-governmental Relations. The board aims to improve and coordinate government through meetings for the discussion of common problems, and acts as a nonprofit association solely to inform its individual members, and through them the public, of general and current problems. It takes no action, directly or indirectly, which might be construed as carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

"Thus far every meeting has had virtually full attendance, from the three Governors down. Typical subjects discussed to date include Federal-State-local tax and fiscal relationships; division of welfare costs; forest development, conservation, and protection; educational programs for veterans and nonveterans; problems of minorities in metropolitan centers; employment and unemployment; public-works planning and timing; adequate housing programs; industrial reconversion; availability of materials; and surplus property disposal."

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 190-191:

*"National Institute of Public Affairs"*

"The National Institute of Public Affairs recruits from the immediate graduates of the colleges and universities in the country talent for administrative and management posts in the Government of the United States and other jurisdictions. Sponsored by a board of public-minded citizens and acting as a liaison unit between the colleges and universities and the Federal departments, it has completed the 12th year of its unique public service training program, under which 30 to 50 college graduates each year have been selected and given rotating assignments on a nonsalaried basis within Federal agencies. The institute provides intensive orientation, supervision, and a carefully planned program of reading, studies, and conferences with public officials.

"The foundation has supported this program since 1935. Maintenance for about half the interns is financed by funds or fellowships raised by various colleges or their alumni. Encouraging is the competition and career interest which the program stimulates on college campuses throughout the country; also the rapidity with which graduates of the institute have risen to positions of responsibility in public life.

"A natural complementary development, guided by the institute in its first stages is a parallel inservice training program, for selected personnel of some 15 Federal departments or agencies, which is now in its seventh 6-month session under a coordinator furnished by the Civil Service Commission. The departments of State, War, Navy, Commerce, and Agriculture, are supplementing this with coordinated programs of their own."

\* \* \* \* \*

## INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Page 204-205: "There is an urgent and ever-increasing need in this country for basic information on the economic and political structure of the world and on the trends and forces which prevail and collide in various parts of the world and which affect the United States in its international relations. It is not enough to point out these trends and forces; it is essential to measure and weigh them.

"At Johns Hopkins University, Dr. W. S. Woytinsky has undertaken a piece of work which should help to answer this demand by giving an inclusive statistical picture of the different patterns of life of all nations of the globe and of the conditions in which they are facing the future. It will provide at least a partial background for discussion of such problems as the future of various races and continents; the fate of colonial empires; relations between industrial and agricultural nations; growth or decline of foreign trade; competition of raw materials, sources of energy, and means of transportation within the world economy; and conditions of world prosperity and peace. The work goes beyond the simple source book of statistics of international interest, in that these statistics are selected and organized with reference to specific problems of international importance. The resulting volume, *America in the Changing World*, should be valuable in promoting a better understanding of statistics, not as a mathematical discipline but as quantitative thinking on human affairs. The Rockefeller Foundation is supporting this project with a 3-year appropriation of \$37,400."

\* \* \* \* \*

*"Council on Foreign Relations*

Page 205:

\* \* \* \* \*

"The role of conflicting ideologies in foreign affairs is under discussion in a study group which the council has recently initiated on public opinion and foreign policy. The central problem of the group concerns the proper function of propaganda in the conduct of foreign affairs. Progress has been made on another study, the problem of Germany, which is financed by a special grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The Netherlands Institute of International Affairs invited the Council on Foreign Relations to participate in this study, which is being undertaken on an international basis."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1948 annual report:)

## FOUNDATION POLICIES

Pages 8-9:

\* \* \* \* \*

"In general the policy of the foundation and, with occasional exceptions, its practice have conformed to the following principles: (1) The support of the foundation should be directed to purposes for which it is otherwise difficult to secure funds; (2) the support should be of an initial or catalytic character, with the idea that what has been demonstrated to be useful should then be carried on by other means; (3) current and palliative types of philanthropy should accordingly be left to others, not because they are unimportant, but because the needs they encompass are more generally recognized. Furthermore, the resources of this foundation, and indeed of all similar foundations combined, are insignificant in relation to such needs."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 243:

*"Columbia University Far Eastern Studies*

"Without question east Asia will remain for a long time to come one of the great problem areas of the world. The United States has need of specialists who possess at once high technical competence in the social sciences and a knowledge of the languages and cultures of the area. Looking toward the establishment of a research institute in the east Asian field, the school of international affairs at Columbia University has started a program of Far Eastern studies through the various social-science departments. Owing to recent expansion in the fields of Chinese and Japanese languages, literature, and history, Columbia has a firm foundation for these studies. The aim at present

is to promote a similar expansion in the social sciences, in order to provide advanced training in economics, political science, and social analysis as related to China and Japan. \* \* \*

\* \* \*  
 Pages 247-248:

*"United Nations Economic Commission for Europe—Training Scholarships*

"The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe has received a grant of \$12,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation to provide social-science scholarships for selected European students.

\* \* \*  
 "An operational body which deals with virtually all aspects of European recovery and development, the Commission has attracted to its staff an international group of competent economists. These men can offer promising graduate students an introduction to the international approach to economic problems while they are acquiring first-hand knowledge of applied economics. The Research and Planning Division, headed by Mr. Nicholas Kalder, formerly of the London School of Economics, carries on work which is closely linked with the technical economic problems encountered in the operational activities of the Commission. Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, of Sweden, Executive Secretary of the Commission, has established a special committee to administer the program."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1949 annual report:)

PRESIDENT'S REVIEW

\* \* \*  
 Page 5-7: "The deeply disturbed political situation now prevailing in a large part of the world has had the effect of considerably curtailing the worldwide and international scope of foundation programs. Profound political changes have prevented the foundation from operating in several countries in which it was formerly active. These countries include Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and China. During the past year the far-eastern office of the international health division of the Rockefeller Foundation was moved from Shanghai to Macao and then to Bangalore, India. All personnel were withdrawn from China, and a malaria project under way in the island of Formosa was transferred to Government auspices.

"Monetarily speaking, this is an age of huge financial operations. In the United States large funds, chiefly governmental, are available even in the relatively restricted field of research and fellowships. This has brought about a sharp awareness of the discrepancy between the resources of any privately endowed philanthropic organization, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, and the magnitude of funds needed today for large-scale research or educational enterprises.

"Until recently the Rockefeller Foundation was a principal source of funds for foreign student fellowships at the advanced level. Today, as shown by the United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organization handbook of available fellowships, Study Abroad, appointments made annually by the foundation constitute hardly 2 percent of the 15,070 comparable awards now offered, 62.5 percent of them by Government agencies. It has been calculated that in 1913, when there were about 900 institutions of higher education in the United States, the appropriations of the General Education Board and of the Carnegie Corp., the 2 principal foundations at that time, represented more than 15 percent of the current income of all higher educational institutions. In other words, these philanthropic resources were fairly large in relation to the activities with which they were concerned, and they were not unsubstantial even with reference to public primary and secondary education.

"As things stand now, the income of the Rockefeller Foundation, the General Education Board, and the Carnegie Corp. covers less than 1 percent of the budgetary needs of the 1,800 institutions now ministering to higher education. Indeed, the annual expenditures of all foundations, even though roughly \$100 million, are insignificant in relation to public and private funds now needed and now available for education, scientific research, and scholarly activities.

"In the light of these changed conditions I propose to devote part of this review to a brief discussion of Rockefeller Foundation techniques in giving and in cooperating with other agencies and other countries. It is hoped that some light may be shed on the comparatively modest, yet significant, role that can

still be played under present world conditions by a privately endowed philanthropic organization."

\* \* \* \* \*  
 Pages 253-254:

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

*"Council on Foreign Relations:*

"The Rockefeller Foundation in 1949 appropriated \$50,000 to the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, for an organized study of problems of aid to Europe in its broadest aspects. The European recovery program of the United States has a significance for our future prosperity and security so great as to challenge the best efforts of private citizens as well as those in public office. The Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) believed that it would be of great value to the Government and to the public at large to have an appraisal of the European situation by a group of competent private persons free from the pressure of day-to-day decisions and unhampered by governmental procedures or the considerations of practical politics.

"Upon the invitation of the ECA, the council organized a group of leaders in the fields of economics, politics, and military strategy under the chairmanship of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. At its monthly meetings this group has carefully examined the aims of American foreign policy with respect to Western Europe and has assessed the means—economic, political, and military—for achieving those aims. Special attention has been given to the continuing interests of this country, as opposed to urgent expediencies of today and tomorrow, and to the relation between current measures of policy and the attainment of long-term goals. Close liaison has been maintained with ECA and with other Federal agencies and departments, but the group has functioned independently of the Government.

"Conclusions will be presented in the form of memoranda to responsible Government officials. Nonrestricted information is to be released to the general public by means of articles or pamphlets in order to help the public understand and judge the measures which it will be asked to endorse and carry out. In addition, it is hoped to issue a major publication or series of publications on the operations, effects, shortcomings, and interrelations of United States aid to Europe under ECA and under the provisions of military lend-lease.

"To assist the group the council has provided a full-time research staff of experts in the various fields of study, headed by Prof. Howard Ellis of the University of California. Under the guidance of the study commission the research staff gathers facts and data for the discussion meetings and prepares memoranda on assigned topics. The council also furnishes library and clerical assistance. The study group is serving on a voluntary basis. The Rockefeller Foundation's grant is to cover salaries and expenses of the research staff."

*"Institute of Pacific Relations*

\* \* \* \* \*  
 Page 256-257: "The eleventh conference will convene in 1950 in India and will discuss recent political and economic trends in the Far East and their consequences for the Western World. Preparation for the conference is a part of the research program of the Pacific council, which is responsible for writing up the data papers which give the members of the conference the background information they need for the discussions. Some of these papers, such as those on the Chinese Communist movement, nationalism and communism in Burma, postwar development of Indian capitalist enterprise, the development of political parties in Japan and the international effects of the withdrawal of western power from the Far East, are of wide interest. In order to enable the institute to strengthen its conference and educational activities at a critical time in Far Eastern relations, the foundation in 1949 made a supplementary grant of \$25,000, available until the end of March 1950. Of this, approximately \$14,000 is to augment the research function of the Pacific council and \$11,000 toward the expenses of 1950 conference."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1950 annual report:)

*"Brookings Institution*

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 208-209: "The 10 yearly issues contain research on the immediate issues to be faced by foreign policymakers. Additional publications put out under the new program include a series of individual analyses on long-range problems. Recent studies in this group have been on the International Trade Organization as an instrument of American economic foreign policy, the United States and peace settlements, and a history of the United Nations Charter. In order that the values of this problem approach may be extended to Government leaders, educators, and businessmen, the Brookings Institution now holds an annual 2-week seminar on Problems of United States Foreign Policy. Seminars have already been held at Dartmouth College, Stanford University, Lake Forest College, and the University of Denver, with over a hundred persons attending each one."

Pages 209-210:

*"Foreign Policy Association"*

"The Foreign Policy Association was created in 1918 for the purpose of carrying on 'research and education activities to aid in the understanding and constructive development of American foreign policy.' As the role of the United States has expanded in the international sphere, the association has undertaken to explain this role and its implications to an ever-increasing number of Americans. Thirty-two branch organizations have been organized in large cities throughout the country. Through the activities of these branches there have been organized local and national conferences, and a widespread educational program with frequent use made of radio and television. The three publications of the Foreign Policy Association, available to the general public, schools, organizations, and Government agencies, are a weekly foreign policy bulletin, which covers current issues, the foreign policy reports, published twice monthly, which discuss at some length pressing international issues and the popular *Headline Books*, with details on problems of importance to Americans and to the world."

(Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1951 annual report:)  
Pages 68, 69, 70:

THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

"With the enigma of Russian intentions still the top problem in world politics, the Russian Institute of Columbia University's School of International Affairs continues to be a key center for research and training in this field. Its 2-year course, requiring familiarity with the Russian language and providing intensive postgraduate instruction in the history, economics, law, politics, and culture of Russia, has in 5 years supplied the United States Army, the Department of State, and other Government services with more than 100 trained men. Staff members are frequently called on to lecture at the National War College, the Air War College, and outside universities. Earlier grants for the institute, which was established in 1946, totaled \$362,000; and in 1950 the foundation appropriated an additional \$420,000 toward support over a 5-year period.

"A postwar development of the Brookings Institution is its international studies group, organized in 1946 for research, education, and publication on questions of American foreign policy. Directed by Dr. Leo Pasvolosky and using a technique which is called 'the problem method,' the group has held 10 seminars in various parts of the United States for university teachers, advanced students, Government administrators, and journalists. To date some 800 university professors have shared in foreign policy analysis through participation in these seminars. Research activities are reflected in a number of books, notably in the annual *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy*, which has been adopted as a textbook at West Point, Annapolis, and various universities and colleges. A projected study which is now in the planning stage will analyze the basic framework of international relations, including the fundamental concepts and objectives of the major nations, patterns of economic behavior, political attitudes in international relations, the channels and instrumentalities of national action, and in general the whole pattern of internal and external factors which condition the international scene. Since the international studies group began 6 years ago, the foundation has appropriated \$480,000 toward its program, including \$180,000 in 1950."

\* \* \* \* \*

Pages 355-356:

*"United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*

*Long-run tendencies in the European economy:*

"In connection with its overall program on postwar recovery, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) in 1949 asked Prof. Ingvar Svennilson, the Swedish economist, to undertake a study of long-run trends in the European economy. Professor Svennilson and a staff of assistants at Geneva are now nearing the end of this work. It is essentially a survey of trends in the European economy for the years 1913-50, with emphasis on population, industrialization, manpower, and production, the influence of foreign trade on production and the important factors contributing to economic growth in Europe.

"The Rockefeller Foundation appropriated \$50,000 to the Economic Commission for Europe when Professor Svennilson began this work in 1949; in 1951 the foundation made a 1-year grant of \$23,725 for expenses in connection with the completion of the survey. The United Nations intends to publish the findings."

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 359:

*"Public Administration Clearing House  
Consultant for Japan.*

"Throughout the period of allied occupation of Japan there has been an effort to shift the emphasis of the Japanese governmental organization from a highly centralized bureaucratic control system to a more widely diffused pattern, with large areas of self-determination in local matters delegated to prefectures, cities, towns, and villages.

"One group in Japan which is sponsoring the spread of this movement is the recently organized Japan Public Administration Clearing House. All three levels of local government are represented in this group, which is made up of delegates from the Tokyo Bureau of Municipal Research and the national associations of prefectural governors, prefectural assembly chairmen, municipal mayors, city assembly chairmen, town and village mayors, and town and village assembly chairmen.

"Assistance was offered to the new organization by the Public Administration Clearing House of Chicago. With a grant of \$10,740 from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Chicago Public Administration Clearing House arranged to send a consultant to Japan and to make its official resources available to the group in Japan."

\* \* \* \* \*

---

(Source: The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, by Raymond B. Fosdick:)  
Pages 283-284:

"As we have already seen in earlier chapters, the example of Rose and Pearce in developing their programs on a worldwide basis was eagerly followed by the other divisions of the foundation as they began their activities after the reorganization of 1928. The details of many of these activities have already been considered; in all cases they were motivated by the single phrase in the charter: 'the well-being of mankind throughout the world'; and they were predicated on the conception that civilization and the intellectual life of men represent a co-operative achievement, and that the experience of the race can be pooled for the common good. It is an ironic circumstance that this objective should have had to run the gauntlet of two world wars with their hideous aftermaths, when behind closed frontiers, rigidly sealed off from contact with the ideas and opinions of other nations, vast populations have suffered from mental undernourishment and starvation. Intellectual malnutrition can be as stunting to human life and character as the absence of calories and vitamins. The influences that in normal times flow freely across boundary lines, the uninhibited stream of ideas coming from all corners of the world, are, in this modern society of ours, a corrective and stabilizing factor in the lives of men, bringing strength and fertility to soils that would otherwise become sterile and dry. 'Speech is civilization itself,' says Thomas Mann. 'The word, even the most contradictory word, preserve contact—it is silence that isolates.'"

\* \* \* \* \*



Page 297:

"A foundation with wide and intimate contacts can perform a useful function in serving as an unofficial clearinghouse for ideas and plans in many fields. Certainly this has been true of the Rockefeller Foundation. Its officers are in continual touch with promising developments and personnel around the world. The most effective projects it has supported have been developed in the field. These projects have come from close acquaintance with scientists and laboratories, from days and weeks spent on university campuses, from hard journeys on horseback and riverboat to discover the breeding places of disease or the prospects for a new type of corn. The officers thus develop a point of view that is both cumulative and comparative.

"Consequently, the foundation has become a center to which research students and universities turn for information; and much of the time of the officers is spent, not on questions of financial support, but in discussing with eager inquirers the developments in their fields in other institutions and in other countries. As the late President Keppel of the Carnegie Corp. said: 'Much of what one university learns about another is learned in foundation offices.'"





7 TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

---

REPORT

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND  
COMPARABLE ORGANIZATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. Res. 217



DECEMBER 16, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1954

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT  
FOUNDATIONS

B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee, *Chairman*

JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan

WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio

ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts

GRACIE PFOST, Idaho

RENE A. WORMSER, *General Counsel*

ARNOLD KOCH, *Associate Counsel*

NORMAN DODD, *Research Director*

THOMAS McNIECE, *Assistant Research Director*

KARL ETTINGER, *was a Research Consultant  
with the Committee from October 1953 to April  
1, 1954*

KATHRYN CASEY, *Legal Analyst*

JOHN MARSHALL, JR., *Chief Clerk*

MILDRED COX, *Assistant Clerk, March 1, 1954,  
to July 1, 1954, Acting Clerk, July 1, 1954, to  
December 31, 1954*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## PART ONE. INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

	Page
I. THE CREATION AND FUNCTIONING OF THE COMMITTEE.....	1
II. THE APPROACH OF THE COMMITTEE.....	2
III. THE FOUNDATIONS AND TAXES.....	4
The Present Basis of Federal Interest.....	4
The Possibility of Wider Interest.....	5
How Foundations Are Created.....	5
What Induces the Creation of Foundations.....	5
The Ford Foundation: An Example of the Use of a Foundation to Retain Management Control of an Enterprise.....	6
The Reid Foundation: Another Example of the Use of a Founda- tion to Retain Management Control of an Enterprise.....	8
The Eugene and Agnes Meyer Foundation.....	10
Taxes and the Increasing Foundation Birth-Rate.....	11
Corporate-Created Foundations.....	12
IV. STATISTICAL MATERIAL.....	13

## PART TWO. FINDINGS OF FACT AND SUPPORTING MATERIAL


V. PREFATORY NOTES AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	15
Summary of Committee Findings.....	16
VI. THE POWER OF THE LARGE FOUNDATION.....	19
The Impact of Size.....	19
Public Accountability.....	21
Abdication of Trustees' Responsibility.....	22
The Social Sciences.....	30
Patronage and Control.....	33
The Foundation Bureaucrats.....	37
Criticism and Defense.....	38
VII. THE CONCENTRATION OF POWER—THE INTERLOCKS.....	39
The Hazards to Society in an Interlock.....	39
Does a Concentration of Power Exist?.....	39
The Cartel and Its Operations.....	41
What Makes up the Interlock.....	45
The Social Science Research Council.....	47
The American Council on Education.....	52
Other Interlocks and Further Dangers.....	53
Politics—Power Flow—Planning.....	57
VIII. THE FOUNDATIONS AND RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES.....	60
The Predominance of Empiricism.....	60
The "Fact-Finding Mania".....	62
Limitations and Dangers.....	66
Dr. Kinsey Counts Noses.....	67
More "Scientism".....	72
Scientism and Causality.....	73
"The American Soldier".....	73
Some Results of Excessive Empiricism.....	75
Moral Relativity.....	76
Social Science Research in the Universities and Colleges.....	78
"The Social Sciences at Mid-Century".....	82
The Slant to the Left.....	85
"An American Dilemma".....	89
The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.....	91
"Experiment," "Risk Capital," and the Colleges.....	94

PART TWO. FINDINGS OF FACT AND  
SUPPORTING MATERIAL—Continued

	Page
IX. THE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF FOUNDATIONS.....	95
The Quantitative Test.....	95
The Qualitative Test.....	96
The League for Industrial Democracy.....	96
Another Specific Instance of Clear Political Use: The American Labor Education Service.....	106
The Twentieth Century Fund.....	109
The Fund for the Republic.....	110
Other "Civil Liberties" Projects.....	114
The Slant of the Concentration.....	116
A Carnegie Corporation Example.....	117
Another Example of Slant: The Citizenship Education Project.....	120
The General Problem.....	122
Social Engineering.....	123
The "Elite".....	126
The "Engineers," "Planning," and Socialism.....	129
The International Press Institute.....	133
The University of Chicago Roundtable Broadcasts.....	133
Facts Forum.....	133
The Public Affairs Pamphlets.....	134
X. FOUNDATIONS AND EDUCATION.....	134
Carnegie and Rockefeller Reform the Colleges.....	134
The Carnegie Corporation Finances Socialism.....	137
"Social Engineering" and Education.....	142
The Foundation-Supported Collectivist Text-Books—The Background.....	146
The Rugg Textbooks.....	149
Dr. Counts and Others.....	151
The Building America Textbooks.....	154
The Moscow University Summer Session.....	157
The Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education.....	161
Inter-University Labor Education Committee.....	162
Good Books Discussion Groups; Another Ford Fund for Adult Education project.....	164
An Inevitable Conclusion.....	167
XI. "INTERNATIONALISM" AND THE EFFECT OF FOUNDATION POWER ON FOREIGN POLICY.....	168
The New "Internationalism".....	168
The Interlock in "Internationalism".....	170
Carnegie's Money for Peace.....	170
The Endowment's "Mind Alcoves".....	173
A Carnegie Endowment-Created International Relations Club.....	174
The Foreign Policy Association.....	175
The Council on Foreign Relations.....	176
The Historical Backout.....	178
The Institute of Pacific Relations.....	179
The Foundations, the State Department and Foreign Policy.....	181
The United Nations and UNESCO.....	182
Carnegie Endowment and the Bar Association.....	184
An International Social Science Research Council.....	185
Ford Enters the Field.....	186
American Friends Service Committee.....	186
Intercultural Publications, Inc.....	188
Globalistic Economics.....	190
The National Education Association Goes "International".....	191
Expenditures Abroad.....	194
The Basic, Foundation-Supported Propaganda re Foreign Affairs.....	194
XII. COMMUNISM AND SUBVERSION.....	196
The Communist Penetration.....	196
How Do They Do It?.....	198
The Extent of Subversive Grants.....	199
Subversives Fed to Government.....	200
The Basic Problem of Subversion.....	201
Foundations and Subversion.....	205

## PART THREE. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

	Page
XIII. SOME SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS.....	207
The Problem of Foundation Survival.....	207
The Proposed Continued Inquiry.....	208
The Attitude of the Foundations.....	210
XIV. SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS NOT FULLY COVERED BY THE PREVIOUS TEXT.....	212
The Jurisdiction of Ways and Means.....	212
Reform From Within the Foundations.....	212
Limitations on Operating Costs.....	212
"Collecting" Foundations.....	213
Waste in General.....	213
Defining Foundations.....	213
Internal Revenue Service Manpower.....	213
Full Public Access to Form 990A.....	214
A "Rule Against Perpetuities".....	214
Accumulations.....	214
Capital Gains.....	214
Restrictions on Corporate-Created Foundations.....	215
National Incorporation.....	215
Retroactive Loss of Exemption.....	215
Removal of Trustees.....	215
Public Directors.....	215
Revolving Directorates.....	216
Selection of Working Trustees.....	216
Relief for the Alert Citizen.....	216
Prohibited Abuses.....	216
Foundations Used To Control Enterprises.....	216
Area Exclusions and Restrictions.....	217
Type Exclusions.....	218
Protection Against Interlock.....	218
Greater Use of Colleges and Universities.....	219
The Excess of Empiricism.....	219
Political Use and Propaganda.....	219
Lobbying.....	220
Subversion.....	220
Foreign Use of Foundation Funds.....	220
Further Areas of Investigation.....	220
Statement of B. Carroll Reece, supplementary to the Report.....	223
Appendix to the Report.....	227
Minority Views.....	417





---

---

# Union Calendar No. 926

83D CONGRESS  
*2d Session*

} HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES {

REPORT  
No. 2681

---

---

## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

---

DECEMBER 16, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. REECE of Tennessee, from the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Foundations, submitted the following

## R E P O R T

[Pursuant to H. Res. 217, 83d Cong., 2d sess.]



# TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

## PART ONE

### INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

#### I. THE CREATION AND FUNCTIONING OF THE COMMITTEE

This Committee was created by House Resolution 217, 83rd Congress, first session, adopted July 27, 1953. The resolution authorized an investigation as follows:

The Committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation to determine if any foundations and organizations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities; for political purposes; propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.

The resolution directed a report to be filed by January 3, 1955.

House Resolution 373, 83rd Congress, first session, adopted on August 1, 1953, appropriated the sum of \$50,000, with the expectation of the Committee that further funds would be granted after the first of the following year. Counsel was engaged as of September 1, 1953; the building of a staff commenced about September 15, 1953.

It was decided to engage in an intensive period of assembling and study of material, after which public hearings were planned to be held starting at the end of February or the beginning of March. After the first of the year, an additional appropriation was requested in the sum of \$125,000 to carry the Committee through until January, 1955. After considerable delay, a sub-committee of the Committee on House Administration decided to recommend the reduced sum of \$100,000 as an additional appropriation; later the full Committee on Administration reduced this sum further to \$65,000, which appropriation was granted by House Resolution 433 on April 6, 1954.

This additional appropriation was patently inadequate to enable this Committee to do the work for which it had been created. Moreover, there were moments when considerable doubt existed whether any additional appropriation would be granted. This doubt, the long delay while its funds were being exhausted, and other harassments to which the Committee and its employees were subjected, made it impossible for the Committee to schedule any hearings until it had funds at hand. The Easter recess then faced the Committee. Thus the first hearing could not be scheduled until May 10, 1954. Moreover, radical revisions in the Committee's plans had to be made. It was decided to hold such hearings as might be possible in May, June and early July and then to report. It was obvious that the appropriation which had finally been granted could not possibly support continued studies for the remainder of the Committee's permitted life.

A committee had been created by the previous Congress to investigate the same field. We shall refer to it as the "Cox Committee."

It had sent out questionnaires to about 1500 foundations, and about two-thirds of the foundations solicited had filed answers to them. The material in these answers was found to be of considerable value. However, our staff was distressed to find that much of the data collected and memoranda prepared by the previous staff were missing from the files. (Hearings, p. 14, et seq.)

A request was made on November 16, 1953 for an executive order to examine the forms known as 990A filed by foundations with the Internal Revenue Service. This order was not granted until February 11, 1954, and actual access to these reports, containing much valuable information which otherwise would have had to be obtained by individual solicitation from the foundations or by subpoena, was not granted by the Service until April 8, 1954. When access was finally obtained, the Committee was informed that it could not photostat these reports nor borrow them from the Service. This, in the light of their volume, limited their usefulness. Moreover, all the forms requested had not been brought into Washington from field offices.

Sixteen public hearings were held, the last on June 17th. Further public hearings were discontinued by a resolution passed at an executive meeting of the Committee on July 1, 1954. The Committee discontinued hearings with deep regret and only through necessity. It understood that depriving foundation spokesmen of an opportunity to state positions orally might affect its public relations; it concluded, nevertheless, that the circumstances permitted no other course. Moreover, the discontinuance of the hearings resulted in no serious loss to the inquiry, for oral testimony in an investigation of this nature is of far less importance than research.

Nor did the foundations lose any opportunity either to present their points of view or to receive attendant publicity. Written statements were solicited from them, which gave them the opportunity to answer the material already presented to the Committee and to add freely such further comments as they might choose. These statements were carefully considered and added in full to the record. The statements were given full publicity and were widely reported in the newspapers, appearing in a most favorable manner in view of the fact that no critical comments by the Committee were simultaneously publicized. The foundations touched by the hearings were thus given a fair opportunity to put their best foot forward at the same time that they escaped the embarrassment of cross examination.

The Committee's work by no means ended with the discontinuance of public hearings. An investigation of this type is, after all, primarily a matter of laborious research; the research continued industriously, hampered only by a gradual reduction in the staff which the Committee's limited finances necessitated.

In the following text we have used italics in conventional manner, but also to designate foundations and tax-free organizations other than universities, colleges, and schools, and to identify certain individuals, special reference to whose records is made in appendices.

## II. THE APPROACH OF THE COMMITTEE

The Cox Committee admittedly had been allotted insufficient time within which to do a complete study or even adequately to outline the full scope of inquiry. The present committee deemed its mandate

to be virtually a continuation of the investigation of its predecessor. It considered itself authorized to make a study not only of specific abuses which might come to light but also of the general orientation of foundations in our society. It has deemed itself primarily a fact-finding body, intending to make recommendations to the House only where such seemed clearly wise. Principally, its function was considered to be to bring into clear relief any grave criticisms which appeared to be reasonably warranted in order that the House itself could have a basis for considering whether further action should be taken by way of additional study or the application of means of correction or control.

*The Committee was and is well aware of the many magnificent services which foundations have rendered to the people of the United States in many fields and areas, particularly in medicine, public health and science. Nothing has occurred to change its initial conviction that the foundation, as an institution, is desirable and should be encouraged. If little time is spent in this report reciting the good which the foundations have done, it is not because this Committee is unaware of it or in any way reluctant to acknowledge it. Rather, this Committee considers that it is necessarily concerned with the evaluation of criticisms. A fair judgment of the work and the position of foundations in our society must obviously take into account the great measure of benefit for which they have been responsible. At the same time, the power of these foundations is so great that a proper evaluation must give great weight to the dangers which have appeared in their operations in certain areas of activity.*

We wish, therefore, to make clear that not even an inferential conclusion is to be drawn from this report that foundations are undesirable. Our conclusion is the opposite. It is our intention to present critical material for the very purpose of increasing the usefulness of foundations and of making their place in our society firmer and safer. We hope that such material will induce the foundations themselves to "clean house," if that is necessary. This Committee is opposed to any *unnecessary* government regulation; and would recommend Congressional action only in so far as the seriousness of certain abuses might be accompanied by any unwillingness of the foundations to reform themselves, or in the event that it were concluded that certain dangers could be guarded against *only* through regulation.

It was our hope, to begin with, that no remedial action by the Congress might be necessary. But foundations play a part in our society the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated; and, in the course of our investigation, evidence of very grave abuses accumulated to the point of indicating that intervention by Congress to protect our society is badly needed. Some remedies can be instituted at once. Others should perhaps be considered only after that continued and more intensive study of foundation activities which the facts already disclosed have proved to be utterly necessary. Even with an adequate appropriation, this Committee could probably not have done the full study of the subject which the circumstances warrant. It has been variously estimated that this would take a period of three to seven years, by a full staff amply financed.

Our own studies soon disclosed the measure of this problem. Accordingly, it was decided to limit the work by confining it to "foundations" included under Section 501 (c) (3), [formerly Section 101 (6)] of the Internal Revenue Code; and, within that category, to

eliminate (except where direct reference seemed necessary for other reasons) consideration of (a) religious institutions, (b) operating academic institutions and (c) certain other sub-divisions of the 501 (c) (3) [formerly 101 (6)] class, as well as (d) the small foundations which are mere media for distributing the annual charitable income tax deductions of individuals and (e) other minor distributing or collecting foundations.

The term "foundation" is a broad one. In this report it is intended to denote "foundations" as the term is ordinarily used by the layman—indicating such foundations as *The Rockefeller Foundation*, *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, *The Ford Foundation*, *The Twentieth Century Fund*, etc. We shall also, sometimes, include certain types of organizations which are "foundations" within the term but are not generally so recognized by the public. These are the intermediary organizations, used by foundations, such as *The Social Science Research Council*.

For reasons to be explained later, we decided, moreover, to confine our inquiry chiefly to the activities of the foundations in what are known as the "social sciences."

\* \* \* \* \*

This report is based upon the testimony at hearings; the statements filed by foundations and others; the other material included in the record; data and information secured by personal conferences, correspondence and telephone conferences; and materials assembled by a reading, study and analysis of books and literature relating to foundations and to the social sciences.

### III. THE FOUNDATIONS AND TAXES

#### *THE PRESENT BASIS OF FEDERAL INTEREST.*

With an occasional but rare exception, foundations are created under state law. Their activities are, therefore, under state control, for the most part. The Federal government acquires its immediate interest through the tax laws. It has never sought directly to regulate foundations, deeming this to be the province of the respective states in which the foundations are created and operate. But the Federal government extends to foundations certain exemptions from Federal taxation. Their income is exempt from Federal income tax; contributions to them are free of gift tax and estate tax; and the donor is permitted a deduction for income tax purposes to the extent of 20% of the income of an individual donor and 5% of that of a corporate donor.<sup>1</sup> These exemptions are acts of grace by the Federal government. In so far as they relieve foundations and their creators and supporters from taxation, they impose a greater tax burden upon the generality of the people of the country. Thus the Federal government permits the equivalent of public money to be used by these foundations. Accordingly, it is justified in applying certain restrictions on the right to the various exemptions granted to foundations.

The theory behind such restrictions is simply that, as exemptions are acts of grace, the government may clearly impose such conditions on the exemptions as may be calculated to prevent abuse of the privilege and to prevent the use of the exempted funds against the public interest.

<sup>1</sup> Under the 1954 amendments to the tax law an individual is granted a 30% deduction for charitable donations but only 20% of this may go to foundations.

*THE POSSIBILITY OF WIDER INTEREST.*

Whether a Constitutional basis for a more extended Federal control of foundation activities can be found, other than that which the tax laws offer, is a matter which warrants careful study. The tax laws can control foundations only in limited fashion. If greater control becomes necessary or advisable, and a movement should come into being in some degree to supplant or amplify the control now resting with the states, a basis for legislative action might conceivably be found in the general welfare clauses of the Constitution or elsewhere in it; but this would require a careful study of constitutional law. The problem is not easy.

Many suggestions have been made in the "there ought to be a law" area. This Committee repeats, however, that it does not favor any *unnecessary* extension of Federal jurisdiction. It hopes that whatever errors in foundation operation and management now exist may be corrected within the Federal tax laws, by state law and by the willingness of foundations to maintain more vigilant safeguards against abuses which have existed in the past.

*HOW FOUNDATIONS ARE CREATED.*

They may be created by act of Congress, but few have been.

The usual methods are two: by the creation of a trust under state law, having "charitable" purposes; and by the creation of a corporation under the state law (generally what is known as a "membership corporation") having exclusively "charitable" purposes. The trust is managed by trustees who usually are authorized to fill their own ranks as vacancies appear. The corporation is managed by a board of trustees or directors, elected and replaced by the members. The members are usually small in number and it is not uncommon for the members to make themselves the directors.

*WHAT INDUCES THE CREATION OF FOUNDATIONS.*

Mr. Leo Eagan, in an article on foundations in the *New York Times* of March 1, 1954, called attention to the "enormous growth that has taken place in the number and assets of foundations over the last fifteen years.", saying later:

"All authorities agree that the number has risen rapidly since 1939 and is still on the increase. It is likewise agreed that extremely high income and inheritance taxes on big incomes and estates have been a major factor in promoting this growth."

A very common use of smaller foundations is as a means for distributing at leisure the charitable donations which are deductible under the income tax law. This applies both to individual and corporate donors. Instead of rushing at the end of the year to make the necessary charitable payments to get within the full income tax deduction allowance, one single contribution is made to a foundation, which then may take its time to distribute the fund in detail. But these contributions are not always distributed. Technically, they constitute capital in the hands of the foundation, and not income. As the tax law proscribes the unreasonable accumulation of income, the distinction is important; the foundation may aggregate the donations received, paying out merely the income which this aggregation earns and holding the capital intact for some special purpose, perhaps to buy assets from the donor's estate at his death.

In this era, the larger foundations are sometimes created because the donor, anticipating that part of his estate may be taxed at an almost confiscatory rate, prefers to set this part of his estate aside, tax free, for a public benefit rather than to have the greater part of it pass to the Government.

But perhaps the most frequent motivation in the creation of large foundations today is that the proprietor of a substantial enterprise, who wishes to have it continued after his death in the hands of his family, has insufficient liquid means available to satisfy his estate tax obligations at death. There are other ways of solving the estate-liquidation problem, such as buy-and-sell agreements with other stockholders; the carrying of sufficient life insurance; the use of Section 303 [formerly Section 115 (g) (3)] of the Internal Revenue Code, which permits the corporation under certain circumstances to purchase enough stock from the deceased, without tax penalty to the estate, to pay the tax bill, etc. But there are many instances in which, no other means seeming practicable, a foundation is resorted to.

The usual procedure then is to transfer (or arrange to transfer at death) to a foundation created for the purpose enough of the ownership of a corporation to reduce the estate tax impact to a point where the liquid assets of the proprietor (and other means he may have devised to solve the problem) are sufficient to meet the death taxes. Such donations are usually in the form of preferred or non-voting stock. Combinations of these advantages result:

1. The family may remain in full voting control;
2. The family has a pleasant partner, managed by gentle hands;
3. The family may reap the benefit of any increase in the value of the equity;
4. If further inflation should come, it is the family which can become entitled to receive the benefit of the increase in monetary value of the company;
5. No working capital is lost by the venture; and
6. The foundation may even be used as a vehicle for the employment of associates and relatives.

It is not always, however, non-voting stock which is transferred to a foundation. Where a foundation is to be guided by friendly hands, the donor may be willing to let it become a partner in management by giving it voting stock. That was the case, for example, with the Duke Foundation, the assets of which include voting stock of the Duke Power companies. As the charter provides that this stock cannot be sold without the consent of all of the trustees, a sale is unlikely and the voting stock is rather sure to remain in friendly hands.

*THE FORD FOUNDATION: AN EXAMPLE OF THE USE OF A FOUNDATION TO RETAIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL OF AN ENTERPRISE.*

The Ford Foundation affords a good example of the use of a foundation to solve the death tax problem and, at the same time, the problem of how to retain control of a great enterprise in the hands of the family. 90% of the ownership of the Ford Motor Company was transferred to *The Ford Foundation*, created for the purpose. Had it not been, it is almost certain that the family would have lost control. The



only practical alternative might have been to sell a large part of the stock to the public or to bankers, or to sell the entire Company. The huge taxes payable by the Ford estates could not have been paid without liquidating a considerable part—possibly a controlling part—of the family business. The solution selected was to give away 90% of the Company to “charity”, so that the greater part of the estates would be free of death taxation.

The “charitable” transfers, could have been made, of course, direct to universities, churches, hospitals and other institutions. But this would have put the donated stock of the Ford Company into the hands of strangers. For this reason, we assume, a foundation was created, and to make doubly certain that there would be no interference with the Company’s management, the donated stock was in the form of non-voting shares. Not only did the family thus retain 100% voting control, but the Ford Company lost no working capital whatsoever. Moreover, even non-voting stock can be something of a nuisance in the hands of strangers but, held by an amiable creature, operated by friendly nominees of the family, it would not be likely to bring any pressure to bear on the management of the Company of the kind which might be expected of an alert general stockholder.

There is nothing illegal about such a plan. It is entirely proper as the law now stands and it is a mechanism frequently used to reach just the results which the Ford family anticipated. But in the case of a large company such as Ford, it is subject to considerable social or economic criticism on the ground of its unfair business impact. The April 1954 issue of *The Corporate Director* contained a study of *The Ford Foundation*. It was referred to in detail by Mr. Aaron Sargent, a witness before the Committee (in full, Hearings, p. 373 *et seq.*). The article points out that members of the Ford family, as officers of the Ford Company, are able to draw salaries and are thus in a position, being assured of their own income, to allow the Company to operate on a cost basis, without having to pay dividends. By that means, they could bring destructive economic power to bear upon competitors of the Ford Company which must pay dividends to stockholders and maintain a credit position. No other automobile manufacturing company is in a position to ignore stability of earnings or continuity of dividend payments. If General Motors or Chrysler earned no money, the article said, the management heads would roll; but Ford management would remain in power regardless of its earning record.

There is no evidence that the Ford Company has taken any unfair advantage of its competitors in the manner which the article describes as possible. The point is discussed here merely to illustrate an abuse which can accompany the use of a foundation in business and estate planning.

*The Ford Foundation* has been criticised in another respect, however, relating to unfair competition. The Television programs and other enterprises conducted by the *Foundation* advertise the name of “Ford.” This, say some critics, because the association with the Ford automobile is self-evident, constitutes a form of advertising with the public’s money and gives the Ford Company an undue advantage over its competitors.

*THE REID FOUNDATION: ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE USE OF A FOUNDATION TO RETAIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL OF AN ENTERPRISE.*

On August 2, 1946, Ogden M. Reid created and transferred to *The Reid Foundation, Inc.* seventeen promissory, non-interest bearing notes dated January 2, 1942, payable to him by the publishing company which owns the *New York Herald-Tribune*, a newspaper. The notes were payable annually, starting April 15, 1953 and ending April 15, 1969. Further notes and open accounts were left to the *Reid Foundation* under Mr. Reid's will. The gift of the notes, and the bequest of further notes and open accounts, were apparently cleared as free of gift tax and estate tax respectively.

There seems to be considerable doubt whether these transfers were truly tax-exempt, and a careful review of the facts by the Internal Revenue Service might well be in order. The notes and open accounts aggregated about eight and one-half million dollars in face value, resulting in a huge saving in taxes to Mr. Reid's estate.

The deed of gift which transferred the first batch of notes (\$2,473,392.05) to the *Foundation* was an odd instrument. The notes bear no interest. On the other hand, the transfer authorizes the collection of the notes by the *Foundation* only "for its sole use and benefit." We assume this means that the notes apparently cannot be transferred or sold. The *Foundation* thus has been given a frozen asset, bearing no income, and with no right to sell it to produce income from reinvestment. Is that a true "charitable" gift entitling the donor and his estate to tax exemption? We doubt it.

It might be answered that the *Foundation*, even if it earns no interest on the notes, can spend its principal. True, but its only obligation under the tax law is to pay out its income—a payment on a note would constitute principal and not income. Moreover, the notes are not payable unless the *New York Tribune, Inc.* cares to pay them. For the deed of gift provides that the *Foundation* "at the request of *New York Tribune, Inc.* and from time to time, will extend or consent to the extension of the time of payment of said indebtedness or any part thereof on such terms and conditions as a majority of the directors of the Donee may in their discretion decide." The only condition put upon this right of the publishing company to get an extension of its obligations is "Unless such action would in the opinion of a majority of the directors of the Donee, prejudice the right of the Donee to ultimate payment of the said indebtedness." We have italicized the term, "the right",—the condition is *only* that nothing shall be done to destroy the bare legal right eventually to collect—in other words, the trustees are merely prohibited from completely abandoning the right to collect a thousand years from now. Note also that, while the *Foundation* may stage "terms and conditions" for an extension of payment, *they cannot deny the right to an extension which perpetuates the debt.* Note, finally, that the directors of the *Foundation* were nominees of its creator, the donor of the notes. *What is of even greater significance is that of the seven directors of the Foundation, four are directors of the Herald-Tribune (see chart facing). The two boards are, therefore, in relation to purposes of control, Tweedledum and Tweeledgee.*

There are other conditions in the deed. No action can be started to collect the notes unless (a) a majority of the directors of the *Foundation* agree and (b) their decision is that the action is necessary to protect "the rights of the Donee to ultimate payment—not ultimate

Officers	New York Herald-Tribune	Reid Foundation, Inc.
Chairman.....	Helen Rogers Reid. <sup>1</sup>	None.
President.....	Whitelaw Reid. <sup>1</sup>	Helen Rogers Reid. <sup>1</sup>
Executive vice president.....	William E. Robinson. <sup>1</sup>	None.
Vice president.....	None.	Whitelaw Reid. <sup>1</sup>
Treasurer.....	A. V. Miller. <sup>1</sup>	Whitelaw Reid. <sup>1</sup>
2d vice president.....	None.	William E. Robinson. <sup>1</sup>
Secretary.....	Stanley D. Brown.	William E. Robinson. <sup>1</sup>
Directors.....	Ferdinand Eberstadt.	Goeffrey Parsons. <sup>2</sup>
	Oveta Culp Hobby.	Roy Gasser.
	Charles Seymour.	Wilbur Forrest.
		George Cornish. <sup>3</sup>
		Warner R. Moore. <sup>4</sup>
		James Parton. <sup>5</sup>
		Everett Walker. <sup>6</sup>
		Howard Davis. <sup>7</sup>
		Ogden Reid. <sup>8</sup>
		Barney Camcron. <sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Also member of board of directors.  
<sup>2</sup> Chief editorial adviser, formerly chief editorial writer; son (Jr.), was foreign editor, New York Herald-Tribune, now with NATO, Paris.  
<sup>3</sup> Executive editor, New York Herald-Tribune.  
<sup>4</sup> Business manager, New York Herald-Tribune.  
<sup>5</sup> Assistant to president, New York Herald-Tribune.  
<sup>6</sup> Managing editor, New York Herald-Tribune.  
<sup>7</sup> Formerly executive vice president, now president, American Newspaper Publishers Association.  
<sup>8</sup> "President, New York Herald-Tribune, S. A. since 1953" (Volume 28, Who's Who).  
<sup>9</sup> Circulation department, New York Herald-Tribune.

payment but the rights to ultimate payment. And the Foundation may compromise the indebtedness (that is, forgive it in as large a part as it wishes), at will, and thus virtually make a gift to the *Herald-Tribune of property dedicated to public use.*

But perhaps the most interesting clauses in the deed are those which cast grave doubt on the basic tax-exempt character of the *Foundation*. The deed recites that "It is understood and agreed" \* \* \* that the ultimate payment of said notes may be dependent upon the continuing operation as a going concern of *New York Herald-Tribune Inc.* \* \* \*—"accordingly", the deed proceeds, the Donee agrees to certain conditions applying to the notes. The very first of these is:

"New York Tribune Inc. shall be given by the Donee every reasonable opportunity and the full cooperation of the Donee to work out its financial affairs."

It is the conclusion of this Committee that what was intended was a business arrangement. We conclude that the *Foundation* was not to be engaged solely in charitable work as required by the rules exempting 501 (c) (3) [formerly 101 (6)] organizations. It was to exercise charity in behalf of the *New York Herald-Tribune*. It was to subordinate whatever philanthropic work had been planned to the welfare of that newspaper and the interest of the Reid family in it. It was a business deal. There was no free gift of the notes. They were transferred pursuant to a contract under which the *Foundation* agreed to assist the publishing company in its financial problem and, by inference, but clear inference, to make this objective superior to its presumed charitable function.

It was on its face, a magnificently designed arrangement. Whether or not Ogden Reid's estate could have paid the heavy death duties, if eight and a half million dollars had not been exempted, we do not know. It is very likely that it might have been impossible to pay the taxes on this additional eight and a half million and still retain in the family control of a *Herald-Tribune* left financially sound. The general plan adopted was somewhat similar to that used by the Ford family.

However, the Ford arrangement seems entirely within the scope and intent of the exempting law, while the Reid arrangement would seem to violate both its intent and its specific restrictions. We wonder if Internal Revenue should not review its decision to exempt the *Foundation*.

Comparatively little in the way of "charity" has been done by the *Foundation* in relation to the size of its assumed capital—and naturally so. Earning no interest, it is dependent on capital payments from the *Herald-Tribune* when it chooses to make payments. There have been some principal payments, and some of these have evidently been used to create Reid Fellowships and for other purposes. But its performance as an eight and a half million dollar foundation has been, in the aggregate, understandably pitiful—its first obligation has been to support the *Herald-Tribune*.

It must be noted, in closing this discussion of the *Reid Foundation*, that the *New York Herald-Tribune* leveled quite extraordinarily savage attacks at this Committee during its work, both in that newspaper's editorials and in what purported to be its news columns.

#### *EUGENE AND AGNES E. MEYER FOUNDATION.*

Unlike the Reid Foundation the Meyer Foundation did not receive its primary impetus because of the death of the donor; as a matter of fact, it is typical of foundations set up by individuals in order to provide an orderly and consistent method of making contributions to their chosen charitable and educational institutions. *No criticism is made of this entirely legitimate use of foundations.*

However, this Committee has some doubts in connection with the close relationship of the *Foundation* and the *Washington Post Company*, which in addition to owning the *Washington Post and Times-Herald* also owns all the stock of WTOP, Inc., a radio and TV station in Washington D. C., as well as a radio and TV station in Jacksonville, Florida. The assets of the Foundation (1953) are approximately 7.8 million dollars, of which 1.65 million dollars are invested in various securities. The balance of 6.2 million dollars apparently represents the value of 153,750 shares of Class B (non-voting) Common Stock of the *Washington Post Company* held by the *Foundation*.

The net worth of the *Washington Post Company* cannot be obtained from the company itself. However, there are a total of 186,750 shares of Class B (non-voting) Common Stock outstanding, as well as 12,724 shares outstanding of Class A (voting) Common Stock. The 153,750 shares of Class B Common Stock held by the *Foundation* represents 82.5% of the total of such shares. None of the voting stock is held by the *Foundation*, but according to limited information available the greater portion is controlled by Mr. and Mrs. Meyer.

In view of this intimate relationship, the intensely critical attitude of the *Washington Post and Times-Herald* toward the work of this Committee appears to be something in the nature of a defense mechanism, rather than the unbiased reporting of facts by a newspaper.

Again, this is a subject which warrants further study—to insure that the press will be free of undue influence by any group with an axe to grind, whether such groups are tax exempt or other types of corporate organizations.

*TAXES AND THE INCREASING FOUNDATION BIRTH-RATE.*

It is the pressure of the present high rates of taxation which now induces the creation of foundations. Some of the foundation executives who testified before the Cox Committee opined that the birth-rate of foundations must soon decline because great fortunes can no longer be made. This opinion seems incorrect. When Counsel asked Mr. Andrews, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whether the high tax rates of recent years had not "materially increased the incidence of foundations" largely as a means for solving the problem of liquidating estate tax obligations, the Commissioner answered: "There is no doubt in the world about that." (Hearings, p. 462.) Despite high taxation, great fortunes continue to be made. Witness the new oil fortunes of Texas, Oklahoma and elsewhere, as well as other startling accumulations of wealth. Indeed, many existing small foundations are deceptive. They have been created with small capital, to be in being at the death of the donor for the purpose of receiving huge testamentary bequests.

There is no reason to suppose that great fortunes will not continue to be built, each of which will be faced with the serious problem of preparing for the death tax impact. Moreover, it is not only the enormously rich who create foundations today. Countless owners of substantial business enterprises are today planning to solve their estate problems through the use of foundations, and there is reason to believe that this tendency will continue and perhaps even increase. Ingenious experts in estate and tax planning have devised many interesting ways to use a foundation in an estate or business plan. The use of a foundation to permit a family to control a business after the death of the proprietor is widely promoted. For example, the August 15, 1954 issue of the *J. K. Lasser Tax Reports* contains this statement:

"Note there is nothing wrong—morally or legally—in using a foundation to effectuate tax savings. A family can legitimately establish a foundation where charitable motives are closely tied to reduced costs of charitable giving because of income tax deductions allowed. Also, the owner of a business may create a foundation so as to cut his estate tax and leave his family in control of the business after death—he leaves non-voting stock to the foundation with his family retaining the voting stock. Control of the auto company was retained by the Ford family in that way."

What is an increasing, rather than a decreasing, birth rate, and an increasing aggregate of foundation funds, makes the problems treated by this Committee all the more serious. In an address delivered at the University of Chicago on November 27, 1952, General Counsel to this Committee said:

"It seems to me that the ingenious legal creatures developed by tax experts to solve the unusual social, economic, and legal problems of the past several generations will become Frankensteins, though perhaps benevolent ones. It is possible that, in fifty or a hundred years, a great part of American industry will be controlled by pension and profit-sharing trusts and foundations and a large part of the balance by insurance companies and labor unions. What eventual repercussions may come from such a development, one can only guess. It may be that we will in this manner reach some form of society similar to socialism, without consciously intending it. Or it may be, to protect ourselves against the strictures which such concentrations of power can effect, that we might have to enact legislation analogous to the Statutes of Mortmain which, centuries ago, were deemed necessary in order to prevent all of England's wealth from passing into the hands of the church."

If a great increase in the aggregate of foundation funds should occur, either foundations will have to operate in a way which the country will be certain is to its incontrovertible benefit or else strict rules of control may have to be enacted.

#### *CORPORATE-CREATED FOUNDATIONS.*

High corporate tax rates have added to the birthrate of foundations. Many corporations, faced with excess profits taxes, created foundations to take advantage of their full permitted income tax deduction for charitable gifts. By creating their own vehicles for distribution, they are able better to organize and plan the distribution of their "charities". They can make a single contribution at the end of each year to the foundation and then, as in the case of an individual creating one for the same purpose, take time to plan out the individual grants. As each year's contribution is capital in the hands of the foundation and not income—only the income from these contributions need be distributed. Thus there is the possibility of large funds being built up by corporation-created foundations which can add considerably to the aggregate mass of foundation funds.

This Committee has not wished to take time from more pressing problems to go into the corporate area. However, corporation-created foundations present some special problems which are worth full study.

Two groups are sometimes inclined to oppose corporation-created foundations—labor and the stockholders of the individual corporation. Labor's argument is: If there is any unneeded surplus, why not pay it to us in increased wages? The stockholders' argument is: If there is unneeded surplus, why not pay it to us in dividends?—by distributing to charity what are really our profits (for we are the proprietors of the company) are you not forcing us to make distributions we may not wish to make? These arguments strike, basically, at corporate charitable donations, as such, of course, and not at foundations *per se*.

But there is much to be said on the other side. From a social point of view, the advocates of corporation-created foundations say: private support of philanthropic causes is vital to our society, and corporations should do their part—or, corporate philanthropic giving is now larger, in the aggregate, than individual giving and, to dry it up, would be catastrophic for the supported "charities"—or, corporate giving is cheaper than giving by the individual shareholder, whose profits, if he pays them out, would first have been subjected to corporate income tax.

From a practical point of view, they argue: the corporation can designate "charities" which are directly beneficial to its employees and to the community within which it operates and, thus, serve a practical business purpose in bettering public relations—or, the corporation can make donations which can have a definitive benefit to itself or to its industry—as in the case of grants to technical schools and to universities and colleges where possible future employees can be trained and improved methods and devices can be developed.

Aside from the problems arising out of the conflicts of interest among the stockholders, the employees and the corporation itself, there are philosophic problems involved which merit consideration. A corporation is a legal entity, entitled in many respects to the same treatment as an individual. But there is a limit to its assumption of personality. Certain privileges given as a matter of social grace

to individuals need not necessarily be granted to the fictitious personality of a corporation. Nor has a corporation any inalienable rights. Whether a corporation, as such, is qualified to exercise charitable patronage, involving factors such as pity and conscience is questionable.

The problem of limiting or controlling such foundations should be studied carefully. We shall point out in this report how vast can be the power of an individual foundation, and how much greater when foundations act in combination. The potential danger should not be overlooked that huge corporation-created foundations might play too strong and active a part in our social structure. The answer to this problem is not abolition but some intelligent supervision or limitation.

From a practical point of view, they argue: the corporation can designate "charities" which are directly beneficial to its employees and to the community within which it operates and, thus, serve a practical business purpose in bettering public relations—or, the corporation can make donations which can have a definitive benefit to itself or to its industry—as in the case of grants to technical schools and to universities and colleges where possible future employees can be trained and improved methods and devices can be developed.

Aside from the problems arising out of the conflicts of interest among the stockholders, the employees and the corporation itself, there are philosophic problems involved which merit consideration. A corporation is a legal entity, entitled in many respects to the same treatment as an individual. But there is a limit to its assumption of personality. Certain privileges given as a matter of social grace to individuals need not necessarily be granted to the fictitious personality of a corporation. Nor has a corporation any inalienable rights. Whether a corporation, as such, is qualified to exercise charitable patronage, involving factors such as pity and conscience is questionable.

The problem of limiting or controlling such foundations should be studied carefully. We shall point out in this report how vast can be the power of an individual foundation, and how much greater when foundations act in combination. The potential danger should not be overlooked that huge corporation-created foundations might play too strong and active a part in our social structure. The answer to this problem is not abolition but some intelligent supervision or limitation.

#### IV. STATISTICAL MATERIAL

No comprehensive statistics are available. The source from which one might expect to get them is the Internal Revenue Service. However, Section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code included various types of tax-exempt organizations in addition to foundations. Moreover, foundation bookkeeping introduced complications such as cross-grants. Therefore, the Service would have been unable to produce complete statistics except at prohibitive cost in labor and money.

The staff of this Committee assembled, and commented upon, some valuable statistics based chiefly on the answers to the questionnaires sent out by the Cox Committee. See Hearings, page 9, *et seq.* (Note that some adjustment must be made in using these statistics in view of the depreciation of the dollar in recent years.) Statistical studies

made by others, notably the Russell Sage Foundation, though necessarily incomplete, are also useful to give some basic financial facts.

There are between six and seven thousand foundations at the present time, probably close to the latter figure. Their aggregate funds amount to some \$7,500,000,000, and their aggregate annual income to nearly \$675,000,000. It is estimated that foundations of \$10,000,000 capital or over comprise only 7% of the total number, but account for 56% of the total endowment and 32% of the aggregate income of foundations.



## PART TWO

### FINDINGS OF FACT AND SUPPORTING MATERIAL

#### V. PREFATORY NOTES AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The "full and complete" investigation anticipated by the creating resolution was an impossibility under the conditions met. To some extent, therefore, this must be regarded as a pilot study.

The creation of this Committee was greeted by some with the question: "Why another investigation of foundations when we had one so recently?" The answer can be found in a comparison of the material produced by the Cox Committee and by this one. The Cox Committee simply did not have time to do much more than it did. A Congressional committee of this kind is chiefly dependent on its counsel and staff for the production of research material. In its approximately six months of theoretical, and approximately four months of practical existence, the Cox Committee's counsel and staff did not have time to do that preliminary research which might have disclosed extremely important critical material. It did not even use a considerable amount of the material it had at hand, as much of its energies were consumed in listening to adulatory testimony by foundation executives and supporters.

Hampered and limited as the current investigation has been, it has well merited the energy given to it. It has disclosed and assembled material never before integratedly exhibited to the Congress and the people, and opened up lines of inquiry, the seriousness of which cannot be overemphasized. It should act as a base for a far more intense and extended investigation. *It is the conclusion of this Committee that the subject of foundations urgently requires the continued attention of Congress.*

Should the study be resumed, we recommend that it be on a somewhat different basis. The process of investigation through public hearings is inadequate for a subject such as that of foundations. As we have said, an inquiry into this subject is primarily a research undertaking. The materials of most value are to be found in voluminous literature, reports and records. Deciding among points of view becomes chiefly a matter of processing the mass of research material which is available, and determining, not on the basis of witnesses' opinions but on a judicial weighing of the factual evidence, which are correct.

To some extent, sampling methods must be used.

Reliance on staff work and staff reports seems essential. The Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) used similar methods. It conducted hearings but leaned heavily on staff reports published in over forty volumes. There is need for a similar thoroughness in approaching the foundation problems, a time-consuming use of library sources, of questionnaires and of field studies in addition to hearings, public or private.

It would thus be an injustice to arrive at generalized conclusions except upon intense studies of wide sampling. Generalizing from a small sample might well give a distorted picture and cause for rightful complaint by those to whom the generalizations do not apply. We have, ourselves, tried to be very careful not to arrive at final conclusions on general bases, except where the facts seemed incontrovertibly to justify it. Where we have arrived at specific, in contrast to generalized, conclusions, it has been upon specifically pertinent material.

In some instances the experience of one particular foundation or a sampled group may indicate a significant trend in foundation activities. It may illustrate what happens, under the system of foundation tax exemption, to the citizens who establish foundations, to the trustees who manage them in theory and to the executives who manage them in fact. Foundations cannot be understood except in relation to their acts.

#### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE FINDINGS

Subject, then, to the foregoing comments, the following is a brief summary of the more important findings of this Committee. It is introduced here in introductory fashion. Further conclusions and findings are contained in the subsequent text. Moreover, a reading of the text is often necessary to amplify the brief statement of a finding here given.

#### *THE COMMITTEE FINDS AS FOLLOWS:*

1. The country is faced with a rapidly increasing birth-rate of foundations. The compelling motivation behind this rapid increase in numbers is tax planning rather than "charity." The possibility exists that a large part of American industry may eventually come into the hands of foundations. This may perpetuate control of individual enterprises in a way not contemplated by existing legislation, in the hands of closed groups, perhaps controlled in turn by families. Because of the tax exemption granted them, and because they must be dedicated to public purposes, the foundations are public trusts, administering funds of which the public is the equitable owner. However, under the present law there is little implementation of this responsibility to the general welfare; the foundations administer their capital and income with the widest freedom, bordering at times on irresponsibility. Wide freedom is highly desirable, as long as the public dedication is faithfully followed. But as will be observed later, the present laws do not compel such performance.

The increasing number of foundations presents another problem. The Internal Revenue Service is not staffed to adequately scrutinize the propriety and legality of the work of this ever-enlarging multitude of foundations.

2. Foundations are clearly desirable when operating in the natural sciences and when making direct donations to religious, educational, scientific, and other institutional donees. However, when their activities spread into the field of the so-called "social sciences" or into other areas in which our basic moral, social, economic, and governmental principles can be vitally affected, the public should be alerted to these activities and be made aware of the impact of foundation influence on our accepted way of life.

3. The power of the individual large foundation is enormous. It can exercise various forms of patronage which carry with them elements of thought control. It can exert immense influence on educational institutions, upon the educational processes, and upon educators. It is capable of invisible coercion through the power of its purse. It can materially predetermine the development of social and political concepts and courses of action through the process of granting and withholding foundation awards upon a selective basis, and by designing and promulgating projects which propel researchers in selected directions. It can play a powerful part in the determination of academic opinion, and, through this thought leadership, materially influence public opinion.

4. This power to influence national policy is amplified tremendously when foundations act in concert. There is such a concentration of foundation power in the United States, operating in the social sciences and education. It consists basically of a group of major foundations, representing a gigantic aggregate of capital and income. There is no conclusive evidence that this interlock, this concentration of power, having some of the characteristics of an intellectual cartel, came into being as the result of an over-all, conscious plan. Nevertheless, it exists. It operates in part through certain intermediary organizations supported by the foundations. It has ramifications in almost every phase of research and education, in communications and even in government. Such a concentration of power is highly undesirable, whether the net result of its operations is benign or not.

5. Because foundation funds are public funds, the trustees of these organizations must conscientiously exercise the highest degree of fiduciary responsibility. Under the system of operation common to most large foundations this fiduciary responsibility has been largely abdicated, and in two ways. First, in fact if not in theory, the trustees have all too frequently passed solely upon general plans and left the detailed administration of donations (and the consequent selection of projects and grantees) to professional employees. Second, these trustees have all too often delegated much of their authority and function to intermediary organizations.

6. A professional class of administrators of foundation funds has emerged, intent upon creating and maintaining personal prestige and independence of action, and upon preserving its position and emoluments. This informal "guild" has already fallen into many of the vices of a bureaucratic system, involving vast opportunities for selective patronage, preference and privilege. It has already come to exercise a very extensive, practical control over most research in the social sciences, much of our educational process, and a good part of government administration in these and related fields. The aggregate thought-control power of this foundation and foundation-supported bureaucracy can hardly be exaggerated. A system has thus arisen (without its significance being realized by foundation trustees) which gives enormous power to a relatively small group of individuals, having at their virtual command, huge sums in public trust funds. It is a system which is antithetical to American principles.

7. The far-reaching power of the large foundations and of the interlock, has so influenced the press, the radio, and even the government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism

of foundation practices to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed. Nothing short of an unhampered Congressional investigation could hope to bring out the vital facts; and the pressure against Congressional investigation has been almost incredible. As indicated by their arrogance in dealing with this committee, the major foundations and their associated intermediary organizations have entrenched themselves behind a totality of power which presumes to place them beyond serious criticism and attack.

8. Research in the social sciences plays a key part in the evolution of our society. Such research is now almost wholly in the control of the professional employees of the large foundations and their obedient satellites. Even the great sums allotted by the Federal Government for social science research have come into the virtual control of this professional group.

9. This power team has promoted a great excess of empirical research, as contrasted with theoretical research. It has promoted what has been called an irresponsible "fact finding mania." It is true that a balanced empirical approach is essential to sound investigation. But it is equally true that if it is not sufficiently balanced and guided by the theoretical approach, it leads all too frequently to what has been termed "scientism" or fake science, seriously endangering our society upon subsequent general acceptance as "scientific" fact. It is not the part of Congress to dictate methods of research, but an alertness by foundation trustees to the dangers of supporting unbalanced and unscientific research is clearly indicated.

10. Associated with the excessive support of the empirical method, the concentration of power has tended to support the dangerous "cultural lag" theory and to promote "moral relativity", to the detriment of our basic moral, religious, and governmental principles. It has tended to support the concept of "social engineering"—that "social scientists" and they alone are capable of guiding us into better ways of living and improved or substituted fundamental principles of action.

11. Accompanying these directions in research grants, the concentration has shown a distinct tendency to favor political opinions to the left. These foundations and their intermediaries engage extensively in political activity, not in the form of direct support of political candidates or political parties, but in the conscious promotion of carefully calculated political concepts. The qualitative and quantitative restrictions of the Federal law are wholly inadequate to prevent this mis-use of public trust funds.

12. The impact of foundation money upon education has been very heavy, largely tending to promote uniformity in approach and method, tending to induce the educator to become an agent for social change and a propagandist for the development of our society in the direction of some form of collectivism. Foundations have supported text books (and books intended for inclusion in collateral reading lists) which are destructive of our basic governmental and social principles and highly critical of some of our cherished institutions.

13. In the international field, foundations, and an interlock among some of them and certain intermediary organizations, have exercised a strong effect upon our foreign policy and upon public education in things international. This has been accomplished by vast propa-

ganda, by supplying executives and advisers to government and by controlling much research in this area through the power of the purse. The net result of these combined efforts has been to promote "internationalism" in a particular sense—a form directed toward "world government" and a derogation of American "nationalism." Foundations have supported a conscious distortion of history, propagandized blindly for the United Nations as the hope of the world, supported that organization's agencies to an extent beyond general public acceptance, and leaned toward a generally "leftist" approach to international problems.

14. With several tragically outstanding exceptions, such as *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, foundations have not directly supported organizations which, in turn, operated to support Communism. However, some of the larger foundations have directly supported "subversion" in the true meaning of that term, namely, the process of undermining some of our vitally protective concepts and principles. They have actively supported attacks upon our social and governmental system and financed the promotion of socialism and collectivist ideas.

## VI. THE POWER OF THE LARGE FOUNDATION

### *THE IMPACT OF SIZE.*

Several executives of large foundations in their statements at the Cox Committee hearings expressed the opinion that some regulation of smaller foundations might be desirable because they are so frequently set up for tax or other personal advantages. The same executives expressed the opinion that further regulation of the large foundations was undesirable. We believe that the premises upon which these conclusions were based are erroneous. Great foundations are also set up for tax or other personal advantages. Moreover there is a distinct danger in mere size.

In the so-called Walsh investigation, which took place in 1917, both Samuel Untermyer and Louis D. Brandeis concluded that the foundation as a perpetuity was "inconsistent with democratic conceptions." Granting that they might then have been in the hands of good men, the fear was expressed that foundations might become "great powers for evil in the hands of persons whom we cannot foresee." They might even, it was feared, grow stronger than the Government.

This fear was based upon the conservative character and poor public relations of the creators of the first great foundations; it was anticipated that the power of the huge foundation funds could be used for "reactionary" purposes. The current vice seems to be that some of the great foundations are now permitting their funds to be used largely in the promotion of projects politically directed to the left. But the issue is not whether these great public trusts are being employed in one political direction or another. The issue is whether there should be *any* political direction in the use of public trust moneys. *We share the fear of men like Untermyer and Brandeis that the power in itself constitutes a threat and a danger.*

According to Raymond B. Fosdick, in his *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, when Federal incorporation of the Foundation was sought, protests were made not only on the basis of the prospective power of such a foundation but also of its possible use as a medium for

perpetuating wealth. The following is from Dr. Fosdick's book, on page 18:

" . . . In letters which have since been published, it appears that George W. Wickersham, the Attorney General, wrote to President Taft denouncing the proposal. 'Never,' he declared, 'has there been submitted to Congress or to any legislative body, such an indefinite scheme for perpetuating vast wealth as this; and personally I believe it to be entirely inconsistent with the public interest that any such bill should be passed.' To this Mr. Taft replied: 'I agree with your . . . characterization of the proposed act to incorporate John D. Rockefeller.' "

Some of the individual foundations have increased enormously in size through the accumulation of income (now more carefully restricted than before) and through accretions in capital value (wholly unrestricted). In spite of heavy expenditures, some of the foundations are now far larger in capital than they were when created. Where, as is frequently the case, the foundation portfolio contains blocks of equity stocks in growing enterprises, the limits of capital increase cannot be foreseen.

The power to allot or distribute substantial funds carries with it the opportunity to exercise a substantial degree of control over the recipients. We tolerate such risks to society in the free and uncontrolled use of private funds. An individual of wealth has wide freedom to expend his money for power or propaganda purposes; in the process, he may obtain control of educational institutions, media of communication and other agencies which have an important impact on society. Distasteful though this may sometimes be, broad freedom to do it is consonant with our general ideas of freedom and liberty for the individual.

When we are dealing with foundations, the situation is quite different. Problems arise in connection with granting full liberty to foundations which increase geometrically with their size. The power of the purse becomes something with which the public must reckon. *For these great foundations are public trusts, employing the public's money—become so through tax exemption and dedication to public purposes. Foundations are permitted to exist by the grace of the public, exempted from the taxation to which private funds are subjected, and are entitled to their privileges only because they are, and must be, dedicated to the public welfare. The public has the right to expect of those who operate the foundations the highest degree of fiduciary responsibility. The fiduciary duty is not merely to administer the funds carefully from a financial standpoint. It includes the obligation to see that the public dedication is properly applied.*

The large foundations admit this fiduciary responsibility and affirmatively proclaim their consciousness of it. But, the freedom of action they insist on sometimes permits transgressing the border of license. The trustees of the foundations are, by overwhelming preponderance, estimable men; their errors of operation chiefly result from an apparent misconception of their fiduciary duty. It is not that they do not intend to act with full trust responsibility; they are perhaps too often too busy to think their problems through in detail.

There are limits to their freedom of action as trustees. Their financial power gives them enormous leverage in influencing public opinion. They should thus be very chary of promoting ideas, concepts and opinion-forming material which run contrary to what the public currently wishes, approves and likes. Professor Thomas H.

Briggs,<sup>1</sup> an eminent educator, put it this way in his testimony (Hearings, p. 96):

But whatever the stated purpose or purposes, the public has a deep concern and an actual responsibility to see that the activities of each and every foundation, whether its resources are large or small, not only does not harm but also contributes to a maximum degree possible to the welfare of the Nation. This right and this responsibility are derived from the fact that the public has chartered the foundations and also that by remission of taxes it is furnishing a large part of the available revenue. In the case of the Ford Foundation, which has an annual income in excess of \$30 million, the public contributes more than \$27 million, or \$9 to every \$1 that comes from the original donor.

In addition to the right and the responsibility of the public to insure that foundation moneys are spent for the maximum good of society in general, *the public is concerned that no chartered foundation promote a program which in any way and to any extent militates against what society has decided is for its own good.* [Emphasis ours.]

Dr. Frederick P. Keppel once said that the officers of foundations steadily tend toward "an illusion of omniscience and omnipotence." They thus fall easily into the error of deeming themselves a group of the elite, entitled to use the seductive methods of educational and research propaganda to promote what they themselves believe to be best for the people. In this they seem to follow the thesis of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

Rousseau was perhaps the most ardent intellectual supporter of absolute democracy. He believed that the majority must rule without hindrance, and that minority rights are nonsense. Yet he was the intellectual father of Communism and Fascism. For, while he believed in the absolute rights of the majority, he did say that the people did not always know what was good for them; presumably a group of the elite would have to tell them. Thus, in both totalitarian systems, an elite group controls the state for the presumed benefit of the mass. Such a system is antithetical of our own. As Prof. Briggs said:

The principle that the public should decide what it wants in order to promote its own welfare and happiness is unquestionably sound. An assumption that the public does not know what is for its own good is simply contrary to the fundamental principles of democracy. (Hearings, p. 98.)

The fact is that the foundations have become a force in our society second only to that of government itself. Administering about seven and a half billion dollars, of which a very small number control about a third, they are in a position, through the power of public money to make their influence felt so heavily as to warrant careful study of the line between freedom of action and license.

#### *PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY.*

Annual returns are required of the foundations which give certain information to the Federal government. Parts of these reports are open to the public. Others are not; they may be examined only by Executive Order of the President of the United States. Even this Committee, as earlier described, has had difficulty in securing such an order; the public in general has no chance of securing one. Thus even the material which by law must now be recorded is not fully open to the public. This Committee fails to understand why any part of any report by a foundation should not be open to the public. Its funds are public and its benefactions, its activities, should be public

<sup>1</sup> Professor emeritus, Columbia University.

also. In any event, the report which must be filed is wholly inadequate to enable either government or the public to determine whether a foundation has fulfilled its duty to the public.

Some of the major foundations prepare and issue public reports which are admirable as far as they go, disclosing full financial statements and descriptions of their work during the period covered by the report. But even these are inadequate fully to inform the public of the backgrounds, the motivations, the detail of operation and the results of the activities of the foundations.

While truly full reports would give to those interested an opportunity to be critical, such criticism would be ineffective in most instances. The foundations are free to do as they please with the public funds at their command, so long as they do not transgress certain rules of law which are so general in their terms, and so difficult to interpret except in a few instances, that they are virtually useless as deterrents. Political propaganda, for example, is proscribed. But many foundations *do* engage in active political propaganda, and the present laws cannot stop them.

The testimony of Internal Revenue Commissioner Andrews and Assistant Commissioner Sugarman brought out clearly (1) that the courts have construed the restrictions in the tax law very liberally, perhaps far too liberally; (2) that the Internal Revenue Service has great difficulty in drawing lines; and (3) that it does not have the manpower or the machinery to act as a watchdog to make sure that the law is not violated.

Where the organization claims exemption on the ground that it is "educational" the law requires that it have been organized exclusively for that purpose, yet the word "exclusively" has been weakened by judicial interpretation. Again, the words proscribing political activity provide that it may not use a "substantial" part of its funds in that area. The test is thus quantitative as well as qualitative, and the difficulty in determining the borderlines can well be imagined. The fact is, and this seems to us of enormous importance, that the Internal Revenue Service cannot possibly read all the literature produced or financed by foundations, or follow and check the application of their expenditures. The Commissioner must rely chiefly on complaints by indignant citizens to raise a question in his own mind. Even then, it is difficult for the Service to carry this burden, both from limitations of personnel and budget, and because it is here concerned with an area which requires technical skill not normally to be found in a tax bureau.

Our conclusion is that there is no true public accountability under the present laws.

What is the penalty if, by chance, serious malfeasance is proved—perhaps by substantial grants for subversive purposes or for active political propaganda? The mere loss of the income tax exemption. That is the sole penalty, other than the loss of the right of future donors to take gift or estate tax exemption on their donations. The capital of the foundation may still be used for a malevolent purpose. The trustees are not subjected to any personal penalty. The fund merely suffers by, thereafter, having to pay income tax on its earnings!

#### *ABDICATION OF TRUSTEES' RESPONSIBILITY.*

The great foundations are enterprises of such magnitude that they cannot be managed by visiting trustees. In their filed statements,



several of the foundations have denied indignantly that their trustees neglected their work. The fact is that, as some of the large foundations are organized, the trustees *cannot* fully perform those duties which their fiduciary responsibility imposes.

An illustration of this was given by Professor Briggs in discussing the *Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*. He indicated that the trustees were too busy with their own affairs and "put trust in their elected administrative officers." In the foundation subsidiary to which he referred he said all of these officers were "directly or indirectly nominated by a former influential officer of *The Ford Foundation* who is notoriously critical—I may even say contemptuous—of the professional education of teachers." The result in this instance he described as follows:

These administrative officers doubtless present to the board, as they do to the public, a program so general as to get approval and yet so indefinite as to permit activities which in the judgment of most competent critics are either wasteful or harmful to the education program that has been approved by the public. (Hearings, p. 97.)

To do a truly fiduciary job, as a trustee of one of the major foundations, would require virtually full time occupation.

Typically in the large foundation, there is a set of eminent and responsible trustees at the top who may well wish to be alert to their public duty. Most, however, are busy men with many other occupations and avocations. They may attend quarterly meetings, sometimes less often, rarely more. At such meetings they may be presented with voluminous reports and be asked to consider and give their approval to programs and projects. However long such meetings may last, it is impossible for such trustees to fulfill their fiduciary responsibility adequately at the equivalent of directors' meetings. In such infrequent attendance, they cannot give the attention to the detail of management which the trust nature of these enterprises requires. Perforce, they delegate their powers to professional subordinates, sometimes selected for their peculiar knowledge of the field, sometimes selected casually and without previous experience or special knowledge.

That they are not always careful in their selection of executives and staffs is attested by this testimony of Professor Briggs, in which he refers to *The Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*, upon whose Advisory Committee he served until his resignation in disgust (Hearings, pp. 96-97):

Not a single member of the staff, from the president down to the lowliest employee, has had any experience, certainly none in recent years, that would give understanding of the problems that are met daily by the teachers and administrators of our schools. It is true that they have from time to time called in for counsel experienced educators of their own choosing, but there is little evidence that they have been materially influenced by the advice that was proffered. As one prominent educator who was invited to give advice reported, "any suggestions for changes in the project (proposed by the fund) were glossed over without discussion." As a former member of a so-called advisory committee I testify that at no time did the administration of the fund seek from it any advice on principles of operation nor did it hospitably receive or act in accordance with such advice as was volunteered.

Mr. Alfred Kohlberg testified before the Cox Committee. As a member of the *Institute of Pacific Relations*, he had brought up charges of subversion apparently before *The Rockefeller Foundation's* trustees had become aware that anything was wrong with their long-favored

beneficiary. He also testified to certain communications he had had with John Foster Dulles when Alger Hiss had been made President of *The Carnegie Endowment For International Peace* at Mr. Dulles' suggestion. When Mr. Kohlberg was asked if he was critical of Mr. Dulles for his connection with the Hiss matter, he stated that he was critical in general of the trustees of the two large foundations concerning which he had testified—*The Carnegie Endowment* and *Rockefeller Foundation*—on the ground that they “delegate most of their duties to the staff.” He continued: “And while we all realize that they are very busy men, that the affairs of these foundations are vast in scope, I criticize them for a lack of understanding of the damage that can be done to the country when these institutions get infiltrated or when institutions they are aiding get infiltrated with communists.”

Mr. Kohlberg illustrated further:

“That has been the reaction—the trustees of the Institute of Pacific Relations, for example, which has now been found by the Senate committee to be considered an organ of the Communist Party of the United States, by the Communist Party, the majority of those trustees are men of unquestioned integrity, and although charges were brought to their attention—what is it? Eight years ago?—they have never yet investigated it on their own.”

An analogy with a commercial enterprise is not correct. Some foundations, like the *Twentieth Century Fund*, engage directly in research projects. Others are in the business of distributing funds to still others for research and other purposes. In either case, the operation is not a private one for profit but a public one for the public benefit, and the obligations of the trustees extend far beyond the limited fiduciary responsibility of a commercial director.

These obligations are comparatively easy to meet in small foundations with moderate operations. The larger the foundation enterprise, the more difficult the execution of the fiduciary duty. So complex and intricate have some of the foundations become that a few, like the *Ford Foundation*, have felt obliged to divide themselves into subsidiaries and affiliates. The diagram set opposite this page shows part of the intricacy of the *Ford* operation.

Trustees of great foundations are unable to keep their fingers on the pulse of operations, except to very limited degree. They cannot take time to watch that detail of operation which alone would give them an insight into the fairness and objectivity of selections. Nor can they see to the effect of what they have permitted to be done. They incline generally to feel that they have done their part when a grant has been made. They seem to have neither the time nor the disposition to study the consequences of the grant, its impact upon society. No other explanation of the long-continued enormous grants by *The Rockefeller Foundation* and others to *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, nor of the *Rockefeller* support of the Kinsey reports, seems logical.

Mr. Henry Allen Moe, of the *John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation* put it this way in this statement before the Cox Committee:

\* \* \* ‘delegatus non potest delegare,’ that is to say that no trustee can delegate his trust function.

He proceeded to say that neither within law nor equity could trustees delegate their judgment.

*What is this judgment, the chief component of the trust function? It is the judgment of the desirability of a grant, both as to specific purpose and*

as to the identity of the grantee. It is this which cannot be delegated. Yet it all too frequently is delegated to professional subordinates who do not have the duty of trustees. Clearly enough, where a great many grants are to be awarded, administrative assistance is unavoidably necessary. But ultimate responsibility must rest on the trustees. They may have assistance, but they cannot merely shunt off the process of selection to others, perfunctorily accepting what these agents have decided. If the problem is that the size of some foundations prevents selections by the trustees themselves, the answer cannot lie in an abandonment of responsibility by delegation but perhaps in a radical reorganization of its processes and methods.

Some trustees seek to escape the full impact of the principle of *delegatus non potest delegare*, by organizing themselves in such manner that they are expressly excluded from the detail of selection. For example, the *Ford Foundation* caused a report to be prepared called the *Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program*, dated November 19, 1949. This report contained the following passages:

"Individual members of the Board of Trustees should not seek to decide the technical questions involved in particular applications and projects. Nothing would more certainly destroy the effectiveness of a foundation. On the contrary, the Trustees will be most surely able to control the main lines of policy of the Foundation, and the contribution it will make to human welfare, if they give the President and the officers considerable freedom in developing the program, while they avoid influencing (even by indirection) the conduct of projects to which the Foundation has granted funds." (Pages 127 and 128.)

"As individuals, the Trustees should learn as much as they can by all means possible, formal and informal, about the program of the Foundation in relation to the affairs of the world. But the Board of Trustees, as a responsible body, should act only according to its regular formal procedures, and usually on the agenda, the dockets, and the recommendations presented by the President." (Page 128.)

"The meetings of the Board should be arranged so that the discussion will not be directed mainly at the individual grants recommended by the officers, and institutions to receive them. Nothing could destroy the effectiveness of the Board more certainly than to have the agenda for its meetings consist exclusively of small appropriation items, each of which has to be judged on the basis of scientific considerations, the academic reputation of research workers, or the standing of institutions. If the agenda calls solely for such discussions the Board will necessarily fail to discuss the main issues of policy and will inevitably interfere in matters in which it has no special competence." (Page 130.)

"A foundation may wish from time to time to make small grants, either to explore the possibilities of larger programs, or to take advantage of an isolated and unusual opportunity. For such purposes it will be useful for the Trustees to set up (and replenish from time to time) a discretionary fund out of which the President may make grants on his own authority. The Trustees should set a limit on the aggregate amount which the President may award in discretionary grants during a given period, rather than set a fixed limit on the size of a single grant. \* \* \*" (Page 132.)

"The President of The Ford Foundation, as its principal officer, should not only serve as a member of the Board of Trustees, but should be given full authority to administer its organization.

"He should have full responsibility for presenting recommendations on program to the Board, and full authority to appoint and remove all other officers and employees of the Foundation. \* \* \*" (Page 132.)

"The founders of at least two of the larger American foundations intended their trustees to devote a major amount of their time to the active conduct of foundation affairs. Usually this arrangement has not proved practicable. \* \* \*" (Page 133.)

"\* \* \* for the program of a foundation may be determined more certainly by the selection of its top officers than by any statement of policy or any set of directions. \* \* \*" (Page 133.)

*We cannot escape the conclusion that the trustees of the Ford Foundation abdicated their trust responsibility in assenting to this plan of operation under which everything except possibly the establishment of glittering generalities could be left to employees.*

On the subject of trustees' responsibility, Professor Kenneth Colegrove<sup>2</sup> testified under questioning as follows:

Mr. WORMSER. Professor, I would like your comments on this subject, if you will. The trustees of these foundations have a distinct fiduciary responsibility which they recognize, in principle, at least, as the trustees of public funds. It seems to me the most important trust function they have is to exercise judgment in connection with the selection of grants and grantees. Does it not seem to you that to a very large extent they have abandoned that trust function, that trust duty, and have delegated the whole thing to other organizations? That in certain areas they have used these intermediate organizations to fulfill their judgment function for them, which they, as trustees, should exercise? Would you comment on that?

Dr. COLEGROVE. I think that has very largely occurred. I do not quite like to put it this way, but the trustees are in many cases just window dressing to give popular confidence in the institution. In the United States we think an institution needs a very distinguished board of trustees; and, of course, you know, from college experience, a great many men are made trustees of a university because the university expects them to make a large donation to the endowment fund or build a building or something like that. And to offset a group of rich trustees, you put on some trustees who have large reputations in the literary world or in other fields than merely finance.

Many of the trustees, I am afraid, have gotten into a very bad habit. They are perfectly realistic. They know why they are put on the board of trustees. And they are not as careful as they should be in taking responsibility for the operation of those organizations.

I think the *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, which was set up under Elihu Root and President Nicholas Murray Butler way back, I think, about 1908, had a board of trustees picked by President Butler, and I think Butler expected to get a great deal of advice from those trustees.

But I do recall many years later President Butler told me that he had to use very extraordinary methods to get his trustees to meet even for the annual meeting.

Mr. WORMSER. Then, in practice, they delegate their authority partly to other organizations. Of course, where they do make their own grants directly, they delegate enormously to their professional employees, the executives, who do not have the same trust responsibility but are merely executives.

Dr. COLEGROVE. Yes, they delegate their authority in several directions. Trustees delegate their authority to the president of the foundation. The president in large measure even delegates his authority to the heads of departments. A president of one of these large funds sometimes is a little hazy about what is happening in this division or in that division. And in these heads of departments—let's say of the *Rockefeller Foundation*, where you have the social sciences and humanities—you will find a delegation of authority in the case of the social sciences to the operating society, *The Social Science Research Council*, and to *The American Council of Learned Societies* in the case of the humanities. So you have a delegation of authority in two directions there.

Mr. WORMSER. So whether a foundation fulfills its obligation to the public rests primarily on the selection of its employees and the association with these intermediate groups. Is it your opinion, Professor, that these employees—I don't mean in a derogatory sense to say "employees", the officers of these organizations—are on the same calioer as a whole, do they compare well with university executives or those who would administer grants under university administration?

Dr. COLEGROVE. Well, I think those of us in political science feel that Joe Willits,<sup>3</sup> who was a professor of the University of Pennsylvania before he took the position that he has at the present time, is an outstanding scholar, a most competent administrator, a very good judge of human nature. And yet he cannot give all of his attention to the expenditure of these vast sums.

<sup>2</sup> Formerly Professor of Political Science Northwestern University, where he taught for 30 years before his automatic retirement at age 65. For eleven years, Secretary and Treasurer, American Political Science Association.

<sup>3</sup> Vice-President, The Rockefeller Found

What applies, of course, to *The Rockefeller Foundation* applies even more forcibly to *The Ford Foundation*, which is much larger.

Mr. WORMSER. One witness, Professor Briggs, testified that in his opinion there wasn't one single employee in the *Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*, from the top down to the bottom, who had had enough experience in the areas in which they were operating to make proper judgments. That does not sound very good for foundation practices, if they select men as carelessly, let us say, as that. I am trying to make a comparison with universities, because I am interested particularly in the possibility that a better medium for foundation largesse may be through the universities, instead of through professional agencies.

Dr. COLEGROVE. Oh, quite true. I think it would require a larger number of topnotch administrators in the foundations to exercise more critical judgment than can be exercised at the present time. Even there, however, you would have to choose between universities; and if you are going to the small colleges, there is a case where you would have to have many careful surveys and studies, and an acquaintance with the personnel and faculties of those universities. Probably the staffs of high-grade men, let us say men serving under Dr. Willits, ought to be a little higher caliber.

\* \* \* \* \*  
Mr. HAYS. Well, now, you talked a little bit ago about the delegation of authority. Do you have any specific ideas about what we could do to remedy that, if that is bad? I mean how are you going to get away from it?

Dr. COLEGROVE. Well, you cannot avoid delegation of authority, but a good administrator has to know how to delegate. He has to choose to whom he is going to delegate, and choose what powers he is going to delegate, and then finally he has to have his system of reviewing the achievements of persons to whom power to make decisions has been delegated.

Mr. WORMSER. May I interrupt to help Mr. Hays' question?

Mr. HAYS. You are sure this is going to be helpful?

Mr. WORMSER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hays has said that it seemed to him a trustee should not act as a trustee of a foundation unless he was willing to give the time to it that was necessary. It seemed to me that that was a very apt remark. And I wonder if that is not the answer, that these men are so busy with their own lives that although they are eminent they are not capable of being trustees of foundations. That is no criticism of them as persons.

Dr. COLEGROVE. Yes; undoubtedly many of the trustees would not serve if they felt that they would be called upon to do much more than go to the meetings, hear the reports, and sometimes not say a single word. You would not have as brilliant, as lofty, as remarkable, a collection of men as trustees if you required a little more responsibility on their part. I would say, on the whole, the board of trustees is too large. There are too many remarkable men, in New York and elsewhere, who are trustees of more than one foundation. And just as we exercise in the *American Political Science Association* a "self-denying ordinance" where no member of the association speaks more than twice in an annual meeting, I would like to see these interlocking trusteeships more or less abolished. You cannot abolish them by law, of course. You could abolish them by practice. So you would reduce the size of the board of trustees and then expect more consideration, more consultation, more advice, from the men who had accepted this great responsibility.

Mr. WORMSER. Was that not your idea, Mr. Hays, that they should be working directly?

Mr. HAYS. Oh, sure. Exactly. (Hearings, pp. 583, 584, 585, 586.)

Mr. Koch, the Associate Counsel joined in the colloquy with a comment which seems to this Committee especially apt:

Mr. KOCH. Here is something that worries me. Suppose I had a great big motor company or a steel mill or this and that, and they picked me because they wanted, as you say, window dressing. The first thing that puzzles me is why they need window dressing in a foundation of this kind. If you are running a foundation where you go to the people every year, like the Red Cross or the March of Dimes, for money, then you want to impress the populace that there are big names behind it. But here, where Mr. Ford or Mr. Carnegie or Mr. Rockefeller plumps millions of dollars in the laps of the foundation, and they do not have to go to the public for 1 cent more, I always wonder: why do they need big names in that case? And would it not be better, instead of picking me, the head of a

big steel mill, pick somebody who was a little more familiar with the educational field? Because I can see exactly what I would do if I were that fortunate head of a big steel mill. As soon as somebody said, "Let us do something about education, or study this," if I were honest, I would immediately say, "I do not know anything about it, so what do the professors say?" And the professors would immediately tell me what they thought the trend of the times was, and I would say, "I will be safe if I follow the trend of the times."

And it seems to me the dismal part of the testimony so far is that there has been so much unanimity among the big foundations in following the supposed trend of the times. I would rather see one day *Rockefeller* in this corner slugging it out with *Ford Foundation* in this corner to try to argue a particular thing. Here we get into a depression, and we find out Professor Beard and Professor Muzzey have said things they later veered away from, and yet all of the foundations at that time may have put their money in the direction of that project, pushing the pendulum along much farther than it probably should have been pushed. And yet there was no foundation that said, "Well, change may be necessary, but let us find out what is good about the old order so that, when we decide on the change, we have at least heard both sides."

It seems to me there has not been that debate. And it may have been probably because the big name probably said, "We don't really know much about it ourselves. We will have to see what is the fad, what the ladies are wearing in Paris today, or what the trend is in education." I therefore wonder whether it would not be better to suggest that where they do not need big names they get lesser names who can spend more time and are a little bit more familiar with the subject matter. That, unfortunately, was an awfully long speech, but that has been worrying me.

Dr. COLEGROVE. I think you have given an accurate picture of the actual situation. The large number of famous names on the list of trustees is due to the old superstition that our institutions must be headed by a famous group of men. And I will say frankly it is to impress Congress as well as the American people; to impress public opinion as fully as possible. It is an old superstition. It is not necessary at all. With a group of 7 trustees, using 7 because it is an odd number, I imagine most of these trustees if they were trustees of only one other organization, maybe trustees of a church, would be able to give more attention to their duties as trustees of foundations. They could not pass on the responsibility. (Hearings, pp. 586, 587.)

One of the dangers of delegating excessive authority to officers and employees of a foundation is that there is a tendency for these delegates to run off with the entire operation and, for all practical purposes, to take it away from the trustees who bear the fiduciary duty to the public.

Professor David N. Rowe <sup>4</sup> testified that the directors of the *Institute of Pacific Relations* (of whom he was one for several years) had—very little control over the day-to-day operation. I don't know whether this is characteristic of all boards or all organizations, but I felt, and I testified previously to this effect, that the IPR was essentially controlled by a very small group of people who were sometimes an official executive committee, or otherwise an informal one, who ran things pretty much as they would and who commented to the Foundation's own personnel and problems of the kind I was talking to Evans <sup>5</sup> about in exactly the opposite way. (Hearings, pp. 538, 539.)

In answer to the question why, like directors of a bank, the directors of I. P. R. had not been able to learn the mischief which was going on and to control it, Professor Rowe replied:

\* \* \* I would have the greatest respect for the ability of either of you gentlemen or others that I know to read a bank balance sheet and to tell the difference between red ink and black ink. As you say, that is your business. You are on the board of directors; you have to know. But I would like to know whether you would have equal confidence in your ability at all times as a member of a board of directors to be able to point the finger at the fellow that is putting his fingers on

<sup>4</sup> Professor of Political Science, Yale University.

<sup>5</sup> Roger Evans, Social Science Director of the Rockefeller Foundation.

the till. You can't do that, so you bond these people. You bond them against losses, and you protect yourself, and the bank, and you have a system for doing that.

You don't have a system like that in the intellectual world. You try to work one up and I will be the first to adopt it. I will say this. You are never going to be able to spot such people, who operate down in the levels (of) an organization, from away up high where the directors sit, because they don't know what the people are doing, they can't possibly supervise them directly. This is left to the executive people. If the executive people know what they are doing—I testified before the McCarran committee that I was present once at a board of directors' meeting of the IPR at which they were discussing the appointment of a new executive secretary, and I had to sit there in the board and hear the executive committee members refuse to divulge the names of the candidates they were thinking about in the presence of the board of directors, and they got away with it.

Mr. HAYS. What did you do about that?

Dr. ROWE. What could I do. I was practically a minority of one. The board upheld their decision not to do this. It was not too long after that as I remember it that I resigned from the board. They had a monopoly and they were bringing people like me in for purposes of setting up a front, and I hope, giving a different kind of coloring to the membership of the board.

Mr. WORMSER. How often did that board meet, Professor?

Dr. ROWE. I don't think I ever was called in there more than once a year, and you would spend a couple of hours, and that is all.

Mr. KOCH. Did the men come from all over the United States on that board?

Dr. ROWE. The last meeting I attended the members from California were not present. There was a member there from Oregon.

Mr. KOCH. But was the membership of the board spread over the United States?

Dr. ROWE. Yes, it was, and those people could not always attend. (Hearings, pp. 542, 543.)

Mr. Hays later made his apt comment that no one should remain on the board of directors unless he could give the proper time to its work, whereupon Professor Rowe answered:

Dr. ROWE. I would have been perfectly willing to sacrifice the time necessary to get full information and participate in policy decisions. One of the things that motivated me was the fact that you could spend the time—I could—but you could not get the facts and information or get in the inside circles. I submit to you that taking 3 years to find that out in an organization of the complexity of the IPR was not an unconscionably long period of time. (Hearings, p. 544.)

*We do not believe that public trusts are properly administered through delegated fiduciary authority. We question whether individuals should act as trustees if they are too busy or otherwise occupied to give the work the full attention which their fiduciary duty requires. The trustees of the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation could not have permitted continued grants to something like I. P. R. had they been aware of what was going on. But the expenditure of sufficient time in checking and observing would have made them conscious of what the Institute of Pacific Relations was doing to our country. To expend that time seems to us the duty of a foundation trustee. To fail to do so is to fail in the discharge of a fiduciary duty to the public. Alertness on the part of the Rockefeller and Carnegie trustees, and expenditure of the time necessary to see to the use made of the public's money by I. P. R. might have saved China from the Communists and prevented the war in Korea.*

The extent to which trustees of foundations have further delegated their authority and abdicated their responsibility through the use of intermediary organizations, will appear in the next section of this report.

*THE SOCIAL SCIENCES.*

Raymond B. Fosdick, in *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*,<sup>6</sup> quoted Mr. Gates, long-time advisor to John D. Rockefeller, Sr., in matters of charity, as follows:

"If I have any regret, it is that the charter of *The Rockefeller Foundation* did not confine its work strictly to national and international medicine, health and its appointments \* \* \* Insofar as the disbursements of the Rockefeller incorporated philanthropies have been rigidly confined to these two fields of philanthropy (medicine and public health) they have been almost universally commended at home and abroad. Where they have inadvertently transgressed these limits, they have been widely and in some particulars perhaps not unfairly condemned."

In his article in the *New York Times* of March 1, 1954, Mr. Leo Eagan attributes wide concern about foundations in part to "a belated recognition of the great influence that foundations have exercised on social developments and ideas", and "a fear that a changing emphasis in foundation programs may upset many long-established social relationships."

Foundations can play a powerful role in ushering in changes in our form of society. As Frederick P. Keppel, himself President of the Carnegie Corporation, put it in *The Foundation; Its Place in American Life* (p. 107):

"We all know that foundation aid can increase measurably the pace of any social tendency, but we don't know when this artificial acceleration ceases to be desirable \* \* \* All I can say is that here as elsewhere safety lies in the fullest available information as to foundation affairs and the widest possible discussion regarding them."

The dangers inherent in size, and the accompanying power which a large purse gives, apply to some degree in all fields of foundation operation. They are most hazardous, however, in the so-called "social sciences."

Dean Myers of the New York State College of Agriculture defined the social sciences in the Cox Committee hearings as follows:

"The subject or the name 'social science' is intended to cover those studies which have as their center man in his relation to other men as individuals, as groups, or as nations.

"Perhaps the name 'social science' might be made clear by indicating its relation to other branches of knowledge, the natural or physical sciences which relate to the physical world, the medical sciences which are self-explanatory, the humanities which deal with art, literature, with things of the spirit, and the social sciences which are concerned with the studies of man as an individual, as groups, and as nations."

Within the scope of the term "social sciences" he named as typical: economics; psychology; sociology; anthropology; political science or government; demography or populations studies; history; statistics; and various sub-divisions of these.

While mistakes in the other branches of knowledge may have serious results, there is not in them nearly the room for damage to our society which exists in the social sciences. Possibilities of error and mischief are so much greater. The methods employed in the natural sciences are not applicable to the social sciences except in limited degree. Research is thus far more apt to be fallacious, in social than in natural science.

Dr. L. F. Ward once said: "the knowledge how to improve human relations can come only for the social sciences." That statement is

<sup>6</sup> Chapter II, p. 29, quoting from *The Gates Papers: A memorandum entitled "Principles of Philanthropy as a Science and Art" 1923.*



subject to serious doubt by those who believe that an understanding of ethics, morals and fundamental principles, and an application of these, can do a lot to help "improve human relationships." Those who believe that the statement of Dr. Ward is correct, often risk the safety of our state and our society. The results of social science research are subject to such frequent discount or doubt, because of the possibilities of error, that we can hardly afford to base changes in our forms or principles of government upon them. As Professor A. H. Hobbs<sup>7</sup> has said in his *Social Problems and Scientism* (p. 196):

"\* \* \* remember the fundamental differences between the physical sciences and the social sciences. Physical science has a solid bed-rock of tested knowledge, and the verified theories constitute reliable guideposts. Contrasted with this situation, social science knowledge is an uncharted swamp. There is no solid footing of coordinated knowledge to serve as a vantage point from which to survey the terrain ahead. There is a labyrinth of paths leading everywhere—and nowhere. The principles are not anchored but drift in currents of opinion."

This Committee has been far more interested, therefore, in the activities of the foundations in the social sciences than elsewhere. Here the greater danger lies. Here the most grievous acts of abuse have occurred.

Foundation history has shown a rapidly increasing interest in social science research. More and more foundation funds have been poured into this area until, with the creation of the largest of the foundations, the *Ford Foundation*, we see an addition of almost all its half-billion capital devoted to the social sciences, including education. Since the second World War, the government itself has increasingly entered the field of social science research, giving it direct support through research contracts from military and civilian agencies. Today, nearly all research in the social sciences is dependent on foundation grants or government contracts. The same executives and directors who control foundation support of social science research have been extremely active in the formulation of research policies in the government research programs; and a major part of the social scientists of America are either on government payrolls or supported by grants and contracts via universities, their research bureaus or foundation-sponsored councils.

The foundations themselves feel that they should use their funds within the social sciences as "risk capital", for "experiment." Experiment in the natural sciences is highly desirable. Experiment with human beings and their mode of living and being governed is, however, quite a different matter. If by "experiment" is meant trying to find ways in which to make existing institutions better or better working, that too would be admirable. If by "experiment" is meant trying to find ways in which other political and social institutions could be devised to supplant those we live by and are satisfied with—then such experiment is not a desirable use of public funds expended by private individuals without public accountability.

*The inherent uncertainties of research in the social sciences, the enormous factor of indefiniteness, the impossibility of truly experimenting to test a conditional hypothesis before proclaiming it as a proven conclusion, the grave danger of fallacious results, makes it highly questionable whether public money should be so used to promote abandonment of institutions and ways of life which have been found satisfactory, in favor of questionable substitutes.*

<sup>7</sup> Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania.

Some of the social scientists are very careful to state that their conclusions are not fixed and absolute—to recognize and admit that their research results are, at best, tentative; that no ultimate conclusions can be drawn from them. Nevertheless, it is natural and in- evitable that others take up the results of social science research—ignoring the uncertainty, they use the results as bases for recommend- ing social action and even legislation. Through such a process, fallacious conclusions (even some which the social scientists them- selves might admit were not yet satisfactorily proven) are often promoted for the purpose of altering the opinion of the intellectual professions and finally the public itself. The widespread dissemina- tion by foundations of results of social science research, among intellectuals, teachers, writers, etc., can itself start a propulsion toward a demand for legislation to implement a conclusion which has no basis in scientific fact.

The following was reported in the *New York Times* of May 3, 1945, referring to a speech made by Mr. Raymond Fosdick to the *Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace*:

“Mr. Raymond Fosdick, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, warned 300 members representing 38 States that the growing distrust of Russia menaced the future of world peace.”

This was brought out in the testimony of Alfred Kohlberg before the Cox Committee, after which Mr. Kohlberg made these apt remarks:

“Now, I am bringing these names up because these gentlemen are beyond question in their loyalty and patriotism, you see; but somebody has twisted their mental processes.

“*They paid out millions of dollars for so-called research in foreign policy, and it seems that the result of that research has come back and twisted their mental processes* so that Mr. Fosdick warns that ‘The growing distrust of Russia menaces the future of world peace,’ prior to VE day.

“Of course, if we had had just a little distrust of Russia at that time, we might not have turned over Eastern Europe and China to them.” [Emphasis ours.]

Mr. Kohlberg, whose testimony before the Cox Committee is well worth study, also brought out that, according to the *New York Times* of December 29, 1950, Prof. Robert C. North, speaking at the opening of the annual convention of the *American Historical Society* (heavily supported by foundations) had said “that the United States has been on the wrong side of the Asian revolution this far.” That, as Mr. Kohlberg pointed out, was after the Chinese Communists had entered the Korean War against us.

Mr. Kohlberg also noted that Prof. North and one Harold R. Isaacs had travelled around the United States making a survey for the *Ford Foundation*, as a result of which that foundation granted “\* \* \* I think, \$250,000 to the *Council of Learned Societies* to carry on the recommendations of these two gentlemen who have this kind of opinion. \* \* \*”

Can we afford to take the risks involved in permitting privately managed foundations to expend public funds in areas which could endanger our national safety? Officers of some of the foundations frequently assert that they must take risks to do their work effectively. But risks with the public welfare had better be taken by the Congress and not by private individuals, many of whom appear too busy with their own affairs to pay close attention to what the foundation, which they in theory manage, is doing.

*PATRONAGE AND CONTROL.*

The power of money is obvious enough. The huge funds controlled by the great foundations involve patronage to banks, investment houses, law firms and others. Through their holdings of securities and purchasing power they exercise additional influence. Appointment to the board of one of the larger foundations is considered something of a public honor. Accordingly, by selecting strategically-placed trustees who welcome appointment, a foundation can extend its power and its influence. The presence of Arthur Hays Sulzberger, President and publisher of the *New York Times*, on the board of the *Rockefeller Foundation* is an illustration of this extension of power and influence.<sup>8</sup> We do not mean to imply that Mr. Sulzberger directed his editors to slant their reporting on this Committee's work, but his very presence on the *Rockefeller Foundation* Board could have been an indirect, intangible, influencing factor. At any rate, the *Times* has bowed to no other newspaper in the vindictiveness of its attacks on this Committee. In its issue of August 5, 1954, it gave 856 lines of laudatory columnar space, starting with a front-page article, to the statement filed by the *Rockefeller Foundation*. The following day, August 6, 1954, appeared one of a succession of bitter editorials attacking this Committee.

Some of the foundations go so far as to engage high grade and expensive "public relations counsellors" to cement their power and influence. This strikes us as a dubious use of public money. Through such counsellors, more than ordinary influence on the press and other media of public communication can be exerted.

These are only some of the ramifications of the colossal power which large foundations possess. In some instances their influence is amplified by the power of great corporations with which they are associated through large stock holdings or through interlocking directorships. Examples of this would be the *Ford Foundation* and the *Rockefeller Foundations*.

A great foundation can often exercise heavy influence over a college or university, sometimes to the extent of suborning it to its own ends. The privately-financed institutions of higher learning have had a distressing time; the inflation of the past decade or so has increased to the point of desperation the problem of keeping a college going. In these circumstances, foundation grants are so important a source of support that it is not uncommon for university or college presidents to hang upon the wishes of the executives who distribute the largess for foundations. Most college presidents will frankly admit that they dislike receiving restricted or labelled grants from foundations—that they would much prefer direct and unrestricted grants to their institutions; or, if a purpose must be attached to the grant, that the university be permitted to construct and direct the study as it wishes. But they will also admit that they hesitate to turn down any grant, however restricted, from a great foundation. After all, if they get on the wrong side of these sources of support they may be stricken from the list of beneficiaries.

As academic opinion today is the opinion of the intellectuals of tomorrow and will very likely be reflected into legislation and in public affairs thereafter, the opportunities available to the founda-

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Sulzberger is also on the boards of several other foundations.

tions to influence the course of society through grants to institutions of higher learning are far reaching. That such influence has been exerted is beyond question.

In reply to the question: had the foundations been able to channel thinking down one narrow channel?, Professor David N. Rowe of Yale answered that "efforts to that end had been made." He then testified to an astounding example of a foundation attempting to exercise control of a university function in a most radical manner. His testimony ran:

\* \* \* The effort to influence the content of area programs at Yale has been made by at least one foundation that I know of, namely, the Carnegie Corporation. I can't give you the precise date of this, but I would judge it was in about 1947. I think that isn't too much to say that this incident is rather typical of some types of foundation activity that are going on today. I don't pretend to know how constant they are or how general they are around the country.

This involved an effort on the part of the Carnegie Corporation through one of its representatives by the name of John Gardner, I believe, to influence the administration of Yale to eliminate the work we were doing in the far-eastern field and to concentrate our work on the southeast Asian field. This was a rather surprising suggestion. Yale has a long tradition of interest in the Far East. You may have heard of the organization known as Yale in China.

At the time this suggestion was made, we were spending a considerable sum of money each year on faculty salaries for teaching and research in the far-eastern field.

Mr. HAYS. What year was this, sir?

Dr. ROWE. I think it was about 1947. I can't give you the precise date.

Mr. HAYS. Just so we get some idea.

Dr. ROWE. Yes. This had to do with the desire on the part of Yale to develop and expand its work in the southeast Asian field, where again we had important work for a number of years. We have had some eminent people in the southeast Asian field for years in the past.

In this connection, the visit of Mr. Gardner to the university was undertaken, I believe, at that time the dean of Yale College was in charge of the whole foreign area program, and I was working directly under him as director of graduate and undergraduate studies as the biography indicated. We were rather shocked at Mr. Gardner's suggestion that we drop all our work on the Far East and concentrate on southeast Asia.

The dean questioned Mr. Gardner as to why this suggestion was being made. In the general conversation that followed—I got this second hand from the dean, because I was not present then—the philosophy of the foundations along this line was brought out. They look upon their funds or tend to look upon their funds as being expendable with the greatest possible economy. That is natural. They look upon the resources in these fields where the people are few and far between as scarce, which is correct, and they are interested in integrating and coordinating the study of these subjects in this country. Therefore, the suggestion that we cut out far-eastern studies seemed to be based on a notion on their part that no one university should attempt to cover too many different fields at one time.

The practical obstacles in the way of following the suggestion made by Mr. Gardner at that time were pretty clear. There were quite a few of the members of the staff on the far-eastern studies at that time who were already on permanent faculty tenure at Yale and could hardly have been moved around at the volition of the university, even if it had wanted to do it. The investment in library resources and other fixed items of that kind was very large. The suggestion that we just liquidate all this in order to concentrate on southeast Asian studies, even though it was accompanied by a suggestion that if this kind of a policy was adopted, the Carnegie Corporation would be willing to subsidize pretty heavily the development of southeast Asian studies, was met by a flat refusal on the part of the university administration.

Subsequently the dean asked me to write the initial memorandum for submission to the Carnegie Corporation on the basis of which, without acceding to their suggestion that we eliminate far eastern studies from our curriculum, that we wanted to expand our southeast Asian studies with their funds.

They subsequently did give us a grant for this purpose, and they have given a second grant. I don't know precisely what the amounts were in either case.

The only reason for my giving you this incident in somewhat detail is to indicate what I consider to be a real tendency in foundations today—in some foundations, not all—to adopt a function of trying to rationalize higher education and research in this country along the lines of the greatest so-called efficiency. I used the word "so-called" there designedly, because in my view, the notion that educational and research and scholarly efficiency can be produced this way in a democratic society is unacceptable. It seems to me that in a democratic society we have to strive for the greatest possible variegation and differentiation as between universities along these lines, and the suggestion that any one university should more or less monopolize one field or any few universities monopolize one field, and give the other fields to others to do likewise with, it is personally repugnant to me. It does not jibe with my notion of academic freedom in the kind of democratic society that I believe in. (Hearings, pp. 527, 528.)

*This incident at Yale strikes this Committee as appalling. Any attempts by foundations, or concentrations of foundation power, to control research in the universities and colleges and to create conformity, uniformity or foundation-policed research should receive from Congress and the public the censure it well merits.*

On the subject of conformity, Professor Rowe testified as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

In the academic field, of course, we have what is known as academic tenure or faculty tenure. After they get permanent tenure in a university, providing they don't stray off the beaten path too far from an ethical point of view, people can say almost anything they want. I have never felt that any of my colleagues should be afraid to express their opinions on any subject, as long as they stay within the bounds of good taste and ordinary common decency. Nobody in the world is going to be able to do anything to them. This is fact and not fiction. It is not fancy. Their degree of security is put there to be exploited in this way.

Now, of course, some of the people that complain most bitterly about the invasion of academic privilege along that line are those who indulge themselves in invading it. What, for instance, is a professor to think when people with money come along and tell his university that what he is doing there is useless and ought to be liquidated, because it is being done much better some place else?

We hear a lot of the use of the word "conformity" nowadays, that congressional investigations are trying to induce conformity. The inducement of conformity by the use of power is as old as the human race, and I doubt if it is going to be ended in a short time. But one of the purposes of having academic institutions which are on a private basis is to maximize the security of individuals who will refuse to knuckle under to the pressures of money or opinion or anything of that kind. This problem is always going to be with us, because anybody that has money wants to use it, and he wants to use it to advance what he considers to be his interests. In doing so, he is bound to come up against contrary opinions of people who don't have that much money and that much power and whose only security lies in our system, whereby academic personnel are given security in tenure, no matter what their opinions are within the framework of public acceptability and security, to say what they want and do what they please, without being integrated by anybody.

Mr. WORMSER. Professor, this committee in some of the newspapers has been criticized in just that area. It has been said that it tended to promote conformity and exercise thought control or censorship. That of course is far from its intention.

I wonder if I gather from your remarks correctly you think that the foundations to some extent have tended to do just that?

Dr. ROWE. I would say that there are examples of foundations trying to engage in controlling the course of academic research and teaching by the use of their funds. As to whether this is a general tendency in all foundations, I would be very much surprised if that were so. But if this committee can illuminate any and all cases in which the power of foundations, which is immense, has been used in such a way as to impinge upon the complete freedom of the intellectual community to do what it wants in its own area, I should think it would be rendering a tremendous public service.

I am not prejudicing the result. I don't know whether you are going to prove any of this or not. But the investigation of this subject is to me not only highly

justifiable, but it is highly desirable in an age when we are confronted all around in the environment in which we live with illustrations of how great power can be concentrated and used to prevent the normal amount of differentiation and variation from individual to individual, university to university, and college to college. The totalitarian societies, of course, have none of this freedom in the intellectual field. (Hearings, pp. 532, 533.)

The control exercisable by the great foundations through their patronage goes far deeper than the upper level of institutional management. For most academicians the route of foundation grants is the only one available for success in their professions. Moreover, badly paid as most of them are, it is generally only through foundation grants that their income can be amplified to a reasonable standard.

The pressure starts at the very bottom of the academic ladder. Instances of it have come to our attention but we shall not specify them for fear of injuring the reputations or hampering the careers of those who have succumbed to the temptation put before them by foundation funds. A foundation grant may enable a neophyte to reach that all-important doctor's degree through support of his graduate studies. If it seems necessary to conform to what he may think is the point of view promoted by a foundation which might honor him with its grace, is it unnatural that he conform? When he becomes a teacher, a foundation grant may supplement his meager salary; will he reject a grant because he does not like its possible objective? Foundations may finance a study leading to a book which will advance his standing and prestige in his medium, the bases for academic advancement. Is he likely to do a study that the foundation would find undesirable? Is it likely, indeed, to make the grant if it is not satisfied the recipient will comply with any predilections it may have? We do not mean to assert that all foundations impose conditions of conformity on all grantees. We point out merely that the power to do so is there, and that this power has been used. Some foundations set up more or less elaborate machinery for the selection of grantees, such as committees to sift the applicants. But control can be exercised as well through such machinery, by carefully selecting the committees or other human agencies.

A foundation may send the grantee to a foreign country to increase his knowledge and prestige. It may even accept his research proposal and set him up in business by making his proposal a project in one of its favored universities. A research organization may be set up under his direction. A foundation may recommend him to a university for a teaching vacancy. He may even come to be recommended by the foundation for the presidency of some college or university.

Will any of these lifts come to the academician if he does not conform to whatever predilections or prejudices the foundation bureaucrats may have? Perhaps—but the academician cannot often afford the risk. Just as the president of the institution, whose main job today may well be fund-raising, cannot afford to ignore the bureaucrats' wishes, so the academician cannot. Scholars and fund-raisers both soon learn to study the predilections, preferences and aversions of foundations' executives, and benefit from such knowledge by presenting projects likely to please them.

*THE FOUNDATION BUREAUCRATS.*

These executives are not generally the trustees of the foundations. The trustees, estimable citizens though they may be, do not spend the time necessary to engage in the intimate and frequent contact which is necessary in the actual making of grant-decisions. The executives, those who truly have the say, those to whom this right is delegated by the large foundation's board of trustees, are the professional managers of foundation enterprises. Thus, it often becomes a matter of one foundation-employed individual impressing his opinions and his predilections and his aversions on an institution or an individual recipient of a grant. Whatever methods of clearing grants may exist within a given foundation, it is frequently, in the last analysis, the decision of one man which prevails.

In a letter of October 1, 1953 addressed to the Chairman of this Committee, Professor Kenneth Colgrove said:

"In the aggregate, the officers of these foundations wield a staggering sum of influence and direction upon research, education and propaganda in the United States and even in foreign countries."

In a letter of August 4, 1951, J. Fred Rippey, Professor of American History at University of Chicago, writing to the late Honorable E. E. Cox, later Chairman of the Cox Committee, said:

"At present and for years to come, scholars in our universities will not be able to do much research on their own because of high prices and heavy taxes. The recipients of these tax free subsidies from the foundations will therefore have great advantages that will be denied the rest of the university staffs. The favored few will get the promotions and rise to prominence. The others will tend to sink into obscurity and have little influence in the promotion of ideas and culture. Unless the power to distribute these immense foundation funds is decentralized, the little controlling committees and those to whom they award grants and other favors will practically dominate every field of higher education in the United States. Even granting them great wisdom and patriotism, one might still complain against this injury to the great principle of equality of opportunity. But I have never been impressed by the superior wisdom of the foundation heads and executive committees. The heads tend to become arrogant; the members of the committees are, as a rule, far from the ablest scholars in this country."

*The bureaucrats of the foundations have become a powerful group indeed. Not only do they, more often than the trustees of foundations, determine grants and grantees, but they exert an influence on academic life second to no other group in our society. They become advisers to government in matters of science. They are often consulted before the selection of teachers in universities. They serve on international bodies for the United States Government. They become virtual symbols of prestige, responsible only to a small group of foundation trustees who have come to follow their views. The fact is that those who control the great foundations possess opportunities for patronage which in some ways may exceed anything which the elected officials of government have to distribute.*

The professionals, who exert so important an influence upon thought and public opinion in the United States, form a sort of professional class, an elite of management of the vast public funds available to their will. They can scarcely avoid getting an exaggerated idea of their own importance and becoming preoccupied with holding and enlarging their roles.

That this leads to arrogance was established by Prof. Briggs in testifying regarding the *Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*:

I charge that the present officers of the *Fund for the Advancement of Education* have arrogated to themselves an assumption of omniscience, which responsibility for distributing millions of donated dollars does not automatically bestow, nor does it bestow a becoming humility and respect for the judgment of others.

\* \* \* Whenever foundation officers, subordinate as well as chief, confuse position with ability and power with wisdom, losing the humility that would keep ears and mind hospitably open to what others think, the welfare of the general public is endangered.

It can hardly be wondered at that the officers of a foundation steadily tend, as Dr. Keppel once said, toward "an illusion of omniscience or omnipotence." Even a chauffeur feels that the powerful engine in the car that he is hired to drive increases his importance, is in a sense his own personal power. (Hearings, p. 97.)

The place of foundations in our culture cannot be understood without a recognition of the emergence of this special class in our society, the professional managers of foundations. They are highly paid; they ordinarily have job security. They acquire great prestige through their offices and the power they wield. They disburse vast sums of money with but moderate control, frequently with virtually no supervision. Their hackles rise at any criticism of the system by which they prosper. More often than not, the power of the foundation is their power. They like things as they are.

#### *CRITICISM AND DEFENSE.*

In the light of the power of the foundations, it is not surprising that the vocal critics of foundations are comparatively small in number. Professor Briggs made the reasons clear in testifying regarding his resignation from the Advisory Board of the *Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*:

Especially disturbing in a large number of the responses to my letter of resignation was the fear, often expressed and always implied, of making criticisms of the fund lest they prejudice the chances of the institution represented by the critic or of some project favored by him of getting financial aid from the fund at some future time.

It is tragic in a high degree that men who have won confidence and position in the educational world should be intimidated from expressing criticism of a foundation whose administrators and policies they do not respect. (Hearings, p. 97.)

Prof. Briggs continued:

It has been stated that, unlike colleges and universities, foundations have no alumni to defend them. *But they do have influential people as members of their boards, and these members have powerful friends, some of whom are more inclined to be partisanly defensive than objectively critical.* Moreover, there are also thousands who, hopeful of becoming beneficiaries of future grants, either conceal their criticisms or else give expression to a defense that may not be wholly sincere. (Hearings, pp. 101, 102.) [Emphasis ours.]

*The abuse which has been heaped upon this Committee and its staff for daring to consider serious criticisms of foundation management and operation well illustrates that some of the foundations do, indeed, have "influential people" on their boards and very "powerful friends" who are "partisanly defensive."*



## VII. THE CONCENTRATION OF POWER—THE INTERLOCKS

*THE HAZARDS TO SOCIETY IN AN INTERLOCK.*

Social scientists have been articulate in presenting the theory that concentration of Economic Power is a threat to the American system. The Temporary National Economic Committee during the years 1938 to 1940 devoted a great deal of effort to the study of the patterns of influence resulting from interlocking directorates, from voluntary associations of business, from growth tendencies in industry. The tradition of American Federal legislation is one of suspicion against any accumulation of power which enables a group of citizens to control economic and social aspects of our life. We have a consistent record of regulatory laws meant to prevent domination of important aspects of our social life by private powers outside of the system of checks and balances established by our Constitution. The anti-trust laws, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal supervision of communications and of transportation serve to protect society against concentration of power. The existence of excessive power free from control by the administrative and judicial processes is contrary to the principle of free competition. The American system combats monopolism. The Supreme Court in recent decisions declared that not only actual collusions in restraint of competition, but the very existence of power to restrain competition, warrants remedial action.

Whatever dangers to society may exist in the great power which the large tax exempt foundations possess as individual units are multiplied to the point of enormous hazard if numbers of these colossi combine together. If some of these great foundations have acted together or are closely connected in operation, through interlocking directorates, interchanging administrative personnel and the use of intermediary organizations commonly supported, it may be necessary that we consider protecting ourselves against such a combine in the foundation world just as we would if it existed in the business world.

*DOES A CONCENTRATION OF POWER EXIST?*

It is the conclusion of this Committee that such a combine does exist and that its impact upon our society is that of an intellectual cartel. The statement filed with the Committee by the *American Council of Learned Societies* is typical of the generality of the foundations in emphatically denying the existence of a "conspiracy" among the operating organizations and the foundations. This Committee does not see any evidence that the concentration of power arose as the result of a "conspiracy". It has not been created as the result of a plot by a single group of identifiable individuals. It has not been "created" at all, in the sense of a conscious plan having been worked out in advance to construct and implement its essentials. It has, however, happened. Any informed observer would so conclude. Charles S. Hyneman, for example, a Professor of Political Science at Northwestern University and a firm friend of the foundations, in a letter to Committee Counsel, dated July 22, 1954, wrote:

"I have always supposed that there is indeed a 'close interlock or a concentration of power' between the foundations on the one hand and the so-called learned societies, such as the *Social Science Research Council* and the *American Council of Learned Societies*, on the other hand."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix to Hearings.

*The concentration has happened. And it is something as definite to reckon with as though it had, in fact, been consciously created. Its looseness of organization, its incomplete integration, its lack of formality, the inability to put a finger on all the exact mechanics of its connected operation, does not detract from its reality or from the dangers which it potentially carries. Even were its conduct simon-pure, such a concentration of power would, in essence, be un-American and undesirable. And the fact seems to be that it has not always worked to the benefit of the Nation.*

Some of the foundations have fallen into a system or habit of working together, with each other and with the foundation-supported intermediary organizations which all exhibit most clearly that an interlock exists. It has been perhaps a convenience, and it is readily understandable how this could have developed without the trustees of foundations being conscious of the dangers this system involved. Most of them would probably be unable to recognize that a combine actually exists: its coordination and the integration of its parts result from executive action rather than from trustee direction.

Those who support this aggregation of power, and they are many, assert that its personnel comprises, for the most part, the persons most qualified in their respective fields of research, research direction, teaching and writing. They say, further, that this close association is both natural and desirable. But who is to judge whether this group is the truly elite? If it has the services of most of those social scientists who are eminent, is this because they are deservedly so or perhaps because the group has often closed its doors to those of contrary opinion or made it difficult for those of different approach to rise in their *metiers*?

We cannot possibly determine the cause-effect relationship between influence and scientific prestige. There are some strong indications, however, that scientific prestige is frequently the result rather than the cause of an appointment as an executive or a director of a foundation or a scientific council. The monetary power, the ability to supply jobs and research funds, has made many a man a presumed authority in the social sciences, although he started out with only modest knowledge in the area. In the last analysis, it is these executives who are the effective "elite." And even if it should be true that most of the "best minds" are in the group, do we wish to permit them virtual control of intellectual direction in our country? It smacks somewhat of the once-proposed "managerial revolution." *That the development of research and the consequent moulding of public opinion in the United States should lie in the hands of any dominating group seems contrary indeed to our concepts of freedom and competition.*

Assuming for the sake of argument (though it is subject to considerable doubt) that the presently guiding group has superiority, how can society be sure that it will maintain this superiority? Will it receive or open its ranks to contrary opinion? Will it permit entry to younger men who do not agree with its thesis? Will the group truly be the guardians of scientific objectivity, or become propagandists for that in which they happen to believe?

*The risk is great. It is so easy for such a group, wielding the power which the support of the great foundations gives it, to become a bulwark against freedom of inquiry and freedom of instruction. Power does corrupt. Nor are the wielders of power always aware that their power is corroding their judgment.*

There is the further risk that a few of the major foundations, those which contribute the principal support of the intermediary organizations through which the concentration, the intellectual cartel, largely operates, could come to exercise direct and complete control over the combine through the power of the purse, with all the far-reaching consequences of such control. The aggregate power, for example, of the *Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie* funds, coming into the managerial hands of like-minded persons, might result in the complete domination of the intellectual life of the country.

Is this far-fetched? Foundations now controlled by admirable men of public interest could easily come into the control of others with political axes to grind. It has happened. The Institute of Pacific Relations was one of the "clearing house" organizations, supported to the extent of millions of dollars by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations and others. It came under the control of Communists and their sympathizers, with the result that it had tragically much to do with the loss of China to the Communists. *This ghastly example of how dangerous reliance on an intermediary organization can be, must not be easily forgotten. It should be ever present in the minds of foundation trustees to caution them against readily escaping their fiduciary obligation to see to the proper use of the public money they dispense, by handing it to others to do their work for them.*

An *Institute of Pacific Relations* could happen again! Indeed, it is a conclusion of this Committee that the trustees of some of the major foundations have on numerous important occasions been beguiled by truly subversive influences. Without many of their trustees having the remotest idea of what has happened, these foundations have frequently been put substantially to uses which have adversely affected the best interests of the United States. From the statements which they have filed with this Committee, we cannot agree that they have disproved this contention, nor that they have satisfied what is probably a fair affirmative burden to place upon their shoulders. That burden is to show, to demonstrate, that they have made strong, positive contributions to offset the baleful influences which they have sometimes underwritten through their financial power. These influences we shall discuss in some detail in subsequent sections of this report.

It is our opinion that the concentration of power has taken away much of the safety which independent foundation operation should provide; that this concentration has been used to undermine many of our most precious institutions, and to promote radical change in the form of our government and our society.

#### *THE CARTEL AND ITS OPERATIONS.*

Numbers of professors in the social sciences have pointed out the existence of an interlock, a cartel.

In testifying before the McCarran Committee (pp. 4023-27), Professor Rowe of Yale was asked by Counsel:

"Do you know anything, Professor, of the general tendency, to integrate studies and to bring about unanimity of agreement on any particular subject, with the foundations?"

This question led to the following testimony which seems to us important and revealing:

"Mr. ROWE. Well, let's take a possible hypothetical case. Let's assume that organization A wants to promote point of view B and they get money from founda-

tion C and allocate it to a lot of people. They want to have a place for these people to work. They want to maintain them. So they send them around to universities like Yale, Columbia, and California, three I have mentioned where this actually happened, you see. And they hold the final strings.

*"Now, of course, in the interests supposedly of efficiency, integration, coordination, and all these shibboleths of the American foundation point of view, maybe this is a good thing. From my point of view, the foundations and these research organizations like the Institute of Pacific Relations have gone hog wild on the coordination of research. They have committed themselves so thoroughly to coordination of research that in fact instead of supporting a great variety of research projects, which would enrich the American intellectual scene through variegation, which is a value I very basically believe in, you have a narrowing of emphasis, a concentration of power, a concentration of authority, and an impoverishment of the American intellectual scene.*

"These people like organization. They like to have a man in a university, for example, who will take the responsibility for organizing research around a narrow topic. This means he acquires a staff, and you go to work on a special project. You may spend \$250,000 or \$500,000 working on some narrow field, which may or may not ever yield you any results.

"If I were doing the thing, I would talk in terms of supporting individual scholars, and not in terms of supporting these highly organization concentrated narrow specialized research projects that are supported in some of the universities.

*"Now, as I said, I am off on a hobbyhorse at this point. But it is of particular interest, because by exercising power over research in this way, you see, by insisting on the integration of research activity, anybody who wants to, can control the results of research in American universities. And I think this is a very questionable business that the public ought to look at very, very closely, and see whether they want a few monopolies of the money, like, for instance, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corp., who have done immense amounts of good, to emphasize narrow concentration to the extent that they have.*

"Mr. MORRIS. Well, can you think of a particular example of how this would be applied, Professor?

"Mr. ROWE. Well, I can cite cases in which I think this method has been overdone, this kind of an approach has been overdone, cases in which a quarter of a million dollars is allocated over a 10-year period for research on a narrow topic in Chinese history, let's say, in which the graduate students who come into this field in that university are pushed into confining their research to this narrow field so as to contribute to it; where the personnel drawn into the university is drawn into this framework; and where, as a result, the broad general interest in the whole field of Chinese history is made difficult to maintain. All this is done in the interest of efficiency, you know, the great American shibboleth.

"I often say that if we try to become as efficient as the really efficient, supposedly, people, the dictators, then we destroy American scholarship and everything that it stands for. And I often wonder whether my colleagues realize who won the last war. *Intellectually speaking, this country has a great danger of intellectually trying to imitate the totalitarian approach, in allowing people at centers of financial power—they aren't political powers in this sense—to tell the public what to study and what to work on, and to set up a framework.*

"Now, of course, as you know, scholars like freedom. Maybe they come up with a lot of useless information. But in my value standard, as soon as we diminish the free exercise of unhampered curiosity, free curiosity, by channeling our efforts along this line, we then destroy the American mentality. Because the great feature of the American mentality is the belief in allowing people to rush off in all kinds of different directions at once. Because we don't know what is absolutely right. You can't tell that far in advance.

"If I may just continue one moment more, Senator, I would like to point out to you that Adolf Hitler very effectively crippled atomic research in Germany by telling the physicists what he wanted them to come up with. Now, this is true. And if you can do that in atomic physics, you can do it 10 times as fast in the so-called social sciences, which really aren't sciences at all, where really opinion, differentiation of opinion, is the thing that matters and what we stand for in this country.

*"That is why I become very much inflamed when I even smell the first hint of a combination in restraint of trade in the intellectual sphere.*

*"Now, you see what I am talking about with this interlocking directorate? That is what bothers me about it. I don't mind if the boys go off and have a club of their own. That is their own business. But when you get a tie-in of money, a tie-in of the promotion of monographs, a tie-in of research, and a tie-in of publication, then I say that the intellectuals are having the reins put on them and blinders.*

"Senator WATKINS. Otherwise, they do not get on the team.

"Mr. ROWE. That is right. They don't get on the team, and they don't get a chance to carry the ball.

"Now to the faculty member, this means money, income, what he lives on. It is vital. It is not just some recreational thing, you see.

"Senator WATKINS. What I wanted to ask you was this: As a matter of practice, is it not true that in graduate schools of most of our American universities and colleges, the head of the department usually pretty well dictates to the young man who is working for his Ph. D. or master of arts what he is going to write about or what field he is going to investigate?

"Mr. ROWE. No, sir, Senator, not in any department I have ever been connected with. The student is in an open market, where he can go and buy the specialty that any professor has got to offer.

"Senator WATKINS. It has to be approved, though.

"Mr. ROWE. Oh, yes. It has to be approved. But remember this. At this point, you get into the activities of the club. And this is one of the ways in which the individual has a chance to assert himself, because, as you know, if Mr. X doesn't approve of Mr. Y's project, then Mr. Y doesn't have to approve his project. I mean, there is a trade back and forth business.

"Senator WATKINS. There is an interlocking group.

"Mr. ROWE. In the interlocking group it is a different business. This has to do with monopoly of funds and support for research work in the large. I am not talking now about students and dissertations and things of that sort.

"Senator WATKINS. This is more or less research when the student is taking his work for his Ph.D. and he has to write his dissertation.

"Mr. ROWE. But you see, actually, Senator, the only place I know of where all students in the field of Chinese history are integrated into the study of one 15-year period of Chinese history, is in connection with one of these research projects.

"That is the only case in the United States that I know of. I have never seen it operate any place else.

*"This kind of thing is supported by foundation money. And, of course, the temptation is to bring everybody in and integrate, through a genteel process of bribery. That is to say, you support the student, you give him a fellowship, if he will buy your subject matter area. And if you do this for 15 years, the only Ph.D.'s you turn out will be people who know that 12-year period or 15-year period of Chinese history. I say this is intellectual impoverishment.*

"Senator WATKINS. You think that is not true, however, elsewhere?

"Mr. ROWE. It is not generally true.

"Senator WATKINS. I hope it is not, because I thought maybe it might be in some universities I know about.

"Mr. ROWE. It is not generally true, but it is the inevitable kind of thing which happens with this hot pursuit of efficiency, integration. *And, of course, remember this. The foundation people have to have jobs. They have to have something to administer. They don't want to give away the money to the universities and say 'Go ahead and spend it any way you want.' They want to see that the activity pays. That is, we have got to have a regular flow of the so-called materials of research coming out. We want to see this flow in certain quantity. It has to have a certain weight in the hand. And to see that this happens, we do not just give it to a university where they are going to allow any Tom, Dick and Harry of a professor to do his own thing. 'No, we want an integration.'*

"As I warned, Mr. Morris, you see—he set me off, here.

"Senator WATKINS. I take it that is a pretty good plea for the university as against the foundation.

"Mr. ROWE. Absolutely. And, as a matter of fact, *I couldn't find a better illustration of the dangers of consistently over the years donating very large sums of money to organizations, you see, for research purposes, than is involved in the very Institute of Pacific Relations itself. It is a fine illustration of the fact that power corrupts, and the more power you get the more corrupt you get.*

\* \* \* \* \*

"Mr. ROBERT MORRIS (Special Counsel). Was any inducement ever made to you in connection with your membership in the Institute of Pacific Relations that would indicate it would be favorable to you—

"Mr. ROWE. Well, I would say this. I was indoctrinated at some point in my education with a general distaste for joining many organizations. I have a feeling I got this from my former professor of politics at Princeton, Prof. William Starr Myers. But wherever I got it, it is a fact. And when I first came back

from China and entered into my first academic job in Princeton in 1938, I refrained from joining the Institute of Pacific Relations.

"I was approached and invited, but I refrained from joining. And I will say that the only reason I ever did join was on account of a letter I got from Mr. Lockwood, who was then in the organization, the general tenor of which was that young people just starting out in the far eastern field are 'well advised to become a member of this organization.' It was a very genteel statement, but the meaning of it was quite obvious. And I joined only because I got that letter. It is the sort of letter that a young man beginning in a profession can hardly afford to disregard. Five dollars a year to protect yourself? O. K. You pay. You join. That is the only interest I had at the time.

"I later got involved in the organization, and as I told you this morning became a member of the board of trustees in 1947. But in 1938, well, \$5 was pretty important to me in those days. On a salary of \$2,000 a year, I didn't join more organizations than I had to." [Emphasis ours.]

The Committee is well aware that a parade of professors in the social sciences could be marshalled who would deny that a concentration of power exists, who would assert that the great foundations act independently, sagely and objectively throughout their work. We are inclined, however, to listen carefully to the voices raised by courageous, qualified critics in the profession. Professor Rowe, for example, had no axe to grind. He is an academician of eminence and exceptional ability who is friendly to foundations and by his own testimony has enjoyed grants from them. It does take courage to criticize the foundations whose benefactions are so important to academicians, both financially and professionally. The system is very likely to punish its critics, as it has, in instances, certainly done.

In this letter of August 4, 1951, to Congressman Cox, previously referred to,<sup>10</sup> Professor Rippey stated that he had never been impressed with the great wisdom of foundation executives. He said they tended to be arrogant, and that members of the distributing committees are as a rule far from the best scholars. He recommended decentralization of control of the use of funds, suggesting the democratic progress of selection through faculty committees in the universities—"In numbers there will be more wisdom and justice." He continued:

"I believe our way of life is based upon the principles of local autonomy and equality of opportunity. I strongly approve those principles and I believe you do likewise. I should not be surprised if your proposed committee of investigation should discover that concentration of power, favoritism, and inefficient use of funds are the worst evils that may be attributed to the Foundations."

In a second letter to the Chairman of the Cox Committee on November 8, 1952, Professor Rippey wrote as follows (Hearings, p. 62):

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COX: Since I wrote you on August 4, 1951, Dr. Abraham Flexner, a man who has had much experience with the foundations, has published a book entitled "Funds and Foundations," in which he expresses views similar to those contained in my letter. I call your attention to the following pages of Flexner's volume: 84, 92, 94, 124, and 125. Here Dr. Flexner denies that the foundation staffs had the capacity to pass wisely on the numerous projects and individuals for which and to which grants were made, and contends that the grants should have been made to universities as contributions to their endowments for research and other purposes.

The problem is clearly one of the concentration of power in hands that could not possibly be competent to perform the enormous task which the small staffs had the presumption to undertake. This, says Flexner, was both "pretentious" and "absurd." In my opinion, it was worse than that. The staffs were guilty of favoritism. The small committees who passed on the grants for projects and to individuals were dominated by small coteries connected with certain eastern universities. A committee on Latin American studies, set up in the

<sup>10</sup> Supra, p. 37.

1940's for instance, was filled with Harvard graduates. A single professor of history on the Harvard faculty had the decisive word regarding every request for aid presented by historians.

By granting these subsidies to favorite individuals and favored ideas, the foundations contribute to inequalities in opportunity and interfere with "free trade and ideas." They increase the power of favored groups to dominate our colleges and universities. Men whose power exceeds their wisdom, or men who are not guided by the principle of equality of opportunity, could become a menace. If possible, under the terms of our Federal Constitution, these foundations should either be taxed out of existence or compelled to make their grants to colleges and universities, to be distributed by faculty committees of these institutions. Evenhanded justice may not prevail even then because such justice is rarely achieved in human relations. But a greater approximation to evenhanded justice will be made because these local committees will have more intimate knowledge of recipients. This, as you know, is the fundamental justification for decentralization of power, for the local autonomy which was so prominent in the thinking of our Founding Fathers.

Interlocks in commercial enterprises have been studied frequently enough, and an analogy is apt. In monograph ii *Bureaucracy and Trusteeship in Large Corporations*, TNEC, the problem of interlocking directorships is explained as follows:

"The existence of interlocking directorships is not conclusive proof that the companies involved work in close harmony. Some directors in reality have little to say about management, either because they are relatively inactive, or because they are members of the minority, or, perhaps most common of all, because the officers of the particular companies run their enterprises without substantive assistance from their boards. Nevertheless, many directors are influential and in any case there can be little doubt that interlockings at least contribute substantially to the so-called climate of opinion, within which policies are determined. Moreover the majority of those who hold the most directorships among the largest corporations also have active positions in at least one of the companies they serve. It is possible that 'such men are likely to take a responsible share in the development of policy in any corporation in which they hold a responsible position.'" [Emphasis ours.]

Among tax exempt educational and charitable organizations there exists a pattern of relationships and interlocking activity somewhat similar to the structure of business as presented by the Temporary National Economic Committee.

#### WHAT MAKES UP THE INTERLOCK.

The component parts of the network or cartel in the social sciences are:

(1) Certain of the major foundations, notably, the various *Rockefeller* foundations, the various *Carnegie* foundations, the *Ford Foundation* (a late comer but already partially integrated), the *Commonwealth Fund*, *Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation*, *Russell Sage Foundation*, etc.

(2) What might be called intermediary, clearing house, or executive, organizations and in a way act as wholesalers, such as: *The Council of Learned Societies*; *The American Council on Education*; *The National Academy of Sciences*; *The National Education Association*; *The National Research Council*; *The National Science Foundation*; *The Social Science Research Council*; *The American Historical Association*; *The Progressive Education Association*; *The John Dewey Society*; *The Institute of Pacific Relations*; *The League for Industrial Democracy*; *The American Labor Education Service* and others.

(3) The learned societies in the social sciences.

(4) The learned journals in the social sciences.

(5) Certain individuals in strategic positions, such as certain professors in the institutions which receive the preference of the combine.

The patterns of interlocking positions of power may take various shapes. The following are the most frequent ones:

(1) Trustees or employed executives are successively or simultaneously trustees and executives of several foundations.

(2) Trustees or executives serve successively or simultaneously as officers of other tax exempt organizations receiving grants and/or retailing the wholesale grants from their own foundations.

(3) Trustees or executives accept appointments to positions of power in control of education and/or charity so as to multiply their influence beyond the budgetary powers of their foundation resources.

(4) Foundations jointly underwrite major projects, thus arriving at a condition of coordination restraining competition.

(5) Foundations jointly create and support centralized coordinating agencies that operate as instruments of control by claiming supreme authority in a field of education, science, the arts, etc. without any resemblance of democratic representation of the professionals in the management of these agencies.

(6) Rather than distribute money without strings attached, foundations favor projects of their own and supply the recipient institutions not only with the program, but also with the staff and the detailed operations budget so that the project is actually under control of the foundation, while professionally benefiting from the prestige of the recipient institution. The choice of professors often is one by the foundation and not one by the university. Foundation employees frequently switch from work in the foundation, or in the councils supported by the foundation, to work on sponsored projects and in professional organizations supported by their funds. They become most influential in the professional organizations, are elected to presidencies and generally rule the research industry.

One example of interlocking directorates, officers and staff members, out of many which could be given, is the case of *The Rand Corporation*, a corporation in the nature of a foundation. It plays a very important part in the world of research for the government and would bear careful study in connection with the extent of interlocked foundation influence on government projects. Among the trustees of *The Rand Corporation* are the following, shown with their foundation connections:

Charles Dollard.....	Carnegie Corporation
L. A. Dubridge.....	Carnegie Endowment
	National Science Foundation
H. Rowan Gaither, Jr.....	Ford Foundation
Philip E. Mosely.....	Ford Foundation
	Rockefeller Foundation
Harvey S. Mudd.....	Mudd Foundation
	Santa Anita Foundation
	American Heritage Foundation
Frederick F. Stephan.....	Rockefeller Foundation
Clyde Williams.....	Batelle Memorial Institute
Hans Speier.....	(Ford) Behavioral Science Foundation

This example is particularly interesting because the Chairman of *The Rand Corporation* is also the President of *The Ford Foundation*, which granted it one million dollars in 1952. The filed statement of *The Ford Foundation* states that the research being conducted under its grant is entirely "unclassified." It does not explain, however, why the president of a foundation should be the Chairman of a semi-



governmental research organization dealing not only with unclassified material but also with, we understand, highly secret material.

Apart from the interlocking of directorates, but parallel to it, we observe a high concentration of foundation favors on a limited number of recipient organizations. It is common knowledge that there are favored universities and favored individuals. The practice is defended on the ground that these are the most qualified institutions and individuals. This contention is subject to reasonable doubt. And if it were true, it is possible that the foundations have contributed to make it so. It is hard to believe it would not be better for the country if more institutions and more individuals were encouraged and trained in research.

The direction of foundation policies and operations by a group of persons influencing the actions of more than one tax exempt organization is *per se* of greatest concern, for it indicates the existence of the power to control, even if the actual control and the detailed manner in which it restrains cultural competition were not always provable. A condition of control calls for protection against its abuse. Foundations, becoming more numerous every day, may some day control our whole intellectual and cultural life—and with it the future of this country. The impact of this interlock, this intellectual cartel, has already been felt deeply in education and in the political scene.

#### THE SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

As an example of the association of individual foundations with one of the intermediary or executive foundations, let us take *The Social Science Research Council*. It has been supported by contributions from: *The Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial*, *The Russell Sage Foundation*, *The Carnegie Corporation*, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., *The Commonwealth Fund*, *The Julius Rosenwald Fund*, Revell McCallum, *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, *The Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation*, *The General Education Board* (Rockefeller), *the Spellman Fund*, *Trustees of W. E. Uppjohn Unemployment Trustee Corporation*, *The Committee of Trustees on Experimental Programs*, *The Grant Foundation*, *The Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems*, *The American Philosophical Society*, *Carnegie Corporation of New York*, *The John and Mary R. Markle Foundation*, *The Ford Foundation*, *The Twentieth Century Fund*, the U. S. Bureau of the Census, *The East European Fund*, and *The Rockefeller Brothers Fund*.

*The Social Science Research Council* is now probably the greatest power in the social science research field. *That this organization is closely interlocked in an important network is affirmatively asserted by its annual report of 1929-30 as follows:*

"With our sister councils, the *National Research Council*,<sup>11</sup> the *American Council of Learned Societies*, and the *American Council on Education*, cooperation remains good and becomes increasingly close and significant. *There are interlocking members and much personal contact of the respective staffs.*" [Emphasis ours.]

Professor Colgrove testified to the tendency of the "clearing house" organizations to move their offices to Washington and to cause their constituent societies to make the same move. This geographical con-

<sup>11</sup> Active in the natural sciences.

centration is in the interests of efficiency, but is also a way of effecting a greater concentration. He stated that:

\* \* \* There is more day-to-day conversation and consultation between the officers of the professional societies and the officers of the operating societies, like the American Council of Learned Societies, and the officers of the foundations.

I think that the officers of the professional societies are extremely good listeners and follow pretty carefully the advice that is given them by the foundation officers. (Hearings, p. 570.)

He also testified that there has been a conscious concentration of research direction, mainly through the "clearing house" organizations. (Hearings, pp. 570, 571.)

In Vol. 1, No. 3 of the 1947 *Items*, a publication of *The Social Science Research Council*, Donald Young and Paul Webbink present the role of the SSRC in improving research. Their recitation includes this statement:

"The particular role of the Council, however, is that of a *central agency to promote the unity of effort in attacking social problems* which is required to assure maximum returns from the work of a multitude of individual social scientists and of independent private and public institutions." [Emphasis ours.]

While the article says that the *Council* does not "attempt to operate as a coordinating agency in any compulsive sense", its very availability, well-supported by major foundations, seems to have given it a control over social science research which is, in its effective use, undoubtedly compulsive.

To deny that the SSRC is an element in a concentration of power in the social sciences is difficult in the face of this statement of *The Ford Foundation*, quoted by Pendleton Herring in Vol. 4, Number 3 (September, 1950) of the *SSRC Items*:

"The Social Science Research Council has been included in this program because it is *the instrumentality most used by individual scholars, universities and research organizations for interchange of information, planning and other cooperative functions* in the fields described \* \* \* Its grant will be used not so much for the support of independent research projects but rather for any additions to staff or improvements in facilities which would enhance the service it performs for other organizations and scholars." [Emphasis ours.]

The SSRC may be visualized as the center of a net-work of relations reaching into every layer of social activities related to the social sciences. If we draw a graphic "sociogram", we will see the pattern of its operations:

*Constituent societies:*

Represented at various other nationwide "councils."

*Financial support:*

By closely cooperating foundations, which themselves interlock through directorates.

*Supported scholarly activity:*

Concentration on graduates of a few major institutions, which also supply most of the directors of the Council, who since a change of by-laws are chosen by the Council board, not any longer freely elected by constituent associations.

*Influence of government spending for research:*

SSRC or similar foundations-supported groups decisively influence *National Science Foundation* policy and Defense Department spending on research via its officers serving as consultants and board members.

The peculiar nature and construction of *The Social Science Research Council* is worthy of examination. It is a self-perpetuating organization, sharing this characteristic with foundations in general. It has, however, some unique features. It purports more or less, to represent seven of the social science disciplines through their professional societies. Yet these societies are not, in any sense, members of the SSRC. They elect delegates to the Board of the SSRC, but are permitted to elect only from panels of candidates nominated by the SSRC itself. Thus the SSRC Board is able to, and does, control its own character. This process, rather undemocratic to say the least, further tends toward the totalitarian by the fact that the "members" of the SSRC are its former directors.

Some social scientists suspect that this strange system of election of directors has been used in order to maintain a board of a character or bent satisfactory to those in control. The fact remains, whether the control has been used unhappily or not, that it is essentially undemocratic and unrepresentative of the professions which it assumes to represent, and could very easily be used for power purposes.

Some of the results of close cooperation of the foundations supporting the *Council* and of *Council* officers and chosen directors may be illustrated by the following examples:

a.) *The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, published in 1935 in fifteen volumes, contains many contributions of *Council* officers. This publication (to be discussed in more detail later), though not sponsored by the *Council*, was endorsed by the identical associations which constitute the *Council* and carries an imprint similar to the listing of constituent associations on present *Council* stationery.

b.) We find the names of *Council* directors and officers on lists of *The Rand Corporation*, of *The Ford Behavioral Science Fund*, in government advisory groups, and wherever social scientists congregate in leading positions. We find that some of these SSRC officers have advanced into positions controlling the sources of funds (e. g., Messrs. Young and Cotrell now at *Russell Sage*), and since the start of foundation support for the *Council* in the early twenties we find foundation officers participating as *Council* members in running *Council* affairs. (Messrs. Ruml, Herring, etc.)

The *Council* stationery gives the misleading impression that it is a representation of its constituent membership. In reality, since the change in its by-laws, the "constituent" societies have served mainly as the prestige-lending background of the *Council*, creating the impression that the *Council* is a democratically constituted mouthpiece and representation of all social scientists in America.

Even if the *Council* were democratically elected and not operating by continuing the control through a core group, it would not represent all or even most American social scientists. We do not know whether

the seven "constituent" associations of the *Council* can be considered democratically ruled, but in response to our inquiries the seven associations gave us their membership figures. From these it became quite clear that they are only a part, even if in some instances a substantial part, of the total. Whatever the composition may be, the SSRC has in the past gained leadership, among other reasons, because it successfully created the impression of representing the majority of all social scientists in America.

The power of the SSRC seems to be used to effect control of the field of social sciences. *The concept of an efficient central clearing house, available to foundations to assist them in spending their funds is attractive on its face. But this type of delegation by foundations, resulting in the concentration of enormous power into a few executive hands, not only violates the essential quality of foundation-trustees' fiduciary responsibility but gives to the individuals controlling the delegated mechanism, in the interests of efficiency, a power which can be dangerous by reason of that very fact.*

There is evidence that professorial appointments all over the United States are influenced by SSRC blessing. With great foundation support at its command, it has the power to reach in various directions to exercise influence and, often, control. The 1933-34 Report of the National Planning Board (prepared, incidentally by a committee of the SSRC) stated:

"The *Council* (the SSRC) has been concerned chiefly with the determination of the groups and persons with whom special types of research should be placed."

To have this function (gained by foundation support) gives it a power the ultimate results of which can be far-reaching.

It would be interesting in any continued investigation to study the part played by *The Social Science Research Council* and the societies associated with it in controlling book reviews and the literary production of social scientists. In the American academic world scholars are largely rated by their publications, and it is often on a quantitative as well as a qualitative basis. Consequently, the opportunities for securing publication of scientific papers can have much to do with the academic career of a social scientist. Similarly, the type of reviews given to such books as he may write can obviously have a bearing upon his future and his standing.

Professor Rowe (Hearings, p. 549), speaking of the influence of foundations in educational institutions, said:

"\* \* \* you have to realize \* \* \* that advancement and promotion and survival in the academic field depend upon research and the results and the publication thereof. Here you have, you see, outside organizations influencing the course of the careers of personnel in universities through their control of funds which can liberate these people from teaching duties, for example, and making it possible for them to publish more than their competitors."

Thus the control over a scientific journal permits any group in power to favor or disfavor certain scholars and to impress its concepts and philosophy on a generation of school teachers, textbook authors, writers and others. A careful study should be made to ascertain whether the professional journals in the social sciences have been truly objective in their editorial and reviewing approach.

It can be contended that there are other powerful centers of social studies in the United States in competition with SSRC: the *Ford Behavioral Science Fund*, *The Twentieth Century Fund*, *The American*

*Academy of Political and Social Sciences* and others; but with almost all of them there exist personal and organizational ties and cross connections via supporting foundations. Moreover, there is a strange similarity of approach among such groups; they all seem to fall into the same "liberal" economic and social points of view. Is this accident or coincidence? It suggests itself to us (and it is a matter requiring far more investigation) that the concentration of power to which we refer has been consciously used to foster and develop this attitude.

Charles Dollard (President of *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*) contributed an article, in *Items, The Social Science Research Council Publication, The Strategy for Advancing the Social Sciences*, in which he refers to the errors of election polls and to the statistical mistakes of Kinsey, and says:

"The third strategic move which I would suggest is that *social science initiate a more rigorous system of internal policing.*" (Page 19.) [Emphasis ours.]

We ourselves are extremely dubious of the scientific character of the methods used by Dr. Kinsey, as we shall discuss later. We cannot understand why his work should have been supported by *The Rockefeller Foundation* or any other foundation. But we cheerfully grant to Dr. Kinsey the right, as an individual working with other than public funds, to make any mistakes he wishes and to select any methods or objectives he chooses. The concept of "policing" is rather terrifying. Did Mr. Dollard mean to say that *The Social Science Research Council* and other "clearing house" organizations should do the policing? That any such organization should even entertain a proposal to create uniformity—even in the interests of efficiency and better method—or to press grantees, whether individual or institutional, into common moulds in any way, would be deeply regrettable. Few could risk criticizing, few academicians at least. There would emerge what has been called a "Gresham's Law in the field of professorships in the social sciences."

We could not more strongly support the statement made by President Grayson Kirk of Columbia University in an address on May 31, 1954, in which he said:

"We must maintain the greatest possible opportunities for the free clash of opinions on all subjects, trusting to the innate good judgment of men and women to reach decisions that are beneficial to society."

The very fact that a leading foundation executive, in an America traditionally opposing restrictions of free speech and thought, can call for a system of internal policing indicates the chasm between a concept of scholarly orthodoxy and the real freedom of inquiry to which Dr. Kirk referred.

The various organizations which compose the center of the concentration of power, the "clearing house" organizations, can all clearly point to admirable and valuable work which they have done. It would be difficult, indeed, to find a foundation which is wholly bad, and the "clearing houses" to which we refer have a great deal to their credit. What concerns us at the moment is that a power exists, concentrated in a comparatively small number of hands, a power which, though it has been used often for much good, can be used for evil. *The existence of such a power, dealing with public trust funds, to us seems to involve at least a potential danger or risk, however benevolently to date its relative despotism may have acted.*

*THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.*

Another of the "clearing houses" is *The American Council on Education*. It is a council of national education associations, financed by membership dues and government contracts, and by heavy contributions from major foundations and comparable organizations, such as *The General Education Board* (Rockefeller), *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*, *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, *The Rockefeller Foundation*, *The Ford Fund for Adult Education*, *The Alfred P. Sloan Fund*, *The Payne Fund*, *B'nai Brith*, *The National Conference of Christians and Jews*, *The Edward W. Hazen Foundation*, *The Grant Foundation*, *The Ellis L. Phillips Foundation*, and others.

A pamphlet issued by *The American Council on Education* in July 1953 frankly calls this organization a "clearing house."

"More specifically, the Council has been a clearinghouse for the exchange of information and opinion; it has conducted many scientific inquiries and investigations into specific educational problems and has sought to enlist appropriate agencies for the solution of such problems; it has stimulated experimental activities by institutions and groups of institutions; it has kept in constant touch with pending legislation affecting educational matters; it has pioneered in methodology that has become standard practice on a national basis—\* \* \*; it has acted as liaison agency between the educational institutions of the country and the federal government and has undertaken many significant projects at the request of the Army, Navy and State Departments and other governmental agencies; and \* \* \* it has made available to educators and the general public widely used handbooks, informational reports, and many volumes of critical analysis of social and educational problems."

The *Council* maintains imposing offices in Washington, D. C., which may not be without significance as, among its many committees, some are concerned with tax, social security and other legislation as it affects institutions of higher learning. Its committee most interesting to us is that on Institutional Research Policy. A *Brief Statement of the History and Activities of the American Council on Education*, dated July 1953 describes the functions of the *Research Policy Committee* as follows:

"Established 1952 to study the interrelationships of sponsored research from the viewpoints of federal agencies, industries, and foundations sponsoring such research, and the effect on institutions doing the research. This latter angle involves the distribution of grants among institutions and the concentration of research in fields at the expense of other fields and the distortion of the institutional picture as a whole. The magnitude of the problem is shown by the fact that 20 or more federal agencies are currently subsidizing more than \$150,000,000 worth of research a year; industrial and business concerns and private foundations also sponsor research. The numerous 'special interest' involved may approach the same problems in different ways and come up with different solutions. It is the aim of this Council committee—composed of college presidents, vice-presidents for research, business officers, and faculty members directly engaged in sponsored research projects—to attempt to formulate a policy for the national level based on cooperative relationships." [Emphasis ours.]

Note that, like *The Social Science Research Council*, this *Council* is an interrelating agency, coordinating the work of other research organizations and researchers, establishing policy and acting as a distributing agent for granting-foundations along planned and integrated lines. That may well create efficiency, but is it solely efficiency we want in research in the social sciences? As Professor Rowe and others have said: it would seem far better to lose efficiency and give individuals of quality the opportunity to go in their own respective directions unhampered by any group control, direction or pressure.

However laudable much or most of its work may have been, the *Council* has certainly been one of the media through which foundation funds have been used to effect considerable control or influence over education in the United States. Some may argue that this control or influence has been wholly good—were this so, we would still believe that the power of great foundations to affect educational policies and practices is one which should concern the public. By the same token, we believe that “clearing house” organizations, while they may serve a purpose in the direction of efficiency, are of questionable desirability when interlocked financially or by personnel with these foundations. *The aggregate power involved in such a concentration gives us concern.*

#### *OTHER INTERLOCKS AND FURTHER DANGERS.*

Opposite this page there appears a reproduction of a chart introduced by the Assistant Director of Research, showing the *Interrelationships Between Foundations, Education and Government*. As Mr. McNiece explained:

“The relationships between and among these organized intellectual groups are far more complex than is indicated on the chart. Some of these organizations have many constituent member groups. The *American Council of Learned Societies* has twenty-four constituent societies, the *Social Science Research Council*, seven, the *American Council on Education* seventy-nine constituent members, 64 associate members, and 954 institutional members. In numbers and interlocking combinations they are too numerous and complex to picture on this chart.” (Record, p. 1018.)

There are, moreover, other organizations in some number not noted at all on the chart which fulfill some intermediary function in association with foundations and other organizations which are indicated.

There is, in addition, a *Conference Board of Associated Research Councils*, composed of *The American Council of Learned Societies*, *The American Council on Education*, *The National Research Council* and *The Social Science Research Council*, organized “to facilitate action on matters of common concern.” It “continued earlier informal consultations of the executives of the Councils. Its functions are limited to administration of joint activities authorized by the *Councils* and consideration of mutual interests.” (From the 1943-45 Annual Report of the SSRC, page 16.)

The central organizations, such as *The Social Science Research Council*,

“may be considered as ‘clearing houses’ or perhaps as ‘wholesalers’ of money received from foundations inasmuch as they are frequently the recipients of relatively large grants which they often distribute in subdivided amounts to member groups and individuals.” (Record, p. 1019.)

Nor does the chart show all the functions of government in which foundations operate or to which they contribute.

“The lines connecting the various rectangles on the chart symbolize the paths followed in the flow or interchange of money, men and ideas \* \* \*.”

But this process, highly concentrated through the intricate interrelationships, is both complex and ominous. A high concentration of power is always dangerous to society. As we have said, it can be constructed or come into being for wholly benign purposes, but it can readily be used by those whose objectives are against the public interest.

The Cox Committee record shows that a conscious plan by the Communists was inaugurated to infiltrate the foundations for the purpose of appropriating their funds to Communist uses. We know from the evidence that the Communists succeeded in the case of seven foundations: *The Marshall Field Foundation*; *The Garland Fund*; *The John Simon Guggenheim Foundation*; *The Heckscher Foundation*; *The Robert Marshall Foundation*; *The Rosenwald Fund*; and *The Phelps Stokes Fund*; and we are aware of the tragic result to our nation and to the world of communist infiltration into *The Institute for Pacific Relations*. We know also that (then undisclosed) Communists and their fellow-travellers had been able to secure grants from other foundations, including *Carnegie* and *Rockefeller*. We know, further, what the Cox Committee report referred to as "the ugly unalterable fact that Alger Hiss became the President of *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*." We do not know the full extent to which there has been penetration or use of foundations and their resources. It is too much to assume that Communist success was limited to the exposed instances. Indeed, where foundations are involved in so high a concentration of power as the chart discloses, we may assume that some advantage may have been taken by Communists to use this interlock, directly or indirectly, for malign purposes.

This Committee is not in a position to assess the extent of such use but warns against the inherent danger that a concentration of power constitutes a weapon at hand for such as may wish to suborn it for evil designs. The number of grants made to Communist agents or agencies is relatively tiny in comparison with the aggregate grants by foundations. But this numerical comparison casts no light on the degree of damage which has been done. One grant of comparatively small amount may do frightening damage. Professor Rowe testified (Hearings, p. 534, 535) to the effect that the *test of damage is qualitative and not quantitative*. Moreover, the Communists do not always work directly. In their desire to undermine our society they operate more frequently than not by indirection, supporting causes which merely tend to the left but cannot be identified as actually Communist.

*The main concern of this Committee is not with Communism. We agree with Professor Rowe in his estimate that the greater danger lies in the undermining effect of collectivist or socialist movements. Externally, Communism is the greater danger; internally, socialism offers far greater menace.*

In either event, whether the penetration is by outright Communists or by some other variety of socialists or collectivists, the danger of its occurrence is far greater when there exists a complex of interrelated and interlocked organizations. There are more opportunities for shifting both personnel and grants. There is much less control through supervision by the trustees of the foundations which supply the basic funds used by the intermediaries. After they have poured these funds into the managerial hands of others, the detailed distribution is beyond their control. Perhaps the *Rockefeller Foundation* trustees might well have recognized a Communist penetration in their own foundation had it existed to the extent it did in the *Institute of Pacific Relations*. They did not recognize it in this intermediary to which they granted millions. The difficulty of watching over the disbursements of an intermediary is not the only danger in the current



system. Foundation trustees are inclined to shrug off responsibility on the unsound theory that, having selected a recipient organization, the granting foundation bears no responsibility for what that intermediary does. The menace of extreme leftist penetration of the foundation world is thus multiplied in seriousness by the existing system of interlock and the use of intermediary organizations.

Aside from this direct menace, the dangers of so close an interlock, so high a degree of concentration of power in intellectual fields, tends to violate an essential of the American system, competition. *Some unfriendly newspapers have accused this Committee of trying to establish "thought control" in the foundation world, or to act as a "censor", or to wish to promote "conformity". The exact opposite is the case. This Committee is highly critical of the system of concentration under discussion for the very reason that it promotes conformity, acts in effect as a censor of ideas and projects, and produces a tendency toward uniformity of ideas.*

In this area of discussion it becomes most important to realize that the United States Government now expends annually on research in the social sciences far more than all the foundations put together. This might be a factor offsetting the concentration of power which the foundations and their supported creatures constitute, were it not for the fact that government-financed research in the social sciences is virtually under the direction of the very same persons and organizations who dominate the foundation concentration of power. Thus, not only are great parts of the vast public funds which the foundations represent used in largely coordinated fashion by the concentration, but even larger sums of public money directly provided by government are, to all practical purposes, employed by the same groups.

This situation is quite distasteful. Americans do not cherish the concept that society should be directed by a clique. Though it may indeed be elite, we do not wish it to direct us. Moreover, there is considerable doubt that the presumed elite is indeed so. One of the most important of the "clearing-houses", *The American Council of Learned Societies*, an intrinsic part of the concentration of power, presumes to represent the elite in the disciplines. To this organization, foundations annually grant large sums of public money. Through it a great amount of research in the social sciences is done or directed. Yet its executive secretary for a long period has been MORTIMER GRAVES. In the Cox Committee Record at page 544, Mr. Keele, its Counsel, read from a long list of Communist-front organizations of which MR. GRAVES was a member, and Mr. Keele did not exhaust the list.

We do not accuse MR. GRAVES of being a Communist. But it amazes us that one with so evident a lack of political and social discernment, with such apparent lack of objectivity, should be retained as a directing officer in what purports to be the representative organization for all the social sciences and humanities. MR. GRAVES still holds his position, though the Cox Committee hearings brought out his extensive record of Communist-front affiliations. This leads us to conclude one of two things; either his personal power is astounding or the extreme political slant of an executive is deemed of no moment by that tax-exempt agency of the foundations.

Under date of August 23, 1954, General Counsel to this Committee addressed a letter to MR. GRAVES, a copy of which is attached to

this report as an appendix.<sup>12</sup> A reply was received stating that MR. GRAVES was abroad and would not return until early in September. A reply was finally received from MR. GRAVES in November. In the letter addressed to him, fifteen detailed questions were asked concerning his reported Communist-front affiliations,<sup>13</sup> his sponsorship of known extreme leftists, recommendations made by him (on behalf of *The Council of Learned Societies*) to government agencies (the lists reputedly containing some Communists or fellow-travellers), and concerning other matters important to this investigation.

MR. GRAVES' reply (Hearings, page —) gave the Committee certain responsive material but failed to disclose the recommendations made by him to government agencies. The Committee cannot understand his failure to do so unless it was by intention. Mr. Graves' reply seeks to explain away his Communist-front associations, but the aggregate number of those with which he has been charged by other investigations raises a grave question as to his capacity or willingness to act without bias as a foundation executive.

MR. GRAVES is one of the leading characters in the *dramatis personae* of the foundation world, a major executive of a powerful intermediary organization which is an intrinsic part of the foundation-supported concentration of power, a key figure in academic circles, an adviser to government. The foundation world continues to accept him as one of its leading lights.

So, we ask again, are these officers and directors of the foundations and clearing houses and those whom they favor with their benefactions "elite?" The specialists in the social science fields are obviously better informed in their specialties than is the general public. This does not, however, establish that their judgment regarding the application of their knowledge is sound. We have had plenty of examples of brilliance in a specialty, accompanied by a social judgment so deficient as to be tragic. No one can doubt the genius of Klaus Fuchs, for example, nor his sincerity; neither offered him any basis for sound social judgments.

There is the further danger that an elite group tends to perpetuate itself, both as to personnel and as to opinion and direction. It is only through competition in the intellectual fields, just as in business, that progress can safely be accomplished. Anything which tends to prevent or restrict competition seems to this Committee fraught with frightening danger to our society.

*Public opinion is greatly determined, in the long run, by the influence of intellectuals. Therefore, it seems essential to this Committee that intellectual life be as unhampered and freely competitive as possible. Any concentration of intellectual effort, any mechanism tending to conformity, is essentially undesirable, even if, for the moment, directed solely to desirable ends.* A political dictatorship may be benevolent, but we want none of it. Similarly, an intellectual-group-dictatorship may be benevolent, but we want none of it.

We urge a detailed reading of the testimony of Mr. McNiece, beginning at page 465 of the Hearings, in which he explains the extent and working of the interlocking concentration of power which has been financed by foundations and has taken over much of government function in the social science areas. We are dealing here

<sup>12</sup> See p. —.

<sup>13</sup> See p. — for list of affiliations.

with vast sums of money, the impact of which can be and has been terrific. Mr. McNiece noted that six foundations alone have made grants aggregating over \$60,000,000 to some of the intermediate or clearing-house organizations. Significant also, incidentally, were aggregate grants of over \$4,000,000 to *The London School of Economics*, at a time when it was a fountain-head of Fabian socialism. (Hearings, p. 475.)

*POLITICS—POWER FLOW—PLANNING.*

Mr. McNiece described a "central or main stream of influence" running from the foundations and their centralized agencies into government. (Hearings, p. 601, et seq.) There was considerable evidence to show that the government has come to rely upon the "clearing houses" for lists of men who can assist as specialists in the "social sciences." On its face this practice seems desirable enough, but closer inspection discloses severe dangers. As Mr. Reece, the Chairman of the Committee, remarked:

The CHAIRMAN. We have in the United States the colleges and universities which, while large in number, are very accessible to be advised about the requirements of Government. While there is nothing wrong in asking one of the societies to furnish a list of names, as I see it, do we not know from practical experience that when a council such as the Council of Learned Societies is put in the position of furnishing a list of scholars to advise the Government, that list will be pretty much the recommendation of the man who happens to be administrative officer of the council that makes up and supplies the list. Insofar as that is the case, that puts in the hands of one man a tremendous influence. If he happens to be a man that has certain inclinations, he is in a position to give very wide effect in those inclinations, if he is put in a position where he furnishes the list of the experts the Government calls into the service as advisers. That is the angle that I see that becomes, to my mind, Mr. Hays, very important.

It is the concentration not only in one organization, but ultimately largely in the hands of one man. (Hearings, pp. 602, 603.)

We discuss elsewhere the power which executives of foundations and "clearing houses" exercise. Professor Colgrove gave important testimony in this area. He said that academicians are reluctant to criticize foundations. He testified to the "fawning" over those who distribute foundation funds, giving as an example the attitude of professional associates toward Professor Merriam, long a power in the social-science-foundation world. Professor Merriam himself had said:

"Money is power, and for the last few years I have been dealing with more power than any professor should ever have in his hands." (Hearings, p. 565.)

In the last analysis it is frequently individuals, or small groups of individuals who perform the act of recommendation and virtual appointment of "scientific" personnel to the government. The political slant of these individuals may thus seriously affect the character of government operations. We have seen many Communists and fellow-travellers recommended by foundation executives for government posts. *In the case of the recommendations to the government made by the Institute of Pacific Relations and the American Council of Learned Societies for experts to be used by our occupation forces in Germany and Japan, the lists were heavily salted with Communists and their supporters.* (Hearings, pp. 559, 560.)

The Chairman seriously questioned the process of the government relying on the existing mechanism for making social-science appoint-

ments. He said that the administrative officer of an operating society who made such recommendations

"is a man that has no public responsibility, not like the President or a cabinet officer, whom we know who do have public responsibility. Nor like the President of a college who is identified in the public mind, and to a very large degree is held responsible not only by the board of trustees, but particularly by the alumni of the institution, and a very wide segment of the public, which is quite different from some man that is ensconced in the office of a learned society that is in a building downtown here. At least I see a very wide difference. In so far as there is a disposition to concentrate into one or a few places—it probably should not be described as authority to recommend—the privilege of recommending people for government consultants. I would have quite a serious question in my mind about it." (Record, p. 1342.)

In reply to Counsel's question whether he did not think foundations might better turn to the universities and colleges for research instead of to intermediate organizations, Professor Rowe testified:

Dr. ROWE. Yes, sir. There has, of course, been a mixed method on the part of IPR. You get a very interesting carrying down the line of the funds and the projects. Foundations will give funds to organizations like IPR. Some of this money for research purposes will be directly handled by the IPR. Young people, scholars, will be brought into the organization to do specific jobs for the organization. However, they will also go to universities and ask universities as they did once in our case to provide, so to speak, hospitality for one of the men that they want to have perform a research function under guidance and direction, subsidized by IPR, which money came from *Rockefeller Foundation* in this case. Then they will do other things. For instance, the IPR organization will give money to the university personnel themselves directly for either research or publication purposes. So there are all kinds of ways and manners of doing this. I would submit that in much of this procedure the choice of personnel, the passing on their qualifications, the framing of projects, and the guidance of the researchers in the process of carrying out projects, is not adequately provided for by these organizations, such as the *Institute of Pacific Relations* was and still is today.

In the case of universities, where appointments are made, the universities' faculties are people of long standing, they may be good, bad, or indifferent, but the organization and the procedures of appointment and approval thereof are sufficiently complex and involve sufficient safeguards to cut the errors down considerably below the errors that are possible and probable without these forms of supervision and sanction.

It seems to me that the foundations in giving funds to organizations such as the *Institute of Pacific Relations* are in general on rather weaker ground than if they give funds to established organizations for research purposes in which the criteria for the appointment of people, for their promotions, for their advancements and things of that kind have been worked out over a long period of time.

The informality of the arrangements in the IPR was one of the things that I have always wondered at. To make it possible for so few people to have so much power and influence in determining who got funds for what purpose and determining what kind of projects they worked on and how these projects were supervised seemed to me to be very lax. Of course, toward the end the money that IPR got was heavily given to publications. They would subsidize the publication of works that were produced by research workers in universities and other such organizations, as well as their own people. This seemed to me to be getting away a little bit from the evils of the previous system in which they were directly involved in the research function. But it still put a tremendous lot of power in the hands of a very few people, since they went all over the United States, looking over the products of research in the far eastern field, and deciding which of these they would subsidize and which they would not.

This is not to say for a moment that the foundations have not given funds directly to universities. Of course they have. I suppose they have given far more funds for research purposes directly to universities than to organizations such as the IPR. But it seems to me, and you can, of course, consider the source here—I am a member of a university community—it seems to me logical to say that in those communities you get better safeguards as to quality and personnel than you can get in any such organization as the *Institute of Pacific Relations*, set up to a heavy extent for research purposes outside of academic communities. (Hearings, pp. 544, 545.)

Later the following colloquy took place:

Mr. WORMSER. \* \* \* I would like to get on another subject, which one of your previous remarks introduced. We were discussing the undesirability perhaps of using intermediate organizations like IPR. Would your comments apply also, and perhaps you might discuss this general area, to what we have referred to at times as clearing house organizations? We have talked about a certain interlocking or close relationship between the foundations and intermediate organizations, like *The Social Science Research Council*, and *The American Council of Learned Societies*. I would like you to comment on that, Professor, as well as whether you think the resulting concentration of power through this interlock is a desirable thing or not.

Dr. ROWE. I suppose the proof of it is in what comes out of it. My feeling is that here is another very clear evidence of the difficulty for the foundations in making policy regarding the expenditure of their funds. *The Social Science Research Council* handles social science matters. They will give a large lump sum of money to these people. Then *The Social Science Research Council* has to set up the operations of screening of applications, screening of candidates, supervision of operations and evaluation of results and all that. This costs the foundations something, because part of the money they put in has to go for these administrative purposes. But the foundation doesn't want to do it itself. *The Social Science Research Council* being supposedly a specialized agency simply, it seems to me, relieves the foundation of this to the extent that the foundation gives large sums of money to *The Social Science Research Council*.

What the *Council* does is the responsibility of the foundation, it seems to me, to a very great extent. There is no use trying to blink at that fact in any way, shape, or form. I suppose there is no ideal solution to the problem of the application of expertness to the supervision of the expenditure of money by big foundations. This is why some foundations go in for rather narrow kinds of specialization. They will do one kind of thing and not another. *The General Education Board* is an example of what I am talking about, because their work has been rather narrowly oriented, certainly during the last decade or two. But the big foundations in general spread themselves over the landscape.

*The Ford Foundation* is the latest and greatest. *The Ford Foundation* is even going in for general public education, although I understand this emphasis is decreasing some in the last year or two. But when they first began they were very much interested in general adult education through all kinds of media, radio, conferences, great book seminars all over the country. We had 2 or 3 of them in our immediate area in Connecticut, all financed by *The Ford Foundation*.

The job of running an extension course for universities is a big job. When you start doing this all over the United States, I should think it would be almost impossible to supervise it adequately. If I am right about the tendency in recent years, it might be that this is a conclusion they have reached on the matter, if they are cutting down. I would not know what has guided their policy along this line.

There is inevitably going to be this problem, that as knowledge and as research become more specialized and more technical, and the problem of deciding what you want to do researchwise becomes more difficult, the foundations that have big money to spend are just up against a tremendous policy problem. How do they operate, and how can they possibly guarantee the maximum effectiveness and efficiency in their operations in the light of the objectives which they profess and which underlie their whole activity?

Mr. WORMSER. Does it impress you as socially desirable that the large foundations should concentrate a certain large part of their operations in the social sciences in one group or association of groups, like *The Social Science Research Council*, *The American Council of Learned Societies*, and others?

Dr. ROWE. I suppose the theory behind this is that these organizations, like *The Social Science Research Council*, are truly representative of social science all over the United States. I suppose that is the only possible theoretical justification for this kind of policy. I don't know.

Mr. WORMSER. The question we have, Professor, in that connection is whether that type of concentration, even though it might be efficient mechanically, is desirable insofar as it militates against the competitive factor, which is sort of intrinsic in our society.

Dr. ROWE. There is no question but what an organization like *The Social Science Research Council* has a tremendous amount of power. This power which it exerts, it exerts very heavily on educational institutions and their personnel,

because when you get down to it, who is it that does research in social science? It is educational institutions, because they have the faculties in the various fields, like political science, economics, anthropology, sociology, geography and so on. That is where the people are. To understand the importance of this function, all you have to realize is that advancement and promotion and survival in the academic field depend upon research and the results and the publication thereof. Here you have, you see, outside organizations influencing the course of the careers of personnel in universities through their control of funds which can liberate these people from teaching duties, for example, and making it possible for them to publish more than their competitors.

This, therefore, means that there is a tremendous responsibility here to apportion their awards in a just way—in such a way as takes into account the differences of approach and the differences of opinion in these fields; the theoretical differences from one school to another. *The possibility exists that at all times in any of these organizations that the people in charge thereof become convinced that there is one way to do a job in the social science field, and that only this way will get their support.*

*If and when that time comes—I don't know whether it is here or ever will come—then you will have a combination in restraint of trade within the limits of public acceptability that may have very deleterious effects upon our intellectual community. [Emphasis ours.] (Hearings, pp. 548, 549, 550.)*

Let us see whether in the field of social science research such a movement “in restraint of trade” has not, in effect, come about.

## VIII. THE FOUNDATIONS AND RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

### *THE PREDOMINANCE OF EMPIRICISM.*

There has been frequent and severe criticism of foundations on the ground that, in their support of research in the social sciences in association with the concentration of power described in the previous chapter, they have promoted an excess of empirical research.

The normal scientific process employs both theoretical and empirical research. The theoretical is deductive reasoning from accepted premises. The empirical is inductive reasoning from observed data. The usual process is to set up a hypothesis, derived from some form of reasoning, or selected by accident or arbitrarily. This hypothesis is then generally tested by various means, including both deductive and inductive approaches. Empirical research can produce material of usefulness by way of the collection of data; but it is rare indeed when such research, without relation to or counter-check by theoretical research, can produce a result upon which any new course for society can safely be recommended. Empiricism by the very nature of its approach, ignores moral precepts, principles and established or accepted norms of behavior, and seeks to base conclusions solely upon what the senses will take in by means of observation.

These critics, therefore, say that empirical research is obviously a necessary component of the general investigatory method but, unless combined with the theoretical approach, it can lead into serious and often tragic error. They urge that the foundations are misdirecting their funds in social science research areas if they do not see to it that empirical research is balanced by theoretical. It seems impossible to deny the validity of the comment made by Professor Hobbs in his testimony (Hearings, p. 167):

*I would feel very definitely that so-called empirical findings must be fitted into a framework of the legal precepts, the traditions, the history, the moral codes, the military principles of the area in which they are applied. That in and of themselves, by their very nature, they exclude the intangibles which may be not only important but may be crucial in a final decision.*

It is difficult to decide which is the cart and which the horse; whether a predominance of empirical interest started in the universities and took over the foundations, or whether the foundations have been the controlling factor in filling the universities (and thus research) with empiricists. It seems to this Committee that it makes little difference. If the controlling thought in the universities and in the foundations is in the direction of empiricism, to the virtual exclusion of theory, a situation exists which, in its imbalance, may be very dangerous.

Predominant opinions tend to perpetuate themselves. If a university department is predominantly empiricist, it is likely, through what might be called "intellectual nepotism", to exclude the entrance of teachers of the opposite research persuasion. If a foundation, particularly when associated with the concentration of power which has been referred to, tends predominantly to the empirical, it is likely to promote this approach to the exclusion of the opposite school. Thus, in the course of time, and this seems often to have happened, the whole field is dominated by persons of one persuasion.

A numerical Gallup Poll of "authorities" in the social sciences would undoubtedly show that most of the "best people" in the field would support the predominant empirical approach. That does not prove that they are right. It is quite possible, as the critics suggest, that theorists have not had an equal opportunity to get into the ranks and to rise in them. It might well be as though a group of Republicans, having obtained control of foundation management and of university departments, had steadily increased their control by excluding Democrats and now claim that most people who are prominent in the trade are against Democratic research. This might then be true, but does it prove that the Republicans were right in excluding the Democrats?

If the public money which goes into research in the social sciences through the operation of foundations has been and is being directed consciously and overwhelmingly into one theory of research, to the virtual exclusion of another theory held necessary to be integrated by many men of competence and stature, the Committee would conclude that this favoritism for one theory is against the public interest.

There is considerable evidence to show that this favoritism and exclusion does exist, and to a marked degree.

*The Social Science Research Council*, the most important of the "clearing house" organizations in the social sciences, apparently maintains a program for the development of researchers in these fields. The funds are supplied by major foundations, in substantial amounts; but the SSRC seems to be the chief executive of what is apparently a program widely supported by the foundations to produce more researchers. On the face of it, this seems a most admirable enterprise. However, the conclusion is inevitable that its program is directed overwhelmingly toward the production of empirical research. Pamphlets issued by SSRC announcing "Fellowships and Grants" describe the fellowships as of two classes. The first is "Those designed exclusively to further the training of research workers in social science." The second is "Those designed to aid scholars of established competence in the execution of their research," namely, the *Travel Grants for Area Research*, *Grants-in-Aid of Research*, and *Faculty Research Fellowships*.

In a letter to a member of the Committee staff, the President of SSRC says:

"In the case of the faculty research fellowship program it was agreed that the recipients would be chosen in terms of their competence 'in formulating and testing hypotheses concerning social behavior *by empirical, and if possible quantitative methods.*'" [Emphasis ours.]

The pamphlets, on the other hand, referring to the other group of fellowships—those intended to train researchers—says:

"These fellowships may be granted for programs that will afford either experience in the conduct of research and *first hand analysis of empirical data* under the guidance of mature investigators, or further formal training, or both." [Emphasis ours.]

Thus all the neophytes who are to become "social scientists" must operate empirically to get any help through these fellowships. Similarly, having attained positions on a faculty, it seems they cannot have one of these faculty fellowships except for empirical studies. That leaves only part of the second class, namely, "*Travel Grants for Area Research*", and "*Grants-in-Aid of Research.*" Perhaps empiricism is not demanded for a *Travel Grant*, but it would seem clear that it is again a prerequisite to a *Grant-in-Aid of Research*. The pamphlets recite that "Grants will not be given to subsidize the preparation of textbooks or the publication of books or articles, or to provide income in lieu of salary." Therefore, and because much theoretical research requires little equipment and merely financial support while the time is taken to do thinking, reading and analysis which almost always results in the production of a book or an article, theorists, as against empiricists, seem to be given short shrift.

In *Fellows of the Social Science Research Council 1925-1951*, the Council writes, describing the Research Training Fellowships begun in 1935, as follows:

"There has been no arbitrary assignment of quotas by disciplines, but a constant effort to encourage training by rigorous *empirical* research in all fields." [Emphasis ours.]

#### THE "FACT-FINDING MANIA".

No laboring of this point is needed. The executives of the major "clearing house" organizations on the whole would not only admit that they overwhelmingly support empirical research; they would acclaim it as highly desirable. They maintain that, whatever the weaknesses of data-collection, an accumulation of empirical results adds to the great body of knowledge and forms additional bases for further research. Moreover, it is probable that an opinion census of social science professors would show that most of them believe (1) there is an adequate balance of theoretical with empirical research and (2) that, in any event, there cannot be too much empirical collection of data. A letter to Counsel from Professor of Sociology C. Arnold Anderson, of the University of Kentucky, for example, expresses what is certainly the majority point of view of the present social scientists. He says: "\* \* \* we must recognize that it is impossible to have too many empirical facts." He adds: "The answer to inadequate facts is more facts." He concludes emphatically that "There has not been an unfair or undesirable preponderance of empirical research. What the social sciences need is enormously more money for the collection of facts, and for the testing of theories by facts."



There are eminent professors and social science technicians, however, who insist that empirical research has unfairly predominated. They point out that the mere collection of "facts" unrelated to theory and untested, or unchecked and uncheckable in many instances, adds nothing of any consequence to the sum total of human knowledge. Indeed, Professor Anderson himself says in his letter that "Fact and theory are constantly at play, one upon the other. Every reputable social scientist strives constantly to balance and integrate those two facets of scientific work." Those of the critical point of view believe that great numbers of foundation-supported social scientists, in their anxiety to use the factual approach to research, have failed to do that very integration between "fact" and theory which Professor Anderson indicates is essential to sound work.

In a paper, *New Concepts in Education*, delivered before the *American Association for the Advancement of Science* at Cleveland on December 27, 1950, Stuart A. Curtis commented on one aspect of fact-finding as follows:

"As a result we are today in possession of mountains of quantitative data whose interpretation is not furthered by our experiments, and we have discovered no laws as the exact sciences know law. We possess only large masses of quantitative conclusions nearly worthless for purposes of prediction."

For a full presentation of the absurdity of accumulating facts merely as facts, and also for an analysis of what constitutes a "scientific" fact, we refer the reader to Professor Hobbs' notable book, *Social Problems and Scientism*. In it, Professor Hobbs attacks the excessive and uncontrolled use of empiricism, and points out that the result is often what he refers to as "scientism", or what a layman would call "fake science." He states that many books and articles have been written which purport to give "the facts" regarding some phase of human behavior—the "facts" about marriage, the "facts" about sex, the "facts" about crime, etc. In all too many instances he says, we are not then presented with scientific data but with a collection of scientifically meaningless material (pp. 211-2).

This mania for "fact-finding" has reached a stage which has been sometimes referred to as the "comptometer compulsion." Morton Churman, in *How Discriminatory are College Admissions?*, in *Commentary* of June, 1953, calls it the "IBM fallacy." He says (p. 622):

"Every trade in every age has its special delusions, and a major application of social science might be called the IBM fallacy. This delusion reflects the endemic conviction of 20th-century man that machines can do everything for him—including thinking. In the case of the social scientist it takes the form of a certainty that if you feed enough data through enough electric circuits what you are looking for is bound to come out. The corollary of this hypothesis is the conviction that only a minimum of human cerebration need be combined with a maximum of electronics to produce miraculous results.

"\* \* \* The laboratory experiment, or natural observation, which are analogous to the collection and processing of data in the social sciences, are simply ways of verifying the scientist's hypothesis. They cannot create a hypothesis, only confirm one. Where that hypothesis comes from, God may know, but certainly no one else does. Where it doesn't come from, however, is a machine or any specific body of data. If it did, scientific creation would be possible for almost any high school boy."

Professor Hobbs calls the mania the "fetish of statistics." He writes (*Social Problems and Scientism*, p. 212):

"An over-emphasis on facts as facts is one of the characteristics of what is sometimes called the empirical approach. Ideally, empiricism could mean that

the investigators relied solely upon controlled observation and experimental evidence. Actually, much of the empiricism in social science involves no rigid experimentation, and the facts are questionable, fragmentary, and slanted. Empiricism in social science seems to owe its extreme popularity more nearly to desperation rather than plan. Philosophic and scientific justification for the type of empiricism generally employed in social science is extremely tenuous. It seems to spring more from a frantic effort to acquire the external appearance of science and the accolade of 'practicality' than to grow out of any carefully thought out system of either philosophy or science. \* \* \* A belief appears to exist that somehow empiricism is more advanced, more modern, than reliance on reason and logic, such as rationalism involves."

We quote heavily, throughout this report, from the testimony and writings of Professor Hobbs because his testimony before us was so lucid, impressive and seemingly incontrovertible. Lest it be thought that Professor Hobbs is alone in his observations and opinions, we shall quote, in support, letters to Counsel from three of the most eminent and erudite sociologists in the United States. Each has done extensive research in a variety of fields. Each has published scores of books and articles of a professional nature. It is unlikely that any other three sociologists living have such a wide background or such extensive publications to their credit as these three senior scholars. They are Professor Pitirim A. Sorokin of Harvard, Professor Carle C. Zimmerman of Harvard and Professor James H. S. Bossard of Pennsylvania.

Professor Pitirim A. Sorokin, in a letter to Committee Counsel, said:

"\* \* \* I can state that so far as social sciences are concerned, most of the foundations certainly favor to an excessive degree empirical research and greatly discriminate against theoretical, historical, and other forms of nonempirical research. This one-sidedness by itself would not be objectionable, if (a) empirical research were not still more narrowed and reduced to either statistical research or research along the line of the mathematical and mechanical models, or other imitative varieties of so-called natural science sociology; (b) if the topics investigated were of some theoretical or practical importance; and, (c) if most of the favored researchers were competent social scientists. Unfortunately, in cases of overwhelming bulk of granted financial help, these three conditions were absent."

Similarly, Professor Carle C. Zimmerman:

"The tax exempt foundations in the United States have unfairly and undesirably emphasized empirical research to such an extent that the whole meaning of social science research has come to be ridden with sham and dubious practices."

Professor Bossard:

"For some years, I have regarded with increasing apprehension the development of what I have called the comptometer school of research in social sciences. By this I mean the gathering of detailed social data and their manipulation by all the available statistical techniques. Not that I am objecting to such methods—my reluctance rather lies in an unwillingness to accept these as the core of research in human behavior.

"My own interest lies more in the development of qualitative insights. This accords with my judgment of the life process, that it cannot be reduced to statistical formulae but that it is a richly diversified complex of relationships. The chief purpose of research for university people, most of whom are limited to working with small groups, should be weighted heavily in the direction of research in qualitative insights rather than manipulation of mass data.

"I am particularly concerned with the impression which the recent emphasis upon the comptometer approach has created among younger sociologists as to what constitutes social research. The monies and influences of the large foundations naturally do a great deal to set the norms of professional acceptance in a given field, and it is in this respect, difficult to measure statistically but possibly of very great importance, that a distinct disservice may be done to sociological research by an undue emphasis upon any particular emphasis or methodology."

In his letter, Professor Bossard disqualifies himself as an unprejudiced observer, saying:

"\* \* \* I am indicating the reasonable suspicion that I may be prejudiced in that I have never been able to obtain a single grant from any research foundation or organization."

He adds, however, that he has had no difficulty in getting research grants from his University or from people of means who are familiar with his work. *The conclusion is reasonable that this eminent professor cannot obtain foundation grants because his interests in research are qualitative and not empirical, a rather sad commentary on the objectivity of the foundations. Nor is he alone in being discriminated against because of his research theories. This Committee is confident that an analysis would show that it is far from easy for academicians of Professor Bossard's research persuasions to obtain grants from the major foundations.*

The following discussion, by Professor Rowe in his testimony, of research as promoted by foundations is illuminating:

Dr. ROWE. That is one of the most difficult things to get agreement on, as to what the objectives of research should be. The easiest, quickest way to get massive results is to engage in fact-finding for fact-finding's sake, or the mass accumulation of facts for the sake of accumulating facts. This produces stuff that is big and heavy in your hand, but I don't think it is any more valuable, to put it mildly, than the kind of research that allows a scholar the time for reflection and contemplation, out of which come many of the ideas and thoughts which alone can make valid framework for analyzing the great masses of data that may be accumulated, many times by people who don't have much capacity for effective thinking or for theory or don't have much inclination for that kind of thing. (Hearings, p. 528.)

Asked later if he thought there had been an over-emphasis on empirical research as financed by the foundations, he testified as follows:

Dr. ROWE. It would be very difficult for me to answer that question vis-a-vis all research sponsored by or supported by all foundations because I just don't have the knowledge necessary to make that kind of a comment. Taking it outside of the field of foundation support, I do think in my own field for example, the general field of political science, there has been an overemphasis upon empirical research at the expense of theoretically oriented thinking and analysis. There is a tremendous emphasis upon the census type of thing in political science. Statistics are coming into greater and greater importance. Whereas, this is of course always a valid tool for research workers, the emphasis here tends to detract from the kind of fundamental thinking about great issues and about values which characterize the work of earlier students of politics in the United States, such as for instance, President Wilson, and people of that kind. Those studies, of course, were rooted in history and rooted in law. To the extent that political scientists have tried to divorce themselves from historical and legal study, and from historical and legal background in their study, they have tended to become very pointed fact-gatherers, census-takers and the business of arguing about great issues has been played down to this extent.

Of course, it is much easier and much simpler for political scientists to justify their existence on the basis of a mass production of factual materials than it is for them to justify their existence as great thinkers, because fact-gatherers are a dime a dozen and people who can think are hard to find. This is a comment on the fallibility of human nature. After all, political scientists are human beings.

Mr. HAYS. Professor, is what you are saying, in other words, that thinkers could not get the products of their thinking across because the people would not be able to comprehend and they can comprehend statistics?

Dr. ROWE. No; I don't mean to imply that. I mean to say that ideas and concepts and values are far more important, it seems to me, than much of the indisputable, completely noncontroversial factual material that political scientists seem to occupy themselves with so much in the present day. (Hearings, pp. 531, 532.)

These words of Professor Rowe impress us greatly. It is the position of this Committee that foundations should have the greatest possible freedom of operation consonant with the protection of our society and our institutions. But if it is true, and the evidence persuades us it is, that the large foundations are financing researchers who are almost exclusively empiricist, the saturation of the academic atmosphere with this particular and narrow approach could have very serious effects upon the colleges and secondary schools.

It may well be that we are not competent to evaluate research methods. We are not certain that this is so, for we have the impression that the executives of the foundations and the clearing house organizations make more of a mystery of the social sciences, and the methodism in them, than is justified. But we do not see how Congress, in any event, can regulate methods of research, nor should it wish to. What we do urge is that the trustees of the large foundations make it their business to determine reason and balance for themselves, seeking the advice not only of their own executives and professional employees but also of those academicians who represent the critical point of view, those who believe, as Professor Rowe said, that "ideas, and concepts and values are far more important" than mere "factual material", however the latter may be useful as contributive material.

These trustees might well alert themselves to the dangers and limitations of the empirical method as a primary approach to social problems.

They might well become more conscious also, of the necessity of a foundation justifying its tax-exempt status through a positive demonstration of strong contributions to the public welfare, and not being content merely to "experiment" with that welfare.

#### LIMITATIONS AND DANGERS.

*This Committee wishes to make it clear that it has not attacked, and does not attack, empiricism. To do so would be an absurdity. To allege any implicit vice in empirical research as such would also be palpably ridiculous. It is the excess and the misuse of empiricism and empirical research which appears to this Committee to merit criticism.*

Mr. Pendleton Herring in the statement which he filed with the Committee as President of the *Social Science Research Council*, referred to John Locke as the philosopher "who also developed the doctrine that knowledge is derived from experience." Surely, Locke and philosophers like him believed in the importance of empirical thinking. But we are sure they believed that observations should be based on actual conditions with all facets of a condition taken into consideration. *Much of the empiricism in which foundation-supported research today indulges seems to eliminate all but quantitative, statistically manipulative variables, and eliminates the qualitative factors which Locke and any other respectable philosopher would have deemed essential.*

The very term "social sciences" is misleading because it is so often identified with the same scientific procedures employed in the natural sciences; many, seeing the word "science" mistakenly conclude that social science results are equally exact and accurate.

Professor Hobbs emphasized in his testimony that the social scientists supported by the foundations have failed to alert the public to the *unscientific* character of much of what is called "social science." On the contrary, the attempt has been made "to convince the readers

of the textbook, and trade books," that what they are reading is "science" when in fact it is not. He said (Hearings, p. 122):

I think it should be the burden and the positive responsibility of persons making the study and publishing the study. If they call it science, it should be their positive responsibility to point out the limitations, and not only point them out, but to emphasize them to avoid misleading the reader into the belief that it is science in the same sense that it is used in physical science. \* \* \*

There has been a growing movement to apply the methods used in the natural sciences to research in the social sciences. But a complete translation of these methods into the social sciences is impossible. There are a number of reasons for this. Perhaps the most important is that experiment, except in a very limited way, is not available to the social scientist. The natural scientist, as part of the procedure of investigation, tests a hypothesis through experiment upon the materials to which the hypothesis applies. The social scientist deals with human beings; these he cannot easily use for experimental purposes. He cannot use them as one would use a simple raw material or even lower forms of life in natural science experimentation. Even under a dictatorship which offered him human sacrifices for his experiments, he could rarely isolate individual factors, traits and conditions, making them independent of the complex of factors in individual and group human life. He cannot be certain that he is dealing with one factor at a time. He cannot exercise the controls which are used by natural scientists, on materials simpler than human beings, in order to eliminate error in observation and conclusion when tests are to be applied. He cannot, for example, test people to see whether they or society would be better off if they had extra-marital sex relations.

#### *DR. KINSEY COUNTS NOSES.*

The social scientist, therefore, falls easily into the use of mere observation (empiricism) as a substitute for experiment. Unable to use the experimental method, he takes statistics, he "counts noses." This process is subject to many possibilities of error. It is a process which is valuable in research, but it must be controlled by specific hypotheses; even then, the results will generally be only of qualified, contributory usefulness. Studies such as the Kinsey reports, for example, might disclose that a certain number of people *seem* to have become maladjusted because of a lack of sex experience at an early age, or because they maintained the sanctity of the marriage bond. To conclude, from such limited and questionable observations, that the general public would be better off through early sex experience or by ignoring the sanctity of marriage, would be unwarranted. Various errors of observation would be almost unavoidable in such a collection of statistical material. Were the interviewed cases truly a population cross-section? Were the cases selected at random, or only by the volunteer method? Did all the cases tell the truth? Was there a check made (and could there be?) to take into account the relationship between volunteering and "normality?"

To arrive at a conclusion as to advisable behavior (or as to laws desirable in the field of sex) merely on the basis of such statistical material, would fail to take into account many basic premises in social reasoning, such as: the effect of tentative proposals upon our standards of morality; their effect upon the construction of the state; their effect upon the family and upon the rearing of children; and their

effect upon the mental and social health of individuals left free of moral restraint.

All that a study such as a Kinsey report can prove is that "other forms of sexual behavior, such as pre-marital intercourse, prostitution, extra-marital intercourse, and homosexual behavior *sometimes* occur among *some* members of *some* segments of the population."<sup>14</sup> Many years of labor were spent, and very large amounts of the public's money, contributed by the Rockefeller Foundation, were expended, to produce this stupendous fact. This is perhaps as good an example as any of the extremely limited positive value (combined with extremely grave possibilities of adverse social effect) of much of the empirical research in the social sciences, research for which the public's money is employed through foundation grants.

Though empiricism has its essential place in scientific investigation, its use is dangerous except within the control of accepted social premises. To use it alone and to base conclusions solely upon the method of observation, is to jump to conclusions—to violate the cardinal principle of scientific investigation that there must be cross-checking through the alternate use of the inductive and the deductive method and by relating to actual or apparent axioms. True, Dr. Kinsey has claimed that he has not derived any conclusions from his work. But the advertising of his first report stated that it "answers and clarifies an almost innumerable number of sex behavior problems \* \* \*." The report itself, in the use of terminology, derives conclusions as clearly as though they were so stated. And countless persons who should know better, among them many college professors, have taken up these works and used them to substantiate their own conclusions as though these were Kinsey's. Professor Llewellyn of the Columbia University Law School went so far, in connection with the first Kinsey report, as to recommend that pressure should now be brought on the lawmakers to change our laws regarding sex behavior. Professor MacIver of Columbia proclaimed that the Kinsey report would now "prepare the way for a happier and more enlightened program of public education."

Other writers travelled the same road. Dr. R. L. Dickinson, in a preface to *American Sexual Behavior and the Kinsey Report*, said:

"Surely new programs are indicated. We need to start with parents, educating them to educate their children. Then we can educate the educators—teachers, doctors, ministers, social workers and all concerned in the sexual patterns which Professor Kinsey finds are set so early in life. First and foremost we will train for attitudes. Later we will teach techniques."

The danger of such loose and isolated, uncontrolled empirical studies, particularly when given the seeming authority of support by a major foundation, is great. As Prof. Hobbs has put it regarding Kinsey:

"Despite the patent limitations of the study and its persistent bias, its conclusions regarding sexual behavior were widely believed. They were presented to college classes; medical doctors cited them in lectures; psychiatrists applauded them; a radio program indicated that the findings were serving as a basis for revision of moral codes relating to sex; and an editorial in a college student newspaper admonished the college administration to make provision for sexual outlets for the students in accordance with the 'scientific realities' as established by the book." (*Social Problems and Scientism*, p. 93.)

Hobbs, *Social Problems and Scientism*, p. 94.

Prof. Hobbs narrates many such reactions, among them the statement in *About the Kinsey Report*, by Donald Porter Geddes and Enid Curie, published as a *Signet Special* at 25 cents:

"It does not matter that the report is unscientific, the important thing is that it be publicized and serve as a basis for reform of sexual behavior and of laws which deal with violations of sexual mores."

The Committee wonders whether *The Rockefeller Foundation*, which made the Kinsey study possible by the investment of substantial funds, is proud of its work. Research of this type, of which there is much outside the sex field, seems predicated upon the premise that what is wrong with our society is that our moral codes are seriously in need of re-study and revision.

These excerpts from Professor Hobbs' testimony before this Committee are illuminating (Hearings, p. 124):

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, you are raising a question about the scientific approach which Dr. Kinsey made in conducting this research in the first place, and then some of his comments and conclusions which he wrote into his report, which did not necessarily arise from the basis of his research which he had made?

Dr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And which might have damaging effect on the psychology of the people, particularly the young people of the country.

Dr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And at the same time undertaking to give to the country the overall impression that his findings and his comments were based upon a scientific study which had been made, as the basis of a grant.

Dr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; a scientific study of the type by implication which you have in physics and chemistry, and, therefore, its conclusions cannot be challenged.

The CHAIRMAN. Enumerating in the preface that it was made by a grant from one of the foundations giving it further prestige, possibly, that it was of scientific value, and so forth.

Dr. HOBBS. That would be correct. I have a statement to that effect to show that very type of influence, which I will come to a little bit later.

Dr. Hobbs' detailed testimony is well worth reading. Considerable criticism was made of Dr. Kinsey's work on the basis of statistical theory and because the impression was left that the study made upon a selected number of persons produced a result projected to the entire population of the United States.

Dr. Hobbs, moreover, criticized the Kinsey reports for referring to "socially approved patterns of sexual behavior" as "rationalization". That is:

\* \* \* socially approved patterns of sexual behavior are frequently referred to as rationalization. That is, the socially approved patterns of sexual behavior throughout the Kinsey works are referred to in terms of ridicule, as being mere rationalization, and justifications for types of behaviour which by implication are not the best or even the most desirable.

Socially condemned forms of sexual behavior and criminal forms of sexual behavior are usually in the Kinsey volumes referred to as normal, or normal in the human animal.

The presentation of moral codes, codes of sexual behavior, is such that they are contrasted with what Kinsey calls normal mammalian behavior, which could give the impression, and it gave the impression to a number of reviewers, that things which conform to the socially approved codes of sexual conduct are rationalizations, not quite right, while things which deviate from it, such as homosexuality, are normal, in a sense right. (Hearings, p. 126)

Prof. Hobbs stressed the danger that pseudo-scientific studies could condition the conduct of the public. Statements and conclusions produced by a scientific rather than scientific approach could even severely impair public morality. He testified (Hearings, p. 129):

\* \* \* But what I am trying to illustrate is the manner in which studies can influence important aspects of human behavior. I don't mean to impugn Professor

Kinsey's motives, nor the motives of the members of the foundations or anything of that type. I am merely saying that this can happen and this is an illustration of where it does happen.

For an illustration, in connection with the question of heterosexuality compared with homosexuality, Kinsey in the first volume has this statement:

"It is only because society demands that there be a particular choice in the matter (of heterosexuality or homosexuality) and does not so often dictate one's choice of food or clothing."

He puts it in terms of it is just a custom which society demands.

In the second volume it is stressed, for example, that we object to adult molesters of children primarily because we have become conditioned against such adult molesters of children, and that the children who are molested become emotionally upset, primarily because of the old-fashioned attitudes of their parents about such practices, and the parents (the implication is) are the ones who do the real damage by making a fuss about it if a child is molested. Because the molester, and here I quote from Kinsey, "may have contributed favorably to their later sociosexual development." That is a molester of children may have actually, Kinsey contends, not only not harmed them, but may have contributed favorably to their later sociosexual development.

Especially emphasized in the second volume, the volume on females, is the supposed beneficial effects of premarital sexual experiences. Such experiences, Kinsey states; "provide an opportunity for the females to learn to adjust emotionally to various types of males."

That is on page 266 of the volume on females.

In addition, on page 327 he contends that premarital sexual experience may well contribute to the effectiveness of one's other nonsexual social relationships, and that many females—this is on page 115—will thus learn how to respond to sociosexual contacts.

On page 328, that it should contribute to the development of emotional capacities in a more effective way than if sexual experiences are acquired after marriage.

The avoidance of premarital sexual experience by females, according to Professor Kinsey, may lead to inhibitions which damage the capacity to respond, so much that these inhibitions may persist after years of marriage, "if, indeed, they are ever dissipated." That is from page 330.

So you get a continued emphasis on the desirability of females engaging in premarital sexual behavior. In both of these volumes there is a persistent emphasis, a persistent questioning of the traditional codes, and the laws relating to sexual behavior. Professor Kinsey may be correct or he may be incorrect, but when he gives the impression that the findings are scientific in the same sense as the findings in physical science, then the issue becomes not a matter of whether he as a person is correct or incorrect, but of the impression which is given to the public, which can be quite unfortunate. (Hearings, pp. 129, 130.)

It is difficult for this Committee to understand the propriety of *The Rockefeller Foundation* supporting the dangerous sociological experiment which the Kinsey reports constitute. To use the public money to produce such socially dangerous material as a "best seller" seems beyond all reason.

Not only is there the danger that the public itself can be directly affected by the impact of works of this kind, but it seems to follow that many take up pseudo-scientific results, treat them as established scientific verities and use them for propagandizing for changes in morals, ethics and law. Here are some further examples of this.

Anne G. Freegood in the leading article in the September 1953 *Harpers*, *Dr. Kinsey's Second Sex*, refers to Kinsey as "the American prophet crying in the wilderness, make straight in the desert a pathway for reform." She proceeds:

"The desert in this case is our current code of laws governing sexual activities and the background of Puritan tradition regarding sex under which this country still to some extent operates."



She speaks of the "torrent of *reaction*" that followed the publication of the first Kinsey book. Later, she says that the second (then forthcoming) book

"has gained momentum from the effect of its forerunner, which has already been cited in court decisions and quoted in textbooks as well as blazoned from one end of the country to the other."

Dr. Hobbs referred to a book which was edited by one Albert Ellis, and published in 1954, called *Sex Life of the American Woman and the Kinsey Report*, in which an attorney writing in this volume, says: "It may sound strange to say that the most encouraging note about the new Kinsey Report is its indication that more and more women are beginning to commit more and more sex crimes." (Hearings, p. 130.)

Dr. Hobbs cited statements by a prominent clergyman who labeled social science research as a form of religious devotion. Referring to Kinsey's findings this clergyman states:

"These results are the facts with which the moralist will have to work and build."

The same clergyman also said:

"Yet we cannot go back to the legalistic morality which has prevailed so long. That has really outlived its usefulness if the Kinsey books are right."

And again:

"That legalistic conformism has outlived its usefulness by about 2,000 years, if the New Testament is right. It is an emeritus ethic, due at least for honorable retirement." (Hearings, p. 130.)

The responsibility of *The Rockefeller Foundation* for financing the Kinsey "best sellers" comes sharply home to roost in a quotation offered by Dr. Hobbs from an article in *Harpers Magazine* written by one Albert Deutsch (Hearings, p. 131):

"So startling are its revelations, so contrary to what civilized man has been taught for generations, that they would be unbelievable but for the impressive weight of the scientific agencies backing the survey."

That,

said Dr. Hobbs,

is the unfortunate thing that you have involved here. I do not mean that the foundations meant it to be that way. I do not mean even that Professor Kinsey meant it to be that way. But unfortunately the public does get that impression—that this is something that is final and infallible, which you cannot and should not question. I think that is extremely unfortunate. [Emphasis supplied.]

Further illustrations were given by Dr. Hobbs (and there are more starting at page 99 of his book *Social Problems and Scientism*) of the danger of others promoting pseudo-scientific material financed by foundations and using them as a basis for propaganda. He cited a review of the Kinsey Report in the December 1948 issue of the *Scientific Monthly* in which a respected psychologist said it recorded "tremendous implications for scientists, legislators, physicians and public officers." He contended that the report "shows clearly that our current laws do not comply with the biologic facts of normal sexual behavior."

In other words, said Dr. Hobbs:

\* \* \* the implication is that the laws should be changed to conform with biology. If you have a biological urge, the laws should permit you to express that biological urge as it is demanding on you. (Hearings, p. 131.)

*MORE "SCIENTISM."*

Professor Hobbs was asked by Mr. Hays whether he agreed with a statement in Mr. Dodd's opening report that foundations are willing to "support experiments in fields that defy control". This colloquy followed (Hearings, pp. 174, 175):

Dr. HOBBS. It is true that in any study of the significant aspects of human behavior, such as criminality, juvenile delinquency, political behavior, the studies are such that they defy control, in the sense that there are intangibles involved which, no matter how conscientious you are in making the study, these intangibles still remain.

The word "control" in scientific investigation means that you are able to control, to measure the significant variables, and that no other variables can come into the investigation to significantly influence the results.

That is not the case with studies of human behavior.

Mr. HAYS. That is right. But any field, unless it is completely comprehended—and I don't know that there is any such field—and any research into the unknown would probably defy control, would it not?

Dr. HOBBS. But there is a difference in the usage of the term. A physicist can make a study which is a complete controlled study. His study may be one which involves the weight of matter. He may and can create conditions under which he has to all intents and purposes complete control over the conditions of his experiment. You cannot do that in social science, unfortunately.

To quote Prof. Hobbs again, he has said that the

"zealots" of the new research in the social sciences "lead people to believe that techniques exist in social science which provide accurate description and enable prediction of social behavior. We are told to pattern our behavior and to change our society on the basis of such conclusions regarding criminality, race relations, marriage, mental health, war, divorce, sex, and other personal and social affairs. Yet in these areas of behavior the pertinent knowledge is extremely limited and unreliable, the rules of behavior are vague and changeable, the techniques are crude and untested, and even the basic units required for measurement are non-existent." <sup>15</sup> Again: "character and integrity are dissolved in the acid ridicule of cultural determinism." <sup>16</sup>

*It seems to this Committee that there is a strong tendency on the part of many of the social scientists whose research is favored by the major foundations toward the concept that there are no absolutes, that everything is indeterminate, that no standards of conduct, morals, ethics and government are to be deemed inviolate, that everything, including basic moral law, is subject to change, and that it is the part of the social scientists to take no principle for granted as a premise in social or juridical reasoning, however fundamental it may heretofore have been deemed to be under our Judeo-Christian moral system.*

Perhaps as good an example as any of scientism is the successive methods which social "scientists" have given us by which to raise our children. Each was the last word in the "science" of child psychology. And each was detracted by the advocates of its successor. The *New York Times* of August 15, 1954 reports an address by Dr. Hilde Bruch, of the Department of Psychiatry and Pediatrics at Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, to a session of the International Institute of Child Psychology that "the time has come to leave mother and child alone." She is then quoted as having said:

"One might go so far as to say that an outstanding common factor of the many different approaches in child-care advice is the recklessness with which they are recommended as the 'best' for the future development of a child, without an effort having been made to verify these predictions.

<sup>15</sup> *Social Problems and Scientism*, pp. 248, 261.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 261.

"Yet they are *presented as scientific facts*, often with the implied or open threat that any neglect might injure the child and result in neurosis in the dim and distant future." [Emphasis ours.]

That is a plain accusation that the child psychologists who have inflicted "scientific" methods for raising children on the public have practiced *not science but scientism*.

#### *SCIENTISM AND CAUSALITY.*

The principle of causality is a bog into which social scientists are prone to fall when they attempt to translate the methods of the natural sciences into the social sciences. Cause and effect relationships are obviously infinitely easier to establish in the natural sciences than in the social sciences. Human beings are motivated by a complex of factors: by goals established, in turn, by complex processes; by ethical and moral concepts; by exercises of free will. Some of the social scientists seem to have wholly rejected the concept of free will. It is at least debatable whether man has a free will; to reject the concept outright and to base research and "scientific" conclusions on the theory that there can be completely ascertainable causality in human behavior is hardly in itself scientific. These pseudo-scientists excuse their imperfection by the assertion that they are struggling along the way—that the natural sciences have progressed much further, but that they hope to catch up with them. Give us time, they say. We are a young "science." Our principle is correct—it is only that we have not yet learned how to perfect our methods.

This approach of the social scientists has behind it a wholly materialistic concept of life and behavior. Its natural outcome is an approach to Marxism—it is not surprising that so many of the social scientists tend to collectivism. They believe they can satisfactorily rearrange society; given time and an improvement of their more or less mechanical methods, they will find all the answers. It is a rather pitiful assumption that the springs of human behavior can be reduced to formulae.

#### *THE AMERICAN SOLDIER.*

Professor Hobbs used *The American Soldier* as an example of a scientific approach to an important national problem. This book was prepared and edited under the auspices of a special committee of the *Social Science Research Council* and published by the Princeton University Press in 1949 and 1950. It illustrates "the influence of supposed social science on military policy at a high level \* \* \* ." (Hearings, p. 150.) The story is interesting and, in the opinion of this Committee, tragic.

A group of social scientists, *against the constant reiterated opposition of the military authorities of the United States*, managed to "incorporate their own ideas in a matter of highest military significance against the opposition of the military of the United States." (Hearings, p. 151.) The incident concerns the methods to be used to discharge some part of our armed forces at the termination of World War II. A Research Branch was officially established in October 1941, within what was known, successively, as the Morale Division, Special Services Division, and Information and Education Division. This division came into the control of social scientists, many or most of them associated with foundation work, and their achievements were

finally lauded in *The American Soldier*, a project of *The Social Science Research Council*. Professor Hobbs told the story in detail (Hearings, pp. 150, et seq.), of how *these social scientists, against the reiterated opposition of the Army, insisted upon a demobilization method determined largely by taking an opinion poll of the soldiers themselves.*

Frederick Osborn, a trustee of the *Carnegie Corporation*, in a paper read at the University of Minnesota in April, 1951, commended the social engineering involved in *The American Soldier* project as a "typical example of social science prediction." If this statement is true, it utterly destroys any claim the social scientists may make to the role of "social engineers." Mr. Osborn said that "by weighing the different factors" which "would seem to entitle a man to priority" in discharge, "it would be possible to devise a system of points earned by each man which apparently would decide the order of discharge to the satisfaction of the greatest number of men, and hence with the least injury to morale." So shallow and fractional an approach to the problem of what men to release and when, can hardly be deemed a scientific method. It involved the most casual and dangerous pre-judgment, preevaluation. It assumed that no other factors of importance related to the morale problem. It also assumed that no other military or political factor was of any consequence.

Dr. Hobbs made clear that two highly unfortunate results followed. First he held that the polling method was certain to result in the decline in morale. He said (Hearings, p. 153):

\* \* \* If you give members of the armed services the notion that they are to be and should be consulted on vital military policy, then this fact in itself can create dissatisfaction, unrest, of the very type of thing which the Secretary previously had anticipated.

Moreover, Dr. Hobbs pointed out that the method of demobilization produced by the social scientists was one which failed to take into account the military necessities of the nation. Prof. Hobbs stated that our military "sensed or knew that we were going to run into a situation in Europe with one of our then allies, that is, Russia." Yet they were forced to demobilize men in such a manner that effective units were disorganized and military efficiency was very sadly impaired.

"In other words",

said Professor Hobbs (Hearings, p. 159):

"they pressed the military group, and if they had as their reason the possibility of Russian aggression and encroachment into European territories, such as actually did happen, if the military had that in mind, they could not publicly announce it because Russia at that time was an ally. And from a standpoint of both military policy and from a standpoint of diplomatic policy, it was just something that they could not do. Yet this group pushed them into a position where they had to do it or accept this point system of discharge which the military consistently opposed."

The detail of Dr. Hobbs' testimony in this area is well worth reading. For the Army to have been obliged by social scientists to go to the enlisted man himself for his opinions before promulgating a redeployment and demobilization policy illustrates the way, according to Dr. Hobbs, "in which social science can and does encroach on and expand into areas not only of morality but of politics and in this instance military policy which was of the very highest order." (Hearings, p. 161.)

Had immediate use of our armed forces become necessary after demobilization, the social scientists would have played the major role in reducing our armed forces to a nadir of efficiency. *What had happened is of the utmost significance. The military policymakers were defeated by the social scientists. This was another victory in the struggle of the "social engineers" to gain control of all the throttles of control. Assuming, from their expertness in a single field, that their judgment is superior to that of others who are not "social scientists" (even superior in military matters to the experts of the military arm of government), they presumed to press upon government a social theory of their own and managed to achieve superior influence over the military experts. A few more such victories for "social engineering" might indeed be fatal.*

An interesting appendix must be put to this story. When one scholar had the temerity to question the findings of *The American Soldier* he was castigated as "a young man at the periphery of the profession and hence, perhaps, less heedful of its imperatives toward discretion." This statement Dr. Hobbs has characterized as follows: "If you want to get in with us, watch your step and don't criticize our work." (Hearings, p. 162.)

#### *SOME RESULTS OF EXCESSIVE PROMOTION OF EMPIRICISM*

Professor Carle C. Zimmerman of Harvard, in a letter to Counsel to the Committee dated May 25, 1954, after stating that empirical research had been unfairly emphasized by foundations, described the results as follows:

- "A. It has made research grants large and expensive and few in number.
  - "B. A special class of fund getters has grown up who spend all their time getting funds, and have little time or capacity to do original work.
  - "C. A special class of administrators of these funds have grown up and research is dominated by the administrators rather than the persons who pursue ideas.
  - "D. As a result the large institutions, or a few institutions with prestige, get the most of the money in large grants. Smaller institutions, or professors there, get scant encouragement in seeking out new ideas. These large grants are to big and unity percent wasted and equally brilliant Ph. D.'s, who graduated in the same classes, get no support at all. In the meantime a careful analysis of the origins of scientific men who make a mark (Ph. D.'s who finished by 1940 and were outstanding by 1945) show that they come from these smaller institutions. Of course some argue that all the best men are at the big institutions with prestige but that is *not* true. Finding jobs for young Ph. D.'s puts more good over at the small institutions because there are only a very few places each year opened at the others.
  - "E. Since social science is concentrated in a few urban institutions and bossed both at the foundations and at the institutions by 'public opinion' men, prosaic and important aspects of our life (where real social science needs exist) never get studied. Illustrations among many possible, it is apparent that no institution in the United States pays great attention to the problems of our Appalachian-Ozarkian people, although institutions located in that region do get grants for extraneous things, involving cultures far away (like South America). No institution in our arid west studies the total relations of modern man to arid or semi-arid conditions. A biologist will turn naturally to dirty pond water, because the 'cultures' he is interested in are found there, but our human ponds do not have public opinion prestige, and are not generally studied. (These statements are not a reflection upon any of the provincial groups in America.)
  - "F. The emphasis upon false empiricism is not only a matter of the bias of the 'bosses' or administrators, the bias of the concentrated favored institutions, and the neglect of the provincial and needed problems for study, but it also has led to a malfeasance or injury in method and has harmed the growth of social science.
- "1. Social science is about 95% macroscopically, or broad-scale observational. It is not inevitably less scientific for that reason, as geology and astronomy are not less scientific than zoology or chemistry. The extreme

methods of overluscious empiricism on a few prestige problems is as ridiculous as trying to build a house with the use of a micrometer for each measurement.

"2. As a result we overstudy certain aspects of a few problems and nerve touch the others. As a professor, well renowned for his own social science researches (which have not been supported by the big tax exchange foundations), remarked, 'We research ceaselessly upon getting married, but never study what to do about the problems involved in the act over the next 40 or 50 years.'

"3. We have many persons who can work out correlation coefficients but no one so far has told us what they mean in 'causal' analysis. Our social science is increasingly dominated by meticulous clinical procedures and becoming more and more illiterate as to logic and common observation.

"4. As a result we are creating a social science merely which is the doctrine of a 'cult', read only by a few other social scientists, abstruse to the point of illegibility, valueless for social direction, constantly repeating itself upon immaterial problems, and ending in an aimless existential philosophy. As a prominent European philosopher indicated clearly within the past decade, 'modern social science is becoming an aspect of the existential philosophy of decadence.' (This is a paraphrased quotation from Nordberto Bobbio, *Existentialism the Philosophy of Decadence*, New York, 1947 (English Translation)."

Professor Zimmerman then commented on the undesirability of excessively training researchers in the empirical approach. He said that:

"the overemphasis upon empirical training and support led to a division in the social scientists between those who follow abstruse theoretical 'systems' and those who follow equally abstruse pointless research. Our abstruse theoretical systems have become increasingly only taxonomic (classifying a society into minute details according to one scheme or the other) and useless repetition. There is little or no integration between theory and research, because they deal with different things. As a result the empiricist has no theoretical foundation for valid conclusions.

"To illustrate this, without citing names, one man gathered numerous empirical facts upon the existence and widespread use of small scale torts within our society and came to the conclusion that torts (he did not use this word because he had only empirical training) should all be classified as crimes. Another group gathered a million facts of the same nature in regard to sex ramification and came to the conclusion that there should be no social control of sex. Both studies were, in the opinion of many thoughtful persons, extremely socially disadvantageous and misinforming and both received tax exempt support in large sums.

"As a result of this I feel that the whole emphasis in training, as dominated by our tax exempt foundations, should be overhauled. Our research of an empirical nature is so unrelated to theory that it becomes interpreted in extraneous surface philosophies, socially harmful, and of no material meaning. (I can prove this but it would involve me into polemics, and that I consider inadvisable in a public document.)

"One of the aspects and results of this, is the general feeling that social science should have no 'aim' no 'utility', but should be a 'study for studies sake.' 'We might discover something which will be good fifty years from now', is a shibboleth of this school. Now cast back to 1900, and tell me what could have been discovered by such an activity then, which could have been valuable in the changed social conditions of today? The idea is ridiculous. Yet this feeling is most prevalent in the groups who have the easiest access to tax exempt foundation funds. On the other hand, it is fitting with our culture that the activities of men should aim to do some 'good' or create some understanding. Directly or indirectly, I imagine these foundations are created by funds from persons who are in the very high brackets of taxation, and the public, in a large sense, supports almost entirely these exaggerated empirical falsities. Now just why should the public contribute to an activity which has no social aim?"

#### **MORAL RELATIVITY.**

In answer to Counsel's question whether the over-balance of empiricism did not result in the promotion of "moral relativity," Professor Hobbs testified as follows:

Dr. HOBBS. In this type of empirical approach, by definition you must attempt to reduce the things you are studying to the type of units which I indicated yester-

day, to quantitative units, which are measurable. By the very nature of the approach, therefore, you exclude intangibles, such as sentiments, love, romance, devotion, or other tangibles, such as patriotism, honesty, and things of that type.

So if it is strictly empirical, then the behavior involved is reduced to cold quantitative items which are important, perhaps, but which if presented alone give a very distorted picture of love or sex or patriotism or whatever else the topic may be.

Mr. WORMSER. Is it analogous, perhaps, to use a syllogism without including all the premises? The missing premises being moral codes and basic principles of government and so forth.

Dr. HOBBS. It would be analogous to that. I would say that in the context of the scientific method it is using just one of the elements instead of including all of the elements which should be involved. That is unfortunate. (Hearings, p. 172.)

Professor Colegrove testified on moral relativity as follows:

Then I think on the philosophical side, the psychological side, Harvard went the same way as Columbia did. One of the leaders, of course, was William James. And his book called *Varieties of Religious Experience*, I think, has undermined the religious convictions and faith of thousands of young people in the United States.

You know, Mr. Wormser, with all the attacks that have been made upon religion by certain scientists, by the empirical school, and right at Columbia University and Harvard University, I think that we are finding among scientists themselves a realization that science doesn't have all the answers to reality; that there are experiences of religion, questions of religious faith, that may, after all, be just as much a part of reality as the study of the stars or the study of atomic energy, or anything else.

I see, so far as science is concerned, a move away from the complete control of empirical thinking and a return to a little more rational or a little more humanistic consideration for religious principles, moral principles, and ethics.

Mr. WORMSER. You do not think, then, that you social scientists are capable of producing all the answers?

Dr. COLEGROVE. Oh, absolutely not. No. No, we do not have all the answers in social science. We are rather dangerous people to trust implicitly. (Hearings, p. 574.)

Professor Colegrove also testified to the effect that an excess of empiricism resulted in a decline of morality.

The attitude of many social scientists toward moral codes is evidenced by the discussion of *The Promise of Sociology*, by Ellsworth Paris of the University of Chicago, published in *The American Sociological Review* in 1938. Professor Paris said:

"Morals spring from the human struggle and, while every code has a certain sacredness, yet none is sacrosanct, and all are subject to change. It was our distinguished chairman, Professor Ross, who once wrote in a book that was highly and publicly commended by the president of the United States. 'We need an annual supplement to the decalogue.'" [Emphasis ours.]

It is the privilege of any individual to doubt our existing moral codes. When social scientists presume, however, to approach solutions of human problems, or problems of human relationships, upon the major premise that there is doubt concerning the validity of our basic moral precepts, they run counter to what the public is convinced is its own interests. Consequently, this Committee sees no justification for the use of the public funds which foundation capital and income represent to finance research with such an approach.

In the letter to which we have previously referred, Professor Sorokin of Harvard stated that the excessive empirical research which the foundations have promoted for roughly 30 years has had two results:

"(1) the bulk of this sort of research has been perfectly fruitless and almost sterile from a theoretical or practical standpoint;

"(2) some of the investigations, made especially along Freudian and similar theories (or popularizing this sort of views), have been rather

destructive morally and mentally for this nation." He said, moreover, that the "exceptional emphasis on training researchers along (these) lines, with almost complete exclusion of the theoretical approach, is certainly undesirable for our society, either from a purely scientific or from a practical standpoint."

Professor Sorokin has a book now in process and to be published this year with the title *Fads and Delusions in Modern Sociology, Psychology, Psychiatry, and Cultural Anthropology*. In it, he says, he is "critically examining exactly all the main currents of empirical research in the social sciences particularly favored by the foundations—sometimes by colleges and regularly by the United States Navy, Army, and Air Corps—spending a considerable amount of funds for this sort of research."

One more quote from Professor Sorokin, one of our foremost sociologists:

"The futility of excessively favoring this sort of research (the empirical) particularly is well demonstrated by its sterility—in spite of the many millions of dollars, enormous amount of time and energy expended by research staffs. Almost all of the enormous mass of research along this line in the United States of America for the last 25 or 30 years has not produced either any new significant social theory or any new method, or any new technique, or any scientifically valid test, or even any limited causal uniformity. This sterility is perhaps the most convincing evidence of unwise policies of the foundations, colleges, and Army, Navy, and Air Corps research directors."

#### *SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.*

Some interesting and critical comments were made, in the testimony before the Committee, regarding the types of research supported by the foundations in institutions of higher learning. Professor Hobbs, for example, testified as follows:

Particularly where large grants are involved, the grants tend to be geared into programs of "empiricism"—and I wish the word would be kept in quotes whenever it is used here—and then graduate students receive their training through these grants. I don't mean to imply in any sense that the foundations have organized their grants for this purpose, or that they are promoting intentionally and purposefully the type of thing I am going to describe. I merely wish to point it out as a situation which does arise and which I believe is quite unfortunate.

These graduate students, who, of course, will be the researchers and the teachers of the future, are subjected by the very nature of the situation to enter in disproportionate numbers into this one small area, an important area, to be sure, but just one area of their training. They are encouraged through the situation to embark upon study projects which are extremely narrow, and with the aid of the grant, the persons running the research are able to employ professional interviewers, for example. One part of graduate training should be some acquaintance with people. The graduate student, I would feel, would gain much more if he were to do his own interviewing, rather than merely take the results which were collected by a professional interviewer. In failing to do his own interviewing, he has thereby lost an important element, I would say, of what should be his training.

Furthermore, these projects aid these students to a disproportionate degree. Other students who, through differing interests, through a broader viewpoint of society and behavior, who do their own work and who don't have such assistance, are handicapped in comparison with the ones who receive the aid through foundation grants.

So that there are cases where the graduate student in his training has concentrated in a very small area of the statistical computations—and I wish to add that in themselves there is nothing wrong with that, but they are a very small part of the overall picture—but in such training they neglect studies of the traditions of the country, the studies of the history of the country, they neglect actual experience with people, they neglect studies of the philosophies which have been developed in connection with human civilization, and they even



neglect—and this may sound extreme, but I can vouch that it does happen—they even neglect studies of science.

One of my favorite questions when I am examining students for a graduate degree is a question of this sort. Here you are, you are going to get a doctor of philosophy degree. What have you read in philosophy? I appreciate that this sounds extreme, but there are graduate students who get such degrees who have never read a book in philosophy.

Then another question along the same lines: What have you ever read in the philosophy of science; and some of them have read little or nothing in that area either.

So you get this tendency to overspecialize, overconcentrate in one area which admittedly has its merits, but which leads to a narrowness of mind, not the broader outlook which we need in the present undeveloped conditions associated with social science.

Another aspect of this same situation is that graduate students and faculty members are discouraged from applying for grants unless they, too, are willing to do this type of "empirical" investigation. (Hearings, pp. 168, 169.)

Professor Hobbs then referred to the bulletin of *The Social Science Research Council* regarding the award of research fellowships, which we have previously described. He pointed out that the bulletin—

\* \* \* does tend in the direction of giving the people in the field the impression that unless research involves statistical computation, then they don't have much chance of getting a grant. Now, perhaps that impression is incorrect. It may well be incorrect. I just say that the impression does spread, so that if it does occur to you to ask for a grant to make a broader study of the history of the development of social science or something of that sort, then after having read such things you are likely to be discouraged.

It may be your own fault. Perhaps if you had gone ahead and requested you would have obtained it. I am just saying that atmosphere is created and I think the foundations themselves would regret that this is the situation and would probably be willing to do whatever they can to change that atmosphere to create one which everybody appreciates they are interested in, broader types of research instead of this particular empirical one. (Hearings, p. 170.)

Professor Rowe made this lucid criticism of foundation practices. He stated that the former tendency had been to support the training of individuals, a personnel training program. Now, he said, foundations had turned to an emphasis on sponsoring research as such. (Hearings, pp. 525, 526.) In particular, he was critical of the cooperative or group type of research, giving as an example of this variety of research in which foundations invest heavily, the Tai Ping Rebellion research project. He testified:

Dr. ROWE. You are probably referring to the *Rockefeller Foundation* support of a group study at the University of Washington at Seattle. I don't believe they ever made a single grant of \$200,000, but I think the sum of their grants probably came to that much. This was a grant for the purpose of group research on the Taiping Rebellion, which was a rebellion which took place in China during the middle of the 19th century, about the same time as the Civil War was raging in this country. The importance of this rebellion can be seen from the fact that historians estimate that 20 million persons lost their lives either in the fighting as a result of disease, epidemics, destruction, and so forth, that raged up and down China from south to north during that period of 12 to 14 years, I think. The Taiping Rebellion has long interested historians, and it is worthy of a great deal of study. Here we get into a rather interesting conflict, it seems to me, between the attitudes of foundations on the scarcity of personnel and human resources in the far eastern field on the one hand, and their willingness to financially support a tremendously narrow focus of interest in research on the other hand.

There are a large number of highly controversial questions of method involved here. The question of how to conduct research. There is valid room for experimentation on these matters. But the least that can be said about the University of Washington project is that it was a rather drastic, in my view, experiment in the use of the so-called collective-research project, in which the individuals

counted for a good deal less than the team. The team was put together and people blocked out areas of subject-matter, as I have understood it, and areas of data and evidence and worked on these, and their results were pooled in the shape of card files of detailed information on this episode in Chinese history, the idea being that out of this kind of a team pick and shovel approach, you get a lot of facts together, and out of these facts will be brought forth a series of monographic studies.

There is room for this kind of thing, but I always thought they went a little bit far with it, because I understood—and I beg to be corrected if I am wrong on this, I have never had any official connection with this project—I understood that they even integrated into their Taiping Rebellion studies the work of their doctoral candidates, so that people in Chinese history, for example were brought in there and given support to write theses on some aspect of the Taiping Rebellion.

I thought that in view of the scarcity of human resources and the need for general training on Far Eastern matters, that this was focusing it down pretty firm. It is a wonderful project from the point of view of research. If you believe in gadgetry, this had all the gadgets you will ever want to find. If you believe that the best way to promote research is to pick out highly trained and able people and set them free in a general field, like Chinese studies, to follow their own interests wherever they may lead them, then you see this is the very opposite of that kind of thing. It does achieve a certain kind of mechanical efficiency, it seems to me, at the expense of inhibiting the kind of thing that Mr. Hays was talking about, namely, the freedom of the individual to go down any number of blind alleys he wants to go down in the free pursuit of his curiosity, in the interests of honestly trying to come up with important things. (Hearings, pp. 530, 531.)

There is considerable criticism of foundations for their failure to spread their largess among the smaller colleges. Professor Colegrove expressed this criticism several times in his testimony. For example:

Then I would like to see the foundations sprinkle more of these research projects around the small colleges. There is a wealth of brains, a wealth of competence, in our small colleges and universities, which does not have its share in research grants at the present time. I would hope that the foundations would give much more attention to what is going on in the small colleges. The tendency is to concentrate this in the large universities, if they use the universities, or concentrate in the operating societies.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. WORMSER. Professor, two university presidents told me that they thought in principle it would be a good idea to distribute it among the smaller colleges, but actually it was only in the larger universities that you found the men competent to do research in these various areas.

I think one partial answer to that is that in some of these empirical studies no talent is required. They are more or less quantitative studies, which a professor in a smaller college might be able to do just as well as a university professor. What is your idea as to that?

Dr. COLEGROVE. I would agree with that. There are many small colleges located near the center of a State where the professor—if he is dealing with the area situation—could quite easily do a lot of traveling just as well from a small college as from a large university; I think the foundations have not yet explored enough into the talent that can be found in the small colleges.

Of course, there is a tendency for a young man in a small college who gets a grant and thereby attracts attention to himself to be pulled into a university. Personally, I regret to see the small colleges raided in this way by the great universities taking off the faculties of these small colleges—teachers who are doing so much good for the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. But there would be less likelihood of the so-called raiding both of the faculty and the graduate students in the small colleges if grants were more general and made available to the outstanding faculty members and the outstanding students, don't you think?

Dr. COLEGROVE. Oh, yes, quite true. Quite true. We have had a number of universities that have raided small colleges almost to their destruction. President Harper of the University of Chicago raided Clark University, took pretty largely all of its talent to the University of Chicago. But that was before the foundations were greatly operative; and of course he did it by offering, on the one hand, research facilities, and on the other hand, much higher salaries than they were getting at Clark University. (Hearings, pp. 582, 583.)

*The Social Science Research Council*, in its publication, *Items*, of June, 1952, analyzed the statistics of its grants and reported that 89.1 per cent of their fellowship grants went to sixteen institutions; and that Columbia, Harvard and Chicago universities received 47.6 per cent of the total for the period 1925-51. An analysis of the grants made by *The American Council of Learned Societies* will show a lesser concentration but still a marked favoritism for certain institutions. The offered explanation of such favoritism is that these schools have, in general, the best faculties and the best student body. We are not in a position to judge. It would, however, seem to us important for the trustees of foundations to consider whether it might be advisable to distribute their grants in such manner as to increase the number of institutions which have sufficiently high standards. By a judicious spreading of grants, it might be easy to raise the stature of some of the smaller institutions to the standard which the foundation executives assume is the exclusive property, now, of a few large institutions.

A glance at the list of recent recipients of favor from, and consultants to, the *Behavioral Sciences Division* of *The Ford Foundation* indicates a definite concentration among favored institutions or their faculties. Of the committees which formulated policies for this *Fund*, including a total of 88 persons with university connections, 10 seem to have been from Harvard; 8 from Chicago; 7 from Yale; 5 from California; 5 from Stanford; and 5 from Columbia. A total of 59 of these men (out of 88) represented 12 institutions. There is additional significance in the fact that some of these recipients and consultants were on a multiplicity of committees. For example, Professor Lazarsfeld of Columbia, was on six; Professors Carroll of North Carolina, Merton of Columbia, and Tyler of Chicago, on five; Professors Lasswell of Yale, Simon of Carnegie Tech., and Stouffer of Harvard, on four, etc. Counting the number of times each person with a university connection appears on committees of the *Fund*, we reach this representation:

University of Chicago.....	23
Harvard.....	18
Columbia.....	16
Yale.....	13
North Carolina.....	8
California.....	7
Stanford.....	7
Cornell.....	7, etc.

Note also that associates of *The Rand Corporation* are represented 11 times. This interlock with *The Rand Corporation* is highly interesting.

We must add the intriguing fact that the *Behavioral Science Fund* provided a grant-in-aid program under which each of fifty persons were to receive \$5,000 to be spent at their own discretion for the purpose of enriching their own work. The associates and consultants distributed this largess, and included a goodly number of themselves in their lists.

Note also that *The Social Science Research Council* took part in the policy-making of the *Fund* and that considerable funds were made available to it and through it.

In the Summer of 1950, \$300,000 was given to each of seven universities and to *The Social Science Research Council* (beyond other large grants to the SSRC). Why this money was concentrated on this limited group of institutions, we do not know.

This *Behavioral Science Fund* has vast resources at its command. Its list of objectives indicates an underlying assumption that human behavior can be understood as an object of the natural sciences would be, within the framework of limited numbers of cause-effect relationships. This doctrine is not by any means universally accepted, and there is the danger that the huge sum available to the *Fund* to promote its underlying thesis can make this the ruling doctrine in the social sciences. A full examination of the current and intended operation of this great fund is indicated, as well as a study of why certain institutions have been so greatly favored by it.

*"THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AT MID-CENTURY"*

One of the most important pieces of literature which has come to the attention of the Committee relating to the methods and accomplishments of the social sciences is the booklet, *The Social Sciences At Mid-Century*, published for the Social Science Research Center of the Graduate School by the University of Minnesota Press. It contains a series of papers delivered in honor of Guy Stanton Ford, a former president of the *Social Science Research Council*, April 19-21, 1951. In the first of these papers, Frederick Osborn, trustee of *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*, admits that all social science is influenced by preconceived value judgments. He says that "the social scientist can at best gather only a few of the facts" and thus must engage in evaluation. This certainly distinguishes the social sciences from the natural sciences and gravely weakens the claim that the natural science processes can be applied to the social sciences. Mr. Osborn admits that social scientists are only at the "beginning of knowledge."

Yet, Mr. Osborn later makes the claim that the social scientist "can provide a careful appraisal of the facts" bearing on any "given problem" and thus give the administrator "new and important tools." By inference, however, he admits that this alleged contribution by social scientists is not scientific for he says that "Experience, judgment and intuition must still play a part in making decisions." The sum total of these various statements is that the social scientist does not know all the facts and cannot collect all the facts but, nevertheless, fulfills an important function in giving some of the facts to administrators. It is easy to see that the emphasis produced by a selected group of facts might be worse than producing no facts at all, in so far as it might well imbalance logical decision.

In the same volume, Charles Dollard, president of *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*, calls attention to the "widespread suspicion that social scientists are interested not so much in studying the behavior of men and the social situations and problems which involve men, but rather in planning fundamental changes in our society." However, he does not expressly deny that this suspicion is warranted. He goes so far, in fact, as to admit that there are "those who use the label of social science to validate ideas and programs which are in no sense scientifically derived." He adds that "the social sciences have suffered an incredible amount of damage through the rash pronouncements of some of our number on all manner of subjects on which no real scientific data are available and through predictions and forecasts which have turned out to be lamentably wrong."

Mr. Dollard includes in his paper the rather startling suggestion, to which we have referred, that social science should "initiate a more

rigorous system of internal policing." As he expounds his idea, he intends that such policing should result in higher standards of research. On the other hand, the concept of policing requires police. The concept is eminently dangerous if any one group is to be granted the right to use an intellectual nightstick.

Philip M. Hauser, professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, points out that in the institutions which are most research-minded, "recognition in the form of promotion, salary advancements, etc." depends more on the quantity of research activities and publications than their quality. This is a sad inferential commentary on the contribution of foundations to research in the colleges. Elbridge Sibley, of *The Social Science Research Council*, in his paper admits that "the average 'quality' of students specializing in the social sciences both in undergraduate and graduate schools is indeed inferior to that of those specializing in the 'hard' sciences \* \* \*".

The most interesting of the papers is that by Carl O. Sauer, professor of geography at the University of California, entitled *Folkways of Social Science*. Professor Sauer said that he came to "admonish", and he did indeed, severely criticising the research methods and controls promoted by the great foundations and the clearing house organizations which they support in what we have referred to as the "concentration of power." Those who may believe that freedom of inquiry and freedom of spirit are essential to the preservation of the American way of life will read these quotations from Professor Sauer's paper with profit:

*"In American social science it has indeed become a dominant folkway to associate progress with putting the job inquiry into large-scale organizations, under formally prescribed methods, and with limited objectives. Having adopted the name 'science,' we are impressed by the 'method of science' as inductive, quantitative, experimental. We are even told that such is the only proper method."*

\* \* \*

"The more we get committed to keeping counts and tests going in ever lengthening series, and to adding suitable items as additional series, the more do the limits of social science become defined by what may be measured. And thus the more restricted does the range of personalities and temperaments become who are attracted into social studies. There is further risk that we attach such merit to quantification as to confuse means and ends, industriousness with intellectual achievement."

\* \* \*

"At mid-century the social sciences have moved far away from where they stood at the beginning of the century. In numbers of workers they have multiplied greatly. Thousands fill the places manned by a few score in those early years. When memory calls the roll, however, of that elder generation, we look up to them with respect and admit that they opened up wide horizons that we in part have lost."

\* \* \*

"Most of those I knew were detached observers, unconcerned about choosing or directing their work in terms of social or political ends. (The reform element came along somewhat later. In my Chicago days this intrusion of emotional drive was noticeable only in some students of sociology, then already in some numbers refugees from divinity schools, seekers for a new faith in social welfare. In economics I saw the welfare motivation come in with the young labor economists.)"

\* \* \*

"We have less and less time for thinking, and again we turn to organization to simplify and regulate that part of our activity that is left for research. We acquire space, equipment, manpower, and budgets and put them into a table of organization as research bureaus and institutes. Obviously, long-term projects are favored that project an orderly series of steps in the acquisition of data and of processes for their analysis. Workers are assigned to designated posts and

tasks. Again we have set up an assembly line for mass production, resembling the operations of industry and government. In some cases the product is subjected to scrutiny, even as to policy clearance. And often a distinction develops between directing staff and working staff."

\* \* \*

"I think we must admit, however, that more often the idea of an institute has come first, thereafter the question as to who should run it, and last of all the matter as to why it was needed. Should not the questions be, Is there a problem that has become so complex and sufficiently far advanced that an organized and concerted effort is necessary for further advance, and is it to be under the direction of the man who has thought himself farthest into this matter? I fear that not many institutes originate or are maintained thus. We tend to raise up career administrators, able at finding funds, tactful, energetic operators, who at best have been scholars too briefly and who by temperament and the course of their lives become more and more removed from the contemplation and concentration that are needed for creative work. Thus they may lose even the sensitiveness and understanding by which they know who a scholar or what a piece of creative work is."

"Of all fields, we have perhaps become most given to conferences and committees for the planning of research. We agree as to division of labor, as to preventing duplication of research, as to priority of topics, as to assembling specialists for a cooperative project. *In these and other ways unwittingly are we going about shackling freedom of inquiry.* Borrowing a term from the engineers, we recommend 'pilot studies,' serving as models to be reproduced until another design is approved for another series of studies. Conferences require agenda, and these have offspring that result in another conference. The common variety of scholar is awkward, bewildered, and often bored by these uncongenial procedures, which pass into the control of our entrepreneurial colleagues. *Thus we develop hierarchies of conference members who speak a common language, obscured from us by its own ceremonial terms. They become an elite, fashioning increasingly the directions and limits of our work, as they become more and more removed from the producers.*"

"A serious and delicate problem is posed by the growing role of the national research council and foundation, the last years having seen a continually increasing concentration of influence. Although there are more and more individual workers, there is no such rise in diversity of interests. With the growth of central advisory, planning, and granting agencies, perhaps simply as a matter of economy of attention, it has come about that a reduced number of directions are selected for approval and support. Thus is introduced a grave and growing disorder into the body of our scholarship. When preferments and rewards are being posted for doing certain things and not doing others, the pliable and imitative offer themselves most freely, and the stubborn ones hold out. Local authority is impressed by the objectives expressed by the distant patron. He who is not deflected from his chosen direction to take part in the recommended enterprise is the unhappy guest who sits out the party. Thus conforming to a behavior pattern comes to prevail. Yet the able researcher will always know best how he should employ his mind, and his own inclination will be to seek his own way. The dependent and complaisant ones do not matter. Paved with good intentions, the roads down which we are being urged do not lead toward the promised land of freedom of the spirit. No group can or should wish to be wise and farseeing enough to predetermine the quest for knowledge."

\* \* \*

"Research programs are set up in terms of social goals, and it is assumed that professional training provides the deep insight needed. Having set up schools for the training of prophets, it gratifies us to hear that the great task of social science is to remake the world."

\* \* \*

"In my experience the talented, original student is the only one for whom it is difficult to find a place. He may be as likable as another and as willing to work at the customary tasks of his trade. But it is usually safest not to call attention to any unfamiliar direction his mind is taking. What the market wants and gets is persons who can fill job specifications neatly. We dislike having juniors around who think about matters beyond our ken and reach. We build sheltering walls against the unknown by making organizations and methods, curricula, and research programs. And we get no more than we make room for."

\* \* \*

"Will those who come after us say that we offered protection and encouragement to young minds differing from our own, that we raised no barriers to seeking and

*thinking, that we blocked no paths into the unknown, that we turned no one from whatever most roused curiosity and gave delight, that we 'have loved no darkness, sophisticated no truth' ?”*

*THE SLANT TO THE LEFT.*

*The evidence leads this Committee to the conclusion that the research in the social sciences with foundation support slants heavily to the left. A book written by STUART CHASE called *The Proper Study of Man-kind*, published in 1948 by Harpers, and written at the instance of Donald Young of the *Social Science Research Council* and Charles Dollard of the *Carnegie Corporation* to “run a kind of chain and compass line across the whole front of the sciences devoted to human relations”, is illustrative. The book was planned and developed according to the publisher’s announcement “in consultation with dozens of social scientists in all parts of the country, and Messrs. Young and Dollard followed the project step by step to its completion.” The project was initially financed by the *Carnegie Corporation* and may fairly be characterized as a project of *The Social Science Research Council*; it is virtually an exposition of the SSRC point of view.*

Mr. Hays of the Committee questioned whether the book had a wide circulation. The publisher reported that approximately 50,000 copies had been sold. Taking into account the fact that academicians and many other people would normally read this type of book out of the library, its impact must have been great.

Professor Hobbs questioned why a man like STUART CHASE was selected by foundation representatives to write this particular book giving a survey of the social sciences. He described CHASE as a man “who has in his work definitely indicated his leanings toward collectivism and social planning and that sort of thing \* \* \*”. (Hearings, p. 134.)

Professor Hobbs quoted from a book written by the late Congressman Shafer and one John Howland Snow, called *The Turning of the Tide*, in which the active association of STUART CHASE with the *League for Industrial Democracy* (the original name of which was *Inter-collegiate Socialist Society*) was delineated. (Hearings, circa p. 134.) Prof. Hobbs also quoted from an address by STUART CHASE to the Department of Superintendents of the *National Education Association* on February 25, 1935, in which CHASE said as follows (Hearings, p. 135):

“If we have even a trace of liberalism in our natures, we must be prepared to see an increasing amount of collectivism, Government interference, centralization of economic control, social planning. Here again the relevant question is not how to get rid of government interference, but how to apply it for the greatest good of the greatest number.”

Prof. Hobbs offered a further quotation from a declaration by STUART CHASE in the *NEA Journal* of May 1934, that an abundant economy requires

“the scrapping of outworn political boundaries and of constitutional checks and balances where the issues involved are technical, \* \* \*.” (Hearings, p. 135.)

This Committee, like Dr. Hobbs, cannot understand why a man of STUART CHASE’S obvious leanings should have been selected to make a “chain and compass” survey of the social sciences. The book he produced with foundation support seems replete with what might have been expected of him, including, as Prof. Hobbs explained (Hearings, p. 135, et seq.), a promotion of the completely false notion

that the methods of the physical sciences can be translated to the social sciences.

In his book MR. CHASE said (Hearings, p. 137):

"I am grateful to J. Frederick Dewhurst, Charles Dollard, John Gardner, Pendleton Herring, Ralph Linton, H. A. Murray, Talcott Parsons, Don K. Price, and Paul Webbinck for a reading of the manuscript, but I am, of course, responsible for the final draft."

We understand that all the persons mentioned have been actively associated with foundations or heavily supported by them. The conclusion seems fair that they have endorsed Mr. Chase's ideas and that they themselves lean strongly to the left or at least strongly support that scientism which seems to produce or be an ally of leftism. Indeed, Mr. Charles Dollard, in his statement filed with the Committee in behalf of *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*, of which he is President, registered wide approval among social scientists. He said:

"\* \* \* competent authorities who reviewed *The Proper Study of Mankind* found no lack of balance in MR. CHASE'S treatment of the various social sciences." (Hearings, p. 988.)

The approach advocated by the author and supported by foundation funds derogates conventional morality. He says:

"Social science might be defined on a high level as the application of the scientific method to the study of human relations. What do we know about those relations that is dependable? The 'wisdom of the ages' obviously is not good enough as the state of the post-war world bears eloquent witness."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The scientific method does not tell us how things ought to behave but how they do behave. Clearly, there is no reason why the method should not be applied to the behavior of men as well as to the behavior of electrons." (Hearings, p. 138.)

The author, continuing with the following statement, gives the impression that there is no substantial difference between social science and natural science:

"There are social experiments and physical experiments, and the scientific method can be used most advantageously in both."

Upon which quotation Prof. Hobbs commented as follows (Hearings, p. 139):

"I would like to interject, again, there are social experiments and there are physical experiments, but I would like to point out in the physical experiments you are dealing with electrons and things of that type. With the social experiments you are dealing with human beings and it makes quite a different situation."

The author also commits the error of presenting an unbalanced set of ideas. There is, for example, testified Prof. Hobbs, a stress on "cultural determinism", a doctrine which is subject to very serious doubt. As Prof. Hobbs put it (Hearings, p. 139):

"Sir, it is not a matter of there being no validity whatsoever. It is a matter of a theory of this type being presented to the public with the weight of the foundations behind it, as though it were the scientifically proved fact. In that context, it is not correct."

The book discusses in some detail the theory that by manipulating society you can change not only society itself but also the people in it. "Theoretically," says the book, "a society could be completely made over in something like 15 years, the time it takes to inculcate a new culture into a rising crop of youngsters." (Hearings, p. 141.)



Obviously, "culture determinism" has been a weapon of both Fascism and Communism. And it might readily be concluded that the author thought the use of this method desirable. It is a technique, as Prof. Hobbs pointed out, close to "brain washing".

The following quotation from the Chase book is truly disturbing (Hearings, p. 142):

"Prepare now for a surprising universe. Individual talent is too sporadic and unpredictable to be allowed any important part in the organization of society. Social systems which endure are built on the average person who can be trained to occupy any position adequately if not brilliantly."

This, said Prof. Hobbs, is reminiscent of the Russian (Pavlov's) experiments on the conditioning of dogs.

During Professor Hobbs' testimony the question was raised whether he was not perhaps discussing only isolated books, after which the following colloquy took place between Counsel and the witness (Hearings, p. 146):

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to Dr. Hobbs that I think he ought to make clear, which I believe is the fact, that he does not intend merely to discuss 3 or 4 books as the only books in this area which have any unpleasant connotation to him. What he is really doing is giving them as illustrations, perhaps particularly sharp illustrations, of the use of what he calls scientism and its promotion by foundations. Please answer this yourself, Dr. Hobbs, but isn't your main thesis that what you call scientism widely promoted by foundations and that in itself has a deleterious effect on society?

Dr. HOBBS. The thesis is in the book in relation to the foundations specifically, but I would say that, speaking in general terms, the thing which I call scientism is promoted in an appreciable measure by the foundations. And scientism has been described as a point of view, an idea, that science can solve all of the problems of mankind, that it can take the place of traditions, beliefs, religion, and it is in the direction of that type of thing that so much of the material in the social sciences is pointed. I am not saying that we have reached that, or that many would come out blatantly and say that now that can or should be done. But it seems to me, and I may be wrong, but it does seem to me that we are going in that direction, and it is time that we might take a little stock of it.

Professor Hobbs criticized the discussion of the "cultural lag" theory in CHASE's book, namely that:

\* \* \* technology has advanced very greatly, but that our ideas, our beliefs, our traditions, have not kept pace with it. Therefore, there is a lag between the technological advance and the culture, and the implication is that the beliefs, ideas, sentiments and so on, about the family, the church, about government, should be brought up to date with the technology, which superficially sounds reasonable enough, except when you begin to analyze it it really settles down to being in the first place, a nonscientific notion, because the two things being compared are not commensurable, that is, they have not been reduced to any common denominator by which you can measure the relative rates of change in between them. (Hearings, p. 147.)

This "cultural lag" theory is expressed in the statement filed by *The Rockefeller Foundation*:

"The experiences of World War I and the painful uncertainties of the post-war and depression period seemed to reflect a growing and menacing gap between man's technical and scientific capacity and his apparent inability to deal with his own affairs on a rational basis."

*The Rockefeller Foundation* has long been addicted to the cultural lag theory. As early as 1922, Beardsley Ruml recommended to the *Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund* that it enter the field of the social sciences. He advanced that false analogy between the social and the natural sciences which has led social scientists into "nose-counting" and a mathematical approach to the solution of human

problems. He promoted the idea that the collection and tabulation of social science data should have greater foundation support. Moreover, he strongly supported the cultural lag theory, saying (as quoted in Raymond Fosdick's history of *The Rockefeller Foundation*):

"Unless means are found for meeting the complex social problems that are so rapidly developing, our increased control of physical forces may prove increasingly destructive of human values."

Such a statement may appear to have some validity at first reading. Reading into it, however, what is implicit in its point of view and approach, it proposes that the social scientist can find better ways for human beings to live together, by reorganizing our ideas, our beliefs, our traditions, to keep pace with advancing technology.

Professor Hobbs said that the cultural lag notion:

\* \* \* has the implication that we should keep religion up to date, and patriotic sentiments, ideas about marriage and the family.

Well, if you do this, of course by implication to take an extreme illustration, then you would have to modify your religion every time there was a significant technological change with automobiles or airplanes, things of that sort, which would give you of course a great deal of lack of permanence.

The cultural lag theory has appeared in many if not most of the sociology textbooks with the implication that we should abandon the traditional forms of belief about the family and religion. Inescapably that tends to be the implication. The way Stuart Chase puts it:

"The cultural concept dissolves old ideologies and eternal verities but gives us something more solid to stand on, or so it seems to me. Prediction takes shape, the door to the future opens, and light comes through. Not much yet, but enough to shrivel many intellectual quacks, oververbalized seers and theorists, whose theories cannot be verified."

At the very time he is talking about a theory which cannot be verified. (Hearings, p. 148.)

An interesting recent example of the prevalence of the "cultural lag" theory is to be found in a letter dated August 20, 1954 by Edward L. Bernays, President of *The Edward L. Bernays Foundation*, to the *New York Herald-Tribune*, and published in its issue of August 23, 1954. Mr. Bernays offers \$2,500 on behalf of *The Bernays Foundation* for a private study centering on the four Brooklyn boys who shortly before had shocked the public by violent and murderous acts. These boys had apparently come from good homes and Mr. Bernays' approach to discovering why they could have gone so wrong is disclosed by this quotation from his letter.

"A terrific gap exists between our ability to control the technological elements of our society and our ability to cope with societal problems."

It is very much to be doubted that the "cultural lag" theory can account for the behavior of the four Brooklyn lads.

*Moral relativism and the cultural lag theory strike at the very roots of the average American's traditional values. Promulgation of such unverified, pseudo-scientific theories dissolves the belief that religion gives us certain basic verities upon which we must construct a moral and ethical life, that certain basic and unalterable principles underlie our system of government and should be maintained faithfully for the preservation of our society. It is not our province to prove that such radical theories as relativism and cultural lag are wrong. It is the responsibility of those who advance them under the protecting cloak of "science" to prove that they are accurate and correct. Until such verification has been produced it is difficult to justify the use of tax-free funds for what is an unscientific*

*attack on the very fundamentals upon which the convictions of the American citizen are based.*

The statement filed by Mr. Charles Dollard (Hearings, p. 945, et seq.), as President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, supports the selection of MR. CHASE to write *The Proper Study of Mankind*. MR. CHASE is held to be, and he undoubtedly is, "an extremely able writer." But we have stated that MR. CHASE is far to the left and thus a strange selection to make for the job of writing the bible of *The Social Science Research Council*. This Mr. Dollard seeks to answer by stating that MR. CHASE just previously had done a job for the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. Mr. Dollard's observation in this regard is a *non-sequitur* applied in a frantic attempt to obscure the real issue, which is the pattern of MR. CHASE'S intellectual background. How about MR. CHASE'S record of Communist front associations. They will be found in the Appendix. They do not make him a Communist, but they place him among those whose extreme leftist tendencies have led them into the support of many dangerous organizations. What sort of judgment may be expected from such a man! We find the answer in his adulation of both Lauchlin Currie and Harry Dexter White whose demise the nation need not mourn (*The Proper Study of Mankind*, pages 211, 205).

"AN AMERICAN DILEMMA"

Just as we cannot understand why MR. CHASE was selected to write the bible of the SSRC, we cannot understand why Gunnar Myrdal was selected to make the study which resulted in *An American Dilemma*. This project involved an expenditure of some \$250,000 of funds granted by *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*. The subject of the study, the negro problem in the United States, was of course highly desirable. In a preface to the book written by the President of *The Carnegie Corporation* it is explained that because the subject is charged with emotion it was felt desirable to select as a director "someone who could approach the task with a fresh mind, uninfluenced by traditional attitudes or by earlier conclusions." This eminently commendable statement, however, contrasts with the fact that Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish social scientist, was selected. Dr. Myrdal was and is a socialist. How an unbiased point of view could be expected from one of Dr. Myrdal's persuasion we cannot understand.

The following quotations from the book itself indicate Dr. Myrdal's bias. They also expound theories regarding the American people and their government which this Committee finds most unfortunate.

"Indeed, the new republic began its career with a reaction. Charles Beard in 'An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States', and a group of modern historians, throwing aside the much cherished national mythology which had blurred the difference in spirit between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, have shown that the latter was conceived in considerable suspicion against democracy and fear of 'the people.' It was dominated by property consciousness and designed as a defense against the democratic spirit let loose during the Revolution." (Page 7.)

"This conservatism, in fundamental principles, has, to a great extent, been perverted into a nearly fetishistic cult of the Constitution. This is unfortunate since the 150-year-old Constitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions and since, furthermore, the drafters of the document made it technically difficult to change even if there were no popular feeling against change." (Page 12.)

"Modern historical studies of how the Constitution came to be as it is reveal that the Constitutional Convention was nearly a plot against the common people. Until recently, the Constitution has been used to block the popular will: the Fourteenth Amendment inserted after the Civil War to protect the civil rights of the poor freedmen has, for instance, been used more to protect business corporations against public control." (Page 13.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"Another cultural trait of Americans is a relatively low degree of respect of law and order. This trait, as well as the other one just mentioned is of paramount importance for the Negro problem as we shall show, in some detail in later chapters. There is a relation between these two traits, of high ideals in some laws and low respect for all laws, but this relation is by no means as simple as it appears." (Page 14.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"Undoubtedly the idealistic concept of American law as an emanation of 'natural law' is a force which strengthens the rule of law in America.

"But, in another way, it is at the same time most detrimental to automatic, unreflecting law observance on the part of the citizens. Laws become disputable on moral grounds. Each legislative statute is judged by the common citizen in terms of his conception of the higher 'natural law'. He decides whether it is 'just' or 'unjust' and has the dangerous attitude that, if it is unjust, he may feel free to disobey it." (Page 16.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"This anarchistic tendency in America's legal culture becomes even more dangerous because of the presence of a quite different tendency: a desire to regulate human behavior tyrannically by means of formal laws. This last tendency is a heritage from early American puritanism which was sometimes fanatical and dogmatic and always had a strong inclination to mind other people's business. So we find that this American, who is so proud to announce that he will not obey laws other than those which are 'good' and 'just', as soon as the discussion turns to something which in his opinion is bad and unjust, will emphatically pronounce that 'there ought to be a law against . . .' To demand and legislate all sorts of laws against this or that is just as much part of American freedom as to disobey the laws when they are enacted. America has become a country where exceedingly much is permitted in practice but at the same time exceedingly much is forbidden in law." (Pages 16 and 17.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"And many more of those unrespected laws are damaging in so far as they, for example, prevent a rational organization of various public activities, or when they can be used by individuals for blackmailing purposes or by the state or municipal authorities to persecute unpopular individuals or groups." (Page 17.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"For example, it cannot be conducive to the highest respect for the legal system that the federal government is forced to carry out important social legislation under the fiction that it is regulating 'interstate commerce,' or that federal prosecuting agencies punish dangerous gangsters for income tax evasion rather than for the felonies they have committed.

"So this idealistic America also became the country of legalistic formalism. Contrary to America's basic ideology of natural law and its strong practical sense, 'the letter of the law,' as opposed to its 'spirit,' came to have an excessive importance. The weak bureaucracy became tangled up in 'red tape.' The clever lawyer came to play a large and unsavory role in politics in business; and in the everyday life of the citizen. The Americans thus got a judicial order which is in many respects contrary to all their inclinations." (Page 18.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"We have to conceive of all the numerous breaches of law, which an American citizen commits or learns about in the course of ordinary living, as psychologically a series of shocks which condition him and the entire society to a low degree of law observance. The American nation has, further, experienced disappointments in its attempts to legislate social change, which, with few exceptions, have been badly prepared and inefficiently carried out. The almost traumatic effects of these historical disappointments have been enhanced by America's conspicuous success in so many fields other than legislation. One of the trauma was the Reconstruction legislation, which attempted to give Negroes civil rights in the South; another one was the anti-trust legislation pressed by the Western farmers

and enacted to curb the growth of monopolistic finance capitalism; a third one was the prohibition amendment." (Page 19.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"If in the course of time Americans are brought to be a law-abiding people, and if they at the same time succeed in keeping alive not only their conservatism in fundamental principles and their pride and devotion to their national political institutions, but also some of their puritan eagerness and courage in attempting to reform themselves and the world—redirected somewhat from the old Biblical inclination of thinking only in terms of prescriptions and purges—this great nation may become the master builder of a stable but progressive commonwealth." (Pages 20 and 21.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"The popular explanation of the disparity in America between ideals and actual behavior is that Americans do not have the slightest intention of living up to the ideals which they talk about and put into their Constitution and laws. Many Americans are accustomed to talk loosely and disparagingly about adherence to the American Creed as 'lip-service' and even 'hypocrisy'. Foreigners are even more prone to make such a characterization." (Page 21.)

Mr. Dollard in his statement filed as President of *The Carnegie Corporation* cited other quotations from *An American Dilemma* which are kinder in tone toward the American people. It is our opinion that the sections quoted by Mr. Dollard do not offset the unpleasant and prejudiced references we have quoted above. Nor are we impressed with Mr. Dollard's attempt to characterize Dr. Myrdal as a moderate sort of socialist. Professor Colgrove, who, as Secretary-Treasurer of the *American Political Science Association* for eleven years, ought to know, testified that Myrdal was a "very left wing socialist" and "very anticonservative." He said:

Dr. Myrdal was a Socialist, pretty far left, indeed extremely left. He was not unprejudiced. He came over here with all the prejudices of European Socialists. And the criticism that he makes of the American Constitution, the criticism that he makes of the conservatives of the United States, are bitter criticisms. He didn't have any praise at all for the conservatives. He did praise what he called the liberals. And he implied that it was the conservatives in the United States who created the problem and who continued the difficulties of any solution. I felt the foundations did a great disservice to American scholarship in announcing his study as an objective nonpartisan study whose conclusions were wholly unbiased. It was almost intellectual dishonesty. (Hearings, p. 577.)

This Committee would be far less concerned about the leftist slanting of so many products financed by great foundations in the social sciences if there were a reasonably commensurate number (and weight) of such products slanted in the other direction. There can be no doubt that the greatest freedom consonant with public responsibility is desirable in the conduct of foundation work. *However, we conclude that the freedom which most of those who direct the work of the largest foundations, and some others, insist upon is merely the freedom to propagate leftist propaganda.*

#### *THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES.*

This work is one to which closer study should be given than this Committee was able to give. Though somewhat out of date, it is still the "Supreme Court" of the social sciences, the final authority to which appeal is made in any social science field by many students and researchers. It was estimated as late as 1952 that it was being used at least a half million times per year. Apparently *The Rockefeller Foundation*, *The Carnegie Corporation of New York* and *The Russell Sage Foundation* financed the project or materially supported it. It was, clearly enough, a highly desirable venture. But it does seem,

in view of its enormous importance in conditioning the thinking of reference-users, that every means should have been used by the foundations who made it possible to see that it was a truly objective and representative piece of work. Was it? Let us see.

Perhaps a Communist was not so reprehensible a character in the thirties as one would be today. But a Communist was still a Communist; objectivity could hardly be expected of him, whether in 1930 or 1954. Communists have a way of bringing things political into almost any subject. In the case of the *Encyclopedia*, Communists and pro-Communists were permitted to write articles on subjects in which their slant could obviously be heavily applied, and it was.

The key man in the creation of the *Encyclopedia* was DR. ALVIN JOHNSON, an Associate Editor. In his book, *Pioneer's Progress*, he said:

"In enlisting assistant editors, I forebore all inquiry about infection with Marx. Like a common cold, Marx was in the air, sometimes cutting editorial efficiency, but not irremediably. \* \* \* I had two assistant editors who asserted that they were Socialists. That was nothing to me; they were good and faithful workers. And one was so considerate of my reactionary bent as to inform me that a new editor I had taken on was a Communist."

DR. JOHNSON then told how he interviewed the man and told him he would keep him on—"Your private political views are your own business", said the good Doctor. Incidentally, his reference to himself as "reactionary" was humor—his own Communist-front associations have been recorded; he may certainly be judged as considerably to the left.

The article on *The Rise of Liberalism* was written by HAROLD J. LASKI, a British socialist. He also did the articles on *Bureaucracy*, *Democracy*, *Judiciary: Liberty: Social Contract*: and *Ulyanov, Vladimir Ilich*.

*Atheism, Modern Atheism* was written by Oscar Jassi, a socialist of Hungarian origin. *Bolshevism* was written by Maurice Dobb, an English radical. *Capitalism*, by Werner Sombart, a socialist who became affiliated with the Nazis.

*Communism* was written by MAX BEER, a Marxian of the University of Frankfurt, Germany. *Communist Parties* was written by LEWIS L. LORWIN, whose views may be gleaned from this statement in the article: "The view common in the United States that the Communists are either cranks or criminals is largely a reflection of a conservative outlook." He also wrote the article on *Exploitation*.

*Corporation*, written by two New Dealers, Adolph A. Berle, Jr., and GARDINER C. MEANS, clearly reveals their bias at that time. (Mr. Berle has since written *The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution* and repudiated some of his former views regarding corporations.) They say that the corporation may well equal or exceed the state in power. "The law of corporations, accordingly, might well be considered as a potential constitutional law for the new economic state: while business practice assumes many of the aspects of administrative government."

*Criticism, Social*, was produced by ROBERT MORSE LOVETT, of wide Communist front associations. *Education, History*, was produced by GEORGE S. COUNTS, a radical educator concerning whom we shall have more to say in the section of this report on education. *Fabianism* was written by G. D. H. Cole, a British socialist. He also wrote the article on *Industrialism. Fortunes, Private, Modern*

*Period*, prepared by LEWIS COREY, is easily recognizable as a Marxist analysis.

*Freedom of Speech and of the Press* was written by Robert Eisler of Paris who destroys the Christian ethic with this authoritative pronouncement:

"No one today will consider the particular ethical doctrine of modern, or for that matter of ancient, Christianity as self-evident or natural or as the morality common to all men. The modern relativist theory of values has definitely shattered the basis on which such artificial churches as the various ethical societies orders rested."

*Government, Soviet Russia* was prepared by Otto Hoetzsch of the University of Berlin who gives us kind thoughts about the Soviets—for example:

"Although the elections are subject to pressure of Communist dictatorship, *this workers' democracy* is not entirely a fiction." [Emphasis ours.]

The article on *Labor-Capital Co-Operation* is credited to J. B. S. HARDMAN, whose Communist front affiliations are recorded in Appendix, Part IX of the Dies Committee Reports, 78th Congress (1944). He also wrote *Labor Parties, General, United States, Masses and Terrorism*. *Laissez-Faire* is the product of the socialist, G. D. H. Cole; his job was done with a hatchet. *Large Scale Production*, by Myron W. Watkins, is an attack on the production methods of Big Business.

*Morals* is the product of HORACE M. KALLEN, whose extensive Communist-front associations are a matter of record. *Philosophy* was produced by Horace B. Davis, with ex-Communist-front associations (See Appendix IX). *Political Offenders*, by MAX LERNER, a radical, contains a diatribe against the treatment of political offenders. *Political Police*, is by ROGER N. BALDWIN, recorded by Appendix IX as having Communist-front associations. *Power, Industrial*, by Hugh Quigley, seems to be a plea for more control of business. *Proletariat* is by Alfred Meusel of Germany and seems to admire the Soviet system in Russia.

*Social Work, General Discussion, Social Case Work*, is the work of a Communist-fronter, PHILIP KLEIN. *Socialism* was written by a socialist, OSCAR JANSKI. It is not unsympathetic to Communism.

*Stabilization, Economic*, was written by GEORGE SOULE, of extensive Communist-front affiliations. It expresses doubt that "stabilization" can be accomplished under our present order. *Strikes and Lockouts* is by JOHN A. FITCH, of wide Communist-front affiliations. *Vested Interests* is the work of MAX LERNER.

One of the theses in *Woman, Position in Society*, by the Communist-fronter, BERNHARD J. STERN, is that we are not doing right by our women, while the Soviets are.

This list is not inclusive. Many more instances of radical selection could be given, plus the multitude of articles by moderately slanted writers. What is amazingly characteristic of the *Encyclopedia* is the extent to which articles on "left" subjects have been assigned to leftists; in the case of subjects to the "right", leftists again have been selected to describe and expound them. This is reminiscent of the reviews in the *New York Times* of books on China, in which both pro-and-con-Communist volumes were assigned to pro-Communists for review.

“*EXPERIMENT*”, “*RISK CAPITAL*” AND THE COLLEGES.

The intense application of some of the great foundations to the social sciences seems, by the evidence, to stem from what amounts to a current intellectual fad having its origins in the “cultural lag” theory to which we have referred. It runs that foundations should not longer expend their funds in helping to create a better and healthier physical world—it has already advanced mechanically beyond the ability of human beings to live properly within their new environment. Foundation funds should now be applied to human welfare in the social sense. The social scientists are to be able to give us ways of living together better than those which religious, educational and political leaders have been able to devise for us in the past. We must improve “man’s relation to man.” This concept, widely touted in the foundation world, is illustrated by the underlying report upon which the work of *The Ford Foundation* was based. It contains this statement:

“In the Committee’s opinion the evidence points to the fact that today’s most critical problems are those which are social rather than physical in character—those which arise in man’s relation to man rather than in his relation to nature.”

How are the social scientists to accomplish this reform in our social relations? With financial assistance by the foundations, they are to “experiment”. We have explained some of the dangers of such experimentation for which foundations are to “risk” their funds. Here is part of Professor Hobbs’ testimony about it:

Mr. WORMSER. Dr. Hobbs, do I express your opinion correctly by this statement? The foundations, or some of them, in the Cox hearings last year, maintained that the best use of their funds would be in experiment in reaching out for new horizons, in considering their precious funds in what they call risk capital. You would approve of experiment in the sense of trying to reach new horizons, but you would caution, I assume, against experiment as such where it relates to the relationship of human beings and basic factors in our society?

Dr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; a great deal of caution, I think, should be applied in those areas. For one thing, because of the points I tried to establish yesterday, that the mere fact that the thing is being studied can change the situation; and secondly, because the findings of a study can affect human behavior and we should be extremely cautious when we are entering into areas of that sort. (Hearings, p. 167.)

This Committee strongly supports Professor Hobbs’ opinion that the utmost caution should be used when experimentation with human relationships is involved in a foundation grant or project. We suggest, moreover, that the trustees of foundations consider carefully whether they have not been induced by their executive associates to “go overboard” on the general concept of “experiment.” Among the many letters received by the Committee staff from colleges, criticising the foundations for failure to contribute direct support, and for preferring “new projects” is one from Barnard College (Columbia University) which contains this:

“My only comment about foundation policies is that the foundations all seem to have the point of view that they should contribute only to ‘new projects.’ The College’s largest problems are to maintain faculty salaries and scholarships at a reasonable level, and to keep ancient buildings repaired, so that the basic work of teaching can be continued. It is discouraging to have to add ‘new projects’ in order to secure foundation support when the financial structure of the college has not yet become adjusted to the increase in the cost of living.”



The almost frantic search for something new and experimental in which to invest foundation funds, is a phenomenon with many unhappy repercussions. Among them is the situation of which this college administrator complains. *Would it not be better, in the long run, for foundations to give more direct assistance of widespread nature to sound educational institutions which are dependent on private support, rather than to waste gigantic aggregates of money annually on the pursuit of something "new"?*

## IX. THE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF FOUNDATIONS

### *THE QUANTITATIVE TEST.*

Once a tax-exempt foundation has obtained its initial gift or estate tax exemption, it may spend all its capital, perhaps hundreds of millions, in the support of any "ism" it cares to, and by active propaganda. Nothing prevents it from using its capital in political activity. The only "unless" might be if the Bureau of Internal Revenue, acting soon enough and on sufficient evidence, were able to prove that there had been fraud at its inception.

One penalty is imposed by the tax law if a foundation engages in politics. Its income tax exemption is lost if any "substantial part of the activities" of the foundation is used for "carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence, legislation."<sup>17</sup> Proof that it was violating this prohibition would mean loss of income tax exemption, and subsequent donors to the foundation would not be given gift or estate tax exemption for their donations. *But the foundation could go right on spending its existing principal for its selected "ism".*

Let us look at the quantitative facet of the prohibition. A "substantial part of its activities" is the test. It is evident that a quantitative test, particularly one so vaguely described, is futile and impossible to administer. Take Foundation X with a capital of \$500,000,000 and Foundation Y with a capital of \$50,000. Is the measure of "substantial" to be the amount of money spent, or the proportion of money spent? Y can do far less harm spending all of its income for political purposes than can X, spending but one per cent of its income. The contrast illustrates one of the difficulties of applying a quantitative test.

Is the test, then to be the amount of energy, or time, or effort spent on political action? How could that be measured with sufficient accuracy? Or is it the impact of the work upon society which is to be measured—and if so, how?

It is true that measures of "substance" are sometimes necessary in tax and other laws. In this instance, however, it is a futility. The tax law might better proscribe *all* political activity, leaving it to the courts to make exceptions on the principle of *de minimus non curat lex*.

<sup>17</sup> The 1954 Internal Revenue Code added this further condition on tax exemption: " \* \* \* and which does not participate, or intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office." The interpretation of this addition by the courts will be watched with great interest. Among the interesting issues will be this: will *attacks* on a candidate for office be construed as activity "on behalf" of his opponent? Again, where a foundation is the substantial owner of a newspaper which actively supports candidates, will the foundation have violated this new provision? Can a foundation any longer safely hold substantial ownership in a newspaper? This Committee has given little attention to the problems raised by the new wording because it came into the law at the very end of its research period and because other, less blatant, types of political activity seem far more important and more difficult to combat.

*THE QUALITATIVE TEST.*

A reading of the testimony of Internal Revenue Commissioner Andrews, and his Assistant, Mr. Sugarman, will show that the qualitative test of political use is weak; it has been further enfeebled by court decisions to the point where it is of use only in the most extreme cases. Most of the foundations impinging upon the political area get their tax exemption as "educational" institutions. Yet the courts have so construed the term "educational" that much that is truly political propaganda may be justified within that term. Again, the tax law itself, in referring to "propaganda", ties it in to the phrase "to influence legislation", so that general political propaganda, however forceful and forthright it may be, does not deprive a foundation of its exemption. Only propaganda directed at "influencing legislation" is proscribed, and even this proscription is further weakened by the quantitative test.

*The Committee takes it as axiomatic that, whatever the defects in the tax law as it stands, foundation funds, constituting public money, should not be used for political purposes or with political bias or slant.* It is admittedly extremely difficult to draw the line between what is permissible as "educational" and what should be avoided as "political". Indeed, it may be impossible to find any legislative or regulatory way to delineate the border with clarity. This Committee offers no easy answer, but urges that the problem receive intense attention in the light of our disclosure of political activity by foundations.

*THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY.*

One of the more obvious cases of political activity disclosed by the Committee's research is that of *The League for Industrial Democracy*. This very influential foundation became the subject of litigation in 1932. Its tax-free status was questioned by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but in the case of *Weyl v. Commissioner*, 48 Fed. (2d) 811, the tax exemption was supported on the ground that the foundation was an "educational" organization. We suggest, under the facts to be related, that the Bureau should revive its study of this foundation and move against its tax exemption. To continue to grant this foundation tax exemption would create a precedent for granting tax exemption to all political parties and political organizations.

The witness who testified concerning the League was Mr. Ken Earl, a lawyer formerly on the staff of two subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee—the Subcommittee on Internal Security, and the Subcommittee on Immigration. Mr. Earl's contention was that the LID "is an adjunct of the Socialist Party," a contention which seems soundly concluded from the evidence he produced out of publications of the LID itself, and accounts of its activities and proceedings.

[Whenever in the following quotations italics appear, we have supplied them.]

Quoting from a publication of an affiliate, *The Inter-Collegiate Student Council* of the LID, Mr. Earl gave their statement of "what the LID stands for":

The L. I. D. therefore works to bring a new social order; not by thinking alone, though a high order of thought is required; not by outraged indignation, finding an outlet in a futile banging of fists against the citadel of capitalism; but by the combination of thought and action and an understanding of what is the weakness of capitalism in order to bring about socialism in our own lifetime. (Hearings, p. 740.)

The LID was originally *The Intercollegiate Socialist Society*, founded in 1905 after a call by Upton Sinclair and George H. Strobel (Hearings, p. 740) "for the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." In 1921 its name was changed to the League for Industrial Democracy. There was a mass of evidence to show that the aims were not purely socialist education, but that action, *political action*, was a purpose of the organization. The following quotation from the LID publication *Revolt* (the very name has significance) illustrates:

"The League for Industrial Democracy is a militant educational movement which challenges those who would think and act for a 'new social order based on production for use and not for profit.' That is a revolutionary slogan. It means that members of the L. I. D. think and work for the elimination of capitalism, and the substitution for it of a new order, in whose building the purposeful and passionate thinking of student and worker today will play an important part."

as well as this:

"Men and women who would change a world must blast their way through the impenetrable rock. No stewing over drinks of tea or gin, no lofty down-from-my-favorite cloud, thinking more radical thoughts than thou attitude makes a student movement or a radical movement. L. I. D. students talk and write about conditions. L. I. D. students act about them.

"\* \* \* a staff of 6 or 8 leave the Chicago or New York offices to help coordinate activities. They get into classrooms, they talk to classes. \* \* \* In addition these speakers furnish a valuable link between students and their activities later on. After graduation the work continues unabated. In city chapters, in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, the work of education and action goes on.

"The L. I. D. emergency publication, the Unemployed and Disarm, have reached a circulation of one-half million. \* \* \* Students organized squads of salesmen to sell these magazines, containing slashing attacks on capitalism and the war system, at the same time it enable the unemployed to keep alive.

"In November of this year a training school for recent graduates will be opened in New York \* \* \* to equip students by field work to perform their tasks in the labor movement. \* \* \*" (Hearings, p. 744.)

As Mr. Earl observed: "This language about recruiting and training, I think, would be more appropriate in an Army field manual than in the journal of an 'educational' association."

In the same issue of *Revolt*, PAUL R. PORTER, after using some of the cliché phrases of Stalin and Lenin, advised workers and farmers that ". . . their recourse now is to form a political party which they themselves control, and through which they might conceivably obtain state mastery over the owning class." (Hearings, p. 745.) He added these paragraphs which indicate an intention to support violent action:

"When Community Chests are more barren than Mother Hubbard's cupboard and workers begin to help themselves to necessities in stores and warehouses, when bankrupt municipalities stringently curtail normal services, then vigilante committees of businessmen, abetted by selected gangsters, might quickly and efficiently assume command of governmental functions.

"The assumption of power by vigilantes in a few key cities would quickly spread. The President (Hoover or Roosevelt) would declare a national emergency and dispatch troops to zones where vigilante rule was endangered. Probably he would create a coalition super-Cabinet composed of dominant men in finance, transportation, industry, radio, and the press, a considerable number of whom would be Reserve officers." (Hearings, p. 745.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"The bulldozing methods of the war-time Council of Defense would be employed against protesting labor groups and some individuals might be imprisoned or shot, though several 'cooperative' A. F. of L. officials might be given posts of minor responsibility."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Watch now those little flames of mass unrest \* \* \* Great energy will be generated by those flames of mass revolt. But revolt is not revolution, and even though new blankets of cruel repression fail to smother the fire and in the end only add to its intensity, *that energy may be lost unless it can be translated into purposive action.* Boilers in which steam can be generated—if we may work our metaphor—need be erected over the fire, and that steam forced into engines of reconstruction.

"Trotsky, in describing the role of the Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution, has hit upon a happy figure of speech which we may borrow in this instance. No man, no group of men, created the revolution; Lenin and his associates were but the pistons driven by the steam power of the masses. *The Marxist Bolshevik party saved that steam from aimless dissipation, directed it into the proper channels.*

*"To catch and to be driven by that steam is the function of the radical parties in America today."*

\* \* \* \* \*

"There are members who would pattern it (the Socialist Party of America) after the German Social Democracy and the British Labor Party, despite the disastrous experiences of two great parties of the Second International. There are members who have lost to age and comfort their one-time fervor, and members who would shrink from struggle in time of crisis."

\* \* \* \* \*

"They (the Socialists) must overcome the quiescent influence of those whose socialism has been dulled by intimacy with the bourgeois world, and they must speak boldly and convincingly to the American working people in the workers' language.

*"If their party can rise to these tasks then perhaps capitalism can be decently buried before it has found temporary rejuvenation in a Fascist dictatorship."* (Hearings, p. 747.)

MR. PORTER was an organizer and lecturer for the LID and a missionary to thousands of college students. (Hearings, p. 747.)

The position and objectives of the LID were made clear in an article in *Revolt* written by Felix S. Cohen, who said:

"The crucial issue of industrial civilization today is not between laissez-faire individualism on the one hand and collectivism on the other. History is deciding that question. The question for us is what sort of collectivism we want.

*"Modern technology makes collectivism inevitable. But whether our collectivism is to be Fascist, feudal, or Socialist will depend \* \* \* upon the effectiveness with which we translate those political ideals into action.*

*"You cannot fight on the economic front and stay neutral on the legal or political front. Politics and economics are not two different things, and the failures of the labor movement in this country largely arise from the assumption that they are. Capitalism is as much a legal system as it is an economic system, and the attack on capitalism must be framed in legal or political terms as well as in economic terms."*

*"\* \* \* a Socialist attack on the problem of government cannot be restricted to presidential and congressional elections or even to general programs of legislation. We have to widen our battlefield to include all institutions of government, corporations, trade unions, professional bodies, and even religious bodies, as well as legislatures and courts. We have to frame the issues of socialism and democracy and fight the battles of socialism and democracy in the stockholders' meetings of industrial corporations, in our medical associations, and our bar associations, and our teachers' associations, in labor unions, in student councils, in consumers' and producers' cooperatives—in every social institution in which we can find a foothold \* \* \*"*

\* \* \* \* \*

"But the need of fighting politically within corporations and trade associations and professional bodies, as well as labor unions, is just as pressing if we think that fundamental social change can be secured in this country only by unconstitutional measures.

"In a revolution, when the ordinary political machinery of government breaks down, it is absolutely essential that the revolutionary force control the remaining centers of social power. In Russia the success of the Bolshevik revolution rested with the guilds or soviets, which were not created by the Communist Party and which antedated the revolution. *A socialist revolution in this country will succeed only if our guilds, chief among them our engineering societies, have within them a coherent socialist voice.* (Hearings, pp. 747, 748, 749.)

We leave to the reader to judge whether such pronouncements are purely educational!

The "democratic" process was of small concern to the author of these diatribes. He said: "We do not need a majority" to deal with "the putrid mess of capitalism." (Hearings, p. 749.)

A full reading of Mr. Earl's testimony and of the many quotations from LID pamphlets and publications which he cited is necessary to understand the consistency with which action was urged by the LID spokesmen. We can only give some of them here to illustrate. The quotations from an article by Amicus Most in the December 1932 issue of *Revolt* (Record, p. 1678) is one example. From that same issue comes the following piece of "education" written by the LID Field Secretary, Mr. Porter:

"Planned as an outgrowth of the conference will be a student delegation to Washington soon after Congress convenes, to serve notice that hundreds of students will reject the role of cannon fodder in another war, to request that the State Department furnish a list of investments for which American youth may some day be called upon to fight, and to demand that money now spent in maintaining the ROTC and the CMTC be used providing relief for the unemployed." (Hearings, p. 749.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"Delegates are already making preparations to attend the traditional Christmas holiday conferences of the LID, which will be held for the 18th successive year in New York and for the 5th in Chicago. *This year's New York theme will be "Socialism in Our Time" and has been divided into three main categories, to wit: "How May Power Be Won," "Building a Power Winning Organization," and "The Morning After the Revolution." The Chicago conference will be along similar lines.*"

\* \* \* \* \*

"On Armistice Day military-minded former Senator Wadsworth \* \* \* spoke in Ithaca on behalf of a bigger Army and Navy. Members of the Cornell Liberal Club, the Socialist Party, and student peace groups held a rival meeting after which they marched with banners past the high school in which Wadsworth was speaking. Leonard Luric, Cornell LID representative, describes their gentle reception: 'Several of the Army officers rushed at us and tore down a few posters. The police joined the destruction which was over very shortly. They prodded us along the street with their stick, and Fred Berkowitz remarked, "I wonder how much the police get for hitting people \* \* \*"'

"Growing in frequency are those trips of economics and sociology classes to case illustrations, such as breadlines and strikes, of *this magnificent chaos called capitalism*. Recently students from Amherst and Mount Holyoke, under the leadership of Prof. Colston Warne, made the rounds of New York's choicest soup kitchens, and visited Brookwood Labor College<sup>18</sup> and the officers of various radical organizations." (Hearings, pp. 749, 750.)

See also the *Blueprints for Action* as quoted in the Hearings, p. 749. And this, from the same issue of *Revolt*:

"We must look ahead four years. Local elections are in a sense more important than national elections. *To measure the success of the L. I. D. is to measure the growth of Socialism in the community you are in.*" (Hearings, p. 751.)

The title of *Revolt* was changed in 1933 to *The Student Outlook*, but its nature was not altered one whit. In the first issue under the new name appeared an article by Helen Fisher reporting on the 17th New York conference of the LID:

The speeches and questions were those of participants in the building of a power-winning organization, not spectators.

*It was a conference of practical revolutionists. Both Reinhold Niebuhr and Franz Daniel ruled out the possibility of our ever attaining a Socialist commonwealth by purely parliamentary action \* \* \**

<sup>18</sup> A since dissolved Communist hot-bed!

Both felt that the change would come through the general strike or some weapon similar to it.

*In the discussion of the Day After the Revolution, Paul Blanshard stressed the necessity of presenting at least a sketch of the proposed society to those we are trying to get to fight for it. Sociolopia, according to Mr. Blanshard, would have an international government, some international battleships and airplanes, complete control of munitions, an international language and socialized ownership of industry with control by workers, technicians, and consumers. Lewis Mumford then spoke about the need for disciplining ourselves morally and intellectually the day before the revolution. (Hearings, pp. 751, 752.)*

One Alvin Coons reported, in turn, on the Chicago LID conference:

CLARENCE SENIOR, national secretary of the Socialist Party, expressed the belief that reforms would only further encumber the capitalistic system and that every concession would only hasten its end.

*Affirming his faith in democracy as an instrument of social change, he advocated its use as long as possible, not however, excluding the use of other methods should it fail.*

*"Radical students," he declared, "can spend their time more profitably getting acquainted with the problems of the workers, than they can in studying chemistry to learn how to make bombs, or in going into the ROTC to learn how to shoot. You can hardly expect to teach the workers to shoot straight for bread if you cannot teach them to vote for it". (Hearings, p. 755.)*

Is this ancient history? Has the socialist leopard changed his spots? Indeed, no. Mr. Earl quoted at length from *Freedom and the Welfare State*, the report of a symposium held by the LID on April 15, 1950. (Hearings, pp. 756, et seq., and 762, et seq.) These show that even today the League "is expending more energy in political action than in education." (Hearings, p. 756.) To repeat all these would burden this report. Suffice it to say (which a reading of the record will readily show) the symposium was essentially political in character, and was attended by many eminent political characters.

On April 11, 1953, the 48th LID Annual Luncheon was held in New York. Speakers included persons of political significance and eminence. At this point Mr. Earl was questioned regarding the alleged "leftist" nature of these personalities. Mr. Earl stated that he did not characterize these persons or their political beliefs as bad; he introduced their identities to demonstrate "the political nature of the LID, and the fact that it is constantly in the political arena. *"I am not here to judge the merits or the demerits of the program that the LID has espoused, except to say that the LID has espoused socialism, and that they are for certain things, and that being for a certain political program, for certain legislation, I think they should be plumping for it with dollars that remain after their income has been taxed."* (Hearings, p. 763.)

The political nature of this Luncheon Conference is indicated by its prepared announcement:

*At a time when the country is using up many of its natural resources at an unprecedented rate; \* \* \* when powerful lobbies are seeking to take our offshore oil resources out of the control of the Federal Government, to return the TVA to private monopoly and to prevent the further public development of the Nation's vast hydroelectric resources, and when adequate aid in the development of resources of other lands is vital to the maintenance of world democracy, it is most fitting that the LID should give its attention this year to this important problem of conservation. (Hearings, p. 765.)*

DR. HARRY LAIDLER, executive director of the LID made the political nature doubly clear. This description was given in a LID publication of Dr. Laidler's program for "democracy in action in 1953":

In presenting this program, Dr. Laidler declared that advocates of a strengthened democracy<sup>19</sup> would be confronted in 1953 with powerful opponents, well supplied with funds, and that, for the first time in 20 years, the main body of the Nation's press would be alined on the side of the party in control of our national government \* \* \*.

The description of the "program" continues. Is it educational or political?

1. Conservation of natural resources: It urged the increase of forestland public ownership and control; the retention of offshore oil by the Federal Government and the use of revenues from oil resources for educational purposes; extension of the TVA principle to other river basin developments \* \* \*

2. Social security: The program recommended that the Nation consider the enactment of a democratically operated national health insurance system \* \* \* and the strengthening of the old-age pension and unemployment insurance system \* \* \*

3. Labor legislation: \* \* \* (reorganize child labor laws)

4. Economic stability: It favored the formulation of plans for the maintenance of economic stability when defense tapers off, by means of credit controls, progressive taxation, useful public works, social-security programs, and other measures.

5. Housing: It proposed \* \* \* Federal aid for the construction annually by municipal housing authorities of a minimum of 135,000 apartments for low income and middle income groups—

6. Education: \* \* \* (Federal aid, better salaries for teachers, "freedom of inquiry," etc.)

7. Civil rights and antidiscrimination legislation: (stressed need for Federal and State FEPC laws, liberalization of our immigration laws, fair hearing to all public employees charged with un-American activities.)

8. Corruption: (Favored purge of dishonest officials.)

9. Foreign policy: The program favored, in addition to military aid, increased economic, social, and educational assistance to developed and underdeveloped countries \* \* \*

10. Labor and cooperative movements: It urged \* \* \* labor unity, the strengthening of collective bargaining \* \* \* in white collar trades. \* \* \* It likewise urged the strengthening of the consumers' and producers' cooperative movement \* \* \*

\* \* \* the league report viewed as antidemocratic trends the increased influence of such public figures as Senator McCarthy on important Senate committees; \* \* \* the increased confusion among Americans regarding what should constitute a realistic democratic foreign policy; the bitter propaganda against the United Nations which had been witnessed on all sides during the year and the continued threats of men like Governor Byrnes to destroy their State's public school system rather than abolish segregation in the public schools. (Hearings, pp. 765, 766.)

As Mr. Earl pointed out, the relative merit of these proposals is of no moment. The fact is undeniable that they are political in nature and that the LID was engaging in active politics.

He gave another example from the report on a 1952 symposium luncheon, in which August Claessen, National Chairman of the Social Democratic Federation, referred to capitalism "now so inoffensively called 'private enterprise'" as being "essentially immoral. It is a source of corruption in business and politics. Private enterprise corrupts government enterprise and the only effective steps toward the elimination of these immoral influences are the rapid extension of collectivism and the advance of the cooperative movement." (Hearings, p. 766.)

We pause here to wonder whether the American people wish to grant tax exemptions to donors to this organization whose dedicated purpose is to supplant our form of government with another. We are referring to only a few of the quotations and incidents which cannot

<sup>19</sup> Note the characterization of the Republican party as the foe of "strengthened democracy" (small "d")!

leave any doubt that the LID uses its tax-free money to promote socialism in the United States.

Many of the quotations in the record of Mr. Earl's testimony are from pamphlets sold by the LID and widely distributed. One of these pamphlets, authored by MR. LAIDLER, the Executive Director, and entitled *Toward Nationalization of Industry*, is a plea for socialization. He says:

"Under a system where the basic industries of the country are privately owned and run primarily for profit, therefore, much of the income of its wealthiest citizens bears little or no relation to their industry, ability, or productivity.

"The development of our system of private industry, furthermore, has been accompanied by attempts at autocratic controls of economic, political, and social relationships by owners and managers of our giant industries.

"Many of our great leaders of industry who have constantly and bitterly opposed the extension of Federal power and nationalization on the ground of "regimentation," for years spent much of their time in an attempt to regiment their own labor forces and, through the use of the spy system, armed guard, police, constabulary, militia, injunction, and blacklists, to prevent the workers under them from exercising their American right to organize and to bargain collectively. Laws passed during the thirties have made illegal many of these practices, but ruthless and undemocratic procedures in labor relations are still resorted to in industry after industry by the possessors of economic power. These same leaders have sought to control and regiment political organizations, the press, the platform, the pulpit, the school, and university in the city, the State, and the Nation.

"The industrialists of the Nation have frequently kept prices high and rigid, have kept wages down, have constantly chiseled on quality, and have run their businesses not for the service of the many but for the profit of the few. In many instances they have sought to involve the contry in international conflict with a view of safeguarding their investments abroad."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Our forests should be brought far more completely than at present under Federal administration \* \* \*"

\* \* \* \* \*

"The forests of the country, under private ownership, are, furthermore, cut down faster than they are restored. \* \* \* Public ownership and operation, on the other hand, would guarantee scientific forest management."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Bituminous coal mines should be brought under the control of the Federal Government. \* \* \* The condition of the industry under private control has long been chaotic."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Anthracite coal is another resource which, in the interest of the Nation, should be owned and controlled by the Federal Government."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The waste in the exploitation of our oil resources likewise necessitates further Federal control."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The Federal Government should likewise increase its control over the Nation's power resources \* \* \* Dr. Isador Lubin<sup>20</sup> some years ago suggested the creation of a Federal Power Corporation, which should have ownership not only of water-power, but of coal, oil, and natural gas, with the view of coordinating the efforts on a national scale of all of those industries which generate power."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The case for the nationalization of the railroads is a powerful one. Such ownership, in the first place, would make possible the scientific planning of the transportation industry for the entire country."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Only under Government ownership can a sensible plan be worked out. Only under such ownership can a foundation be laid for cooperation between the railroad system and busses, water transportation, airlines, trucks, and other forms of transportation, a cooperation absolutely essential to the health and welfare of the Nation's transportation system."

<sup>20</sup> Dr. Lubin, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics from 1933 until 1946, was the United States representative to the U. N. Economic and Social Council from 1946 until March of 1953.



We agree with Mr. Earl that "If this means anything at all, it means rigid government control over all forms of transportation, not just railroads. Note also the wholly unreal assumption of bureaucratic infallibility which underlies the case for continental coordination of transportation."

"Only under Government ownership will it be possible to secure enough cheap capital adequately to modernize the railroad system.

"Finally, Government ownership would serve the interests of democracy by taking this vitally necessary industry out of the grip of a mass of holding companies and financial interests intent on profits and placing it in the hands of representatives of the 150 million people in the United States. Surely an industry on which the health of the whole continent system is so dependent should not be the plaything of small groups of railroad magnates and financiers. \* \* \*" (Hearings, pp. 768, 769.)

Can there be any doubt of the political nature of these statements? MR. LAIDLER goes on arguing for public ownership of power, communications, manufacturing, banking and credit (Hearings, p. 770), and includes an advocacy of government planning of a degree which can only be called socialistic. (Hearings, p. 771.)

Mr. Earl included in his statement various passages from utterances of prominent LID members concerning Communism. Actually, while they indicate a distaste for Russian Communism as a violent force they welcome the social and economic ideas behind that Communism. (Hearings, pp. 771, et seq.) Alfred Baker Lewis, Chairman of the LID Board in 1943 suggested that the world revolution promoted by Russia was "largely a defense measure"; that the Russian seizure of part of Poland was merely to achieve a band of defense against Naziism; and that subversion is merely the Russian way of combating the aggressive war plans of the American capitalists. Note the implication in the second sentence of the following quotation that the Communist dictatorship itself is not aggressive:

"The Soviet's original attacks on the governments of the democratic nations through the Communist Parties which it set up and controlled, were defensive measures against attacks actual or expected from those capitalist nations. Russian imperialism today is the result of an act of will on the part of the Russian dictator, Stalin, and not because it is the nature of a Communist dictatorship to practice aggression upon its neighbors." (Hearings, p. 772.)

This was a Chairman of the LID speaking.

Norman Thomas, another LID Board chairman, in the pamphlet entitled *Freedom and the Welfare State*, published in 1950, includes this treasure, after asserting we must save the world through a "cooperative commonwealth":

"That cannot be done simply by the ballot in a world gone mad. Indeed, under no circumstances can the working class put its trust simply in the political democracy of which the ballot is the symbol." (Hearings, p. 773.)

Mr. Earl quoted at length from a pamphlet *Freedom From Want*, which recorded the proceedings of the LID conference of May 8, 1943, in which political discussions were paramount. (Hearings, p. 774, et seq.) Alfred Baker Lewis added his touch with this statement:

"To get freedom from want in the postwar world we must be clear that we cannot do so by reestablishing complete freedom of enterprise, the fifth freedom which ex-President Hoover and the National Association of Manufacturers want to add to the four freedoms." (Hearings, p. 778.)

George Baldanzi, Executive Vice-President of the Textile Workers Union of America contributed this treasure:

"Business and industry are looking for a solution to the problem of full employment within the framework of what they call free enterprise. What they mean, of course, is their old freedoms to exploit. *But free enterprise is drawing its last gasp.* This very war we are fighting, and the causes of the war, are indications of the breakdown of the economy of free enterprise."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Labor believes that special privilege will have to accept a planned economy, that the days of *laissez-faire* are gone with the winds of war. We believe that production will have to be geared to social need rather than to private profit."

\* \* \* \* \*

"History has shown us that full employment is not possible under a system of free enterprise. \* \* \* The free enterprisers are interested in profits, not people."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Whether it is established on the basis of democracy or on the basis of monarchy or on the basis of fascism, *the system of free enterprise inevitably leads to war.* When they dry up at home, entrenched privilege must look for them abroad. War inevitably follows, and another war will follow this war unless the leaders of the United Nations begin to think in terms of changing the economic pattern as well as the political pattern of liberated and conquered nations." (Hearings, pp. 778, 779.)

Among the other speakers was Nathaniel Minkoff of David Dubinsky's International Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU). Mr. Minkoff is this years president of the LID. He contributed this call for political action through a new party:

\* \* \* \* \*

"So much for the present. The real test will come immediately after the war, when, what with sudden deflation, demobilization and shrinkage of production, as well as with the inevitable worldwide confusion, our Nation will face the grave danger of economic collapse. Only a courageous, farsighted economic policy, based on long-range social planning, can save us from disaster. It is not my purpose now to discuss what this postwar planning should consist of nor how it should be undertaken. I merely want to stress that it is not merely an economic and social question, least of all a mere question of technical expertness. *It is primarily a political question, for even the best program in the world must remain a mere scrap of paper unless it is implemented with political power.*"

\* \* \* \* \*

"We must organize independently of old, now meaningless party affiliations into a compact and mobile force able to exert its influence where and how it will do the most good \* \* \*."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Above all we must be clear as to our social basis. What we want, I think, is a democratic coalition of all functional groups in the community with organized labor as its backbone and basis. I am not holding out to you any perfect models but, with all its faults, I think the American Labor Party of New York State is something of the sort we have in mind." (Hearings, p. 779.)

This was hardly "educational" propaganda!

Samuel Wolchok, President of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees of America, CIO, seconded this call in a speech before the Washington Chapter of LID:

There is the sharp line of cleavage as to the future of the postwar world, between the idealistic forces of the liberals on the one hand, and the blind, cruel forces of the reactionaries on the other.

\* \* \* \* \*

The reactionaries are well organized. They have power, the press, the radio, money and ruthlessness on their side. They are well-girded for battle. They are far more interested in controlling the peace than in winning the war and their energies are solely directed to that end.

\* \* \* \* \*

The solution then lies in a third party \* \* \* a party supported by trade unions and true farmers' unions, by welfare organizations, by civic bodies, and by other social-minded groups and committees \* \* \*. (Hearings, pp. 779, 780.)

Other speakers followed the same general line. Interesting also was the round table discussion of *Mobilizing our Forces, Economic, Political, Cultural, In Behalf of the New Freedom*. (Hearings, p. 779; et seq.)

In another LID pamphlet entitled *Toward a Farmer-Labor Party*, HARRY W. LAIDLER issued in 1938, expressed impatience with the Democratic Party and agitated for the formation of a new party on "liberal" lines. (Hearings, p. 781.)

Is this pamphlet educational or political?

Far more excerpts from LID publications could be given to show the essential political character of the organization and that its efforts were directed to influence legislation. See, for example, the discussion of the LID annual conference in New York in April 1951, at Hearings, pp. 781, 782, et seq. The final session of this conference was given over to "consideration of labor political action." Mr. Robert Bendiner, for example, urged:

"Labor should aim at political action that would not be confined to a narrow program of wages and hours, but would be directed to the achievement of public welfare in the broadest sense. Labor should show more and more independence than has been hitherto the case." (Hearings, p. 784.)

There had earlier been a discussion on the subject, *How Free is Free Enterprise*. (Hearings, pp. 768, et seq.)

With these words of Mr. Earl at the end of his presentation, this Committee heartily agrees:

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, let me say that in this presentation I do not quarrel with the right of these many people in the LID, and all of those who have been recipients of its awards or have spoken to it, and I don't quarrel with their people, to say and write the things which we have discussed, though I disagree with many of the things which they advocate.

*My thesis is this: If the LID is to continue to fill the air with propaganda concerning socialism; if it is to continue stumping for certain legislative programs; and if it is to continue to malign the free enterprise system under which we operate—then I believe that it should be made to do so with taxed dollars, just as the Democrats and the Republicans are made to campaign with taxed dollars.* (Hearings, p. 785.)

We urge the Bureau of Internal Revenue to read Mr. Earl's entire prepared statement and all of the long list of LID pamphlets which he submitted in evidence and left with the Committee.

DR. LAIDLER, as Executive Director of the *League for Industrial Democracy* filed a statement with this Committee which is in the record. It is an attempt (1) to show that this socialist organization is no longer socialist and (2) that it is essentially an educational organization. As to the first contention, that it is no longer "socialist", we might grant that it is now "collectivist" if that distinction is in any way helpful. Few of its members, associates and officers may be members of the Socialist Party, but the fact is that very few socialists now belong to the Party. Norman Thomas, so long its leader, has ceased to hope that the Party would continue to be an effective vehicle for the promotion of socialism. The socialist movement is now in substance outside the Party.

As to the second contention, that the organization is essentially an educational institution, it is difficult to reconcile this claim with the literature it has produced, the nature of its meetings and conferences and the identity of the persons associated with it. *We might grant the organization an educational character of a kind—that it is an organization to educate the public into the advantages of over-*

throwing our society and substituting a collectivism for it. If that is properly educational, to entitle it to receive donations with tax exemption to the donors, something is very wrong with the law.

ANOTHER SPECIFIC INSTANCE OF CLEAR POLITICAL USE: THE AMERICAN LABOR EDUCATION SERVICE.

The American Labor Education Service is a foundation presumably engaged in the "education" of "labor." Its activities seem, however, to have trespassed the borders of political propaganda and political action.

The background of some ALES staff members, together with a list of participants in ALES conferences suggests an interlock with individuals and groups associated with militant socialism and, in some instances, with Communist fronts.

ELEANOR C. ANDERSON (Mrs. Sherwood Anderson) is listed in the 1938 ALES report as its treasurer and as a director. Among its other officers have been—

MAX LERNER, a former treasurer and director,

J. RAYMOND WALSH, a director and vice chairman up to at least 1948,

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN, a director until his death in 1953.

All these have a record of Communist front affiliation which will be found in the Appendix to this Report.

An analysis of some of the activities of ALES is included in the record at page 727 *et seq.*, and is worth careful reading. Various conferences have been held by the organization. The Washington's Birthday Workers' Education Conference sponsored annually by ALES was originally started at BROOKWOOD LABOR COLLEGE in 1924 under the auspices of a local of the AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS. This association did not bode too well, for BROOKWOOD COLLEGE was denounced by the American Federation of Labor in 1928 as an "incubator of Communists."

At various ALES conferences, political subjects received prominent attention. Nor were they studied merely from an educational angle. An October 2, 1946 invitation to attend a conference at Milwaukee stated:

"The topic for this year's discussion is a timely one 'How can Workers' Education Advance Labor's Economic and Political Objectives'.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "At the dinner, we shall consider *methods labor must use when collective bargaining does not work, especially methods of dealing with the government.*" [Emphasis ours.]

Among the subjects of the 1947 ALES Mid-West Workers' Education Conference, were "*Political Action for Labor*"; and a work-shop project—"Political Action Techniques." The Conference at the *New School for Social Research* in February, 1950, discussed: "*The Contribution of Labor in Rebuilding Democratic Society*" and "*The Role of Workers' Education in Political Action.*" Similar to a Mid-West Conference in November, 1948, the 1950 Conference strongly stressed "the urgency of participation in political action by labor, and the re-evaluation of education in relation to political action." Nor was political action to be confined to the domestic field at ALES conferences. "International affairs" for labor received much attention, as did foreign policy and the desirability of labor participating in establishing foreign policy. ALES even operates a Philadelphia Center for leadership training in world affairs.

"Joint farmer-labor action" receives frequent attention. "Action", as used, presumably means action, the building up of political pressure. In other words, labor is not being merely educated in facts, issues and principles, but is being urged to take action, sometimes in association with other groups and sometimes by itself, for political goals. Is that "education" of the type entitling the ALES to tax exemption? If it is, there is something wrong with the law which permits tax-exempt money to be used for propaganda to induce political pressure. The 1953 Report of ALES says that it has, in recent years, given special attention to "areas of work where the labor movement believes that, through education, responsible *action might be strengthened*. Action, action, action—education for action—is the keynote of the ALES program. This includes inducing "white collar workers" to join the labor movement (1953 Report, p. 11). It also includes giving attention to

*"the legislative and political scene in Washington; with special emphasis on legislative and community action carried on by organized labor."*

Among the materials used by the ALES for its "educational" service, are a series of pamphlets "for Workers' Classes." These include *Toward a Farmer-Labor Party* by HARRY W. LAIDLER (whom we have met as executive director of *The League for Industrial Democracy*, which published this pamphlet) as well as other publications of the LID. One pamphlet is of a nature which would bring on a smile, were the orientation not so serious. It is called "*Fordism*"; it should bring pleasure to the hearts of those in the Ford Foundation who were responsible for contributing very substantial sums of public money to ALES, through its *Fund for Adult Education*.

These pamphlets were listed in an *Annotated List*, a 45 page brochure, in 1938 and sold by ALES. The brochure also includes a list, with a synopsis of each, of plays which are recommended by production by labor groups in order to improve the "education" of labor. Many of these deserve special attention. They are calls to *action*, indeed! Two of them were sponsored by the HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL of Monteagle, Tenn., directed by Myles Horton and James A. Dombrowski, officers of and two of the leading lights in THE SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE—an organization officially cited as a Communist front. The HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL received large sums of money from the Robert Marshall Foundation. Many were recommended by the BROOKWOOD LABOR COLLEGE, upon which we have already commented. Sponsored by the Southern Summer School, was *Bank Run* and *Job-Hunting*, and *On The Picket Line*, none of which were intended to improve the relationship of labor with the capitalistic system.

A treasure is *Black Pit* by ALBERT MALTZ (who was cited by the House of Representatives on October 24, 1947, for contempt of Congress and subsequently served a jail term) which ALES describes as follows:

"A miner, framed because of union activity, after coming out of jail, attempts to find work but is blacklisted everywhere because of union record. Is driven to accept position as stool pigeon. Requires convincing use of Slavic dialect and intelligent direction."

Another MALTZ masterpiece is *Rehearsal*, recommended highly by ALES; it has to do with the Detroit auto strike. And there are

many more treasures in the recommended list of plays. There is *The Maker of Swords* which, laid in an imaginary country, shows what mischief munitions makers can do. And *Blocks* (sponsored by the Vassar Experimental Theatre) is described as:

"A powerful satire in which Green Worker and Tan Worker symbolize all the masses forced unwillingly to war, while the Green Man and the Tan Man symbolize all the leaders, generals, and capitalists making war without engaging in it." [Emphasis ours.]

Two plays from Soviet Russia are included in the list, which seem to be adulatory of the efforts of the Communists to improve the lot of the Russian peasant.

In 1942 ALES published *Songs Useful for Workers' Groups*. This includes "Socialist and Labor Songs", some of them revolutionary works translated from foreign languages, including the Russian. Some are set to "stirring original music" by HANS EISLER, that notable Communist. There is also a *Rebel Song Book* on the list.

The reader is referred to the material in the record (page 727, *et seq.*) for further examples of the incitement to action and the indications that "education" as recommended by ALES consists largely of creating class hatred and animosity against the free enterprise system.

One person associated with ALES deserves some special attention. He is MARK STARR, its Vice-Chairman. MR. STARR has also been Chairman of the LID. His interlockings are rather extensive. He is Director of Education of the ILGWU, and a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. He has been appointed to responsible policy position in the field of education; as labor consultant to Elmer Davis' Office of War Information (OWI); as a member of the American delegation to establish UNESCO; as a labor education consultant to the American military government in Japan; and as a member of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education. He has also been chairman of the Public Affairs Committee. Let us, then, examine into MR. STARR's philosophy of education to see whether an organization with which he is intimately connected in policy making deserves foundation support.

MR. STARR'S *Labor Looks at Education*, published by the LID in 1947, not only makes no distinction between education and propaganda, but affirmatively approves of the latter. There must be purpose in education, he indicates, and his own purpose is made quite clear:

"A new philosophy of education is striving to be born—a planned community to replace the jerry-built dwellings produced by the haphazard efforts of the past."

He expresses sympathy with the efforts of Marx and Veblen to "blast away the intellectual girders supporting the modern economic system."

MR. STARR has been a heavy beneficiary of largess from the *Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education*. But he has his own opinions about foundations. He says that "*colleges too often have to go cap-in-hand and exploit personal contacts with the uncrowned kings and agents of philanthropy \* \* \* There are, of course some foundations which delouse effectively the millions accumulated by monopolies and dynastic fortunes; but if one could choose a way for the long time support of education, it would be done by community intelligence rather than the caprice of the big shots of big business who wish to perpetuate their names*

*in a spectacular fashion, a process which may not in all cases coincide with the real educational activity of the college."*

Education must be used to cure the social ills. Workers' education, in particular, is necessary to "the end of group action." His general thesis is that labor unions and their leaders have a monopoly on patriotism, while Congress, business and everybody else are selfish. Political science and civics courses should so indoctrinate students. (For an example, see pp. 41-42, of "*Labor Looks at Education.*")

Another ALES director is HILDA SMITH, who has been noted for her questionable connections both by the Dies Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The controversial Director of Workers' Education of the Works Progress Administration, who was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, another organization officially cited to be a Communist front.

Adult education for the so-called "working man" is a truly worthy objective, and its conduct through unions is highly desirable. But this is no mere "education" which is being given by the *American Labor Education Service*. It is incitement to political action and breeding of class hatred. As such, it is neither a proper function for a foundation which enjoys tax-exemption nor does it entitle other foundations to give it support.

#### *THE TWENTIETH CENTURY FUND*

This foundation gives a good example of carelessness in selecting foundation manpower by ignoring radical political bias. This Committee assumes it was carelessness. If the persons discussed below were integrated with the *Fund's* work with a full understanding of their identities, and an intention to use them because they had exhibited strong, radical political bias, our criticism would be far sharper.

*The Twentieth Century Fund* was founded in 1919 by the late Edward H. Filene of Boston. Its purpose is "the improvement of economic, industrial, civic and educational conditions," but the 1951 report of the *Fund* indicates that it has confined itself to economic fields. Apparently, since 1937, the *Fund* has made no grants to others but has acted as an operating unit within itself.

The *Fund* (says its 1951 report) purposely selects subjects for research and study which are "controversial \* \* \* since controversy is an index of importance and since the *Fund's* impartial professional approach is clearly of most value to the public just where controversy is sharpest."

This Committee has not been able to study the work of the *Fund* in detail and can offer no opinion as to the extent that the *Fund* has, in fact, been impartial. It is impressed, however, with the fact that some of the key men associated with the *Fund* have records which would not indicate that they would be likely to give impartial treatment to any subject having political implications. It is, of course, theoretically possible for even a Communist to do an impartial economic study; but it is our opinion that a foundation which selects persons of known radical political opinion risks the misuse of the public money which the foundation's funds represent.

For many years EVANS CLARK was Executive Director of the *Fund* and as such wielded considerable influence. While he no longer

holds that position, he is still a trustee of the *Fund*. Prior to 1920 MR. CLARK was director of the Department of Information, *Bureau of the Representative in the United States of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic*. In 1920, the RAND SCHOOL, well-recognized as a radical institution, published MR. CLARK'S book, *Facts and Fabrications about Soviet Russia*. It is an ardent defense of things Russian and Communist and ridicules the criticism levelled at them. MR. CLARK has been cited a number of times both by the Dies Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

It might be that he has since modified his opinions, and perhaps he has. Perhaps he no longer supports Soviet Russia. But we note that he is the husband of FRIEDA KIRCHWEY, well-known as an extreme radical, whose citations by the Dies Committee and the Un-American Activities Committee are almost monumental. We do not mean to imply "guilt by association," but recite the facts to indicate that the general atmosphere surrounding MR. CLARK would not have recommended him for selection as the Executive Director of an "impartial" foundation active in the politically-charged field of economics.

The Editor of the *Fund's* publications is one, GEORGE SOULE. Mr. Soule was cited by the Dies Committees, and his record is among those in the Appendix to this Report. Should a man with the radical opinions proved by his record be "editor of publications" in a foundation dedicated to the public welfare?

Among the other trustees of the *Fund* are: BRUCE BLIVEN, ROBERT S. LYND, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS all of whom have been cited by congressional committees and their records appear in the Appendix to this Report.

The Twentieth Century Fund has published many of the works of STUART CHASE, whose political bias is discussed in section VIII of this report.

That one officer or one trustee of a foundation may have been cited 10, 15, 20, or more times by a Congressional Committee investigating subversive activities, for his associations and his affiliations with Communist Fronts, may not thereby establish the legal proof required in a court of law that he is a card carrying member of the Communist Party itself; but it would seem to this Committee that such a record would be conclusive evidence that such person was an extreme radical or a complete dupe and has no business serving in a position of trust.

Such an individual would most certainly be tagged as a security risk by any agency of the Government under past or present loyalty standards and dismissed. Tax Exempt Foundations should be no less exact in their standards of loyalty to the United States and our American institutions.

*That several such persons should be actively and importantly associated with a public trust, TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS, spending millions of dollars in public money is, in our considered opinion, highly improper and exhibits an utter lack of responsibility by foundation trustees and directors in the discharge of their duties.*

#### THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

An example of the danger that a great foundation may use its public trust funds for political purposes or with political effect is to



be found in the creation of *The Fund for the Republic* as an offshoot of *The Ford Foundation*.

Mr. Paul Hoffman, Chairman of the *Fund*, filed a statement with the Committee (included in the record) on behalf of the *Fund* "because", he stated, "Representative Reece's speech of July 27, 1953, now a part of the record of the 'investigation',<sup>21</sup> contains references to the *Fund*, and to me personally which, in the interests of accuracy and fairness, require comment." Mr. Hoffman denies that there is any basis "whatsoever for the charge that *The Fund for the Republic* was established to attack Congress." He asks "that the Committee will refer" to "documents and data requested by the Special Committee" which have been supplied, "rather than to the Reece speech for the facts." We shall, in deference to Mr. Hoffman's request, refrain from quoting Mr. Reece and shall use, in this discussion, principally material supplied by *The Ford Foundation* and *The Fund for the Republic* themselves.

The aggregate donation of *The Ford Foundation* to its offspring, created for the purpose, was \$15,000,000. This is a rather large sum of money, even for the gigantic *Ford Foundation*. After all, that foundation's principal assets are in stock of the Ford Company. Its cash resources are pretty much limited to its income of something over \$31,000,000 per year. Thus about half a year's gross income of earnings of the Ford Motor Company was allotted to *The Fund for the Republic*. While *The Fund for the Republic* is presumably under independent management, its Chairman is Mr. Paul Hoffman, who was formerly Chairman of *The Ford Foundation* and who was appointed to head the *Fund* upon his resignation from *The Ford Foundation*.

The first President of *The Fund* was Clifford P. Case, who apparently resigned from Congress to take the job. Mr. Case had made clear while in Congress that he was a severe critic of some Congressional investigations. Recently, Mr. Case resigned from his post with *the Fund* to run for the Senate from New Jersey. His first major speech in his campaign made clear that he is a violent "anti-McCarthyite". We do not object to his taking a strong position in this area; we point out, however, that his public utterances have hardly characterized him as objective in his approach.

Mr. Case's successor is Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, who resigned from a directive post in *The Ford Foundation* to take this new position. Dr. Hutchins' ideas on Congressional investigations are too well known to need any elaboration, as, indeed, are those of Mr. Hoffman. As *The Fund for the Republic* has as one of its purposes an investigation of Congressional investigations, it does not seem to this Committee that the trio of Hoffman, Case and Hutchins was well selected in the interests of objectivity.

Only a small part of the capital of the *Fund* has been spent to date. One of its grants was to the *American Bar Association* for studies relating to "civil rights" and Congressional investigations. The implication is given by the statement filed on behalf of the *Fund for the Republic* by Mr. Hoffman that this is the sum total of its expected activities in the Congressional investigation area. We are inclined to wonder, however, whether the presence of this current investiga-

<sup>21</sup> Putting "investigation" in quotes was an intended insult to this Committee. Mr. Hoffman's statement is, of course, directly insulting to the Chairman of the Committee.

tion by a Congressional Committee has not acted as a deterrent and kept the *Fund* (perhaps only for the moment) from launching an independent "study" of its own. We italicize the word "study"; the evidence persuades us that it would not be a mere study but an attack on Congressional committee methods.

At the time *The Fund for the Republic* was publicly announced stories began to circulate to the effect that it had been created to "investigate Congressional investigations." This rumor has been denied by *The Ford Foundation* and by *The Fund for the Republic*. Yet the conclusion is difficult to avoid that such was, indeed, one of its purposes.

*The Fund for the Republic* was allegedly formed in furtherance of a program of the parent organization as follows:

"The Foundation will support activities directed toward the elimination of restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression in the United States, and the development of policies and procedures best adapted to protect these rights in the face of persistent international tension . . .

"The maintenance of democratic control over concentrations of public and private power, while at the same time preserving freedom for scientific and technological endeavor, economic initiative, and cultural development.

"The strengthening of the political processes through which public officers are chosen and policies determined, and the improvement of the organizations and administrative procedures by which governmental affairs are conducted.

"The strengthening of the organization and procedures involved in the adjudication of private rights and the interpretation and enforcement of law.

"Basic to human welfare is general acceptance of the dignity of man. This rests on the conviction that man is endowed with certain unalienable rights and must be regarded as an end in himself, not as a cog in the mechanics of society or a mere means to some social end. At its heart, this is a belief in the inherent worth of the individual and the intrinsic value of human life. Implicit in this concept is the conviction that society must accord all men equal rights and equal opportunity. Human welfare requires tolerance and respect for individual, social, religious, and cultural differences, and for the varying needs and aspirations to which these differences give rise. It requires freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, and freedom of association. Within wide limits, every person has a right to go his own way and to be free from interference or harassment because of nonconformity."

That the words "*The Foundation will support activities directed toward*" carries the significance of supporting political action or political movements, might fairly be concluded. The contrary has certainly not been made clear in the quoted statement. But the paragraph from which this phrase is taken proceeds: "the elimination of restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression in the United States \* \* \*." What "restrictions" exist in the United States on "freedom of thought"—in fact, what restrictions could conceivably ever be placed anywhere on the freedom to *think*—is a question indeed! The use of the phrase, "freedom to think," one tossed about emotionally by those who falsely call themselves "liberals," does not indicate the sober reflection which one would expect of the managers of public trust funds, but rather an acceptance of the current "liberal" "line".

As to the other restrictions mentioned, it is not difficult to draw the conclusion that Federal loyalty procedures and Congressional investigating activities are intended to come within the compass of the *Fund's* studies. Moreover, political-action significance may well be attached to the rest of the section from which we have quoted.

The second paragraph of the quoted material seems to us either "double-talk" or an advocacy of expanded government control of

industry and business. The third paragraph has political intention if it means what it says. The fourth paragraph is more difficult to understand but seems political. The fifth paragraph contains some admirable material, the significance of which in its context escapes us.

A report of the President of *The Ford Foundation* of October, 1951, stating the purposes for which *The Fund for the Republic* is to be created, says the *Fund* is to take into account: "The danger to the national security arising from fear and mutual suspicion fomented by short-sighted or irresponsible attempts to combat Communism through methods which impair the true sources of our strength." This language, taken in the general context of other statements by *The Ford Foundation* and its off-shoot, *The Fund for the Republic*, cannot mean anything else than that the *Fund* shall attack the Congressional investigations. *It is not wording which indicates an objective point of view. It does not indicate a fair study of pros and cons and a sensible weighing of evidence. It states its bias in advance; it heralds an attack.* The wording used is reminiscent of much similar language used by those who claim that these investigations impair our freedom and thus fight Communism with weapons which are destructive of our society.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the President of *The Ford Foundation*, in making this statement, had in mind a severely critical study of Congressional investigations, and that he starts with the bias that the investigations are "short-sighted" and "irresponsible".

The purpose of *The Fund for the Republic* becomes clearer in the face of a recitation in a report signed by its Chairman, Mr. Hoffman, and made to *The Ford Foundation*. This report recites the "areas of action" which have been chosen for the *Fund*. While it is stated that these are free "from implications of political or legislative activity or propaganda", the list is:

- "1. restrictions and assaults upon academic freedom;
- "2. due process and equal protection of the laws;
- "3. the protection of the rights of minorities;
- "4. censorship, boycotting and blacklisting activities of private groups;
- "5. principle and application of guilt by association."

The report goes on to state:

"The following subjects are also possible subjects for consideration: *the scope and procedure of Congressional investigations; investigation of the loyalty of government employees: \* \* \* and national loyalty of international civil servants.*" [Emphasis ours.]

*The Fund for the Republic was created for the purpose, among others, of investigating Congressional investigations. Whether this is a proper field for the private expenditure of public trust funds is a question we submit to Congress and the people. We conclude that it was the intention of those who were responsible for the creation of the Fund for the Republic to use it, in part, to launch an attack upon Congressional investigations. This strikes us as a wholly unjustifiable use of the public's money.*

*If a "study" of Congressional practices could be made in an unbiased fashion, it might well be of great usefulness, even to Congress itself. But the power of great sums of money thrown into political fields can be very dangerous, indeed. It would have to be administered with the greatest care and objectivity; those into whose hands the expenditure of the appro-*

propriated funds is thrown would have to be selected for unquestioned lack of bias. The publicly expressed opinions of Messrs. Hoffman, Hutchins and Case on some of the subject matters within the expressed scope of activity of the Fund for the Republic, particularly in regard to Congressional investigations, are too well known to permit the conclusion that the public was to be assured of an objective study.

The entry of *The Ford Foundation* into the area of "civil liberties" is, in the opinion of this Committee, highly regrettable. The "civil liberties" issue has been called "one of the great phonies of American politics" by Harold Lord Varney in an *American Mercury* article, entitled *The Egg-head Clutch on the Foundation*. Mr. Varney said that *The Ford Foundation* should have known that under the "high-flown phrases" of the "civil rights" issue, "pro-Communists, muddled liberals and designing pressure groupists scheme constantly to maintain a Left Wing balance of power in America."

In closing this discussion of one Ford venture into politics, we must note this sentence in the *Fund for the Republic's* release to the newspapers, dated February 26, 1953:

"We propose to help restore respectability to individual freedom."

*This astonishing sentence is obviously a product of the "red herring" and "witch hunt" school of political philosophy. It is an understatement to describe the quoted sentence as arrogant, presumptuous and insulting.*

#### OTHER "CIVIL LIBERTIES" PROJECTS

Grants have been made by other foundations in the same general area referred to loosely as "civil liberties". *The Rockefeller Foundation*, for example, refers in its 1947 and 1948 annual reports to a study by Cornell University of loyalty measures, civil liberties, etc., which it had financed. Statements such as this are to be found in the reports: "Nevertheless, it is an important task of political democracy to reconcile, if possible, the claims of national security and civil liberties." Such statements seem to us pretty closely to follow the *Anti-Anti-Communist* line. It is utterly surprising to us that so much greater attention is given to attacks on those who attack Communism than to the basic problem of subversion itself.

The following quotation from an address made by J. Edgar Hoover to the *Daughters of the American Revolution* on April 22, 1954, is apt in this connection:

"In taking a stand for the preservation of the American way of life, your organization became the target of vile and vicious attacks. So have all other patriotic organizations and, for that matter, every other person who has dared to raise his voice against the threat of Communism. It is an established fact that whenever one has dared to expose the Communist threat he has invited upon himself the adroit and skilled talents of experts of character assassination. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has stood year after year as taunts, insults and destructive criticism have been thrown its way.

"To me, one of the most unbelievable and unexplainable phenomena in the fight on Communism is the manner in which otherwise respectable, seemingly intelligent persons, perhaps unknowingly, aid the Communist cause more effectively than the Communists themselves. *The pseudo liberal can be more destructive than the known Communist because of the esteem which his cloak of respectability invites.*" [Emphasis ours.]

Mr. Hoover might well agree that the danger of this pseudo-liberalism is all the greater when the "cloak of respectability" it wears is eminent office in the foundation world. We regret to say that this pseudo-liberalism is not uncommon among the executives

of the great foundations and their intermediary organizations. We regard as unfortunately typical, the address made in 1953 by Mr. Pendleton Herring, now President of *The Social Science Research Council*, to *The American Political Science Association*, of which he was then President. After a discussion of the position and work of the political scientist in America, and after emphasizing the necessity of empirical approaches and of observing the cultural lag theory, he launched into a tirade in the "civil rights" area.

Let us re-quote for guidance, the words of Mr. Hoover—"It is an established fact that whenever one has dared to expose the Communist threat he has invited upon himself the adroit and skilled talents of experts in character assassination." Let us then quote from Mr. Herring's address, made under the cloak of office in *two tax-exempt organizations* supported heavily with the public's money through foundation grace. He speaks of "political quacks" who ask "careers for themselves through exploitation of public concern with the Communist contagion." He does not identify any one man against whom he may have some special animus. His terminology, his selection of phrase, condemns as "quacks" whoever try to expose Communists. He makes no exceptions. He does not exempt from his excoriation any Congressional investigators or investigation. He indicates that investigating Communists may, indeed, be worse than Communism. He repeats the hysterical claim that books have been "burned." How many and how often? Is there truly danger in the United States of "book burning?" He speaks of giving "cool, intelligent treatment" to "the transmission of erroneous information and propaganda"—is it not transmitting "erroneous information and propaganda" to infer that there is widespread "book burning" in this country!

He uses the term "witchdoctors" to characterize the whole breed of exposers of Communism. He speaks of "contrived excursions and alarms"—implying that the Communist menace has been grossly exaggerated for political reasons. He refers to the whole exposure business as "MALARKYISM", putting it in capital letters. He gives us this profound comment upon our concern with the Communist menace:

"We must go from symptoms to the causes. A deep cause, I think, is a failure to understand the forces operating in the world around us. Why do so many Americans feel threatened? It is the stubborn complexity of world problems and the difficulties arising from ideological differences and international rivalries that lead them to seek scapegoats among their fellow-countrymen."

That is an astounding statement to come from one of the top rank of those who disburse the public money which foundations control. "You poor dumb Americans", he might well have said, "you are afraid of the Russian-Communists only because you do not understand the dears."

Mr. Herring says: "Why assume that the conspiracy of Communism is best exposed where the limelight shines brightest?" He forgets that it has frequently taken a glaring limelight to induce government officials to expose a Communist—witness, among many, the case of Harry Dexter White.

Another example of the "cloak of respectability" (to which Mr. J. Edgar Hoover referred) through eminence in the foundation world, is to be found in public utterances of Mr. Paul Hoffman, formerly

Chairman of the Ford Foundation and now Chairman of its offspring, the Fund for the Republic. In an article *To Insure the End of Our Hysteria* in the New York Times Magazine Section of November 14, 1954, Mr. Hoffman referred to the California Senate Un-American Activities Committee as a "highly publicized witch hunt."

*THE SLANT OF THE "CONCENTRATION"*

There are many foundations whose activities deserve the detailed attention which our limitations of time and money prevented giving. Some show strong indications of transgressing the border of political action, whether to the left or the right. In the political area, however, we have felt obliged to confine ourselves chiefly to the major foundations and to the "clearing houses" associated in what we have referred to as a "concentration of power".

We cannot escape the conclusion that some of the major foundations, in association with the operating, intermediary associations, have been turned substantially to the left and have supported slanted material having a leftist propaganda character.

It is difficult to realize that great funds established by such conservative individuals as Rockefeller, Carnegie and Ford have been turned strongly to the left. It appears to have happened largely through a process of administrative infiltration and through the influence of academic consultants of leftist tendencies.

The trustees of these foundations, with a few possible exceptions, could not have intended this result. It seems to us that it must have happened through their lack of understanding of what was developing, or through negligence.

What seems most unfortunate, however, is that the foundations have been so rarely willing to admit an error, or the seriousness of it. They assert that they are entitled to reasonable error, as, indeed, they are—for all human institutions are susceptible of mistake. But the individual instance of error is generally defended, instead of being frankly admitted. This Committee has found this to be true in examining the statements filed by some of the foundations. Rarely is there to be found a candid confession of error. The impression is given that only minor errors have occurred, and without specification.

This Committee would feel more encouraged about the willingness of foundation trustees fully to discharge their fiduciary duties if they would, occasionally, repudiate expressly some venture which has gone wrong. The statement filed by *The Rockefeller Foundation*, for example, says that "If in rare instances the recipient of a grant has departed from" the high standards which the foundation has set for itself, "this has not been done with the consent or approval of our organization." But *how many of such cases of "departure" from high standards has the Foundation itself repudiated or publicly criticized?*

One clue to the apparently strong leftist movement of some of the foundations was given by Professor Colegrove in his testimony. He said: "Curiously enough, people are sometimes much more interested in pathology,<sup>22</sup> in disease, than they are interested in the healthy body." He continued:

\* \* \* I think there has been unfortunately a tendency on the part of the foundations to promote research that is pathological in that respect, that is point-

<sup>22</sup> During the hearings the ranking minority member of the Committee remarked that the Committee itself was too interested in pathology, concerning itself only with criticism, instead of applying itself to the admittedly fine things for which foundations have been responsible. The Committee submits that its work must necessarily deal with the pathological. A Congressional Committee, by the very nature of its investigative function, must be chiefly concerned to find out what is wrong in the area under study.

ing out the bad aspects of American government, American politics, American society, and so on, instead of emphasizing the good aspects.

Upon being asked whether research had not been used as a "cloak for reform; that there has been this conscious movement to reform our society; and that that has sometimes taken a distinctly radical trend?" he replied:

Yes. Undoubtedly. If you are going to study the pathological aspects, the natural tendency of human nature—we are getting back to human nature, of course—is to find out how to cure it, how to alleviate it, and so on. And if the foundations contribute overmuch to pathological studies, and not sufficiently to the studies with reference to the soundness of our institutions, there would be more conclusions on the pathological side than there would be conclusions on the sounder traditional side of American government, American history, and so on. That would inevitably follow. (Hearings, p. 577.)

Professor Colgrove added that the pathological approach had fastened itself on the concentration of power which the close association of the major foundations and the intermediary organizations represents. This research concentration, he said, directed its work distinctly "to the left." He also saw a tendency to believe that the "conservative" is against progress, saying that "for years and years there has been a tendency in the American classroom \* \* \* to think that intellectualism and liberalism or radicalism were synonymous; but if a person was conservative, like Edmund Burke, he was not an intellectual." (Hearings, p. 572.)

The Committee gives great weight to the testimony of Professor Colegrove, an eminent professor of political science and for eleven years Secretary and Treasurer of the *American Political Science Association*. We were interested, therefore, in his discussion of the probable effect of certain individuals on the swing to the left. He opined, for example, that John Dewey had promoted the movement very strongly, and that another propellant had been Professor Beard who became infected with Fabianism in England and brought back to the United States an enthusiasm for ideas which were distinctly Marxian. Professor Colgrove continued that Professor Beard had exercised a great influence on political scientists and historians—he was "the idol of our political scientists." He noted sadly that, after Beard had changed his political attitude late in life, he was hissed when he made an address before the *American Political Science Association*—"Apparently because he had become a little anti-New Deal, and partly because he opposed bitterly the foreign policy of the New Deal." (Hearings, pp. 572, 573.)

#### *A CARNEGIE CORPORATION EXAMPLE.*

It has been a convenience to some foundations to take the position that they are not responsible for the results of their grants. If the grantee turns out something radical—well, the foundation can say it did not feel warranted in supervising the work and holds no responsibility for what was produced. This Committee suspects that this may sometimes be an evasion—that the identity of the grantee might well have predicted the result; yes, that the foundation, in many such instances, expected it. Certainly that must have been the case in the instance of the grant by the *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* to PROFESSOR ROBERT A. BRADY. In 1934 no congressional investigations had mentioned the name of PROFESSOR ROBERT A. BRADY, and the *Foundation* cannot be held accountable for making

the initial grant. However, once the manuscript of the book had been read and its theme demonstrated, this Committee is of the opinion that no justification of further grants to this individual can be advanced by the *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching*. The "Acknowledgments" in BRADY'S *Business as a System of Power*, published in 1943, recites that his work was made possible by a *Carnegie* grant in 1934; it also states that a "more recent grant \* \* \* makes possible prompt publication of this book by the Columbia University Press. I am deeply grateful not only for the financial assistance given by the *Foundation*, but also for the keen and sustained interest of Dr. Frederick Keppel and his associates in the work as it has been developed." Dr. Keppel was President of the *Foundation*.

The thesis of this *Carnegie*-supported book is that the structure of capitalistic enterprise is incompatible with democratic government. It is asserted repeatedly or implied that Big Business is a greater threat to freedom than Nazi Germany. In a Foreword by PROFESSOR ROBERT S. LYND (the first Permanent Secretary of *The Social Science Research Council*, a trustee of the *Twentieth Century Fund*, and a man with Communist-front affiliations) he says:

"In this book Dr. Brady cuts through to the central problem disrupting our world, the most dangerous issue democracy faces. This problem is not basically created by Adolf Hitler and the Axis nations, but by the organized economic power backing the Hitlers in nation after nation over the industrial world as a device for shoring up for yet a while longer a disintegrating economic system."

He says, further:

"\* \* \* capitalistic economic power constitutes a direct, continuous and fundamental threat to the whole structure of democratic authority everywhere and always."

and adds:

"Under such a distorted view of democracy [the American System] in which the state and society are nothing and the individual everything, democracy has become increasingly identified with the protection of one's personal affairs: and this has steadily sapped its vitality."

Both DR. BRADY and DR. LYND repeatedly point to Big Business as an essential evil. It is the "great corporations" which account for much of our mischief. And "industrial capitalism is an intensely coercive form of organization of society" from which great evils flow. Emotionalism is shown in such descriptive phrases as "Anglo-American feudal monopoly control"—LYND points this out as a fascist objective of American Big Business.

"In the United States, the present stage of organized, centralized business power, already reaching out in control of schools, media of communication, public opinion and government itself, provides more than a broad hint of the direction events will take, if present tendencies remain unchecked."

Can it be mere chance or accident that foundations like *The Carnegie Corporation* and the *Carnegie Foundation* have so frequently supported the radical thinkers in the United States? DR. LYND predicts in his book that "We shall emerge from this war well on our way to having a permanently planned and managed economy \* \* \*." And, he warns, if this is to be controlled by "business", then "all relevant social and cultural life" will be controlled. The fresh, growing shoots of new life in our American culture will either be destroyed or ruthlessly grafted to the main trunk." DR. BRADY says it is "now truly inescapable" that government "is to be the coordinator" of economic forces, but



he worries for fear this may not reflect what the people want but "the specialized interests of self-assertive and authoritarian minority groups." (p. 6)

*The National Association of Manufacturers* is one of his *betes noire*, which, he predicted, would resort to all sorts of pressures and propaganda to achieve political as well as social and cultural domination of American society. (pp. 193, 198) And, in this effort, *the National Industrial Conference Board* was to be its intelligence agency and ministry of propaganda. (p. 205) The concentration of power through that thing which DR. BRADY deems detestable, "self-government" in business, "would seem on all the evidence, to date, to lead directly to autarchy and the companion use of the government for the purpose of suppressing antagonistic social elements." (p. 219)

The business system is distinctly feudal, according to DR. BRADY, and "completely authoritarian (antidemocratic)." (pp. 311, 310) Leadership is "self-appointed, self-perpetuating, and autocratic." (p. 313) The employer is in a military relationship to his employees. (p. 317) And "business" encourages fear of "aliens" and "fifth columnists" and "other menaces". These "encourage in turn emphasis upon group loyalties, patriotic sentiments." (p. 318) War is necessary for capitalist survival, according to DR. BRADY, as say the Communists. (p. 234) And other Marxian postulates receive DR. BRADY's support—for instance:

"The 'average citizen', for example, is gradually losing his property stakes. The little businessman is in a more precarious position than at any time since the very beginning of the capitalistic system." (p. 292)

"The farmer-operator is in the process of being transferred from an independent owner to a dependent tenant." (p. 292)

"A large and increasing range of skilled crafts and white collar workers are being proletarianized." (p. 292)

Apparently the *Carnegie Corporation* approved by DR. BRADY's position (for it financed the publication of his completed work, after following its development carefully) that, as capitalism had created Hitler and Mussolini, it could do the same thing in the United States and was likely to do so. Said BRADY:

"There is nothing to distinguish the programs of the Reichsverband der deutschen Industrie from that of the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States \* \* \*." (p. 295)

There is much more of this. During war, Big Business comes to the front. And "Mr. Knudsen, Edward Stettinius, and Bernard Baruch are paralleled by Mr. Ogura in Japan, Lord Beaverbrook in England, and Hermann Goerring (himself a leading industrialist), Friedreich Flick, and their group in Germany". (p. 309) It is obvious enough to DR. BRADY (and the *Carnegie Corporation*?) that:

"The natural frame of reference of ownership is, and has been from the beginning, as clearly political as economic, as obviously 'Machiavellian' and 'Ricardian'." (p. 296)

And the law is the mere tool of the "haves" (an old Marxian concept):

"Law and the courts as frequently underline as correct the resultant distortion (of power relationships based on property rights)." (p. 297)

The conclusion of DR. BRADY is that Big Business may well lead us into fascism. There is no fundamental difference between business groups in our country, says DR. BRADY, and those in the states which turned totalitarian.

*ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF SLANT: THE CITIZENS HIP EDUCATION PROJECT*

Many foundation grants and their operation and results should have that detailed examination which our Committee had not time or funds to give. One of these is the *Citizenship Education Project*, financed by *The Carnegie Corporation* and carried on at *Teachers College* of Columbia University. That the *Project* was carried on with considerable bias to the left is unquestionable. To what extent this may have resulted from intention or negligence on the part of the project managers or *The Carnegie Corporation*, respectively, could not be determined without further inquiry. We do, however, see responsibility lodged with *The Carnegie Corporation*. It may not have had the duty to supervise the project or to direct it in transit—this may even have been unwise. But, as the project represented a substantial investment of public money and its impact on society could be very heavy, it seems clearly to have been the duty of *Carnegie* to examine what had been done and to repudiate it if it was against the public interest. This, as far as we know, *Carnegie* did not do.

The *Project* was discussed in a preliminary way by Mr. Dollard, the President of *The Carnegie Corporation*, in his 1948 and 1949 Reports. These statements contain some pleasant platitudes and clichés regarding the necessity of educating the American people into an increased understanding of the principles underlying our society. What apparently prompted the project was essentially, as Mr. Dollard expressed it in the *Corporation's* 1949 Report, that teachers "seemed to be hampered, on the one hand, by a lack of fresh teaching materials, both textual and visual, which relate old principles to contemporary problems, and on the other, by the inherent difficulty of bridging the gap between the classroom and the larger community in which the business of democracy is carried forward". Out of this general problem sprang several *Carnegie* ventures, among them the *Project* under discussion: it was described in the 1950 Report as a program for educating for "*Americanism*"; the 1951 Report, however, and the change may be significant, referred to it as a program of "*Citizenship Education*." The project received aggregate grants far in excess of a million dollars from *Carnegie Corporation*.

Now let us see what was produced. Official discussions of the project stress its non-political character. The fact is, however, that it was heavily slanted to the left. This appears chiefly in one of its main accomplishments, a card index file; the cards summarized selections from books, magazines, articles, films, etc., and were arranged topically so that high school teachers might select from their references to teach citizenship. The card file is sold to schools at nominal cost. The cost of production seems to have been about \$1,500,000.

The primary usefulness of the card index system was to enable teachers to get the gist of each reference without having to read it. The material was roughly "canned". The net result is that no one needs to read the actual references—neither teacher nor student—all that is necessary is to digest what has been "canned" on the card. On educational grounds *per se* this method of teaching is subject to severe criticism, and on many counts. But even those who believe in "canned" education cannot defend the slant with which this card system was devised, unless they believe that education should not be unbiased but should be directed toward selected political ends, and radical ones at that.

The preponderance of "liberal", leftist or internationalistic books and references selected for the card system, over those which are conservative and nationalist, is overwhelming. Many books are included by authors whose works and opinions certainly do not deserve recommendation to schoolchildren except (and they are not given this use) to hold them up as horrors. It would have been useful to include radical authors like LANGSTON HUGHES (of "Goodbye Christ" fame), HOWARD FAST, PAUL ROBESON and other Communists and pro-Communists, if they were held up to the criticism they deserve. But an examination of the cards will show that, with surprising consistency, leftist books received adulatory notation while conservative books received *coups de grace* or derogation.

Here are a few examples:

Card No. 554 refers to *We Are the Government* by Etting and Gossett, and describes it as "factual, entertaining, descriptive, illustrative." Etting was at least a radical.

Card No. 249 refers to *A Mask for Privilege*, by CAREY MCWILLIAMS, who has been named a Communist—the description is: "Historical, descriptive."

Card No. 901 refers to *Building for Peace at Home and Abroad*, by MAXWELL STEWART, who has been named a Communist—it is called "Factual, dramatic."

Card No. 1020 refers to *The American* by HOWARD FAST, a pro-Communist, and is designated: "Historical, Biographical."

Card No. 877 refers to *Rich Land, Poor Land*, by STUART CHASE, a collectivist, and calls it "Descriptive, Factual, Illustrative."

One of the infamous *Building America* productions, *Privileges of American Citizenship*, is called by card No. 34: "Factual, Ideals and Concepts of Democracy."

Now let us compare the way some conservative works are characterized by this guide for teachers prepared by *Teachers College* and financed by *Carnegie*:

*The Road to Serfdom* by Frederick A. Hayek is described by card No. 809 as: "Factual, *strongly opinionated*, logical. [Emphasis ours.]

Card No. 730 refers to *Be Glad You're a Real Liberal*, by Earl Bunting, is called by card No. 730 "Opinionated, biased, descriptive." Moreover, the author is noted as a director of the N. A. M. and his use of the term "liberal" is noted to be as defined by the National Association of Manufacturers. Similar notations in the case of leftists are not apparently deemed necessary.

A full examination of this card index system would reveal further wonders. It would also reveal (at least it was true of the 1950 index) that books like these are not included:

*America's Second Crusade*, by William Henry Chamberlain;  
*The Roosevelt Myth*, by John T. Flynn;  
*The Key to Peace*, by Clarence Manion;  
*Pearl Harbor*, by George Norgenstern;  
*Seeds of Treason*, by Ralph Toledano and Victor Laski;

*Undermining the Constitution*, by Thomas James Norton;  
*Ordeal by Planning*, by John Jewkes;  
*Economics in One Lesson*, by Henry Hazlitt;  
*The Road Ahead*, by John T. Flynn;  
*The Return of Adam Smith*, by George Montgomery;  
*The Red Decade*, by Eugene Lyons; etc.

No full examination of this card index has been possible. The Committee's request of September 16, 1954, for a set of cards has thus far elicited first the statement that revision is now underway, and when the request was pursued, with promise on December 10, 1954, that arrangements would be made to furnish it to the Committee. Reluctantly, to the Committee this does not seem that full measure of cooperation which a Congressional Committee has the right to expect and which in this instance was so fulsomely promised by foundations and their grantees.

It would be highly advisable to investigate who was responsible for producing this heavily slanted "canned" reference material to American teachers under this project financed by one of our great foundations and operated by one of our foremost institutions. It would moreover, seem to us to be the duty of that foundation itself to have a truly objective study made, and to make a public report on its findings. *To merely wash its hands of such a project, having once granted it financial existence, seems violative of its fiduciary duty.*

#### THE GENERAL PROBLEM.

If social scientists were content to produce the results of their research as data to be added to the general store of knowledge, that would be admirable. But those of them who have been associated with the developing cartel have generally no such idea of limiting their work to the mere accumulation of knowledge. They clearly see that they can make, and they intend to make, a contribution to "planning", a planning which necessitates or looks forward to the enactment of change either by legislation or by radical alterations in our society. An expression of this is to be found in *Wealth and Culture* published in 1936 and written by EDUARD C. LINDEMAN, an educator and prominent foundation executive. He says:

"The New State of the future will need social technicians who will be asked to engage in cultural planning just as technological experts and economists will be called upon to plan for orderly material production and distribution. Those who have exercised a similar function during the individualist-competitive phase of modern economy have been, to a very large extent, associated with foundations and trusts. Consequently it becomes pertinent to discover how these culture-determiners operated in the past."

Note that he gave the *coup de grace* to the "competitive" system. Note also that the planners of the future must take over the foundations; there, he implies, is where the control of our culture lies. He makes this doubly clear elsewhere in saying:

"Taken as a group, that is, as a whole, the trustees of foundations wield a power in American life which is probably equalled only by the national government itself."

And that was in 1936; since then foundation wealth and power have grown enormously.

*To the extent that it can be prevented, society cannot sanction the use of the public funds which foundations represent for any political purpose.*

There are instances enough of direct or obviously recognizable political action, and these should receive the attention of the Internal Revenue Service. Such instances as the *League for Industrial Democracy* are readily recognizable. The more subtle cases are the more dangerous to our society because of the greater difficulty of identifying them and proving their political character. Political slants are easily introduced into social material. Here is an example taken from the September 20, 1952 Report of *The Ford Foundation*:

"The high cost of a college and of a higher education in general makes real equality of opportunity impossible. More and more the financial burden is being thrust upon the student in the form of higher tuition fees. In consequence, higher education threatens to become increasingly the prerogative of the well-to-do."

That statement is just not true. "More and more", to use the *Ford* phrase, those who are *not* well-to-do are taking higher education. Here are the statistics of enrollment:

Year	Students enrolled	Thousands
1900	-----	238
1910	-----	355
1920	-----	598
1930	-----	1, 101
1940	-----	1, 494
1950	-----	2, 659

Why did representatives of *The Ford Foundation*, who were well aware of the true facts, make such false statements? Did they intend political propaganda? Did they wish to manufacture a class argument, an attack on the well-to-do who alone are able (which is false) to attend colleges!

#### *SOCIAL ENGINEERING.*

According to Professor Rowe, the roots of the distinct leftist political trend in foundation-supported research in the social sciences lie largely in the urge to reform and in the concept of "social engineering."

Mr. WORMSER. As an extension of just what you have been talking about, Professor, is it your opinion that there has been a result already from the power of these foundations to control or affect research, particularly in their associations together in some sort of what you might loosely call an interlock, and the use of these intermediate organizations? Has that resulted in some sort of political slanting in your opinion? I want to be a little more precise than that, and refer to the term which has been used quite frequently in social science literature of "social engineering." There seems to be a tendency to develop a caste of social scientists who apparently deem themselves qualified to tell people what is good for them, and to engineer changes in our social status. Would you comment on that?

Dr. ROWE. Here, of course, you are getting into a problem of what is the cause and what is the effect. I am not quite clear as to whether the activities of the foundations along this line are the result of the development of social science in the United States over the last 40 or 50 years, or whether the development of social science in the United States over the last 40 or 50 years along such lines has been primarily the result or even heavily the result of foundation initiative.

I would be inclined to the former of these two views, but I don't think you can completely disentangle these two things. I think that the development of the social sciences in this country in the last 40 or 50 years has been very heavily influenced, in my opinion, by ideas imported from abroad, which have been connected with, if not originated in, socialistic mentality, and to say this is to simply say that it is normal in social science to accept today a great deal of economic determinism, to accept a great deal of emphasis upon empirical re-

search over and against basic thinking and the advancement of theory, and to accept a lot of ideas about the position of the social scientist in the society that seem to me rather alien to the American tradition.

*I think it must be kept in mind that the theory of social engineering is closely related to the notion of the elite which we find dominant in Marxism, the notion that a few people are those who hold the tradition and who have the expertness and that these people can engineer the people as a whole into a better way of living, whether they like it or want it or not. It is their duty to lead them forcibly so to speak in this direction.*

That is all tied up with the conviction of the Marxists that they seem to have, rather that they do have, a perfect social science. This is one of the main tenets of Marxism, that they have a social science which is perfect; it not only explains all the past history, but it will lead to the complete victory of the socialist state on a worldwide basis.

I am not maintaining that my colleagues are all dyed in the wool along this line, but there is such a thing as infection. I think some of these ideas have infected us, and have gotten over into a much more influential place in our thinking than many of us understand or realize. The complete respectability of some of the basic ideas I have been talking about in the framework of American intellectual life can be seen when you ask yourself the question, "When I was in college, what was I taught about the economic interpretation of history, the frontier interpretation of American history, the economic basis of the American Constitution, and things of this kind?"

This is the entering wedge for the economic analysis of social problems which is related to economic determinism, which is the very heart and soul of the Marxist ideology. When we reflect on the extent to which these ideas have become accepted in the American intellectual community, I think we ought to be a bit alarmed, and be a bit hesitant about the direction in which we are going.

For my own purposes, I would much rather complicate the analysis of social phenomena by insisting that at all times there are at least three different kinds of components that have to be taken into account. There is not only the basic economic thing. We all recognize its importance. But there are what I call political factors. These have to do with the fundamental presuppositions people have about the values that they consider important and desirable. These can be just as well related to abstract and to absolute truth, which we are all trying to search for in our own way, as they can be to economic formation and predetermination, if I make myself clear. Along with this you have to take into account the power element in the military field. If you throw all these things in together, I think it rather tends to scramble the analysis and reduce it from its stark simplicity, as it is embodied in the doctrines of communism, into something which is much harder to handle and much more difficult and complicated, but is a good deal closer to the truth.

I make this rather long statement only because the subject is extremely complicated. I know I can't discuss it adequately here, and I don't pretend to try, but I am trying to introduce a few of the things which give me the feeling that in our academic community as a whole we have gone down the road in the direction of the dominance of an intellectual elite. We have gone down the road in the direction of economic determination of everything, throwing abstract values out of the window.

Mr. WORMSER. Moral relativity.

Dr. ROWE. Moral relativism is implicit. It is not important whether it is right or wrong in abstract terms. It is only when it works and who works and things of that kind. This is the evil of the sin of social science in this country which can only be redressed by adequate emphasis on humanistic studies, and even there you have to be extremely careful about how you do it in order to get the maximum effect out of it. (Hearings, pp. 550, 551, 552.)

Professor Colegrove commented on "social engineering" in the following testimony:

Mr. WORMSER. Professor, the term "social engineering" has become rather widespread. We seem to find social scientists conceiving of themselves as sort of an elite entitled by their peculiar qualifications and by their presumed ability as scientists to solve human problems, justified in telling the rest of us how we should organize ourselves and what form our society should take.

Would you comment on that, on this social-engineering feature which has arrived in the social sciences?

Dr. COLEGROVE. That, of course, grows out of the overemphasis on the constant need for reform. The assumption is that everything needs reform, that unless you are reforming you are not progressing. I think it is in large part due to the failure of the foundations, the failure of many of the scholars they choose, to fully understand what the principles of the American Constitution are, what the principles of American tradition are. Some of them, I know, do not accept those principles as sound. They even attack the principles. Of course, we all know that the principles should be examined and reexamined. But there is a tendency on the part of those who get grants from the foundations to think that they must turn out something in the way of reform; not a study which does not suggest a definite reform but a study more like Myrdal's study, *The American Dilemma*, which poses a condition in which there must be reform.

Mr. WORMSER. Does that tendency to insist on reform in turn tend to attract the more radical type of scholar, with the result that grants are made more generally to those considerably to the left?

Dr. COLEGROVE. I think undoubtedly it does, especially in the cooperative research, where a large number of people cooperate or operate together on one research project.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. WORMSER. Professor, back to this term "social engineering," again, is there not a certain presumption, or presumptuousness, on the part of social scientists, to consider themselves a group of the elite who are solely capable and should be given the sole opportunity to guide us in our social development? They exclude by inference, I suppose, religious leaders and what you might call humanistic leaders. They combine the tendency toward the self-generated social engineering concept with a high concentration of power in that interlocking arrangement of foundations and agencies, and it seems to me you might have something rather dangerous.

Dr. COLEGROVE. I think so. Very decisively. There is a sort of arrogance in a large number of people, and the arrogance of scholarship is in many cases a very irritating affair. But there is a tendency of scholars to become arrogant, to be contemptuous of other people's opinions. (Hearings, pp. 577, 578, 579.)

Professor Hobbs, in his testimony, indicated that the "social engineers" were not merely to engage in useful studies pointed at easing us into new social forms, but were to exercise or contribute to political control.

Mr. WORMSER. Dr. Hobbs, in connection with one subject you discussed, that the foundations support a type of research which you call scientism, which sometimes penetrates the political area, do you have any opinion that any of the foundations themselves encourage going into the political scene?

Dr. HOBBS. Certainly, that type of thing is indicated repeatedly throughout one of the books that I mentioned yesterday, in Stuart Chase's *The Proper Study of Mankind*.

In addition here is a report of the Social Science Research Council, annual report, 1928-29, in which they have what I would consider to be quite an extreme statement, but perhaps there is some other explanation of it. They have a listing of their history and purposes of the Social Science Research Council, and one of these purposes is that—

*a sounder empirical method of research had to be achieved in political science, if it were to assist in the development of a scientific political control.*

Mr. WORMSER. Is that a quote?

Dr. HOBBS. That is a direct quote from this annual report.

Mr. HAYS. Is that bad?

Dr. HOBBS. It could be. The implications that you are going to control political—

Mr. HAYS. They say "on a sounder." In other words, the inference is there that they recognize it is not very sound.

Dr. HOBBS (reading):

*"A sounder empirical method of research to assist in the development of a scientific political control."*

*If you are talking in terms of "scientific political control," it would seem to me that you are going to hand over government to these social scientists. That seems to be the implication. [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearings, pp. 170, 171.)*

The term "social engineering" appears frequently in the foundation-financed literature of the intermediary organizations. The concept of the "social engineer" is widespread in the social science fields. What are these "engineers" to do? They are to be the planners who are to lead us into *The Promised Land*. Mr. Pendleton Herring's filed statement denies that *The Social Science Research Council* is "engaged in developing or in advocating public policies or political programs." This statement seems to conflict sharply with statements made, for example, in the 1933-4 Annual Report of the *Council*:

"Beyond the preparation of materials for the use of policy and action-determining agencies of government, the Council took a further step in its endeavors to be of direct public service, in appointing two commissions of inquiry. One commission has been created on national policy in international economic relations; one has been created on public service personnel. Both undertakings were approved at their beginning by the President of the United States and by members of the Cabinet. Both commenced work in January 1934. The commissions represent an attempt by the Council to contribute directly to clarity of thinking on important public issues. Acceptance or rejection of any conclusions at which these commissions may themselves arrive on questions of public policy is a matter of less concern than the fact that their analysis of issues will contribute to the organization of intelligent public opinion." [Emphasis supplied.]

Perhaps this is no evidence of a plan to promote a specific theory or program; but it certainly indicates a policy to participate in the determining of policies. Moreover, the literature of the *SSRC* is replete with further indications. The emphasis on "planning" is paramount. In an article by Mr. Herring himself in the first issue of *Items*, an *SSRC* publication, he says:

"With respect to social problems, there is much more reliance upon planning and organized philanthropic effort, whether public or private. \* \* \* Here we wish simply to emphasize that in our generation efforts are being made to arrange and control human relationships more consciously, more deliberately, and, it is to be hoped, more responsibly than during the last century. An interdependent world is being forced to an awareness of the limitations of individual freedom and personal choice."

#### THE "ELITE."

The concept of *the elite* may be one of the factors which has led the executives of some of the great foundations and their clearing-house agencies into an assumption of the right to direct us politically.

In his statement filed with the Committee on behalf of *The Social Science Research Council*, Mr. Herring, its President, included this observation:

"In conclusion I would like to emphasize that it is the men and the women in these fields of learning who are our strongest national resource for advancing the ranges of knowledge that will make us better able to understand our common problems. They command the analytical methods for most effectively getting at such questions in basic and tangible terms. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and social science research is an essential tool for the vigilant."

It seems to this Committee that this is an expression of the presumed elite character of the social science profession. We would certainly not for one moment deny the value of the so-called "social scientists", the specialists in history, anthropology, economics and the other so-called "sciences" included within the class designated as "social". But these specialists are no more capable of making ultimate decisions or of giving ultimate advice than other groups of citizens who, in their own fields learn as much and have as much to contribute, the clergymen, the lawyers, the doctors and others. Indeed,



even the business men have contributions to make to ultimate decisions. For what reason do the "social scientists" presume that their contributions are greater than those of other professions and vocations! Yes, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—but we are inclined to conclude that the public must be eternally vigilant to see that no group like the social scientists arrogates to itself effectively the role of designers of our political, economic or social destinies.

Mr. Herring says later:

"To deny that the social sciences have a contribution to make, or to cast doubt on the capacity of man to guide his destiny by applying thought to human problems, in secular terms at least is to embrace either an obscurantist or anti-intellectual position or to adhere to a determinist position."

This statement sets up a straw man and knocks him down. This Committee knows of no one who denies that social scientists have a contribution to make!

There follows an implication that because the Russian Communists are anti-empirical, those who believe foundations have over-promoted the empirical approach in research in the United States are in some way intellectually authoritarian. Mr. Herring asserts that "authoritarianism" is expressed in the initial statement filed by Mr. Dodd, the Director of Research, "in an indirect and subtle fashion, and is all the more dangerous for that reason." This attempt to make an authoritarian out of our Research Director would be laughable were it not deadly serious in its implications. What Mr. Dodd referred to in his statement was the existence of certain basic moral and jurisprudential principles which must be taken into consideration in the making of all sound decisions regarding our society. Who can doubt that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself contain such principles! If Mr. Herring means to imply that the belief that these basic verities, fundamental to our system of society, form an authoritarian base which the social scientists must penetrate or ignore in arriving at his "scientific" conclusions, then he implies the structure of our society and government rests on insecure ground indeed. We doubt that many Americans would accept Mr. Herring's position as valid. *If the foundations accept it, they are accepting moral relativism and are expending public money in a direction which certainly is hardly consonant with our traditions.*

Mr. Herring, in his article *The Social Sciences in Modern Society*, published in the SSRC *Items* of March, 1947, said, at page 5:

"One of the greatest needs in the social sciences is for the development of skilled practitioners who can use social data for the cure of social ills as doctors use scientific data to cure bodily ills."

These "skilled practitioners"—are they to be our salvation? We quote again this testimony by Professor Briggs regarding *The Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*:

"Like stockholders in any other enterprise, the public has a right to determine what it wishes the product to be. The principle that the public should decide what it wants in order to promote its own welfare and happiness is unquestionably sound. An assumption that the public does not know what is for its own good is simply contrary to the fundamental principles of democracy." (Hearings, p. 97.)

What the "engineers" are to produce is not always what the people may want but what these "engineers" believe to be good for them. The 1927 annual report of *The Social Science Research Council* gave,

among its aims: "to make possible the substituting of more scientific social control for the rule-of-thumb methods which men have happened upon in their effort to live together." We wonder whether the Ten Commandments and the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are deemed by these "social engineers" to be mere "rule-of-thumb?" We shall not labor the point, but, we repeat, *we do not understand the desirability of permitting a self-appointed set of guardians to determine our ways of living together merely because they call themselves "social scientists" or "social engineers" and by these terms seek to set themselves up as social arbiters superior to legislators, lawyers, clergymen and intelligent citizens in general.*

The Report of the SSRC for 1930-31 speaks of the pressure groups which manipulate public opinion. The Report suggests a study on a large scale to see, among other things, "whether these varied elements are themselves susceptible to coordination and control in the public interest." The concept of "control" is to this Committee somewhat alarming. It is repeated in the Report of the following year, which speaks of "the controversial field of industrial control which involves the relationships between government and private enterprise." The Report proceeds:

"Here *the attack* must be piecemeal, the first move leading toward a planning program in the field of public utilities." [Emphasis supplied.]

The 1934 Decennial Report says that the *Council* "determined not to avoid current issues by reason of their generally controversial nature, but rather to give weight to the promise of particular research to contribute to an understanding of contemporary questions." It says later, indeed, that the "research function" has not been extended "to the solution of problems of policy and action" but merely to the "marshalling of knowledge in forms readily applicable to the practical needs of society." This qualification reads meritoriously. But the very study of controversial political problems by organizations which have shown by their actions that they represent a distinct political bias, is a danger in itself.

"*Marshalled Knowledge*" can easily be propaganda, and has frequently been so.

This problem becomes all the more acute when such organizations with a tendency to promote collectivist programs or principles become agencies for other organizations. *The Social Science Research Council's* Decennial Report, 1923-33, contains a reference to a request from *The Rockefeller Foundation* for "suggestions of work relating to urgent problems confronting the National Government in the current emergency." The Report continues:

"Drawing largely upon the crystallizing plans of the Council's division of Industry and Trade, suggestions were offered relating to banking unemployment, national planning, governmental statistics and other data, taxation, and the examination of measures for the stimulation of business revival. The Rockefeller Foundation has financed, among studies proposed by various agencies, a number of studies in line with the Council's suggestions: Administration of the Agricultural Relief Act, Effects of Sales Taxes, Administration of the National Recovery Act, and Government Financial Policy. The Committee on Government Statistics and Information Services, a joint committee of the Council and of the American Statistical Association, was also financed for a year's work in Washington."

THE "ENGINEERS", "PLANNING" AND SOCIALISM.

There is a justified suspicion that the "social engineers" who so strongly advocate "planning" are often motivated by an urge to usher in a quite radical form of society. The very concept of "planning" has connotations of what may be, moderately, called "collectivism."

Mr. McNiece pointed out that the Socialist program had, from the first, called for national planning, quoting Engels:

"The planless production of capitalist society capitulates before the planned production of the invading socialist society." (Hearings, p. 612.)

He also gave strong arguments to support the impossibility of effective and rational planning by our Federal Government. (Hearings, pp. 610 et seq.) Nevertheless, after five years of deliberation, *The Commission on Social Studies of The American Historical Association* (a foundation-supported 101 (6) organization) echoed the Socialist concept as follows (page 16 of its Report):

Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living, drives of technology and science, pressures of changing thought and policy, and disrupting impacts of economic disaster, there is a *notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism*; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of *ever wider measures of planning and control*. [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearings, p. 612.)

This was no mere "ivory-tower" pronouncement. The concept found its way into government. The National Planning Board was formed in 1933. Its 1933-4 Report includes the following (page 11):

State and interstate planning is a lusty infant but the work is only beginning. *Advisory economic councils may be regarded as instrumentalities for stimulating a coordinated view of national life and for developing mental attitudes favorable to the principle of national planning.* [Emphasis ours.]

\* \* \* \* \*

Finally mention should be made of the fact that there are three great national councils which contribute to research in the social sciences. *The Council of Learned Societies*, the *American Council on Education*, and the *Social Science Research Council* are important factors in the development of research and add their activities to the body of scientific material available in any program of national planning. (Hearings, p. 612.)

Was this perhaps, in turn, an independent aberration of government, disassociated from the foundations and their agencies? Indeed not. The Report continues:

*The Council of Learned Societies* has promoted historical and general social research.

*The American Council on Education* has recently sponsored an inquiry into the relation of Federal, State, and local governments to the conduct of public education. It has served as the organizing center for studies of materials of instruction and problems of educational administration. It represents the educational organizations of the country and is active in promoting research in its special field.

*The Social Science Research Council*, a committee of which prepared this memorandum, is an organization engaged in planning research. It is true that its object has not been to make social plans, but rather to plan research in the social field. A decade of thought on planning activities through its committees, distributed widely over the social sciences, has given it an experience, a background with regard to the idea of planning, that should be of value if it were called on to aid in national planning. Furthermore, the members of the *Social Science Research Council*, its staff, and the members of its committees are perhaps more familiar than the members of any other organization with the personnel in the social sciences, with the research interests of social scientists, and

with the experience and capabilities of social science research workers in the United States. The members of the council are familiar with the different bureaus of research. The council has been concerned chiefly with the determination of the groups and persons with whom special types of research should be placed. For this purpose it has set up committees, organized commissions, promoted research, and sponsored the development of various research agencies and interests. With its pivotal position among the social sciences, it could undoubtedly render valuable aid if called on to do so, in the formidable task of national planning. [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearings, pp. 612, 613.)

Further quotations from this Report are pertinent:

It was after the Civil War that American economic life came to be dominated by the philosophy of laissez faire and by the doctrines of rugged individualism. But the economic and social evils of the period resulted in the development of new planning attitudes tending to emphasize especially public control and regulation.

Summing up the developments of these 125 years, one may say that insofar as the subject here considered is concerned, they are important because they left us a fourfold heritage:

First, to think in terms of an institutional framework which may be fashioned in accordance with prepared plans;

Second, a tendency to achieve results by compromise in which different lines and policies are more or less reconciled;

Third, a tendency to stress in theory the part played in economic life by individualism, while at the same time having recourse in practice to governmental aid and to collective action when necessary; and

Fourth, a continued social control applied to special areas of economic life.

Such was the note already heard in America when during 1928-29 came the first intimations of the 5-year plan, and the Western World began to be interested in the work and methods of the Gosplan in Moscow. *The Russian experience was not embodied in any concrete way in American thinking, but it stimulated the idea that we need to develop in an American plan out of our American background.* [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearings, p. 613.)

Its work done, the National Planning Board discontinued. The National Resources Committee took its place and ran from 1934 to 1939. Its personnel was somewhat the same as that of its predecessor. Page 3 of its final report contained the following:

The National Resources Planning Board believes that it should be the declared policy of the United States Government to promote and maintain a high level of national production and consumption by all appropriate measures necessary for this purpose. The Board further believes that it should be the declared policy of the United States Government.

To underwrite full employment for the employables;

To guarantee a job for every man released from the Armed Forces and the war industries at the close of the war, with fair pay and working conditions;

To guarantee and, when necessary, underwrite:

Equal access to security,

Equal access to education for all,

Equal access to health and nutrition for all, and

Wholesome housing conditions for all.

This policy grows directly out of the Board's statement concerning which the President has said:

"All of the free peoples must plan, work, and fight together for the maintenance and development of our freedoms and rights."

#### THE FOUR FREEDOMS

Freedom of speech and expression, freedom to worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear: and

#### A NEW BILL OF RIGHTS

1. The right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years;
2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service;
3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care;

4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment, and accident;
5. The right to live in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies;
6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police;
7. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness;
8. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact; and
9. The right to rest, recreation, and adventure, the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization.

Plans for this purpose are supported and explained in this report. The previous publications of the Board, including *National Resources Development Report for 1942*, transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 14, 1942, and a series of pamphlets (*After Defense—What? After the War—Full Employment, Postwar Planning*, etc.), also provide background for this proposal. (Hearings, pp. 613, 614.)

The reader is referred to pages 612 et seq. of the Hearings for further quotations from this report which indicate a complete program of social, as well as economic, planning—a program more detailed and comprehensive than that proposed by avowed socialists. The inclusion (in the statement of proposed government policy quoted above) of “*A New Bill of Rights*” is more than astounding. It implies that our Constitutional Bill of Rights is not good enough; we must have a new one. This new one has features which we find later in the *Declaration of Human Rights* drafted in UNO with the collaboration of Communist delegates, and rejected by our government. The “*New Bill of Rights*” is silent about property rights and contains strange new rights some of which could be effected only under a government so directive as to be totalitarian. It reads nobly; but it is the product of advocates of the compulsive state.

*One cannot read the report without concluding that it was intended to lay out a program for enormously increased centralization, a rapidly enlarged participation by government in human affairs, a sharp turn toward paternalism and away from free enterprise and individual freedom. In a broad sense, the proposals were revolutionary, both the National Planning Board and the National Resources Board having followed rather closely the plan of The Commission on Social Studies, embracing virtually all phases of our economic life, including education.*

We cannot trace the influence of each leader of this movement for a planned (socialized) economy in detail, leaders who were almost all part and parcel of tax-free organizations or actively associated with them and beneficiaries of foundations. But the career of one of these leaders may illustrate the point of view which dominated.

The man is Charles K. Merriam, who held a dominating position in the foundation world for many years. He was Chairman of a *Committee on Political Research* of the *American Political Science Association* in 1921, the purpose of which was to examine research in government and to offer recommendations. Its report in 1922 advised that “a sounder empirical method of research had to be achieved in political science if it were to assist in the development of scientific political control.” It recommended the creation of *The Social Science Research Council*, and this was, in turn, formed in 1923. Mr. Merriam became its first President, serving until 1927.

Mr. Merriam could hardly be called a conservative. Yet he himself was a dissenting member of the *Commission on Social Studies*,

whose report has previously been discussed. It may have been that some parts of the report were too extreme for him to swallow. If he objected to its strongly Marxist tendency, however, it is probably that his distaste was only a matter of degree. His *The Agenda of Democracy* and his *New Democracy and the New Despotism* indicate that he was one of the most active proponents of a new order and a revolutionary one. "The old world is gone," he said, "and will not return. We face a new era, which searches all creeds, all forms, all programs of action, and spares none." The new era must be planned. His active political part in planning it may be gleaned in part from the frequent references to him and his work in both published volumes of Harold L. Ickes' *Diary*.

The Committee's Assistant Director of Research filed with the Committee (it is included in the Hearings, pp. 627, et seq.) a report entitled "*Economics and the Public Interest*." In this report he showed in considerable and valuable detail how the expenditures of government had followed the proposals of *The National Planning Board*, *The National Resources Committee*, and *The National Resources Planning Board* closely. We cannot in this report go into his material in detail. We recommend that it be read in full. *It is the opinion of this Committee that this material, together with the data provided elsewhere in Mr. McNiece's testimony, establishes clearly that Government agencies consciously planned for what can fairly be called at least a semi-socialist economy; that this planning was the work, substantially, of foundation-supported, tax-free organizations; and that these plans were effected to a very considerable degree in the ensuing period.*

There may be doubt as to the exclusiveness of the factors which Mr. McNiece discussed and which have been testified to elsewhere by others. Other factors, indeed, may have played some part in what happened. *But what cannot be doubted is that foundation's funds financed and supported a definite political and economic propulsion to the left and away from our traditional forms. Could they have done so with closed eyes?*

*Something close to a social revolution took place. We doubt the right of foundations to use their public funds for the purpose of propelling a revolution. A Communist not aligned with Russia might well have the right fully to try to promote his political purposes, as long as no treasonable acts are involved. But we deny the right of any public trust fund to use its public money, or permit it to be used, for political purposes. That is clearly what has occurred.*

We have advanced considerably toward that "welfare state" which the new Fabians in England understand is a stage intermediate between free enterprise and socialism. (See the *New Fabian Essays*, the current *Mein Kampf* of British Socialism). The necessary mechanism to reach the welfare state in full, and to go on from there to socialism or some form of totalitarianism, is high centralization and the absorption by the Federal government of more and more of the powers of the States. We fully agree with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who in 1949, while still president of Columbia University, said <sup>23</sup>:

"I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater a greadater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal

<sup>23</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, in letter to Hon. Ralph W. Gwinn, dated Columbia University, New York, June 7, 1949, in opposition to a general Federal-aid-to-education program. (Congressional Record, 81st Cong., 1st sess., vol. 95, p. 14, p. A3690.)

Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us."

*The evidence warrants the conclusion that the foundations have contributed substantially and consciously to the movement which President Eisenhower so condemned.*

#### *THE INTERNATIONAL PRESS INSTITUTE*

Among the many organizations supported by foundations to which this Committee has been unable to give close attention but which deserve intensive research, is *The International Press Institute* located at Zurich, Switzerland. This organization was granted \$120,000 by *The Rockefeller Foundation* initially, and received further support from it and other foundations. Its purposes, as contained in *The Rockefeller Foundation Review for 1950 and 1951*, include "the immediate objective of advancing and safeguarding the freedom of the press throughout the world." It is quite conceivable, however, that the concept of "freedom" espoused by this foundation may differ from that held by others.

The possible political implications of *The International Press Institute* will warrant study.

#### *THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUNDTABLE BROADCASTS.*

The *Roundtable* broadcasts have been abandoned, presumably because their leftist slant became so apparent. They were financed by the *Alfred P. Sloan Foundation*, to its distinct discredit. A careful analysis could be made of the actual broadcasts, the material used and the speakers selected to disclose an example of how foundation money can be used for quite direct political purposes.

#### *FACTS FORUM.*

The Committee staff, at the request of Mr. Hays, collected transcripts and tape recordings of *Facts Forum* broadcasts and turned these over to him, also at his request.

This material has not been returned by Mr. Hays, nor has any pertinent<sup>24</sup> report been made to the other members of the Committee by him.

Without being in a position to judge of the propriety of the *Facts Forum* broadcasts, this Committee puts itself on record, in any event, as concluding that the financing of a radio or a television program (or, for that matter, any program using any form of public communication) by a foundation directed in such a way as to have political slant, either to the left or to the right, is highly improper.

Referring to *Facts Forum*, the ranking minority member of this committee, during the hearings, made these comments (Hearings, p. 185):

I want to make it clear here, which apparently it has not been in some people's minds, that if they are biased, they still have a perfect right to go on the air; but they don't have any right to go on with tax-exempt funds.

\* \* \* \* \*

They can be just as biased as they want to as long as they are using their own money without any tax exemption.

*For the reasons stated above, the other members of this Committee are not in a position to determine whether or not Facts Forum has been*

<sup>24</sup> At the time the Committee met on November 29, 1954 to consider the final draft of this report, Mr. Hays at this point in the discussion asked to have included at this point a reference to the report he said he made to Congress on *Facts Forum*. No copy of that report has been officially filed with the Committee.

guilty of bias. In any event, however, Mr. Hays' comments just quoted have the full and complete support of the other members in relation to any foundation which does show bias, or permits it; the comments would apply, of course, whatever the direction in which a foundation's bias might run.

#### THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS PAMPHLETS.

These have been produced under the aegis or with the financing of the Sloan and other foundations, and also deserve a detailed study which we have been unable to give. The pamphlets were under the editorship of MAXWELL STEWART, who had been an associate editor of the Moscow News and, according to proven reports, had taught in Moscow. MR. STEWART wrote a good many of the PUBLIC AFFAIRS PAMPHLETS, heavily biased against the free enterprise system. Others of the pamphlets were written by other leftists and some contain heavily slanted bibliographies.

Further illustrations of the use of foundation funds for political purposes will be given in Section X. FOUNDATIONS AND EDUCATION, and in Section XI. "INTERNATIONALISM."

### X. FOUNDATIONS AND EDUCATION

#### CARNEGIE AND ROCKEFELLER REFORM THE COLLEGES.

The Rockefeller General Education Board (terminated in 1953) was chartered in 1903; The Carnegie Fund for the Advancement of Teaching, in 1905. Other organizations created by the Rockefeller and Carnegie reservoirs of wealth which went into educational work were:

*The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 1910

*The Carnegie Corporation of New York*, 1911

*The Rockefeller Foundation*, 1918 and

*The Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial*, 1918 (later merged with the Rockefeller Foundation).

Miss Kathryn Casey, legal analyst of the Committee, filed a detailed report on the educational activities of these foundations (hearings, pp. 668 et seq.). One of the subjects treated in this report was the campaign instituted by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations to raise the standards of our institutions of higher learning. Dr. Ernest Victor Hollis (now Chief of College Administration in the United States Office of Education) once described the background of this campaign as follows:

"\* \* \* unfavorable public estimate of the elder Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie, made it inexpedient in 1905 for their newly created philanthropic foundations to attempt any direct reforms in higher education." (Hearings, p. 671.)

The method adopted, therefore, was one of coercion by indirection.

"The subject was approached indirectly through general and non-controversial purposes—nearly all foundation grants made before 1920 being for such purposes."

As Dr. Hollis said: <sup>25</sup>

Far-reaching college reform was carefully embedded in many of these non-controversial grants. It was so skillfully done that few of the grants are directly chargeable to the ultimate reforms they sought to effect. For instance, there is little obvious connection between giving a pension to a college professor or giving

<sup>25</sup> Philanthropic Foundation and Higher Education, Ernest Victor Hollis, p. 127.



a sum to the general endowment of his college, and reforming the entrance requirements, the financial practices, and the scholastic standards of his institution. This situation makes it necessary to present qualitative influence without immediately showing the quantitative grant that made the influence possible. (Hearings, p. 671.)

The *Carnegie* and *Rockefeller* foundations aligned themselves behind the "progressive educators" (the words are those of Dr. Hollis—Hearing, p. 672), "who are seeking such changes as those described as taking place at the University of Chicago \* \* \*"; and financed, to the tune of several hundreds of millions of dollars, measures which were intended to reform the colleges and universities. It is undoubtedly true that many or most of the results were highly commendable, in the sense that the standards in institutions of higher learning were effectively raised. *We question, however, whether foundations should have the power even to do good in the coercive manner which was employed. We cannot repeat too often that power in itself is dangerous. What may have been used for a benign purpose could in the future be used for the promotion of purposes against the interests of the people. It does not write off this danger to say that good men ran the foundations. It is power which is dangerous—power uncontrolled by public responsibility.*

Plans for the pensioning of professors, and offers of college endowment, were conditioned upon conformity to the plans and standards of the granting foundations. These plans and offers were irresistible. Accrediting systems were established. Grants and pensions were not available unless the arbitrary standards set by the foundations were accepted. Thus, the foundations grew to be the comptrollers of higher education in the United States, its directors and molders.

Research and experimental work in education was established, largely at Columbia, Chicago and Stanford Universities. *The American Council on Education* "provided the general administrative and supervisory direction necessary to coordinate such a large cooperative undertaking." (Hearings, p. 672.) Regional accrediting associations were formed, and other media were created or used to implement the coercive plans of the *Carnegie* and *Rockefeller* funds. As an example of the extent of the coercion, *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education* held that no college could participate in its pension fund if it remained under the control of a religious group. Moreover, those colleges which were deemed (by the foundation executives) to be "weak and tottering" or "superfluous" were permitted to die a hoped-for natural death.

"Clearing house" organizations and other agencies were treated to very substantial contributions: among them *The American Council on Education*, *The National Education Association* and *The Progressive Education Association*.

Miss Casey took up separately each of the major foundations involved in her exposition. She found that *The Carnegie Corporation of New York* had contributed a total of \$1,237,711 to *The National Education Association*, *The Progressive Education Association* and *The American Council on Education*, perhaps the major part of their sustenance in the early years. (Hearings p. 679.) She concluded that these three organizations have operated to the end of producing uniformity in teaching, teacher-training and administrative practices in education and that the *Carnegie Corporation* must have approved this work. It must also have approved the work done by *The Institute of*

*International Education, The Institute of Educational Research, Columbia Teachers College and its appendage, the Lindoln School, into which enterprises millions were poured. (Hearings, p. 704.)* Miss Casey said:

Even those not in the educational field recognize that today there is, in effect, a national set of standards of education, curricula, and methods of teaching prevailing throughout the United States. As a practical matter, the net result of this is nothing more nor less than a system of education which is uniform throughout the country. Moreover, in the case of the *National Education Association*, one of its goals for the "united teaching profession in 1951-57," is stated on page 13 of the *National Education Association Handbook for 1953-54* to be:

"A strong, adequately staffed State department of education in each State and a more adequate Federal education agency.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Equalization and expansion of educational opportunity including needed State and national financing." (Hearings, p. 704.)

*The Carnegie Foundation* gave considerable attention to the place, relationship and function of the secondary and primary schools as well. (Hearings, pp. 684 et seq.). This was done largely through *The National Education Association* and *The Progressive Education Association*, to which other foundations also contributed heavily. Some of the strange things which have happened in the secondary and primary educational fields can be traced directly to the influence of these two organizations.

*The General Education Board* was, initially, the chief dispenser of Rockefeller moneys in the field of education. Its activities were chiefly in the southern states and largely in the areas of primary and secondary education, and Negro education. It dispensed much of its funds unquestionably commendably. Yet its operations illustrate the dangers which lie in great power. It lent its financial assistance to the preparation of the *Building America* texts which we shall later discuss. *That public funds should have been used in the preparation of these educational horrors is a tragic example of foundation negligence, recklessness or incompetence.*

This foundation, too, lent itself to experiment in education. The agencies it chose for this work were chiefly *The Progressive Education Association, The National Education Association, Department of Secondary School Principals, and The American Council on Education*, as well as *The National Council of Parent Education, the American Youth Commission* and Teachers College at Columbia University. (Hearings, p. 696.)

*The Rockefeller Foundation* has spent vast sums of money both in education and in research in the social sciences generally.

Without going into further detail as to the educational activities of the foundations mentioned, let us examine the import of their work on a broad scale. Miss Casey quoted Dr. Hollis as saying that "foundations" had influenced higher education notably and increasingly "toward supporting social and cultural ideas and institutions that contribute to a rapidly changing civilization \* \* \* *the chief contribution of the foundations has been in accelerating the rate of acceptance of the ideas they choose to promote.*" [Emphasis ours.] (Hearings, p. 707.) Dr. Hollis also wrote:

"The Philanthropic Foundation is a social institution important enough to be ranked with the school, the press, and the Church. It often fails to be accorded a ranking with these agencies however because, unlike them, it most frequently

attacks social problems indirectly. \* \* \* *Through these agencies [(to which the foundations make grants) its influence extends to cultural and social planning in almost every department of our life.]* [Emphasis supplied.]

In the field of education it seems clear that foundations have played an almost controlling part in promoting uniformity and conformity on a national scale. Miss Casey questioned whether a national system of education was not a violation of the principle of separation of powers between the Federal government and the States, a violation of States' rights. (Hearings, p. 708, 709.) This is worthy of careful consideration by those who see in continued extensions of Federal power a danger to our system of limited Federal jurisdiction. What impresses this Committee with equal or greater seriousness is the danger which lies inherently in the power of vast funds of public trust-capital, administered without public responsibility by private individuals. That they may have directed education in the United States desirably (if that is so) is beside the point. *Should not education be directed by local government or, at least, by government, and the people? Should it be directed and controlled by the power of privately administered public trusts?*

#### *THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION FINANCES SOCIALISM.*

From 1928 to 1933 *The Carnegie Corporation of New York* provided heavy aggregate financing (a total of \$340,000) to *The American Historical Society*, a constituent of *The American Council of Learned Societies*, for the production of a study by its *Commission on Social Studies* whose final report was published in sixteen sections. The last section, issued in 1934, is known as *Conclusions and Recommendations*. This is a momentous document. We have referred to it briefly in the previous section of this report. It deserves closer study.

*The Commission* heralds the decline of the free enterprise system. It does not contest the movement for radical social change. It accepts the new era as already *fait accompli*, saying:

"9. Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging." (Hearings, pp. 476, 477.)

There follows this remarkable statement:

10. As to the specific form which this "collectivism," this integration and interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence at hand is by no means clear or unequivocal. *It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property* or it may entail the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses. Most likely, it will issue from a process of experimentation and will represent a composite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear. Almost certainly it will involve a larger measure of compulsory as well as voluntary cooperation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to the individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative. In any event the Commission is convinced *by its interpretation of available empirical data* that the actually integrating economy of the present day is the forerunner of a consciously integrated society in which individual economic actions and individual property rights will be altered and abridged. [Emphasis supplied.]

We pause here to note that the social scientists who composed this masterpiece apparently made up their minds on empirical data. No better illustration could be given than this to show the fallacy of an

overemphasis on empiricism in the social sciences. The document proceeds:

11. The emerging age is particularly an age of transition. It is marked by numerous and severe tensions arising out of the conflict between the actual trend toward integrated economy and society, on the one side, and the traditional practices, dispositions, ideas, and institutional arrangements inherited from the *passing age of individualism*, on the other. In all the recommendations that follow the transitional character of the present epoch is recognized. [Emphasis supplied.]

Note "the passing age of individualism." The statement is not that the age of individualism may be passing; the statement is definite—the age of individualism *is* passing. Is there any expression of disapproval or regret at its passing? We find none. We must assume that the foundation-financed authors approved, that they were eager to help put skids under the free enterprise system to help slide it out of the United States. This was their right as individuals. But we question the right of a foundation to finance the undertaking with public funds!

The statement continues:

12. Underlying and illustrative of these tensions are privation in the midst of plenty, violations of fiduciary trust, gross inequalities in income and wealth, widespread racketeering and banditry, wasteful use of natural resources, unbalanced distribution and organization of labor and leisure, the harnessing of science to individualism in business enterprise, the artificiality of political boundaries and divisions, the subjection of public welfare to the egoism of private interests, the maladjustment of production and consumption, persistent tendencies toward economic instability, disproportionate growth of debt and property claims in relation to production, deliberate destruction of goods and withdrawal of efficiency from production, accelerating tempo of panics, crises, and depressions attended by ever-wider destruction of capital and demoralization of labor, struggles among nations for markets and raw materials leading to international conflicts and wars.

We pause again to note that this description of the era does not expose these "elite" social scientists as objective students of history. The description smacks of either hysteria or intended bias. It gives the impression that the world has gone to pot and the United States particularly. The facts are that a higher standard of living had been attained in the United States than ever before in our history. There was a depression but we had had depressions before. There had been a war not so long before, but there had been wars before. To sum up the condition of the world and of the United States as uniquely disturbing was blind or unconscionable. One cannot escape the conclusion that these "scientists" were merely echoing the political ideas which precipitated the strong political movement toward paternalism and looked far beyond it rather than doing that objective analysis which one would expect of those who deem themselves an elite entitled to tell the rest of us what is good for us. The report continues:

13. If historical knowledge is any guide, these tensions, accompanied by oscillations in popular opinion, public policy, and the fortunes of the struggle for power, will continue until some approximate adjustment is made between social thought, social practice, and economic realities, or until society, exhausted by the conflict and at the end of its spiritual and inventive resources, sinks back into a more primitive order of economy and life. Such is the long-run view of social development in general, and of American life in particular, which must form the background for any educational program designed to prepare either children or adults for their coming trials, opportunities, and responsibilities. (Hearings, pp. 476, 477.)

Under the heading of "CHOICES DEEMED POSSIBLE AND DESIRABLE" the report proceeds:

1. Within the limits of the broad trend toward social integration the possible forms of economic and political life are many and varied, *involving wide differences in modes of distributing wealth, income, and cultural opportunity*, embracing various conceptions of the State and of the rights, duties, and privileges of the ordinary citizen, and representing the most diverse ideals concerning the relations of sexes, classes, religions, nations, and races. \* \* \* [Emphasis supplied.]

The emphasized phrase in this section interests us. Under our form of society, "wealth" and "income" and "cultural opportunity" are not *distributed*. To some extent we "re-distribute" wealth and income—that is, by taxing it heavily and using the proceeds for social purposes. Perhaps we overemphasize the selection of the term "distributing"; but it seems to be an intended selection, one anticipating (and approving) a form of collectivism.

Under the heading of "THE REDISTRIBUTION OF POWER" it continues:

1. If the teacher is to achieve these conditions of improved status and thus free the school from the domination of special interests and convert it into a truly enlightening force in society, there must be a redistribution of power in the general conduct of education—the board of education will have to be made more representative, the administration of the school will have to be conceived more broadly and the teaching profession as a whole will have to organize, develop a theory of its social function and create certain instrumentalities indispensable to the realization of its aims.

2. The ordinary board of education in the United States, with the exception of the rural district board, is composed for the most part of business and professional men; the ordinary rural district board is composed almost altogether of landholders. In the former case the board is not fully representative of the supporting population and thus tends to impose upon the school the social ideas of a special class; in both instances its membership is apt to be peculiarly rooted in the economic individualism of the 19th century.

3. If the board of education is to support a school program conceived in terms of the general welfare and adjusted to *the needs of an epoch marked by transition to some form of socialized economy*, it should include in its membership adequate representation of points of view other than those of private business.

4. With the expansion of education and the growth of large school systems, involving the coordination of the efforts of tens, hundreds and even thousands of professional workers and the expenditure of vast sums of money on grounds, buildings and equipment, the function of administration has become increasingly important and indispensable. (Hearings, pp. 477, 478.) [Emphasis supplied.]

It is apparent that this foundation-supported report lends its vast influence to the concept that education must be turned in the direction of preparing the public for a new form of society, a collectivist or socialist system, the coming of which is taken for granted and apparently approved by the "scientists" who presume to tell us what is good for us. Of course, this movement for adjustment to the expected Nirvana must be implemented. Under the heading "APPENDIX A—NEXT STEPS" the Report continues:

2. However, the commission is mindful of the proper and practical question: What are the next steps? It indicates, therefore, the lines along which attacks can and will be made on the problem of applying its conclusions with respect to instruction in the social sciences. (Hearings, p. 478.)

After this comes what might be called the "pay-off":

3. As often repeated, the first step is to awaken and consolidate leadership around the philosophy and purpose of education herein expounded—leadership among administrators, teachers, boards of trustees, colleges and normal school presidents—thinkers and workers in every field of education and the social

sciences. Signs of such an awakening and consolidation of leadership are already abundantly evident; in the resolutions on instruction in the social sciences adopted in 1933 by the department of superintendence of the National Education Association at Minneapolis and by the association itself at Chicago; in the activities of the United States Commissioner of Education during the past few years; and in almost every local or national meeting of representatives of the teaching profession. (Hearings, p. 478.)

*A concerted effort is thus to be made by all those having to do with education to help with the business of easing in the new era, the age of collectivism.* The report sees signs of an "awakening and consolidation of leadership", noting among them "the resolutions on instruction in the social sciences adopted in 1933 by *The Department of Superintendence of The National Education Association* at Minneapolis and by *The Association* itself at Chicago." *The American Historical Association* announces further that it has taken over a publication called *The Historical Outlook*, a journal for social science teachers, (it was then re-named *The Social Sciences*). Among the new purposes of the publication was to be "to furnish as rapidly as possible various programs of instruction organized within the frame of reference outlined by the *Commission*."

Writers of textbooks, said the report, were "expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference and new writers in the field of the social sciences will undoubtedly attack the central problem here conceived \* \* \*." "Makers of programs in the social sciences in cities, towns and states" were expected to "recast existing syllabi and schemes of instruction \* \* \*." Colleges and normal schools were to "review their current programs" and conform to the "frame of reference." One of the objectives was the "guaranteeing" of "a supply of teachers more competent to carry out the philosophy and purpose here presented."

"Educational journalism" was expected to follow the same line. And, continues the Report, it is important that "the spirit" of its "frame of reference" be "understood and appreciated" in order to "facilitate the fulfillment of the *Commission's* offering."

*This Committee finds the document from which we have quoted an astounding piece of work. We cannot understand how a foundation, Carnegie in this instance, administering funds dedicated to a public trust and made free of taxation by the grace of the people, could justify itself in having supported such a program. Is this what foundation executives refer to when they assert the right of foundations to "experiment" and to use "risk capital" to reach "new horizons?" These same men caution Congress against any regulation or control which would deprive them of the freedom to use foundation funds as they, the supposed elite, see fit. We wonder whether they have merited that confidence. We wonder whether our society can afford to let them "experiment" with our institutions—whether we the people of the United States can afford the "risk"!*

The aggregate import of this document financed by the *Carnegie Corporation* was that our American way of life was a failure; that it must give way to a collectivist society; that educators must now prepare the public for a New Order; and traditional American principles must be abandoned. *In his filed statement, Mr. Dollard, President of the Carnegie Corporation says: "The Corporation regards its entire program as 'pro-American'." We do not so regard the product*

in which it invested hundreds of thousands of dollars of public-dedicated money.

The late Congressman Shafer and his collaborator, Mr. Snow, expressed their view of this foundation-supported Report in *The Turning of the Tides*:

"A strategic wedge was driven in 1934 following the *Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies*.

"Its point of entry was adroitly chosen. The *Commission* proposed to consolidate the traditional high school subjects of geography, economics, sociology, political science, civics and history, into a single category designated as the 'social studies'. Here was the most strategic of all teaching areas for the advancement of a particular philosophy.

"Success in enlisting teachers in this field in the cause of a 'new social order' would have an influence out of all proportion to the number of teachers involved.

"What this all meant was summed up by Professor Harold J. Laski, philosopher of British socialism. He stated:

"'At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America' ". [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearings, p. 480.)

The reader who would excuse *The Carnegie Corporation* from responsibility for the report of its agent, *The American Historical Association* on the ground that it merely provided the funds for the study project, must reconcile this viewpoint, so assiduously nurtured by foundation spokesmen, with the fact that the annual report of the President and Treasurer of *The Carnegie Corporation of New York* for 1933-4 not only endorsed but lauded this program of socialism:

"That its (*the Commission's*) findings were not unanimously supported within the *Commission* itself, and that they are already the subject of vigorous debate outside it, does not detract from their importance, and both the educational world and the public at large owe a debt of gratitude both to the Association for having sponsored this important and timely study in a field of peculiar difficulty, and to the distinguished men and women who served upon the *Commission*."

According to *The Carnegie Corporation*, the public owes a debt of gratitude for the production of a document of tremendous influence in the educational field promoting socialism!

It must not be concluded that the report referred to was an accidental or incidental thing, the product of one isolated group, the opinion of a tiny fraction of the foundation-financed intellectual world. The following quotation is from *Education for the New America*, by Willard E. Givens, in the Proceedings of the 72nd Annual Meeting of *The National Education Association*:

"A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the 'owners' must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership." [Hearings, p. 482.]

Nor was Mr. Givens himself an isolated person acting solely on his own. He was executive secretary of the *NEA* from 1935 to 1952 and was given its award in 1953 for his "many contributions to the field of education" which were deemed "without parallel."

In the *Agenda of Democracy*, by C. E. Merriam, vice-chairman of the *National Resources Planning Board* and for many years the leading figure in *The Social Science Research Council*, the author wrote:

"The days of little-restricted laissez-faire, the days when government was looked upon as a necessary evil—these have gone for a long time, perhaps forever, although in the mutations of time one never knows what forms may recur." [Hearings, p. 482.]

Example after example can be given of the widespread expression, by persons connected with or financed by foundations, of approving conviction that free enterprise was dead and a new order must be ushered in, an order of collectivism.

*The Commission on Higher Education* appointed by the President produced a report in the form of six pamphlets in 1947. The President of *The American Council of Learned Societies* was Chairman of this *Commission*. The reports gave credit to *The American Council of Learned Societies*, *The American Council on Education*, *The American Association of University Professors* and *The Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities* for aid received.

This report emphasized that higher education must be guided to help usher in the new society. Not only was the domestic scene to be changed by a concerted effort on the part of the intellectual leaders of the nation, but we were to be led toward world citizenship as well. The Report of the *President's Commission on Higher Education* contained this statement:

#### PREPARATION FOR WORLD CITIZENSHIP

In speed of transportation and communication and in economic interdependence, the nations of the globe are already one world; the task is to secure recognition and acceptance of this oneness in the thinking of the people, as that the concept of one world may be realized psychologically, socially and in good time politically.

It is this task in particular that challenges our scholars and teachers to lead the way toward a new way of thinking.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is an urgent need for a program for world citizenship that can be made a part of every person's general education. (Hearings, p. 483.)

#### 'SOCIAL ENGINEERING' AND EDUCATION.

The 1947 Report of the *President's Commission on Higher Education* makes clear that our old friend, the "social engineer", is to lead us into better pastures. It recites:

It will take social science and *social engineering* to solve the problems of human relations. Our people must learn to respect the need for special knowledge and technical training in this field as they have come to defer to the expert in physics, chemistry, medicine, and other sciences. (Hearings, p. 483.) [Emphasis supplied.]

The people are no longer to direct their own welfare. "Scientists" must be trained to lead us, to "engineer" us into that better world, domestic and international, which only these experts are capable of determining. It would, of course, be foolish to discount the valuable aid which specialists can give in the advancement of human knowledge and the development of a better society. But the concept of "social engineering" is one with which this Committee has no sympathy. It is again the concept of an elite group determining what is good for the people; it smacks so closely of the fascist principle of a guiding party that we find it distasteful and indigestible. That the governing party might be composed of presumed scientists does not make it a more palatable dish. Moreover, there is evidence enough in the record that the "social sciences" are not sciences and the "social scientists" cannot fairly compare themselves with the experts in physics, chemistry, medicine, and other sciences. *There is something completely false, as well as highly dangerous, in the entire concept of "social engineering."*



The presumption of it all is quite astounding. The same report contains this statement:

Colleges must accelerate the normal slow rate of social change which the educational system reflects; we need to find ways quickly of making the understanding and vision of our most farsighted and sensitive citizens the common possession of all our people. (Hearings, pp. 483, 484.)

Who are these "most farsighted and sensitive citizens" who are to use the colleges and universities to accelerate the "normally slow rate of social change?" They are, of course, the intellectual elite, the foundation-financed, self-appointed "social engineers" who misleadingly bear the title of "scientist" by carrying the label of "social" scientists. "We need", says the report, "men in education who can apply at the point of social action what the social scientist has discovered regarding the laws of human behavior." The basic laws of human behavior have not been "discovered" by self-designated "scientists" but by great philosophers and ethical leaders. We doubt that the social-scientific mind can be relied upon to discover, by inductive methods and quantitative measurement, such laws of human behavior as may be sound determinants in delineating a new society.

"Certainly", continues the report, "the destiny of mankind today rests as much with the social sciences as with the natural sciences." That statement may well be doubted. What is more serious is that these "social scientists" who subscribe to the point of view expressed do not truly mean that the solution rests in science. They do mean that it rests in their own opinions and predilections. That is evidenced by the following quotations from an article in *Progressive Education* for January-February, 1934 by Horace M. Kallen, a member of the *President's Commission*, entitled "*Can We Be Saved by Indoctrination?*":

I find, within the babel of plans and plots against the evils of our times, one only which does not merely repeat the past but varies from it. This is a proposal that the country's pedagogues shall undertake to establish themselves as the country's saviors. It appears in two pamphlets. The first is a challenge to teachers entitled, "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" Its author is George Counts. The second is, "A Call to the Teachers of the Nation."

With an imagination unparalleled among the saviors of civilization, with a faith stronger than every doubt and an earnestness overruling all irony, Mr. Counts suggests that the Great Revolution might be better accomplished and the Great Happiness more quickly established if the teachers rather than the proletarians seized power.

Having taken power, the teachers must use it to attain the "central purpose" of realizing the "American Dream." They must operate education as the instrument of social regeneration. This consists of inculcating right doctrine. (Hearings, p. 484.)

Clearly enough "right doctrine" is what the elite believe in.

A strong proponent of this proposal that the social scientist should be given the task of directing society is Professor Norman Woelfel. His *Molders of the American Mind*, was dedicated "to the teachers of America, active sharers in the building of attitudes, may they collectively choose a destiny which honors only productive labor and promotes the ascendancy of the common man over the forces that make possible an economy of plenty." In it, we find this:

To the teachers of America, active sharers in the building of attitudes, may they collectively choose a destiny which honors only productive labor and pro-

notes the ascendancy of the common man over the forces that make possible an economy of plenty.

\* \* \* \* \*

*The younger generation is on its own and the last thing that would interest modern youth is the salvaging of the Christian tradition. The environmental controls which technologists have achieved, and the operations by means of which workers earn their livelihood, need no aid or sanction from God nor any blessing from the church.*

\* \* \* \* \*

The influence which may prove most effective in promoting the demise of private business as the dominant force in American economic life is the modern racketeer. His activities are constantly in the spotlight of public attention, and the logic upon which he pursues them is the logic of competitive business. He carries the main principles of the business life to their logical extreme and demonstrates their essential absurdity. Like the businessman he is interested in gain, and like the businessman he believes in doing the least to get the most, in buying cheap and selling dear. Like the businessman he believes in attaining a monopoly by cornering the market whenever possible. *The chief difference between the racketeer and the businessman is that the businessman's pursuits have about them an air of respectability given by customary usage and established law.* He may pursue them in the open, advertise them in the public press and over the radio, whereas the racketeer must work undercover.

\* \* \* \* \*

*In the minds of the men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions and of capitalistic profit economy.*

\* \* \* \* \*

This Committee wonders whether the phrase "the men who think experimentally" relates to the insistence of many foundation executives that foundation funds must be used as "risk capital," for "experiment." Is this the kind of experiment which the foundations defend? Professor Woelfel makes his own experimental objectives very clear:

*From the vantage point of the present study, the following objectives for educators are suggested. They, in no sense, purport to be all-comprehensive or final. They do, however, lay claim to be along the line of much needed strategy if educational workers are to play any important part in the society which is building in America.*

\* \* \* \* \*

5. Active participation by educators and teachers in various organizations of the lay public agitating for social reforms whose realization would be in harmony with evolving ideals of American society.

\* \* \* \* \*

9. Active participation of individual educators and of professional organizations of educators in the gradually crystallizing public effort to create out of prevailing chaos and confusion in economic, political, spiritual, ethical, and artistic realms a culture which is under no continuing obligations to past American or foreign cultural pattern.

\* \* \* \* \*

11. A system of school administration constructed under the guidance of experimental social philosophy with the major aim of meeting the professional needs of teachers. This implies relegating the elaborate administrative technology modeled after business practice and capitalistic finance to the background where it may be drawn upon when needed in reconstruction programs.

\* \* \* \* \*

14. A program of public elementary and secondary education organized in the interest of collective ideals and emphasizing the attainment of economic equality as fundamental to the detailed determination of more broadly cultural aims.

15. Centralized organization in public education to an extent which will not only guarantee provision of the most valid knowledge together with adequate facilities for incorporating it into educational practice in every local community throughout the country, but promote as well the construction of attitudes, in the populace, conducive to enlightened reconstruction of social institutions.

"16. A program of public vocational, professional, and higher education integrally organized in terms of a social order wherein all natural resources and the entire industrial structure is controlled by governmental agencies and operated for the

equal benefit of all. This portends educational planning in terms of broadly cultural and creative motives and the final disappearance of programs of education based upon the motive of individual monetary success.

\* \* \* \* \*

20. Gradual abolition of specified grades, subjects, textbooks, testing, and promotion schemes as conceived under the present administrative-supervisory set-up in public education. The development of a series of flexible organizational schemes and teaching programs by local faculties under the guidance and sanction of professional associations and of the lay public.

21. Domination of all specific teaching aims for an indefinite period by the general aim of rendering the attitudes of all normal individuals toward all the problems of life sufficiently tentative to allow for growth and change. (Hearings, pp. 485, 486.) [Emphasis supplied.]

Professor Woelfel does not mince words. In an article, in *Progressive Education* in 1934 called *The Educator, The New Deal and Revolution* he said:

*The call now is for the utmost capitalization of the discontent manifest among teachers for the benefit of revolutionary social goals. This means that all available energies of radically inclined leaders within the profession should be directed toward the building of a united radical front. Warm collectivistic sentiment and intelligent vision, propagated in clever and undisturbing manner by a few individual leaders, no longer suits the occasion.*

\* \* \* \* \*

If we wish the intelligent utilization of the marvelous natural resources and the superb productive machinery which America possesses, for all of the people, with common privileges, and an equal chance to all for the realization of exclusively human potentialities—that is possible, although we must not blindly shrink from the fact that it may require some use of force against those at present privileged. (Hearings, p. 486.)

Professor Woelfel's call to force indicates the intensity of the messianic impulse of many of the social scientists who contributed to the movement for the reform of society, the financing of which was chiefly supplied by foundation funds.

In the *Social Frontier*, of which DR. COUNTS was editor and Professor Woelfel an associate editor, appeared these remarks in the October 1934 issue:

In a word, for the American people, the age of individualism in economy is closing and an age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch.

#### Page 5, Educating for Tomorrow:

To enable the school to participate in raising the level of American life the educational profession must win meaningful academic freedom, not merely the freedom for individuals to teach this or that, but the freedom of the teaching profession to utilize education in shaping the society of tomorrow. (Hearings, p. 488.)

and

The task of enlarging the role of education in shaping the future of our collective life cannot be accomplished by individual educators nor by individual institutions. It is a task for an organized profession as a whole. It is a task which the NEA might make its central project. (Hearings, p. 489.)

\* \* \* \* \*

We submit to the membership of the NEA that its role in the life of the nation would be greatly enhanced if it identified itself with an ideal of social living which alone can bring the social crisis to a happy resolution—a collectivistic and classless society. We further submit that the effectiveness of the NEA would be greatly increased if instead of looking for defenders of education among the ranks of conservative groups, it would identify itself with the underprivileged classes who are the real beneficiaries of public education and who can find their adjustment only in a radically democratic social order. (Hearings, p. 489.)

Professor Woelfel's appeal to *The National Education Association* is indeed a dangerous one, in view of the power of that organization. The 1953 *NEA Handbook* proclaims that the Association has 490,000 individual members and 950,000 affiliated members; that it consists of 66 state organizations and 4434 Affiliated Associations; that it has 29 departments, 14 Headquarters divisions and 23 Commissions and Committees: It says:

"THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IS THE ONLY ORGANIZATION THAT REPRESENTS OR HAS THE POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTING THE GREAT BODY OF TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES." [Emphasis supplied.]

It thus professes itself to be a monopoly. As it is characteristic of organizations that a small group usually controls, it gives one pause to think what such a powerful organization could do if its leaders listened to voices like that of Professor Woelfel.

The activities of *The Progressive Education Association* (for some period called the *American Education Fellowship*) have been strongly in the direction of the promotion of the thesis that the schools should be used as an instrument for social change. This organization, which up to 1943, had received \$4,257,800 from foundations (we do not have a record of subsequent donations) indicated its position in its publication called at various times, *The Social Frontier*, *Frontiers of Democracy*, and *Progressive Education*. In the issue of December 15, 1942, for example, appeared a series of letters by PROFESSOR RUGG which constitute a "call to arms." He announces *The Battle for Consent*. The "Consent" is the consent of the governed to accept change, and it is the position of PROFESSOR RUGG (of whom, more later) which undoubtedly was supported by *The Progressive Education Association*, that this consent can only be obtained through proper education of the people. They must, we gather, be educated into understanding the necessity for social change as Professor Rugg believes it should change—then the battle for the new era can be won. Thus the schools are to be a weapon by these agitators for the winning of the war against our institutions.

*There may not have been a (legal) "conspiracy" to change our social and governmental system, but a mass of evidence demonstrates that the most influential formulators of educational thought strenuously attempted to suborn our schools and that heavy contributions from the tax-exempt foundations provided them with effective sounding-boards for their subverting doctrines.*

#### THE FOUNDATION-SUPPORTED COLLECTIVIST TEXT-BOOKS—THE BACKGROUND.

The witness Aaron M. Sargent is a lawyer actively practicing in the State of California, to the bar of which he was admitted in 1926. He testified that he had 27 years' active experience in the practice of law and 17 years "concerned to some extent with anti-subversive work and investigations affecting American education, and particularly the public schools system." He participated in hearings in 1941-42 before the San Francisco City Board of Education in regard to Rugg social science textbooks. At the request of the California Society, *Sons of the American Revolution*, he studied the progressive system of education between 1942 and 1945 and inquired into the textbook condition of the state schools and the State Department of Education in Sacramento.

In 1946 he began an inquiry which led up to proceedings which were brought to Congress on the so-called *Building America* textbooks. He handled these proceedings for the *Sons of the American Revolution* before the State Board of Education in California and California legislative committees. He drafted legislative bills on education and studied the national aspects of this subversive teaching problem. He is the author of a *Bill of Grievances* which was filed with the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate and the House Committee on Un-American Activities by the *National Society, Sons of the American Revolution*, and conducted the research on which that document was based.

In May, 1952 for a brief period he was employed as a consultant for staff work in research by the Senate Internal Security Committee. In 1952-53 he directed research at the *Hoover Institute at Stanford University on War, Peace and Revolution*. He served for a number of years as Chairman of the Americanization Committee of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution. He had been approached by Congressman Cox, Chairman of the Cox Committee, to act as Counsel to that Committee.

Mr. Sargent testified that in his opinion the investigation of this Committee "is one of the most important matters which has ever come before the Congress of the United States. It concerns the national security, the defense of the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States. You will find that the situation confronting you is the result of a disregard of trust responsibility—a condition amounting to abdication of duty by the trustees of the tax-exempt foundations which have exerted such a great influence in the history of our country since the turn of the century." (Hearings, p. 198.)

Mr. Sargent stated in his opinion the following should be the yardstick to be applied to the conduct of foundations:

Standards of foundation conduct: It is the duty of tax-exempt foundations and their trustees to observe and be guided by the following standards of conduct:

First: Patriotism. To bear true faith and allegiance to the philosophy and principles of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Second: Loyalty. To be active and positive in supporting the United States Government against revolutionary and other subversive attacks;

To put patriotic money at the disposal of patriotic men in this field of education to enable them to support and defend our Constitution and form of government.

Third: Obedience to law. To faithfully obey the laws of the United States and the provisions of State law under which foundation charters are granted;

Fourth: Respect for exemption. To use the tax-exemption privilege in good faith, recognizing the purpose for which that privilege is granted;

To refrain from supporting communism, socialism, and other movements which (1) increase the cost of government, (2) endanger the national security, or (3) threaten the integrity of the Federal Government.

The fifth standard here is academic responsibility. This is a part of my concept of standards of foundation conduct.

Academic responsibility requires these foundations to limit their activities to projects which are, in fact, educational, and are conducted in an academically responsible manner in accordance with proper academic standards;

To refrain from using education as a device for lobbying or a means to disseminate propaganda. (Hearings, pp. 108, 201.)

In using the term "socialism" Mr. Sargent carefully distinguished this area of criticism, defining the term as follows:

When I use the term "socialism," I refer to the political movement which is known as the Socialist movement. The movement which is working for a general program of planned economy based on nationalization of industry, business,

national resources, and credit. The political operation of a nation's economy, not fragmentary things. Politics is something which these foundations are not supposed to go into, and I think they have no right to undermine the basis of their exemption by doing things of that type. (Hearings p. 201.)

Mr. Sargent's testimony concerned itself chiefly with the support by foundations of policies and programs in education of a nature which he deemed destructive of American principles. He narrated that a movement began in the United States shortly before the turn of the century, closely related to Fabian socialism, which had previously become established in Great Britain "which has undermined and almost destroyed the economic system of Great Britain." According to Mr. Sargent, a group of American radical intellectuals organized an attack upon patriotism, "challenging basic American philosophy founded on the doctrine of natural law." He asserted that this group sought to slant and distort history and to introduce a new and revolutionary philosophy, based on the teachings of John Dewey. He called this movement "the greatest betrayal which has ever occurred in American history." (Hearings, p. 203.) He indicated that one of the most vicious aspects of this betrayal was the attack on the doctrine of unalienable rights and natural law set forth in the Declaration of Independence. (Hearings p. 206.)

Mr. Sargent suggested that foundations had supported a movement to attack the stature and function of the Supreme Court as the bulwark of our judiciary system, pointing out that in October, 1936, before the Presidential election, a group of educators had put in the hands of American school children a school book advocating a plan to pack the Supreme Court of the United States. (Hearings, p. 213.)

He accused the foundations of propaganda in having a consistent policy of always supporting one side of controversies having political connotations and never supporting the other. The side which the foundations have neglected is the side of conservatism. (Hearings, p. 214.)

Citing the book, *Fabianism in Great Britain*, by Sister Margaret Patricia McCarran, the daughter of Senator McCarran, which narrates the history of Fabianism in England, Mr. Sargent drew a parallel between this movement and its intellectual offspring, the socialist movement in the United States. What he described as the "beachhead" occurred with the organization of *The Intercollegiate Socialist Society* in 1905 under the direction of Jack London, Upton Sinclair and others. This organization, which we have already discussed,<sup>26</sup> later changed its name to *The League for Industrial Democracy* and exists and operates to this day as a tax-exempt foundation. Branches were installed in many of the major colleges and universities, and persons now well-known were among the leaders of these branch groups, among them BRUCE BLIVEN, FRED KIRCHWEY, Paul (Senator) Douglas, KENNETH MACGOWAN, ISADORE LUBIN, EVANS CLARK, JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES, Jr., and others. The purpose of the *Society* was the active promotion of socialism. (Hearings, p. 220.)

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT, a man with a total of 56 Communist front affiliations, became the first president of the *Intercollegiate Socialist League*. (Hearings, pp. 221, 222, 223, 224.)

<sup>26</sup> See page —.

Mr. Sargent indicated that the movement propelled by this socialist group took over the teaching of John Dewey "who expounded a principle which has become destructive of traditions and has created the difficulties and the confusion, much of it, that we find today. Professor Dewey denied that there was any such thing as absolute truth, that everything was relative, everything was doubtful, that there were no basic values and nothing which was specifically true." With this philosophy, Mr. Sargent points out, "you automatically wipe the slate clean, you throw historical experience and background to the wind and you begin all over again, which is just exactly what the Marxians want someone to do." John Dewey, said Mr. Sargent was a "gift from the Gods to the radicals." His teachings brought on attacks on American tradition and on patriotism. (Hearings, p. 217.)

A natural consequence of this movement to reject tradition was an undermining of the doctrine of inalienable rights proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence and a denial of the theory of natural rights upon which our government is based.

According to Mr. Sargent, the philosophy of John Dewey had appeared just about the time when John D. Rockefeller established his first foundation, *The General Education Board* in 1902. It was an era of reform agitation; and reform was badly needed in several areas of our economic and social life. The socialists, crypto-socialists and collectivists then took hold of the Dewey philosophy and spread it, taking advantage of the existing discontent to make considerable inroads in academic fields. *The National Education Association*, another tax-free organization, also began early to promote the Dewey philosophy.

Mr. Sargent narrated that, in 1916 the Department of Educational Research was established at Teachers College, Columbia University. Under its direction, *The Lincoln School* was established in 1917, and this "kindled the fire which helped to spread progressive education." The quotation is from a pamphlet issued by *Teachers College* itself. The same pamphlet states that John D. Rockefeller made available \$100,000 per year for ten years for Teachers College through *The International Education Board*, to establish and maintain an *International Institute* at that *College*. It also recorded, among other things, that a DR. GEORGE S. COUNTS had been made Associate Director of the *Institute* a few years before 1923. (Hearings, pp. 252, 253.) Reference will later be made to the opinions of DR. COUNTS. Suffice it to record here that his work proceeded with *Rockefeller Foundation* financing.

Mr. Sargent pointed out that the period under discussion was one of growing intellectual radicalism, citing the statement of Professor Von Mises that socialism does not spring from the people but is a program instigated by special types of intellectuals "that form themselves into a clique and bore from within and operate that way. \* \* \* It is not a people's movement at all. It is a capitalizing on the people's emotions and sympathies and skillfully directing those sympathies toward a point these people wish to reach." (Hearings p. 254.)

#### *THE RUGG TEXTBOOKS.*

Among these intellectuals was PROFESSOR HAROLD RUGG, who began issuing pamphlets in the *Lincoln Experimental School* as early

as 1920. The RUGG pamphlets subsequently were developed into what came to be known as the RUGG *Social Science Textbook Series*. About five million of these books had been put into the American public schools. Yet their character may be assessed through a proceeding before the San Francisco Board of Education as a result of which a panel of highly competent men was appointed to evaluate the RUGG books: the Provost of the University of California, professors at Mills College, the University of San Francisco and Stanford University, and a member of the Bar.

The report of this panel was unanimous; it recommended that the RUGG textbooks be barred. The Report is well-worth reading. (Hearings, p. 256, et seq.) It condemns the RUGG books for advocating the principle that "it is one of the functions of the school, indeed it appears at times to be the chief function, to plan the future of society. From this view we emphatically dissent. Moreover, the books contain a constant emphasis on our national defects. Certainly we should think it a great mistake to picture our nation as perfect or flawless either in its past or its present, but it is our conviction that these books give a decidedly distorted impression through overstressing weaknesses and injustices. They therefore tend to weaken the student's love for his country, respect for its past and confidence in its future."

One of the members of the panel, Mr. McKinnon, added:

What Professor Rugg is trying to do is to achieve a social reconstruction through education. The end in view is a new social order in which all the aspects of human relationships, including the political and economic, are to be refashioned and rebuilt. The means by which this end is to be accomplished is education.

\* \* \* \* \*

The lack of an underlying assumption of moral law which is inherent in human nature and which is the norm of good conduct, of happiness, and of socially desirable traits, is evident throughout the texts. Professor Rugg, of course rejects such an idea of law.

\* \* \* \* \*

Nothing is more insistent in the books than the idea of change. From the habit of denying facts and fixed realities, Professor Rugg proceeds to the motion of trial and error in all human affairs. One is never sure one is right. Since everything changes, there is nothing upon which one can build with permanence. Experiment is the rule in social affairs as well as in physical science—experiment in government, in education, in economics, and in family life.

\* \* \* \* \*

Throughout the books runs an antireligious bias. (Hearings, p. 259.)

Joining his fellow panel-members in the unanimous decision to bar the RUGG books, Mr. McKinnon added:

America, in spite of all its faults, has achieved something in the history of social and political life which has borne rich fruit and which may bear richer provided we do not lose the thread. But this is the condition: provided we do not lose the thread.

What is that thread? It is the concept upon which our country was founded, that man is a rational being who possesses rights and duties. (Hearings, p. 260.)

Mr. McKinnon continued that PROFESSOR RUGG's philosophy contravened the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Mr. McKinnon said:

It is true that social conditions and circumstances change. The point is that the principles themselves do not change, for they are inherent in the nature of man, a nature which does not change. (Hearings, p. 260.)



*DR. COUNTS AND OTHERS*

It was Rockefeller money which had made possible this attempt by PROFESSOR RUGG, and those who agreed with his thesis, to use the schools as an active force for social and political change. This Committee wonders whether those who provided the money for such a movement acted in ignorance or with intention.

Nor was PROFESSOR RUGG alone. Among others who employed foundation largess in their attempt to introduce radical social and political change through the use of the school, was the DR. COUNTS to whom we have previously referred. In his pamphlet, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order*, published in 1932, a composition of addresses made to *The Progressive Education Association* in Washington and *The National Council of Education* in Washington, DR. COUNTS advocated "Education through indoctrination." The pamphlet is a call for action: education must be "emancipated" from the influence of the "conservative class"; "it is a fallacy that the school shall be impartial in its emphasis and that no bias should be given to instruction"; "Progressive education wishes to build a new world but refuses to be held accountable for the kind of world it builds."

In 1933 *The Progressive Education Association*, a foundation, supported in part by other foundations, issued a pamphlet called *A Call to The Teachers of the Nation*. It was prepared by a committee of which DR. COUNTS was chairman. It contained this:

"The progressive minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization militantly devoted to the building of a better social order, in the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged. Such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the talent, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence to wage successful war in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the nation. To serve the teaching profession in this way should be one of the major purposes of the Progressive Education Association."

This Committee wonders whether anyone would seriously assert that such proposed conduct is properly encouraged by a tax-free foundation supported by other tax-free foundations. There can be little doubt that DR. COUNTS' call to action was answered, and answered with foundation funds.

It seems reasonable that one be known somewhat by the company one keeps. *The Progressive Education Association* (which had changed its name to the *American Education Fellowship*) publishes a magazine, *Progressive Education*. Its November, 1947 issue has a lead article by John J. DeBoer, the president of the organization, in which he recites that at the 1947 convention there were such speakers as W. E. B. DUBOIS (whose Communist front record is well-known) and LANGSTON HUGHES, a Communist. It is very edifying to learn that this educational organization was addressed by HUGHES, the author of the notorious poem, "Goodbye Christ", which contains sentiments such as this:

"Goodbye,  
Christ Jesus Lord God Jehova,  
Beat it on away from here now.  
Make way for a new guy with no religion at all—  
A real guy named  
Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, Worker Me—"

In the same issue of the magazine there is an article by THEODORE BRAMELD entitled "A New Policy for A. E. F." (the American Education Fellowship). This article contains a resolution which was adopted at the 1947 convention and contains these interesting proposals:

"I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system, a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional 'free enterprise'; a system in which the interests, wants and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are owned and controlled by the people, a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned 'public' utilities; a system in which federal authority is synchronized with decentralized regional and community administration; a system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation, and education, are universalized; a system in which the majority of the people is the sovereign determinant of every basic economy policy.

"II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war (including atomic energy, first of all) and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic planning, of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards, is practiced, parallel with the best standards of individual nations; an order in which . . . races and religions receive equal rights in its democratic control; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship." [Emphasis supplied.]

The same THEODORE BRAMELD, writing in *Science and Society* in 1936, had said:

"The thesis of this article is simply that liberal educators who look towards collectivism as a way out of our economic, political, and cultural morass must give more serious consideration than they have thus far to the methodology of Marx. . . . The possibility remains that ultimately they will agree with the value of Marxian philosophy not only methodologically but systematically as well. But at present what they need especially to consider in devising a strong and skillful strategy to cross the social frontier of a new America, is whether Marxism has not less but rather more—much more—to offer than as yet they willingly admit." [Emphasis supplied.]

Now let us return to DR. COUNTS.

And what was this new social order of which *The Progressive Education Association* was to become a leader? DR. COUNTS became a member of the American Advisory Organization connected with the summer sessions at MOSCOW UNIVERSITY. The purpose of this Organization was to introduce American teachers and students to the new education methods used in Soviet Russia. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that DR. COUNTS, and perhaps some of his associates, were very sympathetic to the Communist experiments in education and willing enough to have them introduced into America. (Hearings, p. 266, et seq.) Mr. Sargent gave this as his opinion:

My comments are that this document shows a framework of a complete system of indoctrination of American educators which could only be put together on the theory of their receiving such indoctrination and coming back here and introducing it into our school system. It even includes the reflexology item I just referred to, including material on Pavlov, who was the author of the principles of brain washing. (Hearings, p. 283.)

DR. COUNTS' interest in things Russian was evident by several of his books, among them *The Soviet Challenge to America*. His work had the approval of the Russians, witness the February 1933 issue of the *Progressive Education Journal*, the official organ of the foundation

known as *The Progressive Education Association*, which contained an article in which reference was made to a letter written by Johannson I. Zilberfarb, a member of the State Scientific Council and Commissariat of Education of the Soviet Union. This was a letter to DR. COUNTS congratulating him on *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*, and the "remarkable progress you have made in challenging capitalism." He added "May I be so bold as to hope that your profound and consistent attack on the social order in your country will eventually lead you to a complete emancipation from American exclusiveness and intellectual messiahship so aptly exposed in your pamphlet, thus enabling you to consider all social progress from a universal proletarian point of view." (Hearings, p. 285.)

PROFESSOR RUGG and DR. COUNTS cannot lightly be dismissed as incidental examples of those "rare and inevitable mistakes" confessed by the foundations—on the contrary, both of these gentlemen appear by the evidence to be typical spearheads of the foundation-supported movement to convert our schools into vehicles for radical social change. DR. COUNTS, it should be noted, was among the signatories of the *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Special Studies of the American Historical Association*. We have already discussed it in detail, but Mr. Sargent's testimony on the *Conclusions and Recommendations* is particularly significant:

What these gentlemen propose to do is set forth in their chapter at the end talking about next steps. It says that it is first to awaken and consolidate leadership around the philosophy and purpose of education expounded in the report. That *The American Historical Association* in cooperation with the *National Council on the Social Studies* has arranged to take over the magazine, *The Outlook*, as a social science journal for teachers. That writers of textbooks are to be expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference. That makers of programs in social sciences in cities and towns may be expected to evaluate the findings. That it is not too much to expect in the near future a decided shift in emphasis from mechanics and methodology to the content and function of courses in the social studies. That is the gist of it.

This report became the basis for a definite slanting in the curriculum by selecting certain historical facts and by no longer presenting others, \* \* \*. (Hearings, pp. 287 et seq.)

It seems undeniable that these *Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association* played a great part in the campaign to slant education by playing down American traditions, thus paving the way for radical social change, and other foundations and foundation-supported enterprises joined in this campaign.

In *The Progressive Education Magazine* of May, 1946 appeared an article by Norman Woelfel in which he stated:

"It might be necessary paradoxically for us to control our press as the Russian press is controlled and as the Nazi press is controlled." (Hearings, p. 292.)

The analogy with Russian methods seems pretty close. It was the purpose of the Communists in Russia (as it is the purpose of every totalitarianism) to condition youth to accept the new state. Radical educators in the United States such as Dr. Woelfel, DR. COUNTS and DR. RUGG, and there were many others, proposed a method quite similar. There is even some evidence to indicate that the progressive education movement itself was intended to be a vehicle for this form of thought control. (Hearings, p. 302.)

We have discussed another evident instrument of this movement to condition the American mind toward social change, namely *The*

*League for Industrial Democracy.* Mr. Sargent in his testimony referred to a letter written by HARRY W. LAIDLER, secretary of this organization, on September 9, 1935 which was a blueprint of their specific plans.

As to plans for the immediate future—we must launch student organization everywhere and at once, early in the college and high school year. We must build up the lecture circuits in new centers. We must arrange various radio programs. We must complete the pamphlets begun in the summer. These are preliminary to establishing a new research service which we believe will double the amount of research produced and reach a much larger audience than we have had in the past. The Chicago office, with a plan for extended work in the metropolitan area, is ready to reopen. The emergency committee for strikers relief will be called upon to renew its efforts on behalf of the sharecroppers who are about to undertake a cotton pickers strike.

In addition to our major program, the L. I. D. continues its work of active cooperation with other groups. By arrangement with the New Beginning group, which carries on underground work in Germany, one of its leaders is to come to America under our auspices. With several defense organizations we are undertaking a campaign to widen the support for Angelo Herndon; we are active on the Sacramento defense committee to fight the criminal syndicalism laws in California. Other joint efforts find the L. I. D. actively participating. (Hearings, p. 306.)

#### *THE BUILDING AMERICA TEXTBOOKS.*

The story of the *Building America* textbooks is as good an example as any of the attempt by radical educators financed by foundations to subvert the schools. *The General Education Board* of Rockefeller provided over \$50,000 to assist in the development of this series of textbooks. (Hearings, p. 309.) It is impossible to believe that those in this Foundation who authorized the work did not appreciate what its significance could be. The 1940 Annual Report of *The General Education Board* describes the "project" in some detail and anticipates that it will cover such subjects as "planning and natural resources", "personal security and self-development", "free enterprise and collectivism", etc.

Mr. Sargent pointed out instance after instance in which the attempt was made to destroy our traditions and to use the schools for political propaganda. (Hearings, p. 311, et seq.) *Yet these books were taken over by the National Education Association and promoted broadly for use in the schools.*

These *NEA* sponsored books came under severe criticism in the State of California where, as a result of a proceeding, they were barred from the California schools. The report of the Senate Investigating Committee on Education of the California Legislature, known as the Dilworth Committee, severely condemned these books and labeled them as subtle attempts to play up Marxism and to destroy our traditions. Interesting quotations from the report of this Committee are to be found on page 315 of the Hearings and elsewhere.

The legislative report listed the many front organizations of some of the authors of reference material in these books, among them ANNA LOUISE STRONG, ALBERT RHYS, and ALLEN ROBERTS. One cannot read the quotations from these books and the comments of the California legislative committee, as contained in the testimony of Mr. Sargent (Hearings, p. 309 et seq.), without coming to the conclusion that *these books promoted by the National Education Association and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation contained vicious, radical propaganda in substantial degree.*

Part of the plan of the radical educators financed by foundations was apparently to combine various courses, history, geography, etc.

into a new course generally known as "social studies". This mechanism assisted them in using the schools for propaganda. Later, borrowing a Communist term, the combined courses were sometimes called "core studies". Mr. Sargent pointed out that there was a blackout in history in California for a long period. No history books were furnished by the Department of Education from 1928 to almost 1940. It was not until a legislative investigation that history books were furnished as required by law. The *Building America* books apparently took their place. The books, along with a great amount of propaganda, lampooned some of our great traditional figures such as Lincoln and Jefferson and in contrast exhibited Stalin in friendly light. The Dilworth Committee was profoundly shocked at the presence of a cartoon showing President Lincoln burying the Constitution. Nothing was provided to teach the children that Lincoln was a noble and inspiring character. As the Dilworth Committee said:

"Nothing so vividly illustrates the change in attitude of some of our national educational leaders in some policy-forming positions of the National Education Association of professional educators and teachers as this about-face toward the memory of Abraham Lincoln who lived and labored 'That government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not persih from the earth.'" (Hearings, p. 319.)

The Committee Report stated further:

"There are two great Americans that the devotees of foreign isms and ideologies consistently smear. They are Abraham Lincoln because he suppressed a revolution and Thomas Jefferson because he is the great advocate of rights of state and individuals as opposed to centralized government control." (Hearings, p. 319.)

It could not have been coincidence that the Dilworth Committee "found among other things that 113 Communist-front organizations had to do with some of the material in these books and that 50 Communist-front authors were connected with it. Among the authors are Sidney and Beatrice Webb, identified with the Fabian Socialist Movement in Great Britain." (Hearings, p. 319.)

One of the basic components of the *Building America* textbooks was a pamphlet entitled the *American Way of Business*, by OSCAR LANGE and ABBA P. LERNER. Both have been beneficiaries of *Rockefeller* fellowships. Both have been collectivists for a long time. OSCAR P. LANGE, a professor at the University of Chicago under ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS, renounced his American citizenship in Warsaw in order to accept appointment as ambassador to the United Nations from Communist dominated Poland. It would be difficult for the *National Education Association* or the *Rockefeller Foundation* to convince the average American citizen that the "American way of business" should be taught to the American school child by MESSRS. LANGE and LERNER. The following are quotations from this piece of literature widely promoted for use in our schools:

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "The idea of abolishing private enterprise came from socialist thinkers who believed that this change would actually further the development and freedom of the individual."

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "Public enterprise must become a major constituent of our economy, if we are really going to have economic prosperity."

\* \* \* \* \*  
 "It is necessary to have public ownership of banking and credit (investment banks and insurance companies)."

\* \* \* \* \*

"A publicly owned banking and credit system alone is compatible with the flexibility of capital value necessary to maintain competitive standards in production and trade."

\* \* \* \* \*

"It is necessary to have public ownership of monopolistic key industries. . . . The legal basis for public ownership of such industries should be provided by an amendment to the anti-trust laws, providing that in cases of proved repetition of monopolistic practices and impossibility of correcting the situation on the basis of private enterprise, the companies in question should be transferred into public ownership and operated on the 'principle of public service.'"

\* \* \* \* \*

"It is necessary to have public ownership of basic natural resources (mines, oil fields, timber, coal, etc.)."

\* \* \* \* \*

"in order to insure that the public corporations act in accordance with the competitive 'rules of the game,' special economic court (enjoying the same independence as the courts of justice) might be established . . . and that the economic court be given the power to repeal any rules of Congress, of legislatures, or of the municipal councils. . . ."

The *Building America* textbooks are apparently still used in some of the schools. They are being used in Arlington, Virginia and in Maryland right now. (Hearings, p. 320.)

Mr. Sargent introduced evidence that *The National Education Association* in the anxiety of its leaders to promote a "progressivism" in education along radical lines has been aggressive in its "smearing" of Americans who opposed its policies (Hearings, p. 321, et seq.), has engaged in extensive lobbying and interfered substantially with the local jurisdiction of school authorities.

Mr. Sargent testified that in his opinion the chief support for the radical movement in education had come from the *Rockefeller, Carnegie and Ford Foundations*.

Mr. SARGENT. *The Rockefeller Foundation* has actively promoted and supported the injection and the propagation of the so-called John Dewey system of experimental education and has aided the introduction of Communist practices in our school system and is defending and supporting the continuance of those practices in the schools.

Mr. HAYS. That is the *Rockefeller Foundation*?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, sir, and also the *General Education Board* and the *International Education Institute*.

*Carnegie* has aided it through various grants; both of them incidentally are carrying on a lobby and a very extensive lobby, involving the schools which I will testify about this afternoon.

*The Ford Foundation* has become the lobby which has interfered or is interfering with the integrity of local schools and is promoting world federalism and world federal government, among other things, and extending its power into many areas capable of being dangerous. (Hearings, p. 337.)

Many have pointed out that few of the major foundations do much, if anything, in the way of an affirmative defence of existing institutions. The witness, Mr. Sargent, testified that he had written to 115 text book publishers throughout the country to determine "what materials were available for instructing students and adult groups desiring to study the propaganda and activities of socialist and communist organizations, or for the study of the economic, financial and political and constitutional effects of Fabian Socialism and the social welfare state." (Hearings, p. 387.) He stated that the substance of the replies was "that practically no material of this kind was available by any of these publishers." He submitted supporting data to the Committee. It would be interesting to aggregate the total funds poured by foundations into the dissemination of leftist propaganda and compare it with

the tiny trickle which flowed into an exposition of the fallacies and frailties of collectivism.

*THE MOSCOW UNIVERSITY SUMMER SESSIONS*

In the hearings starting at page 272 is disclosed a remarkable document: a travel information folder published by World Tourists, Inc., an agency of the Soviet Government, announcing the Anglo-American Section of a summer session at Moscow University. The Institute of International Education, Inc., is listed as the "American Advisory Organization", and among its individual "advisors" appear the names of George S. Counts and Heber Harper. Then there is listed a "National Advisory Council" which contains the names of some eminent professors, presidents and chancellors of universities, and a selection of social scientists and executives of foundations. Immediately under this list of names there is the following recitation:

"The tremendous progress of the Soviet Union in the cultural field creates for Americans an unequalled observation ground for education, psychology, and the social sciences. The Soviet Union presents a unique opportunity for the study of the processes of cultural change. \* \* \* The Soviet Union possesses the most progressive system of public education, extensively making use of the best achievements of international pedagogy. \* \* \*"

Summer courses are then announced to be held in the University of Moscow, and the attendance of American students is solicited. Apparently they are to learn how pleasant life is in Soviet Russia and how much better the Communists have solved their social problems. The entire announcement is worth reading.

Significant is the fact, however, that among the members of the National Advisory Council which participated in the project were Stephen Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, John A. Kingsbury, secretary of the Milbank Memorial Fund; Charles R. Mann, director of the American Council on Education; and Edward R. Murrow, then assistant director of the Institute of International Education. It was a strange venture, indeed, to receive American foundation support.

There had been previous summer sessions of the Moscow University—in 1933 and 1934. The first one (1933) was called the First Russian Seminar and Near East Cruise. The brochure for the 1935 Summer Session (Anglo-American Section of the Moscow State University) contains the following paragraph indicating that the 1933 session was also under the auspices of the Institute of International Education:

"In order to insure close cooperation with American educational institutions, and with students and educators in the United States, an advisory relationship was established in 1933 with the Institute of International Education. At the same time, a National Advisory Council of prominent American educators was formed by Professor Stephen Duggan to assist the Institute of International Education in its advisory capacity. To facilitate still closer rapprochement, each year several American educators are invited to Moscow as resident advisors to the Summer Session. Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Heber Harper, Professors of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, will act as advisors during the summer session of 1935."

The Advisory Committee for 1933 was:

STUART CHASE, New York City.

KENNETH CONANT, Associate Professor of Architecture, Harvard University.

SAMUEL H. CROSS, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literature, Harvard University.

**HENRY W. L. DANA**, Cambridge.

**GEORGE N. DAY**, Professor of Economics and Sociology, Occidental College.

**SAMUEL N. HARPER**, Professor of Russian Language and Institutions, The University of Chicago.

**HENRY L. HARRIMAN**, President, United States Chamber of Commerce, Boston.

**BRUCE C. HOPPER**, Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University.

**WALTER W. HYDE**, Professor of Greek and Ancient History, University of Pennsylvania.

**EDWARD R. MURROW**, Assistant Director, Institute of International Education, Inc., New York City.

**FRANK NOWAK**, Professor of Slavic History, Boston University.

**GROVE PATTERSON**, Editor of the *Toledo Blade*, Toledo.

**D. C. POOLE**, School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University.

**GEROUD T. ROBINSON**, Associate Professor of History, Columbia University.

**TREDWELL SMITH**, New York City.

**WHITING WILLIAMS**, Cleveland.

According to the brochure (page 4) "The Summer Session is officially an organizational part of the Moscow State University" and

"The Moscow University Summer Session is sponsored in the Soviet Union by the Peoples' Commissariat of Education of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic; by VOKS, the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries; and by *Intourist*, the State Travel Company of the U. S. S. R. *Intourist*, through its Educational Department, will supply information to persons interested."

VOKS was the subject of testimony before the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee Hearings (July 25, 1951-June 20, 1952) by two witnesses both of whom stated under oath that it was an operation supervised by the Communist Party. According to one witness the official translation of these letters is: "Society for Cultural Relations Between Soviet Union and Foreign Countries". He added, "Actually it was one of the cover organizations for, again, these double tracks, getting information from abroad to the Soviet Intelligence, and sending infiltration of ideas and selling Communist ideas to the west."

The 1933 announcement of the 1933 Seminar carried these statements under the heading "Seminar Aims":

"The Russian Revolution has brought on one of the greatest social upheavals of all time. Socialism has been given microscopic trials before, but never on such a Gargantuan scale. Now, in our own times and under our very eyes, the world's most important experiment in Communism is taking place. The inspirational opportunities for study and observation are unlimited. Would you like to have been an observer in France during the French Revolution? The present opportunity in Russia is of equal significance. The First Russian Seminar will take advantage of this opportunity.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Those for whom the Seminar will be a success, those who derive the greatest benefit therefrom, those who will come away heavily laden with thought-provoking experiences and unforgettable memories, will be those members who have entered into the spirit of the Seminar. This may be tersely worded as follows: 'We are interested in seeing and understanding. We desire something more lasting than the memory of de luxe accommodations. For these we do not even need to leave our American homes where these comforts abound, but Russia has something to show us. Let us try to comprehend.'"

The 1934 session was known as the American Institute of Moscow University (instead of the Anglo-American Institute); and according to a report entitled "Report For the Institute of International Education" it functioned under the auspices of:

1. The Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries—VOKS

2. The All-Union Travel Company *Intourist*



The lectures were held in the morning, and the afternoons were devoted to field trips, 130 such excursions being made. After examinations students had a choice of one of the following four itineraries:

	Days	Students
1. Kharkov, Yalta, Sevastopol, Odessa, Kiev.....	15	39
2. Kharkov, Yalta, Sevastopol, Odessa, Kiev.....	10	66
Both these tours were conducted by Professor Svadkovsky (assistant director of the Central Pedagogical Institute) and Miss Samokhvalova.		
3. Gorki, Volga, Rostov, Kharkov, Kiev.....	15	40
Conducted by Y. L. Robbins of VOKS.		
4. Leningrad, Baltic and White Sea Canal, Kharkov and Kiev....	15	25
Conducted by Professor Gramp.		

Attendance of less than 40 at the 1933 session increased to 212 at the 1934 session (according to announcement of 1935 session), among whom were "undergraduates, teachers, principals, professors, psychologists, social workers, physicians, nurses and artists". The following reference to the previous sessions is also taken from the 1935 announcement:

"Basing their judgment upon the undeniable success of these ventures, the Soviet Educational authorities organized at the University of Moscow, an Anglo-American Section offering full and regular instruction in English. The students and professors of the 1933 and 1934 sessions approved the academic advantages of the plan, which enabled the student to travel during his vacation period and at the same time to further his own professional experience. It is a plan that has the full support of the foremost educators and scientists of the Soviet Union."

One of the academic regulations was:

"2. The course, "Principles of the Collective and Socialist Society" is *prerequisite for admission to all other courses*; however, the student may enroll simultaneously in this and other courses. Students may be exempted from this requirement by presenting evidence of having completed:

a. An equivalent course during the Moscow University Summer sessions of 1933 or 1934."

(Italics in original.)

Principles of the Collective and Socialist Society teach the violent overthrow of the traditional social order—it is the communist creed—yet it was "*prerequisite*" for acceptance at the *American Institute* of the Moscow University.

According to the same announcement folder:

"All student applications must be approved by the office of the Institute of International Education."

To summarize:

1. Summer sessions of the Moscow University were held in 1933 and 1934.

2. A projected summer session in 1935 was not held as such; however an "alternative program" was offered (see post).

3. The 1933 and 1934 sessions were under the auspices of a. VOKS—an undercover organization for soviet Intelligence.

b. The Institute of International Education.

Stephen Duggan (who advocated recognition of Russia in 1920, the father of Laurence Duggan—named under oath as a Soviet agent) was director of the Institute and Edward R. Murrow was assistant director, serving as acting director during Duggan's absence in 1933-34.

4. The announced 1935 summer session was to be under the same auspices.

5. Applications were subject to approval by the Institute of International Education.

6. Prerequisite for admission was the course which teaches the overthrow of government by force and violence.

Since all student applications were approved by the Institute it is interesting to look into some of those who were approved—obviously, it has been impossible to check into all of the over two hundred such students, nor does the committee have a complete list of them. The names referred to, however, are fairly familiar.

#### *Julia Older*

Sister of Andrew Older, an exposed Communist. According to the report made to the Institute of International Education on the 1934 Moscow Summer School "Julia Older of Hartford Courant" was chairman of the Editorial Committee which "prepared two issues of the student wall newspaper 'Soviet Summer'."

Julia Older Bazar appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee on two occasions (September 25, and October 14, 1952) at which time she refused to answer questions regarding the Moscow University Summer school under the privilege of the Fifth Amendment.

At that time, Julia Older Bazar was employed by the Bureau of Documents and Editorial Control Section of the United Nations: "I review manuscripts that come through for reproduction and prepare reports of the various departments of the United Nations for publication."

She refused to state whether she had been a member of the Communist party while doing this work, or while she worked for the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture and the Coordinator of Information Office.

She refused to state whether she had been a roommate of Anna Louise Strong, an exposed Communist; and other questions regarding her activities drew a refusal to answer on "the basis of the first and fifth amendments."

#### *John Bovingdon*

According to the February 11, 1941 issue of *The Peoples World* (west coast official organ of the Communist Party) John Bovingdon was to lecture throughout America on "what Soviet Russia is trying to accomplish".

Referring to his stay in Russia, Bovingdon said his final successful year in Russia made him realize the work to be done in the United States.

#### *Ring Lardner, Jr.*

Exposed as a Hollywood Communist (as a result of his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee he was indicted and convicted) Ring Lardner, Jr., refused to answer as to his Communist Party membership, even when faced with a card showing membership in the Communist Party.

#### *Oakley Johnson*

The 1940 report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities referred to the American League for Peace and Democracy (cited

by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist) and stated that its secretaries "Oakley Johnson and Dinald Henderson were well-known Communists".

*Ballis Edwin Blaisdell*

In May, 1953, Blaisdell testified before the Sub-committee of the House Un-American Activities investigating infiltration in Education that he had been approved to attend the Moscow University Summer session in 1935 and when it was not held availed himself of the opportunity offered to spend an equivalent amount of time travelling in the Soviet Union with guided tours. He also testified that the following spring—1936—he looked up the Communist Party address and joined the Party.

Mr. Hays (Hearings, p. 266 et seq.) stressed that the 1935 summer session of the American Institute of the Moscow State University was never held. That appears to be the fact; *yet it is equally the fact* that when the decision not to hold the session was reached an alternative program was offered and many of those "approved" by the Institute of International Education availed themselves of that alternative program. This is evidenced by the following letter, which is on file with one of the government agencies:

We, a group of students who were enrolled in the Anglo-American Summer School at the Moscow University, although regretting the necessity which caused the closing of the school, nevertheless wish to express our appreciation for the unending thoughtfulness shown us by the Intourist organization and staff in their efforts to make our stay in the Soviet Union enjoyable and instructive. No expense has been spared to take care of our needs. The greatest of pains have been taken by Intourist with the cooperation of VOKS, to arrange visits and interviews for us with many directors of institutes and factories, teachers, writers and artists. These men and women have spent hours answering our questions and delivering exhaustive talks to us on the various phases of socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. The greatest hospitality was shown us during the course of these interviews.

By this means, and by mixing with the people in the streets, parks and elsewhere, we have obtained a clear picture of the life and culture of this country, a picture which we hope to make more complete when we travel among the minority nations of the Soviet Union during the next few weeks.

Moscow, July 28, 1935.

Louis Cohen  
Louise M. Edelson  
Genevieve Williamson  
H. R. Buros  
Leopold London  
Shirley Olmsted  
John Galio  
H. H. Gleickman  
John Bovingdon  
R. N. Rubin  
Baronig Baron  
S. K. Bedekar  
Gert Davidson  
Alvin E. Coons

Celia Lipsky  
Adele C. Martin  
Sarah Goodman  
Charlotte Owen  
Adele Birnbaum  
Herberg Eiges  
Helen Eiges  
Oakley Johnson  
Ena Lu Sharer  
Joyce Lengler  
D. Zablodowsky  
Mollie Rice  
Betty Turner  
Gene Lizitzky

John Fisher  
Marian Grosberg  
Lee Saltzman  
Jack Cohn  
L. O. Ghaller  
Louise Bovingdon  
Lillie Davidson  
Majorie Schwarz  
Britton Morris  
Betty Padford  
J. W. Nixon  
Alice Stewart

*THE FORD FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION*

The Testimony of Prof. Thomas H. Briggs (Record, p. 94 et seq.) indicates that a thorough investigation of this unit of the *Ford Founda-*

tion is highly desirable. Prof. Briggs (now retired) was one of our most eminent educators. He was selected by the *Ford Fund* as a member of its Advisory Committee and resigned in disgust at its policies and principles. He testified, moreover, that although the *Fund* had expressed gratefulness to the Advisory Committee for its help, that Committee had really not been consulted at all in any significant manner.

Among the projects of *The Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education* which would bear scrutiny is its support of the *Institute for Philosophical Research*, San Francisco, California. The 1952 annual report of *The Ford Foundation* states that one of the problems upon which it would concentrate is a "clarification of educational philosophy." In the same report appears this:

"A more fundamental and long-range approach to clarifying the philosophical questions basic to education in the United States is being made by the Institute of Philosophic Research, supported jointly by the Fund and the Old Dominion Foundation. The Institute is undertaking, with the counsel and participation of leading thinkers, to clarify the whole body of Western thought. It hopes, thereby, to foster a community of understanding that will make discussion about fundamental issues more intelligible."

The annual report of *The Fund for the Advancement of Education* reports a three year grant of \$565,000 to the *Institute* and notes that it is to be under the direction of MR. MORTIMER ADLER. The project is there described as

"undertaking a dialectical examination of Western humanistic thought with a view to providing assistance in the clarification of basic philosophical and educational issues in the modern world."

That this project deserves attention is witnessed by the well-known radical opinions of MR. ADLER, its director. In the January, 1949 issue of *Common Cause*, MR. ADLER had an article entitled *The Quiet Revolution*, in which he said:

"The basic trend toward socialism, which began with Wilson's New Freedom, and which was greatly accelerated by Roosevelt's New Deal, has been confirmed by Truman's return to the presidency on a platform which does not yield an inch to the right and in many respects goes further to the left. That fact suggests the possibility that some form of socialism which is quite compatible with democracy—as in England and the United States—may prove to be the middle ground between the free enterprise capitalism and the oligarchical politics of the 'economic royalists' on the one hand, and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the despotism of the party on the other."

The following is from the same article by the man selected to direct "a dialectical examination of Western thought" to the tune of over a half-million dollars of *Ford Foundation* (public) money:

"It all adds up to a clear picture. It looks like a quiet but none the less effective revolution. If we still wish to be cautious we need say no more than that we have reached a turning point in American politics at which it has become evident that the general social process of the last twenty years is irreversible—except by force. By choice the American people are never going to fall back to the right again. That deserves to be called a revolution accomplished. But it is also a revolution which will continue. Either the Democratic Party will move further to the left or a new political party will form to the left of the Democrats."

#### INTER-UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Another Fund for Adult Education grant which warrants study is that to the Inter-University Labor Education Committee (totalling \$384,000 from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953). There exists an

undated publication of this Committee called *Labor's Stake in World Affairs*, marked "Preliminary Draft for Limited Distribution and Comment". It was prepared by the Union Leadership Project of the University of Chicago under the direction of the Review and Evaluation Committee of the Inter-University Labor Education Committee, and credit is given to members of the faculty, including Bert H. Hoselitz, who had been active in the Inter-Collegiate Socialist Society. This Committee finds highly reprehensible in this booklet the characterization of the conflict between Russia and the United States as a "struggle for world power". And, while the booklet says that labor must help in the fight against Communism, one would gather from it: that the Soviet Union wants peace; is against imperialism and intervention; and wishes to cooperate with the United States. The reader is left with the impression that, in view of Russia's good-will, there is no point in arming—we should just make peace. A distorted account of the events preceding and following the institution of the Marshall Plan further misleads the reader, as does the inference that the growing Communist movement in Eastern nations is the pure result of nationalism.

Race relations is treated in a most unfortunate manner. The question is asked whether we would have used the atom bomb on white Europeans—did we not use it against the Japanese only because they had yellow skins? The same question is raised over our use of napalm in Korea.

The section of the booklet devoted to "People Of The World—A Day In Their Lives" has a definite pro-Russian slant. In a French family, the question is asked: If Russia invades, should we fight?—and a worker answers "yes". Then the question is asked: "But what if American starts it—are we still supposed to fight? The question is left unanswered. In a Russian family the wife asks for some new shoes for the children, but the husband replies that she must get used to it—"Our country must first build up its industrial might. Today steel is more important than a large selection of shoes". There is no intimation that the build-up is for armament purposes.

In a reference to the Berlin Blockade, the pamphlet intimates that the difficulties arose because the original agreement between the three parties provided that Germany would be kept as an agricultural state, but later America began competing with Russia for German's favor and opposed an agricultural economy. When the four-power control broke down the American, French and English zones were consolidated and currency reforms were made in the Western zone. The increased production and industrialization in that zone made it mandatory on Russia to retaliate and this she did by what the pamphlet implies was the only method she could choose—The Berlin Blockade. The airlift is treated as similar to the Russian blockade. The section again contains what seem to this committee as very slanted questions, raising the question "was the U. S. airlift consistent with American policy objectives?"

Bert H. Hoselitz is one of those to whom the pamphlet expresses appreciation for the discussion materials—and Mr. Hoselitz was an active member of the Socialist group on the campus of Chicago University.

*GOOD BOOKS DISCUSSION GROUPS: ANOTHER FORD FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION PROJECT*

Increasing emphasis is being placed on continuing the educational process beyond the adolescent and usual years of schooling. The basic idea is certainly a worthy one, but this Committee seriously questions whether one Fund project in this field has been entirely commendable. That is another of the matters which warrant inquiry by a continued investigation.

We refer to the support of the American Library Association—American Heritage Project, which has received substantial sums from the Ford Fund for Adult Education. It is based on group discussion of books (selected from the so-called "Good Books") and 16 mm educational films designed to "bring adults together at their public libraries to discuss the great American documents and American political freedoms".

The Great Books project is closely allied through its directorate with the Encyclopedia Britannica, and the latter issues 16 mm documentary and educational films used by the discussion groups.

It is obvious that because of its very nature "adult education" has tremendous possibilities for use as a propaganda medium, directed as it is particularly to adults of foreign birth (whose formal schooling in this country may have been limited) and to those who seek a greater knowledge of political science and America's place in the world today. The material in the hands of this Committee is not exhaustive but it appears to lean heavily to civil liberties, political and social action, and international world politics.

In addition to the fact that the preponderance of current authors are definitely not of the conservative point of view (and many of them, as will be seen by referring to the Appendix to this Report have citations of various degrees) the films suggested as part of these joint presentations are even more radical and contentious. There seems little justification for the use of any of the films mentioned here, even if they were balanced by an equal number of innocuous ones—which is not the case. When the nature of the films is considered in the light of some of the personalities associated with the project and with the films, this committee questions the objectivity and the good faith of those responsible for the selection of individuals and discussion material.

*Due Process of Law Denied*

This film, somewhat uniquely paired with "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn" deals with excerpts from "The Ox Bow Incident", a brutal story of mob "justice". Described in the material furnished to the discussion groups as "forceful re-enacting of a lynching", a more accurate statement is that it is inflammatory and designed to convey the impression that throughout the United States there is widespread disregard for law and order.

*The Cummington Story*

By WALDO SALT, who on April 15, 1951, refused to answer, claiming the privilege of the Fifth Amendment when questioned by the House Un-American Activities Committee regarding his Communist affiliations.

*The House I Live In*

By ALBERT MALTZ referred to earlier, who refused to answer questions regarding his Communist Party record, and was cited for contempt.

*Of Human Rights*

Prepared by the United Nations Film Department, it is used with the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, and is described as follows:

"An incident involving economic and racial prejudice among children is used to dramatize the importance of bringing to the attention of the peoples of the world *their rights as human beings* as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed by the UNP General Assembly in December 1948." [Emphasis supplied.]

The United States government by rejecting this Universal Declaration has gone on record as stating this country does not consider that document—prepared in collaboration with the Communists—as a statement of our "rights as human beings". The rights of citizens of the United States are set forth in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution and its Amendments.

*Brotherhood of Man*

Also suggested for use on the program "Human Rights" this film produced by United Productions of America for the United Automobile Workers of the CIO is distributed by Brandon Films. The Washington representative of Brandon Films testified before the Jenner Committee in May 1951 that Brandon Films advertised in the *Daily Worker* but took refuge behind the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination when questioned as to his own Communist Party membership.

The film itself is based on the pamphlet "Races of Mankind" written by RUTH BENEDICT and GENE WELTFISH, whose records are included in the Appendix. Following complaints as to its nature and accuracy the pamphlet was withdrawn from the Armed Forces Education Program—but as recently as *September of this year the film was in use at the Film Center at Fort Monmouth*. To this Committee the use of such a film cannot be justified, and it condemns the subterfuge by which a document branded as inaccurate is withdrawn as it were by one hand and surreptitiously reinstated with the other.

*With These Hands*

Produced by the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, this film is a highly colored portrayal of violence on the picket lines, featuring the horrors of the Triangle Fire in New York City almost fifty years ago, giving a completely unrealistic picture of present day working conditions.

*The Challenge*

This is another film on the theme that the guarantee of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is denied to Negroes and other minority group members in the United States; it is unrealistic, distorted and deceptive.

Such presentations as these cannot be called educational in the opinion of this Committee, they deliberately seek to stress "what's wrong" in present and past group relations rather than provide facts

for objective discussion of such relations, and ignore the fact that here in the United States can be found the outstanding example of liberty in action in the world today.

The Fund For Adult Education along with the 20th Century Fund, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, is closely associated with the Film Council of America. Evans Clark is listed as a member and William F. Kruse (at one time connected with Bell and Howell) is in a policy-making position on the Film Council. Mr. Kruse's background is particularly interesting to this Committee since he carries great weight with the Council—and the Council's films find their way into the discussion groups sponsored by the American Library Association with Ford money.

Mr. Kruse is reliably reported to have been a communist as recently as 1943, and there are witnesses who state he still was after that date. As late as 1943 he was listed as sponsoring the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Another individual indirectly associated with the Film Council is John Grierson, who produced "Round Trip" spearhead for a world trade campaign in this country starring Paul Hoffman. Grierson resigned as head of the National Film Board of Canada at the time of the Canadian atomic spy ring revelations. Denied a visa to this country he came in through Unesco and thereafter headed the film section of that organization. Unesco and UNO films are likewise used in the Good Books discussion groups.

The 16 mm film is being increasingly recommended for use in all levels of education—including so-called adult education. This Committee would strongly urge that the whole matter of the type of films as well as the subject matter and the individuals and organizations who produce these films, be carefully studied. There is no greater media today through which to propagandize and it is no exaggeration to say that such things as ostensibly "educational" films can well prove to be the Trojan horse of those ideologies which seek to scuttle American principles and ideals.

Other projects of *The Fund for the Advancement of Education* need the attention of a continued investigation. Professor Briggs' testimony indicated that much was badly wrong with the operation of the great *Fund* and very seriously so. We have referred to his testimony elsewhere but add these excerpts from it:

"Representing, as I think I do, the sentiment of the vast majority of educators of the country, I am deeply concerned that a major part of the program of *The Fund for the Advancement of Education* deprecates the professional education of teachers and of school administrators.

"It apparently is assuming that a good general education is sufficient to insure effective professional work." (Hearings, p. 99.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"The desired increase in general education of teachers will not result from the projects, costly as they are, of the Fund for the Advancement of Education. They may improve a small fraction of teachers, but they are unlikely to have any widespread national effect." (Hearings, p. 100.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"But after 3 years of what the *Fund* erroneously calls "a great experiment" there is no evidence that the hoped-for result is in sight. Nor, according to reports from a number of schools from which the favored teachers were selected, has the expenditure of several million dollars on the project produced any material improvement in education or in the increased ambition of other teachers.

"This is but one of several expensive projects that the *Fund* has financed for a purpose praiseworthy in itself but wastefully unlikely to have any significant



results on education throughout the country. The relatively few fortunate teachers probably profited from their year of study, but it was unrealistic to expect that their experience would materially affect all, or any considerable part, of the schools of the Nation." (Hearings, p. 100.)

\* \* \* \* \*

"\* \* \* But concerning the professional education of school people the officers of the Fund begin their propaganda against current practices by an assumption that they know what the preparation should be with such an assumption, however unsound, would not be disturbing if these officers did not have at their disposal millions of money, yours and mine, as well as Mr. Ford's to promote their theories. To whatever extent successful their propaganda, disguised under declared benevolence, the effect is likely to be decreasing public confidence and perhaps decreased public support for what is desirable and necessary. (Hearings, p. 101.)"

\* \* \* \* \*

"All this being understood, we can assert without fear of successful contradiction that any attempt by outside agencies, however heavily they may be financed and however supported by eminent individuals, to influence school administrators and teachers to seek other objectives than those which have public approval or to use methods and materials not directed by responsible management is an impudence not to be tolerated. Though cloaked with declared benevolence, it cannot hide the arrogance underneath." (Hearings, p. 99.) [Emphasis supplied.]

The following was Professor Briggs' summarized indictment against the *Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education*:

In summary, I charge:

1. That *The Fund for the Advancement of Education* is improperly manned with a staff inexperienced in public elementary and secondary schools, ignorant at firsthand of the problems that daily confront teachers and school administrators, and out of sympathy with the democratic ideal of giving an appropriate education to all the children of all of the people;
2. That the Fund is using its great resources, mostly contributed by the public by the remission of taxes, to deprecate a program of professional education of teachers and school administrators that has been approved by the public with legislation and appropriations;
3. That the Fund has ignored the professional organizations of teachers and school administrators, neither seeking their advice and cooperation nor making appropriation to support projects proposed by them;
4. That the Fund has made grants to favored localities and individuals for projects that are not likely to have any wide or important influence;
5. That the Fund has given no evidence of its realization of its obligation as a public trust to promote the general good of the entire Nation;
6. That the Fund has in some cases been wastefully prodigal in making grants beyond the importance of the projects; and
7. That the Fund either has no balanced program of correlated constructive policies, or else it has failed to make them public. (Hearings, p. 103.)

#### AN INEVITABLE CONCLUSION.

*The evidence forces the conclusion that the movement which resulted in the use of the school systems to change our social order was basically socialistic in nature. Its purpose was to turn educators into political agitators. The term "collectivism" was frequently used by the organs and agents of the movement. That term will do as well as "socialism" if one prefers to use it. Some organizations and individuals promoting the movement were not abashed at using the bare term "socialism."*

*The League for Industrial Democracy, a still functioning and still tax-exempt foundation, in its *New Frontiers*, Vol. IV, No. 4, of June, 1936 said:*

"All political institutions of democracy are perverted by private property in the means of production. Personal, legal, political equality—they all can be fully realized only when private property is abolished, when men have an equal control over property." (Hearings, p. 467.)

A similar expression of purpose is to be found in the October 13, 1943 issue of *Frontiers of Democracy*, the successor to the *Social Frontier*. DR. HAROLD RUGG was editor of this magazine and author of an article which included the following:

\* \* \* We have suddenly come out upon a new frontier and must chart a new course. It is a psychological frontier, an unmarked wilderness of competing desires and possessions, of property ownerships and power complexes \* \* \*.

\* \* \* The test is whether enough of our people—perhaps a compact minority of 10 million will be enough—can grasp the established fact that, in company with other industrializing peoples, we are living in a worldwide social revolution. (Hearings, p. 468.)

*This Committee wishes to make its position completely clear. It does not support uniformity; it insists that the individual shall have the right to advocate and teach and promote socialism if he wishes to. It does insist, however, that a trust administering public funds has no right to support a movement so antithetical in its basic designs to the American system as is the socialist movement. We are dealing, after all, with trusts which are and must be dedicated to the public welfare. What is that welfare? Is it what the accidental administrators of the public trusts deem it to be; or is it what the people deem to constitute their own welfare? Along with that eminent educator, Professor Briggs, who testified before us, we believe that the public has the right to determine what is in its interest, and that it perforce rejects the dissemination of socialist teaching in the schools of the nation—that is not in the public interest as the public sees it.*

As Mr. Wolcott of this Committee stated it:

I am sure that the founders of these foundations would turn over several times in their graves if they felt that their money was being used for the destruction of the American system of government. Whether it is destroyed by socialism or communism is not the point. I think we owe them an obligation, as well as ourselves and the people whom we represent, to find out whether there is any danger to the American system, and where it lies. That is the reason I am on this committee. I would not be on the committee if I was not interested in that subject. (Hearings, p. 237.)

We believe this expresses the point of view of every conscientious American.

## XI. "INTERNATIONALISM" AND THE EFFECT OF FOUNDATION POWER ON FOREIGN POLICY

### *THE NEW "INTERNATIONALISM".*

Some of the major foundations have had a significant impact upon our foreign policy and have done much to condition the thinking of our people along "internationalist" lines. What is this "internationalism" which meets with such hearty foundation support? Professor Colegrove in his testimony described it well. He said:

"In my opinion, a great many of the staffs of the foundations have gone way beyond Wendell Willkie with reference to internationalism and globalism. \* \* \* There is undoubtedly too much money put into studies which support globalism and internationalism. You might say that the other side has not been as fully developed as it should be." (Hearings, p. 595.)

Professor Colegrove pointed out that "the other side" had been well represented in Congress but that the foundations had seen fit to support only the one point of view or approach. He felt that there

is a definite tendency to "sacrifice the national interest of our country in dealing with foreign affairs." He said:

"\* \* \* But there is too frequently a tendency of Americans not to think in international conferences on foreign policy about the national interest of the United States. We are thinking always of what is the interest of the whole world.

"And that kind of thinking always brings us to the point where we are too likely to make sacrifices to accomplish this globalism which England would not be willing to make under Churchill, or Attlee for that matter, which Laniel would not be willing to make, or Bidault, or whoever is Prime Minister. That is a very unfortunate tendency. \* \* \*"

Many Americans today join with former Assistant Secretary of State, Spruille Braden, who said in a letter to Counsel for this Committee:

"I have a very definite feeling that a number of the foundations have been taken over by what I describe in my testimony before the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee, not so much the Communists, as by state interventionists, collectivists, misguided idealists, 'do-gooders' and 'whatnots', and that this is one of the greatest perils confronting our country today. \* \* \* my respect for the Rockefeller Foundation in connection with its health work in such places as Colombia, in yellow fever, malaria, etc., has been severely jolted when I read that Chester Bowles has now been made a director of that institution. The reason for my concern is that only a few months ago I heard the former Ambassador and Governor of Connecticut declaim against the Farewell Address of George Washington as typifying the evils of isolationism [sic]! \* \* \* I have the very definite feeling that these various foundations you mention very definitely do exercise both overt and covert influences on our foreign relations and that their influences are counter to the fundamental principles on which this nation was founded and which have made it great." [Emphasis supplied.]

(The "various foundations" referred to in counsel's letter are "Carnegie Endowment, Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, Rhodes Scholarship Trust, etc.")

*The weight of evidence before this Committee, which the foundations have made no serious effort to rebut, indicates that the form of globalism which the foundations have so actively promoted and from which our foreign policy has suffered seriously, relates definitely to a collectivist point of view. Despite vehement disclaimers of bias, despite platitudinous affirmations of loyalty to American traditions, the statements filed by those foundations whose operation touch on foreign policy have produced no rebuttal to the evidence of support of collectivism. Some indication of this is given by the 1934 Yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which complains about the "economic nationalism which is still running riot and which is the greatest obstacle to the reestablishment of prosperity and genuine peace \* \* \*," referring to it later as "this violently reactionary movement." (Hearings, p. 910.)*

*The Rockefeller Foundation minced no words in its 1946 Report (Hearings, p. 934):*

"The challenge of the future is to make this world one world—a world truly free to engage in common and constructive intellectual efforts that will serve the welfare of mankind everywhere."

However well-meaning the advocates of complete internationalism may be, they often play into the hands of the Communists. Communists recognize that a breakdown of nationalism is a prerequisite to the introduction of Communism. This appears in a translation of

a Russian poster dealing with international education, which reads as follows (Hearings, p. 288):

*"Without educating internationalists, we will not build socialism. Animosity between nations is the support of counter-revolutions and of capital. It is therefore profitable and so is maintained. War is needed by capitalists for still greater enslavement of oppressed people. International education is the way toward socialism and toward the union of the toilers of the whole world."*

*THE INTERLOCK IN "INTERNATIONALISM."*

Substantial evidence indicates there is more than a mere close working together among some foundations, operating in the international field. There is here, as in the general realm of the social sciences, a close interlock. *The Carnegie Corporation, The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Rockefeller Foundation* and, recently, *The Ford Foundation*, joined by some others, have commonly cross-financed, to the tune of many millions, various intermediate and agency organizations concerned with internationalism, among them the

*Institute of Pacific Relations*

*The Foreign Policy Association*

*The Council on Foreign Relations*

*The Royal Institute of International Affairs*

and others. No one would claim, of course, that there has been a contract or agreement among this group of foundations for the common support of these organizations, or the common support of like-minded propagandists, but the close working together has incontrovertibly happened. That it happened by sheer coincidence stretches credulity. That such unity of purpose, effort and direction resulted from chance or happenstance seems unlikely.

*CARNEGIE'S MONEY FOR PEACE.*

In 1910 Andrew Carnegie created *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. His motive could not have been more commendable. How to expend the granted funds for the purpose of promoting peace, however, became a difficult problem. Unable to think of many direct ways in which to accomplish Mr. Carnegie's purposes, the trustees, from time to time, suggested various collateral approaches. That these occasionally went far beyond the donor's intention is testified to by the minutes of an Executive Committee meeting in August, 1913, in which, referring to certain proposals, the minutes read:

*"Mr. Choate raised the question whether 'the recommendations as a whole did not seem to suggest the diversion of the Endowment from its particular object of promoting international peace to a general plan for the uplift and education of humanity'".*

At the same meeting Mr. Carnegie stated that he "understood the *Endowment's* resources were to be applied to the direct means for abolishing war, that he did not regard the proposed expenditures in the Orient as coming within these means, and that there were other more important and pressing things bearing directly upon the question of war and peace which could be done instead."

It is to be doubted that Mr. Carnegie would have approved of some of the methods later used to distribute the fund which he had created

to promote peace. He must have contemplated that some propaganda-production might be necessary. However, we doubt that he had any idea that the propaganda would reach into fields other than the promotion of international arbitration and things directly concerned with the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Yet the *Endowment* started early to organize media for widespread propaganda efforts to educate the American public into what Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler called "the international mind." *It was as though the conception was that we could have world peace if only Americans became more world-minded.*

An extremely powerful propaganda machine was created. It spent many millions of dollars in:

The production of masses of material for distribution;

The creation and support of large numbers of international polity clubs, and other local organizations at colleges and elsewhere;

The underwriting and dissemination of many books on various subjects, through the "International Mind Alcoves" and the "International Relations Clubs and Centers" which it organized all over the country;

The collaboration with agents of publicity, such as newspaper editors;

The preparation of material to be used in school text books, and cooperation with publishers of text books to incorporate this material;

The establishing of professorships at the colleges and the training and indoctrination of teachers;

The financing of lecturers and the importation of foreign lecturers and exchange professors;

The support of outside agencies touching the international field, such as the *Institute of International Education*, the *Foreign Policy Association*, the *American Association For the Advancement of Science*, the *American Council on Education*, the *American Council of Learned Societies*, the *American Historical Association*, the *American Association of International Conciliation*, the *Institute of Pacific Relations*, the *International Parliamentary Union* and others, and acting as mid-wife at the birth of some of them.

Miss Casey's report (Hearings, p. 869, et seq.) proves beyond any doubt that *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* created powerful propaganda mechanisms and was, indeed, quite frank about it. There was no hesitation in its minutes, for example, at using the term "propaganda." Its eventual Division of Intercourse and Education was originally referred to as the "Division of Propaganda." (Hearings, p. 871.)

One does not need to doubt the complete good will of those who passed upon the *Endowment's* various activities. The *Endowment* has always had and still has on its Board men of high competence and character. *But there is inherent danger in the creation of a great propaganda machine.* It can be used for good, but it is also available for undesirable purposes. No other proof of the truth of this statement is needed than the history of the *Institute of Pacific Relations* which undoubtedly started as a desirable enterprise, operated by good men for benign purposes. Yet it became an instrument for

subversion; its great propaganda power, originally the weapon of well-intended men, became a powerful force for evil.

The danger of misuse is all the more serious in the light of the *Endowment's* own estimate of the effectiveness of its propaganda. Its yearbook of 1945 states:

"every part of the United States and every element in its population have been reached by the Endowment's work. The result may be seen in the recorded attitude of public opinion which makes it certain that the American government will be strongly supported in the accomplishment of its effort to offer guidance and commanding influence to the establishment of a world organization for protection of international peace and preservation of resultant prosperity." (Hearings, p. 899.)

It thus takes credit for having a powerful propaganda machine indeed.

It is not beyond possibility that *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* might have followed the same course as did the *Institute of Pacific Relations*. After all, Alger Hiss was made President of the *Endowment*. He was probably not in office long enough to do irremediable damage, but it is always possible that a great propaganda machine could get into the hands of another traitor, with tragic results to our country. *When it is easy for a Hiss to become a trustee of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, a director of the Executive Committee of the American Association for the United Nations, a director of the American Peace Society, a trustee of the World Peace Foundation, a director of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, and the President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, it is highly doubtful that propaganda machines should be operated by foundations.* They have a way, at times, of getting out of hand and being used for purposes other than originally intended.

The basic problem of the *Endowment* trustees was: what activities do in fact weightily relate to its intended purpose of promoting international peace? The trustees decided upon some strange ways to approach this problem. The 1939 Year Book of the *Endowment* recites:

"Recognizing the desire of American public opinion for educational material on economic questions and also for encouragement in the effort to carry on democratic discussion of these problems, the division has cooperated with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, in its discussion program and with the campaign for world economic cooperation of the *National Peace Conference* described later in this report."

It is difficult to understand the connection of such activities with the promotion of international peace. Perhaps a case could be made for the proposition that, regardless of how belligerent or aggressive the rest of the world might be, a mere increase in the education of the American public, an expansion of its understanding of "Economic questions", of agriculture and of "world economic problems", might promote the cause of peace. That seems rather far-fetched. But it is the conclusion of this Committee, from a reading of *Carnegie Endowment reports*, that no simple educational program was intended. The term "public education" is used far less often than the term, the "education of public opinion" (Hearings, pp. 906, 907, 908), which is a far different thing. This term is too apt to result from accident. It has the clear connotation of propaganda.

By its own admission, a prime purpose of the *Endowment* was to "educate" the public so that it would be *conditioned* to the points of view which the *Endowment* favored. There is very serious doubt

whether these points of view were always in the best interests of our nation; but here their validity or falsity is beside the point. The basic question is: *should vast aggregations of public money in the control of a handful of men, however well selected, have the power and the right to condition public opinion!*

Of all the many media of propaganda used by the *Endowment*, perhaps the most reprehensible was its attempt to control or, at least, deeply influence text book material. It engaged in close and intensive collaboration with publishers with the objective of making sure that the historical material used in text books suited its own positions. Time has not permitted an analysis of the products of this collaboration; we are not in a position to judge of the damage to objectivity which resulted from this collaboration. But one thing seems utterly clear: *no private group should have the power or the right to dictate what should be read and taught in our schools and colleges.*

*THE ENDOWMENT'S "MIND ALCOVES"*

A random sampling was taken by Miss Casey of books distributed by the *Carnegie Endowment* through the *International Mind Alcoves* or through the *International Relations Clubs and Centers*. Professor Kenneth Colegrove looked over the names of some of these books and commented upon a number of them as follows (Hearings, p. 926, et seq.):

Author	Name of Book	Prof. Colegrove's Comments
Harold J. Laski	Studies in the Problem Sovereignty.	"Opposed to the 'national interest' Inclines toward extreme left."
Raymond Leslie Buell	International Relations	"Globalist"
Read, Elizabeth F.	International Law and International Relations.	"Rather Leftist"
Buck, Pearl S.	The Good Earth	"Slightly leftist"
Angell, Norman	The Unseen Assassins	"Globalist"
Patterson, Ernest Minor	America: World Leader or World Led?	"Globalist"
Salter, Sir Arthur	Recovery, the Second Effort	"Globalist"
Ware, Edith E.	Business and Politics in the Far East.	"Doubtful"
Hindus, Maurice	Humanity Uprooted	"Marxian slant"
McMullen, Laura W	Building the World Society	"Globalist"
Strong, Anna Louise	The Road to the Grey Pamir	"Well known communist"
de Madariga, Salvador	Disarmament	"Ultra globalist and aimed at submergence of 'national interest.'"
James T. Shotwell	On the Abyss	"Globalist"
William T. Stone and Clark M. Eichelberger	Peaceful Change	"Globalist and leftist. Regarding W. T. Stone, see report of McCarran sub-committee. Stone was closely associated with Edward Carter of I. P. R."
Salter, Sir Arthur	World Trade and Its Future	"Globalist"
Angell, Norman	Peace with the Dictators?	"Globalist"
Streit, Clarence K.	Union Now	"Globalist and submersion of national interest. Fallacious in his analogy of Union of American states in 1781 with world federation"
Bisson, T. A.	American Policy in the Far East, 1931-	"Pro-communist"
Hunt, Dr. Erling (Teachers College)	Citizens for a New World, year-book of Commission for Organization of Peace.	"Ultra Globalist"
MacIver, R. M.	Toward an Abiding Peace	"Extremely globalist and careless of the American 'national interest.'"
Lattimore, Owen	America and Asia	"Subtle propaganda along Communist line. Lattimore cited in McCarran sub-committee report as part of Communist cell in the Institute of Pacific Relations."
Pfeffer, Nathaniel	Basis for Peace in the Far East	"Leftist. See McCarran sub-committee report."
The Soviet Union Today an Outline Study.	American Russian Institute	"Favorable to U. S. S. R."
Percy E. Corbett	Britain: Partner for Peace	"Extremely globalist"

A detailed analysis of the entire list of books distributed by the *Endowment* would probably disclose many more, the distribution of which could be seriously criticized on the ground of lack of objectivity or because in the aggregate they represent a distinct and forceful slanting to the globalist point of view. Nor is "globalism" the limit or extent of the criticism of the Endowment in its selection of books for wide distribution through the International Mind Alcoves and otherwise. It has been called to our attention that *The Pupils of the Soviet Union*, by Corliss Lamont currently a professor of philosophy at Columbia University, is being distributed by the Carnegie Endowment to the Alcoves. In view of the well-known fellow-traveller identity of the author (whose Communist affiliations are too extensive to be included in this report), it is quite shocking to learn that public funds are being used to distribute his literature.

*A CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT CREATED INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUB.*

Dr. Felix Wittmer, formerly Associate Professor of the Social Studies at New Jersey State Teachers College, filed a sworn statement with the Committee (Hearings, Part 2) describing his experiences as faculty advisor to one of the *International Relations Clubs* founded by the *Carnegie Endowment* at the colleges. He stated that there was a network of close to a thousand of such clubs and indicated that, as a result of their operation and of the material fed into them by the *Endowment*, a large proportion of the student members had acquired leftist tendencies.

Dr. Lamont in a recent Facts Forum program, *Answers for Americans*, made the following amazing remarks:

"I don't think that Communist China is under control of Soviet Russia."

"We should have Communist China come in as a member [of the] UN]." (Facts Forum News, August 1954, page 26.)

*The Endowment* supplied a large amount of printed material to the Clubs, Bulletins of the *Foreign Policy Association*, the *Headline Books*, publications of the *Institute of Pacific Relations* and of the *American Russian Institute*, and numbers of books on international subjects. Let us look at some of this literature fed into the colleges by the *Endowment*.

According to Dr. Wittmer, they included works by such pro-Communist stalwarts as RUTH BENEDICT, T. A. BISSON, EVANS CLARK, CORLISS LAMONT, OWEN LATTIMORE, NATHANIEL PFEFFER and ALEXANDER WERTH. Three of these, T. A. BISSON, CORLISS LAMONT and OWEN LATTIMORE were identified as Communists before the McCarran Committee. MISS BENEDICT was the co-author with GENE WELTFISH of a pamphlet which was finally barred by the War Department. MISS WELTFISH resigned from Columbia University after a Fifth Amendment refusal to state whether she was a Communist or not. EVANS CLARK (for many years a Director of the *Twentieth Century Fund*—which seems to need explaining at some future inquiry) has had a long record of association with subversive organizations. PROFESSOR PFEFFER has disclosed himself frequently as a pro-Communist or, at least, an advocate of support of the Chinese Communists. In a review of George Creel's *Russia's Race for Asia* in the New York Times, PFEFFER reprimanded Creel because "he fears Russia and does not like or trust the Chinese Communists." ALEXANDER WERTH is a well-known European apologist for many Communist causes.



Dr. Wittmer notes that "Many other books which the *Carnegie Endowment* sent to our college club as gifts, while not quite so outspokenly pro-Communist, were of the leftwing variety", and he named several in his statement.

Dr. Wittmer apparently had to supply his students from other sources with books which might tend to counteract the radical points of view of the literature presented by the *Endowment*. Such books were not obtainable from the *Endowment* itself.

Regional conferences were held from time to time and Dr. Wittmer notes that "a large majority of those students who attended such conferences favored the views which came close to that of the Kremlin." One can hardly avoid the conclusion that these points of view had been indoctrinated through the material supplied by the *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.

Speakers were furnished for the *International Relations Club* by the *Endowment*. Dr. Wittmer notes that, as a final speaker, one year the *Endowment* suggested Alger Hiss. Dr. Wittmer, knowing something of his activities, protested but was overruled. The Secretary of the *Endowment* reminded him "in no uncertain terms that our club, like all the hundreds of other clubs, was under the direction of the *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, which had for years liberally supplied it with reading material, and which contributed funds to cover the Honoraria of conference speakers."

Dr. Wittmer states that radical infiltration into the *International Relations Club* of which he was faculty adviser became so acute that he finally felt obliged to disassociate himself from it.

The cumulative evidence indicates that the *Carnegie Endowment* created something of a Frankenstein in building up its vast propaganda machine. We suggest that much further study should be given to this subject. The extent to which this machine has been responsible for indoctrinating our students with radical internationalism needs careful inquiry. We have said that a propaganda machine can become a dangerous weapon, even though designed for good. How this propaganda machine may have been suborned deserves intense study.

#### *THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION.*

Some of the worst literature distributed by the *Carnegie Endowment* apparently came from the *Foreign Policy Association*, which it heavily subsidized. It is quite astonishing how frequently we find leftists in important positions in organizations supported by major foundations. The *Foreign Policy Association* was created "to carry on research and educational activities to aid in the understanding and constructive development of American Foreign policy." [Emphasis supplied.] Its Research Director for years has been VERA MICHAELS DEAN. Here is what Dr. Wittmer had to say about MRS. DEAN:

"MRS. DEAN belonged among those who in 1937 signed their names in the Golden Book of American-Soviet Friendship, a memorial which appeared in the Communist front magazine *Soviet Russia Today*, of November, 1937. According to the testimony of Walter S. Steele, before the House Un-American Activities Committee, on July 21, 1947, Mrs. Dean's writings figured in the Communist propaganda kit for teachers of the NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP.

"MRS. DEAN cooperated with the world's toughest Communist agents, such as Tsola N. Dragiocheva, of Bulgaria, and Madame Madeleine Braun, the French Communist deputy, in helping set up the Congress of American Women, a Com-

munist front so important in its world-wide ramifications that the House Un-American Activities Committee devoted a 114-page pamphlet to it. At one of the preliminary meetings of this Communist front VERA MICHEALS DEAN, according to *The New York Times* of October 14, 1946 (page 26), told 150 foreign and 50 American delegates to "whittle away their conceptions of national sovereignty" and to pull themselves out of the "ancient grooves of nationalism."

This was the selection of the *Foreign Policy Association*, virtually a creature of the *Carnegie Endowment*, to run its "research!"

*The Foreign Policy Association* purports to be objective and disclaims seeking "to promote any one point of view toward international affairs." Its produce, however, indicates that it is only interested in promoting that form of internationalism which Dr. Colegrove described in his testimony, frequently referred to as "globalism." Its principal financing has come from *The Carnegie Endowment* and *The Rockefeller Foundation* and, recently, from the *Ford Fund for Adult Education*, and in very substantial amounts indeed.

Among its productions have been the "*Headline Books*." These supposedly objective studies are worth a detailed examination. One of them, *World of the Great Powers*, by MAX LERNER, (1947), graciously says: "There are undoubtedly valuable elements in the capitalist economic organizations." It proceeds to say that "The economic techniques of the future are likely to be an amalgam of the techniques of American business management with those of government ownership, control, and regulation. For the people of the world, whatever their philosophies, are moving towards similar methods of making their economic system work." MR. LERNER, this foundation-supported author, proceeds to tell us that:

"If democracy is to survive, it too must move toward socialism. \* \* \* It is the only principle that can organize the restless energies of the world's peoples. \* \* \*"  
(Hearings, p. 883.) [Emphasis supplied.]

MR. LERNER'S position regarding Russia is made clear. We must allay the mutual fear and suspicion by granting loans to Russia to provide her with tools and machinery. We must also give "greater United Nations control of Japan and the former Japanese Island bases in the Pacific." Thus we can live in peace with Russia. Thus money indirectly contributed by the American taxpayers is employed to promote doctrines which many, if not most, seriously question or directly oppose. Yet the 1950 Rockefeller annual report refers to the *Headline Books* as "the popular *Headline Books*, with details on problems of importance to America and to the World." (Hearings, pp. 883, 941.)

Another of the *Foreign Policy Association's Headline Books* is *Freedom's Choice, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, by Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, which lauds this Declaration (emphatically rejected by our Government) without any mention of possibly distressing effects on our Constitutional law. (Hearings, p. 884.)

All this is "education" of our public, to give it the "international mind!"

#### *THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.*

This is another organization dealing with internationalism which has the substantial financial support of both the *Carnegie Endowment* and the *Rockefeller Foundation*. And, as in the case of the *Foreign Policy Association*, its productions are not objective but are directed overwhelmingly at promoting the globalism concept. *There*

are, after all, many Americans who think that our foreign policy should follow the principle consistently adopted by the British and the French, among others, that the national interest comes first and must not be subordinated to any theoretical internationalistic concept; that international cooperation is essential but only as directed in favor of the national interest. That point of view goes begging in the organizations supported by the Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford organizations. If private fortunes were being used to the exclusive support of the globalist point of view, that would be beyond criticism. But it is important to keep constantly in mind that we are dealing with the public's money, public trust funds.

We would like to make it clear that this Committee does not speak from an "isolationist" standpoint. It is obvious enough that the world has grown smaller and that international cooperation is highly desirable. But the essence of intelligent international cooperation can be measured by its direct usefulness to our national interest. Globalists may be correct in believing we should ignore the national interest in the wider interest of creating a world collectivism; but we feel confident we are right in our conclusion that a public foundation has no right to promote globalism to the exclusion of support for a fair presentation of the opposite theory of foreign policy.

The Council on Foreign Relations came to be in essence an agency of the United States government, no doubt carrying its internationalist bias with it. When World War II broke out, it offered its assistance to the Secretary of State. As a result, under the Council's Committee on Studies, The Rockefeller Foundation initiated and financed certain studies on: Security and Armaments Problems; Economic and Financial Problems; Political Problems; and Territorial Problems. These were known as the *War and Peace Studies*. Later this project was actually taken over by the State Department itself, engaging the secretaries who had been serving with the Council groups. A fifth subject was added in 1942, through the "Peace Aims Group."

There was a precedent for this. The Carnegie Endowment had offered its services to the Government in both World War I and World War II. There was even an interlock in personnel in the person of Professor Shotwell and many others, some of whom proceeded into executive and consultative office in the Government. There can be no doubt that much of the thinking in the State Department and much of the background of direction of its policies came from the personnel of *The Carnegie Endowment* and *The Council on Foreign Relations*. In considering the propriety of this, it must be kept in mind that these organizations promoted only the internationalist point of view, rejecting and failing to support the contrary position that our foreign policy should be based primarily on our own national interest. A reading of Miss Casey's report (Hearings, pp. 878, 879, 884 et seq.) gives some idea of the substantial integration of these two organizations with the State Department.

The *Endowment* in its 1934 Yearbook proudly asserts that it—

"is becoming an unofficial instrument of international policy, taking up here and there the ends and threads of international problems and questions which the governments find it difficult to handle, and through private initiative reaching conclusions which are not of a formal nature but which unofficially find their way into the policies of governments." (Hearings, p. 909.) [Emphasis ours.]

Note, moreover, that the term used is "governments", the plural.

Perhaps this marked a feeling of satisfaction at having accomplished a successful infiltration into government function. The original method of the *Endowment* had been limited to arousing public pressure. Its 1925 Yearbook had stated:

"Underneath and behind all these undertakings there remains the task to instruct and to enlighten public opinion so that it may not only guide but compel the action of governments and public officers in the direction of constructive progress." (Hearings, p. 908.) [Emphasis ours.]

It is quite astounding to this Committee that the trustees of a public trust could possibly conceive of having the right to use public funds for the purpose of putting pressure on the government, to adopt the ideas the trustees happened to favor, by inflaming public opinion.

#### *THE HISTORICAL BLACKOUT.*

It must be kept in mind that the evils attendant on permitting propaganda by any individual foundation multiply geometrically when there is unified or combined or similar action by a group of foundations. We have seen that *The Carnegie Endowment* financed the production of text book material approved by its elite. *The Rockefeller Foundation* and some of its associates also entered this field of propaganda.

Professor Harry Elmer Barnes in his *The Struggle Against the Historical Blackout*, said:

"The readjustment of historical writing to historical facts relative to background and causes of the first World War—what is popularly known in the historical craft as 'Revisionism'—was the most important development in historiography during the decade of the 1920's."

Wars in this day and age are accompanied by the perversion of history to suit a propaganda thesis. Historians know this. Many of them, in a spirit of patriotism, misguided or not, lend themselves to this propaganda process. Whether they are ethically justified in this, is gravely questionable. It certainly becomes their duty, however, to revise their contorted historical emanations after propaganda reason for perversion has ceased to be in any way useful. This most of them seem not to do.

Where have the foundations fitted into this picture? *The Council on Foreign Relations*, an organization supported by *The Rockefeller Foundation*, *The Carnegie Corporation* and others, made up its mind that no "revisionism" was to be encouraged after World War II. The following is an extract from the 1946 Report of *The Rockefeller Foundation*, referring to the Council's work:

"The Committee on Studies of the *Council on Foreign Relations* is concerned that the debunking journalistic campaign following World War I should not be repeated and believes that the American public deserves a clear and competent statement of our basic aims and activities during the second World War."

Accordingly, a three volume history of the War was to be prepared under the direction of Professor William Langer of Harvard, in which (one must gather this from the use of the term "debunking") no revisionism was to appear. In other words, the official propaganda of World War II was to be perpetuated and the public was to be protected against learning the truth. As Professor Charles Austin Beard put it:

"In short, they hope that, among other things, the policies and measures of Franklin D. Roosevelt will escape in the coming years the critical analysis

evaluation and exposition that befell the policies and measures of Woodrow Wilson and the Entente Allies after World War I."

*Do foundations have the right, using public funds, to support measures calculated to hide historical facts from the public and to perpetuate those contortions of history which war propaganda imposes on us!*

A reading of Dr. Barnes' *Historical Blackout* is rewarding. He sets forth in detail what verges on a veritable conspiracy to prevent the people from learning the historical truth. Parties to this conspiracy are a good many of the professors of history with notable names; the State Department of former years; publishers who, under some misapprehension of their duty to the public, refuse to publish critical books; and newspapers which attempt to suppress such books either by ignoring them or giving them for review to rabidly antagonistic "hatchet-men". But what is most shocking in the story he tells is the part played knowingly or unknowingly by foundations in trying to suppress the truth. *The Rockefeller Foundation*, in 1946, allotted \$139,000 to the support of the three volume history which was to be produced as described above.

#### *THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS.*

The most tragic example of foundation negligence is to be found in the long continued support of *The Institute of Pacific Relations* by both *The Carnegie Corporation of New York* and the *Rockefeller Foundation*, as well as the *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. We have referred elsewhere to the great power of the large foundations, for good or evil—what intrinsic danger there is in permitting them to have free rein in areas which involve human behavior or relations, or impinge on the political. Foundation executives have said that, while they make mistakes with some frequency, freedom of action is essential to enable them to perform their part of leading society into betterment. Should they have this license when some of their mistakes have tragic consequences?

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held long hearings on IPR. Its report, substantially its opinion at length, concludes:

"The subcommittee concludes \* \* \* that the IPR has been in general, neither objective nor nonpartisan; and concludes further that, at least since the mid-1930's, the net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been pro-communist and pro-Soviet, and has frequently and repeatedly been such as to serve international Communist, and Soviet interests, and to subvert the interests of the United States." (Report, p. 84.)

Note that the Committee held that IPR had become a propaganda vehicle for the Communists as early as the mid-1930's. We have, then, the astounding picture of great foundations, presuming to have the right to expend public trust funds in the public interest, so unaware of the mis-use to which their funds were being applied that they permitted, year after year, Communist propaganda to be produced and circulated with funds supplied by these foundations. The contributions of *The Carnegie Corporation*, *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* and *The Rockefeller Foundation* to the IPR (the Pacific and American groups taken together for this purpose) ran into the millions.

In addition to these grants, both the *Rockefeller* and *Carnegie* foundations made individual grants to some of the most reprehens-

sible characters associated with IPR, these contributions to the Communist cause running into very substantial sums of public money.

The story of the suborning of our foreign policy through the activities of IPR and persons associated with it, including the sad story of infiltration into our State Department, has been told. *Nor does the point need to be labored that the loss of China to the Communists may have been the most tragic event in our history, and one to which the foundation-supported Institute of Pacific Relations heavily contributed.*

It must be remembered that the foundation executives consider themselves elite groups, entitled to guide the people by financing with public money research and propaganda in social fields. Are they elite if they have been so blind or so careless in their use of funds that their acts may actually be held to have been responsible for one of the most tragic events in our history?

According to the McCarran Committee, the foundations should perhaps have known in the 1930's that the IPR had ceased to be a proper or even safe recipient of foundations funds. Can they excuse themselves by saying they did not know or had not been informed? Were they not in fiduciary duty bound to learn? *Are the trustees of a foundation entitled to give money, year after year, to an institution without making any attempt to follow the effects of their donations?*

But the situation is worse even than this. The hearings of the Cox Committee disclose this set of facts. Mr. Alfred Kohlberg testified that he had been a member of IPR; that he had never paid much attention to what it was producing until 1943, when he saw some material which he found questionable. He then studied an accumulation of IPR material and made a lengthy report which he sent in 1944 to Mr. Carter, the secretary-general of IPR, and to the trustees and others. As a result he came into communication with Mr. Willets, a Vice-President of *The Rockefeller Foundation*. In the summer of 1945 an arrangement was made, apparently through Mr. Willets, for a committee of three persons to hear Mr. Kohlberg's charges, and his evidence of Communist infiltration and propaganda, and to make a report to IPR and to *The Rockefeller Foundation*. Later, apparently at the insistence of Mr. Carter, Mr. Willets withdrew as a mediator. Mr. Carter had indicated that he would take the matter up himself.

In the meantime, Mr. Kohlberg had brought, and lost, an action to compel IPR to give him a list of his fellow-members. At any rate, a meeting of the members was finally called at which Mr. Kohlberg presented his charges and asked for an investigation. His motion was voted down and no investigation was held.

*The Rockefeller Foundation* nevertheless went right on supporting the Institute. The explanations made by Mr. Rusk (now, but not then, its President) in his statement filed on behalf of the *Foundation* (Hearings, p. 1062 et seq.) and by Mr. Willets, its Director of Social Studies, in a separate statement (Hearings, Appendix), are highly unsatisfactory. Mr. Rusk stated that, at the time the Kohlberg charges were levied, the *Foundation* could not conduct a "public" hearing, "an undertaking for which the *Foundation* was neither equipped nor qualified." (Hearings, Part 2) This begs the question, as no public hearing was necessary. Mr. Willets, on the other hand, admitted that the *Foundation* was equipped to make a thorough investigation. He said that one was actually made—"a very thor-

ough inquiry into the whole IPR situation by the *Foundation* staff"—“a careful investigation by us.” But what sort of an investigation was this? Mr. Kohlberg, from his testimony before the Cox Committee, evidently had never heard of it. The grave charges had been made by him, yet he seems not to have been called upon to present them to the *Foundation* either in person or in documentary detail.

According to Mr. Willets' statement, great reliance was placed upon “A special committee of IPR trustees” who “reported that the Executive Committee had investigated Mr. Kohlberg's charges and found them inaccurate and irresponsible.” Was this a way to discharge the duty of the *Rockefeller* trustees to determine whether support of the IPR should be continued—to rely largely upon some cursory investigation by the trustees or officers of that organization itself? Using such methods as this, it is no wonder that the *Foundation* concluded that the Kohlberg charges had been “exaggerated.” The McCarran Committee did not find them exaggerated in any degree!

We have this sorry situation, then, that after Kohlberg had made his grave charges, *The Rockefeller Foundation* continued active support of the unit which was later declared to have supported subversion. The official *Rockefeller Foundation* position, from its filed statement, seems to be that further funds were advanced in order to help reform the organization. That is not convincing. Neither a sufficient alertness to danger was shown, nor a willingness to face the facts when disclosed and to repudiate an organization which had demonstrably turned out to be an instrument of subversion. *This baleful incident illustrates all too clearly the dangers of permitting public money to be used by private persons, without responsibility, in areas vitally affecting the public weal. It further illustrates the danger of delegating the discretion involved in the distribution of public funds, to an intermediary organization.*

We must grant to the *Carnegie Endowment* that it apparently withdrew its support of the IPR in 1939. Whether this was due partly or wholly to other reasons we have not investigated. If it was because of an understanding that the IPR had come upon evil ways, this would make all the more reprehensible the continued contributions by *The Rockefeller Foundation* after 1939.

#### *THE FOUNDATIONS, THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN POLICY.*

Miss Casey's report (Hearings, pp. 877, 878, 879, 881, et seq.) shows clearly the interlock between *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* and some of its associated organizations, such as the *Council on Foreign Relations*, and other foundations with the State Department. Indeed, these foundations and organizations would not dream of denying this interlock. They proudly note it in reports. They have

- undertaken vital research projects for the Department;
- virtually created minor departments or groups within the Department for it;
- supplied advisors and executives from their ranks;
- fed a constant stream of personnel into the State Department trained by themselves or under programs which they have financed; and
- have had much to do with the formulation of foreign policy both in principle and detail.

They have, to a marked degree, acted as direct agents of the State Department. And they have engaged actively, and with the expenditure of enormous sums, in propagandizing ("educating"—public opinion) in support of the policies which they have helped to formulate. (Hearings, pp. 886 et seq.)

It is obvious enough that a state department should be able to draw upon the services of specialists in the international field for necessary assistance in times of emergency and even in times of peace. No one could doubt the desirability of such procedure. *What this Committee questions, however, is whether it is proper for the State Department to permit organizations to take over important parts of its research and policy-making functions when these organizations consistently maintain a biased, one-tracked point of view.* Whether that point of view is the majority's, whether it is perhaps entirely sound (and historical events have proved it not to be) is beside the point. It is only through a conflict of ideas, and the presentation of opposite points of view, that objective decisions can be made.

What we see here is a number of large foundations, primarily *The Rockefeller Foundation*, *The Carnegie Corporation of New York*, and *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, using their enormous public funds to finance a one-sided approach to foreign policy and to promote it actively, among the public by propaganda, and in the Government through infiltration. The power to do this comes out of the power of the vast funds employed. Research and propaganda by those of the persuasion opposite that of the agencies of these foundations (*The Council on Foreign Relations*, *The Institute of International Education*, *The Foreign Policy Association*, *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, and others) receive little support.

It may well be said that a majority of the "experts" in the international field are on the side of globalism. It would be amazing if this were otherwise, after so many years of gigantic expenditure by foundations in virtually sole support of the globalist point of view. Professors and researchers have to eat and raise families. They cannot themselves spend the money to finance research and publications. The road to eminence in international areas, therefore, just as in the case of the social sciences generally, is by way of foundation grants or support.

#### *THE UNITED NATIONS AND UNESCO.*

*The Carnegie Endowment* has justified its ardent support of the *United Nations* on the ground that support of UNO is an official part of United States policy. We are not convinced that this is the basic reason for the *Endowment's* support. It gave equally fervent support to the old *League of Nations*, after that organization had been repudiated by our Senate. The fact is that the *Endowment* has consistently advocated and propagandized for an international organization to promote peace as shown by its own report. (Hearings, pp. 909, 910, 911, et seq.)

That would be an estimable objective and a worthy cause to support in principle. To blindly support and educate an international organization merely because it is international seems hardly to be of benefit to our country. That seems to be exactly what the *Endowment* has done with its public funds. There are many who believe that an effective international organization is most highly desirable—



and even that it may be the only sound, eventual solution to the problem of preserving peace—and yet feel that the UNO as it now exists is abysmally ineffective, showing no hope of being reformed to effectiveness. Yet you may search in vain among the material circulated by the *Endowment* and the organizations it supports for any presentation of this point of view. If there is any such literature among the produce of these organizations, we have missed it.

What the official position of our Government may have been, or may now be, there are innumerable Americans who view the *United Nations Organization* with much less than enthusiasm. It is generally accepted that we are in it and should not at the moment desert it. Yet it is obvious enough that, short of a miracle or complete reform of the Communists, the UNO is a hopeless vehicle for producing international peace and understanding. Why, therefore, should foundations pour millions of public funds into “educating” the public into the idea that the UNO is our light and our savior, the hope of humanity. It may be granted that it has some usefulness as a place to exchange ideas with other nations and to reach some common understandings on lower levels of interest and importance, but to play it up as the magnificent instrument for peace which it so clearly is not, does our people a distinct disservice by obstructing that realism without which we cannot hope to solve our international problems.

Even the “sounding board” theory of UNO usefulness finds eminent detractors. The *New York Times* of August 11, 1953, reports General Mark W. Clark as saying:

“That, although he had been the commander of United Nations forces in Korea, he ‘had not had much respect’ for the United Nations. It had high purposes, he said, a nice big building in New York, and delegates from all over the world. But, he added, it gave a ‘sounding board’ to Soviet Russia and its satellites, and turned loose spies, saboteurs, to the point of giving great assets to Russia and dangerous disadvantage to the United States.”

*Why are these critical points of view, shared by many eminent Americans, such as Generals MacArthur and Van Fleet and innumerable other worthy citizens, military and civilian, not supported or even given some distribution by the foundations and the organizations they finance, which deal with things international?*

The 1947 Year Book of *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* contains a reprint of a document called *Recommendations of the President to the Trustees*, which recites that the most significant special circumstances favorable to an expansion of the *Endowment's* own direct activities is the establishment of the *United Nations* with its headquarters in New York, and with the United States as its leading and most influential member. “The opportunity for an endowed American institution having the objectives, traditions and prestige of the *Endowment*, to support and serve the United Nations is very great.”

The *President* then recommended earnestly “that the *Endowment* construct its program for the period that lies ahead primarily for the support and the assistance of the *United Nations*.” The program suggested should have two objectives. First, it was to be “widely educational in order to encourage public understanding and support of the *United Nations* at home and abroad” and “it should aid in the adoption of wise policies, both by our own government in its capacity as a member of the *United Nations*, and by the *United Nations Organization* as a whole.”

The report then proceeds:

"The number and importance of decisions in the field of foreign relations with which the United States will be faced during the next few years are of such magnitude that the widest possible stimulation of public education in this field is of major and pressing importance. In furthering its educational objectives the *Endowment* should utilize its existing resources, such as *The International Relations Clubs* in the colleges, and *International Conciliation*, and should strengthen its relationships with existing agencies interested in the field of foreign affairs. These relationships should include close collaboration with other organizations principally engaged in the study of foreign affairs, such as *The Council on Foreign Relations*, *The Foreign Policy Association*, *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, the developing university centers of international studies, and local community groups interested in foreign affairs of which the *Cleveland Council on World Affairs* and the projected *World Affairs Council* in San Francisco are examples.

"Of particular importance is the unusual opportunity of reaching large segments of the population by establishing relations of a rather novel sort with the large national organizations which today are desirous of supplying their members with objective information on public affairs, including international issues. These organizations—designed to serve, respectively, the broad interests of business, church, women's, farm, labor, veterans', educational, and other large groups of our citizens—are not equipped to set up foreign policy research staffs of their own. *The Endowment* should supply these organizations with basic information about the *United Nations* and should assist them both in selecting topics of interest to their members and in presenting those topics so as to be most readily understood by their members. We should urge *The Foreign Policy Association* and *The Institute of Pacific Relations* to supply similar service on other topics of international significance.

"Exploration should also be made by the endowment as to the possibilities of increasing the effectiveness of the radio and motion pictures in public education on world affairs." (Hearings, pp. 920, 921.)

*It should be noted at this point that the President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace who made these recommendations was Mr. Alger Hiss.*

A continued inquiry into foundation activities might well study their support of *Unesco* projects. Whether all these are to the best interests of the United States, warranting the support by public funds through foundations, is doubtful.

#### *AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL.*

One agency which has come into being as a result of *Unesco* action deserves special study. It is the *Provisional International Social Science Council*. Donald Young, President of the *Russell Sage Foundation*, explains the origin of this new organization in the March, 1952 issue of *Items*, the publication of the *Social Science Research Council*. A consultative organization meeting was held at the call of MME. ALVA MYRDAL as Director of the Department of Social Sciences of *Unesco*. MME. MYRDAL (wife of Gunnar Myrdal, whose *An American Dilemma* is discussed in section XIII of this report) is an extreme leftist who was at one time denied a visa by our State Department. That a person of MME. MYRDAL's persuasion should be a director of the social science department of *Unesco* is rather forbidding.

Three Americans were selected for places in the ten man initial group to organize the new *International Council*. One of these was Mr. Young, who was elected president; another was Professor P. H. Odegard of the University of California; the third was PROFESSOR OTTO KLINEBERG of Columbia University, well-known as an extreme leftist.

We have been unable to expend the time to investigate this new organization with any thoroughness. We suggest that such an in-

vestigation is highly desirable. There are indications that it is to act in the international field somewhat in the manner *The Social Science Research Council* acts in the domestic scene. The opportunities for coercive direction of research into a leftist direction will be present; and its integration with *Unesco* makes it likely that its direction will be to the left. Foundation support for its activities is apparently expected. The extent and purpose of such support, currently and in the future, bears watching. Perhaps more significant than anything else is that the *International Council* shall have among its duties (according to Mr. Young's article) this function:

"Whenever asked to do so, to tender [to *Unesco*] advice on the choice of suitable social scientists for interdisciplinary projects of research."

It could thus become a virtual accrediting agency, with all the power and danger such a system involves. The danger is increased by the apparent fact that the structure of the new organization is un-democratic, perhaps even more so than that of *The Social Science Research Council* after which it seems to have been somewhat patterned.

#### CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT AND THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION.

Starting in 1946 *The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* made substantial contributions to the *American Bar Association* on a matched-fund basis—that is, requiring the Association itself to supply part of the necessary funds—for the purpose of studying problems of international law. One of the problems contemplated for study was the crime of genocide. This project commenced while ALGER HISS was President of the *Endowment* and progressed while Professor Shotwell was his interim successor. Shortly after Joseph E. Johnson, the present President of the *Endowment*, came into office he launched into a controversy with the *American Bar Association* claiming that it had misused the funds granted by the *Endowment*. His main claim, as expressed in a letter of September 27, 1950 to Mr. Codey Fowler, President of the *American Bar Association*, was "that funds from the *Endowment* grant have been or are being employed for the purpose of opposing ratification of the Genocide Convention as submitted to the United States Senate by the President." Mr. Johnson also complained that in the deliberations of the Association the point of view supporting the Genocide Convention had not been given sufficient hearing.

Without going into details of the controversy, which involved some rather sharp correspondence, we conclude from the facts that Mr. Johnson's irritation stemmed from the *Bar Association's* having *dared* to condemn the Genocide Convention.

Foundation executives make much of the assertion that they are under no obligation to follow up their grants and that they have in fact no right to interfere with the use of funds which they have allotted. Mr. Johnson's quite bitter controversy with the *Bar Association*, however, indicates that when the grantee arrives at conclusions distasteful to those who control the granting foundation, they feel they have a right to object and complain. We do not believe that Mr. Johnson would have complained if the *American Bar Association* had come to the conclusion that the Genocide Convention should be ratified. This is consistent with the propaganda nature of the *Carnegie Endowment*.

*FORD ENTERS THE FIELD.*

The Ford Foundation entered the international field with ardor. It has already spent vast sums of money on projects abroad. One of its five major programs concerns international and foreign objectives.

We find, in the furtherance of this program, grants in 1951 and 1952 to the *American Friends Service Committee* aggregating \$1,134,000. The *Ford Foundation Annual Report* for 1951 recites that the "officers" (note it is not the trustees) "felt that the *American Friends Service Committee* had demonstrated over a long period its capacity to deal effectively with many of the economic, social and educational conditions that lead to international tensions." The same report later contains this somewhat naive statement:

"Our policy in Asia has failed to lead us to the real objectives of the American people because its preoccupation with strategy and ideology has prevented our giving sufficient weight to the economic, social and political realities of Asia. *There, as elsewhere, we have tended to label as Communist any movement that sought a radical change in the established order, without consideration of the roots of such a movement.* Quaker workers, during years of service in the troubled Orient, have witnessed the great changes taking place and the increasing hostility with which the United States has regarded them. They are convinced that an effective policy must take into account the actual conditions that have produced these changes, as well as the new situation that revolution has created in Asia. Our fundamental ignorance of the East is costing us dear, but the situation has been further complicated by the fact that United States policy towards Asia has recently been exposed in an unusual degree to the hazards of domestic criticism arising from political partisanship.

"It is surprising that we have not been able to understand the situation in Asia, because Americans should be peculiarly able to comprehend the meaning of revolution. *Our own independence was achieved through a revolution, and we have traditionally sympathized with the determined attempts of other peoples to win national independence and higher standards of living. The current revolution in Asia is a similar movement, whatever its present association with Soviet Communism.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

*Are these "officers" of a foundation who characterize a Russian-Communist armed and financed coup in China as a revolutionary movement similar to our War of Independence qualified to expend huge sums of money belonging in equity to the American people! Can a foundation be trusted to administer a half billion dollars of public funds in an area having to do with foreign affairs and international relations when its trustees apparently follow the advice of "officers" so uninformed in American history and institutions as to draw an analogy between a Communist conquest and the American Revolution!*

*AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE.*

Now let us briefly examine the record of the *American Friends Service Committee* to which the officers of the *Ford Foundation* attributed such "capacity to deal effectively" with vital problems that the *Foundation* granted that organization a total of \$1,134,000 of the public's money.

The *Friends Service Committee* supported the pacifist *Frazier Bill* which would have prevented us from waging war; and the *Griffen Bill* which would have prevented us from denying citizenship to those aliens who refused to take oath to defend the United States.

It sponsored the WORLD YOUTH CONGRESS which has been cited as a Communist front. It sent a delegate to the WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL, held in Prague in 1947, a pro-Soviet and Communist-sponsored affair.

In June, 1948 it circulated Congress with a statement expressing its unalterable opposition to conscription for military service. This

statement was signed by its Chairman, HENRY J. CADBURY, and its Executive Secretary, CLARENCE E. PICKETT. The Communist front affiliations of these two men (as well as of others associated with the *Friends Service Committee*) are shown in an appendix to this report.

The *Friends Service Committee* organized the *Student Peace Service Committee*, which assisted in the organization of the *Youth Committee Against War*, which brought together:

THE AMERICAN STUDENT UNION (cited as a Communist front);  
 THE WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE;  
 THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION;  
 THE YOUNG PEOPLES SOCIALIST LEAGUE;  
 THE FARMERS UNION;  
 THE INDEPENDENT COMMUNIST LABOR LEAGUE;  
 THE METHODIST FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE (Youth Section);  
 THE AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS;

and other left wing groups.

The *Friends Service Committee* has been an active lobbyist. A few years ago an organization known as the *Friends Committee on National Legislation* was set up in Washington. It is believed to be a vehicle of the *American Friends Service Committee*, or closely associated with it. This unit opposes military training, favors liberalization of the immigration laws and asks legislation to sustain conscientious objectors. It supported the *Lehman Amendment* to the *McCarran-Walter Immigration Act*; it urges extensive foreign aid programs. It solicits financial contributions. Whether it is right or wrong in its respective legislative positions is of no moment here—the point is that it engages actively in prompting some legislation and opposing other measures. This function should, in itself, deny it the support of a foundation.

Nor does the *American Friends Service Committee* itself refrain from political pressure. In January, 1950, it wrote the following message to President Truman, presuming to press him in an area of government activity of the greatest moment:

“Further intervention will result in the hardening of Chinese resentment against America and the strengthening of Sino-Russian ties by treating Communist China as an enemy and by refusing to recognize her, we are not isolating China, we are isolating ourselves.”

It is the conclusion of this Committee that, in deciding that this organization should be supported, the officers of *The Ford Foundation* exhibited a lack of sound bases for judgment; and the trustees who gave these officers their support in distributing \$1,134,000 of public trust money were guilty of gross negligence.

Remember the contention of the foundations, expressed several times in the Cox Committee hearings, that they are entitled to make mistakes, that they cannot enter “experimental” fields without making mistakes! This contention is wholly acceptable when a mistake is sometimes made in some innocuous, nose-counting piece of research. When the mistake relates to the safety of our country, the burden passes heavily to the foundation to prove that its action was reasonable, carefully thought-out and *without* reasonable possibility of damage.

*The Ford Foundation* has become a propagandist for *Unesco*, as indeed have several of the other great foundations. Our school chil-

dren are being taught that *Unesco* is one of the hopes of the world. No critical analysis is ever given, as far as we have been able to determine, but merely blind adulation. The following testimony by Mr. Aaron Sargent is illuminating regarding *Ford's* position:

*The Ford Foundation* used its financial power to attempt to resist the will of the people of Los Angeles in connection with a pamphlet known as "*The E in Unesco*." This pamphlet was put out by the Los Angeles City School Department, and it promotes various *Unesco* activities, and it includes the international declaration of human rights.

Mr. Paul Hoffman, the president of *The Ford Foundation*, personally appeared before the Los Angeles Board of Education and sought to prevent the removal of these pamphlets out of the Los Angeles city schools by the action of a duly constituted board of the city of Los Angeles, and in so doing he engaged in lobbying, an activity prohibited to *The Ford Foundation*.

I have a news clipping, bearing date of August 26, 1952, Tuesday, in the Los Angeles Times, and it contains a picture of Mr. Hoffman, several other gentlemen with him, and the statement below reads as follows:

"Urge that it stay—These proponents of teaching *Unesco* were on hand as speakers. From left: Dr. Hugh M. Tiner, Pepperdine College president; Paul G. Hoffman, of *Ford Foundation*; Elmer Franzwa, district governor of Rotary, and William Joyce."

Mr. HAYS. What is wrong with that?

Mr. SARGENT. He has no right to engage in lobbying, and he was opposing a local matter and should not have in any way interfered with it. He was president of *The Ford Foundation*.

Mr. HAYS. You would not want anybody to say you have no right to come here and expound your views, would you?

Mr. SARGENT. He did it as president of *The Ford Foundation*, and used the power of *The Ford Foundation* as a leverage in the case. (Hearings, p. 379.)

Later came the following colloquy:

Mr. HAYS. You are inferring that because he was president of *The Ford Foundation* and he went out there to advocate this, he automatically brought *The Ford Foundation* into it.

Mr. SARGENT. They were discussing how they were going to handle it and they were afraid the *Unesco* pamphlet was going to be thrown out and they were discussing other ways in which they could back up Mr. Hoffman and bring more strength to bear on that Los Angeles City Board of Education. I overheard that conversation, and I was in the office at the time. Mr. Hoffman was lobbying intentionally. (Hearings, p. 381.)

(The statement filed by the *Ford Foundation* maintains that Mr. Hoffman did this bit of lobbying on his own as a private citizen and a resident of California, unconnected with his position with the *Foundation*. That may, of course, well be. He may, for the moment, have stepped out of his official character to go to work as an individual, but the general impression that he was acting as President of *The Ford Foundation* was a reasonable one.)

Subsequently Mr. Sargent explained that the propaganda in the *Unesco* matter included the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which has been rejected by the *American Bar Association* and our government itself. (Hearings, p. 382 et seq.)

The frantic efforts of some of the foundations to widen public support for *Unesco* deserve studied attention.

#### *INTERCULTURAL PUBLICATIONS, INC.*

One of the organizations established by the *Ford Foundation*

"In an attempt to increase understanding among the peoples of the world and to advance mutual appreciation of differing cultural and intellectual backgrounds through the exchange of ideas and literary and artistic productions \* \* \*

was Intercultural Publications, Inc. According to the application for a tax-exempt status filed with the Internal Revenue Service, it was organized, among other purposes

“\* \* \* to help maintain world peace and to promote better understanding between peoples of different nations, races and relations; to increase without the United States knowledge of the culture, art, intellectual works, customs, and interests of the United States and its peoples; \* \* \*”

by means of production and distribution of all forms of written and spoken communication.

In addition to the quarterly magazine *Perspectives*, U. S., which is published in 20 countries, it also publishes *Diogenes*, *Kultura*, and an *Atlantic Monthly Supplement*, *Perspective of India*.

From its establishment in April 1952 until the close of 1953 *The Ford Foundation* has granted \$759,950 to Intercultural Publications, Inc., no figures being available for the year 1954.

As in so many of the projects with which *The Ford Foundation* and its offspring have associated themselves, the purposes set forth are entirely praiseworthy. But as a practical matter, based on a study of the six issues of *Perspectives* published to date, it is evident that there might be two schools of thought as to whether the particular means selected, as demonstrated by the content of these quarterly volumes, would necessarily accomplish the avowed purposes.

There is a much bigger question mark, however, in the minds of this committee, based on a study of the personalities associated with this “cultural” disciple of *The Ford Foundation*, either as a member of the advisory board, as a contributing author, or as an author whose works are selected for review.

The latest volume available (No. 6) lists 59 individuals as members of the advisory board. Of that number 18 have been mentioned in one way or another before Government agencies looking into subversion. These individuals, whose complete records are included in the appendix to this report are—

MORTIMER ADLER

JAMES AGEE

W. H. Auden

Jacques Barzun

BERNARD BERELSON

Paul Bigelow

R. P. Blackmur

Francois Bondy

Harvey Breit

Cleanth Brooks

Marguerite Caetani

Cyril Connolly

AARON COPLAND

MALCOLM COWLEY

HALLIE FLANAGAN DAVIS

IRVIN EDMAN

JAMES T. FARRELL

Francis Fergusson

W. H. Ferry

Alfred M. Frankfurter

ALBERT J. GUERARD

Hiram Haydn

Rudolf Hirsch

Henry Russell Hitchcock

Alfred Kazin

Paul Henry Lang

Melvin J. Lasky

HARRY LEVIN

Alvin Lustig

Richard P. McKeon

PERRY MILLER

Robert Motherwell

Dorothy Norman

Norman Holmes Pearson

Duncan Phillips

Renato Poggioli

John Crowe Ransom

Annada Sankar Ray

ROBERT REDFIELD

Kenneth Rexroth

Selden Rodman

Eero Saarinen

MEYER SCHAPIRO

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.

Mark Schorer

Delmore Schwartz

GILBERT SELDES

KAEL J. SHAPIRO

Wallace Stegner

Allen Tate

Lionel Trilling

Ralph E. Turner

ROBERT PENN WARREN

Gordon Bailey Washburn

Victor Weybright

Monroe Wheeler

TENNESSEE WILLIAMS

Kurt Wolff

Morton D. Zabel

Among those who have contributed to the periodical, or whose books have been favorably reviewed are the following, whose records are also in the appendix.

KENNETH BURKE  
AARON COPLAND  
MALCOLM COWLEY  
MARTHA GRAHAM  
HORACE GREGORY  
KENNETH GEARING  
ALBERT J. GUERARD  
SIDNEY HOOK  
ROBERT HUTCHINS  
JOHN HOUSEMAN  
GEORGE F. KENNAN  
ARCHIBALD M. MACLEISH  
NORMAN MAILER

PERRY MILLER  
GARDNER MURPHY  
HENRY MURRAY  
REINHOLD NIEBUHR  
MEYER SCHAPIRO  
KARL SHAPIRO  
ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.  
GILBERT SELDES  
JACOB VINER  
ALEXANDER WERTH  
WILLIAM CARLOS WILLIAMS  
EDMUND WILSON

Summarized, tax exempt funds are being channeled into the hands of persons like Malcolm Cowley (literary editor of the *New Republic*), a member of the advisory board who has consistently followed the Communist Party line, has sponsored or been a member of at least half a dozen or so organizations cited by the Attorney General and Congressional committees and other governmental agencies as Communist, subversive or Communist front organizations. Or, like Aaron Copland, also a member of the advisory board, who in addition to a consistent record of joining such organizations as did Cowley, has composed a song entitled "The First of May" which drew high praise from such Communists as Hans Eisler.

The records of individuals obtained from official sources have been included in the appendix, and will bear close scrutiny. This Committee finds it difficult to believe that *only these individuals* can adequately portray to the people of the world the culture of the United States, and equally difficult to believe that there do not exist in this country rising artists of equal ability, whose art would be enhanced by a firm belief in the fundamental concepts of our political philosophy.

#### *GLOBALISTIC ECONOMICS.*

The extent to which foundations have promoted the theory that we must subordinate our own economic welfare for that of the world in order to have peace is worth an investigation of its own. *The Rockefeller Foundation* in its 1941 report said:

"If we are to have a durable peace after the war, if out of the wreckage of the present a new kind of cooperative life is to be built on a global scale, the part that science and advancing knowledge will play must not be overlooked."

The presumption is that a global economic system is desirable. Such a system could not exist without some form of coercive supervision. Whether Americans are ready to accept such supervision is extremely doubtful.

An aspect of this subject which may sorely need attention is the use made of foundation funds to promote international arrangements for the control and distribution of raw materials and other interferences with domestic manufacture and trade. In the overwhelming desire to make us part of "one world" as quickly as possible, many associated with foundation work have supported movements which are decidedly short-sighted from the standpoint of the nationalistic world in which we still, as a practical matter, live and work.



*THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION GOES "INTERNATIONAL."*

In 1948 the *National Education Association* issued a volume entitled *Education for International Understanding in American Schools—Suggestions and Recommendations*, prepared by the *Committee on International Relations, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* and the *National Council for the Social Studies*, all departments of the *NEA*. (Hearings, p. 64 et seq.) It was the result of a project financed in part directly by the *NEA* through contributions from teachers and partly by a grant from the *Carnegie Corporation of New York*. (Hearings, p. 65.)

The foreword by Warren Robinson Austin, then our representative at the UN, stated that the UN in 1949 had unanimously called upon the member states to provide effective teaching about the UN in schools. Apparently the *NEA* project was at least partially in answer to this call. It recommended that the teachers in our schools educate pupils into internationalism and gave specific suggestions as to objectives and methods. (Hearings, p. 65.)

There is a grave question in the minds of this Committee whether this powerful organization of teachers has any right to attempt to promote a uniform program of education on a national basis; but, if such a procedure is proper, it might well be that planning to educate our children into a better understanding of the world and its component parts and how international things work might be highly desirable. The program of the *NEA*, however, as expressed in the book under discussion, went far further than a mere educational program. It assumed that because the *United Nations* had been accepted as an intrinsic part of American foreign policy it should receive virtually unqualified and uncritical support.

The fact is that while the *United Nations* does play an intrinsic part in our foreign policy, support among our citizens for its mechanism and the detailed actions of its various constituents, boards and bodies is far from universal. The intelligent observer cannot escape the conclusion that the agencies of the *United Nations* themselves in many instances have promoted ideas and concepts which seem antithetical to many of our own basic principles.

We find in Mr. Austin's preface, for example, reference to the necessity for "rationalization of production and distribution on a world-wide basis." It is suggested that "solution of economic problems on a purely national basis without regard to the effect of their conduct on other peoples and nations breeds economic war." (Hearings, p. 66.) That may well be but there are many in the United States who believe that our efforts to improve the world's economy at enormous cost to the American taxpayer have not only been ineffective but have been met with a universal egocentric response by the other nations. The general tone of the volume is that we must sacrifice a considerable part of our national independence in order to create a stable and peaceful world. That may also be true if and when the time comes when most of the nations of the world will be ready themselves for honest international collaboration. *In the meantime, to train our children into the desirability of becoming internationalists at a time when world society is characterized by the most intense kind of selfish nationalism seems both unrealistic and dangerous.*

The volume implies that the creation of the *United Nations* is only the first step in the establishment of a world order. Its adulation of

the *United Nations* itself is almost childish. In the face of our difficulties with Russia it says: "Through its Security Council, every dispute that affects the peace of the world can be brought before an international body endowed with authority to take all necessary steps for the restraint of aggression." (Hearings, p. 67.). *To impose this concept upon our children in the schools is to teach them nonsense. The futility of the United Nations in settling international disputes has been tragically evident. And this futility, moreover, is not the result of a failure on our part to be "international minded."*

"Collaboration" is emphasized in this volume. We are to collaborate with all the various UNO bureaus and agencies, even the *Commission on Human Rights*.

The volume emphasizes the responsibility of teachers for "contributing to the maintenance of enduring peace". (Hearings, p. 67.) This is to be accomplished by indoctrinating our children with the desirability of full cooperation with the UNO and all its works. "This will certainly involve curriculum revision and the recasting of many time-honored educational policies and practices. It is a case in which half-measures and lip-service will not be adequate, for if these are the substance of the effort, the challenge will go unanswered." (Hearings, p. 68.) The goal is set as producing citizens who might be called "world-minded Americans". We cannot escape the conclusion that what is meant is the production of advocates of a world state.

Again, we say that someday a world state may be desirable and possible. However, we are living in a very realistic era in which "one world" could only be accomplished by succumbing to Communism. The program suggested contains this specific identification of the "world-minded American": "The world-minded American knows that unlimited national sovereignty is a threat to world peace and that nations must cooperate to achieve peace and human progress."

On page 21 of this volume we find this astounding statement (Hearings, p. 69):

"\* \* \* More recently, the idea has become established that the preservation of international peace and order may require that force be used to compel a nation to conduct its affairs within the framework of an established world system. The most modern expression of this doctrine of collective security is in the United Nations Charter."

On page 31 we find this:

"\* \* \* The social causes of war are overwhelmingly more important than the attitudes and behavior of individuals. If this be true, the primary approach to the prevention of war must involve action in the area of social and political organization and control. (Hearings, p. 69.) [Emphasis supplied.]

Education is the recommended road to "social and political organization and control" and education is described "as a force for conditioning the will of a people \* \* \*. It utilizes old techniques and mass media such as the printed word, the cinema, the radio, and now television." (Hearings, p. 69.) If we read these terms correctly they seem to mean to us that the educators are to use all the techniques of propaganda in order to condition our children to the particular variety of "world-mindedness" which these educators have adopted. Considerable space is later spent for "education for peace through mass media." (Hearings, pp. 69, 70.)

There is constant repetition of the idea that "the world-minded American believes that unlimited national sovereignty is a threat to world peace". On page 44 we find:

*"\* \* \* Many persons believe that enduring peace cannot be achieved so long as the nation-state system continues as at present constituted. It is a system of international anarchy—a species of jungle warfare. Enduring peace cannot be attained until the nation-states surrender to a world organization the exercise of jurisdiction over those problems with which they have found themselves unable to deal singly in the past. If like conditions continue in the future as in the past, like situations will arise. Change the conditions, and the situations will change."*

Again, on page 46, we find this:

*"We are likely to take the present nation-state system for granted; but in so doing, we are likely to overestimate its permanence and underestimate its significance. \* \* \*"* [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearings, p. 70.)

There is a definite call to political action or at least to a promotion of the idea that we must surrender some of our political independence. On page 57 we find this:

*"\* \* \* The demonstration of the feasibility of international organization in nonpolitical fields and the failure of the League of Nations makes even more clear the fact that it is in the area of 'political' organization where failure seems to be consistent. This suggests that the difficulty may be traceable to the dogma of unlimited sovereignty—that nothing must be allowed to restrict the complete independence of the state. It suggests also that the dogma of sovereignty has a high emotional content that is self-generated and self-sustained and that so long as the dogma of illimitability obtains, international cooperation of a political nature will at best be tenuous."* (Hearings, p. 71.)

On page 60 we find this recommendation that we must conform our national economic policies to an international world economy:

*"\* \* \* The development of international cooperation as a contributing force to economic well-being is possible only insofar as it is applied to give direction to common positive aims and to condition the effects of national economic policies that would otherwise be serious disruptions of the interdependent world economy."* (Hearings, p. 71.)

We must have (page 62) a "planned economic cooperation on a world-wide scale."

Our children are not merely to be educated into international points of view—they are told how to make themselves effective in creating political pressure. We offer these quotations as examples:

Page 80:

*"\* \* \* An individual can increase his effectiveness in influencing foreign policy by associating himself with organizations and by helping to formulate their attitudes on international questions. The groups most suitable for this purpose are the political party and those generally called pressure groups."*

Page 81:

*"\* \* \* The world-minded American, as a part of his program of action, should concern himself with how these groups operate. He will find that he himself can probably have a greater influence through this technique. He will also find that since a great deal of official action is determined by pressure group action, the use of this device will enable him to be heard and will also enable him to urge his interest for peace against those he considers to be urging a contrary interest. He will find that the variety and interest of the groups with which he can affiliate are endless; and he must, therefore, examine carefully the aims of the group or groups to which he will devote his energies."*

Page 82:

*"\* \* \* Teachers must act. As citizens, their obligation to act on behalf of peace and international cooperation is a responsibility shared with all other citizens. But teachers cannot be content merely to do just as much as others; they must do more. Teachers in almost any American community have greater competence in leadership skills and in knowledge than most of their fellow*

citizens. With greater capacity goes greater responsibility for bringing personal influence to bear on civic action on the local, State, and National levels." (Hearings, p. 72.)

The school is to be a sort of militant agent so that "the total impact of community thinking may be brought to bear on major issues. Such a role brings the school into working contact with those agencies in the community which are keyed to action \* \* \*."

The schools are told how "to assume their responsibility". Programs are to be developed rapidly. School planning committees are to pool ideas and coordinate. "Aids and sources" are recommended, including reading materials, film and film strips, etc. A list of books are recommended and among them we find some the advisability of recommendations we seriously doubt. (Hearings, p. 73.)

*Putting the evidence together, we conclude that the National Education Association has been an important element in the tax-exempt world used to indoctrinate American youth with "internationalism", the particular variety which Professor Colgrove referred to as "globalism." This point of view is closely related to the "new era" which so many social scientists have envisioned as the ultimate goal of our society when they have gotten through "engineering" us into it.*

We note that the filed statement by the National Education Association has made no effort to explain any of the criticisms made of that organization in the testimony, including the material we have just treated on globalism. This crucial and well documented issue is completely evaded with the remark that the NEA is "unable to learn whether any of the previous testimony is regarded by your Committee as worthy of further examination." The following characterization disposes of the evidence itself: "This testimony, insofar as we have been able to examine it, is so vague and so self-contradictory, that detailed comment seems unnecessary." (Hearings, p. 1147.) We beg to differ with the NEA.

#### *EXPENDITURES ABROAD.*

This Committee has not been able to expend the time to ascertain the extent of foundation spending abroad. It is clear, however, that millions of the taxpayers' money are spent annually outside of the United States. A further investigation might well consider whether there should not be some limitations placed upon such a foreign use of American money. In this era in which our Government feels obliged to pour billions into the support of the rest of the world, it is questionable whether foundations should have the right, freely to use further millions of the people's money in alien ventures.

There is the further problem of whether foundation expenditures abroad may not, at times, directly conflict with government policy. The whole subject is worthy of intensive study.

#### *THE BASIC, FOUNDATION-SUPPORTED PROPAGANDA RE FOREIGN AFFAIRS.*

It is our conclusion, from the evidence, that the foundation supported activities which relate to foreign policy have been turned consciously and expressly in the direction of propagandizing for one point of view. That point of view, widely disseminated by foundations at great cost in public funds, has been the official line of the former two administrations, submitted with such rare criticism, if any, as to constitute truly political activity. Where has been the objectivity which we have the right to expect when trustees disburse our

money? Where has been an expression of the minority points of view which have, in the course of time, proved themselves correct?

The following quotation is from the speech of ex-President Hoover, as reported in *The New York Times* of August 11, 1954, upon the occasion of his 80th birthday, after so many years of selfless devotion to the people of the United States:

"In our foreign relations there are great dangers and also vital safeguards to free men. During the last war we witnessed a special encroachment of the Executive upon the legislative branch. This has been through a new type of commitment of the United States to other nations.

"I am not going to argue legalisms, for they do not go to the center of the issue. The real issue is whether the President, through declaration or implication or by appeasement or by acquiescence or by joint statements with foreign officials, can commit the American people to foreign nations without the specific consent of the elected representatives of the people.

"There has been a grievous list of such commitments. They include international agreements which shackle our economy by limiting a free market. But more terrible were such executive agreements as our recognition of Soviet Russia which opened the headgates for a torrent of traitors.

"Our tacit alliance with Soviet Russia spread communism over the earth. Our acquiescence in the annexation by Russia of the Baltic States at Moscow and the partition of Poland at Teheran extinguished the liberties of tens of millions of people.

"Worse still was the appeasement and surrender at Yalta of ten nations to slavery. And there was the secret agreement with respect to China which set in train the communization of Mongolia, North Korea and all of China.

"These unrestrained Presidential actions have resulted in a shrinking of human freedom over the whole world. From these actions came the jeopardies of the 'Cold War.' As a by-product these actions have shrunk our freedoms by crushing taxes, huge defense costs, inflation and compulsory military service.

"We must make such misuse of power forever impossible.

"And let me say, I have no fears of this evil from President Eisenhower but he will not always be President.

"Our dangers from the Communist source of gigantic evil in the world are unending. All of the peace agencies we have created and all of the repeated conferences we have held have failed to find even a whisper of real peace.

"Amid these malign forces, our haunting anxiety and our paramount necessity is the defense of our country.

"It is not my purpose to define the foreign policies of our Government.

"Sooner or later a new line of action will become imperative.

"I have disagreed with, and protested against, the most dangerous of our foreign political policies during the whole of the twenty years prior to the last Presidential election. I opposed and protested every step in the policies which led us into the Second World War.

"Especially in June, 1941, when Britain was safe from a German invasion due to Hitler's diversion to attack on Stalin, I urged that the gargantuan jest of all history would be our giving aid to the Soviet Government. I urged we should allow those two dictators to exhaust each other. I stated that the result of our assistance would be to spread communism over the whole world. I urged that if we stood aside the time would come when we could bring lasting peace to the world.

"I have no regrets. The consequences have proved that I was right."

It would be interesting to take each criticism offered by President Hoover and to determine how much foundation money has been spent in disseminating it among our people, as against disseminating the concept or principle which it criticizes. We are confident, from the evidence we have examined, that the result would show a preponderance against Mr. Hoover's criticisms of about one million to one, in almost every instance. *If this is the way these foundations have discharged their duty to the people to be objective and fair, we are frank to say that their tax exemption may have been a tragic mistake. They have been propaganda agencies; and foundation propaganda in any political area cannot be tolerated.*

## XII. COMMUNISM AND SUBVERSION

*THE COMMUNIST PENETRATION.*

The group frequently referred to as the "anti-anti-Communists" has persuaded a large part of the American public that exposing Communists and their helpers undermines our traditions and principles. It admits that Communism is a grave danger to our national safety. It asserts that Communists should be driven out of government and places of power and influence. But it suggests that this should be done (in some mysterious and undefined way) by the government. Yet, strangely, these anti-anti-Communists vigorously and consistently oppose all determined and effective measures by which the government, through its duly delegated committees, exposes Communists.

It does not seem quite clear how this is to be managed; but nothing is worse, in the opinion of this vociferous group, than a Congressional investigation. That, they assert, is the worst way to handle the problem; a Congressional investigation is almost *per se* a violation of individual right; the individual must be protected, they allege, against the abuse inherent in Congressional inquiries even if the safety of the nation is at stake.

Some of this group say that the Attorney General should act, and he alone; forgetting that he cannot prosecute anyone for merely being a Communist: he can prosecute for espionage (and how rarely a spy is caught) or for perjury (and how rarely even a *Hiss* is caught). Others say that the job is one for the F. B. I., as though it should be used as a sort of *Gestapo*, with the right to both catch and try and, perhaps convict, for Communism. The fact is that the F. B. I. can only report what it finds to executive authority and then hope for the best. Many feel that, in any event, no man should be deprived of any right to position or employment unless he has actually been convicted of espionage or something equally overt and sinister. A man may, after all, they say, be a Communist and still be a good citizen and mean us no harm.

Against these various types of soft-mindedness and blindness to danger, the Congressional investigation still stands as a protection. *If, for example, the Cox Committee had done nothing else, its investigation was justified in so far as it disclosed that there had been an actual, definitive and successful Russian-Communist plan to infiltrate American philanthropic foundations.* Little reference has subsequently been made to this material disclosed by the Cox Committee hearings—it has certainly been conveniently forgotten by those in the foundations who are anti-anti-Communists. It bears review.

One of the Cox witnesses was Maurice Malkin, Consultant with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, who had been a charter member of the Communist party in America and had been expelled in 1937. He testified that a Russian agent had come to this country in 1936 "and ordered us that instead of depending on Moscow to finance the American party directly and at all times, we should try to work out ways and means of penetrating philanthropic, charitable, grants, foundations, and et cetera, and these organizations like social-service organizations, charitable institutions, and other cultural fronts, to try to penetrate these organizations, if necessary take control of them and their treasuries: if not, to at least penetrate them where we would have a voice of influence amongst those organizations, in

order to drain their treasuries that they should be able to finance the Communist Party propaganda in the United States, besides the subsidies that will be granted by Moscow." (Cox Hearings, p. —.)

The existence of this plot was corroborated by others and stands amply proved. The infiltration had commenced earlier than 1936. Mr. Bogolepov testified before the Cox Committee concerning infiltration as early as 1930. Bogolepov quoted Stalin as having said that Marx was wrong in so far as he may have thought that the Western world could be won by the workers. Stalin said:

"\* \* \* it would be necessary to maintain the revolutionary status through the brains of Western intellectuals who were said to be sympathetic with Communist ideas." (Cox Hearings, p. 676 et seq.)

There were many waiting to be used by the Communists for their own purposes,—socialists and other leftists who did not always have sympathy with Communism itself but joined with it in certain immediate objectives, not realizing that, by doing so, they were assisting Communism to achieve its ultimate goals. Among this group were *those innocents who, in the 30's, sought to direct education in the United States, and research in the social sciences, to the end of ushering in a new order, prerequisite to which was the destruction or sapping of free enterprise. We have met some of them in previous sections of this report.*

In the August 20, 1954 issue of *U. S. News and World Report* is a long interview with Congressman Martin Dies, entitled *They Tried To Get Me, Too*. It is well worth reading. Mr. Dies tells the story of his difficulties as Chairman of the famous committee bearing his name which investigated Communism, in the face of the most bitter opposition from the then Administration. To the "liberals" of that day, Mr. Dies was worse than McCarthy is to the "liberals" of today. Yet his disclosures of Communism in high and important places were beyond questioning and were staggering in their implications. At one time he presented to the Executive a list of 2,000 Communists on the Federal payroll, including Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White and Harold Glasser. Perhaps no one man, outside the F. B. I., knows more about the subversive movement during the period of his investigation than Mr. Dies. In his interview he recounts how so many "liberals" became the tools of Communism:

"The truth of the matter was, as I told the Jenner Committee, there were 10 million 'liberals' running around like a chicken with its head chopped off and wanting to change everything. They didn't know exactly what they wanted to change, but they were for changes. Along came the Commies, and they were the only group in that bunch that had a program. They knew where they were going and what they were doing.

"So they took over this 10 million and used them, and then suddenly came the exposure that here were these organizations that the 'liberals' had sponsored and worked under and contributed money to under the control of Moscow."

Mr. Louis Budenz testified before the Cox Committee that he was chairman of a Communist group which penetrated the press and other media of public information and that a commission had been created to penetrate the foundations, and he named names. Mr. Manning Johnson testified that he was a member of the Party from 1930 to 1940 and gave his opinion that the foundations had been successfully penetrated on both high and low levels. He said that from his own personal experience he knew that the *Garland Fund*, the *Marshall Foundation*, the *John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation* and the

*Rosenwald Fund*, in particular has been used, as well as the *Institute of Pacific Relations*.

### *How Do THEY Do IT?*

How has the penetration by Communists taken place? How was it accomplished? In an effort to see if the foundations themselves could assist in answering these questions, Counsel to this Committee asked three selected foundations, the *William C. Whitney Foundation*, the *Rockefeller Foundation* and the *John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation*, to examine their own records to try to see if they could shed any light on how grants to Communists and Fellow-travellers came to be made. In the case of the *Whitney Foundation*, two of its officers cooperated fully. In conferences with Counsel, it was agreed that no pattern appeared and the number of grants to subversives was, in any case, insufficient to provide a pattern.

In the case of the *Rockefeller Foundation*, Mr. Dean Rusk, its President, also cooperated fully, reporting to Counsel in writing both for the *Foundation* and for the (Rockefeller) *General Education Board*. The reports described the origin of each grant in so far as Mr. Rusk was able to ascertain it, and stated his conclusion that "no pattern emerges."

In the case of the *Guggenheim Foundation*, nothing further was heard from Dr. Moe, its chief officer, after the request for a study was made by Counsel. As the suggestion had been made merely to see if the foundations could assist in discovering how subversive grants came about, nothing further was done in the case of the *Guggenheim Foundation*, which apparently did not see fit to cooperate. (Appendix to Report, pp. —.)

This Committee is unable to arrive at any express conclusion as to the methods and manner of Communist penetration of foundations or the ways which have been used to take advantage of foundations. The subject would require detailed study far beyond this Committee's capacity in time and money. We suspect, however, that one factor which has contributed to the ease with which Communism has used our foundations has been the attitude of many foundation executives that the political opinions of a grantee is of no consequence. Dr. Hutchins, long a power in *The Ford Foundation* and now President of its offspring, *The Fund for the Republic*, has put himself on record as taking that position, and he is not alone. The attitude of Dr. Johnson in selecting his assistants in connection with the preparation of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, referred to elsewhere, seems typical of many of the leading characters in the social science field.

Some foundations have prided themselves that they do not enquire into the "politics" of those who receive grants or fellowships. They say they would not, of course, take on an avowed or proven, present Communist, but they do not seem concerned, however leftist the political or social bias of the prospective recipient of public money by their grace may be, short of actual, present, proven Communist membership. To some this position may seem sound—that a "scientist" should not be condemned or discriminated against unless he is established as an enemy of our country. Certainly whether the recipient is a Democrat or a Republican can make no possible difference. It may not even matter that he is some variety of collectivist, provided his political slant could make no material difference in the area in



which he is to work. But we are concerned in this report almost exclusively with the social sciences; in these, the political slant of a grantee may have enormous impact on his work. In dealing with mathematics or physics, it may be utterly inconsequential that a researcher is a socialist; in the social sciences, which so often have direct or indirect political significance, the radical character of the researcher may be all-important. *Political conformity should not be the price of foundation support. However, in projects of political significance, when the radical opinions of the applicant may affect his work, foundation support should be denied. Nor is it sufficient for a foundation to take the position that it is not responsible for the results produced by a radical who has received a grant in error or who has abused the confidence of the foundation. It is incumbent on the foundation, as a dispenser of public money, to publicly disavow the radical results promptly and without equivocation.*

#### THE EXTENT OF SUBVERSIVE GRANTS.

During the testimony of Professor Rowe of Yale, Mr. Hays of this Committee pointed out that, in the case of one foundation, it had made only forty grants to persons or organizations allegedly subversive, and that this was but a small percentage of the total grants. Professor Rowe answered that it seemed to him this was a mis-use of statistics. His position was that it was the aggregate impact of the unfortunate grants which was important, not their relative number. The Chairman then suggested that the number of grants did not tell the whole story of Communist infiltration, whereupon the testimony continued:

Dr. ROWE. Yes. Could I comment on that briefly, and make a few other comments that are connected with this? I am fully in agreement with the notion that—picking a figure out of the air—2 or 3 grants that are made to wrong people can have a tremendous effect in undoing much of the good that is made by the rest of the 40,000. Again it is not a matter of every grant being equal in significance. You can't evaluate them in terms of how many dollars were involved. A small grant made to a person in a critical position where he is going to make a wrong move, and implement the matter, can negate hundreds and thousands of grants made to people who are out on the fringes, the outskirts of positions of power and influence where the impact of everything they do that may be good will not be directly felt in policy areas.

Another interesting feature of that is that grants to organizations, it seems to me, have to be very carefully taken into account when you are talking about the total number of grants. I don't quite understand here whether the grants to organizations were included in this total figure.

The CHAIRMAN. They were not. These are grants to individuals.

Dr. ROWE. Of the grants to organizations I can only give you the best example that I know of. Those that involved, for instance, the *Institute of Pacific Relations*. I don't know what the sum total of the money was. It came from *Rockefeller* and *Carnegie* and from private contributions.

Mr. WORMSER. I believe it was something over \$3 million.

Dr. ROWE. \$3 million. The grants to the *Institute of Pacific Relations*, it seems to me, helped to implement a lot of people who did not, in my opinion, have the best interests of the United States at heart. (Hearings, pp. 535, 536.)

Professor Rowe then proceeded with testimony which this Committee found to be of extreme importance:

Here I want to talk about another item. It seems to me we make a mistake in talking about identifying Communists as grantees on the one hand, non-Communists as grantees on the other hand. *In much of the activity that has to do with identification of Communist activity in the United States, it has seemed to me that we are going off on the wrong track when we limit ourselves to efforts to identify overt Communists, or let us say organizational Communists, people who carry a card or who can be positively identified as members of an organization subject to organized discipline. For every one of those that you fail to identify, and it seems*

to me we even fail to identify most of those, there are a thousand people who could not possibly be identified as such, because they have never had any kind of organizational affiliation, but among those people are many people who advance the interests of world communism, in spite of the fact that they are not subject to discipline and do not belong to any organization.

So here again I think your categories, statistically, have to be refined somewhat. Here, of course, you get into this area of opinion. What constitutes an individual who is attempting to advance the interests of world communism?

This is a very controversial subject, but if we are ever to deal with the problem of Communist influence in this country, or ever to deal with the problem of preserving our security against the world Communist conspiracy, this is the critical area. The people who can be trailed and tagged by the FBI are a very, very small minority. They occupy a very powerful position and a potentially important one, but the people who do the important work are unidentifiable, and if I were planning to infiltrate the United States, I would see to it that they were unidentifiable.

Here it seems to me you have to set up an entirely different category than the two categories of Communists on the one side, and other people on the other side. (Hearings, p. 536.) [Emphasis supplied.]

To illustrate the necessity of making qualitative rather than quantitative judgments as to foundation grants, Professor Rowe discussed the IPR situation as follows:

\* \* \* I would like to add this regarding the IPR and regarding the problem of Far Eastern policy. You remember some of my earlier remarks about the state of Far Eastern studies in the United States 20 or 30 years ago, how I said there was practically none of it; how some of the foundations started to finance the building up and training of personnel. It seems to me this kind of thing has to be taken into account in evaluating foundation grants, namely, that the area of ignorance in the United States about Far Eastern matters was so great that here was the strategic place in which to strike at the security of the United States by people interested in imperilling our security and fostering the aims of world communism. They would naturally not pick the area in which we have the greatest intellectual capacities and in which we have the greatest capacities for defense. They would pick the area of greatest public ignorance, with the greatest difficulty of defending against the tactics of their attack, and so these people naturally poured into Far Eastern studies and exploited this area as the area in which they could promote the interests of world communism most successfully in the general ignorance and blindness of the American people.

So that it is not only quantitative evaluation that counts; it is not only the numbers of grants or the amounts of grants; it is the areas in which the grants are given that are significant. Here, you see, it seems to me, it takes a great deal of subject matter know-how—quite apart from dollars and cents—people and their affiliations or lack thereof, to evaluate the impact on this country of any given foundation grant, I don't care whether it is \$50 or \$5 million. It is a qualitative matter, not a quantitative matter. Here is where judgment comes in and where the greatest possibility of disagreements and controversies lies. But where it seems to me if you are going to do an evaluating job on foundation activities you are going to have to make up your mind with the best help you can find just what the meaning of the grants was. (Hearings, pp. 541, 542.)

#### *SUBVERSIVES FED TO GOVERNMENT.*

We have described briefly elsewhere the extent to which the government has come to rely upon foundations and foundation-supported organizations to provide "social scientists" for research and in advisory capacities. The whole subject deserves deep and careful study and analysis, particularly the part which these foundations and associated organizations have played in infiltrating government with subversives. A shocking example of this was disclosed by the testimony of Professor Kenneth Colegrove.

Professor Colegrove testified concerning the appointment of political advisors to the occupation forces at the end of the second World War. In 1945, as Secretary of the *American Political Science Asso-*

ciation he submitted a list of names of experts for the Army of Occupation in Japan and for that in Germany—a list of political scientists who would be helpful to the government. While he did not put his own name on the list, he was asked to become an adviser to General MacArthur, and did subsequently occupy that position. (Hearings, p. 560.)

What became of the list which Professor Colegrove had provided? It was not accepted by the Pentagon. Another list was accepted and, as Professor Colegrove testified:

I was shocked when I saw the list, because there were none of the recommendations that we had made.

I took that list over to an old friend of mine who had served as Chief of the Far Eastern Division in OSS (Office of Strategic Services). His name is Charles Burton Fahs, a very outstanding specialist in Japan and a man of great integrity. And I remember that Charles Burton Fahs was astonished by the character of the names that had been recommended.

We checked those names off. *Some of them were known to us to be Communists, many of them pro-Communists or fellow travelers. They were extremely leftist.*

I went back to the Pentagon to protest against a number of these people, and to my amazement I found that they had all been invited, and they had all accepted, and some of them were already on their way to Japan.

I wanted to find out where the list came from, and *I was told that the list had come from the Institute of Pacific Relations.* [Emphasis supplied.] (Hearing, p. 561.)

Professor Colegrove testified later that *another list had been supplied by the American Council of Learned Societies* and that *the final selections had been made from these two lists* (the IPR and the American Council of Learned Societies) and the list of the American Political Science Association had been ignored. (Hearings, p. 580.)

“And so”,  
said Professor Colegrove,

“General MacArthur, who had very little control over the personnel that was sent to Japan at this time for civil affairs, practically no control, had to receive a large group of very leftist and some of them communist advisers in the field of political science.” (Hearing, p. 561.)

#### *THE BASIC PROBLEM OF SUBVERSION.*

There have been very few foundations which would consciously make a grant to a known Communist. In fact, with a few notable and tragic exceptions such as the *Institute of Pacific Relations*, the *Marshall Foundation* and the *Garland Fund* (these last two having lost their tax exemption and being now extinct) we do not know that any large sums of foundation money have gone directly into Communist channels. That is not the most serious problem which faces those foundation trustees who wish to do their full fiduciary duty to the people whose money, in the form of foundation trust funds, they administer. The leakage, *the substantial diversion of foundation funds to subversive purposes, comes clearly through the support of individuals and efforts which are contributive to Communist success though not always easily so recognizable.*

Many individuals have permitted themselves to be seduced into the support of Communist front organizations through negligence and an anxiety to join “progressive” and “liberal” causes. So, the foundations have often, in the social sciences, lent themselves to the support of efforts and causes which weaken our society and create factors of dissidence and disorganization of which the Communists are alert to take advantage. *We cannot too strongly state that this Committee*

respects the true liberal and deems him as important to the proper political functioning of our society as is the conservative. In using the term "liberal" in quotes, we do so to indicate a type of leftist who is the unconscious helper of Communism. He may be, with the utmost earnestness, a violent and inveterate opponent of Communism; but he travels IN, if not UNDER the same direction. The term "fellow-traveller" is perhaps too extreme. He may utterly reject revolution in favor of evolution, but the evolutionary change he seeks must be a quick one, and he must hurry to aid in ushering it in. In his anxiety for the better world of the future, he falls into the error of wishing to destroy before he knows the significance of that with which he wishes to replace.

These political comments are to this Committee of grave importance in relation to foundations. The evidence indicates that the foundations dealing in the social sciences have become so enamoured of the idea that foundations funds must be used for "risk capital" that they have all too infrequently failed to measure the risk. The "risk capital" concept is admirable in such areas as medicine and health and the physical sciences. To apply it in areas where the security of the state is involved, and the construction and manner of our society, converts it into "danger capital" instead of "risk capital." It propels foundation executives into a constant search for something new, a pathological scrutinizing of what we have, on the premise that there must be something better. Much of what we have is undoubtedly susceptible of improvement or even desirable supplanting. But much that we have is, to the average American, sound and inviolate. The tendency always to seek an improvement runs foundation executives into the hazards of neglecting the study of what we have in order to ascertain why it is so good and, rather, supporting change on the premise that what we have must be wrong.

This premise leads to the support of the leftist, the man who does not like what we have and wants to change it. What so few of the trustees of the major foundations seem to realize is, as Harold Lord Varney put it in his article in the *American Mercury* entitled *The Egg-Head Clutch on the Foundations*:

"The social sciences are the citadel of the 'egg-heads'. Once the foundation millions begin to flow into these fields, queer specimens with queer ideas begin to come out from under the academic logs, and qualify for grants and fellowships and sinecures. The Left Wing boys constitute the largest segment of this zany band."

We quote again from Mr. Hoover's speech<sup>27</sup> rendered on his 80th birthday:

"Despite the clamor over ferreting out these persons, you must not be led into the mistake that Moscow has closed down its recruiting offices for American agents. Or that continued action of the F. B. I. and Congressional committees is not equally imperative.

"I have little fear that these Communist agents can destroy the Republic if we continue to ferret them out. Our greater concern should be the other varieties of *Karl Marx virus*.

"Among them are the Socialists. They assert they would proceed only by Constitutional means.

"The Socialists prowl on many fronts. They promote the centralized Federal Government, with its huge bureaucracy. They drive to absorb the income of the people by unnecessary government spending and exorbitant taxes. They have pushed our government deep into enterprises which compete with the rights of free men. These enterprises are endowed with exemption from control of state and local governments. Congressional committees have listed hundreds of these

<sup>27</sup> *New York Times*, August 11, 1954.

Federal activities. But only a drop of typhoid in a barrel of drinking water sickens a whole village.

"Every step of these programs somewhere, somehow, stultifies the freedom, the incentives, the courage and the creative impulses of our people.

"Beyond all this, there is proof in the world that the end result of socialism can be bloody communism. *In the Iron Curtain states it was the Socialist intellectuals who weakened the freedom of men by destroying free enterprise.* Thus they furnished the boarding ladders by which the Communists captured the Ship of State.

"One of the post-war cousins of socialism is the so-called 'Welfare State.' This poison gas is generated by the same sort of fuzzy-minded intellectuals. Its slogan is 'Planned Economy.' The phrase itself was borrowed from totalitarian governments. The end of it would at least be a government wherein whatever is not forbidden would be compulsory.

"*One of the annoyances of this cult is its false assumption that our nation has never been heedful of the welfare of our people. That we are our brother's keeper was rooted in religious faith long before these fuzzy-minded men were born.* Since the foundation of the Republic we have recognized and practiced both private and governmental responsibility for the unfortunate and the aged; for the education of our youth and the health of our people.

"Moreover, this cult has a host of gimmicks for giving away the people's money. Among their ideas is that government should guarantee every citizen security from the cradle to the grave.

"But it is solely the initiative and the labor of the physically able in the prime of life that can support the aged, the young, the sick—and the bureaucracy. And this active earning group requires the pressures of competition, the rewards of enterprise and new adventure to keep it on the job.

"Even if security from the cradle to the grave could eliminate the risks of life, it would be a dead hand on the creative spirit of our people. Also, the judgment of the Lord to Adam about sweat has not been repealed.

"When we flirt with the Delilah of security for our productive group we had better watch out lest in our blindness we pull down the pillars of the temple of free men.

"The British under a Socialist government tried it. Its result was a level of poverty which British Socialists sought to obscure with the term 'austerity.' Britain is now in retreat from it.

"Among the delusions offered us by fuzzy-minded people is that imaginary creature, the Common Man. It is dinned into us that this is the Century of the Common Man. The whole idea is another cousin of the Soviet proletariat. The Uncommon Man is to be whittled down to size. It is the negation of individual dignity and a slogan of mediocrity and uniformity.

"The Common Man dogma may be of use as a vote-getting apparatus. It supposedly proves the humility of demagogues.

"The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women. You have perhaps heard of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, or Thomas Edison. They were humble in origin, but that was not their greatness.

"The humor of it is that when we get sick, we want an uncommon doctor. When we go to war, we yearn for an uncommon general or admiral. When we choose the President of a university, we want an uncommon educator.

"The imperative need of this nation at all times is the leadership of the Uncommon Men or Women. We need men and women who cannot be intimidated, who are not concerned with applause meters, nor those who sell tomorrow for cheers today.

"Such leaders are not to be made like queen bees. They must rise by their own merits. America recognizes no frozen social stratifications which prevent this free rise of every individual. They rise by merit from our shops and farms. They rise from the thirty-five million boys and girls in our schools and colleges. That they have the determination to rise is the glorious promise of leadership among free men.

"A nation is strong or weak, it thrives or perishes upon what it believes to be true. If our youth is rightly instructed in the faith of our fathers; in the traditions of our country; in the dignity of each individual man, then our power will be stronger than any weapon of destruction that man can devise.

"And now as to this whole gamut of Socialist infections, I say to you, the neighbors of my childhood, the sons and daughters of my native state, God has blessed us with another wonderful word—heritage. *The great documents of that heritage are not from Karl Marx. They are the Bible, the Declaration of Independence*

and the Constitution of the United States. Within them alone can the safeguards of freedom survive. Safeguard the true spirit of these guarantees for your children, that they may not become the prisoners of a hydraheaded socialism.

"If anyone rises to say that all this is reactionary, you may class him as either fuzzy-minded or an ignorant enemy of free men." [Emphasis supplied.]

The evidence before us leads to the conclusion that conservative causes, those which seek to support what we have, have received but meager support from foundations operating in the social sciences; overwhelmingly, the foundations have prompted and supported ventures and individuals to the left. *In a broad sense, and vitally so, much of this leftist trend of the foundations in the social sciences has been "subversive", in so far as it has worked to undermine some of our precious institutions, and some of our basic moral and religious and political principles.*

The social scientist can fall readily into a close relationship with Communism or socialism if he succumbs to what Professor Hobbs has called "liberal scientism." Starting at page 145 of his *Social Problems and Scientism*, Professor Hobbs says:

"One of the greatest windfalls which ever fell the way of the zealots of scientism was the depression of the 1930's. How eagerly they exploited this temporary condition, and how reluctant they are to recognize that it is long since past. Particularly amusing was the exploitation of 'one-third of a nation.' This phrase, or a similar one, is to be found in practically every sociology textbook published from 1937 to the present. The wide usage, and the unquestioning acceptance of such a phrase is another illustration of the double standard of evidence employed by 'liberal' zealots of scientism. The phrase itself goes back at least to 1919, when it was picked out of the air by a social worker to dramatize poor housing among unskilled workers. It was then revived on the basis of a study made in the mid-thirties. This study was not even a study of income distribution, and was full of misleading interpretations. Did the 'scientists' investigate it, and point out the fallacies? Not at all. They were even more eager than politicians to seize upon any data which seemed to give scientific support to their dramatization of the failure of capitalism. They not only accepted the conclusions of one of the loosest studies ever made, they even exaggerated them. They coupled such conclusions with horrendous complaints about the breakdown of the system, the death of opportunities for youth, and the futility of efforts to improve one's economic or social status. They were pathetically eager to seize this seeming excuse to plead for ever-greater expansion of government.

"When the depression ended, the scientific liberals were among the last to admit it, and they still continue to present figures to 'prove' that a large percentage of the people are in an 'underprivileged' category. Despite great increases in wages—increases which far outstrip rises in prices—despite marked narrowing of the gap between upper and lower income groups, the theme continues to be played. As a matter of fact, several of the textbooks appearing during the period of high wage levels following World War II contained figures which 'proved' that there was a *higher percentage* of underprivileged than was alleged to exist during the depression! Governmental agencies have also contributed toward fostering this delusion. The exaggerated and one-sided criticism of the economic system is not confined to textbooks but is also expressed in many novels and in some of the most popular non-fiction 'trade' books. One of the more popular of these was *Middletown*.

"Scientific liberals make no serious effort to describe the economic system nor to present an objective description of economic conditions. Their efforts are devoted almost solely to criticism. This criticism paints a picture of tragic conditions which can be remedied only by 'social planning.' The details of such planning are not described, nor are the ramifications admitted, but almost invariably it is presented as a remedy. You will find 'social planning' recommended in a substantial majority of the modern textbooks in sociology, and I believe you will also find it in other fields of social science. It is commonly recommended even in the professional journals, which are supposed to be much more scientific and moderate than the texts. A study of articles dealing with the topic of social planning was made by a graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kenneth E. Cuthbertson. Mr. Cuthbertson analysed all such articles which

appeared in *Sociology and Social Research* from 1930 to 1950. The conclusion he reached was:

"There is only one generalization that can be made. In all of the forty-seven articles studied, not one raises the question of the desirability and necessity of social planning. Without exception, every article is based on the assumption that social planning is necessary."

"Recommendations for social planning are presented in a manner which gives the impression that they have a scientific basis, whereas no scientific basis actually exists. The technique is one wherein one-sided criticism is levelled against the economic system; economic conditions arising out of capitalism are assumed to cause a wide variety of individual and social problems, and social planning is presented as the remedy. Of course, it has never been proved that economic conditions do actually cause delinquency, marital maladjustment and the other problems which they are supposed to cause. Nor do the 'liberal' advocates of social planning specify *how* the planning is to be scientifically accomplished or how it will remedy the conditions it is designed to cure. As with most other aspects of scientific liberal programs, social planning is offered as an amorphous idealism. On this level, those who question social planning can be denounced as 'reactionaries,' 'vested interest groups,' and enemies of progress."

"Liberals' as well as Communists and Socialists consistently criticize private enterprise and capitalism. The criticism is frequently one-sided and creates a very unfavorable impression of what has been, by and large, a highly successful economic system. The criticism is not confined to intervals of economic depression, but continues unabated during prosperity such as no society in history has ever witnessed. *It is of such persistence and variety that it can never be satisfied by any objective improvement in the system or in economic conditions.*

"These three groups similarly advocate 'social planning.' The programs and techniques differ in detail, but are similar in principle. This similarity should not serve as an excuse for silencing merited criticism of capitalism, nor for labelling all critics as 'Communists' or 'Socialists,' but it should be recognized."

He says further, at p. 160:

"The line of liberal scientism parallels those of communism and socialism through several important areas. All three have a common focus in economic determinism which contends that economic inequalities are responsible for delinquency, unhappiness, marital maladjustment, war, and a variety of other problems. All three slant toward an exaggerated and one-sided criticism of the economic system of capitalism and private enterprise. All three contrapose their exaggerated criticism with idealisms such as 'cooperation' and 'security' and 'democracy.' All three, but in varying degrees, advocate governmental regulation of economic processes in a program of 'social planning.' All three promote political policies behind a facade of 'science' and 'democracy'. All three exploit desire for peace and the conditions of war to promote their economic-political programs, to disparage patriotism, and to promote internationalism. All three emphasize differences between social classes and the extent of class conflict."

#### *FOUNDATIONS AND SUBVERSION.*

Foundation spokesmen have emphatically denied any support of subversion. We question, however, whether in such denials they did not misinterpret the meaning of the term "subversion". Their denials were justified in so far as they are related to the direct support of Communism, but these spokesmen were well aware of the nature of some of the evidence produced before this Committee which showed that foundations had frequently supported those who wish to undermine our society. Their denials of subversion in relation to such activities are without merit.

*What does the term "subversion" mean? In contemporary usage and practice, it does not refer to outright revolution, but to a promotion of tendencies which lead, in their inevitable consequences, to the destruction of principles through perversion or alienation. Subversion, in modern society, is not a sudden, cataclysmic explosion, but a gradual undermining, a persistent chipping away at foundations upon which beliefs rest.*

*Subversion*

By its very nature, successful subversion is difficult to detect. It can easily be confused with honest, forthright criticism. In our free society outright and honest criticism is not only permissible but immensely desirable. Individuals who engage openly in such criticism, who criticize political institutions from a political perspective, and economic institutions from an economic perspective, should be given free rein and encouraged. The issues involved in permitting open and honest criticism, however, differ vitally from the issues raised by subversion promoted by foundations. Some of these vital differences (which foundation spokesmen refused to acknowledge, much less discuss, in their conscious misinterpretation of the term "subversive") are these:

Fundamental to the entire concept of tax-exemption for foundations is the principle that their grants are to be primarily directed to strengthening the structure of the society which creates them. *Society does not grant tax exemption for the privilege of undermining it.* Reasonable license is granted to satisfy personal idiosyncracies, with the result that there is much social waste when grants serve no truly useful purpose to society. But such tolerated waste is something far different from the impact of grants made by foundations which tend to undermine our society. Such grants violate the underlying, essential assumption of the tax-exemption privilege, that the substantial weight of foundation effort must operate to strengthen, improve and promote the economic, political and moral pillars upon which our society rests.

Despite vehement protestations to the contrary, abundant evidence indicates that many of the social science projects sponsored by foundations are neither in the form of open and honest criticism, nor can they be interpreted as promoting the welfare of our society—except as interpreted by those who wish radically to change its form and nature.

*In the modern usage of the term, "subversion", it is no exaggeration to state that in the field of the social sciences many major projects which have been most prominently sponsored by foundations have been subversive.*

Numerous examples of such foundation-sponsored projects, subversive of American moral, political and economic principles, were offered in testimony. Foundation spokesmen failed utterly to provide any evidence that such heavily-financed and prominently-sponsored projects were in any real sense balanced by projects which promoted or strengthened the principles upon which our society rests. In this sense, the weight of influence of foundation tax-exempt funds applied in the social sciences has been on the side of subversion.

Moreover, the subversive projects have been offered with spurious claims to "science." With this false label they have been awarded a privileged status. They have been offered as "scientific" and, therefore, beyond rebuttal. The impact of these subversive works has been intensified manifold by the sponsorship of foundations.



PART THREE  
CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

XIII. SOME SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS

*THE PROBLEM OF FOUNDATION SURVIVAL.*

A number of foundations have complained bitterly about a "second" investigation, bemoaning the inconvenience of repeated inquiries. Whatever the inconvenience, this Committee urgently recommends a continued inquiry. The fullest possible study is necessary adequately to expose certain weaknesses and errors of operation, the failure to recognize which might, some day, result in a growing movement to destroy the foundation as an institution by wholly denying it tax exemption.

There are many today who believe that foundations should not be permitted. Among them are one group of advocates of "state planning," who take the position that all the functions now performed by foundations should be in government control; that foundations prevent the over-all coordinated planning in Washington which, they say, should be our goal. Others feel that the privilege of giving away the public's money (tax-exempt money) should not be subject to the idiosyncrasy of the donor or the disposition of a self-perpetuating group of foundation managers. There are others who resent, on a simple motivation of human envy, the presence of great sums of money segregated to the directed desires of some person of great wealth.

*None of these points of view are received sympathetically by this Committee.*

There is another group, however, which says that nothing would be lost by abolishing foundations, except factors which are undesirable or unpleasant. That is, they say, a donor could still make all the charitable donations he wished, by conferring his benefactions on existing institutions such as colleges and universities, hospitals, churches, etc. He could still get the same tax benefit for himself and for his estate, and save the equity control of a business for his family through such transfers. He could give himself the same egotistical satisfaction, if that is important to him, by attaching his name to a fund. He could even designate a purpose for which a recipient college, for example, must use his grant. He could even attach reasonable conditions and restrictions to his gifts.

All that would thus be lost by abolishing foundations, say these critics, would be (1) the inability to use a foundation itself as a vehicle for maintaining control or partial control of a business and (2) the inability to insist upon the management of the fund through family members or other self-perpetuating, designated persons. We would thus still have the equivalent of foundations, but they would be administered by universities and other responsible institutions instead of by those appointed by a miscellaneous selected board of private trustees and by "clearing houses."

This argument cannot be lightly dismissed. Nor can it be defeated by the insistence that foundation funds are most valuable as "risk capital." If the risk capital theory is sound, would it not be a safer "risk" to society to have such funds administered by responsible university trustees? The delineation of scope of purpose in a deed of gift could very easily warrant the taking of reasonable "risks."

*While we recognize the weight of these arguments, we do not support the proposal that foundations be abolished or refused Federal tax exemption.* One reason is that foundations are generally creatures of state law and it does not seem to us that the Federal government should, through the power of its taxing arm, virtually prevent the states from retaining the foundation as a permissible institution if they wish to.

Another reason is that some foundations have accomplished so much that is good. Institutions which are capable of doing for the American people the magnificent things which foundations have been responsible for, in medicine, public health and elsewhere, indicate that they should be saved if they can be. But the foundations cannot rest on their beneficial accomplishments alone. Not only must their balance sheets show a preponderance of good—that preponderance must be truly overwhelming. That they have improved the public health, for example, cannot offset that they have permitted themselves to be used to undermine our society and some of our most precious basic concepts and principles.

If they are to be permitted to continue and to wield the tremendous power which they now exercise, it must be upon the basis of complete public acceptance—because they will have committed mere venial sins and not mortal ones. For this reason we so strongly advocate the most complete possible airing of criticism and the most thorough possible assembling of facts. In no other way can foundation trustees come to realize the full degree of their responsibility, nor the extent of the dangers which they must avoid to prevent foundation destruction.

#### *THE PROPOSED CONTINUED INQUIRY.*

Various suggestions have been made as to the proper or most advisable vehicle for a continued inquiry. One is that a permanent sub-committee of Ways and Means be created to complete the investigation and to act as a permanent "watch-dog." Another is that the whole problem be turned over to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. A third is that something in the nature of a British "royal commission" be created. Whatever the means used, we urge that the investigation be retained under the control of the legislative branch of the government, where it belongs.

How should that continued inquiry be conducted? We have pointed out that such an inquiry is primarily a matter of laborious research. Facts are best secured by this method, rather than through the examination and cross-examination of a parade of witnesses.

Some foundation spokesmen have alluded to "Committee witnesses" and "foundation witnesses" in connection with the current investigation. There has been no such division of witnesses. All who came, or were to come, before us were, or were to be, "Committee witnesses." What these foundation spokesmen have attempted to do is give this proceeding the character of a trial, rather than an investigation. It has been no trial, and could not be.

There has been a growing insistence on the part of some groups of extreme "liberals" that Congressional investigations be changed in character to approach very closely to trial practice. Such suggestions fly in the very face of the nature of Congressional investigations and seek to undermine the independence of the legislative arm of the government by depriving it of the right to unhampered inquiry.

The use of a trial method, with complaint, answer, reply, rebuttal, surrebuttal, etc., as to each issue, would mean utter confusion and make of each investigation an endless "circus."

This Committee has been much maligned, in part by the press and by foundation spokesmen, because it first placed critical witnesses on the stand. This was done, with the unanimous approval of the full Committee, in order to be utterly fair to the foundations by letting them know, in advance of their own expected appearances, the main lines of inquiry which were to be followed. This was explained repeatedly by the Chairman and by Counsel, and appears in the record again and again. In the face of these statements foundation spokesmen, echoed by parts of the press inimical to this investigation for whatever reasons of their own, have cried "unfair!"

The insistence on something close to trial practice is illustrated by a telegram from *The Rockefeller Foundation* to the Committee which says:

"We must assume that the Committee's decision [(to discontinue the hearings)] means that it will not submit a report to the Congress containing any material adverse to our foundation on which we are not fully heard." (Hearings, p. 1062.)

This statement is made as though this condition were advanced as a matter of right. We reject it emphatically. We are not "trying" the foundations; we are investigating them. To require us, in advance of a report, to submit to a foundation every piece of evidence or comment which our staff may have collected would be an absurdity, hampering a committee such as this to the point of destroying its effectiveness.

*The Rockefeller Foundation* statement goes even further than demanding to see every piece of material which might be used in criticism of it. It says: "We suggest that the Committee insure this [refraining from unfairly injuring the foundations] by affording the foundations an opportunity to be heard on the draft of any report which the Committee proposes to submit." That is both intolerable arrogance and an absurdity. Perhaps this will be added to the list of things which the advanced "liberals" are asking of Congressional procedure—that no Congressional committee be permitted to file any report until all persons interested have had an opportunity to see it in draft and comment upon it to the committee!

Such procedure, aside from its interference with the independence of Congress, would involve the endless protraction of investigations. In our case, for example, there are some seven thousand foundations. Does Mr. Rusk, who signed the Rockefeller statement, believe that only *The Rockefeller Foundation* should have the right of examination? Or does he believe all foundations should have that right? Does he suggest they be called in one by one, or all in a group? The impossibility of his suggestion is obvious enough. And how about the cost? We have heard no foundation voice raised to assist this Committee in securing adequate financing.

*THE ATTITUDE OF THE FOUNDATIONS.*

*United States News and World Report* of October 22, 1954, page 104, contains excerpts from an article in *Harpers Magazine* for February, 1936, concerning Congressional investigations, written by Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black. Justice Black describes how pressure against an investigation commences before the investigation even begins.

"At the first suggestion of an investigation the ever-busy, ceaseless vigilant Washington lobby sounds the alarm."

The instant a "resolution is offered, or even rumored, the call to arms is sounded by the interest to be investigated."

"High-priced political lawyers swarm into the Capitol. Lobbyists descend upon members. Telegrams of protest come from citizens back home protesting against the suggested infamy."

Certain newspapers can generally be depended upon to raise a cry against the proposed investigation. The opposition does not end when a resolution passes; the next step is to try to influence appointments to the Committee. Finally, pressure is put upon the controlling legislative Committee to restrict the activities of the investigating committee by limiting its funds.

Justice Black's article is worth reading. It goes on to describe the difficulties which confront Congressional investigations when they do get under way.

Unfortunately this Committee concludes that some of the foundations have followed the traditional course which Justice Black described as taken by "the interest to be investigated." Nor have we been impressed with the general willingness of foundations to submit their performance to public scrutiny.

This Committee can judge the attitude only of those foundations with which it has had intimate contact. These, as well as the "clearing house" organizations have been fully cooperative in supplying information. Both groups, however, have demonstrated an intolerance toward criticism. This unwillingness even to consider that they might, in any respect, be guilty of serious error, we find distressing and discouraging. We can only conclude that it emanates from a sense of power and security, even *vis-a-vis* the Congress. Some of the foundations have gone so far as to imply that it is an injustice for Congress to investigate any complaint against them.

They have filled their statements with cliché material regarding the desirability of "free speech", and "freedom of thought", and "academic freedom" as though they had a monopoly on the defense of freedom and there were serious danger that Congress might unfairly curtail it. A form of arrogance and a pretension to superiority leads them to believe that critics must, *per se*, be wrong. Foundations are sacred cows. The men who run them are above being questioned. This Committee, continues their general attitude, is bent upon the destruction of the sacred right of foundations to do as they please; it is full of malice; its staff is manned with incompetents who have called in incompetents as witnesses; no one who criticizes a foundation could be competent.

One gathers the impression from some of the filed statements that the foundation officers who have signed them believe that they have a vested and inalienable right to do as they please, and that it is an

outrage that a Congressional Committee should dare to question any of their actions. The fact is that they have a limited privilege—limited by what the public may determine is for its own good; and the public, in this sense, is represented by the Congress.

This Committee has even been attacked by foundations which it has not investigated in any detail. Several such attacks, for example, have been launched by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, one appearing in its October, 1954, *Bulletin*, which begins by announcing—before the completion of our investigation, that it has failed. The lengthy article refers to the Committee members and staff as “actors” in a “charade”, and refers to the witnesses called by the Committee as “a strange group.” It is replete with vituperation and prejudices in vicious manner before the publishing of a report upon which alone any final judgment of this Committee’s work could be made. The concluding sentence of the article is:

“Its failure as a Congressional investigation is a great victory for the American people.”

There can be no possible justification for such an attack by a tax exempt organization in the course of a Congressional investigation.

This Committee is quite conscious of the possibility that it may itself have erred in some facts or in some judgments. Unlike some of the foundation-supported social scientists and some of the foundation executives (to judge them from their own statements) we do not consider ourselves Olympian. It is partly for this reason that we strongly recommend a completion of the project of an investigation of foundations—so that all possible facts in the criticized areas may be adduced which might be favorable to them. Based on an incomplete inquiry, all final conclusions are subject to possible revision.

On the other hand, we are quite shocked that some of the foundations have presumed to imply malice and an intention by this Committee to do a biased and prejudiced job. We should like to print in full the initial report prepared by Counsel to the Committee under date of October 23, 1953, outlining his proposals for the conduct of the work. It is a measured, objective and thoroughly unprejudiced document running to 22 pages, the result of extremely careful thought; it formed the basis upon which the Committee built its operations. We shall quote merely part of it to indicate the attitude which this Committee has had in its work.

“*Control as a Basic Problem.* This brings us to the basic control problem. We would assume that the Committee would be disposed to a minimum of Federal control. The rights, duties and responsibilities of foundations are, in our opinion, primarily matters of state law with which the Federal government should not interfere unless grounds of national welfare, strong enough to induce an application of a broad Federal constitutional theory, should appear. For the moment, then, the only available mechanism of control available to the Congress is the tax law. Congress has the clear right to place reasonable conditions upon the privilege of tax exemption. It has done so, as to income tax, gift tax and estate tax. If amendments to these tax laws come to appear desirable it is the province of the Committee on Ways and Means, as we understand it, to consider such amendments. We conceive our function in part to be to produce the facts upon which that Committee may, if it chooses, act further. We deem it within our province to state the facts which have appeared, collate them, and suggest areas of consideration for Ways and Means if the Committee finds this desirable.

“If acute or chronic foundation ailments should appear, the remedies may not, in every case, be through legislation. A disclosure of the ailments may, to some extent, induce reform within the ailing foundation itself. And the very statement of the facts may induce the public to take an interest of a nature to bring about reform through the force of public opinion.”

This measured language does not indicate an intention to "railroad" the foundations or to impose restrictions on them which might, as some of the foundations purport to fear, destroy their usefulness. To quote once more from this initial and guiding report of Counsel:

"Starting with the premise that foundations are basically desirable, excessive regulation, which would deprive them virtually of all freedom, might well destroy their character, their usefulness and their desirability. Therefore, regulatory measures should be approached with great caution. We are not prepared at this time even to suggest that further regulation is needed. It seems essential to us that as scientific a collection and integration of facts as possible be accomplished before anyone, whether in this Committee or outside, arrives at any precise conclusions."

*This is the spirit in which this Committee started its work and in which it has continued through the preparation of this report.*

#### XIV. SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS NOT FULLY COVERED IN THE PREVIOUS TEXT

We shall not burden this already lengthy report with a repetition of all the various observations, conclusions and recommendations stated in its course. Because of the incompleteness of the inquiry, we have been disinclined to arrive at many final and fixed recommendations. We shall, however, discuss briefly some features of foundation operation which seem to require additional or fresh comment.

##### *THE JURISDICTION OF WAYS AND MEANS.*

Wherever suggestions are made herein for possible changes in the tax laws, we are mindful of the superior jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and respectfully offer such suggestions to that Committee for its consideration.

##### *REFORM FROM WITHIN THE FOUNDATIONS.*

This Committee has never swerved from the concept laid out in the initial report of Counsel to it that whatever reform of foundation procedure is necessary should, if possible, come from within the foundations themselves. We are not overly encouraged, from the content and import of the statements filed by some of the foundations, and their general attitude, that much willingness exists among executives of the foundations and of the associated organizations to institute any reform whatsoever. A prerequisite to such reform from the inside would lie in a recognition that it is needed. If these foundations and organizations persist in their attitude that they are sacrosanct, that they have not committed and cannot commit any serious errors, and that they, therefore, need no reform whatsoever, then Congressional action in various directions seems inevitably necessary, even to the possible extent of a complete denial of tax exemption.

##### *LIMITATIONS ON OPERATING COSTS.*

Suggestions have been made that the operating cost of foundations is sometimes excessive, resulting in a waste of public funds. There is much to this allegation, particularly in the case of heavily-staffed foundations with complex machinery of operation, and those which double overhead by using intermediary organizations to distribute some of their funds. There seems to be no reasonable way, however,

to control such waste through any form of regulation. It is our opinion that this is one of the areas in which reform from the inside is the only kind possible. We urge foundations trustees to consider it carefully.

#### *"COLLECTING" FOUNDATIONS.*

Special attention might be given to abuses by foundations used for the purpose of collecting money from the public. These have been extensively investigated in the State of New York and elsewhere, and organizations like the National Better Business Bureau can supply much data concerning them. The chief complaint against many of these organizations is that their costs of operation often far exceed the net amount available for distribution to "charities." Legislation to protect the public against abuses of foundations of this type is possible, perhaps in the form of a limitation on a percentage of permitted overhead. This Committee has not had time, however, to study this specific problem nor did it feel it advisable to duplicate any of the work done, for example, by the investigation in the State of New York.

#### *WASTE IN GENERAL.*

The evidence indicates that there is a good deal of waste in the selection of projects, particularly mass research projects in which large sums are expended, and the services of a substantial number of researchers employed, when the end to be achieved does not measure favorably against the aggregate expenditure of valuable manpower and of money. This error seems to us often to relate to an excessive interest in empirical research. The services of ten or more researchers might be used to assemble "facts" on some narrow subject when the same money spent on this piece of mass-fact-production could support those ten or more men, each in valuable, independent research. It would not be difficult, for example, to find a better use for \$250,000 than the mass research on the Tai Ping Rebellion concerning which Professor Rowe testified. We urge foundation trustees, who alone can prevent such waste, to scrutinize carefully the proposed end-objective of any suggested research project involving possible waste of manpower and public funds. We suggest to them, further, that foundation money is precious; that the capacity to distribute it is not a right but a privilege, a privilege granted by the people—that, therefore, waste should be avoided even more strictly than in the use of one's personal funds.

#### *DEFINING FOUNDATIONS.*

In order that statistical material of great value may be produced by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and so that special rules might be applied to foundations (and "clearing house" organizations) as distinguished from the miscellany of organizations included within the scope of Section 101 (6) (now 501 (c) (3)) of the Code, we suggest that the Committee on Ways and Means consider a division of that section into two parts.

#### *INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE MANPOWER.*

It is the opinion of this Committee that, although complete observation of foundation activity by the Internal Revenue Service is impossible, the subject is of sufficient social importance to warrant an

increase in the manpower of the pertinent department of the Bureau to enable it more closely to watch foundation activity.

#### *FULL PUBLIC ACCESS TO FORM 990A.*

We consider it an absurdity that the public does not have open access to the full reports filed by the foundations and known as Form 990A. Why any part of the activity or operation of a foundation, a public body, should not be open to the public eye, we cannot understand.

#### *A "RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES"*

Many have urged that a "rule against perpetuities" be applied to foundations in the form of an aggregate limit on life of, say, from ten to twenty-five years. We strongly support this proposal. It should be applied primarily to foundations and other non-institutional organizations whose sole or chief function is distributing grants. Some operating research organizations might, possibly, be exempted from the rule and classed with institutional organizations such as colleges, universities, hospitals, churches, etc. And careful study may disclose other types of foundations which might be excluded from the proposed limitation on length of existence. It would not be easy to define these classes or to draw the lines of demarcation; but the difficulty of delineation should not prevent the undertaking.

Measures to forestall evasion would have to be considered. For example, a foundation, shortly before its duration-expiration, might pass its assets to another foundation created for the purpose or having similar objectives and management. There are other problems requiring difficult study. But it seems wise to proscribe perpetual foundations of the general class. This would minimize the use of the mechanism to enable a family to continue control of enterprises *ad infinitum*; avoid the calcification which sometimes sets in on foundations; and, among other desirable objectives, minimize the seriousness of the danger that a foundation might, in some future period, pass into the control of persons whose objectives differed materially from those which the creator of the foundation intended.

#### *ACCUMULATIONS.*

Foundations may not accumulate income "unreasonably." The pertinent provision of the tax law is analogous to Section 102 applying to ordinary corporations, and has a sound principle behind it. Yet it seems to us to sometimes work out unhappily. Foundations should not be overly-pressed to distribute their income, lest they do so casually or recklessly. We suggest, therefore, that this rule be changed so that:

1. a foundation be given a period of two or three years within which to distribute each year's income, but that
2. within that period, *all* of that year's income be paid out.

If a "rule against perpetuities" were applied, our suggestion might be that a foundation be given an even longer period of income accumulation.

#### *CAPITAL GAINS.*

With the objective of preventing any accumulations (beyond the limits discussed above), we suggest that capital gains be treated as income. That is, all capital gains realized should be subjected to the



same rule as to accumulations, as though they were ordinary income. Whether or not capital losses should be allowed as an offset for the purpose of treating accumulations is debatable.

#### *RESTRICTIONS ON CORPORATION-CREATED FOUNDATIONS.*

We have suggested that such foundations require the thorough study which we have not been able to give them. We are not in a position to make final recommendations. We do suggest that, while such foundations seem entirely desirable, they should be subjected to some restrictions which would prevent them from aggregating enormous capital funds with which they could (1) exercise powerful control of enterprises through investment and (2) come to have a very strong impact upon our society. One method might be to treat all donations to such foundations as income for the purpose of compelling distributions and proscribing accumulations. That is, whatever rule is applied, directed at the improper accumulation of income, should be applied to a corporation's annual donations as though these were income to the foundation.

#### *NATIONAL INCORPORATION.*

It has been suggested that foundations be either compelled or permitted to incorporate under Federal law. We adopt neither suggestion. This Committee does not advocate any unnecessary extension of Federal jurisdiction. Federal incorporation would have the advantage of permitting regulations to be enacted on a broader base than the tax law. But we feel that the further centralization of government function would be an unhappy invasion of states rights.

#### *RETROACTIVE LOSS OF EXEMPTIONS.*

This Committee has pointed out that, upon violation by a tax-exempt organization of the rules of the tax law relating to subversion and political activity, the only penalty is the future loss of income tax exemption (and the corresponding right of future donors to take tax deductions for gifts or bequests). We urgently recommend that means be studied by which the initial gift tax and/or estate tax exemption, granted upon the creation of the organization, may be withdrawn and the tax due collected to the extent of the remaining assets of the organization. It impresses us as absurd that, having been guilty, for example, of subversive activity, a foundation whose funds were permitted to be set aside because of tax exemption, can go right on expending its capital for further subversion.

#### *REMOVAL OF TRUSTEES.*

A sensible alternative to the imposition of the retroactive penalty described above, would be the immediate removal of the trustees or directors. This is primarily a matter of state law, and the Federal government could not force such removal. It could, however, we believe, provide that the retroactive penalty be assessed unless all the trustees or directors forthwith resign and arrangements are made for the election of directors appointed by a court or an agency of the state of incorporation or of the situs of the trust.

#### *PUBLIC DIRECTORS.*

The suggestion has been made that each foundation should be required to have, upon its board, or as one of its trustees, a member selected by a government agency, perhaps the state government.

The purpose of the suggestion is that the public would thus have a direct representative who could watch the operations of the foundation and take whatever action he might deem necessary if he found a violation of good practice or of law. The suggestion may have merit; it may be well worth the consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### *REVOLVING DIRECTORATES.*

Directed against the calcification which may set in upon a foundation, the suggestion has been made that a director or trustee be permitted to sit upon a board for only a reasonably limited number of years, after which he would be ineligible for reelection. This suggestion also seems to have considerable merit, and may be worth the attention of Ways and Means.

#### *SELECTION OF WORKING TRUSTEES.*

We urge most strongly upon those who control the great foundations, in particular, that they fill their boards with men who are willing to take the time to do a full job of trust administration. This is meant as no personal criticism of those many estimable men who sit upon foundations boards. We have gone into this matter elsewhere in this report. The president of a great corporation cannot possibly give to the management of a foundation the time which should be required. Many of the weaknesses of foundation management might be avoided if the trustees were selected from among men able and willing to give a large amount of time to their work.

#### *RELIEF FOR THE ALERT CITIZEN.*

As it is obvious that the Internal Revenue Service cannot, except at prohibitive cost, follow the activities of the individual foundations to ascertain whether violations of law exist, this Committee believes that some additional method should be established to protect the people against a misuse of the public funds which foundation money represents. An interesting suggestion has been made, which deserves careful study, that legal procedure should be available in the Federal courts under which a citizen could bring a proceeding to compel the Attorney General to take action against a foundation upon a showing, to the satisfaction of a Federal judge, that a *prima facie* or probable cause exists.

#### *PROHIBITED ABUSES.*

The Internal Revenue Code specially taxes "unrelated income" and proscribes certain transactions and uses of foundations. Among them are the unreasonable accumulation of income and certain prohibited transactions between the foundation and its creator or other closely associated persons and corporations. Within the limitations of time and funds faced by this Committee it did not feel warranted to enter this area of research which is, in any event, peculiarly the province of the Committee of Ways and Means. Doubtless certain defects in the existing law covering these areas need attention, but these must be left to consideration by the controlling Committee.

#### *FOUNDATIONS USED TO CONTROL ENTERPRISES.*

One subject which does need careful consideration by the Congress is the use now so frequently made of foundations to control businesses. In an early section of this report we alluded to the extent to which

foundations are being currently created in order to solve estate and business planning problems. We mentioned also the possibility that so great a percentage of enterprises may, someday, come into the hands of foundations that this very factor in itself may oblige legislative relief. We believe the Congress and the public should be sharply aware of this factor of enterprise-control through foundations; it has already had some effect on our economy.

There is nothing now in the law prohibiting such control. A donor or testator can transfer the controlling stock of an enterprise to a foundation and it may hold it in perpetuity, its self-perpetuating directors or trustees voting the stock as they please. It is conceivable that certain situations of a special character might be attacked by the Internal Revenue Service. For example, if the continued holding of one stock by a foundation seemed to prevent it from using its funds to the best advantage in relation to its dedicated purposes, it is possible that a court might cut off its tax exemption. But such instances would have to be extreme and irrefutably clear to promise relief. In the ordinary case, nothing will interfere with the continued holding. By the same token, foundations holding only a minority percentage of the voting stock of a corporation can act in consort with other stockholders, perhaps of one family, to become part of a controlling group; there is nothing in the law to prevent this either.

To prevent a foundation from receiving any substantial part of the securities of an industrial enterprise would extremely limit the use of the foundation mechanism for the solution of the problem of how to meet the heavy death charges in estates whose assets consist chiefly of securities in a closely held enterprise. On the other hand, the retention of a substantial holding in any enterprise may, in the long run, operate against the general public interest. We are not absolute in our conclusion, but suggest to the Committee on Ways and Means that it consider the advisability of denying the tax exemption to any foundation which holds more than five or ten per cent of its capital in the securities of one enterprise—and, in the case of an initial receipt of such securities, it might be well to give the foundation a period of two to five years within which to bring its holdings down to the prescribed maximum level.

#### *AREA EXCLUSIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.*

We qualifiedly support the theory of the foundations that their capital and income is often wisely used in "experimenting" in areas which the government or other private philanthropic organizations do not enter—we support this theory, however, only as to such areas where there is no grave risk to our body politic and to our form of society. With this limitation, the theory of "risk capital" seems sound and its observation accounts for many of the great boons to society for which foundations have been responsible, particularly in medicine and public health.

The question comes—should foundations be excluded from any special fields, such as the social sciences? Some ask that they be restricted to certain limited fields, such as religion, medicine, public health and the physical sciences. We do not support this theory. We believe they should be prohibited from using their funds for "subversive" purposes and from all political use, and we shall discuss this further. Beyond that, we believe that foundations should have full freedom of selection of areas of operation.

In giving them this freedom, there is a great risk of waste. This risk must be taken at the alternative cost of such hampering of operations through controls as to make foundation independence a virtual fiction. But we urge again that foundation trustees exercise great care in avoiding waste.

#### *TYPE EXCLUSIONS.*

Suggestions have also been made that foundations be restricted in various ways as to type of operation. These suggestions are of all sorts, some of them conflicting:

- That they should not be permitted to act as operating units;
- That they should only be permitted to operate, and should not be permitted merely to make grants;

- That they should not be permitted to create subsidiaries, affiliates or progeny foundations or operating units;

- That they be permitted to make grants only to existing operating units of certain types, such as colleges, universities, hospitals, churches, etc.

- That they be denied the right, in the social sciences, to attach any condition to a grant, as to detail of operation, personnel, etc.;

- That they be excluded from grants to other foundations, including "intermediary" organizations;

and many others.

If any of these and similar suggestions are to be considered, we recommend that this be done only after a truly complete investigation has been had; and then only, after the most careful study. It is the general position of this Committee that no restraints should be put upon the operation of foundations which do not seem inevitably necessary for the protection of our society.

#### *PROTECTION AGAINST INTERLOCK.*

Many detailed suggestions have been made to prevent the growth and even the continuance of the concentration of power to which we have given considerable attention. These suggestions, for the most part, should also await the completed study and should be approached with great care. Some of the intermediary organizations should perhaps be continued, to go on with whatever valuable and safe activities they now pursue; but efforts should be made to induce or prevent them from acting in any coercive role, whether by intention or by the very nature of the structure of the foundation world.

Some few suggestions are, however, worthy of immediate consideration. One is that no trustee, director or officer of any foundation or intermediary organization be permitted to act as a trustee, director or officer of another, except where members of constituent societies may be associated with a parent body.

Another is that the fullest democracy be imposed on the election of members of such associations of societies and similar organizations to prevent the self-perpetuance which exists, for example, in the *Social Science Research Council*.

For the moment, we believe that the problem of "power" urgently demands the attention of foundation trustees. In order to escape an eventual substantial curtailment of foundation independence, trustees will have to understand how powerful their organizations are and how much care must be exercised so that no abuse of this power

occurs. They must also understand the terrific social impact which a concentration of foundation power entails and avoid, like the plague, operations or associations which tend to coerce, or even carry the propensity for coercing or in any way effecting, social controls, compulsions toward uniformity or any form of pressure on society or on those who are or are to become its intellectual leaders.

#### *GREATER USE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.*

Among other approaches to the solution of the problems raised by a concentration of power, this Committee urges trustees of foundations more frequently to use colleges and universities as media for research operations, suggesting further that grants to such institutions be made as free as possible of conditions and limitations.

#### *THE EXCESS OF EMPIRICISM.*

This Committee is entirely convinced by the evidence that the foundations have been "sold" by some social scientists and employee-executives on the proposition that empirical and mass research in the social sciences is far more important than theoretical and individual research, and should be supported with overwhelming preponderance. We are conscious of the fact that Congress should not attempt to exert any control over the selection of methods of research or the relative distribution of foundation funds over various types. Nevertheless, this Committee suggests that foundation trustees consider carefully and objectively our conclusion, from the evidence, that an overindulgence in empiricism has had results deleterious to our society, particularly in subordinating basic and fundamental principles, religious, ethical, moral and legal. In such consideration, we also suggest, as we have previously in this report, that they consult not alone with their professional employees who are the advocates of overwhelming empiricism but also with those scholars and students who are critical of the preponderance.

#### *POLITICAL USE AND PROPAGANDA.*

It is the opinion of this Committee that the wording of the tax law regarding the prohibition of political activity of foundations should be carefully re-examined. We recognize that it is extremely difficult to draw the line between what should be permissible and what should not. Nevertheless, the present rule, as interpreted by the courts, permits far too much license. While further study may be indicated, we are inclined to support the suggestion that the limiting conditions of the present statute be dropped—those which restrict to the prohibition of political activity "to influence legislation" and those which condemn only if a "substantial" part of the foundation's funds are so used. These restrictions make the entire prohibition meaningless. We advocate the complete exclusion of political activity, leaving it to the courts to apply the maxim of *de minimis non curat lex*. Carefully devised exceptions to this general prohibition against political activity might be made in the case of certain special types of organizations, such as bar associations.

Whatever the difficulties which foundations may face in determining when a proposed activity may have political implications, we cannot see any reason why public funds should be used when any political impact may result.

*LOBBYING.*

An astonishing number of tax-exempt foundations are registered as lobbyists in Washington. Under the present law, it seems clear that lobbying in itself is not held to be political activity of a type which might deprive a foundation of its tax exemption. Moreover, registration may, in many instances, take place to protect the foundation against a technical violation of the law requiring registration, when the only activity approaching true lobbying may consist of merely keeping an eye on developing legislation in some special field of interest. Nevertheless, there is evidence to indicate that much true lobbying goes on. The whole area needs investigation. Whether tax-exempt organizations should have the privilege of lobbying is at least extremely doubtful.

*SUBVERSION.*

The prohibition against the use of foundation funds to support subversion also needs wholesale revision. As the law stands it is only the support of Communism and Fascism which is prohibited. It may be that the adequate revision of the law regarding political use would suffice, but it is clear to us that all support of socialism, collectivism or any other form of society or government which is at variance with the basic principles of ours should be proscribed. This subject, too, requires considerable study. We well understand that some research clearly not intended to have any political implication may, nevertheless, incidentally impinge on the political. We also understand that the effect may relate to what is merely one facet of an aggregate of collectivist thought. Yet we feel that the whole field of the social sciences is of such a nature that "risk" is not desirable. As much as we support taking "risks" in the physical sciences, in medicine and public health and other areas, it is clear to us that risks taken with our governmental, juridical or social system are undesirable. If there is a burden placed on the foundations through the difficulty of drawing a line between what is in the broad sense "subversive" or "political" and what is not, it is better that the foundations suffer this burden than that they take risks with our happiness and safety.

*FOREIGN USE OF FOUNDATION FUNDS.*

In this area this Committee has not been able to do sufficient study to come to a final evaluation. However, we offer this suggestion tentatively and subject to further investigation of the extent and significance of foreign grants and grants for foreign use—that such grants be limited to ten per cent of the annual income of the foundation or, if it is disbursing principal, ten per cent, in the aggregate, of its principal fund. An exception should be made in the case of religious organizations, such as foreign missions, and perhaps in some other instances of peculiar and historic nature.

*FURTHER AREAS OF INVESTIGATION.*

We have limited ourselves in the scope of our inquiry, in order not to scatter over the entire, gigantic field. We urge, however, that the proposed continued inquiry cover those sections which we have perforce omitted. Among them is that of organizations which have religious names, or some connection with religion or a religious group, which have engaged in political activity. There is evidence that such

groups exist in all three major sects. The right of a minister, priest or rabbi to engage in political activity is clear enough. When such activity takes place, however, under the shelter of a tax-exempt organization which is not in itself a church, we question its permissibility.

There are some special types of tax-exempt organizations which seem to us seriously to need investigation. Among them are the cooperative organizations, some of which seem to engage in political activity and even to promote a form of collectivism. Some labor and union organizations also might be studied to see if they have not crossed the border from privilege to license in matters political. Among unions, for example, there is the basic question whether dues payable by the members should be used for political purposes which the members have not authorized.

There are some special foundations or similar organizations to which we have been able to give insufficient attention in some cases and none in others. These should all be studied. Among those which we have not heretofore mentioned (or mentioned only briefly) are these:

*The Public Administration Clearing House;*  
*The National Citizens Commission for Public Schools;*  
*The Advertising Council;*  
*The Great Books Foundation;*  
*The American Heritage Council;*  
*The American Heritage Program of the National Library Association;*  
*The American Foundation for Political Education;*  
*The American Friends Service Committee;*  
*The Institute of International Education.*

Another special group requiring study is the so-called "accrediting" organizations. These (apparently tax-exempt) organizations are extra-governmental, yet they act, in effect, as comptrollers of education to a considerable degree. For various reasons colleges, universities and specialized schools and departments today require "accreditation", that is, approval of one or more of these organizations which presume to set standards. Some of these accrediting organizations are supported by foundations; through such support, they may well control them. An incidental factor involved in this accrediting system imposed on American education is its often substantial expense to the institutions themselves. The Committee is informed that some colleges are obliged, through this system, to pay as much as \$20,000 per year to enable them to stay in business. The standards set may perhaps in every instance be beyond criticism, yet the system in itself is subject to question in so far as it imposes on institutions standards set by private organizations not responsible to the people or to government.

As we have been able to devote intensive study only to some of the major foundations, we suggest that a selected number of the more important foundations of what might be called the second rank in size should be examined carefully. A study of these may produce type or sampling material of great value in considering the over-all foundation problems.

We have been unable to do much concerning small foundations and their problems and difficulties. Some of these involve matters which should be primarily the concern of the Internal Revenue Service, but we have pointed out that its capacity for watching over the foundation field to discover breaches of law and offensive practices is very limited. A thorough study should, therefore, perhaps solicit from the public complaints against smaller foundations, as well as large, in order that studies may disclose what weaknesses exist in the operation of these smaller organizations.

\* \* \* \* \*

While this Committee has spent little time in investigating the activities of foundations in the natural sciences on the ground that their performance in this area has been subjected to very little criticism, a continued inquiry might well give attention to this field in relation to the problem of subversion. There is evidence that some foundations and foundation-supported scientific enterprises have been used by Communists, through a special form of infiltration which has escaped the notice of those in control. Several important scientific projects seem to have been so employed for Communist purposes. They have become clearing centers for building up the reputation of persons of hidden Communist persuasion and subsequently placing these pseudo-scientists in situations where they are able to engage in espionage. The process includes using the assistance of scientists who are fellow-travellers or outright Communists to provide the material which is then used by the infiltrate to establish his scientific reputation. This is all done so adroitly that the foundations which support such projects know nothing of it.

This Committee was fortunate in securing Mr. Rene A. Wormser, of New York, as general counsel. In addition to his great ability he brought to the Committee a wealth of training and experience in the field of our inquiry. The Committee appreciates his devotion to the task and the superior contribution he has made. The Committee has relied heavily upon him in assembling and consolidating the material embodied in this report. He and Mr. Arnold Koch, the associate counsel, were able to associate themselves with the Committee only at considerable personal sacrifice.

The Committee has received material assistance from the Internal Revenue Service which has been at all times cooperative, from the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and from the Senate and House committees covering certain aspects of the subject matter involved.

The Committee also desired to express its appreciation and give recognition to the able and untiring work of the members of the staff.

The foregoing report is respectfully submitted, this 20th day of December, 1954, on the affirmative votes of the following members:

B. CARROLL REECE, *Chairman*, Tennessee.  
 JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan.  
 ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts.

Casting contrary votes were:

WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio.  
 GRACIE PFOST, Idaho.



## STATEMENT OF B. CARROLL REECE SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE MAJORITY REPORT

In view of the decision of the ranking minority member of the Committee to file a minority report, copies of which will not be made available to the other members of the Committee until released to the press, I feel it is desirable to include a brief summation of the attempts to frustrate the work of the Committee for which the ranking minority member has been responsible.

It was made clear at the outset that the inquiry was to be an objective study. In line with this purpose and after consultation by Counsel with attorneys for some of the foundations, the Committee decided to inform the foundations in advance of the main lines of criticism into which inquiry would be made, giving sufficient supporting evidence so that they would know what to reply to in their own testimony. This decision was unanimous. It seemed the most fair approach for the foundations.

In accordance with the unanimously agreed procedure, and also by unanimous assent, Mr. Dodd, the Director of Research, prepared an initial report to the Committee which was read into the record at the first two hearings. This report, representing his tentative personal observations after initial studies had been made, was intended to indicate the main lines of inquiry. His report stated:

"As this report will hereafter contain many statements which appear to be conclusive, I emphasize here that each one of them must be understood to have resulted from studies which were essentially exploratory. In no sense should they be considered proved. I mention this in order to avoid the necessity of qualifying each as made."

This statement could not be clearer. On the first day both the Chairman and Counsel made the purpose of the report utterly clear—it was "to give the foundations an opportunity to know what most important matters we want to go into in relation to them." During the hearings this identification of Mr. Dodd's report was repeated both by the Chairman and Counsel. Yet the ranking minority member repeatedly asserted that the majority had arrived at pre-judged decisions. Newspapers reported him as having said that this was an "Alice-in-Wonderland" investigation in which a decision had been made in advance of the trial of a case. The majority submits that in taking this attitude the ranking minority member intended to discredit and harass the investigation, and to impugn the good faith of the majority and of the staff.

From the start, Mr. Hays has assumed an attitude of aggressive suspicion and insulting distrust of the majority members and the staff. He has said frequently that he has known in advance what the majority was going to decide. The shoe is, in fact, on the other foot. Mr. Hays could not have made clearer, from the beginning of our work, that he intended to frustrate the investigation to the limit of his abilities, and to attempt wholly to "whitewash" the foundations.

The lines have not been drawn in this Committee on a political party basis. The opinions of the majority are not party-line opinions. They are not "Republican" opinions, any more than the opinions of the minority are "Democratic" opinions. Many Democrats voted for the establishment of this Committee, and many Republicans

voted against it. There is no party significance whatsoever in this Committee's work, which crosses party lines, and I am confident that our findings will find both supporters and opponents in both parties.

Sixteen public hearings were held, in the course of which the patient attempt was made by the Chairman to follow the procedure unanimously agreed upon in advance: that the main lines of criticism to be investigated were first to be aired, with sufficient evidence to show the reasonableness of investigating them, after which the foundations were to be brought into the hearings to state their positions.

The last public hearing was held on June 17th. Further public hearings were discontinued by a resolution passed by the majority at an executive meeting on July 2, 1954.

The reason for the cessation of hearings was that the attitude and conduct of the ranking minority member had made it impossible to conduct orderly hearings. Among the obstructive and harassing acts of Mr. Hays—all of them during the public sessions—were these:

He interrupted witnesses beyond all reason, attempting to frighten witnesses and to disorganize both the initial presentations and orderly interrogation by others. In one session of 185 minutes he interrupted 246 times.

When, after harrowingly frequent interruptions by Mr. Hays, great numbers of which were on extraneous matters, a rule was passed by a majority that a witness was to be permitted to finish his presentation before being questioned, Mr. Hays angrily remarked that he would pay no attention to any such rule and would interrupt whenever he pleased; and this he continued to do.

His interruptions were very frequently intemperate, both in tone and substance, and in purposeful disregard of parliamentary procedure and the rules of the House.

He repeatedly, and from the rostrum, villified the staff and accused it of having prejudged the complaints against the foundations.

He repeatedly, from the rostrum, vilified other members of the Committee and questioned their good faith. He publicly accused the Chairman of lying and being a coward; and accused Mr. Goodwin of duplicity and of cowardice. The following excerpt from the record of the hearings which I, as Chairman, had deleted from the printed record in an effort to achieve harmony and to maintain the dignity of the Committee and the House, is illustrative of the violent and abusive remarks of Mr. Hays.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure is not going to get anybody worked up or irritated here. If he has that in mind he might just as well subside, because the Chairman for one has made up his mind that he is not going to let any byplay get him out of temper. That would impair the usefulness of this committee.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say to the Chairman that I took his word and he assured me his word was good, and if the time arose when I felt that we needed somebody on the minority side that the Chairman would put somebody on.

The CHAIRMAN. The conversation was that if the gentleman from Ohio and his colleague should finally decide to write a minority report, that a member of the staff would be made available to cooperate with them on that.

Mr. HAYS. No, that was not the agreement, because I don't want any member of this staff writing a minority report for me.

The CHAIRMAN. I said cooperate.

Mr. HAYS. Or to cooperate either.

The CHAIRMAN. And assist. That was the conversation. I do not know what the gentleman had in mind.

Mr. HAYS. I will say this to the gentleman, that out where I come from we have a saying that if a man doublecrosses you once, that is his fault; if he doublecrosses you twice, that is your fault. I just want you to know you won't get the second opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Even that statement is not going to provoke the Chairman, but there is no living man can justifiably say that this Chairman—that this man who happens to be Chairman at this time—has ever doublecrossed anybody or he had failed to keep his word.

Mr. HAYS. I am saying both.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right.

Mr. HAYS. Is that clear enough? There is no inference there, is there?

The CHAIRMAN. That does not disturb me a particle.

Mr. HAYS. I know. You are pretty hard to disturb. I thought they had more guts in Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not going to provoke me. You need not worry, I have already made up my mind on that.

\* \* \* \* \*

In an effort to discredit a staff witness, he employed quotations from papal encyclicals, bringing in by inference a religious issue where it had no bearing.

He cast aspersions on the character and record of a Catholic nun, the daughter of Senator McCarran.

He repeatedly vilified and openly insulted witnesses appearing before the Committee. In a letter dated May 30, 1954 Professor Kenneth Colgrove noted that Mr. Hays had insulted, villified and browbeat a witness "in the most brutal fashion." "On thirty or more occasions" wrote Prof. Colgrove, "Congressman Hays deliberately insulted the witness, and on numerous occasions, he inferred that he was a liar. Throughout three days, Congressman Hays was allowed to interrupt the testimony with irrelevant questions and to make distracting and insolent remarks. On the second day, even after Congressman Hays promised to refrain from interruptions (see page 638), he continued to interrupt and insult the witness without rebuke from the Chairman.<sup>1</sup> I doubt whether the entire history of Congressional investigations will show more unfair or cowardly attack upon a witness than the treatment accorded to Mr. Sargent. Obviously no self-respecting scholar will care to testify before such a Committee under such conditions."

Mr. Hays referred in scurrilous terms to witnesses who had been heard, using such expressions as suggesting that the Committee should have a psychiatrist present; referring to witnesses as "crackpots"; asserting that they had been "dredged up" by the majority or the staff; asserting that not one single fact had been adduced by the testimony; etc. Among these witnesses were professors of repute and eminence. In a letter to the Chairman dated June 21, 1954 Professor Hobbs referred to the conduct of Mr. Hays and said that an atmosphere was created "of fear among competent persons who might otherwise question the omniscience of the directors of those foundations. Witnesses are thereby warned that no matter how objective their testimony, no matter how legitimate their questions, their character will be smeared and their testimony ridiculed. Such threats add substance to an existing awareness that any pointed questioning of anti-intellectual or

<sup>1</sup>Note that the record will show that the Chairman used unlimited patience to try to induce a reasonable attitude on the part of Mr. Hays without converting the hearings into an open brawl.

*unscientific activities of these foundations will seriously handicap or permanently destroy an academic career."*

The first witness who might be called a spokesman for the foundations was Mr. Pendleton Herring, President of the Social Science Research Council. After Mr. Herring had stated what he wished, and at great length, the Committee's Associate Counsel began cross-examination, whereupon the ranking minority member of the Committee immediately made plain that he would not permit sequential, orderly examination. Starting with an insult to the Associate Counsel, he indicated by his conduct that he intended to frustrate the cross-examination of foundation representatives by counsel and to prevent the eliciting of any material unfavorable to the foundations. The record of that last hearing on June 17th will show that a final incident of interference by Mr. Hays with orderly procedure justified the majority in concluding that no further hope existed of conducting public hearings properly in view of Mr. Hays' intransigence and refusal to obey rules of decency and propriety.

Among the other difficulties for which the ranking minority member was responsible was the loss, in the middle of its work, of two of its ablest investigators, released at the insistence of the ranking minority member who indicated that he would otherwise oppose any additional appropriation for the Committee. It was felt advisable to comply with this demand rather than to risk the abandonment of the investigation for lack of funds. The loss of the two investigators was a severe one. Several extremely valuable projects which had been started by the released investigators were left unfinished, and the remainder of the staff could not add the completion of these studies to their own heavy schedules. It is the belief of the undersigned that the demand for the release of the two investigators was prompted by their very evident ability and information.

One more comment upon the termination of the hearings. Some of the foundation statements filed with the Committee have been more than intemperate in castigating this Committee for ending the hearings. The Ford Foundation, for example, said:

"We therefore regard the decision of the Committee to discontinue public hearings and to limit the foundations' defense to written statements or closed sessions as a puzzling and unexpected act of injustice."

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was even more belligerent. It commenced its statement with an introductory paragraph which is an affront to a committee of the Congress of the United States. Other foundations approached this insolence in their statements.

What impresses this Committee, in relation to these unwarranted and intemperate remarks, is the fact that none of these foundations interposed any objections to the harassments to which this Committee was subjected in the course of its work. Indeed, some foundations very obviously worked closely with the ranking minority member of the Committee in his attempts to frustrate the investigation.

B. CARROLL REECE.

(Mr. Goodwin's added remarks were not received in time to be included in this printing of the report, but will be included when the report is reprinted.)

## APPENDIX TO THE REPORT

Throughout the text of this report the names of certain individuals or organizations appear in a distinctive kind of type. This was in order to identify them immediately as having been cited by the Attorney General of the United States, or by various governmental agencies for associations and affiliations of a questionable character.

All the material contained in this Appendix is taken from the public records, files and publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and is arranged alphabetically in this Appendix for ready reference. In some cases the records are in narrative form, and in others they are in columnar form. The latter identify particular organizations indicating citation by one of the following:

- (1) The Special Committee and/or Committee on Un-American Activities
- (2) The U. S. Attorney General
- (3) Other government agencies, state or municipal, etc.

### MORTIMER J. ADLER

It is noted that Ernie Adamson, Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, addressed a letter to Prof. Mortimer J. Adler on December 14, 1945, requesting a copy of a speech delivered by Professor Adler in Cleveland, Ohio, October 29, 1945.

Under date of December 19, 1945, Professor Adler replied:

I do not have a copy of the speech I delivered in Cleveland and elsewhere because I spoke extemporaneously from manuscript notes. The content of the lecture, however, was taken from my published book, *How to Think About War and Peace*, and the lecture said neither more nor less than that book said.

Briefly, the thesis of my lecture, as of my book, is that world peace depends on world federal government; that world federal government requires the total relinquishment and abolishment of the external sovereignty of the United States as well as that of all other presently existing sovereign nations; that this may seem a high price to pay for peace, but that it is nevertheless the absolutely minimum condition, without which we shall have another world war in less than fifteen years. Since I think that the atomic warfare which impends will be absolutely destructive of the civilization of the United States, whether we win or lose that war, I feel that I am justified in strongly recommending action by the American people to prevent that war—even if it means the loss of our national sovereignty.

### ELEANOR COPENHAVER ANDERSON (MRS. SHERWOOD ANDERSON)

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1). Named as a "Representative Individual" in favor of lifting the Spanish embargo.	Booklet, "These Americans Say:" p. 10.
Consumers National Federation (1). Sponsor.	Pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L.," Dec. 11-12, 1937, p. 2.
Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America (1) (2). Sponsor.	Program leaflet, "Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940," p. 4.
Conference on Pan American Democracy (1) (2). Sponsor.	Letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938.

## MRS. SHERWOOD ANDERSON

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

- Action Committee to Free Spain Now (2). Signer of statement protesting the "delay in breaking diplomatic relations with Franco Spain." Daily Worker, June 17, 1946, p. 2.
- American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1). Sponsor of Citizens Rally, Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 13, 1940. Leaflet, "Citizens Rally \* \* \*."
- League of Women Shoppers (1). Sponsor. Letterhead, Apr. 19, 1940.
- New Jersey League of Women Shoppers. Sponsor. Letterhead, July 7, 1941.
- National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) (2). Sponsor and member of its Committee of Women. "Call to a Conference on Women of the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. in the Post-War World," Nov. 18, 1944, New York City; and, letterhead of the NCASF, Committee of Women, Mar. 1, 1948.
- Save the Voice of Freedom Committee [Voice of Freedom Committee (2)]. A tea under sponsorship of the organization given in her home. Undated leaflet issued by the Voice of Freedom Committee.

See Also: Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 4, page 2898; and, vol. 17, pages 10304, 10341, 10345-10348. Public Hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities: Testimony of Walter S. Steele, July 21, 1947, page 83. Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of the Motion Picture Industry, October, 1947, pages 536 and 537.

## NORMAN ANGELL

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

- American League for Peace and Democracy (1) (2). Contributor to "Fight." Fight, July 1938, p. 7; Pamphlet, "7½ Million \* \* \*," p. 40.
- "Soviet Russia Today" (1). Contributor. Soviet Russia Today, Sept. 1936, p. 17.

See Also: Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 1, pages 617, 687, and 689; vol. 4, page 3074.

## ROGER N. BALDWIN

In Report No. 2 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, a chapter was devoted to the American Civil Liberties Union. We find the following excerpt concerning it which was taken from a report of the United Mine Workers, filed in 1924:

There are 200 organizations in the United States actively engaged in or sympathetic with the Communist revolutionary movement as directed and conducted by the Communist Party in America. \* \* \* In virtually every instance, these

organizations have direct contact, through the mechanism of inter-locking directorates, with the central executive committee of the Communist Party of America, or with its "legal" branch, the Workers Party of America.

Illustrative of this arrangement is the executive committee and the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union, at New York, posing as the champion of free speech and civil liberties, but serving as a forerunner and trail blazer for the active and insidious activities of the Communists \* \* \*. The managing director is Roger Baldwin who served a term as a draft evader in the Essex County jail in New Jersey in 1918 and 1919 (Report No. 2, pp. 82 and 83).

In Report No. 2290, the Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States stated the following:

The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 per cent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law. \* \* \*

Roger N. Baldwin, its guiding spirit, makes no attempt to hide his friendship for the Communists and their principles. He was formerly a member of the I. W. W. and served a term in prison as a draft dodger during the war. This is the same Roger N. Baldwin that has recently issued a statement "that the next session of Congress our job is to organize the opposition to the recommendations of the congressional committee investigating communism." In his testimony before the committee he admitted having said at a dinner held in Chicago that "The Fish Committee recommendations will be buried in the Senate." Testifying on force and violence, murder, etc., the following is quoted:

"The CHAIRMAN. Does your organization uphold the right of a citizen or alien— it does not make any difference which—to advocate murder?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Or assassination?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does your organization uphold the right of an American citizen to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly; in so far as mere advocacy is concerned.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does it uphold the right of an alien in this country to urge the overthrow and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Precisely on the same basis as any citizen.

"The CHAIRMAN. You do uphold the right of an alien to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Sure; certainly. It is the healthiest kind of thing for a country, of course, to have free speech—unlimited.

"The American Civil Liberties Union has received large sums from the Garland Fund, of which Roger N. Baldwin is one of the directors." (Report issued January 17, 1931; pp. 56 and 57.)

The American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund), referred to in the foregoing quotation, was established in 1922. "It was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, pp. 75 and 76).

Roger N. Baldwin was a member of the Executive Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown on letterheads of that organization dated November 18, 1936, and February 21, 1938.

A letterhead of the Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., lists the name of Roger N. Baldwin as a member of the Advisory Board of that organization (letterhead dated March 20, 1926).

Mr. Baldwin sponsored the Mother Ella Bloor Birthday Banquet in 1936 (Program, January 24, 1936, pp. 7 and 9); the celebration in 1937 (Daily Worker, June 14, 1937, p. 8); and he sent greetings to and sponsored the 75th birthday celebration (undated letterhead, and Souvenir Book, p. 23).

Roger N. Baldwin was a member of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League in 1928, as shown on a letterhead of that group, dated April 11, 1928.

Letterheads of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, dated April 27, 1938, and January, 1940, list Roger Baldwin as a member of the Advisory Committee of the organization. He was also one of the sponsors of the Fourth Annual Conference of the organization held in Washington, D. C., March 2 and 3, 1940 (letterhead of the Fourth Annual Conference).

An undated letterhead of the New York Tom Mooney Committee listed Mr. Baldwin as a sponsor of the organization.

Labor Defender, a "Communist magazine," in its issue of July 1931 listed the name of Roger N. Baldwin as a member of the Prisoner's Relief Fund of the International Labor Defense; he sent greetings to the Third Biennial National Conference, as shown on the printed program of that Conference.

Roger N. Baldwin was one of the sponsors of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (New Masses, September 28, 1937, p. 28).

A pamphlet entitled "Youngville, U. S. A.," lists Roger N. Baldwin as a member of the National Advisory Committee of the American Youth Congress (p. 62).

Roger N. Baldwin was a member of the Advisory Board of the American Student Union, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union." He was a speaker at the Fourth National Convention of that group (The Student Almanac, 1939, p. 32).

An undated letterhead of Frontier Films lists the name of Roger Baldwin as a member of the Advisory Board of that group.

Roger Baldwin was a contributor to New Masses, issues of November 16, 1937, and May 13, 1941.

Roger Baldwin was a sponsor of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance and signed the call to the Congress ("Unemployment Insurance Review," Volume 1, 1935, p. 3; leaflet "Call to a National Congress for Unemployment \* \* \*").

In a pamphlet entitled "The People vs. H. C. L.," December 11-12, 1937, p. 2, Roger Baldwin is listed as one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation.

The "Struggle Against War" for June 1933, p. 2, listed Roger Baldwin as a member of the American Committee for Struggle Against War; the same publication in the August 1933, issue (p. 2), listed him as a member of the Arrangements Committee for the United States Congress Against War, under the auspices of the American Committee for Struggle Against War; a letterhead of November 1, 1933, of the United States Congress Against War also named him as a member of the Arrangements Committee.

Roger Baldwin was a member of the National Executive Committee of the American League Against War and Fascism (Fight magazine for April 1934, p. 14; the "Call to the Second U. S. Congress Against War and Fascism, September 28, 29, and 30, 1934, Chicago, Illinois," p. 2; and a letterhead of the organization dated August 22, 1935). He spoke at a Legislative Conference of the group, as shown in the Daily Worker (February 27, 1937); and sponsored a joint meeting of the group with the American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, September 24, 1937, p. 6).



A leaflet entitled "Call to Action, American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 6-8, 1939, Washington, D. C." listed the name of Roger Baldwin as one of those who endorsed the Congress. He was a member of the National Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy (letterhead of July 12, 1939, and a pamphlet entitled "7½ Million Speak for Peace"). He spoke at the United Anti-Nazi Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 12, 1938, p. 2.

Mr. Baldwin contributed to the November 1933 and September 1937 issues of Fight magazine, official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism.

The Daily Worker of September 24, 1940, p. 5, reported that Roger Baldwin had signed a letter of the Communist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union, demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston counties.

The Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker) dated October 30, 1949, p. 6, named Roger Baldwin as one of those who had "spoken out against" the verdict handed down against the eleven Communist leaders.

The New York Times of October 27, 1949, p. 29, reported that Roger Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union since its inception in 1920, will resign January 1.

After leaving his administrative post with the union, Mr. Baldwin will devote full time to specialized work in the field of international civil rights.

The article further stated that Mr. Baldwin would act for the International League for the Rights of Man, "an affiliate of the union."

It is noted in the "Korean Independence" of August 6, 1947, that Roger N. Baldwin stated that—

Unless American policy undergoes a change in southern Korea, we are probably going to deliver another country into the waiting arms of the Soviet Union.

Roger Baldwin's name appeared on a partial list of signers on a statement in behalf of Refugees Behind the Iron Curtain as shown in the New York Times of October 20, 1949, p. 25.

The following appeared in the Harvard Class of 1905 Thirtieth Anniversary Report, June, 1935, p. 7:

Roger Nash Baldwin writes, "I have continued directing the unpopular fight for the rights of agitation, as Director of the American Civil Liberties Union; on the side engaging in many efforts to aid working class causes. I have been to Europe several times, mostly in connection with international radical activities, chiefly against war, fascism, and imperialism; and have traveled constantly in the United States to areas of conflict over workers' rights to strike and organize. Aside from social and economic issues, I have been active in the fight for the conservation of birds and animals and forests. My "chief aversion" is the system of greed, private profit, privilege, and violence which makes up the control of the world today, and which has brought it to the tragic crisis of unprecedented hunger and unemployment. I am opposed to the new deal because it strives to strengthen and prolong production for private profit. At bottom I am for conserving the full powers of every person on earth by expanding them to their individual limits. Therefore I am for socialism, disarmament, and ultimately for abolishing the State itself as an instrument of violence and compulsion. I seek social ownership of property, the abolition of the propertied class and sole control by those who produce wealth. Communism is the goal. It all sums up into one single purpose—the abolition of the system of dog-eat-dog under which we live, and the substitution by the most effective non-violence possible of a system of cooperative ownership and use of all wealth."

Cited organizations referred to herein: (1) Cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities and/or the Special Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) Cited by the United States Attorney General.

All-American Anti-Imperialist League (1) and (2)  
 American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2)  
 American Committee for Struggle Against War (1)  
 American Congress for Peace and Democracy (1)  
 American Friends for Spanish Democracy (1)  
 American Friends of the Chinese People (1)  
 American League Against War and Fascism (1) and (2)  
 American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2)  
 American Student Union (1)  
 American Youth Congress (1) and (2)  
 Consumers' National Federation (1)  
 Frontier Films (1)  
 International Labor Defense (1) and (2)  
 Labor Defender (1)  
 National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance (1)  
 New Masses (1) and (2)  
 New York Tom Mooney Committee (1)  
 North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1) and (2)  
 Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc. (1)  
 United States Congress Against War (1) and (2)

#### RUTH BENEDICT

Shortly after her death, Dr. Ruth Fulton Benedict was eulogized by Peter Stone in an article written for the Daily Worker on October 13, 1948 (p. 7).

Ruth Benedict was co-author of a pamphlet entitled "The Races of Mankind" which was the subject of an investigation by the House Committee on Military Affairs in 1944, due to the fact that some fifty-five thousand copies were purchased by the War Department for distribution among students of the Army orientation course.

It is to be noted that the Communist publication, the Daily Worker, condemned the War Department's ban on the use of the pamphlet; an article which appeared on the editorial page of the March 8, 1944, issue of the publication claimed that—

it is difficult to reconcile such an act with the cause for which we are fighting. (See page 6.)

From the same issue (page 4), we find that—

The National CIO War Relief Committee will distribute the pamphlet \* \* \* to members of the House and Senate—

and that—

The CIO Committee began distribution of this pamphlet to members of armed forces following the USO board's decision, upholding Chester I. Barnard's insistence that the popularly written pamphlet be banned from YMCA-sponsored USO units.

On February 25, 1938, Miss Benedict made a speech in the Department of Agriculture Auditorium, comparing American civilization with primitive tribes. The following report is taken from "Agricul-

ture Exchange," a Department of Agriculture employee magazine, for March 3, 1938:

No primitive tribe has gone as far as we. All the people, even be they slaves, are taken care of. Rich and poor eat of the same food. This is in contrast to our own society where an employer may fire his employees without assuming any responsibility for their further welfare or existence \* \* \*. Since no man can have riches and its attendant power, suicide and murder are practically unknown. Initiative is not destroyed; it is developed through group tribal incentive toward bigger projects.

According to a news release of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties dated December 26, 1941, the name of Ruth Benedict appears as one of those who signed the release. The National Federation for \* \* \* has been cited as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of June 25, 1942; March 29, 1944; January 2, 1943); the Attorney General of the United States cited the group as an organization "by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program"; and as subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953.)

"In 1941, the Communists established a school in New York City which was known as the School for Democracy (now merged with the Workers School into the Jefferson School of Social Science)." (From Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944.) A brochure of the School for Democracy dated April 6, 1942, named Miss Benedict as one of the lecturers; the catalogue of the School for January 1942 named her as Guest Lecturer.

Ruth Benedict was a member of the National Committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, according to a letterhead of September 22, 1939; she was named as a member of the New York Committee of the organization on a letterhead dated December 1, 1939; she signed an appeal on behalf of anti-fascist refugees trapped in France, which was sent to Secretary of State Cordell Hull by the organization, as reported in the Daily Worker of July 22, 1940 (page 1, column 5); she signed an Open Letter to Nicholas Murray Butler denouncing "pro war" policies, which letter was sponsored by the organization (Daily Worker, October 7, 1940, page 3).

The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist-front organization which defended Communist teachers (reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, by the Special Committee \* \* \*).

A letterhead of the Council for Pan-American Democracy dated July 11, 1940 named Miss Benedict as one of the members of that organization's Executive Committee; she signed an Open Letter to the President of Brazil to save Luiz Carlos Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader, which letter was sponsored by the Council for Pan-American Democracy (New Masses, December 3, 1940, page 28).

The Council for Pan-American Democracy (known also as the Conference on Pan-American Democracy) was cited by the Special Committee as a Communist-front organization which defended Luiz Carlos Prestes, Brazilian Communist leader and former member of

the executive committee of the Communist International (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the Council as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

Ruth Benedict was one of those who signed a telegram to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union defendants, sponsored by the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights (Daily Worker, September 17, 1940, pages 1 and 5). The New York Conference \* \* \* was cited as a Communist-front organization which called a conference for February 14, 1941 in New York City "to attack anti-sabotage legislation and the Rapp-Coudert Committee investigating subversive activities in the New York public-school system." (Special Committee \* \* \* in report dated March 29, 1944; the Special Committee also cited the union referred to above as being strongly entrenched with Communist leadership.)

A statement by Miss Benedict is included in the pamphlet, "We Hold These Truths," prepared and published by the League of American Writers. The Attorney General found that the League of American Writers was founded in 1935 "under Communist auspices" and "in 1939 \* \* \* began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686.) The Special Committee cited the League as a Communist-front organization in three reports (January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

According to a pamphlet entitled "7½ Million \* \* \*," (page 19) Ruth Benedict was a member of the Commission on Latin America of the American League for Peace and Democracy, an organization cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); previously, the organization had been cited as "designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7683 and 7684). The Special Committee \* \* \* cited the organization as a Communist front (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of August 23, 1948 (page 7), reported that Ruth Benedict was delegate to the Intellectuals World Congress for Peace; she was identified as an anthropologist. The World Congress of Intellectuals was held in Wroclaw, Poland on August 25-28, 1948 and was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as follows:

This bitter hatred for all western culture and the attempt to divorce writers, scientists, and artists from their own native land and win their allegiance for the Soviet Union is the underlying aim and theme of these scientific and cultural conferences for world peace (House Report 1954, April 26, 1950, originally released April 19, 1949.)

T. A. BISSON

*Organization and affiliation*

*Source*

American Friends of the Chinese Letterhead, May 16, 1940.  
 People (1). Member, National  
 Advisory Board.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2). Sponsor, "Boycott Japanese Goods Conference."  | "Daily Worker," Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2.  |
| American Student Union (1). Convention speaker; Foreign Policy Association.   | "The Student Almanac—1939" for the 4th Annual National Convention, Dec. 26—30, 1938, p. 32.   |
| Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Consultant, "Far East Spotlight."  | "Far East Spotlight," March 1949 (inside front cover); "Far East Spotlight," June 1949, p. 2. |
| Member, Board of Directors; Consultant.   | Letterhead, May 28, 1948.   |
| Consultant  | Letterheads, 1946 and 1947.   |
| Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2) and Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East (2). Sponsor.   | "Daily Worker," Jan. 16, 1948, p. 7.  |
| Friends of the Soviet Union (1) and (2). Contributor, "Soviet Russia Today".  | "Soviet Russia Today," November 1938, p. 15.  |
| National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East (2). Co-chairman; former, Spec. advisor, Gov't. Section GHQ, Supreme Command Allied Powers, Japan.   | "Daily Worker," Jan. 1, 1948, p. 3.   |
| National Chairman   | " * * * Jan. 23—25, 1948, New York City" Conf. Call.  |
| Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1). Signer; Research Assoc., Foreign Policy Association.  | "Soviet Russia Today," September 1939, p. 25.   |
| "Soviet Russia Today" (1). Contributor.   | "Soviet Russia Today," November 1940, p. 14.  |
| Author of "Japan in China" reviewed by Anna Louise Strong: "He talked with Mao Tsetung and other Communist leaders last summer."                                      | "New Masses," June 14, 1938, p. 24.   |
| Signed statement* in defense of Chinese Communist armies (*Note: this statement immediately preceded formation of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy). | "Daily Worker," Aug. 17, 1945, p. 2.  |
| His books, "Japan's War Economy" and "American Policy in the Far East, 1931—41" recommended.  | "Spotlight on the Far East," Mar. 1947, p. 7.   |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Referred to as having played an important role in enlightening the American reading public on the Far East.	"Daily Worker," Aug. 3, 1945, p. 11.
His book, "Prospects for Democracy in Japan" favorably reviewed by Philip O. Keeney.	"Far East Spotlight," Feb. 1950, p. 13.
Wrote article of attack on American policy in Japan.	"Daily Worker," Apr. 5, 1948, p. 8.
Photo-----	"Spotlight on the Far East," Feb. 1948, p. 6.
Record given-----	Congressional Record, March 30, 1950, pp. 4433-4470.
Contract as visiting political science lecturer at University of California terminated; was a witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952.	"Daily People's World," July 8, 1953, p. 6.

## PAUL BLANSHEARD

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Student Union (1) Member of the Sponsoring Committee of a dinner.	Announcement, "Are You an Alumnus Without an Alma Mater?" which appeared in "The Student Advocate," publication of the American Student Union issue of Feb. 1937, p. 2.
Consumers Union (1). Sponsor; identified as Commissioner of Accounts, New York City.	Undated circular, "New Masses," Mar. 2, 1937, p. 28.

## BRUCE BLIVEN

Contributions by Bruce Bliven have appeared in the following issues of "New Masses": January 2, 1934 (p. 22); December 21, 1937 (p. 20); March 15, 1938 (p. 19); April 5, 1938 (p. 21); and April 12, 1938 (p. 19).

In the report of March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited "New Masses" as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party." The magazine was cited also by the Attorney General of the United States as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688).

Bruce Bliven, identified as an Editor of "New Republic" was a member of the National Advisory Committee of the American Youth Congress, as shown in the pamphlet, "Youngville, U. S. A.," (p. 62); his name appeared on a letterhead of the American Youth Congress (undated) among the members of the National Advisory Board. "The Student Advocate" for February 1937 (p. 2) listed Bruce Bliven as a member of the Sponsoring Committee for an "Alumni Homecoming"

dinner scheduled for March 21st in New York City, by the American Student Union.

The American Youth Congress was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line \* \* \* under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization" (Report of June 25, 1942, p. 16; also cited in Reports of January 3, 1939, January 3, 1941, and March 29, 1944). The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Youth Congress as having been formed in 1934 and "controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7685); it was included in the Attorney General's lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

The American Student Union was cited as a Communist front which was "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1937. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the American Student Union, and the Union offered free trips to Russia. The Union claims to have led "as many as 500,000 students out in annual April 22 strikes in the United States." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report of January 3, 1939, p. 80; also cited in Reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944.)

The "Daily Worker" of February 13, 1939 (p. 2) reported that Bruce Bliven was a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution; he was listed as a sponsor of the Descendants \* \* \* on the back page of a pamphlet entitled "Descendants of the American Revolution."

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Descendants of the American Revolution as—

a Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The Descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party. \* \* \* The educational director \* \* \* is one Howard Selsam, an instructor at the Communist Party's Workers School in New York. (Report of June 25, 1942, pp. 18 and 19.)

"New Masses" for January 5, 1937 (p. 31) listed Bruce Bliven as a member of the General Committee, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau. A letterhead of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy dated February 21, 1938 listed him as a member of the Committee, and the "Daily Worker" of April 8, 1938 (p. 4) reported that he signed a petition of the American Friends \* \* \* to lift the arms embargo. The "Daily Worker" on February 27, 1937 (p. 2) reported that Mr. Bliven was a tag day sponsor of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. He was listed in the booklet, "These Americans Say:" on p. 8, as one of the representative individuals who advocated lifting the embargo on Spain; the booklet was prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo.

The American Friends of Spanish Democracy was included in the following citation made by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the Report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82):

In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations \* \* \* such as \* \* \* American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

In the same report (pp. 137 and 138), the Special Committee cited the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. The North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee (Reports of January 3, 1940 and March 29, 1944) and as Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, April 27, 1949). This organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list.

The "Daily Worker" of April 6, 1937 (p. 9) reported that Bruce Bliven was a member of the Advisory Board of Frontier Films. His name was carried on an October 3, 1936 letterhead among the members of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio. A letterhead of March 16, 1937 listed him among the members of the National Peoples Committee Against Hearst.

Both Frontier Films and the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio were cited as Communist fronts in the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.

In the June 25, 1942 report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, the National Peoples Committee Against Hearst was cited as a "subsidiary" organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The Special Committee, in its report of January 3, 1939, cited the American League as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States." The League was cited also as a Communist front by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684) and was later included on the Attorney General's lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948). The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list.

A letterhead of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy dated November 16, 1938 listed Bruce Bliven as a sponsor; he signed a Call of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, as shown in "News You Don't Get," November 15, 1938 (p. 3). Mr. Bliven signed a cable sponsored by the Prestes Defense Committee, as reported in the "Daily Worker" of February 13, 1937 (p. 2).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S.



Civil Service Commission, June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee cited the Conference as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the "Communist International" (Report of March 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164). The Prestes Defense Committee was cited as a "Communist organization" by the Special Committee in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112).

In a pamphlet entitled "The People vs. H. C. L." dated December 11-12, 1937 (p. 2), Bruce Bliven was listed as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee in the Report of March 29, 1944.

A statement released by the International Juridical Association was signed by Bruce Bliven, as reported in the "Daily Worker" of July 25, 1936 (p. 2).

The Special Committee, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as a Communist front. In Report 3123 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 21, 1950, it was cited as a Communist front which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

The "Daily Worker" of March 9, 1938 (p. 5) reported that Bruce Bliven was a sponsor of a conference of the Book and Magazine Guild, Local 18, United Office and Professional Workers of America. In Report 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pp. 18 and 19), the Special Committee cited the United Office and Professional Workers of America as one of the CIO unions in which the Committee found Communist leadership entrenched. The Union was expelled from the CIO on charges of Communist domination by vote of the Executive Board, February 15, 1950 (Press Release of the 12th CIO Convention, November 20-24, 1950).

During testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities in public hearings on July 13, 1949, Rabbi Benjamin Schultz stated that Bruce Bliven was "not a Communist." ("Communist Infiltration of Minority Groups," p. 437.)

It is noted that a sworn affidavit of Bruce Bliven, member of the editorial board and managing editor of the "New Republic," is found on page 3092 of the public hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in which Mr. Bliven denied that "New Republic" was a Communist publication.

#### ROBERT BRADY

##### *Organization and affiliation*

American League for Peace and Democracy (1) (2). Member, National Committee (shown as a Professor in California).

##### *Source*

Letterhead of Baltimore Division, ALPD, May 18, 1939; letterhead, ALPD, July 12, 1939; and pamphlet, "7½ Million" page 34.

See Also: Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 3, page 1988; vol. 10, page 6278; Appendix V (1941), pages 1661 and 1680.

## ROBERT A. BRADY

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| Harry Bridges Defense Committee (1). Member, Northern Division, California Sponsoring Committee.  | Letterhead, Aug. 24, 1939.  |
| "Hollywood Quarterly" [published by Hollywood Writers Mobilization (2)]. Writer of article (Professor, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley; author of "The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism").  | Hollywood Quarterly, April, 1947, No. 3, Vol. 11, p. 225; and, Screen Writer, July 1947, p. 41. |
| Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1). Signer (Prof. of Economics, Univ. of Calif.).   | "Soviet Russia Today," Sept. 1939, p. 25.   |
| See Also: House Report No. 2748, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Jan. 2, 1943, page 5. Hearings Regarding Communist Espionage in the United States Government, Committee on Un-American Activities, July-Sept. 1948, page 626. |   |

## THEODORE BRAMELD

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| Signer of statement defending the twelve Communist leaders.  | "Daily Worker," Feb. 28, 1949, p. 9.  |
| Signer of appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.                                  | "Daily Worker," Dec. 10, 1952, p. 4.  |
| Signer of statement in defense of the appointment of Simon W. Gerson, a Communist, to the staff of Stanley Isaacs.   | "Daily Worker," Feb. 10, 1938, p. 1.  |
| American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2). Signer of statement against denaturalization.   | "Daily Worker," Aug. 10, 1950, p. 5.  |
| American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2). Supporter of the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference.   | "Daily Worker," Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2 and Jan. 25, 1938, p. 2.  |
| Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1). Signer of statement calling for an international agreement to ban the use of atomic weapons. | Statement attached to press release of the organization dated Dec. 14, 1949, p. 12.   |
| Mid-Century Conference for Peace (1). Sponsor of conference, May 29 and 30, 1950, Chicago, Ill.  | Conference Program (reprinted in report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on the Communist Peace Offensive, Apr. 1, 1951, pp. 144-146). |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, Mar. 25-27, 1949.	Conference Program.
Sponsor of conference held Oct. 9-10, 1948.	Leaflet, "To Safeguard These Rights * * *," published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the Council.
Signer of statement-----	Congressional Record, July 14, 1949, p. 9620.
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Signer of "Resolution Against Atomic Weapons".	Mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of July 28, 1950.
Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Initiating sponsor.	Letterhead of Minn. Division dated Sept. 28, 1946.
Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-Election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio (1). Member.	Letterhead dated Oct. 3, 1936.
Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign (1). Sponsor.	Letterhead dated Aug. 3, 1939.
Signer-----	Brief on behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo submitted by Cultural Workers to the Supreme Court at the October Term, 1949.

PEARL S. BUCK

Pearl S. Buck contributed a review of John Steinbeck's book, "The Moon is Down," to the March 24, 1942 issue of "New Masses" (p. 23). "New Masses" was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as the—

nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party \* \* \* whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service (from Report 1311 of the Special Committee dated March 29, 1944; also cited in Reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942).

It was cited as a "Communist periodical" by the Attorney General of the United States (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688).

The April 1943 issue of "Soviet Russia Today" (p. 31) listed Pearl S. Buck as a sponsor of the "Soviet Russia Today" dinner celebrating the 25th Anniversary of the Red Army, February 22, (1943), Hotel Commodore, New York City. Jessica Smith, Editor of "Soviet Russia Today," in a letter addressed "To Valentina Grizodubova, Chairman of the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee, and to all Soviet Women" stated:

So as you hold your meetings throughout the Soviet Union on March Eighth International Woman's Day, accept these messages as representing the new spirit that now fills the women of America, \* \* \* ("Soviet Russia Today," March 1942, pp. 10 and 11)—

in this connection, the publication published the following message attributed to Pearl Buck, writer, Nobel Prize Winner 1938:

I send my personal congratulations to the brave Soviet women, who are an encouragement to all women. We look to Russia with fresh hope and new understanding. We work together not only for victory in war but for a better world to come.

It is noted that the west coast organ of the Communist Party, the "Daily People's World" in the issue of March 9, 1942 (p. 5), published the same statement by Mrs. Buck in an article entitled "Messages of Solidarity From U. S. to Women of the U. S. S. R."

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Report of March 29, 1944, cited "Soviet Russia Today" as a Communist front; the Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as a "Communist-front publication" in Report 1953 of April 26, 1950, originally released October 23, 1949 (p. 108).

Pearl Buck was one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown in "Soviet Russia Today" for December 1942 (p. 42); a letterhead of the Congress dated October 27, 1942, listed her as a patron of the group. The Congress of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a "Communist-front" organization by the Special Committee \* \* \* in its Report of March 29, 1944 (p. 94).

"New Masses" for April 7, 1942 (p. 25, an advertisement) and the "Sunday Worker" for March 22, 1942 (p. 8, an advertisement), named Pearl S. Buck as a speaker at a meeting scheduled for April 8, (1942), Manhattan Center, (New York City), under the auspices of the Council on African Affairs. The United States Attorney General included the Council on African Affairs on lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; the Council was redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953.

Mrs. Buck was named as a Representative Individual who advocated lifting the embargo on arms to Spain, in a pamphlet entitled "These Americans Say:" which was prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo. The Special Committee \* \* \*, in its Report of March 29, 1944, cited the Coordinating Committee \* \* \* as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

Pearl S. Buck was the author of "Talk About Russia With Masha Scott," recommended by the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, as shown in "Books on the USSR," a selected bibliography by Bessie Weissman, issued by the Washington Cooperative Bookshop (p. 20):

The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name The Book Shop Association, was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938. \* \* \* It maintains a book shop and art gallery at 916 Seventeenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C., where literature is sold and meetings and lectures held. Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations \* \* \* certain of the officers and employees of the bookshop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688).

The Book Shop was included on the Attorney General's lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order 10450). The Special Committee \* \* \*, in the Report of March 29, 1944, cited the Book Shop as a Communist front.

On January 15, 1951, a letter from Mrs. Buck appeared in the Washington "Evening Star" (p. A-10), in which she made the statement that "The Communists in China know how heartily I oppose their creed."

"New Times" was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as an "internationally circulated Communist publication" published in Moscow. "Its purpose is obviously to guide the policy of Communist Parties throughout the world." Its predecessors were the War and the Working Classes, World News and Views, and Inprecorr (Imprecorr). (Report 1920, May 11, 1948, pp. 23, 25, and 43.) N. Sergeyeva, writing in the "New Times" for August 29, 1951 (pp. 10-12) stated:

"Asia and America" is a subject very much in vogue in the American press. One of those who are racking their brains over the problem is the well-known authoress Pearl S. Buck, who has the reputation of being an authority on China. An article of hers that appeared in the Christian Century of June 27, is typical of others. In order to acquaint our readers with her line of thought, we shall reproduce the gist of her article in the form of a dialogue.

The article concluded with the following statement:

We beg the reader to forgive us for having expounded Pearl S. Buck's article so freely. All the same, her trend of mind is very significant. She cannot help seeing that American policy is a failure, and she ventures to say so more or less coherently. She tries, it is true, to avoid drawing the conclusions, but at bottom her remarks are a damning characterization of imperialist policy in Asia.

A review of Pearl Buck's book, "Kinfolk," published in 1949, is found in the March 15, 1950 issue of "New Times" (pp. 27-32); excerpts from the review, written also by N. Sergeyeva, follow:

"Kinfolk," the latest in Pearl Buck's series of novels about modern China, is a book that merits attention. In it this writer, who is considered an expert on Chinese life and customs, attempts to deal with political, moral and psychological problems of considerable interest at the present time. \* \* \*

The daughter of an American missionary, and a missionary herself, Pearl Buck lived in China for many years. A writer of undoubted ability, she attracted attention in the thirties by her books about the life of the Chinese people, and especially of the Chinese peasants. Her prewar novels \* \* \* which were translated into Russian too, are widely known to the reading public.

However, there was always one big failing in Pearl Buck's books. This was her attempt to ignore the tremendous political and social changes taking place in modern China. Mrs. Buck is not a progressive-minded individual. Her literary ability and gift of observation sometimes get the better of her prepossessions, and the truth of life prevails over her false political views. And so, alien as she is to the vanguard section of Chinese society, to the progressive forces of the people, her books, particularly the earlier ones, were not without social significance. They revealed the appalling poverty of the Chinese peasant, his want and land hunger, the ruthless exploitation to which he was subjected, the bestial visage of militarism. She gave some lifelike portraits of ordinary Chinese folk, very moving in their beauty and integrity of character. The finest traits of the Chinese people were embodied in these toilers of the soil, and they stood out the more saliently against the background of the corrupt and decaying feudal system, the brigandage of the militarists and the rapacity of the comprador bourgeoisie.

But even in these early writings, Pearl Buck's presentation of Chinese realities was very one-sided, precisely because she tried to shut out the class struggle and China's political life from the reader's view. While her books could help the

thoughtful reader to understand the causes of the Chinese popular revolution, this was so against her intention. She did not and would not understand the essence of the profound processes taking place in the country. She would not speak of the development of the popular revolution. She would not see the events that were impending in China. And in the Chinese people's great war for liberation, Pearl Buck was not on their side.

While carefully studying the manners, customs, traditions, and psychology of the Chinese people, Mrs. Buck completely ignored their political aspirations and political life. That was her political contribution to the effort of American big business to subjugate China.

In a China enveloped in the flames of civil war and waging a desperate, heroic struggle against the foreign imperialists and the Chiang Kai-shek clique—a China where new forms of social relations were being established under the guidance of the Communist Party—Pearl Buck's characters lived in a seeming vacuum, totally unaware of any of these events.

\* \* \* In her political utterances and articles on world affairs, Pearl Buck looks at China through the spectacles of U. S. aggressive imperialism. Even today she seems to think that, provided dollars are handed out in sufficient profusion, the march of history could be reversed and the old way of things restored in China.

You will look in vain in Pearl Buck's novels for any mention of imperialists. \* \* \*

And in her latest book, written at the height of the people's victorious liberation movement, Pearl Buck still clings to her false conceptions, and attempts, in spite of everything, to wall herself off from politics and ignore the changes in China. By doing such monstrous violence to realities, she courts—and achieves—utter failure. Her literary ability and craftsmanship are powerless to save her. Mrs. Buck's new novel sets the seal on her bankruptcy, as artist and as "expert on China" alike.

On November 28, 1952, the "Daily People's World" (p. 6M) carried an unsigned review of Miss Buck's "The Hidden Flower," which stated:

Miss Buck could have shown her characters putting up a real fight against prejudice, living happily together and bringing up their babies, as thousands of mixed couples do, even in the U. S. The assumption is such a happy ending might have landed her in trouble with the House un-American committee.

#### RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL

##### *Organization and affiliation*

##### *Source*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1). His Individual Statement on lifting the Spanish embargo appears in the organization's booklet. | Booklet, "These Americans Say,;" p. 4. |
| World Youth Congress (1). Sponsor.   | Daily Worker, Mar. 28, 1938, p. 3.     |

## KENNETH BURKE

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

- Committee of Professional Groups for Earl Browder and James W. Ford, Communist candidates for President and V-President (1). Member. Letterhead, dated Sept. 22, 1936; *Daily Worker*, Sept. 2, 1936.
- Committee for Israel Amter's candidacy for President, N. Y. City Board of Aldermen on Communist party ticket. Member. John Reed Club Writers School, N. Y. City (1) (3). Lecturer. *Daily Worker*, Oct. 21, 1936.
- Proposed national convention of American revolutionary writers, to be affiliated with International Union of Revolutionary writers "as was the John Reed Club." Signer of Call. Testimony, Walter S. Steele, August 1938, Public Hearings, Volume I, pp. 560-561. Same. *Daily Worker*, Jan. 18, 1935.

A Call was issued for a Congress of American revolutionary writers to be held in New York City, May 1, 1935, with the proposal—

that to this Congress shall be invited all writers who have achieved some standing in their respective fields; who have clearly indicated their sympathy to the revolutionary cause; who do not need to be convinced of the decay of capitalism, of the inevitability of revolution \* \* \* We believe such a Congress should create the League of American Writers, affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers.

This source named Kenneth Burke as one of those who "have already responded to this call".

- Congress of American Revolutionary Writers (1) (2) (3). Speaker at First, Second, and Third Congress; Signer of Call for Third Congress. *Daily Worker*, Apr. 29, 1935; *Daily Worker*, July 7 and 9, 1937; Program Direction, May-June, 1939; Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7685, 7686.
- New Masses (1) (2) (3). Contributor Reviewed Kenneth Fearing's "Dead Reckoning." New Masses, June 15, 1937, Oct. 5, 1937, Feb. 8, 1939, Feb. 21, 1939.
- Science and Society (1) (3). Contributing Editor. Science and Society, vol. VIII No. 2.
- The Worker Sunday edition of the *Daily Worker* (1) (3). Contributor. Issues of the Worker Dec. 21, 1931, Dec. 21, 1935.

The chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party \* \* \* founded in response to direct instructions from the Communist International in Moscow. \* \* \* No other paper or publication of any kind in all American history has ever been loaded with such a volume of subversive, seditious, and treasonable utterance as has this organ of the

American Communists. Special Committee, Report, March 29, 1944, pp. 59, 60; Reports, January 3, 1939, p. 30; January 3, 1940, p. 7; January 3, 1941, p. 14; and June 25, 1942, p. 4.

<p>American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) (2) (3). Sponsor.</p> <p>Book Union (2) (3). Member of Advisory Council.</p>	<p>Printed Program of 5th National Conference, Atlantic City, N.J., Mar. 29-30, 1941.</p> <p>Undated letterhead of Book Union, Inc.; Special Committee Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 96.</p>
---	--

#### EDWARD C. CARTER

A letterhead of the American Russian Institute, dated July 12, 1939, named Edward C. Carter as a member of the Board of Directors of that organization; an invitation to dinner issued by the American Russian Institute for October 19, 1944, and dedicated to American-Soviet Post-War Relations, named him as one of the sponsors and as a member of the organization's Board of Directors.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Russian Institute as Communist in letters released to the press April 27, 1949; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in Consolidated List of April 1, 1954.

A letterhead of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, dated October 27, 1942, contains the name of Edward C. Carter in a list of patrons of that congress, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

It was reported in the Daily Worker of March 17, 1938 (p. 2), that Edward C. Carter spoke at a meeting at Mecca Temple Auditorium on "The Soviet Union and Present World Affairs." His photograph appeared in the Daily Worker on November 8, 1941 (p. 5). He was identified in this source as Chairman of the Board, Russian War Relief, Inc., and was being presented with a \$5,000 check "to purchase four portable X-ray machines and accessories." The Daily Worker of June 28, 1945 (p. 4) reported that he had been invited to the U. S. S. R. on relief problems.

The New York Times of July 3, 1944 reported that Edward C. Carter, President, Russian War Relief, was invited to speak at an annual convention of the International Workers Order, Carnegie Hall, New York City.

The International Workers Order has been cited as "one of the most effective and closely knitted organizations among the Communist-'front' movements". It has also been cited as "one of the strongest Communist organizations." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944; and a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated June 26, 1949, respectively.) The Attorney General cited the International Workers Order as subversive and Communist and as "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954; and the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, p. 7688, respectively).

Edward C. Carter contributed to Soviet Russia Today, as shown in the May 1938 issue (page 10); he was named in the September 1941



issue (p. 16), as Chairman, Medical Aid to Russia; he issued a statement, published in Soviet Russia Today (September 1941, p. 29), in support of the U. S. S. R. Soviet Russia Today has been cited as a Communist-front publication (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports of June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944; and the Committee on Un-American Activities, report of October 23, 1949).

#### STUART CHASE

Stuart Chase signed a letter of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to the President as shown in the "Daily Worker" of February 7, 1938 (p. 4).

"In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations \* \* \* such as \* \* \* American Friends of Spanish Democracy." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, March 29, 1944, p. 82.)

The Communist "Daily Worker" of January 21, 1938 (p. 2) named Stuart Chase as a member of the Advisory Board of the organization known as Descendants of the American Revolution; he was listed in the February 13, 1939 issue of that newspaper (p. 2) as a member of that organization; and a pamphlet entitled "Descendants of the American Revolution" named him as one of its sponsors.

The Descendants of the American Revolution has been cited as a "Communist front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The Descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party. \* \* \* The educational director \* \* \* is one Howard Selsam, an instructor at the Communist Party's Workers School in New York." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report No. 2277, dated June 25, 1942, pp. 18 and 19.)

The Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "a Communist enterprise which was directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist, Ella Reeve Bloor. It received funds from the Garland Fund." (Report No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944, p. 76.) On a letterhead of the Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., dated March 20, 1926, Stuart Chase was listed as treasurer of the group.

He was a sponsor of two organizations which were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944: The Consumers National Federation (from a pamphlet entitled, "The People vs. H. C. L.", dated December 11-12, 1937); and the Public Use of Arts Committee (as shown on an undated letterhead of the group).

Stuart Chase was a member of the Reception Committee for the four Soviet flyers who flew the "Land of Soviets" from Moscow to New York in 1929; the reception was arranged under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union (see: pamphlet entitled, "Welcome, 'Land of Soviets'").

The "Daily Worker" of March 2, 1937 (p. 2) listed Stuart Chase as a member of the First American Delegation to the U. S. S. R. Stuart Chase's activities in Moscow as a member of the unofficial American labor delegation in 1927 are described in articles found in the "Daily

People's World," April 3, 1953 (p. 7M) and the March 22, 1953 issue of "The Worker" (p. 3). The March 8, 1937, issue of the "Daily Worker" listed Stuart Chase as one of those who signed a "Call" for the American Delegation to the U. S. S. R., sponsored by the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Friends of the Soviet Union has been cited as "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States" whose purpose "is to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government. \* \* \* (It) is a section of an international movement directed from Moscow." The Friends admit that they "Penetrate our industrial sections." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports of January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.) Friends of the Soviet Union was cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, June 1, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450.

During testimony of Benjamin Gitlow, former general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on September 11, 1939, the following reference was made to Stuart Chase:

Then the party, upon instructions of the Communist International, started the work of organizing what was to be known as an impartial delegation of American trade unionists, who were not Communists, who would visit Soviet Russia, travel over the country, investigate conditions, and submit an impartial, unbiased report to the American people on what were the actual conditions in Soviet Russia. And all this preliminary organization work and how to constitute the committee and how to organize it, was done by the Communist Party in the United States. And the money involved for expenses, that was first raised through the furriers' union by having them take \$500 out of their treasury, which was later supplied by Moscow, because the traveling expenses and all of the expenses involved in the organization of the delegation was paid by Moscow, and when its report was printed, the payment for printing the report also came from Moscow.

Following the above statement, the Honorable Joe Starnes requested Mr. Gitlow to supply names of the members who went on that trip. The name of Stuart Chase appeared on the list, identified as follows:

Director, Labor Bureau, Inc., and certified public accountant, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, author, Tragedy of Waste, etc. (See: Vol. 7, pp. 4699 and 4700, Public Hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.)

The name of Stuart Chase appears in a list of sponsors of a Dinner-Forum on "Europe Today," arranged under the auspices of the American Committee to Save Refugees, the Exiled Writers Committee of the League of American Writers, and the United American Spanish Aid Committee.

The American Committee to Save Refugees was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944.

The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "founded under Communist auspices in 1935" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686). The Special Committee on Un-American

Activities, in its reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944 cited the League of American Writers as a Communist front organization.

The United American Spanish Aid Committee was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released July 25, 1949. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 82 and 138), cited the United American Spanish Aid Committee as a Communist front organization.

According to an article which appeared in the "Daily Worker" of February 13, 1937 (p. 2), Stuart Chase was one of those who signed the cable which was sent to the President of Brazil by the Prestes Defense Committee, "defending Luiz Carlos Prestes, leading Brazilian Communist and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International." (Cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 112.)

Mr. Chase was shown in the October 1927 issue of "New Masses" (p. 3) as Contributing Editor of that publication; in the January 1928 issue (p. 5) he was listed as a contributor.

"Probably no one who is acquainted even superficially with the New Masses Magazine would deny that it is the weekly publication of the Communist Party." (Report No. 2277 of June 25, 1942, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.) The publication was cited several times in the Special Committee's report No. 1311 (pages 127, 139, 166, 75). The Attorney General cited the publication as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688).

Another Communist magazine to which Stuart Chase contributed was "The Liberator," cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 2277 of June 25, 1942. (See: "The Liberator," June 1918, p. 24; July 1922, p. 11; and August 1922, p. 23.)

Stuart Chase was the subject of an article by Ted Tinsley in the March 14, 1952 issue of the "Daily People's World" (Magazine Section, p. 2). The following is quoted from that article: "For a time Stuart Chase was left of center. Now he chases from centerfield to right, patting his glove and waiting to catch the next theory on the fly."

#### EVANS CLARK

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Conference on Pan American Democracy (1) (2). Sponsor.	Letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938; testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, p. 136.
Consumers National Federation (1). Sponsor.	"The People vs. H. C. L." a pamphlet, p. 2, Dec. 11-12, 1937.
Russian Soviet Government Bureau. Member of Staff.	"Revolutionary Radicalism," Part 1, Vol. 1, p. 655 (Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities—1920).

## HENRY STEELE COMMAGER

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

Committee of Welcome for the "Red" Dean of Canterbury, Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, D. D., 1948. Dean Johnson was originally invited to visit the U. S. by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, for a country-wide tour under its auspices. (1) (2) (3). Member.

Wrote article "Who is Loyal to America" for Harpers, September 1947, which was praised by Samuel Sillen in the Daily Worker of September 4, 1947, who said:

Mr. Commager \* \* \* writes in sharp warning and protest against the current "loyalty" agitation in which he sees the reversal of the American heritage. The article by this influential historian is one of the most important statements to appear in an American publication this year.

Wrote in New York Times Magazine, Sunday, November 1950, which was featured in an article in the Daily Worker of November 29, 1950, entitled "Leading Historian Warns: 'We Are Moving Away From Americanism.'" Following are excerpts:

In the nation's embarking on "imperialistic adventures" and its attack on freedom of expression and association we are moving from "Americanism toward un-Americanism," Henry Steele Commager, prominent Columbia University historian, declared Sunday in an article in the New York Times Magazine \* \* \* "Not only the McCarran Act, but a hundred state and local laws and ordinances testify to our readiness to penalize dissent and nonconformity," he wrote, erroneously attributing to the people the actions of the pro-fascist minority. Taking a crack at the Attorney General's list and the McCarran Act, he said "we are no longer willing to take our chances with voluntary organizations—those organizations which from the days of the Mayflower Compact to the present have furnished the real machinery of our democracy—but require that they be vacuum-cleaned in advance \* \* \*" He hit out at the persecution of progressive teachers and the idea that Communists not be allowed to teach by declaring that "we demand that they conform to a prearranged pattern." Closely connected with this attitude toward war and peace, he said, is the deeply ingrained tradition of supremacy of civil over military authority. That principle, he suggested, has gone by the boards, as witness support for MacArthur's "attempt to determine American policy toward Formosa and—by implication—toward China."

## AARON COPLAND

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

All Eisler Program, Town Hall, Release dated Feb. 28, 1948. February 28, 1948. Sponsor.

Aaron Copland signed a petition to the Attorney General in behalf of Hans Eisler, a Communist, according to the Daily Worker, December 17, 1947.

Signed a protest against a ban on a Communist speech, according to Daily Worker, October 23, 1936.

Signed a statement to President Roosevelt, defending the Communist Party, according to the Daily Worker, March 5, 1941.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom Attachment to letterhead of organization, dated Jan. 17, 1940. (2) (3). Signer of petition sponsored by organization.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>  |
|--|--|
| American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) (2) (3)<br>"one of the oldest auxiliaries of Communist Party in the United States." Sponsor, 5th Nat'l. Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., March 1941.                              | Program.   |
| N. Y. Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) (2) (3). Sponsor.   | Letterhead, Jan. 2, 1941.  |
| United Nations in America Dinner, sponsored by American Committee (1) (2) (3). Sponsor.  | Invitation to dinner, Apr. 17, 1943.   |
| American League Against War and Fascism (1) (2) (3) later again known as American League for Peace and Democracy (1) (2) (3). Judge of song contest under auspices of N. Y. City Division.   | New Masses, Nov. 16, 1937.   |
| Artists Front to Win the War (2) (3). Sponsor.   | Program, Oct. 16, 1942, Daily Worker, Oct. 7, 1942.                          |
| Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges (1) (2) (3). Committee member and/or sponsor.   | Letterhead, dated Sept. 11, 1941.  |
| Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford (1). Member.   | Letterhead, dated Sept. 22, 1936, Daily Worker, Sept. 2, 1936.               |
| Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1) (3). (Set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party.) Listed as representative Booklet individual in.  | "These Americans Say!"   |
| American Music Alliance of Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (1) (3). Entertained by Copland.   | Daily Worker, Mar. 26, 1938.   |
| Frontier Films (1) (3). Member of Advisory Board.  | Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1937.  |
| Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1) (2) (3). Sponsor of "The Century of the Common Man" dinner.   |  |
| National Committee for Peoples Rights (formerly known as the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners) (1) (2) (3) "substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party." Member. | Leaflet "News You Don't Get" dated Nov. 15, 1938. Letterhead, Oct. 31, 1935. |

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Sponsor.  | Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, Nov. 6-8, 1943; letter dated Mar. 13, 1946; memorandum issued by organization Mar. 18, 1946.<br>Daily Worker, June 21, 1948.  |
| Signer, statement calling for conference with Soviet Union, sponsored by NCA-SF.  |   |
| Signer of statement in praise of Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin, in May 1948.  | Pamphlet "How to End the Cold War and Build the Peace," issued by National Council.   |
| Signer, letter to Mayor of Stalingrad, released by National Council.  | Soviet Russia Today, June 1943.   |
| Musicians Committee of National Council. Vice Chairman.   | Report to members of NCA-SF by Director, Mar. 7, 1945.  |
| American-Soviet Cultural Conference, November 18, 1945 (1) (2) (3). Speaker.  | Testimony, Walter S. Steele, Public Hearings, July 21, 1947.  |
| National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Signer, letter in support of Henry A. Wallace.  | Daily Worker, Oct. 19, 1948.  |
| Speaker-----  | Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949.  |
| Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (1). Sponsor and speaker.  | Conference program, Daily Worker Feb. 21, 1949, Mar. 13, 1949.  |
| National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) (2) (3). Signer, appeal by NFCL for "immediate dismissal of charges against Sam Adams Darcy, Communist leader * * *" | Daily Worker, Dec. 19, 1940.  |
| Signer, Open Letter to President of U. S., urging reconsideration of order deporting Harry Bridges, sponsored by NFCL.  | Pamphlet, published by NFCL, "600 Prominent Americans Ask President to Rescind Biddle Decision"; Letter referred to fact it is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded." |
| New Masses Benefit (1) (2) (3). Entertainer.  | New Masses, Feb. 1, 1938.   |
| Non-Partisan Committee for Re-Election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio (1) (3). Member.   | Letterhead, dated Oct. 3, 1936.   |
| Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges (1). Signer.  | Daily Worker, July 19, 1942.  |

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

- Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Advertisement appearing in N. Y. Times, Dec. 22, 1943.  
 (1) (3). Signer of Declaration.  
 Schappes Defense Committee (1) Undated letterhead, and pamphlet "In the Case of Morris U. Schappes."  
 (2) (3). Sponsor.  
 "The First of May". Composed and written By Copeland. Testimony of Hans Eisler, Sept. 24, 25 and 26, 1947.

The dark epoch of fascism makes it clear to each honest artist that close cooperation with the working masses is the only way leading to creative art. Only in a revolutionary struggle will an artist find his own individuality. \* \* \* Similar developments can be observed in America where the recognized composer, Aaron Copeland, has composed a mass song "The First of May". \* \* \* Revolutionary music is now more powerful than ever. Its political and artistic importance is growing daily.

In an interview with Eisler appearing in the Evening Moscow June 27, 1935, he stated:

I am extremely pleased to report a considerable shift to the left among the American artistic intelligensia. I don't think it would be an exaggeration to state that the best people in the musical world of America (with very few exceptions) share at present extremely progressive ideas.

Their names? They are Aaron Copeland, \* \* \*

American Council on Soviet Relations. Signer, Statement to the President of the U. S. urging declaration of war on Finland.

#### GEORGE S. COUNTS

George S. Counts was a sponsor of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance, as shown on a list of members of the New York City Sponsoring Committee dated December 12, 1934. The National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance held January 5-7, 1935, in Washington, D. C., and headed by Herbert Benjamin, a leading Communist, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pp. 94 and 116).

A letterhead of the American League Against War and Fascism dated August 22, 1935, listed George S. Counts as a member of the National Executive Committee. The same information was shown in the "Daily Worker" of August 17, 1934, and on the "Call to the Second U. S. Congress Against War and Fascism, September 28, 29, and 30, 1934, Chicago, Illinois" (p. 2). The U. S. Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; it had been cited, previously, by the Attorney General as a Communist front (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26-28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for

Peace and Democracy. \* \* \* It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before." (Report 1311, March 29, 1944, p. 53; also cited in Reports, January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942.)

George S. Counts was a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners (letterhead, October 31, 1935) and a member of the National Committee for People's Rights (letterhead, July 13, 1938; "News You Don't Get," November 15, 1938).

The National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, "substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party," changed its name "in January 1938 to National Committee for People's Rights \* \* \* no substantial change was made in its set-up or functions." (U. S. Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686.) The National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948). Both the National Committee for the Defense \* \* \* and the National Committee for People's Rights were cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Reports of June 25, 1942 (pp. 20) and March 29, 1944 (p. 48 and 182). The National Committee for People's Rights was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as being among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Report 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3).

In a pamphlet entitled "The People vs. H. C. L.," of December 11-12, 1937 (p. 2). George Counts was shown as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311, March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

George S. Counts was one of those who signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo ("Daily Worker," April 8, 1938, p. 4); he was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Pan American Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated November 16, 1938. He was a sponsor of a Citizens' Rally held under the auspices of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, April 13, 1940 in New York City (leaflet, "Citizens Rally").

The American Friends of Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan American Democracy) has been cited as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 2277, June 25, 1942 and Report 1311, March 29, 1944). It has also been cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General (press releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission dated June 1 and September 21, 1948).

The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers



(Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Reports of June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944).

George S. Counts was a member of the Advisory Board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as shown on letterheads of the organization dated January 1940 and April 27, 1938 and on the "Call to the Third Annual Conference" of the group. He was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, according to a letterhead announcing the fourth Annual Conference which was held at the Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., March 2-3, 1940.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. It had previously been cited by the Special Committee in Report 2277 of June 25, 1942. The American Committee \* \* \* has been cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948).

A pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union" (back cover) shows that George S. Counts was a member of the Advisory Board of this organization, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee \* \* \* in Reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.

He was a member of the National Committee of the Student Congress Against War, according to a pamphlet issued by the organization, "Fight War" (p. 4):

During the Christmas holidays of 1932, the Student Congress Against War was convened at the University of Chicago. This gathering was held at the direct instigation of the (Amsterdam) World Congress Against War. The Chicago Congress was completely controlled by the Communists of the National Student League. \* \* \* The gathering ended its sessions by adopting the program of the (Amsterdam) World Congress Against War which, as has been pointed out, called for "the turning of imperialist war into civil war." For many years, the latter slogan represented one of the chief objectives of the Communist movement throughout the world. (Special Committee on Un-American activities, Report 1311, March 29, 1944, p. 119.)

George S. Counts was a sponsor of the New York Tom Mooney Committee, as shown on an undated letterhead of the Committee.

For many years, the Communist Party organized widespread agitation around the Mooney case, and drew its members and followers into the agitation (Report 1311, March 29, 1944, p. 154, Special Committee \* \* \*).

A booklet entitled "These Americans Say:" (p. 8) listed George S. Counts as a representative individual who advocated lifting the embargo against Spain; the booklet was published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, cited as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party (Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \* pp. 137 and 138).

George S. Counts, identified as the editor of "Social Frontier," endorsed the Reorganization Plan of Commonwealth College, as shown in "Fortnightly," August 15, 1937 (p. 3). Commonwealth College at Mena, Arkansas, was cited as Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press release of April 27, 1949). The Special Committee \* \* \* cited it as a "Communist enterprise" (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 76 and 167).

In Public Hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Walter S. Steele testified that Dr. George Counts was one of those who headed the American Russian Institute, New York, New York (Vol. I, p. 344). The American Russian Institute (New York) was cited as Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press release of April 27, 1949).

Dr. George S. Counts, identified as Associate Director of the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, was the chief speaker at the first membership mass meeting of the New York branch of the Friends of the Soviet Union held in New York City, April 11, 1930, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of April 8, 1930 (p. 1). He spoke on "Educational and Social Planning in the Soviet Union." In the same article it was reported that "Dr. Counts has just returned from a 6,000 mile trip through the Soviet Union. He was a member of the technical staff of the American trade union delegation that visited the U. S. S. R. in 1927."

The Friends of the Soviet Union, predecessor of the American Council on Soviet Relations, was cited as Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1, and September 21, 1948). The Special Committee \* \* \* cited the Friends of the Soviet Union as "one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States," whose purpose "is to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government." It "is a section of an international movement directed from Moscow." The Friends admit "they penetrate our industrial sections" (Report, January 3, 1939; also cited in Reports, January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In Public Hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, September 11, 1939, Benjamin Gitlow, former General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, submitted the names of the members of the American Trade Union Delegation to the Soviet Union in 1927. (See reference in first paragraph of this page.) Mr. Gitlow gave the following testimony concerning the delegation and listed "George S. Counts, Ph. D., professor of education, Teachers' College; director of International Institute of Education" as a member of the Technical and Advisory Staff of the delegation:

Mr. GITLOW. \* \* \* In order to win the trade unions' support of Soviet Russia, and particularly to mobilize them behind a campaign for recognition of Soviet Russia, the Communist International instructed the American party to organize a delegation of trade unionists who would be invited to visit the Soviet Union, travel, and see for themselves, and draw up a report. The report should be used for propaganda purposes among trade unionists, and the trade-union leaders, who would be brought to Moscow, an effort would be made to win them over for the campaign of recognition in support of the Soviet Union.

\* \* \* \* \*

Then the party, upon instructions of the Communist International, started the work of organizing what was to be known as an impartial delegation of American trade unionists, who were not Communists, who would visit Soviet Russia, travel over the country, investigate conditions, and submit an impartial, unbiased report to the American people on what were the actual conditions in Soviet Russia.

And all this preliminary organization work and how to constitute the committee and how to organize it, was done by the Communist Party in the United States. And the money involved for expenses, that was first raised through the furriers' union by having them take \$500 out of their treasury, which was later supplied by Moscow, because the traveling expenses and all of the expenses involved in the organization of this delegation was paid by Moscow, and when its

report was printed, the payment for printing the report also came from Moscow. But Moscow paid about five times what it cost to print the report, and the rest of the money went into the party treasury.

\* \* \* \* \*

Well, I can say that the delegation was split into three parts, and in 2 weeks' time they had to cover thousands of miles. Every place where they stopped they were met by a reception committee. They were given banquets. They were taken on sightseeing tours and they had no time to investigate actual conditions. They had what you call one wild party from the day they landed in Russia to the day they got out of Russia.

At the same time the technical staff surrounding the delegation, the staff of economists, so-called, and experts, who were supposed to advise the delegation on what they were seeing and to explain it to them—these people were all party people. And these were the people who actually wrote the report and when they wrote the report, their report first was O. K.'d by the Communist International and later on the American Communist Party again went over the report with a fine comb to see that nothing detrimental to Russia would slip into the report. \* \* \* (Public Hearings, Volume 7, pp. 4699-4701.)

On August 19, 1949, the Committee on Un-American Activities issued the "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace," in which the conference which was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a "gathering at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on March 25, 26 and 27, 1949," which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations." The same Review (p. 13) contains the following reference to Professor Counts:

In an open letter to the Conference signed by Prof. George S. Counts, of Teachers' College, Columbia University, and Sidney Hook, well-known philosopher, they pointed out the plight of culture under Soviet system represented by Fadayev and his associates. We quote the letter in part:

"Over the last three decades the Soviet dictatorship has mercilessly imprisoned, exiled, or executed distinguished men of letters in that country. These were not just ordinary individuals of mediocre attainment. They were men of stature renowned throughout the civilized world to those who know literature and poetry. "Not one of these men is to be found anywhere in the Soviet Union. They have disappeared without a trace. Some we know are dead. Some are perhaps dragging out their last days in a Siberian prison camp."

Addressing themselves to Dr. Harlow Shapley, the Conference chairmen, the writers asked:

"when the delegates from the Soviet Union appear at your Conference, to make inquiry of them as to what has happened to the purged artists, writers, and critics of the Soviet Union. What has happened to Kornilov, Kyrilov, Boris Pasternak, Babel, Ivan Katayev, Orlov and Pilnyak?"

The "Daily Worker" of January 6, 1953 (p. 5) published an editorial, "Dr. Counts is Afraid," which stated:

DR. GEORGE S. COUNTS, many of whose associates in the Liberal Party and the labor movement are demanding clemency for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, sought to dissipate the growing movement against the planned cold-war twin-murder with a red-baiting blast in yesterday's newspapers. Counts spoke for the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, a misnamed group sponsored by the U. S. State Department.

The Rosenbergs are guilty, announced Counts, because "the Daily Worker didn't even bother to inform its readers that the trial was taking place." Are we to believe that henceforth juries will adjudge guilt or innocence on the basis of the Daily Worker's news selection? However, the record will reveal that the Daily Worker did report the trial.

"This preeminent fact of guilt," Counts threatens, "must be openly acknowledged before any appeal for clemency can be regarded as having been made in good faith." Here Counts repeats the Justice Department's immoral invitation

to the Rosenbergs to become stool-pigeons. The Rosenbergs insist upon their right to proclaim their innocence. And those who have read the record of the case agree with them.

This gruesome effort of Counts to smother the Rosenberg clemency movement with a blanket of redbaiting indicates the extent and the power of that movement. \* \* \*

### MALCOLM COWLEY

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Communist Party Mass Meeting (New York District). Speaker.	Daily Worker, Apr. 7, 1933.
Call for support of Communist Party National Elections and its candidates, Foster and Ford. Signer of Call and later statement.	Daily Worker, Sept. 14, 1932; Daily Worker, Nov. 6, 1933.
Protest Against Attack on Right of Communist Party to Use Ballot. Signer, Open Letter to President.	Daily Worker, July 23, 1940.
League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford. Member.	Culture and Crisis, p. 32.
Mother Ella Reeve Bloor 45th Anniversary Banquet. Sponsor.	Program, Jan. 24, 1936.
Mother Bloor Celebration Committee, honoring 75th birthday in 1937. Ella Reeve Bloor was a well-known Communist leader. Sponsor.	Undated letterhead.
Committee for I. Amster's Candidacy. Amster was Communist Party candidate for president N. Y. City Board of Aldermen. Member.	Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1936; New Masses, Nov. 1938; Daily Worker, Nov. 3, 1936.
Letter upholding Simon W. Gerson, avowed Communist, as confidential assistant to Borough president of Manhattan (forced to resign in 1940) (3). Signer.	Daily Worker, Feb. 10, 1938.
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1) (3). Signer, petition attached to letterhead Jan. 17, 1940.	
American Committee for Struggle Against War (1) (3). Chairman.	"The Struggle Against War," June 1933.
American League Against War and Fascism (1) (2) (3). Member, national committee.	Call to the Second U. S. Congress against War and Fascism, Sept. 28, 29, and 30, 1934, Chicago. Letterhead, Aug. 22, 1935.
Member, National executive committee.	
Member, editorial committee of "Fight"—official publication of League.	"Fight", January 1934.
Contributor	December 1933, issue.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American League for Peace and Democracy (successor to American League Against War and Fascism) (1) (2) (3). Member of Advisory Board—N. Y. City Division.	Letterheads dated Sept. 22 and 26, 1938 and Mar. 21, 1939.
Endorsed 5th N. Y. City Conference.	Daily Worker, Mar. 4, 1939.
Writers and Artists Committee of American League (1) (2) (3). Member.	Letterhead of American League Apr. 6, 1939.
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1) (3). Member of General Committee.	New Masses, Jan. 5, 1937.
Medical Bureau. Sponsor. . . . Send-Off Dinner for Ambulance Corps (given by American Writers and Artists Committee). Sponsor.	New Masses, Mar. 16, 1937.
American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy (1). Member, Board of Directors.	New Masses, Jan. 26, Feb. 16, 1937.
North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1) (2) (3). Sponsor.	New Masses, Sept. 28, 1937.
American Relief Ship for Spain (1) (3). Sponsor.	Letterhead, Sept. 3, 1938.
Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (1) (3). Sponsor.	Pamphlet "Children in Concentration Camps."
Conference on Pan American Democracy (1) (2) (3). Signer of "Call." Sponsor.	"News You Don't Get", Nov. 15, 1938. Letterhead dated Nov. 16, 1938.
Defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, Brazilian Communist Leader, and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.	
Descendants of the American Revolution (1) (3). Member, Sponsor.	Daily Worker, Feb. 13, 1939. Pamphlet issued by organization.
Set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which has uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party * * *	Special Committee Report, June 25, 1942.
Friends of the Soviet Union Predecessor of American Council on Soviet Relations (1) (2) (3). Endorsed National Committee.	Soviet Russia Today, December 1933.
Frontier Films (1) (3). Member of Advisory Board.	Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1937.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union (1) (3). Signer.	Soviet Russia Today, November 1937.
Open Letter to American Liberals (1) (3). Signer.	Soviet Russia Today, March 1937.
International Labor Defense Prisoners' Relief Fund (1) (2) (2) (3). Member.	"Labor Defender", publication of I. L. D., July 1931.
Signer of petition to Japanese Ambassador issued by ILD.	Daily Worker, Mar. 19, 1938.
Sponsor of Christmas Drive-----	"Equal Justice," publication of ILD, November 1938.
Sponsor of Summer Milk Drive---	"Equal Justice," publication of ILD, June 1939.
<p>* Cited as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" by Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1943, p. 7686); redesignated by Attorney General April 1, 1954.</p>	
John Reed Clubs (1) (3). Member	Daily Worker, May 21, 1930.
National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners (1) (2) (3). Member.	Letterhead, dated Oct. 31, 1935.
Predecessor of National Committee for Peoples Rights (1) (2) (3). Member.	Letterhead, dated July 13, 1938 "News You Don't Get", Nov. 15, 1938.
National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance (1) (3). Signer of "Call"; Sponsor.	Unemployment Insurance Review, Volume 1 (1935) p. 3; Leaflet, "Call to a National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance," headed by Herbert Benjamin, leading Communist.
National People's Committee Against Hearst (1) (3). (Subsidiary of American League for Peace and Democracy). Member.	Letterhead, Mar. 16, 1937.
National Student League (1) (2) (3). Signer of Call for Support.	Daily Worker, Sept. 28, 1932.
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers (1). Signer of Call.	Daily Worker, Jan. 18, 1935.
League of American Writers (1) (2) (3). Member; Member of Executive Committee; Vice President.	Bulletin of League; Daily Worker, Apr. 30, 1935; Letterheads, dated Dec. 29, 1938 and July 7, 1939.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>  |
|--|--|
| American Writers' Congress Sponsored by League of American Writers (1) (2) (3). Addressed 1st Congress "What the Revolutionary Movement Can Give to The Writer."           | Daily Worker, Apr. 29, 1935.   |
| Elected delegate to International Congress of Writers in Madrid, June 20, 1937; speaker at American Writers' Congress, June 4-6, 1937; elected vice president.             | Daily Worker, June 8, 1937.  |
| Signed call of 3rd American Writers' Congress.   | Direction, May-June 1939.  |
| Chairman of arrangements 3rd American Writers' Congress.   | Program.   |
| Speaker at general delegates session of that congress.   | Program, 3rd American Writers' Congress.   |
| Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party was a speaker at the second biennial American Writers Congress in 1937, sponsored by the League of American Writers |  |
| Book Union (1) (3). Member, editorial Board.   | Book Union Bulletin, August 1938.  |
| International Publishers—Anniversary Reception of (1) (2) (3). Attended dinner:  |  |
| Daily Worker (1) (2) (3). Contributor.   | Issues of Apr. 6, 1933; Sept. 30, 1933; Nov. 6, 1933; Dec. 21, 1935. Photograph in issue of Sept. 21, 1934. Reported as a witness for Alger Hiss issue of June 24, 1949. |
| Soviet Russia Today (1) (3). Member, editorial Board.  | Issues of December 1938, January 1939.   |
| Contributing editor-----   | June 28, 1932.   |
| Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (1) (2) (3). Signer, protest to President and Attorney General against attacks against Abraham Lincoln Brigade.                    | Daily Worker, Feb. 21, 1940.   |
| Defense of Hans Eisler. Communicated with State Department in behalf of Eisler.  | Testimony of George S. Messersmith (Hearings Regarding Hans Eisler, pp. 127-129).  |

Reference to Malcolm Cowley in "International Literature," published by State Publishing House, Moscow, Russia, official organ of International Union of Revolutionary Writers:

Two gatherings held in one evening in New York City were a clear indication of the radicalization of the American Intellectuals as a whole. About 2,000 professionals, artists, writers, and scientists gathered as a public demonstration of the support of the American intellectuals to the Communist candidates in the recent election. \* \* \*

Malcom Cowley, literary editor of the New Republic, explained his reasons for acceptance of a revolutionary position: "It wasn't the depression that got me," Cowley said. "It was the boom; I saw my friends writing tripe demanded by the present order, stultified and corrupted and unable to make real use of their talents. After that I had to discover the reason for this state of affairs which comes from the very nature of the ruling class that lives by exploiting everyone else."

*Organization and affiliation*

*Source*

New Republic. Editor----- Report of House Un-American  
Activities Committee, No. 2277,  
June 25, 1942; No. 2748, Jan.  
2, 1943.

Our investigation has shown that a steady barrage against Congress comes \* \* \* from the New Republic, one of whose editors, Malcolm Cowley, was recently forced out of an \$8,000 Government job by the exposure of his Communist activities \* \* \*

Parenthetically, it may be said that Malcolm Cowley, one of the editors of the New Republic, published a volume of poetry in February of this year in which volume he described enthusiastically the capture of the Capitol in Washington by a revolutionary mob.

On January 15, 1942, the chairman of the committee, in a speech on the floor of the House, called attention to the presence in the Office of Facts and Figures, of one Malcolm Cowley, chief information analyst, at a salary of \$8,000 per annum. The chairman inserted in his speech the record of Malcolm Cowley which showed 72 affiliations with the Communist Party and its front organizations. Several weeks later, Mr. Cowley resigned his position with the Federal Government.

## LAUHLIN CURRIE

On August 13, 1948, Lauchlin Currie appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities at his request to answer false statements and misleading suggestions which had been made concerning him in prior testimony before this committee. His name was first brought into the picture in testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, July 31, 1948 (p. 519), as follows:

Mr. STRIPLING. \* \* \* Are there any other names, Miss Bentley, of the Silvermaster group that you have not mentioned?

Miss BENTLEY. Just one. The man was not a Communist but he did give information. Lauchlin Currie.

Mr. STRIPLING. What type of information did he give?

Miss BENTLEY. Well, being in the position he was in, he had inside information on Government policy.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was he a secretary to the President of the United States?

Miss BENTLEY. I believe that was his title. I am not sure. \* \* \*

Mr. STRIPLING. He was employed in the White House, was he not?

Miss BENTLEY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. What information did he furnish? What type?

Miss BENTLEY. He furnished inside information on this Government's attitude toward China, toward other governments. He once relayed to us the information that the American Government was on the verge of breaking the Soviet code, various things.



Lauchlin Currie's testimony (mentioned above) is quoted, in part, as follows:

Mr. CURRIE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Lauchlin Currie; I reside at 165 Gaylor Road, Scarsdale, N. Y.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 First, some facts concerning my background and history. I was born in 1902 in Nova Scotia, Canada. My father, a Canadian citizen, was of Scottish descent. My mother, nee Alice Eisenhower, also a Canadian citizen, is of German descent. In 1911 and again in 1918 my family spent the year in the United States where I attended school. I took my undergraduate university work at London University and then came to Harvard in 1925 where I did my graduate work and received my Ph. D. and remained as a teacher of economics. Shortly after coming to Harvard I took out my first papers applying for United States citizenship. My naturalization was completed in 1934. While at Harvard I was offered a position in the Treasury Department. In 1934 I accepted it and came to Washington, where I worked under Mr. Marriner Eccles until he was made Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board later in that year. I went with him to the Board as assistant director of research.

In 1939 I was appointed by President Roosevelt as Administrative Assistant to the President with special duties in the field of economics. I retained that position until 1945, during which time I was sent twice to China to confer with Generalissimo Chiang-Kai-shek. During part of this period, in 1943-44, I concurrently held the office of Deputy Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. In early 1945, on behalf of the Secretary of State, I headed a wartime trade and financial mission to Switzerland.

In 1945 I resigned from Government service to enter private business and I am now president of Lauchlin Currie & Co., engaged in the export-import business, with offices at 565 Fifth Avenue, New York.

My name has been brought into the proceedings before this committee through the testimony of Miss Elizabeth Bentley and Mr. N. Gregory Silvermaster. Miss Bentley admitted to you that she had never met me and had never seen me and had never had any communication with me. The statements made by her about me were, as noted by Congressman Rankin, heresay three times removed. I, on my part, wish to assert unequivocally that I never met, saw, nor had any communication with Miss Bentley. The first time I ever heard her name was when I learned of the testimony which she gave the committee.

I understand that there is no accusation that I am or ever have been a Communist. Nevertheless, I welcome this opportunity to state again under oath, as I did before the Federal grand jury, convened in the Eastern District of New York to investigate the charges similar to those before this committee, that I am not and never have been a Communist, a member of the Communist Party, a believer in the tenets or doctrines of communism and that I have never been affiliated with any organization or group sympathetic with the doctrines of communism or engaged in furthering that cause. I have never had any reason to believe that any friends of mine or even acquaintances or associates were Communists. (Public Hearings, pages 852-853.)

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

In the dissenting opinion of J. Edgerton in the "Decision of the U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in re Edward Barsky et al., appellants v. United States of America, appellee" (March 18, 1948, p. 15), the following footnote appears:

Professor Cushman says: "The opprobrious epithet 'un-American' was applied to all those who indulged in any open criticism of our existing institutions, our so-called American way of life, or of Mr. Dies. \* \* \* Good loyal American citizens who ought to know better were persuaded to give their support to the suppression of free speech and free press on the grotesque theory that they were thereby showing their loyalty to the basic principles of American democracy. Bigotry was made not merely respectable but noble. By the skillful use of labels, or slogans, American public opinion was inoculated with the dangerous idea that true Americanism consists in the stalwart defense of the status quo and the suppression of those dangerous and disloyal people who are unpatriotic enough to want to criticize it or suggest any change in it."

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| League of Workers Theaters of the United States Workers' Theater was official, later name changed to The New Theatre (1) (3). Contributing Editor.                           | Issues of January, 1934, May and October 1934 of "New Theatre." |
| New Theatre League. Sponsor, Reunion Dance Apr. 18, 1941.  | Leaflet "Meet the People of the Progressive Theatre."           |
| Moscow University Summer School. Advisory Committee.   | Testimony of Walter S. Steele, Public Hearings, Aug. 17, 1938.  |
| Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, Mar. 25-27, 1949, under auspices of National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (1). Sponsor. | Conference "Call" and Program; Daily Worker Feb. 21, 1949.      |
| Daily Worker (1) (2) (3)-----  | Photograph appeared Dec. 23, 1940.                              |

#### VERA MICHELES DEAN

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union (1). Signer.  | "Soviet Russia Today," November 1937, p. 79.  |
| National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2). Books by Mrs. Dean listed as source material in the Bibliography on the Soviet Union issued by the Committee on Education of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.   | Testimony of Walter S. Steele, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, p. 63.     |
| "The United States and Russia" by Vera Dean reviewed.  | "New Masses," Dec. 23, 1947, p. 19.   |
| Named as author of a favorable survey on Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Poland.  | "Daily Worker," May 3, 1948, p. 8.  |
| Participated in International Assembly of Women held at Kortright, New York, October 21, 1946 " * * * apparently arranged at the initiative of a group of well-known American non-Communist women. The Russians were invited to send a delegation but gave no answer. * * * Fifty-six nations were represented by 150 foreign delegates and fifty Americans. Following the traditional 'boring from within' tactics, foreign Communist women delegates participated, as well as outstanding pro-Soviet Americans." | Committee on Un-American Activities, Report of the Congress of American Women, Oct. 23, 1949. |

## AGNES DEMILLE

(1) indicates that the organization and/or publication has been officially cited by the Special Committee and/or the Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) indicates that it has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2). Chairman, Dance Committee.	Report of the Director to Members of National Council * * * Also Walter S. Steele's testimony before this committee July 21, 1947, p. 66.
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1) and (2). National Sponsor, Spanish Refugee Appeal of the JAFRC. Name shown in these four sources as Agnes George DeMille.	Letterhead of February 26, 1946; letterhead of Feb. 3, 1948; letterhead of Apr. 28, 1949; and letterhead of May 18, 1951.
Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Initiating sponsor.	Letterhead of Nov. 26, 1946.
Artists' Front to Win the War (1). Sponsor.	Program of the Artists' Front * * *, Oct. 16, 1942, p. 4.

## RABBI DAVID DE SOLA POOL

(1) Cited by Special and/or Com. on Un-American Activities; (2) Cited by Attorney General of the United States.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2). Sponsor, National Conference in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25-26, 1947. Name shown in source as Rev. David de Sola Pool.	Program and call for the conference.
Sponsor.....	Letterhead of Dec. 11-12, 1948.
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1) and (2). National Sponsor.	Letterhead of Apr. 28, 1949.
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (1). Panel speaker at conference February 12, 1940.	Program of the conference.
American Committee for Yugoslav Relief (1) and (2). Member, Sponsors Committee.	Photostat of letterhead dated Aug. 6, 1945.
Endorsed appeal.....	Daily Worker, Apr. 26, 1947, p. 2.
Signed statement against the Hobbs Bill.	Daily Worker, Jan. 30, 1950, p. 4.
Signed statement to President Truman against "police state bill" (McCarran Act). Economist.	Daily Worker, Sept. 21, 1950, pp. 1 and 9.

## BERNARD DeVOTO

Joseph North wrote in the Daily Worker of December 29, 1949 (page 7), that "DeVoto has written some millions of words in his time, but few had more point than those of his in Harper's recently which drew instant fire from J. Edgar Hoover. As a nation, DeVoto said, 'we are dividing into the hunted and the hunters.' 'We know,' he continued, 'that the thing stinks to heaven and that it is an avalanching danger to our society.'" Mr. North further quoted Mr. DeVoto as having concluded the FBI "has invaded areas of thought and behavior which are entirely improper for it to enquire into" and "holds ideas about what constitutes dangerous or subversive activity that are unacceptable to our form of government."

## DR. W. E. B. DuBois

The Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist publication, the Daily Worker) on April 27, 1947 reported that—

almost 100 Negro leaders, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson and Poscoe Dunjee, last week called upon President Truman "to repudiate decisively" steps to "illegalize the Communist Party." \* \* \* "As Negro Americans \* \* \* we cannot be unmindful that this proposal to outlaw the Communist Party comes precisely when our Federal government professes grave concern over the democratic rights of peoples in far distant parts of the world." \* \* \* (page 8 of The Worker).

Dr. DuBois sponsored a statement attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders (Daily Worker, August 23, 1948, page 3); he sponsored a "Statement by Negro Americans" on behalf of the Communist leaders (The Worker of August 29, 1948, page 11); he filed a brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of the twelve Communist leaders (Daily Worker, January 9, 1949, page 3); he signed statements on behalf of Communist leaders, as shown in the following sources: Daily Worker, January 17, 1949 (page 3); February 28, 1949 (page 9); Daily People's World, May 12, 1950 (page 12); Daily Worker September 19, 1950 (page 2); and in 1952, he signed an appeal to President Truman, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, page 4). Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the Twelve Communist leaders, as shown on the back of their letterhead dated September 9, 1949.

A statement on behalf of Eugene Dennis, a Communist, contained the signature of Dr. DuBois, identified as an educator (Daily Worker of May 5, 1950, p. 2); he signed a telegram of the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims, greeting Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday (Daily Worker, August 11, 1952, p. 3); Eugene Dennis was formerly Secretary General of the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker of August 2, 1949 (p. 2), disclosed that Dr. DuBois endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., well-known Communist leader; he was Honorary Chairman of the Committee to Defend V. J. Jerome, Chairman, Cultural Commission of the Communist Party, U. S. A. (letterhead dated June 24, 1952). A leaflet of the Civil Rights Congress (dated March 20, 1947) named Dr. DuBois as having defended Gerhart Eisler, Communist. He was one of the sponsors of the Committee to Defend Alexander Tractenberg, former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party (Daily

People's World of April 17, 1952, p. 7; and the Daily Worker of April 18, 1952, p. 6).

The Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (page 16), reported that some—

eighty leading New York civic leaders, trade unionists and professionals yesterday joined Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, president emeritus of the Citizens Union, to demand the prompt seating of Simon W. Gerson to the City Council seat made vacant by the death of Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Brooklyn Communist \* \* \* The civic leaders' statement is directed to Mayor O'Dwyer and City Council majority leader Joseph T. Sharkey. It is a reprint of a letter to the New York Times by Dr. Schieffelin in which he charges that the real reason for the refusal to seat Gorman (sic. Gerson) is "the current anti-Communist hysteria." \* \* \*

Dr. DuBois was named as having signed the statement. (See also advertisement in New York Times of February 19, 1948, page 13.)

Dr. DuBois was a member of a committee formed to protest the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Communist Chilean Senator and world famous poet; he signed a statement of the organization in support of Neruda. (Daily Worker of April 7, 1948, p. 13, and April 10, 1950, p. 2, respectively.) He was sponsor of a reception and testimonial for Harry Sacher, defense attorney for the Communist leaders (Daily Worker of December 5, 1949, p. 2).

When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (Special Committee \* \* \* in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General of the United States had cited the Citizens' Committee as Communist (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687, and press release of April 27, 1949). Dr. DuBois was a member of the Citizens' Committee \* \* \* in 1942, as shown on their letterhead dated February 11, 1942; he sponsored a dinner of the group, according to the Daily Worker of February 5, 1942, and signed the call to the National Free Browder Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942, pages 1 and 4.

A 1950 letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born carries the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors of that organization; the same information appears on an undated letterhead of the group, distributing a speech of Abner Green at the Conference of December 2-3, 1950; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born dated April 30, 1951, names him as a National Sponsor of the organization. He signed the group's statement opposing the Hobbs Bill (Daily Worker, July 25, 1950, page 4); he signed their statement opposing denaturalization (Daily Worker of August 10, 1950, p. 5); and signed a telegram prepared and dispatched by the organization to the Attorney General of the United States, protesting holding nine non-citizens without bail under the McCarran Act (Daily Worker of November 24, 1952, page 3).

The Special Committee cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1

and September 21, 1948, and it was redesignated on April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control (Special Committee's Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Dr. DuBois spoke at a state conference of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of December 12, 1950, page 5); he spoke at a dinner, April 18th, opening the presidential campaign in New York City (Daily Worker of April 14, 1952, page 8, an advertisement; and the Daily Worker of April 21, 1952, page 1); he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, May 13th, held under the auspices of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of May 8, 1952, page 8, an advertisement; and May 14, 1952, page 1); and he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, October 27th (Daily Worker of October 22, 1952, page 8, an advertisement; and October 29, 1952, page 2).

The Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (page 7), named Dr. DuBois as a member of the Executive Board and of the Policy Committee, Council on African Affairs; he signed the Council's petition to the United Nations as shown in the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (page 4); and drafted their statement against the policy of the United States in Korea (Daily Worker of July 25, 1950, page 3); the Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948) and redesignated it on April 27, 1953 pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The Attorney General cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" (press release of December 4, 1947); the Special Committee reported that "at the beginning of the present year, the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science" (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944). Dr. DuBois was honored at the Jefferson School, as shown in the Daily Worker on February 1, 1951 (page 2); it was announced in the Daily Worker on January 2, 1952 (page 7), that Dr. DuBois was scheduled to conduct a seminar on "Background of African Liberation Struggles" at the Jefferson School; the January 26, 1952 issue of the same publication (page 7), named him as a faculty member of that school.

In a report of the Special Committee, dated March 29, 1944, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as having been, in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian (report dated March 29, 1944); Dr. DuBois signed a statement of the National Council in 1947 (Daily Worker, October 17, 1947, page 4); he signed the organization's statement protesting the Iron Curtain, as reported in the Daily People's World on May 20, 1948 (page 5); he signed a statement of the Council, praising Henry Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin in May 1948 (from a pamphlet entitled "How to End the Cold War and Build the Peace," page 9); he signed their statement calling for a conference with the Soviet Union (Daily Worker, June 21, 1948, page 3); he signed their Roll Call for Peace (Daily Worker of August 31, 1948, page 5); he sent greetings through the National Council on the Thirty-First Anniversary of the

Russian Revolution (Daily Worker, November 10, 1948, page 11); he signed the Council's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace," dated December 1948); he spoke at the Congress on American-Soviet Relations, December 3-5, 1949, arranged by the National Council \* \* \* and signed the Council's letter to the American people, urging that a unified democratic Germany be established (Daily People's World, August 13, 1952, pages 4 and 6).

A letterhead of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated August 21, 1949, lists the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois as having signed an Open Letter of the organization, addressed to Senators and Congressmen, urging defeat of President Truman's arms program; he answered a questionnaire of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in favor of recognition of the Chinese Communist government, as shown in Far East Spotlight for December 1949-January 1950 (page 23).

The Conference for Peaceful Alternatives \* \* \* was cited as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D. C., and as having been instigated by "Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 378 on the Communist "Peace" Offensive dated April 1, 1951). The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949).

A page of signatures from the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, "sponsored by American Friends of the Soviet Union, and signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans", was published in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (page 79); the Golden Book was to be presented to President Kalinin at the Twentieth Anniversary Celebration. The page carried the title: "I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th Anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic" and a facsimile of the name, W. E. B. DuBois, appeared on that page.

The Golden Book \* \* \* was cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by "hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of the New York Committee to Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, contains the name of W. E. B. DuBois in a list of New York Committee Members. The National Committee to Win the Peace, with which the New York Committee is affiliated, was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948) and it was redesignated on April 27, 1953 pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

Dr. DuBois sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as disclosed by the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948 (page 2); he signed a statement of the same organization, condemning the Greek government, as reported in the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948 (page 7). The American Council for a Democratic Greece has been cited as subversive and Communist, an organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (U. S. Attorney General in press releases of June 1 and September 21,

1948). The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General on April 27, 1953 pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

Dr. DuBois was a sponsor of a conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, October 9-10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled "To Safeguard These Rights \* \* \*," published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council; a letterhead of the National Council (received for files January 1949) named him as a Member-at-Large of that organization; he was named as Vice Chairman of the group on the leaflet, "Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950"; a letterhead of the same organization's Southern California Chapter, dated April 24, 1950, lists him as a Member-at-Large of the National Council; he was elected vice-Chairman of the group in 1950 (Daily Worker, May 1, 1950, page 12); a letterhead of the group dated July 28, 1950 named him as a vice-Chairman of the group; he endorsed a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts, sciences and professions, sponsored by the New York Council of the Arts, \* \* \* (Daily Worker, November 9, 1951, page 7); the call to the conference contained the same information. A letterhead of the National Council, dated December 7, 1952, named him as Vice-Chairman.

The call to a Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions for New York City, March 25-27, 1949, as well as the conference program (page 12), and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (page 9), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of that conference; he was a member of the Program Committee of the Conference, Honorary Chairman of the panel at Cultural and Scientific Conference (program, page 7), and spoke on "The Nature of Intellectual Freedom" at that conference (page 78 of the edited report of the conference entitled "Speaking for Peace.")

The National Council of the Arts, \* \* \* was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

The Daily People's World of October 28, 1947 (page 4), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of a National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21-23, 1947; he sponsored their Freedom Crusade (Daily Worker, December 15, 1948, page 2); the Call to a Bill of Rights Conference, called by the Civil Rights Congress for July 16-17, 1949 in New York City, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference; the program of the National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, January 18-19, 1949, called by the Civil Rights Congress, lists him as one of the conference sponsors; he was chairman of a conference of the Congress, as reported in The Worker of January 2, 1949 (page 5); Dr. DuBois was defended by the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, February 13, 1951, page 3); he signed the organization's Open Letter to J. Howard McGrath, U. S. Attorney General, on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement "paid for by contributions of signers" which appeared in the Evening Star on October 30, 1951, page A-7); he participated in the organiza-



tion's Sixth Anniversary Dinner in New York City, March 26, 1952 (Daily Worker, March 28, 1952, page 4).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the Congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948) and it was redesignated on April 27, 1953 pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

Dr. DuBois spoke in Washington, D. C., on May 9, 1947, under the auspices of the Washington Book Shop, as shown by a leaflet of the Book Shop, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General; it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as follows: "Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations \* \* \*" (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; and the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, page 7688, respectively). The Special Committee cited the Washington Book Shop as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Workers Book Shop catalogue for 1948 (page 5), advertised Dr. DuBois' "The World and Africa" for sale; the 1949-1950 catalogue (page 11) advertised his "Black Folk Then and Now"; The Worker for March 1, 1953 (page 16) carried an advertisement of Dr. DuBois' books, "The Battle for Peace" and "Black Reconstruction" on sale at the Workers Bookshop, New York City. The Workers Bookshops are a chain of Communist bookshops which are official outlets for Communist literature.

As shown on the following sources, Dr. Dubois was a member of the Advisory Council of Soviet Russia Today: Letterhead of the publication dated September 8, 1947; a letterhead of September 30, 1947; and an undated letterhead received April 1948. The Daily People's World of November 6, 1952 (page 7), reported that Dr. DuBois had written an article for the November issue of New World Review. Soviet Russia Today has been cited as a Communist-front publication by the Special Committee in reports of March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942; the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited it as a Communist-front publication in a report dated October 23, 1949. Soviet Russia Today changed its name to New World Review, effective with the March 1951 issue.

The Daily Worker of July 6, 1951 (page 7), reported that Dr. DuBois was author of the pamphlet, "I Take My Stand for Peace," published by the New Century Publishers, "official Communist Party publishing house which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively \* \* \*" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of May 11, 1948).

In 1947, 1948 and 1950, Dr. DuBois was Contributing Editor on the staff of New Masses magazine (New Masses, July 22, 1947,

page 2; *Masses & Mainstream*, March 1948, Vol. 1, No. 1; and issue of August 1950, page 1); he contributed articles to the following issues of *New Masses* and *Masses & Mainstream*: *New Masses* for September 10, 1946 (page 3) and June 10, 1947 (page 20); *Masses & Mainstream* for April 1951 (pages 10-16); and February 1952 (pages 8-14).

In 1940, Dr. DuBois signed *New Masses* Letter to President Roosevelt as shown in *New Masses* for April 2, 1940 (page 21); he was honored at a dinner in New York City, January 14, 1946, arranged by *New Masses* and at which awards were made for greater inter-racial understanding (*Daily Worker* of January 7, 1946, page 11, columns 1 and 2); he endorsed *New Masses*, as reported in the *Daily Worker* of April 7, 1947 (page 11); he sponsored a plea for financial support of *New Masses*, as disclosed in the issue of that publication for April 8, 1947 (page 9); he received the *New Masses* award for his contribution in promoting democracy and inter-racial unity at the publication's Second Annual Awards Dinner (*New Masses & Mainstream* carried a chapter from Dr. DuBois' book, "The Soul of Black Folk," written fifty years ago (*Daily Worker*, February 23, 1953, page 7); he was author of "In Battle for Peace," described as the story of his 83d birthday, and which was published by *Masses & Mainstream* (*The Daily Worker* of June 18, 1952, page 7; *Daily People's World* of September 17, 1952, page 7; the *Daily Worker* of September 23, 1952, page 7; and *The Worker* of December 21, 1952, page 7).

The Attorney General of the United States cited *New Masses* as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, page 7688); the Special Committee cited it as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942). Beginning with the March 1948 issue, *New Masses* and *Mainstream* (Marxist quarterly) consolidated into what is now known as *Masses & Mainstream*, with the announcement that "here, proudly, in purpose even if not in identical form, is a magazine that combines and carries forward the thirty-seven-year-old tradition of *New Masses* and the more recent literary achievement of *Mainstream*. We have regrouped our energies, not to retire from the battle but to wage it with fresh resolution and confidence" (*Masses & Mainstream* for March 1948, page 3).

A letterhead of the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, dated March 15, 1952, carries the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors; he joined in a request of that Committee for a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg (*Daily Worker* of June 12, 1952, page 6); he participated in a rally October 23 in New York City, to demand clemency for the Rosenbergs (*Daily Worker*, October 27, 1952, page 8); he signed an amicus curiae brief presented to the Supreme Court in Washington, D. C., urging a new trial for the Rosenbergs (*Daily Worker* of November 10, 1952, page 3); and the *Daily People's World* of November 13, 1952, page 8). He wrote an article entitled "A Negro Leader's Plea to Save Rosenbergs" (*The Worker* of November 16, 1952, page 3M); and the *Daily Worker* of January 21, 1953 (page 7), reported that he had urged clemency for the Rosenbergs.

The Daily Worker of April 11, 1949 (page 5), reported that Dr. DuBois was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the World Peace Congress in Paris; he was co-Chairman of the American Sponsoring Committee of the Congress, as disclosed on a leaflet entitled "World Congress for Peace, Paris," April 20-23, 1949; he was proposed as a candidate for the World Peace Prize, awarded by the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of December 7, 1951, page 4); he was a member of the Executive Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of September 14, 1950, page 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Second World Peace Congress in Sheffield, England (Daily Worker of October 19, 1950, page 3); he was elected to the Presiding Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of November 17, 1950, page 1); he was a member of the World Peace Council of that Congress (Daily Worker of November 24, 1950, page 9); a mimeographed letter dated December 1, 1950, contains his name in a list of sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress.

Dr. DuBois was a member of the United States Sponsoring Committee of the American Intercontinental Peace Conference (Daily Worker of December 28, 1951, page 2, and February 6, 1952, page 2); the Peace Conference was called by the World Peace Council, formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw; he was awarded the International Peace Prize for "six world figures" by the World Peace Council (Daily People's World of January 29, 1953, page 7; and The Worker of February 8, 1953, page 5).

The Daily Worker of June 20, 1950 (page 2), reported that Dr. DuBois signed the World Peace Appeal; the same information appears on an undated leaflet of the enterprise, received by this Committee September 11, 1950. A mimeographed list of individuals who signed the Stockholm World Appeal to Outlaw Atomic Weapons, received for filing October 23, 1950, contains the name of Dr. DuBois. He was Chairman of the Peace Information Center where the Stockholm peace petition was made available (Daily Worker of May 25, 1950, page 2; and August 16, 1950, page 5).

The World Peace Congress which was held in Paris, France, April 20-23, 1949, was cited as a Communist front among the "peace" conferences which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact" (Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of April 19, 1949; July 13, 1950; and April 1, 1951). The World Peace Council was formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw and was "heralded by the Moscow radio as the expression of the determination of the peoples to take into their own hands the struggle for peace" (Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 1, 1951).

The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950; it "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy" and was "lauded in the Communist press, putting every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal' \* \* \*" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 1, 1951).

The American Peace Crusade, organized in January 1951, was cited as an organization which "the Communists established as a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" (Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of February 19, 1951 and April 1, 1951); Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the Crusade (Daily Worker of February 1, 1951, page 2); minutes of the Sponsors Meeting which was held in Washington, D. C., March 15, 1951 (page 4), named him as one of the initiators of the Crusade and also as having been proposed as Co-Chairman of that meeting; he was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace which was held in Chicago, June 29-July 1, 1951, called by the American Peace Crusade to advance the theme of world peace (Daily Worker, April 22, 1951, page 2; May 1, 1951, page 11; the American Peace Crusader, May 1951, pages 1 and 4; the Daily Worker of May 9, 1951, page 4; Daily Worker of June 11, 1951, page 2; a leaflet of the Congress; Daily Worker of July 1, 1951, page 3; a leaflet entitled "An Invitation to American Labor to Participate in a Peace Congress \* \* \*"; the Call to the American People's Congress \* \* \*"; the Daily Worker of July 3, 1951, page 2). He signed a petition of the Crusade, calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power pact (Daily Worker, February 1, 1952, page 1); he attended a meeting of Delegates Assembly for Peace, called by the Crusade and held in Washington, D. C., April 1 (Daily Worker, April 3, 1952, page 3); he was one of the sponsors of a Peace Referendum jointly with the American Peace Crusade to make the end of the Korean war a major issue in the 1952 election campaign (Daily People's World of August 25, 1952, page 8).

Dr. DuBois issued a statement on the death of Stalin which read in part as follows: "Let all Negroes, Jews and foreign-born who have suffered in America from prejudice and intolerance, remember Joseph Stalin" (Daily Worker of March 9, 1953, page 3); the Daily Worker of January 18, 1952 (page 8), reported that he had renewed his fight for a passport in order to attend the American Intercontinental Peace Conference in Rio de Janeiro; it was reported in the Washington Evening Star on May 10, 1952 (page B-21), that Dr. DuBois was refused admission to Canada to attend the Canadian Peace Congress because he refused to undergo an examination by the Canadian Immigration service. On September 14, 1952, the Worker (page M6), reported that Dr. DuBois had experienced passport difficulties when leaving the United States.

#### IRWIN EDMAN

Irwin Edman, educator, was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions and held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949. (See: Conference "Call"; Conference Program, p. 12; and Daily Worker, February 21, 1949, p. 2.)

The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities described the Scientific and Cultural Conference as "actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations". (Review of Scientific and Cultural Conference, dated April 19, 1949, p. 1.) The National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization in the Committee's report, page 2.

The "Daily Worker", January 18, 1939, page 7, named Irwin Edman as a Committee Sponsor of the League of American Writers. The U. S. Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as subversive and Communist in his letters to the Loyalty Review Board (released June 1, 1948 and September 21, 1948, also included in the Consolidated list of April 1, 1954). It was cited as a "Communist front" by the Special Committee \* \* \* (Reports of Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 19; March 29, 1944, p. 48.) "The League of American Writers, founded under Communist auspices in 1935 \* \* \* in 1939 \* \* \* began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union \* \* \*. The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control". (The U. S. Attorney General, Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686.)

The booklet, "These Americans Say:" (p. 8) named Irwin Edman as a representative individual of the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Spanish Embargo as "One of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation". (Report, March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138).

Irwin Edman was a member of the Committee of 102 Writers and Artists which protested the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Communist Chilean Senator and World famous poet. (Daily Worker, April 7, 1948, page 13).

The "Daily Worker", February 16, 1948 (p. 16) reported that Professor Irwin Edman, Columbia University, signed a statement to the Mayor and City Council in behalf of the Communist, Simon Gerson. An advertisement in the New York "Times", February 19, 1948 (p. 13) named him as a supporter of the Citizens Committee to Defend Representative Government, supporting the seating of Gerson, Communist.

#### CLARK M. EICHELBERGER

Clark M. Eichelberger was named in the New York Times (December 3, 1938), as a member of the Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts; a letterhead of the same organization, dated September 21, 1938, contains the name of Clark M. Eichelberger as Acting Chairman of the group; on March 16, 1939, the New York Times (page 11), disclosed that he was Chairman of the organization's Executive Committee. He spoke at a meeting of the Massachusetts Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts in Boston, as reported by the Daily Worker on June 10, 1938 (page 2), and again on June 11, 1938 (page 2); he spoke at a public meeting in Carnegie Hall, February 13, 1939, to "Revise the Neutrality Act," as shown on a leaflet advertising the meeting which was held under the auspices of the Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts.

In a report by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, the Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts was cited as an organization with the same aims as the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, a Communist front advocating collective security prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

In the same report, the Special Committee cited the Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation as an organization with the same aims as the American League for Peace and Democracy, a Communist front which beat the drums for collective security against Fascist aggressors in accordance with current Communist Party line. Mr. Eichelberger was a member of the Committee for Peace \* \* \*, as shown on page 2 of the Daily Worker for March 23, 1938; the same information appeared in New Masses for April 5, 1938 (page 27), in connection with a rally held by the Committee for Peace \* \* \* in Madison Square Garden, April 4, 1938. He was named in the Daily Worker of March 29, 1938 (page 4), as having endorsed the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation.

Fight magazine for April 1938 (page 57), named Clark M. Eichelberger as one of the sponsors of a meeting of the American League for Peace and Democracy which was held in Madison Square Garden. The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as having been established "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union"; and as being subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7683 and 7684; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948, respectively.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League for \* \* \* as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States" (reports of January 3, 1939 and March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943).

The Attorney General also cited the American Youth Congress as having "originated in 1934 and \* \* \* controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth"; he also cited it as subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7685; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948, respectively.) The Special Committee cited the American Youth Congress as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and prominently identified with the "White House picket line" (reports of June 25, 1942; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1941; and March 29, 1944).

In a pamphlet entitled "Youngville, U. S. A.," published in 1937 by the American Youth Congress, it is noted that "the following men and women, prominent in the political, social, cultural, educational and religious life of the nation, are firm believers in the cardinal Youth Congress idea—youth organization for mutual youth interest along democratic lines. They subscribe to the Declaration of the Rights of Youth adopted by the Congress and have consented to give some of their valuable time and advice to the central organization of Young America. \* \* \* They are serving in their purely personal capacities because they have a deep interest in American youth and have had long experience with its problems. \* \* \*" Included in the list of members of the National Advisory Committee of the American Youth Congress is the name of Clark M. Eichelberger, identified as Director, League of Nations Association. (See page 63 of the pamphlet.) The same information appears on the organization's letterhead concerning their Fourth Annual Conference which was held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 4, 1937.

Mr. Eichelberger was one of the sponsors of the World Youth Congress which was held in 1938 at Vassar College (Daily Worker March 28, 1938, page 3); the Special Committee cited the World Youth Congress as a "Communist conference" (reports of March 29, 1944 and January 3, 1939).

The American Student Union was cited as a Communist front—which was "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1937. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the organization. (Special Committee's reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.) Dr. Eichelberger spoke at the Fourth National Convention of the American Student Union, December 26–30, 1938, as disclosed in the Student Almanac for 1939 (a publication of the organization).

The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (page 5), reported that Clark M. Eichelberger supported a meeting of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, one of the groups organized during 1937 and 1938 when the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause. (From a report of the Special Committee dated March 29, 1944.)

On January 17, 1950, the New York Times (page 12), reported that Clark M. Eichelberger was the fifty-fourth defense witness for Alger Hiss, tried and convicted for perjury. The article stated that "Mr. Eichelberger is a director of the American Association for the United Nations and appeared for the defense without a subpoena. Mr. Eichelberger testified that the reputation of Mr. Hiss for loyalty, integrity and veracity was 'excellent'."

#### HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

The name of Henry Pratt Fairchild is found in this Committee's Report No. 1954, "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace," April 19, 1949, in connection with officially-cited organizations, on pages 2, 7, 9, 11, 18, 21–29, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46–56, 58 and 60; a copy of the report is enclosed for your information. Further references to Prof. Fairchild are given below:

As shown by the "Daily People's World" of February 27, 1952 (page 2), Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild was a sponsor of an emergency conference dedicated to the defense of Communists arrested under the Smith Act and scheduled to be held in New York on March 16; the same information appeared in the "Daily Worker" on February 25, 1952 (page 1) and March 6, 1952 (page 8). A photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which was received for files September 21, 1951, was signed by Henry Pratt Fairchild; the letter announced the formation of the organization to oppose the Smith Act. Prof. Fairchild was reported to be a sponsor of a two-day conference and forum of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee on "The Bill of Rights-Sublime Risk of Free Men," in New York City, January 30–31 ("Daily Worker" of January 20, 1953, page 3 and "Daily People's World" of January 22, 1953, page 2). A letterhead of the National Committee to Win Amnesty for the Smith Act Victims dated May 22, 1953 carried Prof. Fairchild's name as a sponsor. He signed an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act, as shown by the "Daily Worker," December 10, 1952 (page 4).

Prof. Fairchild was a signer of a statement calling for the end of the war in Korea ("Daily Worker," May 21, 1951, page 1). He was a signer of a statement for world peace submitted to the State Department ("Daily Worker," November 19, 1951, page 1). According to the "Daily Worker" of March 10, 1952 (page 1), Prof. Fairchild signed an open letter to President Truman to halt the rearming of Germany. He signed a letter to President Truman asking that he act on germ warfare ("Daily People's World," June 9, 1952, page 6). He was reported in the "Daily Worker" of March 5, 1951 (page 4) to have signed a letter to President Truman to recognize the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

The "Daily Worker" of February 1, 1951 (p. 2) listed Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, New York University, as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade; he was listed as an initial sponsor on the Crusade's letterheads of February 1951 and February 25, 1953. He was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace of the American Peace Crusade, according to the leaflet, "American People's Congress \* \* \* invites you to participate in a National Peace Competition"; "The Call to the American People's Congress \* \* \*"; and the "Daily Worker," June 11, 1951 (p. 2). The American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace was held in Chicago, Ill., June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951. According to the "Daily Worker," May 1, 1951 (p. 11), Professor Fairchild was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade's contest for songs, essays and paintings advancing the theme of world peace.

The American Peace Crusade was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as an organization which "the Communists established" as "a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" (Report 378, on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 25, 1951, p. 51).

An advertisement ("Paid for by contributions of signers") in the Washington "Evening Star," October 30, 1951 (p. A-7), named Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild as a signer of an "Open Letter to J. Howard McGrath" in behalf of the four jailed trustees of the Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York.

The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; it was redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953. This Committee, on September 2, 1947, released a report on the Civil Rights Congress in which it was cited as having been "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Report No. 1115, p. 19).

Professor Fairchild was shown as a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee on letterheads of that organization dated May 18, 1951 and January 5, 1953. He signed a petition sent to President Truman by the Spanish Refugee Appeal \* \* \* "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain" (mimeographed petition attached to letterhead of May 18, 1951).



The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944 (page 174). The Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450).

The "Daily Worker" of October 22, 1951 (page 8) reported that Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild would speak at a conference of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on October 27 in New York City. It was reported in the "Daily Worker" of November 5, 1951 (page 8) that he would speak at a USA-USSR world peace rally to be held on November 15 in New York City by the National Council \* \* \* He was shown as Secretary of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in the July 28, 1952 issue of the "Daily Worker" (page 3).

The Special Committee \* \* \*, in its report of March 29, 1944 (page 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian." The Attorney General cited the National Council as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953).

"We Join Black's Dissent," a reprint of an article from the "St. Louis Post-Dispatch," June 20, 1951, by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, named Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild as a supporter of a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the Supreme Court. He was Chairman of the "Restore Free Speech" rally held by the National Council, New York City, July 25, 1951, as shown by the "Daily Worker," July 23, 1951 (page 3). He was listed as one who would speak at a meeting calling for the right to advocate peace which was to be held under auspices of the National Council, New York City, September 28, 1951, as shown by the September 26, 1951 issue of the "Daily Worker" (page 8). He signed the statement, "We Uphold the Right of All Citizens to Speak for Peace \* \* \*," as shown by the handbill, "Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American!" which announced the September 28 meeting of the National Council referred to above.

Prof. Fairchild was listed as a sponsor of a conference on Equal Rights for Negroes in the Arts, Sciences and Professions which was to be held in New York City on November 10 by the New York Council of the National Council ("Daily Worker," November 1, 1951, page 7; November 9, 1951, page 7; and "A Call to a Conference on Equal Rights \* \* \*"). He took part in "A Tribute to Jo Davidson" held under auspices of the National Council \* \* \*, New York City, January 30, 1952 (handbill, "Memorial Meeting for Jo Davidson"). Identified as Secretary of the National Council \* \* \*, Prof. Fairchild signed "An Appeal for Peace" to the President and Congress, according to the "Daily Worker," March 25, 1952 (page 2). He participated in a meeting for Academic Freedom Against the Entertainment Blacklist held in New York City, October 10, 1952 by the National Council, as advertised in the October 8, 1952 issue of the "Daily Worker" (page 6). A letterhead of the National Council (photostat dated December 7, 1952) carries the name of Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild as Secretary of the group. The "Daily Worker" of March 30, 1953

(page 6) reported that he served as Chairman of a clemency meeting for the Rosenbergs held March 29, New York City, by the National Council.

The "Daily Worker" of May 1, 1953 (page 2) reported that Prof. Fairchild had been elected national chairman of the National Council at a national convention which concluded its sessions in New York City, April 26. A mimeographed handbill, "Free Cedric Belfrage," carried his name as a speaker at a "Guardians of Liberty Rally," June 5, New York City, sponsored by the National Council and the "National Guardian"; the same information was revealed in the "Daily Worker" on June 3, 1953 (page 8). Identified as Chairman of the National Council, Prof. Fairchild was named as a speaker at a Peace Rally of the organization held in New York City, September 27, 1953 ("Daily Worker," September 15, 1953, page 6; September 21, 1953, page 2; and September 29, 1953, page 3).

The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions as a Communist front in the enclosed report.

The "Daily Worker" of June 20, 1950 (page 2) reported that Henry Pratt Fairchild signed the World Peace Appeal; he was listed as an endorser of the World Peace Appeal on an undated leaflet entitled "Prominent Americans Call For \* \* \*" (received September 11, 1950). He was shown as a sponsor of the World Congress for Peace, American Sponsoring Committee, on a leaflet, "World Congress for Peace, Paris," April 20-23, 1949. He was shown as a sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace in Mexico City, September 5-10, 1949, as shown on the "Call" to the Congress. He was a sponsor of the U. S. Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the Congress of the Peoples for Peace, Vienna, a meeting of the World Peace Council, as shown on a leaflet, "Let's Talk It Over!" and in the "Daily Worker" (October 31, 1952, page 2) and "Daily People's World" (November 5, 1952, page 2).

The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world." (Committee's Report 378, April 25, 1951, page 34.)

The Committee, in Report 378, April 25, 1951, cited the American Continental Congress for Peace in Mexico City as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

The World Peace Congress (Paris, April 20-23, 1949) was cited by this Committee as a Communist front among the " 'peace' conferences" which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact." The World Peace Council was cited as having been formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw and which was heralded by the Moscow

radio as "the expression of the determination of the peoples to take into their own hands the struggle for peace." (Report 378, April 25, 1951, pages 16 and 38, respectively.)

The "Daily Worker" of July 9, 1952 (page 6) reported that Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild signed an open letter of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act; the letter was made to the Platform Committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties and urged that they include in the 1952 platforms "a plank calling for repeal of the McCarran Act." The same organization also released an open letter to Members of the Eighty-Third Congress urging support of legislation to repeal the McCarran Act, as shown on an undated official letterhead (received January 1953) which listed Henry Pratt Fairchild as having signed the letter (page 2).

Prof. Fairchild was among the guests who were present and introduced at the 17th annual education conference of the Teachers Union of New York held March 28 at the Hotel Commodore ("Daily Worker," March 30, 1953, pages 3 and 8).

#### JAMES T. FARRELL

James T. Farrell contributed to the following issues of the Daily Worker: November 29, 1934, p. 5; May 3, 1935, p. 2; and December 21, 1935, p. 3. This publication was cited as the "Official Communist Party, U. S. A. organ" by the Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1920, May 11, 1948, p. 44.

The "Call for Congress of American Revolutionary Writers on May 1" listed James T. Farrell as one of the signers of the "Call." The same information was reported in the Daily Worker of January 18, 1935 (p. 5) and was shown in material presented to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities by Mr. Walter S. Steele in connection with his public testimony before the Committee on August 17, 1938 (Public Hearings, Vol. 1, page 561). The Congress of American Revolutionary Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, and included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.

The Daily Worker of April 29, 1935 (p. 1) reported that James T. Farrell participated in the First American Writers Congress at Mecca Temple, New York, N. Y., April 26-27, 1935. The Walter Steele material referred to above (p. 562) shows that James T. Farrell was elected at that congress to the national council of the League of American Writers. This information was also reported in the Daily Worker of April 30, 1935.

The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948, and included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954. The Attorney General (Cong. Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685-6) stated the League was "founded under Communist auspices in 1935 \* \* \* in 1939 \* \* \* began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. \* \* \*" This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report of January 3, 1940, p. 9. According to the March 29, 1944, Report (p. 82) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, was a speaker

at the second biennial American Writers Congress in 1937; the Congress was sponsored by the League of American Writers.

A letterhead of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners dated October 31, 1935, carried the name of James T. Farrell as a member of that organization. The National Committee for \* \* \* was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954, and as "Substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party \* \* \* (it) caters to financially and socially prominent liberals \* \* \*" (Cong. Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686).

The December, 1930, issue of *New Masses* (which was cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist periodical" Cong. Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688) shows James T. Farrell as a contributor (p. 18), and the June 19, 1934, issue contains his contribution to the *New Masses* Symposium (page 30).

James T. Farrell contributed to *Partisan Review*, publication of the John Reed Clubs, as shown by the February-March, 1934 (p. 16) and January-February, 1935 (p. 20) issues. The Special Committee on \* \* \* Report of March 29, 1944, p. 175, indicates these clubs were "Named after the founder of the American Communist Party."

An undated letterhead of Book Union, Inc., lists James T. Farrell as a member of its advisory council. Writings by James T. Farrell were included in the anthology, "Proletarian Literature in the United States," Book Union's first book selection according to the undated circular, "Triple Combination Offer." This circular also showed that applications and payments were to be sent to *New Masses* and that the "triple offer" consisted of a copy of "Proletarian Literature," a membership in Book Union, and a 12-weeks' subscription to *New Masses*. The Special Committee on \* \* \* in its March 29, 1944, Report (p. 96) found Book Union to be "Distributors of Communist literature."

The folder, "Mother Ella Reeve Bloor 45th Anniversary Banquet," January 24, 1936, lists James Farrell as a sponsor. "Mother Bloor" was one of the outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in the United States.

Other references to James T. Farrell may be found in the following publications of this Committee, copies of which are enclosed for your use:

Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry—Part 3, May and June 1951, p. 596

Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of the Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry—Part 8, May 1952, pp. 3482 and 3487

#### HOWARD FAST

The Committee's "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace," dated April 19, 1949 (p. 2), named Howard Fast as one of the sponsors of the Conference which was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. The same Review showed that Mr. Fast participated in the World Congress of Intellectuals in Wroclaw (Breslau) Poland, August 25 to 28, 1948. He was an American Sponsor of the World Peace Congress held in Paris, April 20-23, 1949 (*ibid.*).

The Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace was cited as a Communist-front organization which was "actually a super-mobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations" (Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference, page 1); the National Council of the Arts, \* \* \*, was also cited in the same Review as a Communist-front organization.

\* \* \* bitter hatred for all western culture and the attempt to divorce writers, scientists, and artists from their own native land and win their allegiance for the Soviet Union is the underlying aim and theme of these scientific and cultural conferences for world peace.

The World Congress of Intellectuals was a forerunner of the Scientific and Cultural Conference. The World Peace Congress in Paris (April 20-23, 1949) was cited as a Communist front among the "peace" conferences which "have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact." (From the Committee's Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference.) A copy of this report is enclosed; and your attention is called to pages 3, 9-11, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33-45, 47-51, 54-56, 58 and 60 which refer to Howard Fast.

In a report of this Committee, dated April 16, 1946, Howard Fast was named as a member of the Executive Board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; while an officer, he was cited for contempt of Congress for refusal to produce records of the organization as subpoenaed by the Committee. The Washington "Post" of April 1, 1947 (p. 1), reported that he was indicted April 1, 1947; and was convicted June 27, 1947 (Washington "Star" of June 28, 1947, pages 1 and 6). The District of Columbia Court sentenced Mr. Fast to three months in jail and a \$500 fine ("PM" of July 17, 1947, page 5). He appealed the decision but "on May 29, 1950, the Supreme Court refused to review the conviction for contempt of Congress of \* \* \* members of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and on June 7, 1950, they went to jail" (Annual Report of the Committee for the Year 1950, page 34).

The "Daily Worker" of September 1, 1950 (pages 2 and 9), reported that Howard Fast, novelist, was released from Federal prison at Mill Point, West Virginia, after completing three months sentence for contempt of the House of Representatives.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944 (page 174). On December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948, lists of organizations cited by the Attorney General of the United States were released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission; the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was one of the organizations shown on the list as subversive and Communist and it was subsequently redesignated by the Attorney General on April 27, 1953 pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450.

Howard Fast signed a statement of the Civil Rights Congress, protesting the jailing of Communist leaders, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of June 6, 1949 (p. 2); he spoke at a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress in behalf of the Communist leaders, according to the "Daily Worker" of June 8, 1949 (p. 3); he spoke again before the same group, as reported in the "Daily Worker" on June 28, 1949 (p. 9).

The Civil Rights Congress published Mr. Fast's book, "Peekskill USA" as was shown in the "Daily Worker" on March 23, 1951 (p. 11) and April 30, 1951 (p. 11). The October 3, (1951) issue of the same publication reported that the Civil Rights Congress had published the second in a series of "Crisis Papers" by Mr. Fast (p. 7).

In a pilgrimage of the Civil Rights Congress, on behalf of the Martinsville Seven, Howard Fast led the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions; the so-called "Martinsville seven" were "Negro youth and men \* \* \* charged with the rape of a white woman in 1949, tried and convicted" ("Daily Worker" of January 29, 1951, p. 1).

The Civil Rights Congress was "an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); it was "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1115 of September 2, 1947). The U. S. Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948). The organization was redesignated on April 27, 1953 pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The "Daily Worker" of September 12, 1949 (p. 4), reported that Howard Fast spoke before the New York State Communist Party; the "Daily Worker" of January 18, 1950 (p. 11), reported that he was Chairman of a meeting on the Soviet Communist Party resolutions on the arts.

The following statement by Mr. Fast appeared in the "Daily Worker" on November 10, 1949 (p. 10):

In the Communist Party is enshrined the future and the hope of mankind \* \* \* There is no nobler, no finer product of man's existence on this earth than the Communist Party.

Howard Fast signed the World Peace Appeal, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of June 20, 1950 (p. 2). An interim statement by the Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1950, revealed that "though labeled as a 'peace petition,' the document (World Peace Appeal) is actually intended to be the entering wedge for a campaign of civil disobedience and defiance of our Government, in the interests of the war effort of a foreign nation" (p. 3). The Committee on Un-American Activities again cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress in a meeting at Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950 (Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 25, 1951, p. 34); the report further stated that the Appeal "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy" and as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R."

The "Daily Worker" of April 6, 1951 (p. 4), reported that the State Department had refused to grant Howard Fast a passport to Prague, Czechoslovakia, to attend the opening of his play, "Thirty Pieces of

Silver." The September 26, 1951 issue of the "Daily Worker" (p. 4), reported that the State Department had refused to grant him a passport to attend the second anniversary celebration of the Chinese People's Republic and that he claimed the Department of State was making "him a sort of house prisoner within the continental border of the United States."

The "Daily Worker" of February 25, 1953 (p. 7), reported that a Czech translation of "Haym Solomon" by Howard Fast was in publication, according to a recent announcement in Prague.

Howard Fast was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act as shown by the December 10, 1952 issue of the "Daily Worker" (p. 4).

The "Daily Worker" of September 10, 1952 (p. 8), reported that Howard Fast was the American Labor Party Congressional candidate in the 23d Congressional District, New York. According to the September 15, 1952 issue of the "Daily Worker" (p. 3), Howard Fast, American Labor Party candidate for Congress from the 23d Congressional District in the Bronx, called on President Truman to order a cease-fire in Korea. The Special Committee \* \* \*, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 78), cited the American Labor Party as follows:

For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City they have been unable to win control.

Howard Fast was a signer of an Open Letter of the American Peace Crusade to the President demanding an immediate cease-fire in Korea and that the prisoner issue be settled later ("Daily Worker," March 11, 1953, p. 8). The Congressional Committee \* \* \*, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and House Report No. 378, on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 25, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which "the Communists established" as "a new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the "Daily Worker" "with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives." On January 22, 1954, the United States Attorney General cited the American Peace Crusade as subversive and Communist, pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The "Daily Worker" of November 10, 1952 (p. 3) reported that Howard Fast was a signer of an amicus curiae brief presented to the Supreme Court, Washington, D. C., urging a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg. He participated in a march to Sing Sing in a demonstration for the Rosenbergs ("Daily People's World," December 23, 1952, p. 1); and he wrote an article on his trip to Sing Sing in behalf of the Rosenbergs ("Daily People's World," December 31, 1952, p. 7). The "Daily Worker" of January 21, 1953 (p. 7) reported that Howard Fast was one of those who urged clemency for the Rosenbergs.

A letterhead of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, dated September 22, 1936, listed Kenneth Fearing as a member of that organization. The Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford has been cited as a Communist-front organization which operated when those two candidates were running for President and Vice President, respectively, on the Communist Party ticket. (From Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944, pages 48 and 181.)

The "Daily Worker" of May 21, 1930 reported that Kenneth Fearing was a member of the John Reed Club; the same information is found in the "New York Times" of May 19, 1930. He contributed to the November-December 1934 (p. 54) and January-February 1935 (p. 29) issues of the Partisan Review, a publication of the John Reed Club of New York.

The John Reed Clubs of the United States were named after the founder of the American Communist Party (report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944, p. 175).

Kenneth Fearing contributed articles to the "Daily Worker" and to its Sunday edition, "The Worker", as shown in the following issues of that publication: August 27, 1934; July 23, 1935 (p. 5); December 24, 1931 (p. 3); December 21, 1935 (p. 3); and January 23, 1936 (p. 5). His photograph appeared in the issue of May 20, 1935 (p. 5).

The Daily Worker has been cited as the official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., by the Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1920 of May 11, 1948 (page 44); also cited by the Special Committee \* \* \* in report dated March 29, 1944 (pages 59 and 60; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939, page 30; January 3, 1940, page 7; January 3, 1941, page 14; and June 25, 1942, page 4).

New Masses magazine for September 1930 (page 3) named Kenneth Fearing as one of its Contributing Editors; he contributed to the following issues of the publication: September 1927 (pages 9 and 29); January 28 (page 5); June 1928 (page 22); September 1930 (page 11); September 6, 1938 (page 20); and November 8, 1938 (page 10). His book of poetry, *Stranger at Coney Island*, was reviewed by Eda Lou Walton in the January 1949 issue of *Masses & Mainstream* (pages 81-83).

The Special Committee \* \* \* cited *New Masses* as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party \* \* \* whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service" (report dated March 29, 1944, pages 48 and 75; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939, page 80; and June 25, 1942, pages 4 and 21). The Attorney General of the United States cited *New Masses* as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688).

The Bulletin of the League of American Writers (issue for the Summer, 1938, page 4), named Kenneth Fearing as one of the members of the League; he signed the Call to the Third American Writers Congress of the League, as shown in *Direction* for May-June 1939 (page 1).

The Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as having been founded under Communist auspices in 1935 and "in 1939" it "began openly to follow the Communist Party line"; it was subsequently cited as subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7680 and 7685; and press releases on June 1 and September 21, 1948, respectively; also included in consolidated list dated April 1, 1954.)

The Special Committee \* \* \* cited the league as a Communist-front organization (report of January 3, 1940; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944).



Soviet Russia Today published (in the issue of September 1939, page 25), the text of an Open Letter—

calling for greater unity of the anti-fascist forces and strengthening of the front against aggression through closer cooperation with the Soviet Union, released on August 14 by 400 leading Americans.

Kenneth Fearing, identified as a Poet, was one of the "400 leading Americans" who signed the letter which urged—

Americans of whatever political persuasion to stand firmly for close cooperation in this sphere between the United States and Soviet Russia, and to be on guard against any and all attempts to prevent such cooperation in this critical period in the affairs of mankind.

The Open Letter described above was known as the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union and was issued by "a group of Communist Party stooges" (from Report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated June 25, 1942, page 21).

#### HAROLD GLASSER

Summarized from the Committee on Un-American Activities report, "The Shameful Years", (House Report No. 1229, January 8, 1952, pp. 58-61), as follows:

#### THE SILVERMASTER-PERLO GROUPS

In order for their espionage apparatus to function as an over-all unit it was necessary for the Russians to establish contact within the various departments and bureaus of the United States Government. The success with which this was accomplished was attested to in testimony given the Committee by Elizabeth T. Bentley in July 1948.

Miss Bentley stated that for more than 11 years she had engaged in Communist Party activity as well as Soviet espionage. In 1938 she became acquainted with Jacob Golos, \* \* \*

\* \* \* She testified that under the direction of Golos, until his death in 1943, she acted as courier and in a liaison capacity between individuals engaged in Soviet espionage and Golos.

Even after Golos died in November 1943, she continued to act in the same capacity under the direction of Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party U. S. A. This arrangement continued until late in 1944, \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

Miss Bentley has stated that all the individuals working in the apparatus were under the direction of the NKVD. These espionage groups with which she was working were composed primarily of individuals employed in the Government in Washington, D. C. The head of the most important and active group with which Miss Bentley had contact was Nathan Gregory Silvermaster. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

The head of another important group contacted by Elizabeth Bentley was Victor Perlo, then an employee of the War Production Board. She first met the members of this group at the apartment of John Abt, then general counsel for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America-CIO. Abt was later to figure in the testimony of Whittaker Chambers as will be shown later in this report.

Another person mentioned by Bentley, who was to figure in the Chambers testimony, was Alger Hiss. Bentley stated that members of the Perlo group had informed her that "Hiss" of the State Department had taken Harold Glasser of the Treasury Department and two or three others, and had turned them over to the direct control of Soviet representatives operating in this country.

The members of the Perlo group who were named by Miss Bentley were:

\* \* \* \* \*

Harold Glasser, Treasury Department; loaned to Government of Ecuador; loaned to War Production Board; adviser on North African Affairs Committee in Algiers, North Africa;

\* \* \* \* \*

Certain of these individuals have denied the allegations concerning themselves either through a personal appearance before the committee or by communication with the committee.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 Norman Bursler, \* \* \*, Harold Glasser, \* \* \*, have not appeared before the committee to affirm or deny the charges made concerning them.

Other references to this matter may be found in the following publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

Hearings Regarding Communist Espionage in the United States Government, July-September 1948, pages: 515, 575, 592, 654, 686, 702, 821, 860, 885, 900, 902, 903, 910, 917, 921, 1273, 1350, 1351

Hearings Regarding Communism in the United States Government—Part 1, April-June, 1950, and July-August, 1948, pages: 1727, 1739, 1748, 1751, 2933, and 2943

Annual Report for the Year 1950, page 9

Methods of Communist Infiltration in the United States Government, May and June 1952, pages: 3406, 3407, 3412, and 3442

#### WALTER GELLHORN

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
National Lawyers Guild (1). Member of the Committee on Administrative Law and Agencies of the Guild; identified as from New York City.	July 1937 News-Letter, p. 2.
Member; identified with Columbia University, New York City.	1939 Membership List.
International Juridical Association (1). Member, National Committee.	Leaflet, "What is the I. J. A.?"
Signer of Statement.....	"Daily Worker," July 25, 1936, p. 2.
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1). Member, Board of Sponsors.	Press release dated Feb. 23, 1940.
Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio (1). Member.	Letterhead dated Oct. 3, 1936.
"Security, Loyalty, and Science" by Dr. Walter Gellhorn reviewed.	"Daily Worker," Nov. 23, 1950 (p. 8), "Daily People's World," Nov. 28, 1950, p. 7 and Feb. 6, 1951, p. 9.

#### MARTHA GRAHAM

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2). Member, Theatre Arts Committee.	Letterhead, Apr. 6, 1939 (photostat).
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2). Vice Chairman, Dance Committee.	Report of the Director to the Members, NCASF, Mar. 7, 1945.

- Organization and affiliation*  
 Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1). Sponsor.  
 Member, Theatre Arts Committee.
- Source*  
 Letterhead, Michigan Chapter, Feb. 2, 1939.  
 Letterhead, July 6, 1938.

**MORTIMER GRAVES**

- Organization and affiliation*  
 Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (1) and (2). Sponsor in Washington.  
 National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2). Sponsor.
- Source*  
 Advertisement in the Washington "Post," May 11, 1942, p. 9.  
 Letterhead dated March 13, 1946, a memorandum of the organization issued March 18, 1946, and the "Call" to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, Nov. 6-8, 1943, p. 4.  
 Bulletin of the Committee on Education, June 1945, p. 22, and the Proceedings of the Conference on Education About the Soviet Union, Oct. 14, 1944, New York City (inside back cover).  
 "Soviet Russia Today," September 1939, p. 25.  
 Leaflet, "China Aid News," June 1940; mimeographed form letter dated Apr. 15, 1941.  
 Leaflet, "Stop Shipments to Japan."
- Member of Sponsoring Committee of the National Council's Committee on Education.
- Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1). Signer.
- Washington Committee for Aid to China (1). Chairman.
- Spoke at meeting of the group at the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., Feb. 11, 1941.
- American Russian Institute (2). Member of Board of Directors and sponsor of dinner dedicated to American-Soviet Post-War Relations, New York, N. Y., Oct. 19, 1944.
- Invitation to dinner.

**HORACE GREGORY**

- Organization and Affiliation*  
 Communist Party (1) and (2). Signed Call for support of the Communist Party National Elections and its candidates.  
 Member, Committee of Professional Groups for (Earl) Browder and (Jas.) Ford, candidates for President and Vice President of the United States on the Communist Party ticket.
- Source*  
 Daily Worker, Sept. 14, 1932, p. 1, c. 2.  
 Daily Worker, Sept. 2, 1936, p. 2; letterhead of Sept. 22, 1936; pamphlet, Culture and the Crisis, p. 32.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
National Committee for People's Rights (1) and (2). Member.	Letterhead of July 13, 1938; and leaflet, "News You Don't Get," dated Nov. 15, 1938.
League of American Writers (1) and (2). Member, National Committee.	Daily Worker, Apr. 30, 1935.
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers (2). Signed Call to the congress.	Daily Worker, Jan. 18, 1935, p. 5.
New Masses (1) and (2). Contributing Editor.	New Masses, September 1930, p. 3; December 1930, p. 3; June 8, 1937, p. 13; Sept. 7, 1937, p. 9; Sept. 14, 1937, p. 9; Nov. 2, 1937, p. 13; Jan. 11, 1938, p. 25
Contributed to the following--	New Masses, February 1928, p. 13; September 1928, p. 6; Mar. 2, 1937, p. 23; Apr. 14, 1937, p. 8; Apr. 20, 1937, p. 25; Aug. 3, 1937, p. 26; Oct. 12, 1937, p. 17; and Dec. 7, 1937, p. 11.
Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union (1). Signed the Golden Book.	Soviet Russia Today, November 1937, p. 79.

#### ALBERT GUERARD

According to the following sources, *Prof. Albert L. Guerard* was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born: A letterhead of the organization dated December 11-12, 1948; an undated letterhead received by this committee July 11, 1950; an undated letterhead distributing a speech by Abner Green at a conference held December 2-3, 1950; a 1950 letterhead; the *Daily Worker* of April 4, 1951 (page 8); a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, dated April 30, 1951, which named him as a National Sponsor of the organization; a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the Twentieth Anniversary National Conference which was held in Chicago, Illinois, December 8-9, 1951; the *Daily Worker* of April 29, 1953 (page 6), in which source he was identified with Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., and which source also gave the name as Prof. Albert Guerard, without a middle initial; and Exhibit 52 of Matthew Cvetic, presented during his testimony before this committee.

The program and call to a National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25-26, 1947, named Prof. Albert Guerard as one of the sponsors of that conference; According to the *Daily Worker* of April 8, 1953 (page 2), Prof. Albert L. Guerard, Waltham, Mass., signed an Open Letter of the American Committee \* \* \*, addressed to the Congress of the United States, calling for repeal of the Walter-McCarran Law.

He was among the "one hundred and thirty" who "joined with the American Committee \* \* \* in signing a scroll presented to the Rt. Rev. Arthur W. Moulton" (honorary chairman of the American Committee) on his 80th birthday (Daily Worker of May 5, 1953, page 8). He was a sponsor of the National Conference to Repeal the Walter-McCarran Law and Defend Its Victims, called by the American Committee \* \* \* for Chicago, Illinois, December 12-13, 1953 (Daily Worker of October 1, 1953, page 2).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report of March 29, 1944).

*Prof. Albert L. Guerard*, identified with Stanford University, Calif., signed an appeal addressed to the President of the United States, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, page 4).

An undated leaflet of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder named Prof. Albert Guerard of Stanford University as having appealed to the President of the United States "for justice in the Browder case." The Attorney General cited the Citizens' Committee \* \* \* as Communist (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687; press release of April 27, 1949; and consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Special Committee \* \* \* cited the organization as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944).

Also cited in the report of the Special Committee \* \* \* (dated March 29, 1944) was the National Free Browder Congress; Albert Guerard signed the call to that congress, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942 (pages 1 and 4).

On September 11, 1942, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties published in pamphlet form, an Open Letter which the organization had sponsored, signed by "600 Prominent Americans" who asked the President of the United States to reconsider the order of the Attorney General for deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member. The Open Letter further stated that "It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded."

Among the "600 Prominent Americans" who signed the letter, dated July 11, 1942, was Prof. Albert Guerard, Stanford University. The same information appeared in the Daily Worker on July 19, 1942 (page 4).

The Daily Worker of November 25, 1953 (page 2), reported that Prof. Albert L. Guerard, General Literature Emeritus, Stanford, California, was one of 134 professionals who signed a statement on behalf of the Jefferson School of Social Science, cited as "an adjunct of the Communist Party" by the Attorney General (press release of December 4, 1947; and consolidated list released on April 1, 1954). The Special Committee . . . also cited the School (report of March 29, 1944).

## JOHN HOUSEMAN

*Organization and affiliation*

Daily Worker (1). Writer of article on the theatre.  
 Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (1). Sponsor.

## National Sponsor-----

Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Member, Executive Council.

Hollywood Writers Mobilization (2). Third Vice-Chairman, Executive Council.

Member, Advisory Committee on Radio of the "Hollywood Quarterly" pub. by Hollywood Writers Mobilization.

Contributed to Hollywood Quarterly.

Member of Panel on Propaganda Analysis at the Writers Congress held October 1-3, 1943, under auspices of H. W. M. and University of California.

New Theatre League (1). Sponsor of drive to raise funds for Artef Theatre. Artef Theatre was described in this article as "proudest and outstanding member" of New Theatre League.

Theatre Arts Committee (affiliated with Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy—cited by 1; and American League for Peace and Democracy, cited by 1 and 2. Member, Advisory Council.

*Source*

Daily Worker, Sept. 18, 1937, p. 7.

Letterhead, Sept. 13, 1937; Information submitted by Walter S. Steele in connection with his testimony given in public hearings before Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Aug. 17, 1938, p. 569; testimony of Mr. Steele, Public Hearings, July 21, 1947, p. 29.  
 Letterhead of Mar. 23, 1939, introduced into Public Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities during testimony of Mrs. Walter Owens Selby, Apr. 12, 1940, pp. 7728-7729.

Letterhead, Oct. 2, 1945.

Letterhead, Oct. 10, 1945.

Hollywood Quarterly, April 1947, No. 3, vol. II.

Hollywood Quarterly, January 1947, p. 161.

Program of the Writers Congress, 1943.

Daily Worker, Jan. 21, 1938, p. 9.

Undated letterhead.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Was reported to film independently a film on the Centralia mine disaster of 1947.	Daily Worker, Sept. 26, 1950, p. 11.

### LANGSTON HUGHES

The Daily Worker of September 14, 1932, named Langston Hughes as one of those who signed a "Call for support of the Communist Party National Elections and its Candidates." The same publication (in the issue of February 7, 1949, page 2), reported that "Langston Hughes, Negro people's poet, defends the Communist leaders on trial and warns the Negro people that they too are being tried, in his column in the current issue of the 'Chicago Defender'." The article further quoted Mr. Hughes as declaring that "If the 12 Communists are sent to jail, in a little while they will send Negroes to jail simply for being Negroes and to concentration camps just for being colored."

Langston Hughes contributed to the Communist Party Yearbook of 1937 (page 79), which is entitled "Ohio Marches Toward Peace and Progress." He contributed to the March, April and July (1925) issues of the Workers Monthly, official organ of the Workers Party (as the American section of the Communist International was known at the time).

In sworn testimony of Dr. Theodore Graebner, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on December 9, 1938 (Volume 4, page 3008), we find the following statement:

It is proper also that outside the state of Minnesota our people know that Langston Hughes, the Communist Poet, wrote:

"Good Morning, Revolution:

You're the very best friend

I ever had.

We gonna' pal around together from now on!"

and more directly the Workers' Song

"Put one more S in the U. S. A.

To make it Soviet.

The U. S. A. when we take control

Will be U. S. S. A. then."

The following poem which was written by Langston Hughes was quoted by Mr. Steve G Adler of St. Paul, Minn., during his sworn testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Volume 2, page 1366):

Listen, Christ,  
You did alright in your day, I reckon—  
But that day's gone now.  
They ghosted you up a swell story, too,  
Called it Bible—  
But it's dead now  
The popes and the preachers've  
Made too much money from it.  
Kings, generals, robbers, and killers—  
Even to the Tzar and the Cossacks.  
Even to Rockefeller's church.  
Even to the Saturday Evening Post.  
You ain't no good no more;  
They've pawned you  
Till you've done wore out.  
Goodbye,  
Christ Jesus, Lord, God Jehovah,

Beat it on away from here now.  
 Make way for a new guy with no religion at all—  
 A real guy named  
 Marx Communist, Lenin Peasant, Stalin Worker, ME—  
 I said, Me!  
 Go ahead on now,  
 You're getting in the way of things, Lord.  
 And please take Saint Ghandi with you when you go  
 And Saint Pope Pius  
 And Saint Aimee McPherson,  
 And big black Saint Becton of the Consecrated Dime.  
 And step on the gas, Christ!  
 Move!  
 Don't be so slow bout movin'!  
 The world is mine from now on—  
 And nobody's gonna sell ME  
 To a king, or a general,  
 Or a millionaire.

The Daily People's World of January 20, 1950 (page 2, Section 2), published Hughes' Ballad of Lenin, part of which is as follows:

Comrade Lenin of Russia  
 High in a marble tomb,  
 Move over, Comrade Lenin,  
 And give me room.

I am Ivan, the peasant,  
 Boots all muddy with soil  
 I fought with you, Comrade Lenin,  
 Now I have finished my toil.

\* \* \*

I am Chico, the Negro,  
 Cutting cane in the sun.  
 I lived for you, Comrade Lenin,  
 Now my work is done.

\* \* \*

I am Chang from the foundries  
 On strike in the streets of Shanghai  
 For the sake of the Revolution  
 I fight, I starve, I die.

Comrade Lenin of Russia  
 Rises in the Marble tomb  
 On guard with the fighters forever—  
 The world is our room!

In 1937 and 1938, "the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into a campaign in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations" such as Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, etc. (Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944.)

Langston Hughes endorsed the drive of Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade to bring the wounded boys back home, as shown in a circular entitled "and tell the folks that I'll be home if \* \* \*" He is listed as a sponsor of the organization on letterheads dated September 10 and 22, 1938. He has contributed to various issues of "Volunteer for Liberty," official organ of Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade: September 6, 1937 (page 1); October 11, 1937 (page 16); November 15, 1937 (page 3); June 15, 1938 (page 15); January 17, 1949 (Introduction in Bound Volume); and his photograph appeared in the February 28, 1938 issue of the same publication. The Daily Worker of February 15, 1949 (page 13), also reported that Mr. Hughes had contributed to "Volunteer for Liberty."



On two occasions, Langston Hughes sent "greetings" to the International Labor Defense, as shown in an official program of a conference held in New York, and Equal Justice for June 1939 (page 3). The International Labor Defense has been cited as being "essentially the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States." It is the American section of M. O. P. R., or Red International of Labor Defense, often referred to as the Red International Aid. Its international congresses meet in Moscow. (See reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; March 29, 1944.) It was again cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities on September 2, 1947 in Report 1115.) The Attorney General of the United States cited the group as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7686; and as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1952; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Langston Hughes is reported to have spoken before and entertained an organization known as International Workers Order on several occasions. (See: Daily Worker for March 1, 1938, page 2; March 4, 1938, page 10; April 23, 1938, page 8; May 14, 1938, page 8). He contributed to the following issues of New Order, official publication of the English and youth sections of the International Workers Order: June 1936 (page 8), and January 1937 (page 2).

The International Workers Order was cited as "one of the most effective and closely knitted organizations among the Communist 'front' movements. It claims a membership of 150,000 bound together through an insurance and social plan \* \* \* It has contributed large sums of money to Communist Party campaigns, and \* \* \* regularly sponsors Communist Party endorsed candidates for public office." (Special Committee \* \* \* in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.) The Attorney General of the United States has cited the group as Communist (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1943; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

The Bulletin of the League of American Writers named Langston Hughes as Vice President of the League; the same information is revealed by a letterhead of the organization dated December 29, 1938, and by another letterhead of July 7, 1939. The Daily Worker of April 30, 1935, lists him as a member of the National Committee of that organization. He signed the Call to the Fourth Congress of the organization which was held in New York City, June 6-8, 1941 (New Masses, April 22, 1941); in a pamphlet of the organization entitled "We Hold These Truths," he has contributed an article concerning anti-Semitism; he also signed a statement of the organization on behalf of the second front (Daily Worker, September 14, 1942).

The League of American Writers was "founded under Communist auspices in 1935 \* \* \* The overt activities of the League in the last two years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (the Attorney General in Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7686); it was cited as a "Communist-front organization" by the Special Committee \* \* \* in three reports: January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. The League was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and Septem-

ber 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

A leaflet of March 2, 1944, lists Langston Hughes as a sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy; he was listed in Spotlight of April 1944 as a national Sponsor of that organization. American Youth for Democracy was cited as "the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress." (Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.) Attorney General of the United States cited the group as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the organization was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (April 17, 1947), and was called "a front formed in October 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League and for the purpose of exploiting to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, inexperience, and craving to join which is characteristic of American college youth."

Letterheads dated February 26, 1946, and May 18, 1952, of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee list Langston Hughes as one of the national sponsors of that group. Another letterhead of the organization, dated April 28, 1949, lists him as one of the sponsors of the group. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Appeal was cited by the Special Committee \* \* \* as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944); it was also cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Langston Hughes was one of the sponsors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on a memorandum issued by the Council on March 18, 1946, and a Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, Nov. 6-8, 1943. The National Council \* \* \* was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it was cited by the Special Committee \* \* \* in a report dated March 29, 1944 as having been, "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian."

The January 1943 Message of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to the House of Representatives of the United States, was signed by Langston Hughes (from a leaflet attached to an undated letterhead of the group). The National Federation was cited as "one of the Communist Party's fronts set up during the period of the Soviet-Nazi Pact" (report of the Special Committee dated June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited it as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program \* \* \*" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687.) It was subsequently cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press release of December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953; included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Langston Hughes has contributed to New Masses magazine over a period of years: February 1928 (page 13); December 1930 (page 23);

August 1931 (page 15); February 1932 (page 10); December 15, 1936 (page 34); January 11, 1938 (page 39); September 28, 1943 (page 14); February 15, 1944 (page 10). He sponsored a protest meeting on behalf of Howard Fast, held in New York City under the auspices of New Masses and Mainstream magazines, as shown in an advertisement in the publication "PM" for October 16, 1947 (page 5). He contributed to the Winter 1947 issue of Mainstream; and to the February 1949 issue of Masses & Mainstream (pages 53 and 78).

According to the Sunday Worker of January 25, 1948 (page 13), the first issue of Masses & Mainstream appeared in March 1948; this article announced that it was to be a "new monthly cultural magazine" and a merger of the two magazines formerly known as New Masses and Mainstream. New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, page 7688); it was also cited by the Special Committee as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party \* \* \* whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service" (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942 of the Special Committee.

Langston Hughes was one of the sponsors of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (from the Conference Program, page 12; conference Call; and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949, page 9). The Scientific and Cultural Conference \* \* \* was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations" (report of April 1, 1951 of the Committee on Un-American Activities).

Identified as a poet, Langston Hughes of New York City signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban the use of atomic weapons, as shown by a statement attached to a press release of December 14, 1949 (page 12). The statement was released by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact which the Committee on Un-American Activities cited as having been set up to further the cause of "Communists in the United States doing their part in the Moscow campaign" (report dated April 25, 1951).

The works of Langston Hughes have been favorably reviewed by and/or advertised in the Communist publication, the Daily Worker, as follows; June 6, 1949 (page 11); The Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, December 4, 1942, page 8; February 13, 1949 (page 13); September 4, 1949 (page 12); the Daily Worker, April 22, 1951 (page 7, section 2); and January 8, 1951, page 11.

The following books by Langston Hughes have also been advertised by the Workers Book Shop in the 1949-1950 Catalogue: "Shakespeare in Harlem"; "The Weary Blues"; "Fields of Wonder"; "The Big Sea"; "Not Without Laughter"; and "The Poetry of the Negro." The Workers Book Shop "carry all books and pamphlets recommended in 'The Guide to Reading on Communism'" (back cover of the Guide). From the same source it is noted that—

What we have attempted to do here is list the minimum required readings for an understanding of the fundamental theoretical and practical questions facing the international as well as the American revolutionary movement.

The Honorable Albert W. Hawkes (Senator, New Jersey), included in a speech delivered on the floor of the Senate, April 1, 1948, a record of Langston Hughes' Communist and Communist-front activities (Congressional Record, April 1, 1948, pages 4011-4012).

The West Coast Communist publication, the Daily People's World for April 16, 1948 (page 5), reported that—

intimidation and hysteria which caused cancellation of scheduled appearances in six American cities within the past two months is no coincidence of reaction as far as Langston Hughes is concerned.

In the same article, Hughes is quoted as having claimed:

I'm no radical on the platform. I read some of my poems, and answer a few questions. And I happen to believe in a democracy where persons are treated equally regardless of race or religion.

The article relates that—

Hughes has been speaking and writing for the last 15 years but finds the pattern of reaction is stronger this year than ever before.

In the Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1951 (dated February 17, 1952), a chapter was devoted to the Complicity of American Communists in the Destruction of Freedom in the Far East; it was brought out that—

Even more interesting was the identification of American citizens who had contributed greatly to the cause of world communism and until this time had gone undisclosed. This list of traitors to the United States and the rest of the free world reads as follows: Agnes Smedley, Miyagi Yotoku, Willie Lehman, Albert Edward Stewart, \* \* \* Langston Hughes \* \* \*. The list set forth above is not by any means complete \* \* \* (See page 23 of the Annual Report of 1951.)

During testimony of Manning Johnson before the Committee, regarding Communist Activities in the New York Area, July 8, 1953, a photostatic copy of Fight magazine for December 1935 (page 2), was received in evidence as Manning Johnson Exhibit No. 11; the page referred to contained names of the members of the National Executive Committee, American League Against War and Fascism and included Langston Hughes. (See Committee's Investigation of Communist Activities in the \* \* \* Part 7, page 2173.) At this point, Mr. Johnson was asked by Committee Counsel "how many of these names he recognizes as people whom he knew to be members of the Communist Party," whereupon Mr. Johnson answered:

Dr. Harry F. Ward, Earl Browder, Israel Amter, Max Bedacht, Fred Biedenkapp, Ella Reeve Bloor, Harry Bridges, Winifred Chappell, H. W. L. Dana, Margaret Forsyth, Gilbert Green, Clarence Hathaway, A. A. Heller, Donald Henderson, Roy Hudson, Langston Hughes \* \* \* (Ibid., page 2174.)

The American League Against War and Fascism, referred to above, has been officially cited by the Attorney General of the United States as a Communist organization (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7683); and as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it was also cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as being "completely under the control of Communists" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942).

## ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, Chancellor, University of Chicago, was named as a member of the Commission for Academic Freedom of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions in the September 13, 1948 issue (page 6) of the Communist newspaper, *Daily Worker*. He was listed as a sponsor of a conference held by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, October 9-10, 1948, in the leaflet, "To Safeguard These Rights \* \* \*", which was published by the Bureau on Academic Freedom of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

The National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in House Report No. 1954, April 26, 1950, page 2.

Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins testified before the Seditious Activities Investigation Commission, State of Illinois, 1949 (Volume II, p. 17, of the Commission's report).

The *Daily Worker* of April 28, 1949, p. 9, featured an article by Gunnar Leander entitled: "Chancellor Hutchins in the Witchhunter's Den," parts of which read as follows:

Sen. Paul Broyles suddenly found himself in the defendant's box during his own inquisition into subversive activities in Chicago colleges this week. Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago, leading an entourage of distinguished witnesses, turned prosecutor in telling off Broyles that his task as a legislator "is to eliminate those social and economic evils and those political injustices which are the sources of discontent and disaffection."

Hutchins turned the tide of the entire state witchhunt as he declared before the Illinois Subversive Activities Commission:

"As is well known, there is a Communist Club among the students of the University (of Chicago). Eleven students belong to it. The Club has not sought to subvert the government of the state. Its members claim that they are interested in studying Communism, and some of them, perhaps all of them, may be sympathetic toward Communism. But the study of Communism is not a subversive activity."

Dr. Hutchins' photograph accompanied the article.

The *Daily People's World*, west coast organ of the Communist Party, in its issue of April 17, 1950, page 2, reported the following:

Chancellor Robert Hutchins, head of the University of Chicago, has informed the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill he has filed a statement with the House Committee on Un-American Activities denouncing the Mundt-Nixon bill as foolish, stupid and dangerous.

The Hutchins statement follows:

"I should like to be recorded as among the numerous citizens of all political parties and all points of view who are united in believing that the Mundt-Nixon bill is foolish, stupid and dangerous. I hope that Congress will display its intelligence, and its faith in freedom and democracy by overwhelmingly defeating the measure."

The *Daily Worker*, June 25, 1951, p. 2, reported that Professor Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago and now associate director of the Ford Foundation, opposed the Supreme Court decision upholding the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders.

The Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1949 (House Report 1950, April 26, 1950) contained the following comment on these Communist leaders (p. 16):

On July 20, 1948, 12 leaders of the Communist Party of the United States were indicted by a Federal grand jury in New York on charges of conspiring to "teach and advocate the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the

United States by force and violence." Eleven of them were convicted on those charges in Federal court on October 14, 1949.

On November 25, 1952, Dr. Hutchins appeared before the Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations (House of Representatives). The following is quoted from his testimony (pp. 263-298 of the printed hearings):

The CHAIRMAN. \* \* \* I had put in my hand some days ago a document which consisted of evidence taken by a select committee set up by the Legislature of Illinois investigating communism in certain schools, and in the body of that report I find testimony that you gave \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*  
I quote from what purports to have been your testimony given in that investigation, and here you are quoted to have said \* \* \*.

"The fact that some Communists belong to, believe in, or even dominate some of the organizations to which some of our professors belong does not show that these professors are engaged in subversive activities. All that such facts would show would be that these professors believe in some of the objects of the organization, and so forth."

\* \* \* I am wondering if since 1949 your thinking has undergone any sort of a change as regards what we should do in an endeavor to combat the spread of this Communist ideology in our own country? \* \* \*

Mr. HUTCHINS. \* \* \* My testimony in this case was directed to the proposition that members of the faculty whom we knew, who had worked loyally for the university and for the country, many of whom had been cleared by Government agencies, were not disqualified to be members of the faculty by reason of membership in this organization \* \* \*.

\* \* \* \* \*  
My view is, and has been, that it is necessary to resist the threat of Communist aggression by military means, that without this we may be overwhelmed by the tremendous masses of the Red Army.

It is also my impression that along with this effort, which is now consuming the greater part of the resources of this country, that are dedicated to governmental purposes, along with this effort we must maintain and develop the basic sources of our strength, and the basic sources of our strength are the western tradition of freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of discussion, and freedom of association.

We have then, as we have had for the last several years, the very delicate problem of balancing security and freedom.

\* \* \* \* \*  
The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, you were asked this question in this investigation: "Do you consider that the Communist Party in the United States comes within the scope of a clear and present danger?"

You are charged with having answered:

"I don't think so."

Do you still adhere to that view?

Mr. HUTCHINS. The Supreme Court has decided that question.

The CHAIRMAN. I know, but I am not talking about the Supreme Court; I am talking about your views now. The Supreme Court is not running the (Ford) foundation; you are, so far as the educational work of the Ford people are concerned.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Well, you were asking me what my attitude toward the Communist Party would be as an officer of the foundation?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Well, as an officer of the foundation, I would not support the Communist Party. What the definition of "clear and present danger" is, I am not at all sure. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*  
As far as I am concerned, the Communist Party is a clear danger. Whether it is in this country an immediate danger so that every day we should think that here is something really dangerous that is going to overwhelm us, I do not know. It certainly is dangerous. \* \* \*

An article in the New York Times (April 20, 1950, p. 4) reported the following:

A movement to set up at colleges throughout the country a fund to assist any University of California faculty members discharged in the current loyalty oath controversy was disclosed today by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, chancellor of the University of Chicago.

\* \* \* Dr. Hutchins reported that the council of the University Senate, faculty representative body at his institution, had voted yesterday approval in principle of voluntary contributions by faculty members of 2 per cent of their salaries for a year to such fund. \* \* \*

The money would be used for assistance of University of California faculty members whose income might be cut off and thus would, Dr. Hutchins said, "remove financial considerations from the decision to be made by the faculty members" on subscribing or refusing to subscribe to a declaration disavowing Communist affiliations.

Such a declaration was tentatively prescribed by the University of California Regents as a condition of employment a year ago. \* \* \*

(Dr. Hutchins) said he considered the proposed oath discriminatory, unnecessary and a result of failure to understand that "a university should be a center of independent thought and criticism."

He did not, he added, consider Communist affiliations in themselves grounds for exclusion from teaching. \* \* \*

### ALVIN JOHNSON

#### *Organization and affiliation*

#### *Source*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Signer of letter to the President; identified as Director of the New School for Social Research.                            | "Daily Worker," Feb. 16, 1938, p. 2.   |
| Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (1). Sponsor.  | Booklet, "Children in Concentration Camps".  |
| Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1) and (2). Name appeared on invitation to dinner on "The Century of the Common Man," Hotel Astor, New York City, Oct. 27, 1943. | Invitation to dinner.  |
| American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1). Sponsor of Citizens' Rally, Carnegie Hall, New York City, Apr. 13, 1940.                                | Leaflet announcing rally.  |
| Consumers Union (1). Sponsor.  | Undated circular; "New Masses," Mar. 2, 1937, p. 28.   |
| Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio (1). Member.  | Letterhead, Oct. 3, 1936.  |
| Public Use of the Arts Committee (1). Sponsor.   | Undated letterhead.  |
| Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (1). Sponsor.  | Printed program of conference held Feb. 12, 1940.  |
| Wrote letter to Hanns Eisler on June 20, 1938 in which he stated that "I personally have no prejudice against Communists * * *"  | Testimony of Investigator Donald Appell of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Sept. 25, 1947, pp. 81 and 82. |

## RUFUS M. JONES

A letterhead of Russian Reconstruction Farms, dated March 20, 1926, lists one Rufus Jones (with no middle initial shown), as one of the members of the Advisory Board of that organization, cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a "Communist enterprise directed by Harold Ware (son of the well-known Communist Ella Reeve Bloor)" (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 76).

Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Chairman, Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, is listed as a member of the Editorial Board of the Protestant Digest on a letterhead of that publication dated December 27, 1939; he was one of the sponsors of the "Protestantism Answers Hate" dinner-forum which was held under the auspices of the Protestant Digest Association in New York City, February 25, 1941 (leaflet announcing the forum). The "Protestant Digest" was cited by the Special Committee on \* \* \*, as a "magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal."

The Daily Worker of March 28, 1938 (p. 3), revealed that Rufus M. Jones was one of the sponsors of the World Youth Congress; as shown in the Special Committee's Report 1311, dated March 29, 1944, the World Youth Congress was cited as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College (also cited in report of January 3, 1939).

The "Call" to the Congress of Youth, fifth national gathering of the American Youth Congress in New York City, July 1-5, 1939, contained the signature of Rufus M. Jones, as was shown on page 3 of the "Proceedings" of the Congress.

The American Youth Congress "originated in 1934 and \* \* \* has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (The Attorney General of the United States, Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7685). The organization was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954); it was cited as a Communist-front organization in reports of the Special Committee \* \* \*, dated January 3, 1939; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones of the American Friends Service Committee was among those who signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, protesting the "Iron Curtain" (Daily People's World of May 20, 1948, p. 5); the National Council \* \* \* was cited as having been, "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian." (See Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944). The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Council \* \* \* as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

Dr. Jones, of Haverford, Pennsylvania, was one of the sponsors of a Congress on Civil Rights, founding meeting of the Civil Rights Congress, which was held in Detroit, Michigan, April 27-28, 1946 (from the "Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights"). The Civil Rights Congress was the subject of a special report by the Committee



on Un-American Activities, issued September 2, 1947, in which the organization was cited as being "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and controlled by "individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it." The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress and its various affiliates as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The Call to a National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, which was held in New York City, January 23-25, 1948, contained the name of Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford College, in the list of sponsors of that conference; he was named as a sponsor of the same conference in the "Daily Worker" of January 1, 1948 (page 3), being identified in this source as leader of American Religious Society of Friends. The National Conference on American Policy \* \* \* (a conference called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy), was cited as Communist by Attorney General of the United States in a list released to the press July 25, 1949.

MATTHEW JOSEPHSON

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Communist Party (1) and (2). Signed call for support of the Communist Party National Elec- tions and its candidates.	Daily Worker, Sept. 14, 1932, p. 1, c. 2.
Communist Party (1) and (2). Signed statement defending Communist Party; i. d. as Histo- rian.	Daily Worker, Apr. 16, 1947, p. 2.
Communist Party (1) and (2). Signed statement condemning "punitive measures directed against the Communist Party"; i. d. as; historian.	The Sunday Worker, Apr. 20, 1947, p. 8.
League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford (1) cited as Committee of * * *. Member.	Leaflet, "Culture and the Crisis," p. 32.
National Committee for the De- fense of Political Prisoners (1) and (2). Member.	Letterhead, Oct. 31, 1935.
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1). Signed Open Letter of organi- zation.	Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5.
National Committee for People's Rights (1) and (2). Member.	Leaflet, "News You Don't Get," Nov. 15, 1938. Also letterhead dated July 13, 1938.
Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio. (1). Member.	Letterhead, Oct. 3, 1936.

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

- Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2). Signed statement defending Communist Party; i. d. as historian. Daily Worker, Apr. 16, 1947, p. 2.
- National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Signed statement in support of Henry A. Wallace. i. d. as a writer. Daily Worker, Oct. 19, 1948, p. 7.
- Sponsor of Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25-27, 1949. i. d. as a writer. Conference "Call." Also Daily Worker, Feb. 21, 1949, p. 9. Also conference program, p. 12.
- To speak at Writing & Publishing Forum of New York Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, March 1, 1953, at ASP Center. Calendar of Events, February-March 1953.
- American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1). Signed petition of organization. Mimeographed sheet attached to letterhead dated Jan. 17, 1940.
- New Masses (1) & (2). Illustrator. Contributor----- New Masses, May 1932, p. 6. New Masses, Apr. 20, 1937, p. 16; June 8, 1937, p. 22; Nov. 25, 1947, p. 15.
- Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Member, General Committee. Letterhead, Nov. 18, 1936; New Masses, Jan. 5, 1937, p. 31.
- Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union (1). Signed Golden Book. Soviet Russia Today, November 1937, p. 79.
- Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1). Signed Open Letter. Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 25.
- American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Member of Committee. Letterhead, Feb. 21, 1938.
- League of American Writers (1) and (2). Member, Executive Committee; Signed statement of League. Daily Worker, Apr. 30, 1935. Daily Worker, Sept. 14, 1942, p. 7; and Daily People's World, Sept. 23, 1942, p. 5.
- Daily Worker (1). Contributor--- Daily Worker, Dec. 24, 1931, p. 3; Dec. 21, 1935, p. 3.

PROF. HORACE M. KALLEN

The "Daily Worker" of February 16, 1938 (page 2) listed the name of Prof. Horace M. Kallen, New School for Social Research, among those who signed a letter to the President and the Foreign Affairs Committee of both Houses of Congress "urging that the Neutrality Act be amended so as to render it inapplicable to Spain";

the letter was sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

The Program of a Dinner-Forum on "Europe Today," held in New York City, October 9, 1941, under auspices of the American Committee to Save Refugees, the Exiled Writers Committee of the League of American Writers, and the United American Spanish Aid Committee, contains the name of Horace M. Kallen on the list of the committee of sponsors.

As reported in the "Daily Worker" on February 21, 1940, Prof. Horace M. Kallen signed a letter to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson protesting the attacks upon the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

"In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations \* \* \* such as \* \* \* the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, United American Spanish Aid Committee, \* \* \* American Friends of Spanish Democracy \* \* \*" (Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, page 82). The Attorney General of the United States cited the United American Spanish Aid Committee as Communist in a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission dated July 25, 1949; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953). The Attorney General also cited the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade as subversive and Communist in lists to the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450).

The American Committee to Save Refugees and the League of American Writers were cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the Report released March 29, 1944.

The League of American Writers, founded under Communist auspices in 1935 \* \* \* in 1939 \* \* \* began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. \* \* \* The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686).

The League was subsequently cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450).

In a booklet, "These Americans Say:" (page 9), prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, Horace Kallen was listed among the Representative Individuals who advocated lifting the Spanish embargo. The Coordinating Committee \* \* \* was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation (Report of March 29, 1944).

Horace M. Kallen was a member of the Advisory Board of Film Audiences for Democracy, as shown in "Film Survey" for June 1939 (page 4); he was also shown to be a member of the Advisory Board of Films for Democracy ("Films for Democracy," April 1939, page 2).

Film Audiences for Democracy and Films for Democracy were cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee \* \* \* in the Report of March 29, 1944.

A pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L.," dated December 11-12, 1937 (page 2), carried the name of Horace M. Kallen as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation which the Special Committee \* \* \* cited as a Communist front in the Report of March 29, 1944 (page 155).

Horace Kallen, Harvard, was shown to be a member of the Sponsoring Committee for an "Alumni Homecoming" Dinner, under auspices of the American Student Union, March 21, 1937, New York City ("The Student Advocate, February 1937, page 2, and a leaflet, "The American Student Union Invites You \* \* \*").

The Special Committee cited the American Student Union as a Communist front which was "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1937. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the American Student Union, and the Union offered free trips to Russia. It claims to have led as many as 500,000 students out in annual April 22 strikes in the United States (Report of January 3, 1939, page 80).

The Program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, dated February 12, 1940, listed Dr. Horace V. Kallen as a sponsor of the Conference. The Special Committee cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference \* \* \* as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (Report of March 29, 1944); in a later report, this Committee cited the Conference as among a "maze of organizations" which were—

spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law (Report 1115, September 2, 1947, page 3).

An undated form letter of the New York Tom Mooney Committee listed the name of H. M. Kallen as a sponsor. The New York Tom Mooney Committee was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee \* \* \*

For many years, the Communist Party organized widespread agitation around the Mooney case, and drew its members and followers into the agitation (Report of March 29, 1944).

#### GEORGE F. KENNAN

##### *Organization and affiliation*

##### *Source*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| New World Review (1). Author of book, "American Diplomacy—1900-1950," reviewed by Jessica Smith in July issue.              | Daily People's World, June 23, 1952, p. 7. |
| Author of "American Diplomacy, 1900-1950, and the Challenge of Soviet Power" reviewed by Jessica Smith in New World Review. | New World Review, June 1952, p. 59.        |
| Attacked witchhunting of communists.  | New York Times, May 28, 1950, p. 17.       |
| Spoke on Communist China. Name shown in this source as George Frost Kennan.   | New York Times, May 9, 1950, p. 16.        |

## DR. WILLIAM KILPATRICK

Professor William H. Kilpatrick was one of the sponsors of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as shown on a letterhead of that organization, dated May 15, 1940; a letterhead of its Fourth Annual Conference which was held in Washington, D. C., March 2-3, 1940; and a booklet published by the organization under the title, "The Registration of Aliens." Prof. William H. Kilpatrick of Columbia University was also a sponsor of the organization's Fifth National Conference, as revealed by the program of the conference which was held in Atlantic City, N. J., March 29, 1941.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

As shown on a program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, February 12, 1940, Professor William Kilpatrick was a member of the General Committee of that conference. He signed the "Call for a National Emergency Conference, May 13-14, 1939, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C." Both the "Legislative Letter" of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (Volume 1, No. 4), dated February 15, 1940, and a press release of the conference, dated February 23, 1940, show Professor William H. Kilpatrick as a member of its Board of Sponsors.

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, the National Emergency Conference and the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights were cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944. The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as among a "maze of organizations" which were—spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law (Report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, page 3).

It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

(Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 115, September 2, 1947, page 12.)

## FREDA KIRCHWEY

<i>Organization and Affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
All-American Anti-Imperialist League (1) and (2). Member, National Committee.	Letterhead, Apr. 11, 1928.
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1). Signer of petition.	Mimeographed sheet attached to letterhead of Jan. 17, 1940.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Committee for Yugoslav Relief (1) and (2). Member, Sponsors Committee. Endorsed appeal-----	Photostat of letterhead, Aug. 6, 1945.  Daily Worker, Apr. 26, 1947, p. 2. Letterhead, May 16, 1940.
American Friends of the Chinese People (1). Member, National Advisory Board.	
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Member of Committee.	Letterhead, Feb. 21, 1938; letterhead, Nov. 18, 1936; "New Masses," Jan. 5, 1937, p. 31.
American Fund for Public Service (1). Member, Board of Directors.	Photostat of letterhead dated Sept. 8, 1930.
American Student Union (1). Member, Advisory Board.	Pamphlet, "Presenting the American Student Union," back cover.
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Member, Board of Directors.	"Far East Spotlight," June 1948, and a letterhead dated May 28, 1948; letterheads dated 1946 and 1947.
Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1). Named as a "representative individual" who advocated lifting the embargo on the sale of arms to Spain.	Booklet, "These Americans Say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain'."
Descendants of the American Revolution (1). Member, Advisory Board.	"Daily Worker," Jan. 21, 1938, p. 2; a pamphlet, "Descendants of the American Revolution," back cover.
Films for Democracy (1). Member, Advisory Board.	April 1939 issue of "Films for Democracy," p. 2.
Film Audiences for Democracy (1). Member, Advisory Board.	"Film Survey," June 1939, p. 4.
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (1). Sponsor.	Program of the Conference, Feb. 12, 1940.
League of Women Shoppers (1). Sponsor.	Letterhead, Apr. 19, 1940, letterhead, Oct. 7, 1935.
Sponsor, New Jersey League	Letterhead, July 7, 1941.
Sponsor, New York League---	Letterhead, Jan. 25, 1940 (photostat).
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1). Member, Board of Sponsors. Signer of Open Letter-----	Press Release, Feb. 23, 1940.
National People's Committee Against Hearst (1). Member.	"Daily Worker," May 13, 1940, pp. 1, 5.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2). Signer of message.	Letterhead, Mar. 16, 1937.
	Leaflet, attached to undated letterhead.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
"New Masses" (1) and (2). Owner	"New Masses," June 1928, p. 23.
Executive Board member-----	"New Masses," Oct. 1927, p. 3.
Contributing Editor-----	"New Masses," June 1928, p. 3.
Contributor-----	"New Masses," June 6, 1944, p. 21.
North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1) and (2). Sponsor.	"New Masses," Oct. 5, 1937, p. 26.
Schappes Defense Committee (1) and (2). Signer of Open Letter of the group to Governor Dewey asking pardon for Morris U. Schappes.	New York "Times," Oct. 9, 1944, p. 12.
Union of Concerted Peace Efforts (1). Signer of manifesto.	"Daily Worker," Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2.
"Woman Today" (1). Member, Advisory Board.	"Woman Today," October 1936.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare (1). Member of a committee.	Letterhead, Dec. 5, 1946.
Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (1). Sponsor.	Back cover of folder entitled "Children in Concentration Camps."
World Congress of Intellectuals (1). American delegate.	"Daily Worker," Aug. 23, 1948, p. 7; Aug. 27, 1948, p. 4.
Intervened for Hanns Eisler-----	"Daily Worker," Sept. 26, 1947, p. 12.
Sponsor of banquet for Mother Bloor, prominent Communist.	Program, Jan. 24, 1936, p. 9.
Urged clemency for Rosenbergs---	"Daily Worker," Jan. 21, 1953, p. 7.
References-----	Congressional Record, June 23, 1942; June 10, 1946.

#### PHILIP KLEIN

A statement urging the President and Congress to defend the rights of the Communist Party was signed by Philip Klein, New York, New York, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of March 5, 1941 (p. 2).

A public statement sponsored by the American Committee to Save Refugees was signed by Philip L. Klein, as shown in "For the Rescue of Refugees" by Lloyd Frankenberg, published by the organization. Mr. Klein was listed among signers in the field of "Science and Education." The American Committee to Save Refugees was cited as a Communist front in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.

Professor Philip Klein was named as a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights in the program of the conference which was held February 12, 1940. He signed the "Call" for the National Emergency Conference held at the Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., May 13 and 14, 1939. An Open Letter issued by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was signed by Philip Klein, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of May 13, 1940 (pp. 1 and 5).

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, the National Emergency Conference, and the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights were cited as Communist fronts in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944 and Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947.

Dr. Philip Klein, New York School for Social Work, New York, signed an appeal of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties for the dismissal of the charges against Sam Adams Darcy, a Communist leader, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of December 19, 1940 (p. 5). An Open Letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties urging "reconsideration of the order of Attorney General Biddle for Mr. Bridges' deportation" and that the "ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded" was published in the "Daily Worker" on July 19, 1942 (p. 4); the letter was later published in pamphlet form by the National Federation \* \* \* under the title "600 Prominent Americans Ask President to Rescind Biddle Decision" (first printing, September 11, 1942). Philip Klein, New York School of Social Work, was shown as a signer of the open letter in each source.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. It was "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation \* \* \* as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Report of March 29, 1944, p. 50); it was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Report 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3).

Dr. Philip Klein was listed as a sponsor of "Social Work Today" in the December 1937 issue of the publication (p. 2); in the same issue (p. 5), a portion of a chapter of a "forthcoming book" by Philip Klein, New York School of Social Work, was published. Also in the same issue (p. 16), he was named as one of the delegates who attended a New York State Conference held by "Social Work Today"; a caricature of him appeared in this connection. Philip Klein was listed as a member of the Editorial Board and as a Cooperator-Sponsor in the June-July 1940 issue of "Social Work Today" (p. 2); he was listed as a "Social Work Today" Cooperator for 1940 in the January 1941 issue of the publication (pp. 16-18). Philip Klein, instructor, New York School of Social Work, was one of the signers of "Meeting Social Need: A Program for Peace" of the "Social Work Today" National Conference of Social Work, according to the June-July 1940 (p. 17) issue of the publication.



In Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944, "Social Work Today" was cited as "a Communist magazine."

Professor Philip Klein was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, as shown in the Conference "Call" and Conference Program (p. 12). He signed a protest against the dismissal of Communist teachers, issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, as shown in an advertisement which appeared in "The Nation," February 19, 1949 (p. 215).

The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace was the subject of a Review prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, April 19, 1949, in which the conference was cited as a "supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations." In the same Review, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a Communist front.

#### OTTO KLINEBERG

On March 5, 1941 (page 2), the Daily Worker featured in a full-page spread, the names of several hundred persons who signed a statement addressed to the President and Congress of the United States, defending the Communist Party against alleged persecution. The statement called attention to "a matter of vital significance to the future of our nation. It is the attitude of our government toward the Communist Party" and further urged all members of Congress "to oppose any legislation, direct or indirect, that would take away from Communists those constitutional guarantees which must be kept open for all if in the future they are to be available for any." The name of Prof. Otto Klineberg, New York City, appeared in the list of persons who signed the statement.

Prof. Klineberg was one of the sponsors of a Citizens Rally April 13, 1940, arranged by the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom in Carnegie Hall, New York City, as shown in a leaflet announcing the rally. The American Committee for \* \* \* has been cited as a Communist-front group which defended Communist teachers (reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, a booklet entitled "The Registration of Aliens," and a letterhead of their Fourth Annual Conference which was held March 2-3, 1940, contain the name of Otto Klineberg in lists of sponsors of that organization. The program of the Fifth National Conference of the group which was held in Atlantic City, N. J., March 29-30, 1941, named Prof. Klineberg as a panel speaker and as a sponsor of the conference; he was identified in that source as a professor at Columbia University.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953). The Special Committee \* \* \* cited the organization as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

Prof. Klineberg was identified as a "representative individual" who advocated lifting the embargo against Spain in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say: \* \* \*" (page 9), prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, cited as one of a number of front organizations which was set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (From a report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 19, 1944.)

It was reported in *New Masses* of December 3, 1940 (page 28), that Otto Klineberg had signed an Open Letter to save Luiz Carlos Prestes which was sent by the Council for Pan American Democracy to the President of Brazil. The Council (also known as Conference) for Pan American Democracy was cited as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International. (From the Special Committee's report of March 29, 1944; also cited in their report of June 25, 1942.) The Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

The *Daily Worker* of May 13, 1940 (pages 1 and 5), reported that Otto Klineberg had signed an Open Letter of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, cited as a Communist-front group by the Special Committee \* \* \* (report of March 29, 1944); in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, released September 1, 1947, it was noted that—

during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

"Characteristics of the American Negro" and "Race Differences," written by Otto Klineberg, were advertised for sale by the Communist Workers Book Shop in 1948 (pages 10 and 12 of the 1948 Catalogue, respectively); both books were also advertised in their 1949-1950 Catalogue (pages 11 and 13).

#### HARRY LAIDLER

##### *Organization and affiliation*

American Student Union (1).  
Member of sponsoring committee of Alumni Homecoming dinner.

U. S. Congress Against War (1) and (2). Member, Arrangements Committee; identified as Director, League for Industrial Democracy.

Consumers National Federation (1). Sponsor.

Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union (1).  
Signer.

##### *Source*

Announcement in "The Student Advocate," February 1937.

"The Struggle Against War," August 1933, p. 2; "Call to the U. S. Congress Against War," Sept. 1-4, 1933, New York City, p. 3.

Pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L., Dec. 11-12, 1937, p. 3.

"Soviet Russia Today." November 1937, p. 79.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>  |
|---|--|
| Sent greetings to Mother Ella Reeve Bloor, well-known Communist Party member, on the occasion of her seventy-fifth birthday.  | Souvenir book containing greetings, p. 24.   |
| Open Road, Inc. Leader of The Intelligent Student's Tour of Socialism; identified as Executive Director, League for Industrial Democracy, and author of numerous economic and social studies. | Folder, "The Land of the Soviets" which reveals that The Open Road has "the technical assistance in the U. S. S. R. of Intourist (The Soviet State Tourist Company) and with the cultural assistance of the U. S. S. R. Society for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries (Voks)." |
| Included in a list of "A Few of the One Hundred and Eighty-One Who Have Led Groups Served by The Open Road."  | Booklet, published in February 1937.   |

#### CORLISS LAMONT

On March 5, 1941 (page 2), the Daily Worker featured in a full-page spread the names of several hundred persons who defended the Communist Party against alleged persecution; the statement was addressed to the President and the Congress of the United States and called attention to "a matter of vital significance to the future of our nation \* \* \* the attitude of our government toward the Communist Party \* \* \*" Corliss Lamont was named as one of those who signed the statement.

The Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (page 9), reported that Corliss Lamont had signed a statement in defense of the twelve leaders of the Communist Party, eleven of whom were convicted October 14, 1949, of conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government (New York Times, October 15, 1949, page 5). An advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post on May 24, 1950 (page 14), listed Mr. Lamont as having signed a petition to the Supreme Court for a reconsideration of its refusal to hear the appeal of the "Hollywood Ten".

On May 8, 1936, the Daily Worker (page 5), reported that Corliss Lamont was chairman of a Symposium on John Reed; he was chairman of a meeting held in New York City, October 20, 1940, to commemorate the death of John Reed in Moscow, according to New Masses of October 8, 1940 (page 2); reference to his being a speaker at this meeting appeared in the Daily Worker of October 14, 1940 (page 7). John Reed was founder of the American Communist Party.

According to the program of the banquet January 24, 1936 (page 9), Mr. Lamont was a sponsor of the Mother Bloor Banquet held in honor of Ella Reeve Bloor, prominent Communist leader.

It was reported in the Daily Worker of April 28, 1938 (page 4), that Mr. Lamont was one of the signers of the Statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials.

The Daily Worker of October 30, 1944 (page 8), reported that Corliss Lamont spoke at the celebration of the Twenty-Seventh Anniversary of the Soviet Union.

Soviet Russia Today for March 1937 (pages 14-15) and the Daily Worker of February 9, 1937 (page 2), showed Mr. Lamont to be one of those who signed an Open Letter to American Liberals, published in March 1937 "by a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators. \* \* \* The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report dated June 25, 1942, page 21).

According to Soviet Russia Today for September 1939 (page 25), Corliss Lamont signed the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union, cited by the Special Committee \* \* \* as having been issued by a group of "Communist Party stooges" (Report of June 25, 1942, page 21).

Corliss Lamont signed an Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges, according to the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (page 4). This Open Letter was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee \* \* \* in its report of March 29, 1944 (pages 87, 112, 129, and 166).

The Call to a National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance (page 3), listed Mr. Lamont as a sponsor of that congress which was held January 5-7, 1935, in Washington, D. C., and cited as a Communist front, headed by Herbert Benjamin, a leading Communist (Special Committee \* \* \* in report of March 29, 1944, pages 94 and 116).

A letterhead of the National People's Committee Against Hearst, dated March 16, 1937, listed Corliss Lamont as a member of the National People's Committee. \* \* \* In its report of June 25, 1942 (page 16), the Special Committee cited the National People's Committee as a "subsidiary" organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which it described as the largest of the Communist "front" movements in the United States.

According to the Daily Worker of July 23, 1934 (page 2), Corliss Lamont was a guarantor of loans to the Herndon Bail Fund of the International Labor Defense. The Daily Worker of April 30, 1937 (page 3), named him as a trustee for Herndon bail under auspices of the ILD. "The International Labor Defense \* \* \* was part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1115 of September 2, 1947, pages 1 and 2). The Special Committee cited the ILD as "the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States" (Reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); it was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; previously cited as the "legal arm of the Communist Party", Congressional Record, September 21, 1942, page 7686).

Corliss Lamont was a member of the Committee of the League of American Writers, as reported in the Daily Worker of January 18, 1939 (page 7); he signed a statement of the League in behalf of a second front, according to the Daily Worker of September 14, 1942, page 7, and the Daily People's World of September 23, 1942, page 5. He signed the Call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American

Writers, held June 6-8, 1941, in New York City (New Masses of April 22, 1941, page 25, and a leaflet, "In Defense of Culture"). The League was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General and as having been founded under Communist auspices in 1935, and in 1939 "began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union" (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; and Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7684 and 7686). The League was also cited by the Special Committee in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.

Mr. Lamont was listed as a member of the Editorial Board of the Book Union on an undated letterhead and in Book Union Bulletin for August 1936 (page 1), and August 1938 (page 1). Book Union was cited by the Special Committee in a report dated March 29, 1944 (page 96).

Pamphlets entitled On Understanding Soviet Russia and Socialist Planning in the Soviet Union, written by Corliss Lamont, were listed in the Guide to Readings on Communism, issued by the Workers Book Shops (pages 14 and 15).

In an advertisement of the Workers Library Publishers which appeared in The Communist International of April 1936 (inside back cover), Religion in Soviet Russia by Corliss Lamont was advertised. A review of Soviet Russia and Religion by Corliss Lamont appeared in The Communist International for August 1936 (page 1093).

The Workers Library Publishers was cited as an "official Communist Party publishing house" by the Special Committee in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942; the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the group in Report 1920 of May 11, 1948.

Soviet Russia and Religion, written by Mr. Lamont, was listed in an undated catalogue of the International Publishers (page 61); Mr. Lamont attended the tenth anniversary reception of International Publishers, according to the Daily Worker of December 18, 1934 (page 5).

The Special Committee \* \* \* reported that the International Publishers was an "official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States," and a medium through which "extensive Soviet propaganda is subsidized in the United States" (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). It was cited as "the Communist Party's publishing house" by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7686; and the Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1920 of May 11, 1948).

A pamphlet entitled Soviet Russia and the Postwar World, written by Mr. Lamont, was listed in New Century Publishers Catalog for 1946 (page 14). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited New Century Publishers as—

an official Communist Party publishing house which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively, as well as the theoretical magazine of the party known as Political Affairs and the Constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A. (Report of May 11, 1948, pages 7 and 35).

The following issues of Soviet Russia Today contain contributions from Corliss Lamont: May 1935 (page 6); June 1935 (page 26); February 1936 (page 32); January 1938 (page 14); February 1939

(page 29); June 1939 (page 30); October 1939 (page 18); November 1939 (page 19); February 1940 (page 33); May 1940 (page 11); August 1940 (page 8); October 1940 (page 30), November 1940 (page 8); December 1940 (page 12); February 1941 (page 8); April 1941 (page 7); June 1941 (page 8); July 1941 (page 7); October 1941 (page 8); November 1941 (page 7); January 1942 (page 29); February 1942 (page 9); May 1942 (page 6); July 1942 (page 20); January 1943 (page 28); March 1943 (page 31); March 1947 (page 13); June 1947 (page 3); September 1947 (page 22); November 1947 (page 8); and December 1947 (page 23). According to the Daily People's World of November 6, 1952 (page 7), he contributed to the November issue of New World Review, successor to Soviet Russia Today.

Soviet Russia Today was cited as a Communist-front publication by the Special Committee in report dated March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942. It was also cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 26, 1950 (page 108).

Corliss Lamont was listed as a member of the Editorial Council of Soviet Russia Today in issues of January 1939 (page 3); January 1940 (page 3); and March 1942 (page 3). He was also shown as a member of the Advisory Council of the same publication, on letterheads of September 8, 1947; September 30, 1947; and an undated letterhead (received in April 1948). In New Masses of February 27, 1934 (page 31), Corliss Lamont was named as chairman of a dinner-dance to be held March 2, 1934 under the auspices of Soviet Russia Today. As shown in Soviet Russia Today for September 1936 (page 3), he was a lecturer of the Soviet Russia Today Lecture Bureau; he was one of the sponsors of Soviet Russia Today Dinner celebrating the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Red Army, according to Soviet Russia Today, April 1943 (page 31). It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 13, 1949 (page 4) that he was a contributor to the issue of November 1949 of Soviet Russia Today. Mr. Lamont's Peoples of the Soviet Union was approved by the Soviet Russia Today Book Club, according to The Worker for February 8, 1948 (p. 7, Southern Edition).

According to the Daily Worker of July 5, 1934 (page 5), Mr. Lamont endorsed that newspaper; he protested an attack on the publication, as shown in the issue of January 25, 1936 (page 2); he contributed to the following issues of the paper: August 24, 1937 (page 7); December 24, 1931 (page 3); and December 21, 1935 (page 3). The Daily Worker has been cited as the official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A. (Report 1920 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated May 11, 1948.)

Mr. Lamont contributed to the following issues of New Masses: February 1932 (page 26); April 1932 (page 18); August 20, 1935 (page 15); May 11, 1937 (page 25); November 2, 1937 (page 23); November 30, 1937 (page 19); July 26, 1938 (page 21); September 20, 1938 (page 19); November 14, 1939 (page 6); May 7, 1940 (page 4); May 28, 1940 (page 12); July 9, 1940 (page 10); July 16, 1940 (page 10); July 23, 1940 (page 13); October 8, 1940 (page 17); April 1, 1941 (page 26); June 17, 1941 (page 19); July 15, 1941 (page 12); November 11, 1941 (page 3); March 10, 1942 (page 21); June 22, 1943 (page 9); February 1, 1944 (page 29); March 7, 1944 (page 23); April 11, 1944 (page 24); May 2, 1944 (page 22). The book, USSR; a Concise Handbook, to which Mr. Lamont contributed, was favorably reviewed in New Masses of June 24, 1947 (page 22).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited *New Masses* as the "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" (Report of March 29, 1944, pages 48 and 75; reports of January 3, 1939, page 80; June 25, 1942, pages 4 and 21). The United States Attorney General cited it as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688).

According to the *Daily Worker* of February 26, 1940 (page 4), he attended the defense rally held by *New Masses*. It was shown in *New Masses* of April 2, 1940 (page 21), that he was a member of the initiating committee of *New Masses* Letter to the President, protesting the questioning of its editors and employees by a Special Grand Jury convened in Washington, D. C., to investigate "alleged military espionage" and requesting that the President exert his influence to "end this attack on freedom of the press"; *New Masses* of April 14, 1942 (page 25) named him as a sponsor of the "New Masses Anti-Cliveden Rally" and a sponsor of the same rally; he sponsored a plea for financial support of *New Masses*, according to the issue of April 8, 1947 (page 9).

Corliss Lamont was speaker at a meeting held under the auspices of Friends of the Soviet Union, as shown in *International Press Correspondence*, Volume 14, No. 11, February 23, 1934 (page 305). He was shown to be a signer of a Manifesto issued by the organization in *International Press Correspondence*, Volume 15, No. 50, November 2, 1935 (page 1443). Friends of the Soviet Union was later known as American Friends of the Soviet Union. Corliss Lamont was reported to be chairman of a meeting held by American Friends of the Soviet Union (*Daily Worker* of January 29, 1938, page 8). The following issues of the *Daily Worker* named him as chairman of the organization: February 2, 1938 (page 3); March 7, 1938 (page 1); and May 14, 1938 (page 2). He was listed as chairman of the organization in *New Masses*, December 21, 1937 (page 8). It was reported in *Soviet Russia Today* for June 1935 (page 30), that Corliss Lamont, national chairman of Friends of the Soviet Union, was speaker at a protest meeting held in Scranton, Pennsylvania, under auspices of the group. A report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated January 3, 1939 said:

The Friends of the Soviet Union is possibly one of the most open Communist "fronts" in the United States. It is headed by the former Columbia University professor, Corliss Lamont, son of the Wall Street banker, J. P. Morgan's partner. Young Lamont has long been a close friend of the Communist regime and a supporter of the system of government existing in Russia.

The *Daily Worker* of February 16, 1938 (page 2), listed Mr. Lamont as a signer of a letter to the President, issued by American Friends of Spanish Democracy. He was a member of the Executive Committee of this organization, as shown by a letterhead dated February 21, 1938. *New Masses* of January 5, 1937 named him as a member of the General Committee, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau (page 31); a letterhead dated November 18, 1936, listed him as a member of the Executive Committee of the Medical Bureau.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy was cited by the Special Committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (page 82), as follows:

In 1937-1938, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing

multifarious so-called relief organizations \* \* \* such as \* \* \* American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

Corliss Lamont was a participant in a Roundtable Conference, held May 24-25, 1940, under auspices of the American Council on Soviet Relations, as shown in the Summary of Proceedings, dated July 15, 1940. He was chairman at a rally held by the American Council on Soviet Relations as shown in the Daily Worker of July 2, 1941 (pages 1 and 2), and was speaker under the auspices of the organization (New Masses, November 11, 1941, page 31).

The American Council on Soviet Relations was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee (report of March 29, 1944, page 174) and by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688; letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948 and September 21, 1948).

A letterhead dated August 22, 1935, showed Corliss Lamont to be a member of the National Executive Committee of the American League Against War and Fascism. He contributed to the December 1933 issue (page 5) of Fight magazine, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism.

The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy \* \* \* "It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before." (Special Committee \* \* \* in report dated March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942). The league was cited as Communist by the Attorney General (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10; Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7683; letters to the Loyalty Review Board in 1947 and 1948).

Mr. Lamont was a member of the National Committee of the Student Congress Against War, as shown in the pamphlet entitled "Fight War" (page 4).

During the Christmas holidays of 1932, the Student Congress Against War convened at the University of Chicago. This gathering was held at the direct instigation of the (Amsterdam) World Congress Against War. The Chicago Congress was completely controlled by the Communists of the National Student League (Special Committee \* \* \* in report of March 29, 1944).

According to "The Struggle Against War" for June 1933 (page 2), Mr. Lamont was a member of the American Committee for Struggle Against War which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944).

Corliss Lamont was a member of the Committee of Sponsors for a Dinner-Forum on "Europe Today" held October 9, 1941, under auspices of the American Committee to Save Refugees, the Exiled Writers Committee of the League of American Writers and the United American Spanish Aid Committee, as shown by the invitation to the dinner-forum.

The American Committee to Save Refugees was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee \* \* \* (report of March 29, 1944; citation of the League of American Writers appears on page 2 of this report). Citation of American Friends of Spanish Democracy



(shown above) also applies to the United American Spanish Aid Committee. The Attorney General cited this organization as Communist (press release of July 25, 1949).

According to the Catalogue and Program (January 1942), Mr. Lamont was a guest lecturer at the School for Democracy.

In 1941, the Communists established a school in New York City which was known as the School for Democracy (now merged with the Workers School into the Jefferson School of Social Science).

It was "established by Communist teachers ousted from the public school system of New York City" (Special Committee \* \* \* in report of March 29, 1944).

It was reported in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (page 4) that Corliss Lamont signed an Open Letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, denouncing the Attorney General's charges against Harry Bridges and the Communist Party. A leaflet attached to an undated letterhead showed him to be a signer of the organization's January 1943 Message to the House of Representatives.

The Special Committee \* \* \* cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942; January 2, 1943). Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947 stated that the National Federation was "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law." It was cited by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948).

It was shown in the Certificate of Incorporation of the People's Radio Foundation, November 27, 1944 (page 6) that Corliss Lamont, 450 Riverside Drive, New York, was a director. In a photostatic copy of an application made by this same organization for a broadcasting station construction permit, July 27, 1945, Corliss Lamont was named as a stockholder and director until the first annual meeting of stockholders (pages 13 and 26).

People's Radio Foundation, Inc., was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948).

According to the Daily Worker of April 22, 1947 (page 4), Corliss Lamont signed a statement condemning the revocation of the charter of the Queens College Chapter of the American Youth for Democracy. In a letter to the Loyalty Review Board, Attorney General McGrath stated that this was an organization for young Communists (letter released August 30, 1950). The organization had been cited previously in 1947 and 1948, in letters from a former Attorney General to the Loyalty Review Board. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization in its report of March 29, 1944 and a citation also appeared in Report No. 271 of April 17, 1947 of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It was shown in a photostatic copy of the Certificate of Incorporation filed in New York State February 15, 1943, that Mr. Lamont was a subscriber to this certificate, and director until the first annual meeting of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. He was shown to be chairman of the National Council of American-

Soviet Friendship in the Daily Worker, October 25, 1943 (page 3) and was so listed on letterheads of the group dated February 8, 1946 and March 13, 1946. He was shown as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on letterheads dated January 23, 1948; April 30, 1949; January 10, 1950; and February 21, 1950. It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 3, 1947 (page 5) that he spoke at a rally held at St. Nicholas Arena, November 9, 1947, under the auspices of the National Council. The Daily Worker of January 31, 1949 (page 5), also named him as speaker at a meeting held under the auspices of that organization. He delivered an address at a rally held in Madison Square Garden, New York City, May 29, 1946, under the auspices of that organization, according to a pamphlet entitled "We have seen America." He was chairman at the Assembly on American-Soviet Relations held June 17, 1947, by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as reported in The Worker of June 15, 1947 (page 10). He spoke at the Congress on American-Soviet Relations held by this same group December 3-5, 1949, as shown in the program.

Mr. Lamont was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship's Committee on Education, according to the Bulletin of the committee issued June 1945 (page 22). He was one of the signers of a statement in praise of Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin, which was circulated by the Council in May 1948, according to a pamphlet entitled "How to End the Cold War and Build the Peace" (page 9). He signed a statement of this organization, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 17, 1949 (page 4). The Daily Worker of April 14, 1952 (page 8, an advertisement), announced that Dr. Lamont was to speak at a symposium of the Council on The Future of Germany and World Peace, April 23, at the Yugoslav-American Home, New York City. The Daily Worker of November 6, 1952 (page 8, an advertisement) and of November 17, 1952 (page 8), named him as a speaker at a rally of the Council November 13th in New York City, on USA-USSR Cooperation for Peace.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities reported that the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian (report of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General cited it as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

Mr. Lamont was named as Chairman of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship on a letterhead dated October 27, 1942. The Congress was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee in its report of March 29, 1944.

According to the Daily People's World of May 15, 1952 (page 7) and May 27, 1952 (page 3), Corliss Lamont was named speaker for the American Russian Institute at its Sixth Annual Banquet, May 23, in Los Angeles. It was reported in the Daily People's World of May 26, 1952 (page 7), that he was to discuss the recent economic conference in Moscow, May 27, for the American-Russian Institute. The Attorney General cited this organization as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953).

Under auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, Corliss Lamont was a member of the National Reception Committee for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie, according to an invitation to a dinner held in New York City, March 31, 1948; he signed an Open Letter to the President on Franco Spain, which letter was released by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown on a mimeographed letter attached to a letterhead of April 28, 1949.

The Special Committee cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a "Communist-front organization headed by Edward K. Barsky" (report of March 29, 1944, page 174). It was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

As shown in the Conference call and the printed program (page 13), Mr. Lamont was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace which was held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949, under the sponsorship of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions; he was listed as having signed a statement of the Council (Congressional Record, July 14, 1949, page 9620), and he signed a Resolution Against Atomic Weapons, prepared and released by the Council, according to a mimeographed list of signers of the resolution attached to a letterhead of July 28, 1950. The following issues of the Daily Worker named him as speaker at a mass meeting of the Council in Carnegie Hall, March 10th: March 4, 1952 (page 3); March 7, 1952 (page 8); March 10, 1952 (page 7); and March 12, 1952 (page 3).

The National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities (Report No. 1954 of April 26, 1950, originally released April 19, 1949, page 2).

According to the Daily Worker of July 25, 1950 (page 4), Corliss Lamont of New York signed a statement against the Hobbs Bill (statement prepared and released by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Committee as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (Report dated March 29, 1944; also cited in a report dated June 25, 1942). The Attorney General cited the organization in letters to the Loyalty Review Board as subversive and Communist (press release of September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

Mr. Lamont was one of the sponsors of the American Continental Congress for World Peace which was held September 5-10, 1949, as shown in the call to that congress and the printed program which is in Spanish (page 7). This congress was cited as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere" (report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 1, 1951, page 21, by the Committee on Un-American Activities).

Encouraged by its success in drawing dupes into its campaign, the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact launched a more ambitious project under the high-sounding title of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace. This was held at the St. James Methodist Church in Chicago on May 29 and 30, 1950. \* \* \* In plain terms, the conference was aimed at assembling as many gullible

persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda. \* \* \* The sponsors of the Mid-Century Conference included a number of the usual supporters of Communist fronts such as \* \* \* Corliss Lamont \* \* \* (Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, pages 58 and 59).

In June 26, 1946, Corliss Lamont was cited for contempt of Congress in the House of Representatives for refusal to supply information and records of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship requested by this committee. (See: Washington Star, June 27, 1946.) The Grand Jury did not indict him. However, Richard Morford, executive director of the National Council \* \* \*, who had custody of the records, was cited at the same time for contempt of Congress because of his refusal to produce records of the organization, as subpoenaed by the Committee on Un-American Activities. He was indicted and later convicted (Daily Worker, June 29, 1950, page 2), and it was reported in the Daily Worker of August 30, 1950 (p. 3), that he had begun his jail sentence.

The Daily Worker of June 10, 1952 (page 2), said:

Former Representative Vito Marcantonio, State Chairman of the American Labor Party, announced today that at a meeting of the American Labor Party State Executive Committee, held on June 3, the nomination of Corliss Lamont as the ALP candidate for United States Senator from the State of New York was unanimously recommended to all ALP clubs and to the ALP State convention, which will take place August 28, 1952.

For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City they have been unable to win control (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report dated March 29, 1944, page 78).

A pamphlet entitled "Are We Being Talked Into War?" which was written by Dr. Corliss Lamont, was reviewed in the Daily People's World of April 4, 1952 (page 6, magazine section), and it was described therein as a pamphlet "that traces the development of the propaganda drive for war against the Soviet Union." The review said that—

Dr. Lamont's well-documented little pamphlet shows just how the war makers and war propagandists have tried to incite the people for war through the years \* \* \* In contrast, Lamont cited the "fundamental attitude" of the Soviet Union as represented by the law passed by the Supreme Soviet in 1951 "outlawing war propaganda through the USSR."

An article by Barbara Schaeffer in the Daily Worker of September 14, 1952 (pages 3 and 6), said, in part:

The very term Iron Curtain was fashioned by that right hand man of Hitler, Goebbels. The United States passport division has given meaning to the term \* \* \* Among those harassed when trying to leave the United States: \* \* \* Corliss Lamont, writer.

In speaking of Mr. Lamont's difficulties, the article stated that he—  
Reported this spring to a meeting of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee that he had been asked for a "complete reorientation of his views" in order to get a passport.

"Soviet Civilization" by Mr. Lamont was reviewed by Robert Friedman in the Daily Worker of November 28, 1952 (page 7). The article said:

A survey of the basic concepts of Soviet socialist society and an account of the specific Soviet achievements in every field of endeavor, Dr. Lamont's book is the work of an American patriot because it calmly, logically, factually destroys many of the anti-Soviet misconceptions on which the whole fight-Russia propaganda is

predicated. Lamont concludes his book with the predication that "the objective verdict of coming generations will be that the Soviet Russians, during their first 35 years, laid the foundations of a great new civilization of enduring achievement and high promise, ranking in world historical significance with the outstanding civilizations of the past."

Mr. Friedman's review also appeared in the Daily People's World December 15, 1952 (page 7).

#### OSCAR LANGE

##### *Organization and affiliation*

American Slav Congress (1) and (2). Delegate to Third American Slav Congress, Manhattan Center, New York City, September 20, 21, 22, 1946; speaker; identified as Polish Ambassador and later U. N. representative.

Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1) and (2). Speaker.

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2). Speaker at the George Washington's Birthday and Red Army Day Celebration Dinner, February 21, 1946, New York City.

Sponsor of Chicago Council--

Reference -----

Reference -----

##### *Source*

Committee on Un-American Activities, Report on American Slav Congress, June 26, 1949, pp. 24, 95.

"Daily Worker," Apr. 1, 1949, p. 5; "The Worker," Mar. 20, 1949, p. 10; and a Postal Card, "Caucus for Peace."

Press release dated Feb. 22, 1946.

Undated leaflet entitled "Speakers on Russia," issued by the Chicago Council in 1945 (p. 12).

Testimony of Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins before the Seditious Activities Investigation Commission, State of Illinois, 1949 (vol. II, p. 25).

Washington "Star" of Nov. 29, 1949, p. B1.

#### OWEN LATTIMORE

A pamphlet entitled a Conference on Democratic Rights named Owen Lattimore as one of the sponsors of that conference which was called by the Maryland Association for Democratic Rights (affiliated with the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights) for June 14-15, 1940. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Emergency Conference \* \* \* as a Communist-front organization in a report dated March 29, 1944.

Owen J. Lattimore was one of the speakers at a discussion meeting in Washington, D. C., February 11, 1941, held under the auspices of the Washington Committee for Aid to China, as shown on a leaflet entitled Stop Shipments to Japan; he was identified in this connection as author of Inner Asian Frontiers of China and Director of the School of International Affairs, Johns Hopkins Institute. The Washington Committee for \* \* \* was also cited by the Special Committee \* \* \* as a Communist-controlled organization (report dated March 29, 1944).

The program of the Writers Congress which was held in 1943 under the joint auspices of the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization from October 1 to 3, named Owen Lattimore as one of the speakers. The Attorney General of the United States cited the Hollywood Writers Mobilization as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

Mr. Lattimore spoke at a meeting of the Washington Book Shop, April 6, 1945, as shown on a mimeographed circular of the organization, first cited by the Attorney General in 1942 as follows: "Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party \* \* \* " (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688; subsequently cited as subversive and Communist in press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953); the Special Committee \* \* \* cited the Washington Book Shop as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 by the Attorney General, April 1, 1954.

The New York Times, in reviewing Mr. Lattimore's book, *The Situation in Asia*, stated that "often he seems to feel that Russian policy is sounder, more astute and/or more progressive than that adopted by the U. S." (New York Times Book Review, April 10, 1949, page 5.)

Mr. Lattimore's *Solution in Asia* (Little, Brown), was recommended by *Spotlight on the Far East* for March 1947 (page 7), official publication of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy; it was favorably reviewed by Harriet Moore for *Soviet Russia Today* in the July, 1945 issue (page 27).

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy was cited by the Attorney General as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 1, 1954. *Soviet Russia Today* has been cited as a Communist-front publication (Special Committee \* \* \* in reports of June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944); subsequently cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front publication (report of October 23, 1949, page 108).

Rob F. Hall, writer for the *Communist Daily Worker*, defended Mr. Lattimore in an article which appeared in that publication on April 3, 1950 (page 7); Mr. Hall quoted Mr. Lattimore with approval in an article which appeared in the *Daily Worker* June 28, 1950 (page 7); Joseph Starobin reviewed Mr. Lattimore's book, *The Situation in Asia*, for the *Daily Worker* of May 24, 1949 (page 8). Mr. Lattimore was interviewed by the *Daily Worker*, as shown in the issue of September 5, 1945 (page 8).

On May 3, 1950 (page 2), the *Daily People's World* defended Mr. Lattimore; on May 4, 1950, the following editorial comment appeared in the same publication (pages 7 and 12): "The latest example of the encroachment upon the rights of all is the hounding of Owen Lattimore \* \* \* this man, along with the Communists and just about everybody else in the world except a small gang of fanatics in Washington, believes that Chiang Kai-shek is washed up." The *Daily People's World* has been cited as "the official organ of the

Communist Party on the West coast" by the Special Committee \* \* \* (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report of January 3, 1941).

Owen Lattimore was a witness in the State Department Employee Loyalty Investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the United States Senate, March-June 1950 (pages 417-486, 799-871, 873-921 of the hearings). A review of charges made against Mr. Lattimore, a review of his testimony, and conclusions of the subcommittee concerning the charges are shown in Report No. 2108 of the Committee on Foreign Relations (pages 48-71, 160, and 161).

On December 17, 1952, the Washington Star reported (page A-3) that "Owen Lattimore, long center of stormy charges of Communist influence in the Government, will appear in court Friday to answer a Federal grand jury indictment accusing him of perjury. The seven-count indictment, handed down yesterday, charges the 52-year-old specialist on Far Eastern affairs with lying under oath while testifying before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee \* \* \*" The same information was reported by the Times-Herald and Washington Post on December 17th (pages 1 of both publications). His photograph appeared in the Star and the Post in this connection.

The Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker) reported on September 14, 1952 (page M6) that Owen Lattimore, a Far East expert, had experienced difficulties when trying to leave the United States.

#### MAX LERNER

On June 2, 1949, the Daily Worker (p. 2) reported that Max Lerner, identified as columnist for the New York Post, had asserted that the trial against the leaders of the Communist Party "has no business being in court. I don't see how anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of the history of Communist movements can doubt the basic rightness of William Z. Foster's plea, in his long manifesto, that violence cannot be pinned on the American Communists and that under American conditions the attempt to use it would be fantastic."

A "Statement of 450 leading figures in America, urging the President and Congress to uphold the Constitutional rights of the Communist Party of the United States," was published in the Communist "Daily Worker" on March 5, 1941 (p. 2, col. 4); the statement called "attention (to) a matter of vital significance to the future of our nation. It is the attitude of our government toward the Communist Party \* \* \*" and urged "all members of Congress to oppose any legislation, direct or indirect, that would take away from Communists those constitutional guarantees which must be kept open for all if in the future they are to be available for any." Max Lerner of Massachusetts was one of those who signed the statement.

Mr. Lerner was named in the "Daily Worker" of June 17, 1937 (p. 2) as having signed a statement, demanding pardon for German Communists; on July 23, 1940 (p. 1) the "Daily Worker" reported in an article datelined Washington, D. C., July 22, that "a strongly-worded protest against the nation-wide attack on the right of the Communist Party to use the ballot was made here yesterday by 65 leading educators, writers, churchmen, lawyers, trade unionists and civic leaders. The 65 liberals demanded that President Roosevelt and Attorney General Robert Jackson take immediate action to

safeguard the constitutional liberties of Communists." The open letter was made public by the National Chairman of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, and was signed by Max Lerner, identified with "The Nation."

The American League for Peace and Democracy, established in 1937, issued a statement on the international situation which appeared in "New Masses" on March 15, 1938 (p.19), together with a list of persons who signed the statement, including the name of Max Lerner.

The American League for Peace and Democracy was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League against War and Fascism

in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. It was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International. (From the Attorney General's citation which appeared in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, pages 7683 and 7684.)

The Attorney General cited the American League \* \* \* as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the Special Committee cited the American League as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States \* \* \* (and) nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason" (reports of January 3, 1939, and March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; and June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943).

Mr. Lerner was one of the sponsors of the American Congress for Peace and Democracy which was held in Washington, D. C., January 6-8, 1939 ("Call") and at which time the American League for Peace and Democracy was formed. The American Congress was cited as "a Communist front advocating collective security against the Fascist aggressors prior to the signing of the Stalin Hitler pact" (Special Committee \* \* \* in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (reports of the Special Committee dated June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944); it was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954. Max Lerner was one of the sponsors of the Fourth Annual Conference of the organization, held in Washington, D. C., March 2-3, 1940, as shown on a letterhead of that conference; a letterhead of the group dated September 11, 1941, named him as one of the sponsors of the American Committee; he was a sponsor of the organization's national "American All" week which was celebrated October 21-28, 1941 (undated letterhead announcing "American All" week); he was a guest of honor at a United Nations in America Dinner, arranged by the organization in New York City, April 17, 1943 (from the invitation to dinner).

Professor Max Lerner of Williams College was named in "The Student Almanac," official publication of the American Student Union, as a speaker at the Fourth National Convention of that organization ("The Student Almanac" for 1939, page 32). The American Student Union was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee \* \* \* (reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).



A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy, dated November 16, 1938, lists Max Lerner as one of the sponsors of that organization, known also as the Council for Pan-American Democracy and cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee (reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944). It was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

Max Lerner was a committee member of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated November 18, 1936; he was a member of the general committee of American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown in "New Masses" for January 5, 1937 (p. 31), and a letterhead of the group dated February 21, 1938; he was identified in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say: \* \* \*" as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo against Loyalist Spain; the booklet was prepared and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy and the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo were cited as among a number of so-called relief groups set up by the Communist Party when it was campaigning for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause in 1937 and 1938 (Report 1311 of the Special Committee dated March 29, 1944).

The "Daily Worker" of April 6, 1937 (p. 9) reported that Max Lerner was a member of the Advisory Board of Frontier Films, an organization cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee in its report of March 29, 1944. He was among those who signed a petition in support of Simon W. Gerson, a Communist, according to the petition and list of persons who signed it, which was released by the League of American Writers as it appeared in the "Daily Worker" of March 10, 1938 (p. 1). The League of American Writers was cited as a Communist front in three reports of the Special Committee \* \* \* (January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The Attorney General stated that the League was founded under Communist auspices in 1935 and in 1939 began openly to "follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686). The organization was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

A leaflet attached to a letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated January 17, 1940, contains the name of Max Lerner, identified as Professor, Williams College, in a list of individuals who signed a petition of the group. The American Committee \* \* \* has been cited as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (reports of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944).

The Communist-front enterprises, cited as such by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944), were the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union (reprinted in "Soviet Russia Today" for November 1937, page 79), and the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union

which was printed in "Soviet Russia Today" for September 1939 (pages 24-26); in both instances, Max Lerner was named as having signed.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited both the Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio and the Prestes Defense Committee as Communist-front organizations; the latter group was further described as "defending Luiz Carlos Prestes, leading Brazilian Communist and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International" (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); Max Lerner signed a cable which was sent by the Prestes Defense Committee, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of February 13, 1937 (p. 2); he was a member of the Non-Partisan Committee for \* \* \* as disclosed by an official letterhead of the group dated October 3, 1936.

The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was another of the Communist fronts cited in Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \* Professor Lerner was listed as a member of the Board of Sponsors, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, according to a press release of February 23, 1940. He was named by the "Daily Worker" of May 13, 1940 (pp. 1 and 5), as having signed an Open Letter of the organization.

The pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L.," published by the Consumers National Federation, December 11-12, 1937 (page 3), reveals that Max Lerner was a sponsor of that organization; on March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities reported that "the Consumers National Federation was a Communist Party front which included a large number of party members and fellow travelers as its sponsors."

Mr. Lerner signed an Open Letter to New Masses, concerning the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky, according to the February 16, 1937, issue of "New Masses" (p. 2); his photograph appeared in connection with his contribution to the July 13, 1943, issue of "New Masses" (pp. 3 and 9). The Attorney General cited "New Masses" as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited "New Masses" as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party \* \* \* whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service." (See Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, pages 48 and 75).

"Soviet Russia Today" for March 1937 (pp. 14-15) and the "Daily Worker" of February 9, 1937 (p. 2) both named Max Lerner as having signed an Open Letter to American Liberals, cited as a Communist-front enterprise by the Special Committee in its report of June 25, 1942.

Mr. Lerner was a member of the Sponsors Committee of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 16, for the Fifth Annual Stenographers' Ball, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated February 1, 1940; the "Daily Worker" of March 9, 1938 (p. 5) named Max Lerner as a sponsor of the conference of the Book and Magazine Guild, Local 18, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the United Office and Professional Workers of America "as strongly entrenched with Communist leadership" (reports of January 3, 1940 and March 29, 1944).

**ALFRED BAKER LEWIS**

*Organization and affiliation*

*Source*

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2). "Daily Worker," July 19, 1942, p. 4.

Signer of Open Letter sponsored by the organization denouncing U. S. Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges and the Communist Party.

See also: Vol. 17, public hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, September-October 1944, pp. 10299, 10301, 10306, 10340, 10347, 10348; Report No. 2277, Special Committee \* \* \*, Subversive Activities Aimed at Destroying Our Representative Form of Government, June 25, 1942, pp. 11, 21.

See also: Congressional Record, June 23, 1942 and October 13, 1942.

**A. A. LIVERIGHT**

A. A. Liveright, identified as executive director of the American Council on Race Relations, was one of the sponsors of a congress on Civil Rights, as shown on the "Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights, Detroit, April 27-28, 1946," for the purpose of organizing "an offensive against the rising Fascist aggression in the United States." The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order 10450; included in consolidated list of cited organizations April 1, 1954). In Report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19, the Committee on Un-American Activities stated that the Civil Rights Congress was "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

The Communist Daily Worker of April 3, 1950, p. 4, named *Alex. A. Liveright*, American Council on Race Relations, Chicago, as one of those who signed a statement of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, cited as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against anti-subversive legislation" (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities released December 7, 1950).

In its issue of January 1941 (pp. 16-18), *Social Work Today* listed A. A. Liveright, Illinois, among the "cooperators" for 1940, with a contribution of \$5. The issue of February 1942 (pp. 51-54) named him as a "cooperator" for 1941. *Social Work Today* was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist magazine (report of March 29, 1944, p. 129).

## DR. ISADORE LUBIN

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

Friends of the Soviet Union (1) and (2). Speaker, Washington, D. C.

"Daily Worker," Mar. 19, 1930, p. 2.

Quotation: "One more depression in the United States, with its equivalent of low production output and mass unemployment, will be enough evidence to starving Europeans that the free enterprise system cannot meet their needs for improved standards of living."

"Washington Post", June 25, 1947, p. 2.

See also: Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Vol. 3, October-November 1938, pp. 2369, 2374.

## ROBERT S. LYND

On December 14, 1939, "the day before the 148th Anniversary of the Bill of Rights," a statement signed by "65 prominent citizens was sent to the American press." The release stated that "we recognize particularly that serious efforts are being made to silence and suppress the Communist Party. We regard as significant the fact that precisely now Earl Browder, its General Secretary, has been indicted on data which the government has evidently had for years. We observe that a charge four years old has just now been revived against another official of the Communist Party, Sam Adams Darcy. Similarly, a minor technicality was invoked in order to rule all Communist candidates off the New York City ballot. \* \* \*" The statement related that "we feel compelled to speak out sharply and boldly at this moment \* \* \* When forces exist, as we believe they do now exist, whose objectives effect \* \* \* is the destruction of civil liberties blindness to facts becomes dangerous, pious protestation of liberalism, becomes mockery, and failure to speak out courageously becomes criminal \* \* \*" The statement was signed by Robert S. Lynd, identified as a professor at Columbia University.

Professor Lynd was one of the sixteen "distinguished Americans" who "denounced the trend toward disciplinary action against lawyers who defend 'political minorities, racial minorities and labor organizations.'" The statement pointed out that such actions "may destroy the right to fair trial and adequate legal counsel as guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment to the American Constitution." The statement was a defense of the five lawyers who defended the eleven leaders of the Communist Party; the lawyers were cited for contempt by Judge Medina. (From the Daily Worker of February 1, 1950, page 3.)

An invitation issued by the American Russian Institute to a dinner dedicated to American-Soviet Post-War Relations, New York City, October 19, 1944, named Professor Lynd as a member of that organization's Board of Directors. On December 12, 1947, the Daily Worker reported that the Board of Superintendents were planning to eliminate a course for teachers on culture in the Soviet Union which was sponsored by the American Russian Institute; the same article revealed

that Prof. Robert S. Lynd of Columbia University was a member of the Board of Directors of the Institute.

The Call of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., to a Congress to be held November 6-8, 1943, a letterhead of the National Council dated March 13, 1946, and a Memorandum issued by the Council March 18, 1946, named Prof. Lynd as one of the sponsors of the organization; he was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the organizations' Committee on Education, as shown on the proceedings of a conference on Education About the Soviet Union, October 14, 1944, in New York City; a bulletin issued by the Committee on Education, June 1945 (page 22), also named him as a member of the Sponsoring Committee \* \* \*. The New York Times of May 19, 1943 (page 17-C), reported that he had signed the National Council's Open Letter to the American People; he signed the organization's Open Letter to the Mayor of Stalingrad, as revealed by Soviet Russia Today for June 1943 (page 21); he signed the organization's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange for a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace," p. 9); on February 17, 1949, the Daily Worker named Prof. Lynd as having signed a statement of the Council urging President Truman to have an interview with Premier Stalin.

As shown in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (page 79), Robert S. Lynd was one of those who signed the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, cited as a "Communist enterprise" signed by "hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of March 29, 1944).

The program of the Fifth National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born which was held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 29-30, 1941, named Prof. Lynd as one of the sponsors of that organization; he was identified with Columbia University. Prof. Lynd signed a statement of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, calling for International Agreement to Ban Use of Atomic Weapons (statement attached to a press release dated December 14, 1949, page 13).

A letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom dated December 1, 1939 named Robert S. Lynd as a member of the New York Committee of that organization; he signed a petition of the group, as shown in a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940; he was one of the sponsors of a Citizens' Rally in New York City, April 13, 1940, held under the auspices of the American Committee \* \* \*, as shown on a leaflet announcing the rally; he signed an appeal of the same organization which was sent to Secretary Hull on behalf of anti-fascist refugees trapped in France (Daily Worker of July 22, 1940, page 1, column 5); he also signed the organization's Open Letter to Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, denouncing his "pro-war" stand (Daily Worker of October 7, 1940, page 3; October 12, 1940, page 4; and New Masses October 15, 1940, page 17).

Robert S. Lynd signed the letter of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy which was addressed to the President of the United States (Daily Worker of February 7, 1938, page 4); and he also signed their

petition to lift the arms embargo against Spain (Daily Worker of April 8, 1938, page 4).

A letter of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, addressed to the President and Attorney General of the United States was signed by Prof. Lynd. The letter protested "attacks upon the Veterans of the \* \* \* and condemning the war hysteria now being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration" (Daily Worker of February 21, 1940).

According to a mimeographed letter, attached to a letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, dated April 28, 1949, Robert S. Lynd signed an Open Letter of the group which was addressed to the President of the United States; he signed the organization's petition to the President "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain" (mimeographed petition attached to a letterhead dated May 18, 1951).

New Masses for December 3, 1940 (page 28), revealed that Robert S. Lynd signed an Open Letter of the Council for Pan American Democracy (also known as the Conference for \* \* \* ), addressed to the President of Brazil, urging him to save Luis Carlos Prestes.

Robert Lynd was a member of the Provisional Sponsoring Committee of the National Emergency Conference, as shown on a letterhead of the organization dated May 19, 1939; he was a member of the Board of Sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, as shown on the organization's Legislative Letter of February 15, 1940 and a press release of February 23, 1940; he signed the Group's Open Letter, as shown in the Daily Worker of May 13, 1940 (pages 1 and 5).

The Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, named Robert S. Lynd as one of the sponsors of that conference. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was formed at this conference and later merged with the International Labor Defense to form the Civil Rights Congress. The Daily Worker of December 29, 1948 (page 2), revealed that Prof. Lynd was one of the sponsors of the Civil Rights Congress of New York State; he was identified with Columbia University.

Prof. Lynd was one of the sponsors of a conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, October 9-10, 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, "To Safeguard These Rights \* \* \* " published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council \* \* \* ; he signed the organization's statement for negotiations with the U. S. S. R., as reported in the Daily Worker of August 7, 1950 (page 8); he was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, called by the National Council \* \* \* in New York City, March 25-27, 1949 (conference call and the program, page 13; also the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949, page 2); he supported a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the United States Supreme Court, as shown in "We Join Black's Dissent," a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1951, by the National Council \* \* \* .

An undated letterhead of Frontier Films named Robert Lynd as a member of the Advisory Board of the organization. He signed an Open Letter of the League of American Writers, addressed to Secretary Cordell Hull and the Pan-American Conference (Daily Worker, July 31, 1940, page 7).

"In March 1937, a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an Open Letter bearing the title, Open Letter to American Liberals. The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of June 25, 1942). The Daily Worker of February 9, 1937 (page 2) and Soviet Russia Today for March 1937 (pages 14-15), revealed that Robert S. Lynd of Columbia University signed the Open Letter to American Liberals.

On May 11, 1937, the Daily Worker reported that Robert Lynd has signed a statement of the American League Against War and Fascism, protesting Franco spies (page one of the Daily Worker); he opposed an amendment barring American Youth for Democracy and declared "I'm glad the (Schultz) amendment was stopped and that I went on record against it" (Daily Worker, November 21, 1947, p. 5); the amendment "could have empowered college faculties to outlaw so-called 'subversive' student groups."

The Daily Worker of March 5, 1941 (page 4) reported that Prof. Lynd had signed a letter to the President of the United States, urging him to recognize seating the People's Republic China in the United Nations; he was a member of the Planning Committee of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act (letterhead of May 25, 1951); a member of the National Committee (Daily Worker, May 14, 1951, page 8); a sponsor of same group (Daily Worker of December 27, 1950, page 9); and he signed the National Committee's Open Letter to the President, urging him to "call a halt to building of concentration camps in the United States" (Daily Worker, January 28, 1952, page 3).

The organizations, unions and publications referred to in this memorandum have been cited by (1) the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and/or the Committee on Un-American Activities; and (2) the Attorney General of the United States, as follows:

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1)  
 American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2)  
 American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1)  
 American League Against War and Fascism (1) and (2)  
 American Russian Institute (2)  
 Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2)  
 Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (1)  
 Council for (or Conference on) Pan American Democracy (1) and (2)  
 Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (1)  
 Daily Worker (1)  
 Frontier Films (1)  
 Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union (1)  
 International Labor Defense (1) and (2)  
 League of American Writers (1) and (2)  
 National Council of American Soviet Friendship (1) and (2)  
 National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1)  
 National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2)  
 Soviet Russia Today (1)  
 Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee  
 (1) and (2)  
 Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (1) and (2)

## KENNETH MACGOWAN

A letterhead of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization dated October 10, 1945 listed Kenneth Macgowan among the members of the organization's Executive Council. He was listed as Editor of the "Hollywood Quarterly," publication of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, in the issue of April 1947.

On October 1-3, 1943, the Hollywood Writers Mobilization and the University of California held a Writers Congress, the program of which listed Kenneth Macgowan as a member of the Advisory Committee; a member of the Seminar on The Documentary Film; and a member of the Committee of the Panel on Pan-American Affairs.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Hollywood Writers Mobilization as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board and released by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Kenneth Macgowan was an instructor at the Peoples Educational Center, as shown by the pamphlet for the Fall Term 1946 (p. 14). The School's Winter 1947 Catalogue listed him as a lecturer on production in the course on Motion-Picture Direction and gave the following biographical note: "Dramatic critic from 1910 to 1923; play producer from 1923 to 1931; motion-picture producer since 1932 \* \* \* Head of theater arts department at U. C. L. A."

The Attorney General cited the People's Educational Center as Communist and subversive in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

A letterhead of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions listed Kenneth MacGowan as a member of the Executive Council (letterhead dated October 2, 1945).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions as a Communist-front organization.

An advertisement in the "Daily People's World," May 2, 1947 (p. 8), listed Kenneth MacGowan as a sponsor of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist



Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

ROBERT M. MACIVER

In a booklet entitled "Can You Name Them?" the name of Robert M. MacIver, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University, is listed on page 3 as one of the endorsers of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (Reports of June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944).

A leaflet published by the American Committee to Save Refugees and entitled "For the Rescue of Refugees," contains the name of Robert M. MacIver among the signers of a public statement of the organization.

The American Committee to Save Refugees was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pages 49, 112, 129, 133, 138, 167 and 180).

It was reported in the "Daily Worker" of April 8, 1938 (page 4) that Prof. R. M. MacIver, Columbia University, was one of the signers of a petition to lift the arms embargo which was sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations \* \* \* such as \* \* \* American Friends of Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1311, March 29, 1944, page 82.)

According to the Daily Worker of April 10, 1953, page 6, Dr. Robert M. MacIver along with Prof. Robert S. Lynd, both identified as being professors at Columbia University, presented a statement to 200 faculty members on April 6, 1953, in which they called the recent stand of the Association of American Universities favoring "cooperation" with the witchhunting committees "the most serious blow that education has received."

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy, dated April 16, 1939, revealed that Mr. MacLeish was a member of the Writers and Artists' Committee of that organization which was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press June 1 and September 21, 1948.

The American League \* \* \* was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism—

in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union \* \* \*. The American League \* \* \* was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International (U. S. Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7683 and 7684).

The American League was the—

largest of the Communist "front" movements in the United States; it was formerly known as the American League Against War and Fascism, and, at the time of its inception, as the United States Congress Against War (Special Committee on

Un-American Activities in reports of January 3, 1939 and March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943).

Mr. MacLeish was chairman of the opening session of the American Writers Congress, June 4-6, 1937, and also spoke before the Congress ("Daily Worker" of June 5, 1937, pages 1 and 4); he was elected vice-President of the organization during that Congress ("Daily Worker" June 8, 1937, page 3).

The American Writers Congress was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as having been sponsored by the League of American Writers; Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, spoke at the second biennial American Writers Congress in 1937. (From the Special Committee's report of March 29, 1944.)

The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General (lists released to the press June 1 and September 21, 1948); the "League \* \* \* was founded under Communist auspices in 1935 (and) in 1939 began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union" (U. S. Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686). The League was also cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

"The Bulletin" of the League of American Writers (page 7), named Mr. MacLeish as a member of that group; he spoke at a meeting of the League, as shown in "New Masses" of April 20, 1937 (page 32); he was a member of the National Council of the League ("The Bulletin," Summer 1938, page 2); and a committee sponsor of the League, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of January 18, 1939 (page 7).

A pamphlet, "Youngville, U. S. A." (page 63), and an undated official letterhead of the American Youth Congress, both list the name of Archibald MacLeish as a member of the National Advisory Board of that organization. The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948). The Congress "originated in 1934 and \* \* \* has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (U. S. Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7685; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10). It was also cited as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" and "prominently identified with the White House picket line \* \* \* under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of June 25, 1942; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1941; and March 29, 1944).

As shown in the "Daily Worker" of April 6, 1937 (page 9), Archibald MacLeish was a member of the Advisory Board of Frontier Films, cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee in its report of March 29, 1944.

A letterhead of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, dated May 28, 1946, listed Archibald MacLeish as vice-Chairman of that organization, cited as a Communist-front group by the Committee on Un-American Activities in

its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, March 26, 1950 (page 2); it was also cited in the Committee's report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive dated April 25, 1951 (pages 11 and 12).

Mr. MacLeish was a member of American Friends of Spanish Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated November 18, 1936. He was one of the sponsors of Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, as disclosed by a letterhead of that organization dated September 10, 1938. A letterhead of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, named him as a member of the organization's Writers and Artists Committee; he was named in the "Daily Worker" of January 12, 1938 (page 7), as one of the sponsors of that organization; the same information was shown in the pamphlet entitled "One Year in Spain" (page 12), and in the "Daily Worker" of February 27, 1937 (page 2). He was one of the sponsors of "Tag Day," held in New York City under the auspices of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of February 27, 1937 (page 2).

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and setting up so-called relief organizations such as American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. (From Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944.)

In a booklet entitled "These Americans Say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain,'" material for which was compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, Archibald MacLeish, identified as a writer, was named as a "representative individual" who advocated lifting the embargo on the sale of arms to Spain. The Coordinating Committee \* \* \* was set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States, and was used by the Communist Party to carry on a great deal of agitation. (Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \*)

The booklet, "Children in Concentration Camps" (on the back cover), lists the name of Archibald MacLeish as one of the sponsors of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, publishers of the booklet; a letterhead of the organization dated November 16, 1939, also named him as national sponsor of the Medical Aid Division of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, cited by the Special Committee \* \* \* as a front organization of the Communist Party (report of January 3, 1940, page 9).

#### CAREY McWILLIAMS

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Anne Kinney (aka Jane Howe) testified that Carey McWilliams was never a member of the Communist Party.	Executive hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities, released to the public in "Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area—Part 5," pp. 867-900.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Louis Budenz testified that Carey McWilliams was a member of the Communist Party.	Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations (House of Representatives), Dec. 23, 1952, p. 721. Washington "Post," Dec. 25, 1952, p. 25.
Mr. McWilliams denied Mr. Budenz' charge and was quoted as saying: "This statement is categorically false. I have never been a member of the Communist Party."	
City government of San Francisco, California, cancelled permission for the use of the War Memorial building for a meeting at which Carey McWilliams had been scheduled to speak.	"Daily People's World," Oct. 14, 1952, p. 3.
Speech by Mr. McWilliams in Portland, Oregon, banned in 1950 after Capt. William Browne, chief of detectives for the Portland police department and head of the American Legion's subversive activities committee told the school authorities that McWilliams was subversive, citing the California Tenney Committee report.	"Daily People's World," Jan. 31, 1950, p. 2.
Opposed to loyalty oath-----	"Daily Workers," Sept. 28, 1950, p. 4; "Daily People's World," Apr. 20, 1949, p. 3; May 17, 1950, p. 3; Aug. 30, 1950, p. 10; Nov. 22, 1950, p. 2; Jan. 18, 1951, p. 9.
Sent message of encouragement to attorneys defending 14 persons being tried under the Smith Act.	"Daily People's World," June 10, 1952, p. 3.
Protested the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the conviction of 11 Communist leaders under the Smith Act.	"Daily People's World," June 28, 1951, p. 6.
Signer of statement in behalf of lawyers defending Communists.	"Daily Worker," Feb. 1, 1950, p. 3.
Signer of statement asking parole for Hollywood cases.	"Daily Worker," Dec. 22, 1950, p. 3.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Statements by Mr. McWilliams on Communist cases have appeared in the following.	"Daily Worker," Dec. 31, 1948, p. 3; Feb. 28, 1949, p. 9; June 10, 1949, p. 4; Oct. 19, 1949, p. 11; Oct. 30, 1949, p. 6 (Southern edition of the Sunday Worker); Narodna Volya (Bulgarian language organ of the Communist Party), Mar. 25, 1949, p. 4.
Signer -----	Brief submitted in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo in the Supreme Court of the United States, October 1949.
Signer of statement opposing Mundt anti-Communist bill.	"Daily Worker," May 4, 1948, p. 11; "Daily People's World," May 12, 1948, p. 3.
Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2). Signer of statement condemning persecution of Gerhart Eisler.	"Daily Worker," Feb. 28, 1947, p. 2.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2). Signer of an open letter sponsored by group urging the President to reconsider the order of the Attorney General for the deportation of Harry Bridges, and to rescind the Attorney General's "ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party."	"The Worker," July 19, 1942, magazine sec., p. 4.
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (1). Chairman of meeting to hear Harry Bridges and his codefendants.	"Daily People's World," Apr. 18, 1950, p. 10.
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (1) and Bridges, Robertson, Schmidt Defense Committee (2). Chairman of dinner in honor of Harry Bridges, J. R. Robertson, and Henry Schmidt.	"Daily People's World," Oct. 2, 1952, p. 3; see also "Daily People's World," Oct. 14, 1952, p. 2.
Bridges, Robertson, Schmidt Defense Committee (2). Participant at meeting and reception in honor of Harry Bridges in New York City, Dec. 10, 1952.	Printed program.
Signer of "strongly worded protest against the nation-wide attack on the right of the Communist Party to use the ballot * * *"	"Daily Worker," July 23, 1940, p. 1.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| Open Letter to American Liberals (1). Signer.  | "Soviet Russia Today," March 1937, pp. 14, 15.  |
| American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2). Chairman.                   | Booklet, "The Registration of Aliens" (back cover); "New Masses," June 4, 1940, p. 2; a letterhead dated June 11, 1940; "Daily Worker," Sept. 11, 1940, p. 3; Sept. 30, 1940, p. 3; Oct. 5, 1940, p. 2; Oct. 8, 1940, p. 5. |
| Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee (1) and (2). Endorser.                                | Leaflet, Censored News.   |
| International Workers Order (1) and (2). Endorser of meeting.                              | Circular announcing public rally, Apr. 28, 1940.  |
| International Labor Defense (1) and (2). Sent greetings.                                   | Program of Third Biennial National Conference.  |
| National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2). Vice chairman.               | Pamphlet, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; letterhead of Nov. 6, 1940; program, "Call National Action Conference for Civil Rights."  |
| National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2). Member, executive committee. | Letterhead, July 3, 1942.   |
| Signer of statement hailing the War Department's order on commissions for Communists.      | "Daily Worker," Mar. 18, 1945, p. 2.  |
| Signer of statement opposing the use of injunctions in labor disputes.                     | Advertisement "New York Times," Apr. 1, 1946, p. 16.  |
| Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2). Sponsor of Freedom Crusade.                             | "Daily Worker," Dec. 15, 1948, p. 11.   |
| National Lawyers Guild (1). Member, Committee on Labor Law and Social Legislation.         | News-Letter, July 1937, p. 2.   |
| Associate editor of Lawyers Guild Review.  | May-June 1948 issue of Lawyers Guild Review, p. 422.  |
| Addressed luncheon meeting.  | "Daily People's World," Oct. 27, 1953, p. 6.  |
| Spoke at banquet May 4 at Hotel Commodore.   | "Daily Worker," May 6, 1954, p. 3.  |
| American Slav Congress (1) and (2). Sponsor of testimonial dinner, Oct. 12, 1947.          | Invitation and program.   |
| American Peace Crusade (1) and (2). Member of council.                                     | "New Masses," Aug. 6, 1940, p. 23.  |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Peace Mobilization (1) and (2). Member, National Council.	"Daily Worker," Sept. 3, 1940, p. 4.
American Continental Congress for Peace (1). Sponsor.	"Daily People's World," Aug. 18, 1949, p. 2.
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Sponsor.	Letterheads dated 1946, 1947, and 1948; "Daily People's World," Feb. 26, 1946, p. 3.
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Signer of statement.	Letterhead received January 1949.
Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (1). Sponsor.	"Daily Worker," Mar. 12, 1949, p. 12 and conference program, p. 15.
Washington Book Shop Association (1) and (2). Book, Factories in the Field listed as dividend for members of association.	Bookplate, publication of group, issue of December 1939, p. 19.
Southern California Country by Mr. McWilliams, listed as dividend.	Bookshopper, May 23, 1946.
Speaker -----	Leaflet dated Dec. 15, 1947.
"New Masses" (1) and (2). Contributor.	"New Masses," June 4, 1940, p. 9; July 16, 1940, p. 12; Sept. 26, 1944, p. 32.
"A Mask for Privilege" by Mr. McWilliams, reviewed favorably.	"Political Affairs," July 1948, p. 665; "The Bookshopper," July 1948, p. 4; "The Worker," Dec. 19, 1948, p. 10, magazine section.
Workers Book Shop. Brothers Under the Skin by Mr. McWilliams advertised and sold.	Workers Book Shop Catalog, 1948, p. 10; Catalog, 1949-50, p. 11.
"Witch Hunt" by Mr. McWilliams reviewed favorably.	"Daily People's World," Dec. 7, 1950, p. 9; Jan. 15, 1951, p. 7; "Daily Worker," Dec. 24, 1950, p. 6, sec. 2.
League of American Writers (1) and (2). Signer of Call to the Fourth American Writers Congress.	Leaflet, "In Defense of Culture"; "New Masses," Apr. 22, 1941, p. 25.
Member of panel on minority groups at 1943 congress.	Program.
People's Institute of Applied Religion (2). Member, International Board and sponsor.	Letterhead, Jan. 1, 1948.
Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (1). Local sponsor.	Undated letterhead.

## NORMAN MAILER

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1).<br>Member.   | Daily Worker, Sept. 21, 1948,<br>p. 7.                     |
| Speaker, New York State Council of the Arts, Sciences.   | Adv. in New York Star, Oct. 5, 1948, p. 6.                 |
| Speaker at Academic Freedom Rally in behalf of dismissed teachers.   | Adv. in New York Star, Oct. 8, 1948, p. 10.                |
| Signed statement in support of Henry A. Wallace; i. d. as author of "The Naked and the Dead."  | Daily Worker, Oct. 19, 1948, p. 7.                         |
| Sponsor, dinner held by org. in honor of Henry A. Wallace, Oct. 28, 1948, New York City.   | Program dated Oct. 28, 1948.                               |
| Signed Call Upon the Film Industry to Revoke Blacklist; call issued by Theatre Div. of the National Council.                             | Variety Dec. 1, 1948, p. 21 (an advertisement).            |
| Signed statement of org-----   | Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 2.                         |
| Signed statement of org-----   | New York Star, Jan. 4, 1949, p. 9 (an adv.).               |
| Sponsor of conference; i. d. as author.  | Daily Worker, Jan. 10, 1949, p. 11.                        |
| Signed statement of org-----   | Letterhead rec'd. Jan. 1949.                               |
| Speaker-----   | Daily People's World, July 26, 1949, p. 5.                 |
| Speaker, Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, Mar. 25-27, 1949; i. d. as author, "The Naked and the Dead." | Conference program, p. 8.                                  |
| Sponsor, Cultural and Scientific Conference.   | Conference program, p. 13.                                 |
| Sponsor, Cultural and Scientific Conference. * * * i. d. as a writer.  | Daily Worker, Feb. 21, 1949, p. 9.                         |
| Sponsor, Cultural and Scientific Conference.   | Conference "Call."   |
| Spoke on "The Only Way for Writers" at Cultural and Scientific Conference.   | Speaking of Peace, the edited report of conference, p. 82. |
| Participated in Cultural and Scientific Conference * * *; biography.   | Speaking of Peace, p. 141.                                 |



<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2). Sponsor of Freedom Crusade.	Daily Worker, Dec. 15, 1948, p. 11.
Sponsor, Freedom Crusade; protests indictment of 12 Communist leaders.	Daily Worker, Dec. 31, 1948, p. 3.
Sponsor, Freedom Crusade --	Program and Conference (Used as Part of Cvetic Exhibit 52 during his testimony before this committee).
Sponsor, National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, Jan. 18 and 19, 1949; i. d. from New York City.	Leaflet of Freedom Crusade, program and conference (Part of Cvetic Exhibit 52).
Masses & Mainstream (1). Author of "The Naked and the Dead," reviewed by Charles Humboldt.	Masses & Mainstream, Aug. 1948, p. 70.
Author of "The Naked and the Dead," recommended by The Worker; photograph appeared in connection with article.	The Worker, December 19, 1948, p. 10, magazine section.
Author of "Naked and the Dead" film adaptation by War Dept.	Daily Worker, May 26, 1950, p. 11.
Daily Worker (1). Author of "Barbary Shore" (Rinehart); critically reviewed by Robert Friedman.	Daily Worker, June 10, 1951, p. 7.
Daily People's World (1). Author of "Barbary Shore"; reviewed critically by Robt. Friedman.	Daily People's World, June 15, 1951, p. M6.
Supported Simon Gerson, a Communist.	Daily Worker, Oct. 18, 1948, p. 4.
Signed brief on behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dal- ton Trumbo submitted by the Cultural Workers to the Supreme Court of the U. S., Oct. 1949 Term.	Brief.

#### ALBERT MALTZ

The Daily Worker of March 5, 1941, p. 2, reported that Albert Maltz, Long Island, N. Y., was one of those who signed a statement to the President defending the Communist Party. The Daily Worker of May 4, 1936, p. 2, reported that a play written by Mr. Maltz was given for the benefit of the Communist Party. The Daily Worker of July 21, 1940, p. 1, reported that "The Underground Stream" by Albert Maltz, the story of a Communist organizer in the Detroit automobile industry, was to run in serial form in the publication. A book by Albert Maltz was advertised in the May 1938 issue of the "Communist International."

The Daily Worker of April 28, 1938, p. 4, reported that Albert Maltz was one of the signers of a statement by American Progressives on the Moscow trials.

Albert Maltz was one of those who signed a statement urging the dismissal of the charges against the Communist prisoners, as shown by the Daily People's World of November 6, 1948, p. 3; and the Daily Worker of January 17, 1949, p. 3, reported that he signed a statement in behalf of the twelve Communist leaders. He was shown as a sponsor of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the Twelve Communist leaders (back of letterhead of September 9, 1949), and he signed a statement of the Committee for Free Political Advocacy, an organization which defended the twelve Communist leaders (Narodna Volya, March 25, 1949, p. 4, and Daily Worker, February 28, 1949, p. 9). The Daily Worker of May 16, 1952, p. 3, reported he was a sponsor of a conference scheduled for June 14 at St. Nicholas Arena in New York City by the National Conference to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims; he was shown as a sponsor of the National Committee to Win Amnesty for the Smith Act Victims on a letterhead of May 22, 1953, and signed a telegram greeting Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday, under auspices of that Committee, as reported in the Daily Worker on August 11, 1952, p. 3. According to the Daily Worker of December 10, 1952, p. 4, he signed an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act. The Daily People's World of July 24, 1953, p. 6, listed his name as having signed an appeal for broad participation in the amnesty campaign launched in behalf of individuals serving sentences under the Smith Act.

An undated leaflet of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born listed Albert Maltz as a member of the Board of Directors of that organization. The Program and Call for the National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, listed him as a sponsor of the conference. He was shown to be a sponsor of the American Committee on a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th Anniversary National Conference \* \* \*, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Illinois (December 8-9, 1951).

The Daily Worker of June 17, 1949, p. 7, reported that Albert Maltz spoke for the American Labor Party.

Albert Maltz contributed to the November 1933 issue of Fight, p. 8, the publication of the American League Against War and Fascism.

Albert Maltz was a sponsor of a testimonial dinner given by the American Slav Congress, New York, N. Y., October 12, 1947, as shown by the Invitation issued by the Congress and the Program of the Dinner.

The Daily People's World of May 28, 1948, p. 3, reported that Albert Maltz spoke for the American Youth for Democracy.

The Program of the Artists' Front to Win the War, dated October 16, 1942, p. 5, listed Albert Maltz as a sponsor of that organization.

Albert Maltz spoke at the California Labor School, according to the July 22, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World, p. 5, and was the guest of honor of the School, according to the April 7, 1949, issue of the same publication, p. 5.

The Daily Worker of June 20, 1949, p. 5, reported that Albert Maltz spoke for the Civil Rights Congress in behalf of the Communist leaders. The Daily People's World of May 2, 1947, in an advertisement on p. 8, listed Albert Maltz as a sponsor of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress. He signed an Open Letter to J. Howard

McGrath in behalf of the four jailed trustees of the Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement in the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1951, p. A-7, "paid for by contributions of signers").

Albert Maltz was a sponsor of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, as shown by the program leaflet of the conference dated June 7, 1940, p. 4. A letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties dated November 6, 1940, and the program, "Call National Action Conference for Civil Rights" listed Mr. Maltz as a sponsor of the National Federation \* \* \*. He signed statements and messages of the organization, as shown by the booklet, "600 Prominent Americans," p. 25; a news release of the organization dated December 26, 1941; a leaflet attached to an undated letterhead of the organization; the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4; and the Daily Worker of December 19, 1940, p. 5.

Albert Maltz contributed to the Daily Worker, as shown by the December 24, 1931, p. 3, December 21, 1935, p. 3, and November 9, 1947, pl. 8, issues of the publication. Equality issues of February 1940, p. 18, and June 1940, p. 35, listed Mr. Maltz as a contributor. He was listed as a member of the Editorial Council of Equality in the July 1939, p. 2, June 1940, p. 3, and July 1940, p. 2, issues.

The Daily Worker of April 6, 1937, p. 9, listed Mr. Maltz as a staff member of Frontier Films.

International Publishers listed Albert Maltz in a catalog, p. 14, as one of the authors whose works they published, and the Daily Worker of March 1, 1950, p. 11, reported that the International Publishers had published "The Citizen Writer" by Mr. Maltz.

New Masses, August 27, 1940, p. 21, reported that Albert Maltz was a sponsor of the Plays for Children Contest of the International Workers Order, Junior Section. Mr. Maltz participated in a program of the Jewish People's Fraternal Order of the International Workers Order, as shown by the Daily People's World of September 5, 1947, p. 5. Mr. Maltz spoke at a meeting of the IWO defending Leon Josephson, Eugene Dennis and Gerhart Eisler, Communists as shown in the Daily People's World of February 13, 1948, p. 3. The Daily People's World of May 19, 1948, p. 5, reported that he spoke at a meeting of the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, IWO, Silver Lake Lodge No. 488.

Albert Maltz' play, "Rehearsal," was produced for the Jefferson School of Social Science, according to the April 15, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker, p. 7.

Letterheads of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated February 26, 1946, April 28, 1949, and May 18, 1951, list Albert Maltz as a sponsor of the organization. He spoke for the organization, as shown by the Daily Worker, April 1, 1948, p. 4; The Worker, October 31, 1947; and the Daily Worker, May 17, 1948, p. 2. A mimeographed letter attached to a letterhead of the organization dated April 28, 1949, listed his name as a signer of an Open Letter to President Truman on Franco Spain; in 1951, he signed the organization's petition to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain" (mimeographed petition attached to letterhead of May 18, 1951).

The Daily Worker of April 29, 1935, pp. 1 and 2, reported that Albert Maltz read "The Working Class Theatre" at the American

Writers' Congress, Mecca Temple, New York, N. Y., April 26-27, 1935. "Direction," May-June, 1939, p. 1, listed Mr. Maltz as one of those who signed the Call to the Third American Writers Congress, and the Program of the Congress listed him as Co-Chairman of the Arrangements Committee. A leaflet, "In Defense of Culture," listed his name as one of those who signed the Call to the 4th American Writers Congress, New York, N. Y., June 6-8, 1941.

The Bulletin of the League of American Writers, p. 12, listed Albert Maltz as a member of the National Board of the League; and the Daily Worker of April 30, 1935, listed his name as a member of the Executive Committee of the organization. New Masses, June 17, 1941, p. 9, and the Daily Worker of September 14, 1942, p. 7, listed Mr. Maltz as Vice President of the League. Mr. Maltz contributed to the pamphlet, "We Hold These Truths," p. 70, which was published by the League; and the Daily Worker of March 26, 1938, p. 5, reported that he was one of those who signed a telegram to Governor Lehman which was sponsored by the League. Albert Maltz signed the Call to the Fourth Congress, League of American Writers, June 6-8, 1941, according to New Masses, April 22, 1941, p. 25, and he was one of those who signed a statement of the League in behalf of a second front, as shown by the Daily Worker of September 14, 1942, p. 7.

The League of Women Shoppers defended Albert Maltz, according to the April 8, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker, p. 5.

Albert Maltz contributed to New Masses, issues of December 15, 1936, p. 37; January 26, 1937, p. 25; and August 17, 1937, p. 16. He signed a letter to the President sent by New Masses, as shown by the April 2, 1940, issue of that publication, p. 21; and he spoke at a symposium, New Masses Theatre Night, May 26, 1941, Manhattan Center, as shown by the May 27, 1941, issue of the periodical, p. 32. The Daily Worker of April 7, 1947, p. 11, listed Albert Maltz as an endorser of the New Masses; and the Daily Worker of October 6, 1947, p. 11, reported that he spoke at a meeting held under the joint auspices of New Masses and Mainstream. An advertisement in PM of October 16, 1947, p. 5, listed his name as a sponsor of a Protest Meeting for Howard Fast held by Masses and Mainstream in New York, N. Y., October 16, 1947. "The Journey of Simon McKeever" by Mr. Maltz was reviewed by Phillip Bonosky in the June 1949 issue of Masses and Mainstream, p. 72. He sent congratulations to Masses and Mainstream on its fifth anniversary (issue of March 1953, p. 54) and contributed an article to the November 1951 issue of the publication, p. 42.

Albert Maltz was a sponsor of the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, as shown by the Call to the conference which was held in New York, N. Y., January 23-25, 1948.

The pamphlet, "How to End the Cold War and Build the Peace," p. 9, listed his name as one of those who signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in praise of Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948. The Daily People's World of October 23, 1943, p. 3, reported that he was on the motion picture committee to organize Hollywood participation in the local observance of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 16, at the Shrine Auditorium.

A letterhead, which was received by the Committee in January 1949, listed Albert Maltz as a member-at-large of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions; the same information was shown on a letterhead of the organization's Southern California Chapter (a photostat dated April 24, 1950). Mr. Maltz was shown to be a member of the Board of Directors of the National Council \* \* \* on letterheads of July 28, 1950, and December 7, 1952, and on a leaflet, "Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention 1950." An undated ballot of the Southern California Chapter of the National Council (to be counted February 9, 1951) listed his name as a member of the organization's Film and Theater Division and as a candidate for Executive Board. The Daily Worker of April 11, 1951, p. 8, reported that he was an honor guest at a meeting of the National Council. He signed a statement of the Council attacking espionage investigations, as shown by the Daily Worker of August 18, 1948, p. 2; he signed the Council's statement protesting curbs on lawyers in political trials, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 10, 1952, p. 3. A statement in support of Henry A. Wallace, sponsored by the Council, was signed by Mr. Maltz, as shown in the Daily Worker of October 19, 1948, p. 7; and he was a sponsor of a dinner held by the Council in honor of Henry A. Wallace, October 28, 1948, Hotel Commodore, New York City, as shown on the Program.

Mr. Maltz was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held under auspices of the National Council \* \* \* in New York, N. Y., March 25-27, 1949, as shown by the Conference Program (p. 13) and the Conference Call.

Mr. Maltz spoke at a meeting of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D. C., on "Legislative Investigation? or Thought Control Agency?", October 20, 1947, p. 3.

New Theatre, May 1935, p. 8, listed Albert Maltz as a contributor to that publication of the New Theatre League and New Dance League. The New Theatre League produced "Black Pit" by Maltz, as shown by the January 8, 1936, issue of the Daily Worker, p. 3; and the Daily Worker of June 10, 1938, p. 7, reported that Maltz was the guest of the New Theatre League.

Albert Maltz was one of those who signed the Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges, as shown by the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4; and he was a member of the International Board and a sponsor of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, Inc., as shown by a letterhead dated January 1, 1948. Mr. Maltz issued a statement in support of the USSR which appeared in the September 1941 issue of "Soviet Russia Today", p. 30; and he was one of those who signed a statement in defense of the members of the National Board of the Spanish Refugee Appeal, as shown by the Daily People's World, June 25, 1948, p. 5.

Albert Maltz was one of those who signed a letter to Governor Thomas E. Dewey which was sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee, as shown by the New York Times of October 9, 1944, p. 12. He signed a letter to President Roosevelt protesting attacks on the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, as shown by the Daily Worker of February 21, 1940; and he was a public sponsor of the Veterans Against Discrimination of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, as shown by a letterhead of that organization dated May 11, 1946.

"Way Things Are" by Albert Maltz was published by the New Century Publishers, as shown by the 1946 catalogue (p. 30). The Workers Bookshop advertises books by Albert Maltz, as shown by the advertisement of "The Journey of Simon McKeever" in the 1949-1950 catalogue of the bookshop, p. 3; and that of "The Citizen Writer" on a leaflet of the Annual Sale, Workers Bookshop, March 10 to April 1, 1950. "The Citizen Writer" was published by International Publishers, as shown in the Daily Worker, issues of November 21, 1949, p. 11, and March 1, 1950, p. 11. "The Journey of Simon McKeever" was recommended by The Worker (issue of December 4, 1949, p. 8, sec. 2, Southern Edition).

Albert Maltz testified in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 21-30, 1947, as shown in the hearings (p. 363). The Daily People's World of October 30, 1947, p. 1, reported that Maltz was cited for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the Committee. He was one of the persons cited for contempt of Congress who agreed to waive a jury trial and abide by the decision of the trial case, the Lawson-Trumbo case. The Washington Post of April 11, 1950, p. 1, reported that the Supreme Court upheld the decision of the lower court and that Lawson and Trumbo were sentenced to pay \$1,000 fines and serve a year in jail. The Daily Worker of April 4, 1951, p. 3, reported that Albert Maltz had been released from the Federal prison at Mill Point, West Virginia, after serving his sentence for contempt; he had started serving his term June 29, 1950.

## CITATIONS

(1) Cited by Committee and/or Special Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) Cited by the United States Attorney General.

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2)  
 American Labor Party (1)  
 American League Against War and Fascism (1) and (2)  
 American Slav Congress (1) and (2)  
 American Writers Congress (1)  
 American Youth for Democracy (1) and (2)  
 Artists Front to Win the War (1)  
 California Labor School (2)  
 Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2)  
 Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America (1) and (2)  
 Daily Worker (1)  
 Equality (1)  
 International Publishers (1)  
 International Workers Order (1) and (2)  
 Jefferson School of Social Science (1) and (2)  
 Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (1) and (2)  
 League of American Writers (1) and (2)  
 League of Women Shoppers (1)  
 Masses and Mainstream (1)  
 National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East (2)  
 National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2)  
 National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1)  
 National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2)

National Lawyers Guild (1)  
 New Century Publishers (1)  
 New Masses (1) and (2)  
 New Theatre (1)  
 New Theatre League (1)  
 Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges (1)  
 People's Institute of Applied Religion, Inc. (2)  
 Schappes Defense Committee (1) and (2)  
 Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace (1)  
 Veterans Against Discrimination of the Civil Rights Congress (2)  
 Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (1) and (2)

## PERRY MILLER

*Organization and affiliation*

Samuel Adams School for Social Science (2). Teacher of course on "The Literature of Industrialism"; biographical notes shown on page 23 of source. i. d. as Dr.

Member of Faculty-----

*Source*

Catalogue for Spring Term, 1947 (pp. 15 & 23); photostat of this used as Struik Exhibit 5, July 24, 1951.

Testimony of Mr. Walter S. Steele before this committee July 21, 1947, p. 52.

## GARDNER MURPHY

*Organization and affiliation*

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (1) and (2). Signed Press release.

American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2). Member of Psychologists Committee.

American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2). Sponsor.

National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Sponsor, Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, March 25-27, 1949. i. d. as Educator.

Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (1). Sponsor.

Conference on Pan American Democracy (1) and (2). Sponsor.

*Source*

Press release dated Dec. 26, 1941.

Letterhead dated Apr. 6, 1939.

Letterhead of June 11, 1940 (written in Spanish); Program of the Fifth National Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., Mar. 29-30, 1941; and a booklet entitled "The Registration of Aliens." Daily Worker, Feb. 21, 1949, p. 2; also conference program, p. 15.

Program of the conference, Feb. 12, 1940.

Letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938; signed call to the conference as shown in "News You Don't Get" for Nov. 15, 1938, p. 3.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>  |
|---|--|
| Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1). Representative Individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo against Spain.   | Booklet entitled "These Americans Say: * * *" (p. 9).  |
| Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1). Psychologists' Committee.   | Letterhead dated July 6, 1938.   |
| American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Signed petition to lift arms embargo.  | Daily Worker, Apr. 8, 1938, p. 4   |
| Civil Rights Congress (1) and (2). Signed an "Open Letter to J. Howard McGrath" on behalf of the four jailed Trustees of the Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York., i. d. as a teacher, New York. | Advertisement ("paid for by contributions of signers"), Evening Star, Oct. 30, 1951, p. A-7. |

## HENRY MURRAY

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>                      |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Daily Worker (1). Marched in May Day Parade, Joliet, Illinois.   | Daily Worker, Apr. 28, 1924, p. 4. |
| National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Sponsor, Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25-27, 1949. Name shown in this source as Henry A. Murray. | Conference program, p. 15.         |
| Reported to be witness in behalf of Alger Hiss. Name shown in source as Dr. Henry A. Murray. Washington Times-Herald, Jan. 13, 1950, p. 5.   |                                    |

## RAY NEWTON

"The Struggle Against War," August 1933 (p. 2) reported that Ray Newton was a member of the Arrangements Committee for the United States Congress Against War of the American Committee for Struggle Against War. A letterhead of the United States Congress Against War dated November 1, 1933 carried the name of Ray Newton as a member of the Arrangements Committee.

The American Committee for Struggle Against War was cited as a Communist front which was formed in response to directives from a World Congress Against War held in Amsterdam in August 1932 under the auspices of the Communist International by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 47 and 119). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the United States Congress Against War as "convened in St. Nicholas



Arena, New York City, on September 29, 1933 \* \* \* it was completely under the control of the Communist Party. Earl Browder was a leading figure in all its deliberations. In his report to the Communist International, Browder stated: "The Congress from the beginning was led by our party quite openly." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, March 29, 1944, p. 119.) The Attorney General of the United States cited the organization as follows: "The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. \* \* \* The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union. \* \* \* Subsequent congresses in 1934 and 1936 reflected the same program." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683.)

#### MILTON MAYER

Material concerning Milton Mayer and the Great Books Foundation was entered in Committee files at the request of the Honorable Richard Nixon in a letter addressed to the Chairman, September 25, 1951. This material contains a letter addressed to Senator Nixon, September 13, 1951, by Charles F. Strubbe, Jr., President of the Great Books Foundation, concerning Milton Mayer and the Foundation. A copy of this letter and the letterhead on which it was written is enclosed for your information.

The reference in the letter to the "Syracuse story," in which Mr. Mayer was accused of advocating 'tearing down the flag' may be found in the Congressional Record of March 6, 1947 (page 1720), where the Honorable Bertrand Gearhart read an article from the Syracuse (New York) Post Standard of February 16, 1947. This article reported that Milton Mayer, professor at the University of Chicago, had addressed a meeting of One Worlders in Syracuse, as follows:

We must haul down the American flag. And if I wanted to be vulgar and shocking, I would go even further, and say haul it down, stamp on it, and spit on it.

Attached to Mr. Strubbe's letter is a photostatic copy of a letter dated March 14, 1947, from District Attorney William H. Powers, to the Assistant Counsel to the Governor of New York, which states:

\* \* \* in connection with the complaint from Mr. Gridley Adams of the United States Flag Foundation, I wish to report that an investigation of this episode indicates no crime was committed, or insult intended to the flag. The objectionable remarks occurred at a Forum held on February 15, 1947, at the Osedaga Hotel in Syracuse, New York, as part of the program of the Institute of International Relations, which is sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee and the Syracuse Peace Council. The subject of the Forum was "world government," a concept apparently opposed by Mr. Mayer.

The attention focused on his statement illustrates the misunderstanding that can arise when a question is taken out of its context. What Mr. Mayer apparently meant was that the persons advocating world government would "haul down the American Flag, etc." which is obviously exactly contrary to advocating such a practice.

Also attached to the file are photostats of a certification of Mr. Bower's signature by the Onondaga County Clerk, May 1, 1951, and clippings of articles reporting on Mr. Bower's investigation which

appeared in the Syracuse Post-Standard on March 19, 1947, and the Syracuse Herald-Journal of the same date.

In an article datelined Whittier, July 4, the Daily People's World of July 5, 1950 (page 4), reported that—

the U. S. policy in Korea today "seems dangerously like the totalitarianism we are supposed to be fighting, Milton Mayer told one of the final sessions of the Institute of International Relations sponsored by the Quakers here \* \* \* Emphasizing that he was himself a rabid anti-Communist, Mayer said he failed to see how war in Korea was going to eliminate communism \* \* \*"

#### REINHOLD NIEBUHR

A letterhead of the Fourth Annual Conference, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held at the Hotel Annapolis in Washington, D. C., March 2-3, 1940, showed Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr to be one of the sponsors of that conference. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, June 1 and September 21, 1948; the organization was redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Committee \* \* \* as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Dr. Niebuhr endorsed the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, as shown on the "Call to Action" by the Congress for January 6-8, 1939, in Washington, D. C.; a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy, dated July 12, 1939, named him as a member of the National Committee of that organization; the "Daily Worker" of January 18, 1938 (page 2) reported that he was one of those who signed a resolution urging passage of the Anti-Lynching Bill, which resolution was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy. Dr. Niebuhr was one of the sponsors of the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference of the American League \* \* \*, as shown in the January 11, 1938 issue of the "Daily Worker" (page 2). It is also shown on a letterhead of the China Aid Council of the League, dated May 18, 1938, that Dr. Niebuhr was a sponsor of the Council. He was chairman of a Mass Reception at the opening session of the United States Congress Against War, as shown on the printed program of the Congress.

The American Congress for Peace and Democracy has been cited as a Communist-front organization advocating collective security against the Fascist aggressors prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact; the American League for Peace and Democracy was formed at this Congress. (From a report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944.)

The American League for Peace and Democracy was "established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union \* \* \* (It) was designed to conceal Communist control in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7683 and 7684); the Attorney General included the

American League \* \* \* on lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948) and redesignated it pursuant to Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953. The Special Committee cited the American League as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States" (Reports of January 3, 1939; March 29, 1944; January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943). The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism which was held in New York City, September 29-October 1, 1933 (United States Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7683); the Special Committee cited the United States Congress Against War as "completely under the control of the Communist Party" (Report of March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, dated February 21, 1938, named Dr. Niebuhr as a member of the Executive Committee of that organization, cited by the Special Committee as a Communist-front group (Report of March 29, 1944).

Dr. Niebuhr was one of the sponsors of a mass rally of the American Labor Party, as shown on a handbill entitled "Protest Brutal Nazi Persecutions!" The Special Committee cited the American Labor Party as follows: "For years the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control" (Report of March 29, 1944).

A leaflet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union" named Dr. Niebuhr as a member of the Advisory Board of the American Student Union; he spoke at the Fourth National Convention of the organization, as shown in the "Student Almanac" for 1939 (page 32); he was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the "Alumni Homecoming" dinner arranged by the American Student Union in New York City, March 21, 1937, according to a photostat of a leaflet announcing the dinner.

The American Student Union has been cited as a Communist-front organization which was "the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists" in 1937; the Young Communist League took credit for creation of the Union, and the Union offered free trips to Russia. The Union claims to have led as many as 500,000 students out in annual April 22 strikes in the United States. (From a Report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated January 3, 1939, page 80.)

Dr. Niebuhr was one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, as shown in the organization's pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L." (page 3), dated December 11-12, 1937. The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front organization in Report 1311 of the Special Committee \* \* \*, dated March 29, 1944.

In a booklet entitled "These Americans Say: 'Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain,'" material for which was compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo, the Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr was named as a "representative" clergyman who advocated lifting the embargo on the sale of arms to Spain, "a well-meant but tragically mistaken effort to legislate

neutrality." The Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo has been cited as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (From the Special Committee's Report of March 29, 1944.)

The organization, American Friends of the Chinese People, has been cited as a Communist-front group by the Special Committee in its Report of March 29, 1944; a letterhead of the organization, dated May 16, 1940, carried the name of Reinhold Niebuhr in a list of members of the National Advisory Board.

#### ERNEST MINOR PATTERSON

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1). Member, National Committee (shown as Ernest M.).   | Letterhead, Sept. 22, 1939.   |
| Member, Executive Committee (shown as Prof. Ernest M.; University of Pennsylvania).   | Letterhead, Dec. 21, 1939.  |
| Signer of Open Letter to Nicholas Murray Butler denouncing his "pro-war" stand.   | Daily Worker, Oct. 7, 1940, p. 3.   |
| American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) (2). Sponsor.   | Letterhead, June 11, 1940; Letterhead, Mar. 29, 1941; Program, Fifth National Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., Mar. 29-30, 1941; and, booklet, "The Registration of Aliens," back cover. |
| New York Conference for Inalienable Rights (1). Signer of telegram to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson in behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union defendants. | Daily Worker, Sept. 17, 1940, pp. 1 and 5.  |
| Philadelphia Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder [Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder (1) (2)]. Signer of Letter to the President.  | The Worker, Mar. 15, 1942, p. 4.  |

#### PAUL RADIN

- (1) Cited by Special and/or Committee on Un-American Activities;  
 (2) Cited by United States Attorney General.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| California Labor School (2). Instructor; Member of faculty; lecturer; biographical note. | Yearbook and catalog, "California Labor School" 1948, pp. 21, 38. |
| Speaker; chairman at lecture.  | Daily People's World, Aug. 9, 1948, p. 5.                         |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
League of American Writers (1) and (2). Member.	The Bulletin, Summer, 1938, p. 4;
Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1). Signed Open Letter.	Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 25.
Science and Society (1). Contributor.	New Masses, Apr. 27, 1937, p. 26.
Washington Book Shop (1) and (2). Member; address shown as 1442 Fairmont Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.	Membership list on file with this committee.

## ELIZABETH F. READ

No Record; the following reference is to one Elizabeth Read.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Youth Congress (1) (2). Member of Continuations Committee (identified as from the National Student Federation of America.)	Program of American Youth Congress, Aug. 15, 16, and 17, 1934, p. 4.

## ROBERT REDFIELD

The "Daily Worker" of June 10, 1938 (page 2) reported that Robert Redfield endorsed an appeal of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to Congress to lift the Spanish embargo.

In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations \* \* \* such as \* \* \* American Friends of Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, March 29, 1944, p. 82.)

Professor Robert Redfield, Chicago, signed a statement of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill as shown by the April 3, 1950, issue of the "Daily Worker" (p. 4).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, January 2, 1951, cited the group as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against anti-subversive legislation."

The "Daily Worker" of July 9, 1952 (p. 6) listed Professor Robert Redfield as having signed an open letter to the Platform Committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties urging that they include in their 1952 platforms "a plank calling for repeal of the McCarran Act."

## MRS. JACOB RIIS

- (1) Cited by Special and/or Committee on Un-American Activities;
- (2) Cited by Attorney General of the United States.

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
League of Women Shoppers (1). Sponsor.....	Letterhead of Oct. 7, 1935.

See also: Hearings before Special Committee on Un-American Activities, pages 530 and 3071.

## PAUL ROBESON

During the committee's hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups, July 14, 1949, Mr. Manning Johnson (member of the Communist Party for ten years) testified as follows concerning Paul Robeson:

I shall never forget when I was called by Charles Dirba, secretary of the national disciplinary commission of the party. Incidentally, the national disciplinary commission is the American Soviet secret police agency in this country. I say that without equivocation and without the slightest hesitation. Charles Dirba was secretary of that commission, and Golos, the head of World Tourists, was chairman.

Because I had insisted that Paul Robeson be called in to assist in our fight against white chauvinism, Dirba said by making such requests I was doing irreparable harm to the Communist Party, because in the first place it was not Paul Robeson's work, and that by the promiscuous use of Paul Robeson's name it would become general knowledge that he was a member of the Communist Party, and they could not afford to have such knowledge become general, because it would endanger much work Paul Robeson was engaged in. I had to accept that or accept expulsion from the party. (See: Hearings Regarding Communist Infiltration of Minority Groups—Part 2, Testimony of Manning Johnson, pages 508 and 509.)

On February 19, 1951, this committee issued a Statement on The March of Treason, a Study of the American "Peace" Crusade, in which the following reference was made to Paul Robeson:

The American Peace Crusade is an organic part of the Communist peace offensive now being waged, \* \* \* as an effort to "disarm and defeat the United States." Spearheading the Crusade are the following known members of the Communist Party: Moscow-trained Ben Gold, also Howard Fast, Alex Sirota, Albert Kahn, Maurice Travis, and Paul Robeson \* \* \*. Once before, we witnessed an American Peace Crusade. That was during the infamous pact between Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin. At that time it was sponsored by the American Peace Mobilization which picketed the White House. Oddly enough, a number of signers of the call for the coming Peace Pilgrimage were likewise supporters of the American Peace Mobilization, namely Paul Robeson, \* \* \* (See page 1 of the Statement.)

Paul Robeson's attitude toward the Soviet Union was reflected in an article which he wrote for the magazine, Soviet Russia Today (August 1936, page 13). Mr. Robeson stated that—

The Soviet Union is the only country I've ever been in, where I've felt completely at ease. I've lived in England and America and I've almost circled the globe—but for myself, wife and son, the Soviet Union is our future home. For a while, however, I wouldn't feel right going there to live. By singing its praises wherever I go, I think I can be of the most value to it. It's too easy to go to the Soviet Union, breathe free air, and live "happily ever afterwards."

During a visit to Moscow, he took occasion to visit a number of Soviet workers' homes. One of them he visited was that of his brother-in-law, John Goode, employed in Moscow as a mechanic and busdriver. Mr. Robeson said that—

he lives in a comfortable airy apartment, plenty of sunlight, surrounded by a number of other workers who had places of the same sort. I don't say everything's perfect, but they're building, improving all the time.

In the Daily Worker of October 11, 1946 (page 11), it is shown that when Mr. Robeson was questioned relative to his visits to the Soviet Union and the schooling his son got there, he replied that "my son had what I would call a very basic Soviet education." When asked whether he was a Communist, Mr. Robeson answered that he charac-

terizes himself as an "anti-Fascist" and although he wasn't a member of the Communist Party, he would choose it over the Republicans, explaining that—

in my association with Communists throughout the world, I have found them to be the first people to die, the first to sacrifice, and the first to understand fascism.

The New York Times reported on July 10, 1949 (page 31), that—  
the famous baritone (Paul Robeson), recently returned from a trip through Europe (and) told the 300 Negro workers in radio, television and the theatre that they were deprived of all rights, whereas inhabitants of the Soviet Union and the "people's democracies" in Western Europe "are in no danger of losing any of their civil rights" (and further) predicted the death of American democracy if Negroes and "progressive" artists in this country did not unite with the twelve indicted leaders of the Communist Party to overthrow the "guys who run this country for bucks and foster cold war hysteria."

On various occasions, Mr. Robeson has defended the Communist Party. On July 23, 1940, the Daily Worker reported that he had signed an Open Letter to President Roosevelt, protesting against the attack on the right of the Communist Party to use the ballot. On September 23, 1940, the same publication revealed that he had signed a statement, urging ballot rights to Communists. The Communist Party of New York wrote a statement to the President, defending the Party; the statement was signed by Paul Robeson and others, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1941 (page 2). The same publication (in the issue of April 22, 1947, page 5), named Mr. Robeson among the one-hundred Negro leaders who called upon President Truman and Congress "to repudiate decisively the fascist-like proposal to illegalize the Communist Party."

The Daily Worker of April 21, 1947 (page 1), reported that when asked if he was a Communist, Mr. Robeson replied that—

there are only two groups in the world today—fascists and anti-fascists. The Communists belong to the anti-fascist group and I label myself an anti-fascist. The Communist Party is a legal one like the Republican or Democratic Party and I could belong to either. I could just as well think of joining the Communist Party as any other.

Mr. Robeson's defense of Communists and Communist candidates is shown by the following: He filed a Supreme Court brief in behalf of the twelve Communist leaders and his photograph appeared in the Daily Worker on January 9, 1949 (page 3) in this connection. When some of the Communist Party leaders were arrested in 1948, Paul Robeson sponsored a "Statement by Negro Americans" on behalf of these people (Daily Worker, August 23, 1948, page 3; August 29, 1948, page 11); on September 16, 1940, the Daily Worker named Paul Robeson as one of those who signed a statement by Negro leaders, protesting attacks against Communist candidates. A meeting was held in Madison Square Garden on March 17, 1941, honoring William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party, on his 60th birthday, on which occasion Mr. Robeson sang (from the Daily Worker of March 19, 1941, page 5).

Paul Robeson was Chairman of the Committee for the reelection of Benj. J. Davis, a Communist Party candidate, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 25, 1945, page 12; an advertisement in the Washington Post of November 4, 1946, named Mr. Robeson as

a member of the Citizens Committee for Robert Thompson and Benjamin J. Davis who were Communist Party candidates. The Daily Worker also shows that Paul Robeson spoke at a dinner honoring Benjamin Davis (see issue of October 20, 1947, page 7); he supported the defense of Gerhart Eisler and Leon Josephson, Communists (Daily Worker, April 28, 1947, page 4). The Daily Worker of March 4, 1952 (page 3) and March 6, 1952 (page 1), reported that Paul Robeson was one of those who signed a protest to Premier Plastires of Greece against the execution of eight Greek Communists.

The pamphlet entitled "What is APM?" (page 12) contained the name of Paul Robeson in a list of members of the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization; he was vice-Chairman of this organization, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 3, 1940 (page 4); he spoke at a mass meeting of the organization in Washington, D. C., September 13, 1940 (Daily Worker, September 13, 1940, page 4; September 15, 1940, page 2).

The American Peace Mobilization was cited as "one of the most seditious organizations which ever operated in the United States" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942; January 2, 1943). The Attorney General of the United States cited the organization as having been—

formed in the summer of 1940 under the auspices of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League as a "front" organization designed to mold American opinion against participation in the war against Germany (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7684);

and as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

Paul Robeson was chairman of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in the following sources: Letterhead of the organization dated May 17, 1945; a leaflet entitled "What of Africa's Peace in Tomorrow's World?"; a pamphlet entitled "Africa in the War"; another, "Seeing is Believing—Here is the Truth About South Africa"; and "The Job to be Done," a leaflet. The Council on African Affairs was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

Letterheads of the Civil Rights Congress dated March 4 and May 7, 1948, and October 20, 1950, named Paul Robeson as Vice-Chairman of the organization; the Daily Worker of January 18, 1949 (page 11) also listed him as Vice-Chairman; he signed the call to the National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, as shown in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1947 (page 5); together with Eugene Dennis (Communist Party member), Mr. Robeson spoke at a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, November 5, 1947, page 5); he also spoke at the National Conference of the group in Chicago, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 19, 1947 (page 6).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed by a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. It was "dedicated \* \* \* specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1115 of September



2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list dated April 1, 1954).

A 1947 catalogue of the Winter Term, George Washington Carver School, listed Paul Robeson as a member of the Board of Directors of the School which was cited as an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party (the Attorney General in press release of December 4, 1947; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

Letterheads of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, dated February 26, 1946 and May 18, 1951, include the name of Paul Robeson in a list of national sponsors of the organization. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as a Communist-front organization headed by Edward K. Barsky (Special Committee \* \* \* in Report of March 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited it as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

The Daily Worker of April 19, 1947 (page 4), named Paul Robeson as one of the sponsors of the May Day Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions; he was a member of the same committee for the May Day Parade (Daily Worker, April 28, 1947, page 3); and one of the Marshals for the United May Day Parade (The Worker, April 27, 1947, page 2). He was a sponsor of a conference in New York City, March 24, 1951, held under the auspices of the Provisional United Labor and People's Committee for May Day as shown by the Call to a United Labor and People's Conference for May Day, 1951. He participated in the May Day Parade in 1951 (Daily Worker, May 2, 1951, page 9).

The May Day Parade has been cited as an annual mobilization in New York City of Communist strength (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Paul Robeson was one of the sponsors of a Win-the-Peace Conference held in the National Press Building, Washington, D. C., April 5-7, 1948, as shown on the call to that conference; a summary of the proceedings of the conference showed that Paul Robeson was elected Co-Chairman, together with Col. Evans F. Carlson, of the National Committee to Win the Peace. On June 13, 1936, Paul Robeson spoke at the Win-the-Peace Rally to Stop World War III, sponsored by the National Committee to Win the Peace (handbill of the rally). A letterhead of the conference, dated February 28, 1946, and the Daily Worker of May 9, 1946 (page 3), name Paul Robeson as a sponsor and Co-Chairman, respectively, of the Win-the-Peace Conference. He was co-Chairman, New York Committee to Win the Peace, as shown on a letterhead dated June 1, 1946; and the call to a conference June 28-29, 1946.

The National Committee to Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

In a pamphlet entitled "For a New Africa," which contains the proceedings of the Conference on Africa, held in New York City, April 14, 1944, Paul Robeson was named as Chairman of the National Negro Congress; he also participated in the Cultural Conference of the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, March 14, 1947, page 11).

"The Communist-front movement in the United States among

Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress" (from a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; March 29, 1944); the Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as "An important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party"; and as subversive and Communist. (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7687 and 7688; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

Paul Robeson was a member of the Executive Board of the New York Committee of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown in an undated leaflet entitled "The South is Closer Than You Think" (received by this committee about February 1947); he was one of the narrators in the attack by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare on the Freedom Train (news release dated November 15, 1947).

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report dated June 12, 1947. The Special Committee \* \* \* cited the group as a Communist-front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation (report dated March 29, 1944).

A letterhead of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, dated October 27, 1942, named Paul Robeson as one of the patrons of that congress; he sang and spoke before the group at a meeting in New York City, November 6-8, 1943 (pamphlet entitled "U. S. A.-U. S. S. R." page 31). According to a letterhead and a memorandum issued by the congress dated March 13, 1946 and March 18, 1946, respectively, Paul Robeson was one of the sponsors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. A printed advertisement announcing a Rally for Peace, sponsored by the group, appeared in the Daily Worker of December 1, 1948 (page 6). Paul Robeson was on the program, arranged by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which was held in Madison Square Garden December 13, 1948.

In a report dated March 29, 1944 by the Special Committee \* \* \* the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as having been, in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian. The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The Worker of June 29, 1947 (page 5m), named Paul Robeson as one of the members of the International Workers Order, cited as "one of the most effective and closely knitted organizations among the Communist-front movements" by the Special Committee \* \* \* (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the International Workers Order as "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688); and as subversive and Communist (press releases of December

4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

Paul Robeson was one of the contributing editors of *New Masses*, as shown in the issues of March 14, 1944 and April 30, 1946; he signed their letter to the President of the United States (*New Masses*, April 2, 1940, page 21); and endorsed the publication, as shown in the *Daily Worker* of October 10, 1944 (page 6). On January 14, 1946, Mr. Robeson was honored at a dinner in New York City for the purpose of making awards to those who contributed to greater inter-racial understanding (*Daily Worker*, January 7, 1946, page 11); he received *New Masses'* Second Annual Award for his contribution to promoting democracy and inter-racial unity (*New Masses*, November 18, 1947, page 7).

The Attorney General cited *New Masses* as a "Communist periodical" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688); and the Special Committee \* \* \* cited it as a "nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party" (report dated March 29, 1944; also cited in their reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942). Beginning in March, 1948, *New Masses* and the Marxist quarterly known as *Mainstream* were consolidated into a publication known as *Masses & Mainstream*; Paul Robeson remained as contributing editor, as shown in the March 1948 issue of *Masses & Mainstream* (Volume 1, No. 1).

The *Daily Worker* of February 4, 1952 (page 8), reported that Paul Robeson was prohibited from leaving this country when he attempted to enter Canada to speak at a convention of the British Columbia International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers.

As a welcome home rally for Paul Robeson in New York City, June 19, 1949 (reported in *The Worker* of June 26, 1949, page 4, and the *Daily Worker* of July 3, 1949, page 6m), arranged by the Council on African Affairs, he was quoted in these sources as having made the following statement: "Yes, I love the Soviet people more than any other nation, because of their suffering and sacrifices for us, the Negro people, the progressive people, the people of the future in this world." He pledged himself to "defend them (the Communists) as they defended us, the Negro people. And I stand firm and immovable by the side of that great leader who has given his whole life in the struggle of the American working class—Bill Foster; by the side of Gene Dennis; by the side of my friend Ben Davis; Johnny Gates; Henry Winston; Gus Hall; Gil Green; Jack Stachel; Carl Winter; Irving Potash; Bob Thompson; Johnny Williamson—twelve brave fighters for my freedom. Their struggle is our struggle."

Mr. Robeson was one of the sponsors of the Non-Partisan Committee to Defend Communist Leaders (*Daily Worker*, July 18, 1949, page 2); and praised those leaders in an article which appeared in the *Daily People's World* of May 16, 1950 (page 11). In an article date-lined Moscow, June 9, 1949 (see the *Daily Worker* of June 10, 1949, page 4), Paul Robeson was quoted as having told the Soviet Academy of Sciences that he would return soon to the United States to testify at the New York trial of Communist leaders. Identified as "one of the most popular of foreign visitors attending a celebration in honor of the poet, Alexander Pushkin," Robeson was quoted in the article as having told the group that "we are fully resolved to struggle for peace and friendship together; \* \* \* with you Soviet people representing the hope of the whole world \* \* \*"

On August 4, 1950, the New York Times (page 1) reported that the State Department had requested Paul Robeson to surrender his passport. The Daily Worker of April 3, 1951 (page 2) reported that on April 5, attorneys before a Federal District Judge would argue for an order compelling the State Department to renew his passport. According to the September 18, 1951 issue of that paper (page 1), Paul Robeson was invited by the Chinese people to attend the Second Anniversary of the People's Republic of China, but that the State Department had denied him the right to leave the country. As shown by the December 9, 1951 issue of The Worker (page 2), Mr. Robeson applied to the State Department for a special passport to go to Paris to present a genocide plea before the General Assembly of the UN. He renewed his fight for a passport in order to attend the American Intercontinental Peace Conference in Rio de Janeiro (Daily Worker, January 18, 1952, page 8). He spoke by long-distance telephone to Canadian unionists in Vancouver, British Columbia, after his passport was canceled, according to the Daily Worker of February 12, 1952 (page 2).

#### ESTHER ROTH

- (1) Cited by Special and/or Committee on Un-American Activities;
- (2) Cited by Attorney General of the United States.

#### *Organization and affiliation*

#### *Source*

Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1).  
Member, Executive Council.  
Name shown in this source as Mrs. Esther Roth.

Letterhead dated Dec. 10, 1946.

See also: Expose of the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania (based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic, undercover agent, February 21, 1950, pages 1202, 1318, and 1442). These are hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

#### Dr. HAROLD O. RUGG

On November 22, 1938, Miss Alice Lee Jemison, Washington representative of Joseph Bruner, national president of the American Indian Federation, was a witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. In connection with this testimony, Miss Jemison submitted a statement concerning Indian affairs in the United States which was incorporated in the record. The following reference to Dr. Harold Rugg is noted in this statement:

In 1935, the council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians conducted an investigation into the new educational program which was put into operation at Cherokee, N. C. This was followed by individual investigations by Mr. and Mrs. Fred B. Bauer, Federation members at Cherokee, by Mr. O. K. Chandler, then Americanism chairman of the Federation, and by Mr. Frank Waldrop, a newspaper man of Washington, D. C. in 1936. These investigations disclosed that:

\* \* \* \* \*

That the books, "Introduction to American Civilization" and "Modern History" by Harold Rugg, member of the Progressive Education Association, were in use in the class rooms, and that these books had been taken out of the schools of the District of Columbia because of their radical teachings \* \* \* (Public Hearings, Volume 4, pages 2502-2503.)

Reference to the Rugg Textbooks is also found in the testimony of James F. O'Neil, vice-chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 27, 1947. The reference appears as follows:

Mr. O'Neil. \* \* \* I speak specifically of the Rugg textbooks. The Rugg textbooks have been removed from the educational systems in many states.

Probably the outstanding instance was in San Francisco, where the Legion urged the removal of these textbooks from the schools because of their un-American teachings and doctrine, and as a result a board was created by the San Francisco Board of Education—an independent group. I don't recall the exact membership, but I believe there was a representative of either the president or somebody in the field of social sciences, from the University of Southern California, the University of California, and a third representative from some other institution. They concurred with the American Legion in the removal and the elimination of these textbooks from the schools.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. BONNER. Just tell me a little something about these Rugg textbooks. What did they comprise— \* \* \*

Mr. O'NEIL. \* \* \* briefly, it was for a science of government that was totally different from the American system of government—an undemocratic system of government—in the social sciences \* \* \*. (Hearings on H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, March 24–28, 1947, page 28.)

It is noted that on page 271 of Rugg's book, "The Great Technology," the following statement appears:

Thus through the schools of the world we shall disseminate a new conception of government—one that will embrace all the collective activities of men; one that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interest of all people.

It is also noted that Washington, D. C. newspapers have reported that Harold Rugg is author of textbooks rejected for use in the schools of the District of Columbia. (See: "Evening Star," December 17, 1947, page B-1; "Times-Herald," February 1, 1948, page 4; and "Times-Herald," December 26, 1948, page 2.)

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.

In "Who's Who in America" for 1936–1937, Arthur Meier Schlesinger is shown to have two children, Arthur Meier and Thomas Bancroft, and to have been professor of history at Harvard University since 1925.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., is the author of an article entitled, "The U. S. Communist Party," which was written exclusively for "Life" magazine and published in the July 29, 1946 issue. The following statement concerning the author accompanied the article:

The author of this article, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., is only 28 years old but is already recognized as an able American historian. His biography, "The Age of Jackson," won the 1946 Pulitzer Prize and he has been awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship to write "The Age of Roosevelt." Last Spring he was named associate professor of history at Harvard. He is currently writing a series of articles for "Fortune," wrote this one especially for "Life."

An undated booklet entitled, "Can You Name Them?" (page 3), lists A. M. Schlesinger as having endorsed the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, organized on Lincoln's birthday in 1939; he signed a petition of the same committee, as was shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940.

The American Committee for Democracy \* \* \* was cited as a Communist-front organization which defended Communist teachers (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Reports of June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944).

Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger was named on a letterhead of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, dated February 21, 1938, as a member of that group; identified as a professor at Harvard University, he signed a letter to President Roosevelt, urging that the Neutrality Act be amended so as to render it inapplicable to Spain; the letter was prepared under the auspices of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy. In information submitted by Mr. Walter S. Steele, during public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 17, 1938 (page 569), it was disclosed that Arthur M. Schlesinger was a member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing so-called relief groups such as American Friends of Spanish Democracy. (From a Report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

In the booklet, "600 Prominent Americans Ask President to Rescind Biddle Decision" (regarding deportation of Harry Renton Bridges), prepared and published by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, September 11, 1942, A. M. Schlesinger was named as one of those who signed an Open Letter of that organization.

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the Attorney General had previously cited it as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations \* \* \* by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation \* \* \* as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Report of March 29, 1944; also reports of June 25, 1942 and January 2, 1943). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation \* \* \* as "actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report dated September 2, 1947).

Prof. A. M. Schlesinger, Harvard University, was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress, as shown on the "Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights" to be held in Detroit, Michigan, April 27 and 28, 1946. The Civil Rights Congress was formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it was "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Report No. 1115 of September 2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

A statement by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., was published in the Book Review Section of the New York Times, December 11, 1949 (page 3), as follows:

I happen to believe that the Communist Party should be granted freedom of political action and that Communists should be allowed to teach in universities so long as they do not disqualify themselves by intellectual distortions in the classroom \* \* \*.

GILBERT SELDES

*Organization and affiliation*

People's Educational Center (2). Sponsor, "Fun For The People," a show at Wilshire-Ebell Theatre, May 21, 1946.

Writers Congress (Cited by 1 as American Writers Congress). Member, Seminar on Radio Television.

Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee (1). Signed Declaration of the organization honoring Georgi Dimitrov.

*Source*

Photostatic copy of the clipping from Daily People's World, May 10, 1946, p. 5.

Program of the congress, 1943.

Full-page advertisement in New York Times, Dec. 22, 1943, p. 40.

KARL SHAPIRO

*Organization and affiliation*

National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill (1). Sponsor, National Committee \* \* \*; i. d. as Prof., Baltimore, Md.

Opposed Ober anti-Communist bill. i. d. as poet laureate of Maryland.

Initiated referendum campaign of Maryland Citizens Committee Against Ober anti-Communist law. i. d. as poet.

Endorsed Referendum of Citizens Committee against Ober Law. i. d. as Assistant Prof.

Member of Citizens Committee Against the Ober Law. i. d. as Assistant Prof.

*Source*

Committee's report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, Dec. 7, 1950, p. 12.

Daily Worker, Mar. 13, 1949, p. 2.

Daily Worker, Apr. 13, 1949, p. 5.

Letterhead, Oct. 14, 1950.

Leaflet, "Civil Liberties in Maryland Are at Stake!"

MEYER SHAPIRO

*Organization and affiliation*

Communist Party. Signed statement of League of Professional Groups in support of Communist Party Elections. Name shown in this source as Meyer *Schapiro*.

*Source*

Daily Worker, Nov. 6, 1933, p. 2.

See also: Hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Volume 1, pages 547 and 561.

## ERNEST J. SIMMONS

A Communist periodical, *New Masses* (February 2, 1937, p. 28), named Ernest J. Simmons as chairman of a symposium under the auspices of the American Russian Institute. He was a speaker for that organization, according to the *Communist Daily Worker*, February 6, 1937, p. 7, and May 20, 1947, p. 2. The *Daily Worker* of December 12, 1947, p. 3, said: "The Board of Superintendents yesterday announced it intended to eliminate a course for teachers on culture in the Soviet Union. The course, for which teachers received credit, was sponsored by the American-Russian Institute. \* \* \* Chairman of the Institute is Prof. Ernest J. Simmons of Columbia University." The American Russian Institute was cited as Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board released April 27, 1949. He redesignated the organization pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953, and included it on the consolidated list of cited organizations April 1, 1954.

*Soviet Russia Today* (cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front publication—Report No. 1953, April 26, 1950, p. 108) published, in its issue of September 1939, p. 24, the text of an Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union. Professor Ernest J. Simmons, Assistant Professor of English Literature, Harvard University, was listed as a signer of the letter, p. 25. According to the *Daily Worker* of February 10, 1933, p. 4, Ernest J. Simmons contributed an article to the February issue of *Soviet Russia Today*.

The Summary of Proceedings of a Roundtable Conference held by the American Council on Soviet Relations, May 24–25, 1940, listed Prof. Ernest Simmons as a participant. The Council was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General, in letters released to the press in 1948. His citation of the organization also appeared in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, p. 7688. He redesignated the organization pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953, and named it on the consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization in its report of March 29, 1944, p. 174.

A Bulletin of the Committee on Education of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (June 1945, p. 22), listed Ernest J. Simmons as a member of the Sponsoring Committee. That organization was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in his letters to the Loyalty Review Board released in 1947 and 1948. He redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, and named it on the consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Council in its report of March 29, 1944, p. 156.

The Bulletin of the League of American Writers (Summer 1938, p. 4) listed Ernest J. Simmons as a member. The League was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released in 1948, and was redesignated April 27, 1953. The League was also named on the consolidated list of April 1, 1954. It was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 19; March 29, 1944, p. 48.



A Message to the House of Representatives, January 1943, sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, listed among the signers Ernest J. Simmons, Professor of Comparative Literature, author, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. The Federation was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters to the Loyalty Review Board released in 1947 and 1948, and in the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687; redesignated April 27, 1953; consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Federation as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (report of March 29, 1944, p. 50).

The Daily Worker of October 19, 1948, p. 7, reported that the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions had issued a statement that 500 leaders in the arts, sciences, and professions had joined in support of Henry A. Wallace. Professor Ernest J. Simmons was listed among the supporters. The National Council has been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front (Report No. 1954, p. 2).

New Masses, October 28, 1941, p. 23, contained an article by Ernest J. Simmons, "Soviet Scholarship and Tolstoy." "USSR: A Concise Handbook," edited by Ernest J. Simmons, was reviewed in New Masses for June 24, 1947, p. 22. New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688) and by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 75).

A "Peace Ballot" issued by "The Yanks Are Not Coming Committee" listed Prof. Ernest J. Simmons, Harvard, as a member of the "Peace Ballot Commission." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, pp. 17, 95, and 100, stated that the Communist Party was "the principal agent" in "the Yanks Are Not Coming movement."

The 1948 Catalog (p. 5) of the Workers Book Shop listed "U. S. S. R. Foreign Policy," by Ernest J. Simmons. "The Workers Book Shop \* \* \* is headquarters of a chain of Communist bookshops, which are the official outlets for Communist literature and at which tickets for Communist Party and front functions customarily are sold" (Hearings Regarding the Communist Infiltration of the Motion Picture Industry, Committee on Un-American Activities, 1947, p. 375).

"Books on the U. S. S. R." (a selected bibliography by Bessie Weissman and issued by the Washington Cooperative Bookshop), pp. 27 and 28, recommended the following books by Ernest J. Simmons: "Dostoevski," "Pushkin," and "An Outline of Modern Russian Literature." The Washington Cooperative Bookshop was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General, in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released in 1947 and 1948. He redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, and named it on the consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The organization was also cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

A book by Professor Simmons—"Problems of Leadership and Control in Soviet Literature"—is referred to in the Communist Daily People's World of May 26, 1949, p. 5.

An article, "The Kremlin Prepares a New Party Line," by Ernest J. Simmons, appeared in the magazine section of the January 8, 1950,

issue of *The New York Times*, p. 13. The following is quoted from the article:

An examination of the Soviet newspaper and periodical press from a time shortly after the end of the war shows a pretty constant pattern of action and ideological propagandizing which merits the most careful consideration as a possible harbinger of the shape of things to come.

Like clever dramatists the Soviets often reveal actions before the motives which govern them. Strange as it may seem, in a dictatorship it is frequently necessary, as in our own country, to prepare public opinion for significant future policy, and this policy in turn may well be connected with international developments since the end of the war which could hardly have been anticipated by the Soviets or explained by Marxian dialectics. In the ideological battle that now rages between the two worlds the Soviets must regain the initiative or lose further ground. So some important change in policy would seem to be inevitable.

Two distinct lines of development emerge from this press campaign. One is the purge—it might be better to say the purification—of intellectuals, which has been gathering momentum ever since 1946. The second is the steady campaign to promote the conviction that the transition from socialism to communism is now a realizable objective in the Soviet Union. At first glance there might not seem to be any connection between these two developments. However, each is worth exploring precisely from the point of view that they are connected and are both part of a single, unified drive toward a future transformation of Soviet policy of momentous concern to the world.

\* \* \* In turn the musicians, artists and architects have been fried in deep fat; then the economists, philosophers, statisticians, mathematicians, biologists, lawyers and astronomers; then the literary critics, teachers of literature and finally teachers, scholars and educators in general. \* \* \*

The extent of the drive indicates clearly that a party directive from on high is being rigorously executed \* \* \*

When asked why the Russians had been so successful in the war, a character in a recent Soviet novel replied: "Because they have not only a state, but a state plus an idea." And the whole vast Soviet propaganda machine has been selling that "idea" to the world with amazing success for over thirty years. Of late, however, the "idea" has been encountering formidable opposition, especially in the West, and the Soviets have evinced a tendency to support the "idea" with elements of power. But they fully realize, in the present international power structure, that their greatest hope in this struggle is their ideological appeal and not military aggressiveness.

To be sure, it is commonly felt that the present growing opposition to the idea of Soviet communism has not been an ideological one, but a political, economic and military one \* \* \*. In fact, it is often said that America and the West have no ideology to answer the ideology of communism on a world plane. This is partly true, for America has failed, except in a negative sense, to combine ideological leadership with its policy to contain Soviet communism.

However, it is also true that all these political, economic and military actions of the United States and the West carry with them the clear implication of ideological opposition \* \* \*.

In this ideological struggle of two worlds it is essential, from the Soviet point of view, that international communism should offer a fresh and inspiring appeal to the allegiance of all peoples. Hence a declaration at the next All-Union Party Congress that the people of the Soviet Union would soon enjoy the benefits of communism—a reward formerly imagined as realizable only in the very distant future—would obviously be designed to provide a tremendous propaganda impetus to international communism, and at the same time would reassert the prominent position of the Soviet people and their party in the battle for the minds of men.

## HILDA SMITH

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

American League for Peace and Democracy (1) (2). Member, Washington Branch (address shown as: 505 18th St., NW., Washington, D. C.).

Membership list—reprinted in Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 10, page 6404.

## HILDA K. SMITH

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

“New Pioneer” (1). Contributor.

New Pioneer, March 1932, p. 12.

## HILDA W. SMITH

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

Washington Book Shop (1) (2). Member (address shown as: 1457 Belmont St., NW., Washington, D. C.).

Membership list in Committee files (1941).

## HILDA SMITH

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

See also: Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 1, pages 565 and 703.

## GEORGE HENRY SOULE, JR.

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

No references were found to George *Henry Soule Jr.*; but the following appears under the name:

## GEORGE SOULE

*Organization and affiliation**Source*

American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau (1). Member, General Committee.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Signer of Letter to the President (editor, The New Republic).

Member, Executive Committee.

Signer of Petition to lift the arms embargo.

American Friends of the Soviet Union (1) (2). Speaker.

American Youth Congress (1) (2). Member, National Advisory Board.

Signer of Call to Congress of Youth, 5th national gathering of the AYC, in New York City (editor, The New Republic).

Conference on Pan-American Democracy (1) (2). Signer of Call to the Conference.

Sponsor

New Masses, Jan. 5, 1937, p. 31.

Daily Worker, Feb. 16, 1938, p. 2.

Letterhead, Feb. 21, 1938.

Daily Worker, Apr. 8, 1938, p. 4.

Daily Worker, Jan. 29, 1938, p. 8, and Feb. 2, 1938, p. 2.

Pamphlet, “Youngville, U. S. A.,” p. 64.

Proceedings of the Congress, July 1-5, 1939, p. 2.

“News You Don’t Get,” Nov. 15, 1938, p. 3.

Letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| Council for Pan American Democracy (1) (2). Vice-Chairman.<br>Signer of Open Letter to the President of Brazil to Save Luiz Carlos Prestes.<br>Vice-Chairman; member, Executive Committee.         | Letterhead, July 11, 1940.<br>New Masses, Dec. 3, 1940, p. 28.  |
| Consumers National Federation (1). Sponsor.  | Pamphlet, "Economic Trends and the New Deal in the Caribbean," pub. by the organization, 1942.<br>Pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L.," Dec. 11-12, 1937, p. 3.<br>Booklet, "These Americans Say," p. 9. |
| Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1). Listed as one of the representative individuals in favor of lifting the Spanish embargo (writer).  | Daily Worker, Jan. 21, 1938, p. 2.  |
| Descendants of the American Revolution (1). Sponsor; and, member of Advisory Board.<br>Member-----   | Daily Worker, Feb. 13, 1939, p. 2.<br>Mimeographed press release on the congress, Mar. 24, 25, 26, 1939.  |
| First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American People of the United States (1). Signer of Call to the congress to be held in Albuquerque, N. Mex. (editor, The New Republic).                  | Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1937, p. 9.   |
| Frontier Films (1). Member, Advisory Board.  | Daily Worker, July 25, 1936, p. 2.  |
| International Juridical Association (1). Signer of statement.<br>Signer of report on mutiny laws prepared under supervision of the I. J. A. at the request of International Labor Defense (1) (2). | I. J. A. Monthly Bulletin, Vol. 5, No. 2, Aug. 1936; and Labor Defender Sept. 1936, p. 15.  |
| International Publishers (1) (2).<br>Writer of introduction to pamphlet by V. Chemadanov of the Young Communist League of the Soviet Union, published by International Publishers.                 | Daily Worker, Apr. 30, 1936, p. 5.  |
| League of American Writers (1) (2). Signer of "A Manifesto and a Call" to the National Writers Congress, New York City, June 4, 5 and 6, 1937.<br>Signer of statement-----                         | New Masses, May 6, 1937, p. 25.<br>Daily Worker, Sept. 1, 1936, p. 4.   |
| Signer of Petition in support of Gerson.   | Daily Worker, Mar. 10, 1938, p. 1.  |

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| Medical Bureau American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Member, Executive Committee.  | Letterhead, Nov. 18, 1936.  |
| National Committee for People's Rights (1) (2). Member.   | Letterhead, July 13, 1938; and "News You Don't Get," Nov. 15, 1938. |
| National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1). Member, Board of Sponsors.   | Press Release, Feb. 23, 1940.                                       |
| "New Masses" (1) (2). Signer of New Masses Letter to the President (editor, The New Republic).                                | New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21.                                    |
| North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1) (2). Sponsor of organization's Tag Day, in New York City.               | Daily Worker, Feb. 27, 1937, p. 2.                                  |
| "Soviet Russia Today" (1). Contributor.   | Soviet Russia Today, Sept. 1936, p. 29.                             |
| United Office and Professional Workers of America (1). Sponsor of conference of the Book and Magazine Guild, Local 18, UOPWA. | Daily Worker, Mar. 9, 1938, p. 5.                                   |
| Member, sponsors committee of UOPWA Local 16's 5th Annual Stenographers' Ball.  | Letterhead, Feb. 1, 1940.   |
- See also: Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Vol. 1, pages 377, 565, 566, 568, 691, 694, 702, 703, and 876; Vol. 3, pages 2167 and 2169; Vol. 17, pages 10300, 10302, 10305, 10306, 10340, 10341-10347, and 10349.

### MARK STARR

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>  |
|--|--|
| Commonwealth College (1) and (2). Endorsed reorganization plan of college; identified as Educational Director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union. | "Fortnightly," publication of Commonwealth College, Aug. 15, 1937 issue, p. 3. |
| Consumers National Federation (1). Sponsor.  | Pamphlet, "The People vs. H. C. L.," Dec. 11-12, 1937, p. 3.                   |
| Film Audiences for Democracy (1). Member, Executive Committee.   | "Film Survey," June 1939, p. 4.  |
| Films for Democracy (1). Member, Executive Committee.  | "Films for Democracy," April 1939, p. 2.                                       |

BERNHARD J. STERN

The following reference to Bernhard Stern is from the testimony of Granville Hicks, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, February 26, 1953 (pp. 96-97):

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HICKS. In the winter of 1934-35.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you remain a member?

Mr. HICKS. Until September 1939.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. TAVENNER. Who asked you to become a member of the Party?

Mr. HICKS. Bernhard Stern.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bernhard Stern. How was he employed?

Mr. HICKS. He was employed in some capacity at Columbia University. I don't know what his rank was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a teacher?

Mr. HICKS. Yes. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee the circumstances under which he asked you to become a party member.

Mr. HICKS. I was living—I was not living in New York at that time. I was living in Troy. As I remember, he wrote and asked me if I would have a meal with him the next time I came to the city. I did so. We had dinner together and he simply asked me if I didn't feel I was now ready to join the party; and after we discussed it a little while I said that I did feel so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you then assigned to a special group or any particular group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HICKS. Well, he took me to the group to which he belonged.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you became a member of the same group or unit of which he was a member?

Mr. HICKS. That is true; which was a group of professional people, writers mostly, in New York City.

In public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on September 13, 1939, Alexander Trachtenberg, a member of the Communist Party and its National Committee since 1921, Secretary and Treasurer of International Publishers, and Chairman of the Literature Department of the Communist Party, gave the following testimony concerning Bernhard J. Stern:

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you published any pamphlets or books by Bernhard J. Stern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I have not. Oh, pamphlets? Yes, I have.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever published a pamphlet by a man called Bennett Stevens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Bennett Stevens? Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And also by Bernhard Stern? You stated a while ago that you had published pamphlets by Bernhard Stern.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Edited; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And do you not know that Bernhard Stern and Bennett Stevens are the same person?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What is the name of the pamphlet? It must be many years ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you met both Bernhard Stern and Bennett Stevens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, there are many authors who write under pseudonyms.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you met Bernhard Stern, whose pamphlets you have published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And have you met Bennett Stevens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; that is the pen name of Bernhard Stern. That is correct. That must have been about 12 years ago that I published those. I have no record before me. You have all these records there, you see.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you know that Bernhard Stern is a professor at Columbia University, do you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think he is teaching there; yes. (Public Hearings, pages 4928-4929.)

The following reference to Bernhard J. Stern appears on page 1623 of Appendix V to the Public Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities:

\* \* \* Charlotte Todes, also a Communist Party functionary and wife of Bernhard J. Stern who was a Columbia University professor using the alias of Bennett Stevens.

Your attention is called to the following pages of the "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace," a copy of which is enclosed: \*

6, 7, 9, 18, 21, 22, 24, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41,  
45, 49, 52, 54, 56, 57, 60.

Subsequent to the above information our files disclose the following:

He signed a statement against denaturalization, which was sponsored by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, according to the Daily Worker, August 30, 1950, page 5. This source identified him as a professor at Columbia University. He signed an Open Letter to the American People in opposition to the Hobbs Bill, H. R. 10, which was sponsored by the American Committee \* \* \* (Daily Worker, July 25, 1950, p. 4). He was a Sponsor of the National Conference to Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, Detroit, Michigan, December 13 and 14, 1952, as shown by a Press Release regarding the conference and the "Call and Program" of the conference. According to the Daily Worker of April 29, 1953 (page 6), Prof. Bernhard Stern was on a list of sponsors of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born for 1953. He was a sponsor of the National Conference to Repeal the Walter-McCarran Law and Defend Its Victims, to be held December 12 and 13, 1953, Chicago, Ill., as shown by the Daily Worker, October 1, 1953, page 2, and the Call and Program of the conference.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

The Call to a Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Bernard J. Stern, Columbia University, as a sponsor. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the "Daily Worker" (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York "Times" (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the twenty resolutions adopted unanimously by the two-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the eleven Communist leaders, the Presidential

\*We do not have an available copy of the "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace." If you wish to see these references you may come to the Publication Service of the Committee.

loyalty order \* \* \* deportation for political belief \* \* \* among others. The Conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities."

Dr. Bernhard J. Stern, New York, signed an Open Letter to President Truman on Franco Spain, which was sponsored by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, according to a mimeographed letter attached to a letterhead of the organization, dated April 28, 1949.

The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as Subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (page 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a "Communist-front organization."

He was a sponsor of the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, as shown by a Conference Call, "\* \* \* January 23-25, 1948, New York City."

The Attorney General cited the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East as Communist and "a conference called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy" in a letter released July 25, 1949. The organization was redesignated April 27, 1953, and included in the April 1, 1954 consolidated list.

A mimeographed list of signers of the "Resolution Against Atomic Weapons," which was sponsored by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, contained the name of Bernhard J. Stern, New York. The list of signers was attached to a letterhead dated July 28, 1950. The letterhead also named him as a member of the Board of Directors. He was shown as a member of the Board of Directors of the organization on a letterhead dated December 7, 1952 (photostat). The "Daily Worker" of March 10, 1952 (p. 3), listed Dr. Bernhard Stern as a signer of a statement of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions protesting curbs on lawyers in political trials.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report, Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, released April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council \* \* \* as a Communist front organization.

Bernhard J. Stern, Columbia University, New York, was one of the endorsers of the World Peace Appeal, as shown by an undated leaflet, Prominent Americans Call for \* \* \*" (leaflet received September 11, 1950).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies



of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world."

The "Times Herald" of March 28, 1953 (p. 2) reported that Bernhard J. Stern, alleged to have used the name of Bennett Stevens in writings or for Communist purposes, denied he is now a Communist before the Senate Investigating Committee; but refused to say whether he ever had been an active member of the Communist Party.

## MAXWELL STEWART

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (1). Signer of petition.	Mimeographed sheet attached to letterhead, Jan. 17, 1940.
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2). Sponsor.	Letterhead, 4th Annual Conference, Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., Mar. 2-3, 1940.
Signer of Statement for American People, and endorsing the Campaign for American Citizenship and Citizenship Rights.	"Daily Worker," Oct. 28, 1940, p. 3.
American Council on Soviet Relations (1) and (2). Participant, Roundtable Conference, May 24-25, 1940.	Summary of Proceedings, July 15, 1940.
American Committee to Save Refugees (1). Sponsor of Dinner-Forum on "Europe Today," held at Biltmore Hotel, New York, Oct. 9, 1941, under joint auspices ACSR, Exiled Writers Committee of League of American Writers and United American Spanish Aid Committee.	Program of Dinner-Forum.
American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau (1). General Committee, Member.	"New Masses," Jan. 5, 1937, p. 31.
Member, Executive Committee.	Letterhead, Nov. 18, 1936.
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (1). Signer of letter to President.	"Daily Worker," Feb. 16, 1938, p. 2.
Member, Executive Committee.	Letterhead, Feb. 21, 1938.
American Friends of the Chinese People (1). Speaker, Mass Meeting.	"Help China!" (Handbill).
Speaker	"Daily Worker," Feb. 2, 1938, p. 8.
Signer, Letter pledging support to China.	"Daily Worker," July 16, 1940, p. 4.
Contributing Editor, "China Today" (official publication of American Friends * * *).	"China Today," Feb. 1938, p. 2.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>  | <i>Source</i>   |
|--|---|
| American League Against War and Fascism (1) and (2). Member, National Committee.   | "Call to the Second U. S. Congress Against War and Fascism," Sept. 28, 29, and 30, 1934, Chicago, Ill., p. 2. |
| Member, National Executive Committee.  | Letterhead, Aug. 22, 1935; "Fight," Dec. 1935, p. 2.  |
| American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2). Urges support of Tag Week drive.  | "Daily Worker," Apr. 16, 1938, p. 2.  |
| Signer of resolution (urging passage of Anti-Lynching Bill).   | "Daily Worker," Jan. 18, 1938, p. 3.  |
| China Aid Council of American League for Peace and Democracy (1) and (2). Sponsor of Easter Drive.   | "Daily Worker," Apr. 8, 1938, p. 2.   |
| China Aid Council (1). Sponsor.  | Letterhead, May 18, 1938.   |
| American Youth Congress (1) and (2). Member, National Advisory Board.  | "Youngville, U. S. A.," p. 64.  |
| Book Union (1). Member, Advisory Council.  | Undated Folder.   |
| Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Consultant.   | Letterheads, 1946 and 1947; letterhead, May 28, 1948.   |
| Sponsor, Conference on China and the Far East, San Francisco (called by National Committee to Win the Peace and Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy).        | Call to the Conference, Oct. 18-20, 1946; letterhead, Sept. 19, 1946.   |
| Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Honored.  | "Spotlight on the Far East," Nov. 1947, p. 2.   |
| Answered questionnaire issued by organization in favor of recognition of Chinese Communist Gov't. (Contributing editor, The Nation; editor, Public Affairs Pamphlets). | Far East Spotlight, Dec. 1949-Jan. 1950, p. 23.   |
| Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Signer of statement for recognition of Communist China.   | "Daily Worker," Jan. 16, 1950, p. 4.  |
| Conference on Pan American Democracy (1) and (2). Sponsor.   | Letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938.  |
| Signer of Call.....  | News You Don't Get, Nov. 15, 1938, p. 3.  |
| Council for Pan American Democracy (1) and (2). Signer of Open Letter to President of Brazil to Save Luis Carlos Prestes.  | "New Masses," Dec. 3, 1940, p. 28.  |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (1). Representative Individual.	Booklet, "These Americans Say:" p. 9.
Fight (1). Contributor.	"Fight," June 1934, p. 2.
Friends of the Soviet Union (1) and (2). Endorser.	"Soviet Russia Today," December 1933, p. 17.
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (1). Sponsor.	Program of Conference, Feb. 12, 1940.
Labor Research Association (1) and (2). Contributor.	"Daily Worker," June 8, 1936, p. 5.
League of American Writers (1) and (2). Member, Committee of Sponsors, Dinner-Forum on "Europe Today" held by Exiled Writers Comm. of Law., American Committee to Save Refugees; United American Spanish Aid Comm.	Program of Dinner-Forum.
Mother Bloor Banquet. Sponsor.	Program, Jan. 24, 1936, p. 9.
National Committee for People's Rights (1) and (2). Member.	Letterhead, July 13, 1938; News You Don't Get, Nov. 15, 1938.
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners (1) and (2). Member.	Letterhead, Oct. 31, 1935.
National Committee to Win the Peace (2). Sponsor, Conference on China and the Far East, San Francisco (called by the National Committee to Win the Peace and Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy).	Call to the Conference Oct. 18-20, 1946; letterhead, Sept. 19, 1946.
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (1) and (2). Sponsor.	Letterhead, Mar. 13, 1946; Memorandum issued by the Council Mar. 18, 1946.
National Emergency Conference (1). Sponsor.	Call to Conference, held at Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., May 13 and 14, 1939, p. 3.
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1). Member, Board of Sponsors.	Letterhead, Feb. 15, 1940; Press Release, Feb. 23, 1940.
National People's Committee Against Hearst (1). Member.	Letterhead, Mar. 16, 1937.
New Masses (1) and (2). Contributor.	"New Masses," August 1929, p. 15; Aug. 8, 1939, p. 24.
Member, Initiating Committee, New Masses Letter to President, and signer of same.	"New Masses," Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21.
Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio (1). Member.	Letterhead, Oct. 3, 1936.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (1) and (2).<br>Speaker; Philadelphia.  | "Daily Worker," Apr. 9, 1937,<br>p. 2.  |
| Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1).<br>Signer.  | "Soviet Russia Today," Sep-<br>tember 1939, p. 28.  |
| Open Letter to American Liberals<br>(1). Signer.  | "Daily Worker," Feb. 9, 1937,<br>p. 2; "Soviet Russia Today,"<br>March 1937, pp. 14-15.   |
| "Soviet Russia Today" (1).<br>Contributor.  | "Soviet Russia Today," Jan-<br>uary 1936, p. 12; "Daily Work-<br>er," June 11, 1937, p. 7;<br>"Soviet Russia Today," June<br>1939, p. 35; November 1939,<br>p. 13; April 1940, p. 9.  |
| "Soviet Russia Today" (1).<br>Member, Editorial Council.  | "Soviet Russia Today," January<br>1939, p. 3; January 1940, p. 3;<br>March 1942, p. 3.  |
| United American Spanish Aid<br>Committee (1) and (2). Mem-<br>ber, Committee of Sponsors,<br>Dinner-Forum on "Europe To-<br>day," held at Biltmore Hotel,<br>New York City, Oct. 9, 1941,<br>under auspices of United Amer-<br>ican Spanish Air Committee;<br>American Committee to Save<br>Refugees; Exiled Writers Com-<br>mittee of League of American<br>Writers. | Program of Dinner-Forum.  |
| Meeting to Greet Soviet Constitu-<br>tion; sponsor.   | "Daily Worker," Nov. 30, 1936,<br>p. 5.   |
| Signed letter protesting ban on<br>Communists in American Civil<br>Liberties Union.   | "Daily Worker," Mar. 19, 1940,<br>p. 4.   |
| Editor, Moscow News   | "Daily Worker," June 28, 1934,<br>p. 3.   |
| Taught in the Moscow Institute  | Testimony of Stuart Lillico, pub-<br>lic hearings, Committee on<br>Un-American Activities, Nov.<br>22, 1938, p. 2512; testimony of<br>Jack B. Tenney, public hear-<br>ings Committee on Un-Ameri-<br>can Activities, March 1947, p.<br>247. |
| Committee for Peaceful Alterna-<br>tives to the Atlantic Pact (1).<br>Signer of statement calling for<br>International Agreement to Ban<br>Use of Atomic Weapons; author,<br>Annandale, N. J.   | Statement attached to Press Re-<br>lease of Dec. 14, 1949, p. 11.   |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Labor Research Association (1) and (2). Contributor.	"Daily Worker," June 8, 1936, p. 5.
Sponsor, meeting to greet Soviet Constitution; NYC.	"Daily Worker," Nov. 30, 1936, p. 5.
Signer, Open Letter to New Masses concerning "American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky."	"New Masses," Feb. 16, 1937, p. 2.
Speaker at Student Strike, Philadelphia.	"Daily Worker," Apr. 24, 1937, p. 5.
Signer, statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials.	"Daily Worker," Apr. 28, 1938, p. 4.
Signed telegram sent to Peru to release political prisoners.	"New Masses," Dec. 6, 1938, p. 20.
Reviews "USSR Foreign Policy, Collection of Litvinov's Speeches," with approval.	"New Masses," Aug. 8, 1939, p. 24.
Signed letter protesting ban on Communists in American Civil Liberties Union.	"Daily Worker," Mar. 19, 1940, p. 4.
Statement: "Of course we should recognize the new gov't of China; recognition provides a means of dealing with it; otherwise we are terribly handicapped—viz. the Ward Case. Recognition has nothing to do with approval or disapproval."; Contributing editor, <i>The Nation</i> ; editor, <i>Public Affairs Pamphlets</i> .	Far East Spotlight, December 1949–January 1950, p. 23.
Condemns South Korean administration; quoted with approval.	"Daily People's World," Oct. 6, 1950, p. 4.
Record given -----	Congressional Record, Feb. 7, 1950, p. A941.

#### JACOB VINER

There are only two references in committee files to Jacob Viner. See Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, page 2374; also Hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities Regarding Communism in the United States Government, Part I, April 25, 1950, page 1727.

#### J. RAYMOND WALSH

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (1) and (2). Sponsor (Identified with Hobart College).	Program, Fifth National Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., Mar. 29–30, 1941.

- | <i>Organization and affiliation</i>   | <i>Source</i>   |
|---|---|
| American Council on Soviet Relations (1) and (2). Signer of open letter to the Pres. of the U. S. urging a declaration of war on the Finnish government in the interests of a speedy victory by the U. N. over Nazi Germany and its Fascist allies. (Ident. with Williams College). | Official folder of the organization.  |
| American Slav Congress (1) and (2). Dinner Chairman and Sponsor of Testimonial Dinner, Hotel Pennsylvania, N. Y. C., Oct. 12, 1947.   | Program of Dinner, p. 2.  |
| American Student Union (1). Convention Speaker.   | "The Student Almanac—1939" for the Fourth Annual National Convention, Dec. 26–30, 1938, p. 32.                            |
| Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (2). Member, Board of Directors.  | Letterhead, May 28, 1948; letterheads of 1946 and 1947; Far East Spotlight, June 1948; Information Bulletin, August 1946. |
| Council for Pan American Democracy (1) and (2). Member, Executive Committee.  | Letterhead, July 18, 1940; pamphlet, "Economic Trends and the New Deal in the Caribbean," published by Council, 1942.     |
| "Daily Worker" (1). Photo-----  | "Daily Worker," Dec. 7, 1936, p. 3.   |
| League of American Writers (1) and (2). Member (N. Y. C.)   | Bulletin of the League of American Writers, Summer, 1938, p. 4.   |
| National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (1). Sponsor, Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, N. Y. C., March 25–27, 1949.   | Conference Program, p. 15.  |
| Signer of statement attacking espionage investigation.  | "Daily Worker," Aug. 18, 1948, p. 2.  |
| National Emergency Conference (1). Signer of Call.  | Call for a National Emergency Conference, Washington, D. C., May 13–14, 1939.   |
| National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (1). Member, Executive Committee.   | Press Releases, Feb. 23, 1940; Feb. 15, 1940.   |
| Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union (1). Signer.   | "Soviet Russia Today," Sept. 1939, pp. 24, 25, 28.  |
| Southern Conference for Human Welfare (1). Speaker.   | News Release, Washington Committee, Apr. 7, 1947.   |

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Win-the-Peace Conference, Wash., D. C., April 5-7, 1946 (formed National Committee to Win the Peace 2). Chairman, Saturday Afternoon Session.	Summary of Proceedings, p. 5.
Signer of statement attacking Mundt anti-Communist bill.	"Daily Worker," May 4, 1948, p. 11.
Opposed to Mundt-Nixon bill-----	"Daily Worker," June 13, 1949, p. 3.
Dies Committee Press Releases and Speeches.	Congressional Record, June 11, 1946, p. 6824.

#### GENE WELTFISH

Gene Weltfish, President of the Congress of American Women, New York, spoke at a meeting of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born ("Daily People's World," November 10, 1947, p. 2); she signed a letter of the group, attacking deportation of Communists ("Daily Worker," March 4, 1948, p. 2); she signed this organization's statement against denaturalization as shown in the "Daily Worker" of August 10, 1950, page 5. She was named as a sponsor of the American Committee \* \* \* in the following sources: Undated letterhead (received for files, July 11, 1950); a 1950 letterhead; and undated letterhead (distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of December 2-3, 1950;) a book of coupons issued by them; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee, April 30, 1951; and the "Daily Worker" of April 4, 1951, p. 8. The "Daily Worker" of August 24, 1951 (page 6) reported that Prof. Gene Weltfish, sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, was one of those who signed an open letter to President Truman protesting the jailing of Abner Green, secretary of the organization.

The United States Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in lists released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. It was also cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" by the Special Committee (Report, March 29, 1944, page 155.

Dr. Gene Weltfish, anthropologist and author, was reported as being a sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace in the "Daily Worker" of July 29, 1949 (page 5). The Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 25, 1951 (page 21), cited the American Continental Congress for Peace as "another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

Dr. Weltfish was a member of the Board of Directors of the American Council for a Democratic Greece as shown by a press release of March 17, 1948. This group was cited as subversive and Communist, the organization formerly was known as the Greek-American Council, by the U. S. Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, June 1, 1948, and September 31, 1948).

The "Daily Worker" of March 15, 1951 (page 8) reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade. She was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace held under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade, Chicago,

Illinois, June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951, as shown by "The Call to the American People's Congress \* \* \*" and a leaflet, "American People's Congress \* \* \* invites you to participate in a National Peace Competition" \* \* \* June 29, 1951. The "Daily Worker" of May 1, 1951 (page 11) reported that she was a sponsor of a contest for songs, essays and paintings advancing the theme of world peace, held under auspices of the American Peace Crusade.

The Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 25, 1951 (page 51) and in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which "the Communists Established" as a "new instrument for their 'peace' offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the "Daily Worker" "with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives."

A "Program of Testimonial Dinner" which was held at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York, on October 12, 1947, page 2, named her as one of the sponsors of a dinner given by the American Slav Congress. The Fall, 1948 issue of the "Slavic-American" (page 18) named Gene Weltfish as a speaker at a meeting of the Congress. The American Slav Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, which were released to the press on June 1, 1948 and September 21, 1948.

The American Slav Congress was the subject of a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, released June 26, 1949, in which it was cited as—

a Moscow-inspired and directed federation of Communist-dominated organizations seeking by methods of propaganda and pressure to subvert the 10,000,000 people in this country of Slavic birth or descent. (page 1)

Dr. Weltfish was a speaker or reporter at a Conference to Safeguard the Welfare of Our Children and Our Homes, held under auspices of the American Women for Peace, March 22 at the Pythian, 135 W. 70th Street, New York, N. Y., as reported by the April 6, 1952 issue of the "Daily Worker" (page 8, magazine section). The Committee, in its report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, cited the American Women for Peace as—

an advance wave to establish a beachhead for other left-wing organizations scheduled to descend on Washington in observance of a Communist-declared "Peace Week."

She was named as a sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy as shown by a "Program of dinner on first anniversary of the American Youth for Democracy" (dated October 16, 1944). The Special Committee \* \* \* cited this group as "the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress." (Report, March 29, 1944, page 102). The Committee also cited this organization as—

a front formed in October 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League and for the purpose of exploiting to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, inexperience, and craving to join which is characteristic of American college youth. Its "high-sounding slogans" cover "a determined effort to disaffect our youth and to turn them against religion, the American home, against the college authorities, and against the American government itself." (Report No. 271, April 17, 1947.) The U. S. Attorney General also cited it as subversive and Communist in lists of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.



Dr. Gene Weltfish was a speaker at a mass rally to protest lynchings which was held under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, August 28, 1946, New York, N. Y., as shown by the handbill, "Lynch Terror Stalks America." She signed a statement of the group in defense of Gerhart Eisler ("Daily Worker," February 28, 1947, p. 2; she was a panel participant at the conference of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, October 11, 1947 ("Program of Conference"); a sponsor of the National Conference of the group which was held in Chicago on November 21-23, 1947 (Program, "Let Freedom Ring," and "Daily People's World," October 28, 1947, p. 4); sponsor of the group's National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, January 18 and 19, 1949 (Leaflet, "Freedom Crusade," program of conference); and an additional sponsor of the Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16-17, 1949, p. 6; she signed an Open Letter to Congress urging defeat of the Mundt Bill; signed a statement of the Congress protesting indictment and arrest of Communist Party leaders ("Daily Worker," August 3, 1948, p. 2); member of their delegation in behalf of Communist leaders ("Daily Worker," January 25, 1949, page 10); signed an open letter to J. Howard McGrath on behalf of the four jailed Trustees of the Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress as shown by an advertisement ("paid for by contributions of signers"), in the October 30, 1951 issue of the "Evening Star" (page A-7). The "Daily Worker" of November 12, 1951 (page 18) reported that she was to speak at a memorial meeting protesting an act of genocide which was to be held under auspices of the Congress. She spoke at an anniversary dinner of the group on March 26, 1952, as reported by the March 26, 1952 issue of the "Daily Worker" (page 3).

The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Civil Rights Congress as—

an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it." (Report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

The U. S. Attorney General cited the group as "subversive and Communist" in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

Letterheads of 1946, 1947, July 11, 1947, and May 28, 1948, named her as one of the sponsors of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. As shown by the pamphlet, "What Price Philippine Independence" by George Phillips (pages 30-32), Gene Weltfish was one of those who signed an Open Letter to President Truman, released on October 7, 1946, under auspices of the Committee for a Democratic \* \* \* cited as "Communist" by the U. S. Attorney General (press release of April 27, 1949). She was a sponsor of the National Conference on American Policy on China and the Far East, as shown by the Conference Call "\* \* \* Jan. 23-25, 1948, New York City." This conference was called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy and was cited as "Communist" by the U. S. Attorney General (press release of July 25, 1949).

Gene Weltfish was President of "Woman Power," published monthly by the Congress of American Women, 55 W. Forty-second Street, New

York, N. Y., as shown in testimony of Walter S. Steele. (Public Hearings, July 21, 1947, p. 35.) She was also the President of the Congress of American Women as shown by a letterhead of February 25, 1949, and by a bulletin of the group (page 2). A leaflet, "What is the Congress of American Women?" listed Dr. Weltfish as vice-chairman of the Continuing Committee of the Congress of American Women. A report of Gene Weltfish of the Congress of American Women to the June 1946 Executive Committee meeting of the International Democratic Women's Federation in Paris, France, appeared in "Soviet Women," July-August 1946 (p. 4). According to the "Daily Worker" of February 11, 1948, p. 10, she is a member of the Executive Committee of the Women's International Democratic Federation.

The Congress of American Women was the subject of a report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, released October 23, 1949, in which it stated that—

The Congress of American Women is an affiliate of the Women's International Democratic Federation, which was founded and supported at all times by the international Communist movement. The purpose of these organizations is not to deal primarily with women's problems, as such, but rather to serve as a specialized arm of Soviet political warfare in the current "peace" campaign to disarm and demobilize the United States and democratic nations generally, in order to render them helpless in the face of the Communist drive for world conquest.

This organization was also cited as "subversive" and "Communist" by the U. S. Attorney General in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases dated June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948).

Dr. Gene Weltfish was one of the signers of a petition to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain" released under auspices of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as shown by a mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of May 18, 1951. The U. S. Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as "subversive and Communist" (see letters of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948). The Special Committee in its report dated March 29, 1944 (page 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist \* \* \* as a "Communist-front organization headed by Edward K. Barsky."

One of the most important "cultural" events of the year for the Reds was the celebration in honor of "Mother" Ella Reeve Bloor on the occasion of her eighty-fifth birthday anniversary. Gene Weltfish was one of the sponsors of this banquet, as shown in the "Daily Worker" of June 11, 1947 (page 5).

Dr. Gene Weltfish, anthropologist, was listed among those who sent greetings to women of the Soviet Union, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("Daily Worker," March 8, 1949, page 7). She was an endorser of this organization as shown by the program, "Congress on American-Soviet Relations," December 3-5, 1949. The U. S. Attorney General cited the National Council \* \* \* as "subversive and Communist" in letters of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (page 156) cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian."

A pamphlet, "Seeing is Believing," (dated 1947) listed her as a Council Member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc. An undated pamphlet named her as a conference participant of the Council (Pamphlet, "For a New Africa," page 37). The "Daily Worker" of

April 26, 1947 (page 12) reported that she signed a statement, sponsored by the Council. She was a member of the Executive Board of this group, according to the "Daily Worker" of March 29, 1948, page 7. The Council on African Affairs was cited as subversive and Communist (U. S. Attorney General's letters to the Loyalty Review Board, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

A pamphlet, "For a New Africa," named Gene Weltfish as an individual participant of the Conference on Africa held in New York on April 14, 1944, under the sponsorship of the National Negro Congress. The Special Committee in its Report of January 3, 1939 (page 81) stated that—

the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress.

The U. S. Attorney General stated that—

Commencing with the formation of the National Negro Congress in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and "fellow travelers" have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the Congress \* \* \* according to A. Phillip Randolph, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed \$100 a month to its support. \* \* \* (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

This group was also cited by the U. S. Attorney General (press releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

The "Daily Worker" of September 20, 1947 (page 8) and the "Worker" for September 28, 1947 (page 10) named Dr. Weltfish as a speaker for the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. The January 15, 1948 (page 5) issue of this paper listed her as a participant in the picket line against Franco, which was sponsored by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. The Special Committee \* \* \* in its report of March 29, 1944 (page 82) stated that—

In 1937-38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations.

Among these was the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. The U. S. Attorney General cited this group as "subversive and Communist" in lists to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948.

Letterheads of September 8, 1947, September 30, 1947, and an undated letterhead (received for files, April 1948) have named Gene Weltfish as a member of the Advisory Council of "Soviet Russia Today" which was cited as a "Communist front" by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its Report of March 29, 1944 (page 167) and Report of June 25, 1942 (page 21).

According to the Conference Program (page 15) Gene Weltfish was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, which was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions and held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949. She participated in this conference by speaking on "Fascism, Colonialism and World Peace" as shown by the edited report of the Conference, "Speaking of Peace" (pages 72 and 143). She was a sponsor of a conference held by the National Council \* \* \* on October 9-10, 1948, as shown by a leaflet, "To Safeguard These Rights \* \* \*", published by the Bureau on Academic Freedom of the National Council. She was also a signer of a statement spon-

sored by this organization, as shown by the Congressional Record of July 14, 1949 (page 9620). She was a sponsor of the World Congress for Peace (American Sponsoring Committee) as shown by the leaflet, "World Congress for Peace, Paris" April 20, 21, 22, 23, 1949.

In its report of April 9, 1949, the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace as a—

gathering at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, which was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

This group prepared "the way for the coming World Peace Congress to be held in Paris on April 20 to 23, 1949, with similar aims in view on a world scale and under similar Communist auspices (page 1). The National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was cited as a "Communist-front organization" on page 2 of the same report.

The "Daily Worker" of February 16, 1949 (page 2) and February 20, 1949 (page 10) named Gene Weltfish as one of those persons protesting the procedure in Communist trials. She was one of those who signed a telegram in behalf of Robert Thompson, Communist, as shown by the "Daily Worker" of November 30, 1948 (page 11), and was also a member of a delegation in behalf of Robert Thompson ("Daily Worker," December 15, 1948, page 1). She was a sponsor of the National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist leaders, as shown by the reverse side of a letterhead dated September 9, 1949. Robert Thompson was one of the eleven Communist leaders who were convicted on October 14, 1949 of conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government ("New York Times," October 15, 1949, page 5).

Gene Weltfish was a signer of a brief submitted in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo, October 1949, by the Cultural Workers in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1949. The following reference to John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo and certain other individuals appears in the Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated December 31, 1948, page 9:

Each of these witnesses refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party \* \* \* In each case the committee presented voluminous evidence to show affiliations with communist organizations and a copy of the witness' Communist Party registration card.

Lawson and Trumbo were convicted of contempt of Congress and sentenced to one year in jail and fined \$1,000 each ("Washington Times Herald," May 30, 1950, page 1). They began serving their sentence on June 11, 1950 ("New York Times," June 11, 1950, page 3).

According to the "Daily Worker" of April 10, 1950 (page 2) Gene Weltfish was a signer of a statement in support of Pablo Neruda, a Chilean Communist. The "Worker" of October 26, 1947 (page 7) named Dr. Weltfish as an active supporter of Ada B. Jackson, an American Labor Party candidate.

For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party

but outside of New York City they have been unable to win control. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1311, March 29, 1944, page 78.)

Dr. Gene Weltfish was a sponsor of a conference called by the Provisional Committee for a United Labor and People's May Day which was organized to "set up May Day Committees" and "to assure the broadest participation in the May Day Demonstration" ("Daily Worker," March 14, 1949, page 8). "The May Day Parade in New York City is an annual mobilization of Communist strength." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1311, March 29, 1944, page 179.)

An undated leaflet, "Prominent Americans Call For \* \* \* (received for files, September 11, 1950) named Prof. Gene Weltfish as an endorser of the World Peace Appeal.

The text of the "peace petition" as adopted in Stockholm on March 15-19, 1950, by the so-called World Peace Congress at the third session of its Permanent Committee, is announced to the world in the March 24, 1950, issue of "for a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy," official organ of the general staff of the International Communist conspiracy, the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties (Cominform). In conformity with this directive, the Communist Party, USA, formulated its own "peace plan" in the "Worker" for June 11, 1950. Calling for a "Nation-wide drive for millions of signatures," every Communist is notified that he "has the duty to rise to this appeal." On June 20, 1950, the "peace petition" received the official stamp of approval from the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. (The Communist "Peace Petition Campaign," Interim Statement of the Committee on Un-American Activities, released July 13, 1950.)

Dr. Weltfish was one of the sponsors of the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, as shown on a letterhead of the group dated June 5, 1952; the "Daily Worker" of October 15, 1952 (page 3), reported that she had protested the death sentence against Ethel and Julius Rosenberg; she was one of the individuals who signed an amicus curiae brief submitted to the U. S. Supreme Court, urging a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg; Dr. Weltfish was identified in this source as an anthropologist at Columbia University. The "Daily Worker" of January 21, 1953 (page 7), also reported that Dr. Weltfish urged clemency for the Rosenbergs, sentenced to death after their conviction in March 1951, of conspiring with a Soviet official to send atomic secrets to Russia between 1944 and 1950.

#### ALEXANDER WERTH

A review of "The Year of Stalingrad," by Alexander Werth, appears in "Soviet Russia Today," June 1947 (p. 23). "Soviet Russia Today" has been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front publication (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, March 29, 1944, p. 167; June 25, 1942, p. 21—Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1953, April 26, 1950, p. 108). The reviewer, Isidor Schneider, states that the task of the book "is to make clear the full significance of the year of the decisive battle which changed the course of the Second World War—and of modern history."

A booklet, "Poland Today," by Alexander Werth, published in 1948 by the Polish Research and Information Service, contains the following statements:

And it must be said that Polish Communists give the impression of being Poles first and foremost, Communists only next, and Pro-Russians last and sometimes not at all. Many say that they want Poland to acquire certain but

by no means all of the features of Soviet economy. A large number of Poles are attracted to the P. P. R. (Communist Party) because it has the best organizing brains at its head \* \* \*.

Soviet Communism is totally unacceptable to the Polish people, and the Polish Communists know it as well as anybody. But there are certain features of Soviet organization and economy which they—and not only they—consider valuable in the process of rebuilding Poland \* \* \* (p. 7).

\* \* \* The Russians in general are not liked, and the "Russian occupation" of 1944-45 has left some bad memories; discipline among some of the Russian troops, especially after victory, went to pieces completely. A growing number of Poles, however, are beginning to realize that it was the Russians, after all, who drove the Germans out of Poland, and the fact that "they did not stay on" is also put to their credit (p. 14).

"Moscow War Dairy," by Alexander Werth, was recommended by the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, in "Books on the U.S.S.R.," a selected bibliography by Bessie Weissman, p. 30. The Congressional Record of September 24, 1942 (p. 7688) contained a statement by the U. S. Attorney General, from which the following is quoted:

The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name, "The Book Shop Association," was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938. \* \* \*

Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations. \* \* \* certain of the officers and employees of the book shop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia.

The Attorney General also cited the organization as subversive and Communist in his letters to the Loyalty Review Board, in 1947 and 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front in its Report, March 29, 1944 (p. 150).

Alexander Werth was quoted with approval by Joseph Starobin in the "Daily Worker" of December 21, 1949 (p. 6).

Joseph Clark, in his "Daily Worker" column of January 30, 1950 (p. 6), said:

Alexander Werth writes from Czechoslovakia in The Nation (Jan. 7): "It seems important to explode another favorite myth of our anti-Communist propagandists—that Czechoslovakia is being "mercilessly exploited" by the Soviet Union. It is not. The clear purpose of Soviet policy is to make Czechoslovakia economically an outstanding success."

An article headed "British Writer Refutes Lies about Soviet 'Forced Labor'" appears on pages 3 and 11 of the "Daily Worker" of February 16, 1949. The following is quoted from the article:

U. S. charges of "forced labor" in the Soviet Union, often exploded as deliberate lies in the past, are based on a recent book by David J. Dallin, which has been exposed are (sic) a series of lies and distortions by leading British and American correspondents in the Soviet Union.

\* \* \* His book, Forced Labor in the Soviet Union, was riddled by the noted British correspondent Alexander Werth some months ago in the British publication New Statesmen and Nation. Werth, who was a correspondent in the Soviet Union for seven years, cited two places named by Dallin as "forced labor camps," which he visited and found to be thriving cities.

In his "Daily Worker" column of January 16, 1950, Joseph Clark quotes from an article by Alexander Werth in the January 2 issue of

"The Nation." The article praised the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia.

An article headed "Anti-Soviet Slander Exposed as Forgery" appears in the "Daily Worker" of February 23, 1949 (p. 6). The following is quoted from the article:

"There are no limits to the methods of anti-Soviet propaganda, and in some countries of western Europe it has become the business not only of the great magnates—such as for example the great organization behind the distribution of Kravchenko's book—but also of all kinds of scum who in normal times would be selling copies, pornographic pictures and other profitable rubbish."

This is the verdict given by the well-known British journalist Alexander Werth in a statement published in Rude Pravo \* \* \*

Werth described \* \* \* a characteristic method of those who trade in what he calls "that highly profitable commodity—anti-Soviet propaganda and slander" \* \* \*.

According to the "Daily Worker" of November 2, 1952 (p. 7), Alexander Werth was a signer of the World Peace Appeal.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950; as having "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy"; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting "every individual Communist on notice that he 'has the duty to rise to this appeal'"; and as having "received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world."

#### TENNESSEE WILLIAMS

<i>Organization and affiliation</i>	<i>Source</i>
Sent greetings to Moscow Art Theater.	Daily Worker, Nov. 1, 1948, p. 13.
Author of "Streetcar Named Desire," praised in Daily Worker.	Daily Worker, Dec. 8, 1947, p. 13.
See also: Public hearings of this committee regarding Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry—Part 2, April and May 1951, pp. 331, 2413.	

#### DR. WILLIAM CARLOS WILLIAMS

The following information from the public records, files and publications of this committee concerning Dr. William Carlos Williams should not be construed as representing results of an investigation by or findings of the committee. It should be noted that the subject individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler, unless so indicated.

On March 5, 1941 (page 2), the Daily Worker featured in a full-page spread the names of several hundred persons who defended the Communist Party against alleged persecution. The statement called attention to "a matter of vital significance to the future of our nation. It is the attitude of our government toward the Communist Party \* \* \*." The name of William Carlos Williams of Rutherford, New Jersey, appeared in the list of persons who signed that statement.

Dr. Williams was one of those who signed an Open Letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to the President of the United States, urging reconsideration of the order of Attorney General Francis Biddle for deportation of Harry Bridges. The Open Letter was published in pamphlet form, September 11, 1942, by the National Federation \* \* \*, under the title "600 Prominent Americans Ask President to Rescind Biddle Decision"; Dr. Williams was identified in this source as being from Rutherford, New Jersey. The Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (page 4), also reported that William Carlos Williams had signed an Open Letter on behalf of Mr. Bridges.

The Attorney General has cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program \* \* \*." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687); the Attorney General also cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found that "there can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation \* \* \* is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (reports of March 29, 1944; June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943). It was cited as having been formed for the "alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1115 of September 2, 1947). Harry Bridges was a Communist Party member and leader of the San Francisco general strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party (see Report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated March 29, 1944, pages 90-97).

The printed program of the Fifth National Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born which was held in Atlantic City, N. J., March 29-30, 1941, contained the name of William Carlos Williams in a list of sponsors of that conference. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has been cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom has been cited as "a Communist front which defended Communist teachers" (Special Committee \* \* \* in reports of June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944); William Carlos Williams was one of those who signed the organization's petition, as was shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to the group's letterhead of January 17, 1940; in this source he was identified as an author.

Dr. Williams signed a statement of the American League for Peace and Democracy, according to New Masses for March 15, 1938 (page 19); he signed a letter of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, addressed to the President of the United States (Daily Worker, Feb-



ruary 7, 1938, page 4); he signed an Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union which was printed in Soviet Russia Today for September 1939 (page 28), in which source he was identified as a writer; he signed the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union, as revealed in Soviet Russia Today for November 1937 (page 79); and signed the Call to the Third American Writers Congress, as reported in Direction for May-June 1939 (page 1).

The American League for Peace and Democracy was established "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7683 and 7684); the organization was also cited by the Attorney General in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954. The Special Committee \* \* \* cited it as "the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States" (reports of January 3, 1939; March 29, 1944; January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and January 2, 1943).

American Friends of Spanish Democracy was one of the organizations formed during 1937 and 1938, when the Communist Party was campaigning for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause (from the Special Committee's report of March 29, 1944). The Special Committee reported on June 25, 1942, that the Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union was issued by "a group of Communist Party stooges." The Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union was a "Communist enterprise" signed by "hundreds" of "well-known Communists and fellow-travelers" (Special Committee \* \* \* in its report of March 29, 1944).

The American Writers Congress was sponsored by the League of American Writers, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954); it was founded "under Communist auspices" in 1935 and in 1939 it began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union" (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686); and was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of April 11, 1951 (page 8), reported that Dr. William Carlos Williams, poet, would speak at a meeting sponsored by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, on behalf of John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, and Albert Maltz; the same publication, in the issue of April 16, 1951 (page 4), announced that Dr. Williams had been unable to appear at the meeting, because of illness, but that he had initiated a letter appealing for parole of the so-called "Hollywood Ten"; he signed a statement on behalf of the "Hollywood Ten", as reported in the Daily Worker on May 12, 1950 (page 3); he signed a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States for a Reconsideration of its Refusal to Hear the Appeal of the Hollywood Ten, as shown in an advertisement inserted in the Washington Post on May 24, 1950 (page 14), in which source he was identified as a poet.

Dr. Williams supported the National Council's effort to secure a rehearing of the case of Communist leaders before the Supreme Court of the United States, as shown in "We Join Black's Dissent", a

reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1951, by the National Council \* \* \*. The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions as a Communist-front organization (Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, released April 19, 1949).

During the Special Committee's investigation in 1939, they unearthed the fact that "Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, had obtained a false American passport in the course of his conspiratorial activities \* \* \*. Browder was tried and convicted on charges in connection with this fraudulent passport. His sentence was a four-year term in Atlanta Federal Penitentiary. During his incarceration in Atlanta, the Communists and their sympathizers all over the United States carried on an intensive campaign in which they pictured Browder as a victim of capitalist persecution. The principal Communist organization which conducted this campaign was known as the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder".

A letterhead of the Citizens Committee to \* \* \*, dated April 2, 1942, named William Carlos Williams as one of the "prominent Americans who favor Presidential clemency for the release of Earl Browder". An undated leaflet of the same organization which was an appeal to President Roosevelt "for justice in the Browder case" named Dr. Williams, author, Collected Poems, as one of those who made the appeal.

Under the title of "Letters from Readers", featured in New Masses for December 1930 (page 22), William Carlos Williams, Rutherford, New Jersey, contributed the following:

I like the John Reed number \* \* \*. I feel in a false position. How can I be a Communist, being what I am. Poetry is the thing which has the hardest hold on me in my daily experiences. But I cannot, without an impossible wrench of my understanding, turn it into a force directed toward one end, Vote the Communist Ticket, or work for the world revolution. There are too many difficulties, unresolved difficulties in my way. I can however see the monumental blockwit of social injustices surrounding me on every side. But why they arise, God only knows. But in any case they are there and I would give my life freely if I could right them. But who the hell wants my life? Nobody as far as I can see. They don't even want my verse, which is of more importance. I'm for you. I'll help as I can. I'd like to see you live. And here's to the light, from wherever it may come.

Mr. Williams contributed to New Masses for November 23, 1937 (page 17), and reviewed "The Spider and the Clock", by S. Funaroff (International Publishers), in the August 16, 1938, issue of the same publication (pages 23-25). Under the heading, "Some Additional Views", which appeared in New Masses for August 17, 1943 (page 22), William Carlos Williams, poet and novelist, expressed his views as follows:

Replying to your question, Can Communists and non-Communists unite? No, not in the same nation, that's why we have nations. But if you'll put your question, Can a Communist nation unite with a non-Communist nation? Certainly and why not? We aren't afraid of them and they're not afraid of us. In fact, we seem to like them, individually, and many of us admire their intellectual make-up. They seem cleaner than the swine we are used to fighting to keep our nation halfway honest and anti-thug.

It is going to be *some* laugh when the war is over and we've beat the mirror-writing we are so practically familiar with under a different name at our own doorsteps—it's going to be *some fun* if Russia or the Russian system, now on a

basis of friendship with us; begins to be a brilliant and overwhelming success from a *business* standpoint. Nobody ever thought of that. Oh boy! Is it going to be fun to watch the subtle change that will come over the local fascist. Man to man, does any one think that a hard boiled American businessman is so stupid that he won't shift his political complexion if there's *money in it*? You've got to ask me a harder one than that.

(Note: Words italicized above were shown in italics in original source.)

EDMUND WILSON

*Organization and affiliation*

*Source*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Communist Party (1) and (2).<br>Signed Call for Support of the<br>Communist Party National<br>Election and its candidates.                                    | Daily Worker, Sept. 14, 1932, p.<br>1, c. 2.   |
| Member, League of Profes-<br>sional Groups for Foster<br>and Ford, C. P. candidates<br>for President and Vice Pres-<br>ident of the U. S., respec-<br>tively. | Pamphlet, "Culture and the Cri-<br>sis," p. 32.  |
| The Liberator (1). Contributor;<br>name shown in all of these<br>sources as Edmund Wilson, Jr.  | The Liberator, April 1920, p. 38;<br>June 1920, p. 27; May 1921, p.<br>25; September 1921, p. 13;<br>February 1922, p. 12. |
| New Masses (1) and (2). Con-<br>tributing Editor; name shown<br>as <i>Edmond Wilson, Jr.</i>  | New Masses, October 1927, p. 3.  |
| Contributor-----  | New Masses, April 1932, p. 7;<br>and September 1932, p. 9.   |

See also: Hearings of Special Committee on Un-American Activities, pages 380, 509, 557, 559, 566, and 703.

ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN STUDENT UNION

The American Student Union was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Reports dated January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.

As a section of the World Student Association for Peace, Freedom and Culture, the American Student Union is the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists. It was formerly known as the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League. The latter was the American section of the Proletarian Youth League of Moscow. Out of the coalition convention, which was held at Columbus, Ohio, in 1937, came the American Student Union. The united front was heralded in Moscow as "one of its (Communism's) greatest triumphs."

The American Student Union claims to have led as many as 500,000 students out in annual April 22 student strikes in the United States \* \* \* It announced that it set up the "front" movement, the United Student Peace Committee in 1938, which has brought into its front 17 national youth organizations. \* \* \*

The Young Communist League takes credit for the creation of the American Student Union, since it was its organization, the National Student League, which issued the call and organized the convention which was held in Columbus.

In an advertisement which appeared in a Communist journal, *New Masses*, the Union offered free trips to Russia. In 1938 it issued a call for a "closed shop

on the campus," urging a united front between its local college groups and certain teachers and professional groups \* \* \* It claims credit for perfecting a united front of Communist and Socialist students in Europe (Report of the Special Committee \* \* \* dated January 3, 1939, page 80).

In the Report on American Youth for Democracy, issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities April 17, 1947, the American Student Union was cited as a Communist-dominated organization (page 16).

Mr. Walter S. Steele, in his testimony in public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 17, 1938, gave information concerning the American Student Union (pages 582 and 584), from which the following is quoted:

The membership of the American Student Union is approximately 30,000. It is a section of the World Student Union, now the World Student Association for Peace, Freedom and Culture. Its organ is the Student Advocate.

The American Section (World Student Association for Peace, Freedom and Culture) was organized at a joint meeting of the (Communist) National Student League and the (Socialist) Student League for Industrial Democracy, held in the Young Women's Christian Association at Columbus, Ohio, December 28-29, 1938. Their report of this congress stated that nearly 500 delegates from 113 schools and colleges in the United States were present. The Communist unit had inveigled the Socialist youth into participating in the congress, usurped the leadership of the organization, and have used it as an adjunct to the Young Communist movement all during its short life \* \* \*

In a report to Moscow, the Communists refer to the American Student Union as one of its greatest triumphs in the United States \* \* \* The April 24, 1938 issue of the Sunday Worker published an article which stated that the Young Communist League created the American Student Union and is the main inspiration behind the student peace activities that rocked America on April 27, 1937 \* \* \*

On February 4, 1938 (Daily Worker, page 6), the American Student Union thanked the official organ for the fine publicity and support it gave the union's Vassar convention \* \* \*

The following is from the testimony of William Nowell, public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, November 30, 1939 (pages 6994 6995):

I am discussing now the general policy, and my knowledge of the fact that the American Students Union was a part of the youth and is a part of the youth program of the Communist Party, that is, the Young Communist League, which received instructions to strive to organize such a body. They succeeded. As I say, the policy was based upon utilizing the discontent of students, based upon the belief that along with depressed conditions and the fact that students who are reasonably enlightened, that is, they have some theoretical and political understandings, since they are students, and are studying, could be and can be easily politicalized. Therefore, the program, that is, the approach to the organization of these students was based upon these facts. That is, the league sponsored it, because of the lack of opportunity, which is true to a certain extent, and the fact that they are in the league tells that they are or would be, and that they are easily politicalized \* \* \*

#### AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS

The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by former Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

"It originated in 1934 and \* \* \* has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth," according to former Attorney General Francis Biddle (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7685; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated June 25, 1942, described the American Youth Congress as follows:

The American Youth Congress was prominently identified with the White House picket line which, under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization, opposed every measure of national defense up until the very day that Hitler attacked Russia. From its very inception the American Youth Congress has been one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party (p. 16).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as "the Communist front which has now been largely absorbed by American Youth for Democracy" in its Report No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944, p. 102.

The following is taken from the testimony of Walter S. Steele during public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947:

The genealogy of American Youth for Democracy extends back through several Red ancestors to the Young Workers League, which was formed in 1922 and was one of the beneficiaries of the American Fund for Public Service, more commonly known as the Garland (Red) Fund. The first national convention of the organization was held May 13-15, 1922. Prior to that time numerous local Communist organizations had been using the name Young Workers' League, and the convention adopted the title. The third national convention of the Red Youth was held in October 1925, when a revised constitution was adopted and the name slightly changed to Young Workers' (Communist) League. Communist youngsters adopted the name Communist Youth League for a brief period in 1929.

The use of the name Young Communist League began with the August 1, 1939 edition of the Young Worker, its official organ at the time. That name continued until the invention of the latest booby-trap, the American Youth for Democracy. At the time of the transformation, Communists said:

"All Communists will naturally hope that thousands of youth who will join the new organization will later join the Communist Party."

\* \* \* \* \*

In the May 1922 issue of Young Worker, then the official organ of the Young Communist League, the following statement appeared:

We hear the tramp of the young as they come in ever larger masses to the banner of the revolutionists. Soon they will conquer. Meanwhile as we view the intolerable situation forced upon us by the master class, let this be our slogan till that happy May Day comes when we have won for ourselves a workers' republic: "We have loved enough; now let us hate" (pp. 71 and 72).

In Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, it was stated that "the American Youth Congress was outstandingly active in the American Peace Mobilization against conscription and the national defense program."

An article entitled "Communist Youth Ask for Unity" appeared in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1935, p. 1, from which the following is quoted:

In the past period of time, we have learned to work together and to act together despite the fundamental differences in program and policy which still separates our two organizations. Working relationships have now existed between the Young Peoples Socialist League and the Young Communist League for over a year. Joint activity for realizing the program of the American Youth Congress resulted in the inspiring student strike of April 12th, participated in unitedly by Socialist and Communist students.

The following statement was made by Earl Browder (then General Secretary of the Communist Party) in his book "Communism in the United States":

The greatest progress has been made among the youth. Without any formal negotiations the Young People's Socialist League and the Young Communist League already find themselves standing upon an agreed platform. This achievement came out of the struggle against the fascist Central Bureau which called the American Youth Congress in which the anti-fascist united front won a complete victory in winning over almost the entire body of delegates to a program entirely opposed to the one proposed by the leaders, with government support, adopting instead a program of struggle against war and fascism, and for the immediate needs of the youth, including unemployment insurance, etc. This victory, the basis of which had already been laid by the Youth Section of the American League Against War and Fascism which was already a growing united front from below, reaching all strata of youth, now comprises 1,700,000, ranging from Y. M. C. A.'s, Y. W. C. A.'s, church youth organizations, trade union youth sections, settlement houses, etc., clear down to the Y. P. S. L. and Y. C. L. In this, the political center of gravity is the work of our Y. C. L. Practically all the basic proposals and policy came from us or from those circles influenced by us through the unanimous support of this broad youth movement" (pp. 265-266).

#### BROOKWOOD LABOR COLLEGE

The subject organization has not been cited as subversive by this committee or by the United States Attorney General. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (House Report No. 1311), referred to the organization as a "communist" school, and named it among "Communist enterprises" which had received financial assistance from the American Fund for Public Service, stating that it had received "at least \$115,000" (pp. 34 and 76). The American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund) was cited in the same report as being "a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises" (pp. 75 and 76).

Brookwood's Fifteenth Anniversary Review contained an article by Spencer Miller, Jr., from which the following is quoted:

The Workers Education Bureau of America and Brookwood celebrate in 1936 the fifteenth anniversary of their establishment. During the period of a decade and a half of their respective service to the labor movement, there have been not a few elements in common in their history. Many of the same persons who were present at the conference called at the Brookwood School in Katonah, New York, to plan for the establishment of a resident labor college on March 30 and April 1, 1921, were also present the following days, April 2 and 3, at the New School for Social Research \* \* \* when the plans were finally adopted for the creation of a national clearing-house on workers' education. \* \* \*

For the first eight years of the existence of Brookwood it was an affiliated and valued member of the Workers Education Bureau. When in 1929 this link of affiliation was discontinued because of the difficulties between Brookwood and the American Federation of Labor, the officers of the Bureau continued unofficially and informally to cooperate with Brookwood. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Brookwood was to be a training center to train workers to work in the workers' movement. (p. 31)

The following is quoted from the preface to "Workers' Education at the Cross Roads—Sixth Annual Conference of Teachers in Workers' Education at Brookwood, February 22-24, 1929 (Edited by a Committee of Local 189, American Federation of Teachers)," p. 3:

\* \* \* In August of that year (1928) the Executive Committee of the A. F. of L. launched an attack upon Brookwood Labor College on the ground that it was "un-American, atheistic, and Red" and that it was too critical of A. F. of L. unions.

Friends of workers' education who saw in this an attack upon the whole movement rallied to the defense of Brookwood and for months the controversy waxed hot. At the New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Labor in

October, 1928, attempts to obtain a hearing for the school were throttled, and the convention confirmed the recommendation of the Executive Council that unions be advised to withhold moral and financial support from the school.

Brookwood was disaffiliated from the Workers Education Bureau by the action of the W. E. B. executive committee on January 18, 1929, on the ground that the Bureau had no other alternative in view of the A. F. of L. action, although it was definitely stated that the W. E. B. had no charges against Brookwood and had made no investigation. \* \* \*

"Ten Years of Workers' Education, a survey of the 8th Annual Conference of Teachers in Workers' Education at Brookwood, February 21-23, 1931" contained a report by Helen G. Norton, of Brookwood, from which the following is quoted (p. 75):

Some graduates have been blacklisted by employers because of strike or organizational activity and have gone into other and unorganized industries.

Some have turned to the Communist or Socialist party. \* \* \* I cannot give you figures on how many of our students were Communists when they came. Some of them are not now party members by their own or the party's wish. The same is true of those who joined the party after they left school. One of them writes, "I am still a left winger with some moderation. I was expelled from the party for being a Trotskyite and I left the latter group for being something else." A number who were in the party's opposition before the present group came into power have been expelled for still being oppositionists. It may be that radicals get into the habit of being in the minority and can't get over it when the minority by chance becomes the majority. The fact that the number of graduates engaging in labor political activity has risen from 13 in the 1923-26 group to 30 in the 1927-30 may be considered a result of the stagnation of the trade union movement. And in their rebellion against the ineffectualness of "business unionism" most of them seized upon the most radical program they could find as is evidenced by the fact that out of 43 persons engaged in labor political activity, 31 are Communists of one brand or another. Thirty graduates are members of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, started two years ago. Be it said to Brookwood's credit that it has not manufactured any Republicans or Democrats. \* \* \*

Further references to Brookwood Labor College may be found in hearings of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Propaganda, as follows: Volume 1, pp. 563, 564, 566, 973; Volume 3, p. 2106.

#### FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

Fellowship of Reconciliation has never been officially cited as a Communist-front organization nor in any other manner by this Committee or the Attorney General of the United States.

In public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, November 7, 1938, the Fellowship of Reconciliation was described by Mr. J. B. Matthews, its former executive secretary, as a "radical peace organization." (Public Hearings, Volume 3, p. 2179.)

According to a pamphlet of the organization, the Fellowship of Reconciliation began in England soon after the outbreak of the First World War "as a movement of Christian protest against war and of faith in a better way than violence for the solution of all conflict." The pamphlet further states that the organization was composed of individual members from more than twenty countries who subscribed to the following Statement of Purpose:

They refuse to participate in any way, or to sanction military preparation; they work to abolish war and to foster good will among nations, races and classes;

They strive to build a social order which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited for the profit or pleasure of another \* \* \*

The Fellowship of Reconciliation has published a magazine, "Fellowship," and has utilized the magazine, "The World Tomorrow," to

reach religious and peace organizations. It has published leaflets, pamphlets, guides for study groups, newsletters, and interracial newsletters.

"Reconciliation Trips" which have piloted 50,000 persons on visits of understanding to all sorts of groups in New York City were inspired by the Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1921 "when in an era of 'red-baiting' propaganda the suggestion was made to a group of clergymen that it might be a good plan to meet and talk with leaders of radical groups in their own headquarters." Some of its officers and members have

conducted reconciliation trips to foreign countries \* \* \* Fellowship members were among the first to visit Soviet Russia and to urge the resumption of diplomatic relations between Russia and the United States. (From John Nevin Sayre's "The Story of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1915-1935.")

Through its official representatives, the Fellowship of Reconciliation has participated in Communist-inspired conference against war, when the line of the Communist Party was anti-war. As executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Joseph B. Matthews attended the Communist-controlled Amsterdam World Congress Against War in 1932. (Public Hearings, Volume 3, p. 2175.) The Fellowship also participated in the United States Congress Against War held in August, 1933, which was the predecessor of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The United States Congress Against War was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Reports dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle found that the "American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism held in New York City, September 29-October 1, 1933" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683).

The American League Against War and Fascism was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." Established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism, "the American League for Peace and Democracy \* \* \* was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (Attorney General Francis Biddle, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7683 and 7684).

Both the American League Against War and Fascism and its successor, the American League for Peace and Democracy, were cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See: Press Releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947 and June 1, 1948 and September 21, 1948.)

Both the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy were cited as Communist-front organizations in Reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. The American League for Peace and Democracy was also cited in Reports of January 3, 1941 and January 2, 1943.



A search of Committee files has revealed no recent literature of the organization in which its present officers might be listed; however, the "Directory of Agencies in Intergroup Relations" for 1948-1949, published by the American Council on Race Relations, Chicago, Illinois, gives the address of Fellowship of Reconciliation, Racial-Industrial Department, as 2929 Broadway, New York 25, New York, and names Bayard Rustin and George M. Houser as co-secretaries (page 21). No information concerning Bayard Rustin or George M. Houser is found in the public records, files and publications of the Committee.

#### HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL

The Highlander Folk School has never been cited as subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities and/or the Attorney General of the United States.

In an article which appeared in the New York Times on December 16, 1946, p. 29, and which was datelined Monteagle, Tennessee, December 15, it was reported that—

the Highlander Folk School here will start next year a three-year inter-racial rural education program throughout the South to promote better understanding between people of rural and urban areas and to combat racial and religious prejudice, it was announced today by Myles Horton, director of the school \* \* \*. The school, since its inception in 1932, has trained more than 7,000 Southerners in residence sessions and more than 12,000 others in field extension courses. Among those who have endorsed the work of the school in the past were listed Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Frank Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, and Senator Elbert Thomas of Utah.

A leaflet of the school, advertising the 1939 Winter Term, claims that the "purpose of Highlander Folk School is to promote the progressive labor movement in the South." Under the courses announced in the same leaflet is one in Union Problems which "deals with definite problems of the students as labor unionists. Methods of organizing, strike tactics, Labor Board procedure, education in unions, race relations are some of the things discussed \* \* \*."

On July 21, 1947, Mr. Walter S. Steele testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities that—

one of the oldest of the Red mediums of propaganda is the Communist school for the training and orientating of new recruits \* \* \*.

The Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tennessee, unquestionably keeps pretty close to the party line. Its directors, James Dombrowski and Myles Horton, are found in the company of Red-fronters. It has been a recipient of funds from the Robert Marshall Foundation \* \* \*.

Mr. Steele continued:

Members of the executive council of the Highlander Folk School are William H. Crawford of the CIO Steelworkers' Union, district director; Edward F. Gallagher, vice president of the Hosiery Workers' Union; Paul R. Christopher, CIO regional director, Tennessee; James Dombrowski, listed as secretary of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Charles Gillman, CIO regional director, Georgia; Carey Haigler, CIO regional director, Alabama; Lucy Randolph Mason, CIO public relations director; George Mitchell, regional director, CIO-PAC; Hollis Reid, legislative board of locomotive firemen; Thomas Starling, director, Region 8, Auto Workers' Union (CIO); Aubrey Williams, organizing director of Regional Farmers' Union and publisher of Southern Farmer (Montgomery, Alabama), a member of the board of directors of the Progressive Citizens Association. (From Mr. Steele's testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, pages 56 and 57.)

Public records, files, and publications of the Committee contain the following information concerning James Dombrowski and Myles Horton, named by Mr. Steele as directors of the Highlander Folk School:

#### JAMES DOMBROWSKI

A list of the 1947-1948 officers of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare named James A. Dombrowski as an administrator of that organization. (Reprinted in Committee's Report on the Southern Conference \* \* \*, June 12, 1947.) The same report also contains a chapter on Mr. Dombrowski, quoted in part as follows:

At the April 1942 sessions of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, James Dombrowski was elected executive secretary. He was the signer of a statement defending the Communist Party in March 1941 and a speaker for the National Conference for Constitutional Liberties in 1940. The latter organization has been cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle.

Dombrowski, together with Myles Horton, a member of the present board of representatives of the conference, helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united-front movement in the South in 1935. As Socialist Party leaders in Tennessee, the two men endorsed a united-front plan of action which included campaigns against the AAA and for a "rank and file" movement in the American Federation of Labor (Chattanooga Times of January 28, 1935, p. 5). They have both been charged with operating as stooges for the Communist Party within Socialist circles.

A clue to Dombrowski's political views is given in his book, "The Early Days of Christian Socialism in America" (1936). Dombrowski asserts that the Rev. George D. Herron, whom he considers "by far the most able man" in the early days of the Christian Socialist movement, pointed out in the last decade of the nineteenth century:

"\* \* \* that class lines were becoming more sharply defined that the logic of the inherent contradictions within capitalism was leading inevitably to more and more concentration of wealth, to the enrichment of the few at the expense of the masses" (p. 30).

Dombrowski goes on to defend Herron's views on violence. Herron, he says: "\* \* \* did not think that violence was inimical to a religious approach to social change. Peace at the expense of justice was not a religious solution to social problems. And resorting to his social interpretation of the cross, according to which all moral progress is made at the expense of suffering and sacrifice, he looked upon a revolution by violence, provided it promised a more just society, as a possible technique for social change worthy of the sanction of religion" (p. 193). "In his acceptance of the fact of the class struggle went the implicit recognition of the necessity for coercion" (p. 192).

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist-front organization which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. (From a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.) The organization "seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States" (Report 592 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated June 12, 1947).

The following is quoted from the testimony of Paul Crouch before this Committee during public hearings, May 6, 1949 (pages 190 and 193):

Mr. CROUCH. \* \* \* Prior to the Southern Conference, there was a small committee, with headquarters in Birmingham, which included as its leading members Joseph S. Gelders, Communist Party leader in Birmingham \* \* \*

Mr. MANDEL. Was James A. Dombrowski in that group?  
Mr. CROUCH. He came into it later.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. MANDEL. Did you know James Dombrowski as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CROUCH. Not as a member of the Communist Party. I do not know whether he is or is not a member of the Communist Party. He professes to be a left Socialist. I have met officially with him on a number of occasions as head of the Communist District Bureau of Tennessee. He and Myles Horton were present at the conference as Socialists and as representatives of the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tenn.

At this conference Mr. Dombrowski gave me the impression of being completely pro-Communist and anxious to collaborate with the Communist Party and follow its leadership, without taking the risk of actual Party membership.

I would like to mention in this connection that the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tenn., was a school organized by Myles Horton and Don West, and which Mr. Dombrowski shortly thereafter joined. Mr. Horton likewise professed to be a left Socialist, with Communist sympathies, and I asked him about joining the Communist Party. He did not give a final answer, but had not joined at the time I left Tennessee in early 1941. His wife, Zylphia, seemed even more pro-Communist than her husband, and I heard reports in party circles, which I am unable to verify, that she had subsequently joined the party.

Mr. MANDEL. Does that finish your comments on the Southern Conference?

Mr. CROUCH. Yes, except I would like to add that my most recent contact with the Southern Conference has been at Birmingham, Ala., where I have attended a number of meetings during the past 18 months, where I have heard Mr. Dombrowski and Clark Howell Foreman speak; and I personally know that the leading officers of the Southern Conference, Theresa Kantor—

Mr. MANDEL. Of what city?

Mr. CROUCH. Miami Beach; and Leo Scheiner, chairman of the Southern Conference in the Miami area, are active members of the Communist Party.

A letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, dated December 11-12, 1948, contains the name of James A. Dombrowski in a list of sponsors of the organization, "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (from a report of the Special Committee dated March 29, 1944; also cited in their report of June 25, 1942); the United States Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

The name of Dr. James Dombrowski, identified with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, appears on a letterhead of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, Inc., dated January 1, 1948, as a member of the International Board, a member of the Southern Conference, and a sponsor of that group. The People's Institute was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953).

James A. Dombrowski was a member of the Advisory Board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, as shown on letterheads of that organization dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947; he spoke at a meeting of the group, as shown in the following sources which identify him as Director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund: Daily People's World of April 25, 1948 (p. 11); Daily Worker of June 7, 1948 (p. 4); June 17, 1948 (p. 7); and June 27, 1948 (p. 2).

The Southern Negro Youth Congress is "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League, as disclosed in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities (which was released April 17, 1947); it was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4,

1947; redesignated April 27, 1953). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization in its report of January 3, 1940.

On March 5, 1941, p. 2, the Communist Daily Worker printed a full-page spread of the names of several hundred persons who defended the Communist Party against alleged persecution. The statement addressed to the President and Congress of the United States, called "attention (to) a matter of vital significance to the future of our nation. It is the attitude of our government toward the Communist Party \* \* \*" The name of James Dombrowski, Monteagle, Tennessee, was signed to the statement.

Identifying himself with the Socialist Party, Tennessee, James Dombrowski was one of those who signed a letter (printed in the Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tennessee, January 28, 1935, p. 5 "calling upon state executive committees of all southern States to hold meetings to effect united front between socialists, communists and other working class groups and suggesting revolutionary campaign."

Fortnightly magazine for August 15, 1937, p. 3, disclosed that James Dombrowski, Secretary, Highlander Folk School, had endorsed the reorganization plan for Commonwealth College (publishers of Fortnightly). The United States Attorney General has cited Commonwealth College (Mena, Ark.) as Communist (letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities called it a "Communist enterprise" (Report, March 29, 1944, pp. 76 and 167).

Mr. Dombrowski spoke at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America which was held in June 1940, as shown on the program (p. 2), and in New Masses of June 18, 1940 (p. 22); he signed the January 1943 Message of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to the House of Representatives (leaflet attached to an undated letterhead of the National Federation).

The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); he redesignated the organization April 27, 1953. The Attorney General called it "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program \* \* \*" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities called it "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Report March 29, 1944, p. 50; also cited in Reports, June 25, 1942, p. 20; and January 2, 1943, pp. 9 and 12). This Committee cited the organization in Report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3.

The Daily Worker of February 1, 1951, p. 2, named Dr. James A. Dombrowski of New Orleans as one of the sponsors of the American Peace Crusade; the "Call for Peace and Freedom" named him as one of the sponsors of the Crusade's American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace which was held in Chicago, June 29-July 1, 1951; he was also identified in this source as being from New Orleans.

The American Peace Crusade has been cited as an organization which the Communists established as "a new instrument for their

'peace' offensive in the United States" and which was heralded by the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives (Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, released by the Committee on Un-American Activities April 1, 1951).

In the same report on the "Peace" Offensive, the Committee disclosed that the World Peace Appeal was a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at the meeting in Stockholm, March 16-19, 1950; it "received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy." Dr. James A. Dombrowski of New Orleans endorsed the World Peace Appeal, as shown on an undated leaflet entitled, "Prominent Americans Call for \* \* \*"

#### MYLES HORTON

The printed program of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, November 20-23, 1938, reveals the name of Myles Horton as a speaker at that conference; it also identified him as a member of the Committee on Resolutions and a member of the Southern Council of the organization. He also spoke at a conference of the group which was held April 14-16, 1940, as was shown on the official program. In both sources Mr. Horton was identified as Director of the Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee. In 1947-1948, Myles Horton was a member of the Board of Representatives of the Southern Conference \* \* \*, according to the organization's publication, "The Southern Patriot", for December 1946, p. 8.

In public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 13, 1938, Mr. John P. Frey, President of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, made the following reference to Myles Horton, in a report which he presented in connection with his testimony:

\* \* \* Elizabeth Hawes, Alton Lawrence, *Miles* Horton: These three people have been in the past, and probably now are, paid organizers for the Textile Workers Organization Committee. They have been active in radical work in the South and a few years ago attended a secret convention in North Carolina, at which time plans were made for spreading the revolutionary theories throughout the South.

In connection with this we might mention that the Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee, was mixed up in this secret convention, in which these three CIO organizers took a very prominent part. (Public Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, volume 1, page 126.)

The Chattanooga Times (Chattanooga, Tennessee), of January 28, 1935, p. 5, reported that Myles Horton was one of those who, "with other Socialists", signed a letter "calling upon state executive committees of all Southern states to hold meetings to effect a united front between socialists, communists and other working class groups, and suggesting a revolutionary campaign." Myles Horton signed the statement and identified himself with "the executive committee of the Socialist party."

Also note reference to Mr. Horton in the testimony of Paul Crouch, under "Dombrowski".

### INDEPENDENT COMMUNIST LABOR LEAGUE OF AMERICA

The following is quoted from a publication of this committee, "Organized Communism in the United States," released August 19, 1953 (p. 143):

Factional fights in the Communist Party of Russia and in the Communist International carried over into the Communist Party in America. The expulsion of Trotsky by the Russian Communist Party was followed by the wholesale expulsion of the followers of Trotsky from the American Party. The factional fight between Stalin and Bukharin also affected the Communist Party in the United States.

Jay Lovestone, who was suspected of sympathy with Bukharin, was ordered to Moscow for work in the Comintern.

On May 12, 1929, the Comintern reported an "Address" it had decided to send to the American Communist Party. Lovestone and others were asked to give their endorsement to this "Address," which was nothing more nor less than a condemnation of the Lovestone group. When Lovestone refused, he was removed from all positions in the American Communist Party and the Communist International and was ordered to remain in Moscow. Several weeks later, Lovestone, without the knowledge or permission of the Comintern, left Moscow and returned to the United States. For this breach of discipline, he was expelled by the Communist Party of the United States.

Lovestone, with some of his followers, formed the Communist Party U. S. A. (majority group); later changed to the Communist Party U. S. A. (opposition); still later changed to the Independent Communist Labor League of America, and finally to the Independent Labor League of America. In January 1941, the Independent Labor League of America, through its general secretary, Jay Lovestone, issued a declaration of dissolution and expressed the belief that radicalism in the United States was "in a hopeless blind alley from which there is no escape along the old lines."

### NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

The National Farmers Union has never been cited by the Attorney General of the United States nor has it ever been investigated or cited as a Communist or a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Guide to Public Affairs Organizations, published by the American Council on Public Affairs in 1946, lists the National Farmers Union as being located at 3501 East 46th Avenue, Denver, Colorado; James Patton, President. The publication further states that the organization maintains an office at 1371 E Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

"The Worker" of November 14, 1943 (page 6) reported in an article datelined Utica, N. Y., that the Farmers Union of New York in its second wartime convention voted to affiliate with the National Farmers Union and to join in the creation of the new Northeastern Division of the National Farmers Union. The same article named Archie Wright as President of the New York organization. "The Worker" is the Sunday edition of the Communist publication, "The Daily Worker."

The following quotations from "The Communist" of October 1937, an official publication of the Communist Party, concern the Communist Party's hopes to infiltrate the National Farmers Union:

Every district of the Party must work to have this program become the property of the National Farmers Union, with special emphasis on making it the rallying point to isolate the Kennedy-Coughlin forces in the Farmers' Union November Central Committee Plenum \* \* \* (page 953).

In our mass work our main concentration must be to build the National Farmers Union, to develop local, state and national programs around which we can rally and crystallize a firm progressive leadership (page 948).

James G. Patton, who signed as President, National Farmers Union, wrote a letter to the Honorable Martin Dies, dated November 12, 1942, concerning statements made on the Floor of the House of Representatives by Mr. Dies. The letter was written on a letterhead of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Office of the President, which showed the address of the organization as 3501 East 46th Ave., Denver, Colorado.

The Honorable Martin Dies in his speech stated that the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America received contributions from the Robert Marshall Foundation in the sum of \$22,500.00. Mr. Dies also stated that the following leaders of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America were national leaders of the American Peace Mobilization: Gerald Harris, Alabama Farmers Union; \* \* \* Clinton Clark, Louisiana Farmers Union; \* \* \* (See: Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7690.)

The Robert Marshall Foundation "has been one of the principal sources for the money with which to finance the Communist Party's fronts generally in recent years" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1311 dated March 29, 1944).

The American Peace Mobilization was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944 (page 5). The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Peace Mobilization as a Communist-front and as subversive and Communist (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7684; letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948, respectively; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The "Daily Worker" of August 2, 1938 (page 3) reported that the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America participated in the World Youth Congress, "a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College" (Special Committee \* \* \* in Report of March 29, 1944).

References to the National Farmers Union are found in the Committee's Hearings Regarding Communist Activities Among Farm Groups, held February 28 and March 9, 1951, a copy of which is enclosed (See: pages 1894-1896, 1901-1903, 1916-1920, 1923).

#### JAMES G. PATTON

An article published in the "Daily Worker" of September 18, 1947 (page 8) stated that "an attempt to disrupt the Farmers Union by raising the red issue was quashed by its top leaders recently. James S. Elmore, until recently editor of the National Union Farmer, resigned under fire after being criticized for inserting a red-baiting editorial and cartoon in the current issue.

James Patton, Farmers Union President, who is recovering from an operation, wrote Elmore declaring the material was inconsistent with Farmers Union policy and "invited" his resignation.

The "Daily Worker" of January 29, 1948 (page 2) reported that James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union, indicated that the organization would support Henry Wallace for President. His photograph appeared in the March 15, 1950 (page 8) issue of that paper; it stated in this connection that he opposed the Mundt anti-Communist bill.

The American Slav Congress issued an invitation to a Testimonial Dinner at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, October 12, 1947; the printed program named James G. Patton as one of the sponsors of the dinner. The American Slav Congress was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "a Moscow-inspired and directed federation of Communist-dominated organizations seeking by methods of propaganda and pressure to subvert the 10,000,000 people in this country of Slavic birth or descent." (Report 1951 dated April 26, 1950, page 1.) The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Slav Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.

On January 11, 1938, the "Daily Worker" named James G. Patton as one of those who signed a manifesto which was sponsored by the Union of Concerted Peace Efforts, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944.

James G. Patton, identified as President of the National Farmers Union, was one of those who signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which hailed the War Department's order regarding commissions for Communists ("Daily Worker," March 18, 1945, page 2). The National Federation \* \* \* was cited as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party" (Special Committee \* \* \* in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in Reports of June 25, 1942 and January 2, 1943).

The National Federation \* \* \* was among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947). The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7687). Subsequently, the Attorney General cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

The Civil Rights Congress issued a statement opposing red-baiting and attacks on Communists, which was signed by James Patton, as shown in "The Worker" of May 25, 1947 (page 9); he was identified as a member of the Executive Board, Local 78, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, Phoenix, Arizona. James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union, was a member of the Initiating Committee for a Congress on Civil Rights held in Detroit, April 27-28, 1946, as shown by the Summons to the Congress.

The following quotation is found on page 19 of a Report on the Civil Rights Congress, released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 1947:



It is worthy of note that subsequent to the formation of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit on April 27-28, 1946, and the enlistment of additional sponsors, the names of a number of members of the initiating committee, having served their decoy purposes, disappeared from the organization's letterhead, among them being \* \* \* James G. Patton \* \* \* This seems to be a favorite device of Communist-front organizations.

From facts available to the Committee on Un-American Activities, it was found that "the Civil Rights Congress is an organization dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party, that the organization is controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Committee Report on the Civil Rights Congress dated September 2, 1947). The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist (letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union, endorsed "In Fact," as shown by a folder entitled "A Statement from George Seldez on In Fact." The publication, "In Fact," was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee in its Report of March 29, 1944.

In addition, Committee records show that in 1947, James G. Patton was an honorary sponsor of the Union for Democratic Action, Washington Chapter (letterhead dated January 10, 1947). This organization has not been cited as a Communist front; it was the predecessor of Americans for Democratic Action whose stated purpose is:

We believe that all forms of totalitarianism, including Communism, are incompatible with these objectives. In our crusade for an expanding democracy and against fascism and reaction we welcome as members of ADA only those whose devotion to the principles of political freedom is unquestioned. (From the Civil Liberties Conference Program of the Philadelphia Chapter, ADA, January 10, 1948.)

Also in 1947, James G. Patton, President, Farmers Union, was one of those who signed a "statement made by eighty-seven leading American liberals, setting forth what they consider to be a standard of political conduct for those who believe in liberalism or progressivism as a middle way between the extremes of reaction and communism \* \* \*" This statement, which was placed in the Congressional Record on May 23, 1947 (pages A2599-2600), by the Honorable James E. Murray, contains the following attack on the Communist Party: "The American Communist group—registered party members, together with their more or less unofficial adherents—has its roots in a foreign land, and the record shows that it follows the behests of a foreign government."

It is noted that the "Statement of James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union, submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, March 31, 1950, in opposition to H. R. 7595 and H. R. 3903" appears in the public hearings on legislation to outlaw certain un-American and subversive Activities, March 21, 22, 23, and 28, 1950 (page 2353).

### PUBLIC AFFAIRS PAMPHLETS, AN ACTIVITY OF THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Public Affairs Committee, Inc., has never been cited in any manner by this Committee or the Attorney General of the United States.

In testimony before this Committee, July 21, 1947, Mr. Walter S. Steele, Managing Editor of the "National Republic" magazine, and Chairman of the National Security Committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies, made the following reference to the Public Affairs Committee, Inc.:

Public Affairs Committee, Inc., with offices at 122 East Thirty-eighth Street, New York, N. Y., entered the pamphleteering field several years ago. It issues higher quality pamphlets on subjects related to those adopted for propagation by the Communist Party. Maxwell S. Stewart, former editor of Moscow News, and with other front connections, is editor of the pamphlet service. Violet Edwards is education and promotion director. Frederick V. Field, of New Masses—Communist organ—is a member of the board.

Ruth Benedict, a member of the East and West Association, and Gene Weltfish, a leader in the Congress of the American Women, have written pamphlets for the Public Affairs Committee. One of them, Races of Mankind, was barred by the War Department after Congress protested against its use in orientation classes of the Army, declaring that its aim was to create racial antagonism. (Testimony of Mr. Walter S. Steele, July 21, 1947, pages 40 and 41.)

The files of the Committee contain a copy of the pamphlet, "The Races of Mankind," written by Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish, copyright, 1943, by the Public Affairs Committee, Inc. In the Report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, released by this Committee, June 16, 1947, "The Races of Mankind" was described as "a eulogy of Russia's treatment of minority groups that was condemned by the War Department" (page 12).

The Committee on Un-American Activities does not maintain a complete file of pamphlets issued by the Public Affairs Committee, Inc. One of the latest publications of the group on file is a pamphlet entitled "Prejudice in Textbooks" (copyright, 1950), which was written by Maxwell S. Stewart. As shown in this source, "The Publication of the Public Affairs Pamphlets is one of the activities of the Committee, whose purpose as expressed in its Constitution is 'to make available in summary and inexpensive form the results of research on economic and social problems to aid in the understanding and development of American policy. The sole purpose of the Committee is educational. It has no economic or social program of its own to promote.' Publication of a pamphlet does not necessarily imply the Committee's approval of all of the views contained in it."

### RAND SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

The Rand School of Social Science has never been cited in any manner by this Committee or the Attorney General of the United States.

A full-page advertisement of the Rand School of Social Science in the New York "Star" for September 21, 1948 gives its address as 7 East 15th Street, New York 3, New York, and shows Theodore Schapiro to be Executive Director. The files also contain several copies of the School's "Index to Labor Articles" published during 1944.

A copy of "100 Questions to the Communists," by Stephen Naft, published by the Rand School Press, copyright 1939, appears in the files, from which is quoted the following:

The following questions, addressed to sympathizers, fellow-travelers and members of the Communist Party, are put with the sincere intention not to antagonize, but rather to evoke answers in their own thoughts on the basis of their own independent sincere reasoning. \* \* \* Therefore we hope that every honest sympathizer and supporter of Communist and Socialist aspirations, who consequently must cherish the ideals of personal and economic security, of freedom, of justice, social equality and brotherly solidarity will not only understand and appreciate our motives but will welcome these questions as an opportunity for self-criticism and self-evaluation of his attitude towards the principles dear to him. \* \* \*

A check of the public records, files and publications of the Committee has shown no other references to Stephen Naft.

Public hearings of this Committee and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities contain references to the Rand School of Social Science, excerpts from which are quoted, as follows:

Mr. John Mills Davis, former Communist Party organizer, testified before this Committee, July 15, 1953, that the "Rand School is an anti-Communist school. It is known as a Socialist school." (Communist Activities in the Albany, N. Y., Area—Part 2, page 2474.)

The Rand School of Social Science was organized in New York in 1906. Its purpose was to instruct leaders in socialism and labor organizations. Each session the school has had enrolled over 1,000 students. Its operation expenses run from \$50,000 to \$100,000 a year. It has 6,000 books in its library. Many C. I. O. unions have contributed financially to the school. It maintains a publishing house which has printed numerous books and pamphlets on socialism.

The officers of Rand School of Social Science are Algernon Lee, president; Dr. William E. Bohn, educational director; and Henry Apotheker, manager. The instructors are Jack L. Afros, former director of the Young Circle League of the Workmen's Circle; \* \* \* Rebecca Jarvis, formerly educational director, Women's Trade Union League; \* \* \* Bela Low, well-known authority on Marxian economics \* \* \*

Rand School was raided by the Government during the war. Its leaders were convicted under the Espionage Act.

The School also operates Camp Tamiment in Pennsylvania. (Public Hearings, information submitted by Walter S. Steele in connection with his testimony before the Special Committee \* \* \*, August 17, 1938, page 566.)

Louis Waldman, born, Yomcherudnia, Russia, January 5, 1892; \* \* \* elected Socialist Party assemblyman, New York City, 1918; reelected in 1920; ousted from assembly, 1920; author, *The Great Collapse and Government Ownership*; member, cutters local, International Ladies Garment Workers Union (C. I. O.); lawyer; Mason, and member of Socialist Party; author, *Socialism of Our Times*; Socialist Party candidate, Governor, New York, 1930-32; board of directors, League for Industrial Democracy (radical Socialist); contributor, Socialist Planning and a Socialist Program; member, national committee, League Against Fascism (Communist set-up); sponsor, radical Artists and Writers Dinner Club, 1935; instructor, Rand School of Social Science (radical Socialist), New York; chairman, People's Party, 1936; member, executive committee, American Labor Party, 1938; associated with the Social Democratic Federation. (Ibid., page 648.)

Joseph Schlossberg, born in Russia, May 1, 1875, edited *Das Abendblatt*, 1900-1902, and *Der Arbeiter* in 1904-11; member of Socialist Workmen's Circle; national committee, American Civil Liberties Union; National committee, League Against Fascism; board of directors, League for Industrial Democracy; American Friends of Spanish Democracy; Emergency Peace Campaign; Rand School, extremely Socialist institution (Ibid., page 682.)

The following is quoted from the testimony of Alexander Trachtenberg during public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on September 13, 1939:

Mr. WHITLEY. What occupations have you followed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From 1908 to 1915 I was a student in three universities, including Yale, and after that I was invited to teach in Rand School of Social Science, and headed the research department of that institution; that was up to 1920 \* \* \*

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, how long have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Since the end of 1921. \* \* \* Prior to that I was a Socialist. (page 4864)

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. \* \* \* Mr. Heller and myself were working together in the Rand School of Social Science some 25 or 26 years ago, he, as a member of the board of directors and myself as an instructor and as head of the public-research department. \* \* \*

And, in 1924 we got together and organized this firm (International Publishing Company) for the purpose of publishing translations, principally of the classics; and other books of interest to the American people and we have engaged regularly in publishing activities \* \* \* on economics, politics, philosophy, arts and sciences. \* \* \* We publish books of our own and publish books from various other publishers, usually under our name. (page 4687)

The CHAIRMAN. Is he (Mr. Heller) a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is.

The CHAIRMAN. And has been since 1921, like you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He has been a member for 40 years of the Socialist movement. \* \* \* I have been for 33 years with the Socialist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. You broke off from the radicals and joined the Communists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. He helped to build the Rand School, which is a Socialist educational institution. (page 4881)

Mr. STARNES. To whom did he (Mr. Heller) make contributions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To educational institutions \* \* \* The Rand School of Social Science. (page 4883)

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Rand School was the primary national educational institution of the Socialist movement at that time, very, very prominent, internationally known institution. For instance, when the building was bought for that school in 1917, he was one of the heaviest contributors to buying that building from the Y. W. C. A. for the Rand School. I remember that.

Mr. STARNES. And that school is still operated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That school is still operated.

Mr. STARNES. But not by the Socialist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; by the Socialist Party. \* \* \* But not actually officially, because there have been so many split-offs, but a certain part which was formerly the Socialist Party, but not by the Communist Party. (page 4884)

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever known Juliet Stuart Poyntz?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When did you know her?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. She went to the Rand School as a teacher, in the years when she was assistant professor, in 1915 or 1916. \* \* \* That was when I was also a teacher in the Rand School. \* \* \*

Mr. WHITLEY. You know of the fact that the New York papers frequently carried her name in the early years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I saw that—

Mr. WHITLEY. As leading demonstrations for the Communist Party; in connection with her arrest?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I saw that (pages 4911 and 4912).

The International Publishers, of which Mr. Trachtenberg was secretary and treasurer, was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as "the (Communist) Party's publishing House" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7686). The Special Committee \* \* \* cited it as an "official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States" and a medium through which "extensive Soviet propaganda is subsidized in the United States" (Reports of January 3, 1940, page 8 and June 25, 1942, page 18); it was cited in a similar manner by this Committee in Report No. 1920 of May 11, 1948 (page 80).

Files show no information concerning the officers of the Rand School of Social Science, Algernon Lee, Dr. William E. Bohn, Henry Apotheker, and Theodore Schapiro, mentioned on pages 1 and 2 of this memorandum.

## WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE

A letterhead of the War Resisters League dated May 6, 1949, signed by George W. Hartman, Chairman, gives the address of this organization as Five Beekman Street, New York 7, New York, and states that it is affiliated with the War Resisters' International, Enfield, Middlesex, England, Laurence Housman, President. This letter was addressed to Members of Congress, a part of which is quoted for your information:

Specifically, the War Resisters League earnestly requests the highest-level political leadership in Washington to offer the people of the world some better protection against the chronic menace of war than that allegedly sought and provided by the North Atlantic Pact. Paradoxically as it may sound, the only real gainers from the Atlantic coalition so far have been the Communists; those advocates of force and violence as the ultimate arbiters of social conflict will not be "contained" merely by the threat to use their own favorite techniques on a bigger scale. Such precedent-bound diplomacy merely makes the supreme horror of atomic and bacteriological warfare more rather than less likely as the days roll by.

\* \* \* \* \*

Far more could be done along the lines of a Joint Congressional Resolution for universal disarmament, limited world government \* \* \*

The following is taken from the testimony of Walter S. Steele during public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 16, 1938:

The American Student Union has cooperated directly with other Communist movements in many avenues in the United States. Its last convention was held at Vassar College, December 27-31, 1937, at which time it took on a direct political tinge by resolution. The union also resolved to boycott Japan and to help the Spanish and Chinese "red" fronts. It especially favors the Nye-Kvale bills to abolish military training in schools and colleges. It passed a resolution eulogizing some of its members fighting on the Spanish "red" front. The union upheld the Mexican confiscation of American properties; it denounced American interference in Puerto Rico and the arrest of revolutionists there, demanding their release; it endorsed the World Youth Congress, to be held at Vassar in August 1938; \* \* \* it urged the passage of the anti-lynching bill; the abolition of poll tax; it supported the Harrison-Black bills, the Southern Negro Congress, the Scottsboro Negroes. The union adopted resolutions opposing theatre owners banning Negroes in movie houses of the South. It ordered its members to cooperate in labor struggles \* \* \* It denounced the jailing of labor agitators, and criticized colleges and universities expelling students and discharging professors for radical activities.

The American Student Union set up the United Student Peace Committee in 1938, through which it has a wider range in organizing strikes in American schools. Molly Yard is organizational secretary of this committee. Through it they claim to have influenced 17 national youth movements to become affiliated with it. These include the \* \* \* American Youth Congress, the American League for Peace and Democracy \* \* \* War Resisters' League \* \* \*

On March 24, the American Student Union called a strike, at which time, according to the Daily Worker, March 22, 1938, page 5, it called on Secretary of State Hull to follow the Soviet peace policy against the "Fascist aggressor." Of course, that policy was to supply money, men, and arms to the "red" fronts, thereby injecting the country into the fracas.

The April 24, 1938, issue of the Sunday Worker published an article which stated that the Young Communist League created the American Student Union and is the "main inspiration behind the student peace activities that rocked America on April 27" (1937). (page 476)

\* \* \* \* \*

Back in 1930 there was also formed the Revolutionary Youth, an organization to contribute further to the Marxian drive in America, that was launched by Jack Rubenstein \* \* \* and others. There has come into being since the following youth movements in the United States; not all are Communist, but most of

them are Marxian to some degree. These were: \* \* \* Youth section of War Resisters' League. (page 593)

The American Youth Congress was conceived by Viola Ilma. Founding the congress, the purpose of which she proclaimed was for "sound intellectual, spiritual, and physical development of the youth of America," the first meeting was called in August of 1934 at the Washington Square College, in New York City.

The first break to the left came several weeks before the congress was to convene, when Prof. Harvey Zorbaugh, of the Sociology Department of Washington Square College, New York City, who in the summer of 1935 served on the advisory council of Moscow State University, became irred at Miss Ilma for holding down liberal and radical organizations to a minimum representation. Professor Zorbaugh invited 12 organizations to participate in the conference, including the ultra-radical and pacifist groups, the League for Industrial Democracy (Socialist), National Student Federation, Pioneer Youth (Socialist), War Resisters' League (ultra-radical pacifists) \* \* \*. (page 611)

On the sponsoring committee of the Second World Youth Congress there are a few fairly conservative individuals sandwiched in with liberals of every trend of thought. Chairman of the committee is Dr. Henry M. MacCracken. The members include Stephen Duggan, John Nevin Sayre, and Mary B. Wooley, and others, many of whom are at least considered extreme "liberals".

Two weeks before the World Youth Congress convened at Vassar College, the 'rolling stone' had gathered considerable moss. According to the official organ of the Communist Party (Daily Worker, August 2, 1938, page 3), the following organizations announced their intention of participating in the "red jubilee": \* \* \* War Resisters' League \* \* \*

The following statements with reference to "The So-Called Fascists" and the War Resisters' International are found on pages 662 and 664 of the Public Hearings:

Long ago the Communist at Moscow set the course insofar as pacifism is concerned, for the radical forces in non-Communist countries. This course is again reiterated in the Moscow Izvestia under date of August 1, 1929. Izvestia is the official organ of the Third International and the Soviet Government, in Moscow. It says:

"While the defense of one's fatherland is not to be tolerated in imperialistic countries, in the country of the proletarian dictatorship it is one's first duty."

Consequently, it is not strange then that we find over 1,000 national pacifist movements within the United States, without a single one in the Soviet Union. \* \* \* that most of these pacifist movements in the United States are bound up into united front groups, then into Internationals with headquarters abroad from where they receive their inspirations and instructions. \* \* \* that we found almost without exception these organizations promoting the propaganda and public sentiment for recognition of Russia \* \* \* carrying on an organized campaign in the United States against "fascism" but not against the more widely organized menace communism; it is not strange then that we find them demanding that we "keep America out of war by keeping war out of the world" meaning it is shown by their demands that we strain our neutrality laws to mean assistance to revolutionist and pro-Russian elements in various countries but not to anti-Soviet forces.

The War Resisters International is called a Communist organization which desires to bring a new social order through revolutionary uprisings. It initiated the War Resisters International Council, which comprises the War Resisters International and its sections, together with the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom \* \* \* Their first international conference was held in Holland; one in Austria in 1928, where resistance and revolution were discussed. They unite for the suppression of capitalism and imperialism and would establish their new social and international order. They maintain that war resistance is a practical policy, but do not oppose war of their own making. Its American section is the War Resisters' League, whose honorary chairman in 1933 was Albert Einstein. They advise that we change our economic system and thus get rid of war. In an Armistice Day peace letter to the President of the United States they announced their "deliberate intention to refuse to support war measures or to render war service" should our Government have to resort to arms.

## WORLD YOUTH CONGRESS

In Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, the World Youth Congress was cited as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

In the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated January 3, 1939, we find that the same organizations which were affiliated with the World Youth Congress were affiliated with the American Youth Congress (see separate memorandum on American Youth Congress).

Right-wing youth movements refused to attend the World Youth Congress which was held at Vassar. The organizers in the United States were leaders of Communist, Communist "front," and Communist sympathizing movements (p. 82).

An article concerning the World Youth Congress appeared in the *Daily Worker* of August 15, 1938, p. 1. According to this article—the World Youth Congress movement originated in 1934 when the League of Nations Association called a conference of all the youth organizations that had grown up in various lands in the struggle against war. \* \* \* The first world Congress convened in Geneva, Switzerland in the late summer of 1936, on the heels of the Italian conquest of Ethiopia and the fascist uprising in Spain. \* \* \* In the United States, the chief center for the World Youth Congress movement has been the American Youth Congress. \* \* \*

It was reported in the same article that fifty leading American youth organizations would be represented at the Congress, and delegates would number almost 500 from 54 countries.

## WORLD YOUTH FESTIVALS

The first World Youth Festival was held in Prague, Czechoslovakia, July 20–August 17, 1947. According to an article which appeared in the *Daily Worker* of August 23, 1947, p. 6, seven of the delegates from the United States charged that the youth festival was dominated by Communists, and distributed a statement to that effect at the closing parade festival. The dissident group was denounced in a statement by other American delegates to the World Federation of Democratic Youth, according to this same source.

The second World Youth Festival was held from August 14–28, 1949, in Budapest, Hungary. The Committee on Un-American Activities (in Report No. 378, April 25, 1951, pp. 77 and 78) stated that the Festival was held in cooperation with the American Youth for a Free World and the World Federation of Democratic Youth. It was reported that delegates were usually led by the Soviet delegation, displaying a huge photograph of Joseph Stalin. Representatives of the Chinese Communist armies won prominent places and high honors in the festivities. The United States was represented by a delegation of 175 students. The *Daily Worker* of August 30, 1949, p. 5, reported that the festival closed with delegates, among them 22 Americans, pledging "to fight for a lasting peace." They were asked by Matthias Rakosi, deputy prime minister and leader of the Hungarian Communist Party, to "take an oath for world peace and to fight against the western union, which is arming the world for a new war." The West coast publication, *Daily People's World*, issue of September 20, 1949, p. 5, carried a reference to the Budapest Youth Festival as being "on our State Department's 'Moscow peace plot' list."

### YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST LEAGUE

The Young People's Socialist League (4th International), is the Youth Section of the Socialist Workers Party, as was shown on an announcement issued by the group for a demonstration against war; the announcement is undated but is attached to a letterhead dated November 13, 1939.

The United States Attorney General cited the Socialist Workers Party as a subversive organization which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948). The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953. The Socialist Workers Party is—

a dissident Communist group not affiliated with the Communist International nor officially recognized by either the Communist hierarchy in Moscow or the Communist Party, U. S. A. Essentially, however, both the official and unofficial groups base themselves upon the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The Socialist Workers Party are followers of Leon Trotsky, who was expelled from the Russian Communist Party. The official Communists are followers of Joseph Stalin.

(Committee on Un-American Activities, Report No. 1920, May 11, 1948, page 141).

"The Challenge of Youth" (January-February 1938), published monthly by the Young Peoples Socialist League (4th Internationalists), reported that—

the New Year's week end saw the formal launching at an impressive convention held in Chicago, of the Socialist Workers Party, American section of the Fourth International movement. The delegates to this convention were made up of rank-and-file representatives of the left-wing of the Socialist Party who had previously been expelled for their belief in revolutionary ideas. Quite a few members of the Y. P. S. L. were included among the more than 100 regular and fraternal delegates. \* \* \*

The convention categorically placed itself and the party in favor of the most loyal and unconditional defense of the Soviet Union, at the same time that it will conduct a relentless struggle against Stalinism. On the Spanish question, the convention reiterated the position of the revolutionists that the working class must conduct a struggle against fascism and at the same time prepare for a final struggle against the capitalist system which breeds fascism. In the spirit of internationalism, the new party affiliated itself to the Fourth International which bases itself on the revolutionary teachings of Marx and Lenin, and which alone carries on the struggle for world socialism today.

Relations between the SWP and the YPSL were firmly established. The National Committee of the SWP has a YPSL representative on it; constitutional provisions provide for a YPSL representative on each corresponding Party committee or body; young socialists attaining a specified age are to (be) automatically enlisted in the party ranks; the Party stands pledged to give the YPSL its utmost cooperation, including financial aid. The relations between the party and YPSL are the greatest omen of the future successes assured our movement.

"Political Affairs" for September 1952 (pages 33-47) published a chapter from William Z. Foster's book, "History of the Communist Party of the United States," under the title, "The Formation of the Communist Party (1919-1921)." Reference to the Young People's Socialist League was made, as follows:

The youth were also a source of strength for the gathering Communist forces. The profound events which had resulted in the split in the Socialist Party and the organization of the Communist Party naturally had its repercussions among the Socialist young people. The S. P., in April 1913, after several years of preliminary work of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, had constituted the Young People's Socialist League. The Y. P. S. L. in 1916 consisted of 150 clubs and



4,000 members. It published *The Young Socialist* and carried on educational and social work. During the war the organization, Leftward-inclined, held many anti-war meetings and made much agitation against conscription.

The treacherous attitude of the Social-Democratic leaders of the Second International, toward the Russian Revolution and the war, produced profound repercussions in the Y. P. S. L., as in other sections of the American Socialist movement. At the Y. P. S. L.'s first national convention, held in May 1919, this Left spirit in the organization found expression. The convention passed resolutions condemning the Second International and supporting the Third International. In December 1919, after the Socialist Party had split in September, the Y. P. S. L. held a special convention, in response to Left-wing demands. It thus set itself up as an independent organization, declaring for the Young Socialist International, which was then in the process of transforming itself into the Young Communist International. When the Palmer raids against the labor and Communist movement took place, the independent Y. P. S. L. disintegrated as a national organization, although some of its sections remained in existence. Wm. F. Kruse, the head of the Y. P. S. L., joined the Workers Party at its formation in December 1921, and many former Y. P. S. L. members also took part in forming the Young Communist League. \* \* \*

The Young Peoples Socialist League supported the "Call to the (first) United States Congress Against War" in New York City, September 2, 3 and 4, 1933 (from "The Struggle Against War," published August 1933), and made a part of public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Volume 10, page 6234). Delegates from the Young Peoples Socialist League attended the Second U. S. Congress Against War and Fascism, as was shown in the printed proceedings of that Congress which was held in Chicago, Illinois, September 28, 29, 30, 1934 (from Public Hearings, Appendix to Volume 10, pages I and XI).

The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism, September 29 to October 1, 1933.

The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union. \* \* \* Subsequent congresses in 1934 and 1936 reflected the same program (U. S. Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7683).

### The Congress—

was completely under the control of the Communist Party. Earl Browder was a leading figure in all its deliberations. In his report to the Communist International, Browder stated: "The Congress from the beginning was led by our party quite openly." (From Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944, page 119; also cited in Reports of January 3, 1940 and June 25, 1942.)

The Young Peoples Socialist League was named in public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of the organizations "cooperating in the American Youth Congress" which was held in New York City in August 1934 (Public Hearings, Volume I, page 613); later, during the same hearings, it was revealed that "two weeks before the World Youth Congress convened at Vassar College, the 'rolling stone' had gathered considerable moss. According to the official organ of the Communist Party (*Daily Worker*, August 2, 1938, page 3), the following organizations announced their intention of participating in the 'red jubilee': Young Communist League, Southern Negro Youth Congress, American Student Union, \* \* \* Young Peoples Socialist League of America." (Public Hearings, Volume I, pages 615-616.)

The American Youth Congress has been cited as subversive and Communist by the U. S. Attorney General (letters released by the Loyalty Review Board, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953); "it originated in 1934 and \* \* \* has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth" (Attorney General, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7685; also cited in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the group as "one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party" (Report of June 25, 1942; also cited in Reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1941 and March 29, 1944).

The World Youth Congress has been cited as a Communist conference which was held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College (Special Committee on \* \* \*, Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, page 183; also cited in Report of January 3, 1939).

In an Open Letter to the American Student Union, dated November 2, 1939, the Young Peoples Socialist League (4th International), Youth Section of the Socialist Workers Party, called upon the American Student Union to—

return to an anti-war program. The YPSL broke with your organization a year ago when you openly supported Roosevelt and his armament program, the war measure of the NYA Air Pilot Schools and the foreign policies known under the general heading "Collective Security." At the same time you opposed any real opposition to war in the form of a popular war referendum and the Oxford Pledge—refusal to support the United States Government in any war it may undertake \* \* \* For the last three years the YPSL has led campus opposition to imperialism and its wars.

"Solidarity" (published by the Young Peoples Socialist League), in the issue of July 1940, expressed the stand of the organization as follows:

Because the Socialist Party is for the workers against the owners, for democracy against depotism, it is also for peace against imperialist war. But we point out that only social ownership will do away with the most important cause of modern wars (page 2).

# TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

---

## MINORITY VIEWS

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND  
COMPARABLE ORGANIZATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. Res. 217



MINORITY VIEWS

SUBMITTED BY

REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE L. HAYS  
REPRESENTATIVE GRACIE PFOST



## CONTENTS

---

	<b>Page</b>
I. Prejudgment.....	421
II. The "factual" basis for the majority report.....	422
III. The denial of a fair hearing to the foundations.....	424
IV. The nature of the public hearings.....	428
V. The report.....	430
VI. What the report should be.....	431
VII. Conclusion.....	



## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

---

The minority does not agree with the report submitted by the majority.<sup>1</sup> It not only disagrees with that report but earnestly believes that it should never be published.

Each step of the proceedings of this committee placed an ugly stain on the majestic record of the United States House of Representatives and the great tradition of the American people. The minority membership of this committee, feeling that fundamental American principles were under attack in the committee, diligently attended its meetings despite the many other congressional responsibilities that were equally demanding of their attention. The majority membership operated primarily through proxies held by the chairman.

A review of the record of the committee proceedings has brought to mind again the elemental unfairness that was the basic characteristic of this intended legislative inquiry by a committee of one of the greatest legislative bodies in the world. The minority members confess that this review first angered and then dismayed them. From the collaboration between them required to state their views, however, there has come a deep sense of the tragedy of these proceedings and the report of the staff which has been approved by the majority.

The House of Representatives, in passing House Resolution 217 creating this committee, had a right to expect an enlightened, impartial and factual inquiry, which would inform the Congress whether legislation in this area was required. It had a right to expect an inquiry affording an opportunity for the fullest expressions of views by all interested persons, and one in which such facts as were necessary for the committee report to have substance and meaning would have been carefully and impartially gathered. A similar inquiry by the Cox committee in the Eighty-second Congress resulted in the submission of a full and detailed report which laid the foundation for a well-considered investigation by this committee.

The hard truth is that, by the manner in which the proceedings of the committee were conducted and by the self-evident bias of the majority report, the committee has failed in the most basic way to carry out the mandate of the Congress. The results of the proceedings are of no value to the Congress, and it was, therefore, a complete waste of public money.

### I. PREJUDGMENT

The theme of prejudice which so singularly characterized the entire course of this committee's activities was, like the theme of doom in a tragic opera, revealed in its prelude. The following remarks

<sup>1</sup> This report submitted by two minority members of the committee may, or may not, be a minority report. One member of the majority has indicated that he disagrees with the report submitted by the staff and approved by two members of the committee, and that he intends to file separate views, although he assented to the submission of the staff report as a "majority" report. However, that is a problem for the parliamentarian. It is mentioned only to emphasize the unreliability of the report submitted by the "majority."

of the chairman in the House, when he called up the resolution, certainly evidenced his unshakable beliefs and his steadfast resolve as to the course the inquiry should and would take and the conclusions it should announce:

Certainly, the Congress has a right and a duty to inquire into the purposes and conduct of institutions to which the taxpayers have made such great sacrifices.

In any event, the Congress should concern itself with certain weaknesses and dangers which have arisen in a minority of these.

Some of these activities and some of these institutions support efforts to overthrow our Government and to undermine our American way of life.

These activities urgently require investigation. Here lies the story of how communism and socialism are financed in the United States, where they get their money. It is the story of who pays the bill.

There is evidence to show there is a diabolical conspiracy back of all this. Its aim is the furtherance of socialism in the United States.

Communism is only a brand name for socialism, and the Communist state represents itself to be only the true form of socialism.

The facts will show that, as usual, it is the ordinary taxpaying citizen who foots most of the bill, not the Communists and Socialists, who know only how to spend money, not how to earn it.

The method by which this is done seems fantastic to reasonable men, for these Communists and Socialists seize control of fortunes left behind by capitalists when they die, and turn these fortunes around to finance the destruction of capitalism.

## II. THE "FACTUAL" BASIS FOR THE MAJORITY REPORT

The "factual" material in the record is a curious mosaic formed by the staff of the committee. It consists primarily of fragmentary quotations from a variety of published materials, larded by staff interpretations and conclusions; various charts prepared by the staff; and the testimony of nine nonstaff witnesses, two of whom were officials of the Internal Revenue Service, and one of whom, as we shall discuss later, was cut off midway in his statement as he began to destroy with facts all the staff testimony. This is in contrast to the hearings of the Cox committee, in which 40 witnesses freely testified in public hearings and were treated fairly and impartially.

Some of the statements of fact and opinion contained in the report are untrue on their face, others are at best half-truths, and the vast majority are misleading. It would unduly lengthen this report to demonstrate each and every such error in the majority report. Certainly those citizens and organizations affected can and should bring all of them to the attention of the American people in due course. It is shocking that anyone in America should be required to follow such a course, but unfortunately the majority has made it necessary.

In this connection it seems fitting to make some mention of the character of principal members of the committee staff. This group was composed of five persons. Two were members of a New York law firm engaged in legal tax work in connection with trusts. One was associated with an investment banking firm in New York. One was a former electrical engineer, and the last a legislative lobbyist. Two other staff members were dismissed on the basis of objections made as to their fitness by the minority.

## III. THE DENIAL OF A FAIR HEARING TO THE FOUNDATIONS

Finally, the record shows that at the sudden conclusion of public hearings on June 17, 1954 (effected July 2 in a 3-to-2 committee vote



over protest of the minority membership that such action would deny fundamental rights to those persons and organizations slandered by the testimony of previous witnesses and by distorted conclusions inserted into the record by the staff), the chairman announced that all persons and organizations desiring to make statements for the record could submit them in writing. It is now evident that, although some of these statements have been included in the last volume of the gargantuan record, the staff either did not read them or, the more likely, deliberately ignored them in the preparation of their report.

It should be noted at this point that the report seeks to justify this denial of the opportunity for the foundations to testify in public hearings by saying that—

The foundations touched by the hearings were thus given a fair opportunity to put their best foot forward at the same time that they escaped the embarrassment of cross-examination (p. 2).

This language brings into clear focus the astonishingly cynical approach of the majority to a denial of the American tradition of fair play, and due process under our laws. This refusal to afford the most elemental rights guaranteed to our citizens is thoroughly indicative of the pattern of the entire proceedings. It is frightening to read a report of a committee of Congress which callously seeks to justify a refusal to grant equal rights under the law, and to deny one who has been accused the opportunity to testify publicly in his own defense, and which implies that the right of a person under attack to take the witness stand and to answer questions under oath is not particularly important.

It is a gratuitous insult to say that under the committee's procedures the foundations escaped the "embarrassment of cross-examination." The minority will not be a party to such an evil disregard of fundamental American guaranties. Furthermore, the minority does not believe that either the Congress or the American people will accept or tolerate that sort of procedure by any committee of Congress.

As evidenced by the testimony of Dr. Pendleton Herring, discussed elsewhere in this report, testimony in public hearing was far from "embarrassing." It was the one certain way that persons and organizations accused by the staff of this committee could destroy the deadly inferences, innuendoes and charges that hung over them.

As the matter now stands, the tax-exempt foundations of this Nation have been indicted and convicted under procedures which can only be characterized as barbaric.

A review of the course of the hearings brings out in bold relief the unfair, undemocratic treatment which has been accorded to the foundations. In the first place, the staff blindly and sullenly refused to permit the admission in public hearing of the very substantial evidence available to rebut and utterly refute the opinions, biases, and prejudices which were being used to indict the foundations. Secondly, the charges against the foundations were aired in public hearings, were televised, were given the benefit of full treatment by the press and radio, and in totality were given all of the publicity which is to be expected to come from such a controversial hearing by a congressional committee. When the staff had exhausted itself and its own hand-picked witnesses, the foundations suddenly found that they were to be denied simple justice—the right to reply in the forum in which the charges against them were made.

Every principle of our Constitution as it protects the individual in his free enjoyment and exercise of individual rights was violated. Every precedent of fair and unbiased congressional inquiry was ignored.

The counsel and staff, apparently remembering the frustration of their plans during the course of the limited public hearings by the persistent cross-examination of their witnesses by the minority, now insist with real conviction that a continuing investigation of foundations be made *sub rosa*, devoid of the frustrations of public hearings. The report states:

Should the study be resumed, we recommend that it be on a somewhat different basis. The process of investigation through public hearings is inadequate for a subject such as that of foundations. As we have said, an inquiry into this subject is primarily a research undertaking (p. 15).

In this transparent language, the staff has inserted into its report a new plea that the investigation of tax-exempt foundations be a one-sided star chamber proceeding, one in which the accused would be given no opportunity to answer publicly any charge, no matter how biased, which staff "research" might conjure up against them.

The question is as fundamental as this: Of what value are the Bill of Rights and our traditional concepts of due process of law if a committee of the Congress of the United States is to be permitted to deny those rights to our citizens?

Further, the record and the report are devoid of any of the facts concerning the great and lasting contributions which the foundations have made to almost every phase of modern life. This shining record of achievement, which the most uninformed citizen would agree should be considered by the committee as a matter of simple "fireside equity," is flatly ignored, with the statement that the committee's objects were only to consider "the errors committed by these private groups."

J. L. Morrill, former vice president of Ohio State University, now president of the University of Minnesota, has pointed to the record of the foundations in these words in a letter to the committee staff, which was never included in the record:

If the best defense against democracy's enemies is to make America a better place in which to live and to place human welfare first, American foundations have rendered service far beyond the actual sums they have contributed to higher educational institutions. Thus, indirectly, the foundations can be credited with a significant role in the never-ending battle against democracy's enemies. And at this point I should like to add one fact of vital importance: In all our dealings with foundations and with their representatives, we have never found evidence of any motivation other than a sincere and patriotic desire to further scholarship in the best American tradition.

#### IV. THE NATURE OF THE PUBLIC HEARINGS

The unfolding of the dedicated purpose of the staff and its deep-seated antagonism toward foundations were made plainly evident early in the hearings, and it is clear that the staff and not the committee members operated and controlled the proceedings at all stages. This self-evident opposition to foundation activity may well be characterized as pathological in the light of the excesses committed by the staff throughout the proceedings.

A significant example of the predisposition of the staff to reach conclusions under the spur of their own biases may be found in the response of the assistant research director, Mr. McNiece, to the fol-

lowing three passages which Mr. Hays read to him before revealing the author of the quoted language, indicating that they were taken from context:

But all agree that there can be no question whatever that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at the moment on a very large majority of the poor. The ancient workmen's guilds were destroyed in the last century and no other organization took their place. Public institutions and the laws have repudiated the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. And to this must be added the custom of working by contract and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals so that a small number of the very rich have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself.

Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs. If in the present state of society this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee every adult workingman just such a wage. In this connection we might utter a word of praise for various systems devised and attempted in practice by which an increased wage is paid in view of increased family burdens and a special provision made for special needs.

For the effect of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely different castes. On the one side there is the party which holds the power because it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labor and all trade, which manipulates for its own benefit and purposes all the sources of supply and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the state itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, always ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together.

The following colloquy then ensued:

Mr. McNIECE. Commenting for a moment, before making a reading of this, the share of the land reference reminds me very much of one of the paragraphs quoted from the findings of the Committee on Social Studies, as supported by the Carnegie Foundation and the American Historical Association.

Mr. HAYS. I gather you disapprove of that, is that right?

Mr. McNIECE. Because I disapprove of communistic and collectivistic tendencies. *All of these [meaning the quotations]—I do not know your source—are closely comparable to Communist literature that I have read.* [Emphasis ours.] The objectives cited parallel very closely communistic ideals or socialistic ideals. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land—in the smaller areas—I should say rather in the areas of less concentrated population, I know from firsthand information that it is the desire and the attained objective of many workingmen to own their own properties

I distinctly remember reading in the papers—that is my only authority for it—that at one time some of the labor union leaders were advising their workmen not to become property owners, because that tended to stabilize them and make them more dependent on local conditions. I don't know how you would reconcile the divergent points of view.

Mr. HAYS. If you are through with those, I would like to have them back so I can identify them.

The first and last were from the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on labor. The middle was from the encyclical of Pope Pius XI.

You have given a very practical demonstration, Mr. McNiece, of the danger of lifting a sentence or paragraph out of context, because you have clearly labeled these as being in conformity with the communistic literature that you have read.

Mr. McNIECE. Yes, and I repeat that \* \* \*.

As Mr. Hays pointed out (hearings, pt. I, p. 607), the Catholic Church is one of the bulwarks against communism in the world. No one in possession of his senses would call the Catholic Church or its leaders communistic. It was left to the committee staff to compare statements of the leaders of the Catholic Church with Communist

writings. In this testimony, we were given the clearest insight into the workings of the minds of the committee's staff.

In the early meetings of the committee the general counsel, Mr. Wormser, advanced the proposal that the inquiry be made without public hearings and without seeking the testimony of interested persons, suggesting instead that the staff be directed to devote its time to independent study and inquiry, the results of which would be brought to the committee when concluded. It apparently never occurred to Mr. Wormser, a member of the bar, that such a proceeding, in a matter so sensitive, inevitably conflicted with constitutional guaranties of free speech and violated every American principle that individuals and groups, subjected to accusations in the course of an inquiry, be permitted to defend themselves.

It was not until May 10, 1954, that a public hearing was held. For 3 days that month the stand was occupied by Mr. Aaron Sargent, a San Francisco attorney, whose testimony can fairly be said to be a representation of the basic theme of the staff testimony of Mr. Dodd, Mr. McNiece, and Miss Casey.

Some insight into Mr. Sargent's political and economic thinking was revealed when he stated that the United States income tax was part of a plot by Fabian Socialists operating from England to pave the way for socialism in this country; that the judicial power of the United States Government has been undermined by court packing; that subversive teaching in our schools is a tax-exempt foundation product and that it has resulted in the greatest betrayal in American history; that the foundations are deliberately stimulating socialism; that the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations are guilty of violating the antitrust laws, and not content with these perversions, that the Spanish-American War was more or less a picnic. (Eleven thousand Americans died in that "picnic.")

Such was the nature of the testimony on which the committee report has been based. Although the tax-exempt foundations submitted detailed factual documentation in refutation of the charges made against them, the report is silent with reference to all of those facts.

The only testimony which brought solid facts into this arena of bias and prejudice was that of Dr. Pendleton Herring, president of the Social Science Research Council. Unfortunately for the foundations, however, the staff had no intention of permitting facts and logic to be introduced into public hearings. For it was midway in Dr. Herring's testimony that the chairman adjourned public hearings for all time to come.

Dr. Herring destroyed the charges made by the staff of an alleged "interlock," the "tight control" of education and research by a "highly efficient functioning whole" made up of the foundations and the learned societies, with undue emphasis on empiricism. He pointed out that the Social Science Research Council received financial support from only 12 of the estimated five or six thousand foundations in this country; that the foundations contribute approximately \$12 million annually to social-science research, only one-tenth of which is available to the council; that there are some 40,000 persons in the United States who could be classed as social scientists and that approximately 40 percent of these were scattered among the 1,700 colleges and universities of the country; that the other 60 percent were engaged in

nonacademic work with business organizations and government; that while there were hundreds of fellowships in social science offered each year by the colleges and universities of the Nation, the Social Science Research Council had only 150 such fellowships at its disposal; that the council granted its fellowships on a nationwide competitive basis and that the emphasis on choosing the successful candidates was on individual ability instead of the type or subject of the research; that there were some 281 formally organized research institutes in 104 different colleges and universities in the country.

An examination of these undisputed figures should convince even the most cynical observer that there is not and could not be any "tight control" exercised by any group, however powerful. The very idea of exercising a tight control over some 40,000 individuals engaged in social science work is in itself ludicrous. When it is considered that more than half of this number are engaged in business or governmental enterprises which are entirely independent of academic or foundation guidance or support, the idea becomes even more ludicrous. And when one takes into consideration that the Social Science Research Council is only one of many organizations conducting or financing social science research, and that it has only \$1,250,000 annually with which to conduct its work, it becomes evident that the idea is "psycho-ceramic," or, in more commonplace usage, crackpot.

Dr. Herring defined empiricism as follows:

To approach a problem empirically is to say: "Let's have a look at the record." To employ the empirical method is to try to get at the facts.

He pointed out that the empirical method of getting at the facts rather than indulging in mere speculation was a deeply ingrained American tendency which had come down to us as a heritage from the Founding Fathers; that—

empiricism tends to be more in the American tradition than rationalism.

He also pointed out that empiricism was totally incompatible with communism and that the Communists "object to it most violently."

He quoted from certain documents to support his contention that the Communists were bitterly hostile to foundations, the learned professional societies and to our work in the social sciences. As to the latter he had this to say:

The social sciences stand four-square in a great tradition of freedom of inquiry which is integral to American life, to the Anglo-Saxon tradition of self-government, and to the concern with the individual fundamental to both western civilization and its ancient heritage stemming back through the Renaissance to the Classic world and to Judaic-Christian concern with human dignity.

Concerning the alleged overemphasis on empirical research Dr. Herring said:

In my opinion, there is not an overemphasis upon empirical research. In my opinion and experience and observation, quite the reverse is true. I observe a strong human tendency on the part of a great many of us, as individuals, to see what we choose to see and to believe what we want to believe. I observe a readiness to speculate, to guess, to haphazard opinions, and to come to judgments on the basis of very inadequate evidence. It is my observation that this is a very human tendency, if not indeed a common human weakness. This tendency is found in all walks of life. It becomes a matter of high moment in policy decisions and in the formation of public opinion.

Dr. Herring's testimony restored some measure of reality and perspective to what had become so much an Alice-in-Wonderland pro-

ceeding in which the verdict was rendered before the evidence was considered.

We are dealing here not with an inquiry in the traditional sense in which this legislative body operates. This was not an investigation in which the purpose was to gather facts, to evaluate them, and then to arrive at fair conclusions on the basis of those facts. Instead, we are presented with an inquiry in which facts have played no part. The committee's activities were in single purpose directed at justifying conclusions arrived at even in advance of the enabling resolution of the House of Representatives.

The minority cannot emphasize too strongly the abhorrence it holds for such a procedure and indeed the abhorrence which the House of Representatives and the American public will hold for the whole unfortunate transaction when the majority report is published.

## V. THE REPORT

The consistency of the dedicated prejudgment of the staff and the real control of the proceedings which it maintained is (aside from the many other examples cited in this report) made further evident by the fact that, from the conclusion of the hearings on June 17, 1954, to the present, the staff has secluded itself to prepare the majority report. There has been no consultation or communication with the minority, and presumably no direction or observation of the preparation of the report by the majority. This report truly has been written in "a dark cellar." The staff went further, and in violation of congressional procedure tampered with and altered the "corrected" copy of the hearings which were submitted by the minority, in some instances changing the context and meaning of questions by minority members.

In view of the manifest unfairness of the proceedings, it might be assumed that the report prepared by the staff would seek to overcome the basic unsoundness of its contribution by preparing a temperate document, short in length and impartial in tone. But, like the theme of doom in a Wagnerian opera, the basic resolve to justify the initial prejudgment of condemnation of foundations is expressed and reexpressed in this enormously lengthy report. Where the record contained no facts to support some particular conclusions, a type of staff "judicial notice" has been taken of facts and conclusions drawn from these facts, from whatever source has seemed convenient.

The great body of the press of the Nation has condemned the committee for its shocking excesses and its denial of elementary fair play. As a result, the press has been attacked in the majority report along with all others who dared to disagree.

Even before the issuance of the report, the chairman of this committee made an unwarranted attack on three of the Nation's leading newspapers, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post and Times Herald. In a statement inserted in the Congressional Record, the chairman accused these three great newspapers of deserting their traditional principles of honest and unbiased presentation of the news. Not content with that reckless assertion, he deliberately linked the names of these newspapers with that of the Daily Worker in an effort somehow to imply guilt by innuendo even though not one iota of evidence was ever presented in support of this poisonous attack.

The report picked up where the chairman left off. It went completely outside of the record to accuse the Reid Foundation of possible illegal practices, with no other point in mind than that this foundation, so the report states, owned stock in the New York Herald Tribune. The fact that the Herald Tribune (in common with a myriad of other newspapers) criticized the manner in which this committee proceeded may have some bearing on the malice evidenced by the staff toward this great newspaper.

From the New York Herald Tribune the report moved to the New York Times, using the following language:

The presence of Mr. Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times, on the board of the Rockefeller Foundation is an illustration of this extension of power and influence. (Mr. Sulzberger is also on the board of several other foundations.) We do not mean to imply that Mr. Sulzberger directed his editors to slant their reporting on this committee's work, but his very presence on the Rockefeller Board could have been an indirect, intangible, influencing factor. At any rate, the Times has bowed to no other newspaper in the vindictiveness of its attack on this committee. In its issue of August 5, 1954, it gave 856<sup>2</sup> lines of laudatory column space, starting with a front-page article, to the statement filed by the Rockefeller Foundation. The following day, August 6, 1954, appeared one of a succession of bitter editorials attacking this committee. (p. 33).

Even more important, the report included in its findings the following statement:

7. The far-reaching power of the large foundations and of the interlock has so influenced the press, the radio, and even the Government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of foundation practices to get into news channels without having first been distorted, slanted, discredited, and at times ridiculed (p. 17).

To the minority, there is an integral relationship between the majority's refusal to accord the foundations a public hearing and its broadside attack on the press of the Nation. For, those who would abuse the rights of the individual fear the press and rail against the right of the press to report the facts and to criticize wrongdoing.

History teaches us that we must be alert to any incursion on our basic freedoms. Here we are confronted with the two specters of a denial of a fair hearing and an effort to intimidate the press for reporting and commenting upon that denial. The minority condemns this and fervently hopes that the majority even at this late hour will recant and vote to issue no report.

In the report, facts have been distorted and quotations from writings have been taken out of context. Apparently, only those witnesses (excepting the two witnesses from the Internal Revenue Service) who possessed the qualifying bias of the staff were invited to testify, but for the rare and refreshing case of Dr. Herring, whose testimony we have discussed.

The other 8 nonstaff witnesses included, in addition to the 2 representatives of the Internal Revenue Service, 2 retired and 2 employed professors and 2 lawyers. These two members of the bar had no special qualifications other than their own bias, which strangely coincided with that of the staff.

The report outstrips the record in its bias, its prejudgment, and its obvious hatred for the object of its wrath—the principal private foundations of the Nation.

<sup>2</sup> Parenthetically, it may be noted that the small-mindedness of the staff is well portrayed by the fact that it took the time to count the lines which a newspaper devoted to a foundation report. A more colossal waste of the taxpayer's money than line counting we can't conceive!

The only concession made by the staff in the interval between the public hearings and the report was the abandonment of the staff's pet theory of the great Fabian Socialist conspiracy of foundations, colleges, and universities, and agencies of the Federal Government to take over America. Quite probably it has now dawned upon the staff that this theory would have made malefactors out of the Congress of the United States—for the Congress passed all of the social legislation condemned as the end result of this "conspiracy," including such programs as social security and Federal aid to education, the enlightened programs for labor and agriculture, the protection of bank deposits and security markets, and a host of others, which strengthen the whole fabric of our society and its economy.

The theory of conspiracy was abandoned, but a charge of a special sort of monopoly was substituted—a monopoly of the educated "elite." The fruit of this monopoly is, so the staff concluded, control by the foundations of the avenues of intellectual exploration which otherwise would not be explored as evidenced by the fact that foundations have given substantial financial support to empirical research and to research in the social sciences.

The staff's report would seem to recommend to the Congress that all foundations should be denied their tax-exempt status unless they shall, in the field of the social sciences, adhere to principles which the staff supports. The following sets forth the lines of censorship suggested by the staff:

They (the trustees) should be very chary of promoting ideas, concepts and opinion-forming material which runs contrary to what the public currently wishes, approves and likes (p. 20).

We assume that the staff would recommend that this censorship be exercised by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; a role, by the way, which the Commissioner in public testimony properly rejected.

The excessive length of the report is, in itself, an index of the unseemly effort of the staff to reach a predetermined conclusion, for if the conclusions stated were valid, then a positive, incisive, and brief statement of facts would be sufficient to support them.

It must be remembered that even though the Congress soundly rejects and repudiates the majority report, as it should, the report will stand forever in all its spuriousness as a "majority report" of facts and the sober conclusions of a majority of the members of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives of the United States and will be quoted by every fear peddler in the Nation as incontrovertible fact.

In addition, the real mischief in these proceedings rests in the effect which they may have on the future conduct of the tax-exempt foundations. If, as a result of this inquiry, the foundations shall surrender to timidity, then the aim of those who would destroy the effectiveness of the foundations shall have been accomplished. Truly, the integrity of the foundations will hinge on the manner in which they meet this challenge.

## VI. WHAT THE REPORT SHOULD BE

It is unfortunate that the minority report, limited as it must be to the record and the majority report, is compelled to place major emphasis upon the errors of both. However, these errors are so basic



and shocking that it is of public importance that they be identified so that every citizen of the land can know what has occurred.

There is little that the minority at this point can recommend as to what the report should contain that can give any real guidance to the Congress in this sensitive area, for there are no reliable facts in the record made up by the staff.

The minority recognizes that foundations are favored by State and Federal tax laws. Even if they were not, however, they have a high duty of public responsibility. This responsibility, however, does not divest such foundations of the rights guaranteed by our Constitution. Inherent in such guaranties is the proposition that Government may not dictate, directly or indirectly, what the officers of such foundations should think or believe or how they shall exercise their trust responsibilities. Government cannot interfere with the lawful operations of these private organizations in any manner. The fact that some or all Members of Congress might disagree with all or a part of the acts of a foundation does not alter the constitutional protection against this attempted invasion of their private rights under the guise of the taxing authority.

The majority report should, in all fairness, state at least the following:

1. The purposes of the resolution were not carried out.
2. The proceedings were grossly unfair and prejudged.
3. The record which was constructed by the staff is not reliable.
4. If there is a necessity, in the public interest, to inquire into the validity of the tax-exempt status of foundations and other charitable institutions, then a new inquiry must be authorized to seek all the facts and to give all interested persons an opportunity to be heard. In truth, such an investigation, made in conformity with the great tradition of congressional inquiry, is the only way in which Congress can be properly advised of the facts in this area—and in which the foundations can be relieved of the cloud of suspicion placed upon them by the majority report.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The proceedings and the rendition of the majority report are both tragic events. The minority members are filled with a sense of deep sorrow in the contemplation of the monstrous nature of both.

The minority members have discussed long and soberly this dark reality, and they have concluded that the cloud of fear so evident in all phases of our national life in recent years has enveloped this committee staff, and that these proceedings, under their guidance, are only a part of a greater and more ominous movement under the direction of a group who would use the deadly evil of fear for their own purposes—purposes which would, in their realization, destroy American constitutional liberty. In this reality, the minority invites the militancy of all Members of Congress and all citizens of this free land to root out now and forever this evil and those who nurture it.

The proceedings and the majority report evidence the tragedy of the men and women of the committee's staff who, having lived and prospered under freedom, yet do not believe in due process and American fair play; who fear the thinkers and those who dare to advance the new and the unaccepted; who believe that universal education for our

people can be risked only if the teachers and their pupils accept their doctrine and are shielded from the mental contamination of other thoughts and beliefs. They would deny the right of individuals to seek truth without limit or restriction.

Happily, the staff is representative of only a small and unhealthy minority in the Nation. The fear-sickness of this group leads them to brand as conspiratorial and un-American the citizens and organizations who support the great liberal tradition in our society including such well-known persons as Edward R. Murrow, Paul Hoffman, Senator-elect Clifford Case, of New Jersey, and Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, and such highly respected organizations as the Federal Council of Churches, the Parent-Teachers Association, the National Education Association, the Anti-Defamation League, and some of the most prominent newspapers and publishers in the land.

This tragic event evidences the decay which has resulted from the cynical disillusionment of the minds of free men and women. These unhappy citizens have forgotten the touchstone of America's greatness—freedom. The American faith is one which accepts the right of free people to make mistakes and believes that a free people, despite its mistakes, will sustain and advance with wisdom the common good.

If there is an element of good to be found in these proceedings, it is the challenge to high leadership. Leadership at every level of society from the smallest community to the White House must find ways to strengthen those among us in this free and vigorous land who have lost faith in freedom. We must rehabilitate those who somehow have forgotten that America's individual and collective strength in a tortured and straining world is, and has always been, in the supremacy of a positive faith in freedom; not in the nursing of doubts and fears.

WAYNE L. HAYS  
GRACIE FOST



(Not printed at Government expense)

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## Special Committee on Tax-Exempt Foundations

SPEECH

OF

**HON. B. CARROLL REECE**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, August 20, 1954*

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to avoid the necessity of making these remarks concerning the work of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, but recent events which, while not materially affecting the work of this committee, have been damaging to the entire principle of congressional investigations have left me no choice.

In my years of service in the Congress, I have never observed a better organized smear campaign against a congressional committee nor such wanton distortion of the facts by the public press. The editorials and articles appearing concurrently in the Daily Worker, the New York Times and Herald Tribune attacking the committee and its work would appear to be more than a coincidence.

Let me go back to the beginning of the work of this committee. As a member of the Cox committee, the predecessor of this committee, I had observed three bodies of evidence which seemed to me of great importance: The first pointed to Communist or Communist sympathizer infiltration into the foundations; the second pointed to a much broader condition, namely, foundation support of Fabian socialism in America; and the third pointed to the financial aspect of the foundations.

There are presently some 7,000 foundations with assets in excess of \$10 billion and with an annual income in excess of \$300 million.

Less than a dozen of these foundations are widely known to the public.

There is much to indicate that the thousands of foundations unknown to

the public are set up generally to avoid payment of taxes.

The number of foundations is rapidly increasing each year. They now have tremendous resources, which largely are taken out of our taxable income.

The tax-exempt foundations in America—big and little—are becoming a major concern.

Fabian socialism is not communism; it is a technique of nonviolent revolution by the consent of a duped, propagandized population.

It is the technique that brought socialism to Great Britain.

In the United States Fabian socialism has taken the name "New Deal" and "Fair Deal."

Of this there can be no doubt.

Norman Thomas, the long-time head of the Socialist Party in the United States, has publicly admitted that the New Deal almost put the Socialist Party out of business by taking all of the principal planks from its platform.

Parenthetically, I want to say a brief word to those Americans who approve of the New Deal-Fair Deal-Fabian revolution, and therefore might call this investigation a tempest in a teapot.

It is their privilege to do so, but it is my privilege to oppose this overt subversion of traditional American ideals.

I have fought it for 20 years during its steady progress, and as long as I continue to serve the public I will continue to fight it.

Although the Cox committee was not looking for Fabian socialism, the evidence presented before it disclosed to me what might be an important clue to the location of the nerve center of subversion in America—the left-wing intellectuals, whose prestige and influence seemed to be the product of the tax-exempt foundation grants.

I therefore suggested to the Congress that the investigation be extended.

In doing so, I realized that if my suspicions were true all of the enormous power and prestige of the foundations, and to some extent that of the corporations from which they sprang, would be pitted against the committee.

If I were wrong, the investigation would cause no more excitement than did the Cox committee investigation.

I also realized that if my surmise concerning Fabian socialism was correct, every left-wing group that is participating in or benefiting from the intellectual revolution would join in the attack on the committee.

I also realized that the left-wing press and the pseudoconservative press would be under terrific pressure from these intellectuals and organizations to discredit the committee and distort the facts concerning its work.

What I did not realize was that this influence would reach even into the conservative press.

And from what has happened in the last month, it is obvious that the large foundations are trying to make certain that never again will a mere committee of the Congress have the temerity to look into their social and political science activities and into their financial power.

Let me review the method adopted by the committee.

After discussing with the staff the best and fairest method of approaching this inquiry, we decided to inform the foundations in advance of the main lines of investigation.

To me, this offered the foundations a tremendous advantage, knowing in advance the area of the inquiry.

But this step was violently attacked as prejudgment of the case, in spite of the fact that when the outline was presented by Mr. Dodd, the committee's director of research, he stated, and I quote:

As this report will hereafter contain many statements which appear to be conclusive, I emphasize here that each of them must be understood to have resulted from studies which were essentially exploratory; in no sense should they be considered proved.

As the hearings got under way, it became very obvious that the ranking minority member of the committee had no intention of permitting orderly hearings and was determined to discredit and harass the investigation.

Throughout the hearings Mr. HAYS assumed an attitude of aggressive suspicion and insulting distrust of the major-

ity members of the committee and of the committee staff.

He could not have made it clearer that he intended to frustrate to the limit of his abilities any orderly procedure.

It is interesting to note that Mr. HAYS the minority member in question, is representative of the political group that has benefited most from the intellectual revolution that has taken place in America, and it seems probable to me that his rude, unreasoning, and ruthless attitude during the foundation hearings is one of defending an important source of New Deal strength in America.

I do not know whether one of Mr. HAYS' objectives was to force the discontinuance of the public hearings, but at least he was successful in making that decision necessary.

I would like to take a moment to describe to you the tactics of Mr. HAYS that eventually forced this action.

In his role of a skillful provocateur he interrupted witnesses beyond all reason, attempting to frighten witnesses and to disorganize both their initial presentations and orderly interrogations by others.

During one of the 3-hour sessions Mr. HAYS interrupted one witness 24 times.

During the public hearings he indulged in intemperate attacks upon the staff and upon the majority members of the committee.

He accused the chairman of lying and being a coward and accused Mr. GOORWIN of duplicity and cowardice.

As an example of the Marxian technique of attacking a messenger when the message cannot be attacked, he cast aspersions upon the character and record of a distinguished Catholic nun, the daughter of Senator McCARRAN, whose scholarly work on Fabian socialism in Great Britain had been placed in evidence.

As further examples, Mr. HAYS characterized an outstanding group of American scholars appearing as committee witnesses as "crackpots," "dredged up by the committee.

As was written to the chairman of the committee by the eminent Pro Kenneth Colgrove, subsequent to his appearance before the committee, Mr. HAYS created, and I quote:

A fear among competent persons will might otherwise question the omniscience of the directors of those foundations. WI

nesses are thereby warned that no matter how objective their testimony, no matter how legitimate their questions, their character would be smeared and their testimony ridiculed.

In spite of the sniping by Mr. HAYS Professor Colgrove was able, on a piecemeal basis, to get a very valuable body of evidence into the record concerning the deplorable lack of science contained in so many of the foundations' social science projects.

Actually, a great deal of so-called social science, as carried on with foundation funds, is little more than an elaborate argument that Government can take better care of the people than the people can take care of themselves.

Prof. A. H. Hobbs was criticized for his attack upon the Kinsey report, which initially was a foundation project.

Actually, anyone who had taken the time to examine this highly questionable statistical study cannot help but agree with Professor Hobbs, even if only for one reason, namely, that it makes a laughing stock of morality and reduces human love to the animal level.

In his letter to the chairman, Professor Colegrove also states:

Obviously, no self-respecting scholar would care to testify before such a committee under such circumstances.

When the truth is known concerning the work of this committee, a large section of the American press which printed virtually none of the competent and pertinent testimony presented to the committee and has printed practically all of Mr. HAYS' tidbits of character assassination and so-called witty barbs, will be faced with an embarrassing situation.

It seems to me that a suitable subject for congressional investigation would be the source and nature of the pressure which is behind the terrific attack upon the committee by three large papers, in addition to the Daily Worker—the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The promptness and uniformity with which a large section of the press has attacked the committee's decision to discontinue the public hearings on the false ground that the foundations would thereby be deprived of a chance to defend themselves, indicates the thoroughness of the plans and press coverage behind Mr. HAYS' effort to frustrate the hearings.

Regarding the cry of injustice resulting from the discontinuance of the public hearings, let me point out that it is only common sense to conclude that no action could have been more favorable to the foundations because they were thereby given an opportunity to speak in their own defense and completely avoid having to substantiate their claims through cross-examination.

Some of the foundation answers have not yet been received, but thus far there has been very little to refute the basic suspicion that caused me to suggest this investigation, namely, that the large foundations have supplied the bulk of the money that has been used to lay the intellectual base for and perpetuate the prestige of the New Deal.

In fact, one of the briefs filed by the Carnegie group states that one of their projects which had been criticized as being socialistic, namely, the report of the Commission on Social Studies by the American Historical Association, was not socialistic.

Here are the exact words used by Mr. Charles Dollard, president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York, in refuting that charge.

I quote:

The worst that can be said is that the authors not only reported this trend but appeared to accept it cheerfully. What they were accepting was not socialism—it was the New Deal.

I believe that special attention should be given to the foundations' charge that the discontinuance of the hearings will deprive them of proper publicity for their filed statements.

A good example of the degree to which they will be penalized is found in a single issue of a single newspaper—the New York Times of July 25—published the day after the Ford Foundation released its statement attacking the committee.

In that 1 issue there were 3 completely favorable stories regarding the Ford Foundation, totaling approximately 4,000 words, that went into more than a million American homes.

One of the articles was a front-page feature carried over to the pages adjacent to the other two articles.

Nothing could have been planned more meticulously.

This was their own story and contained many derogatory statements which would have had to have been cor-

roborated had the Ford Foundation been subjected to the normal procedure of cross-examination.

Every citizen who read the New York Times July 25—Sunday—was completely assured of the purity of the Ford Foundation.

It will be interesting to see how many words of these remarks are carried by the same paper.

In spite of the fact that through this superb public relations smear campaign in an effort to exonerate the tax-exempt foundations of all blame, even before the committee report has been prepared, I am determined that the committee work shall proceed normally, that an adequate public record shall be developed, and that a fair, objective report of findings will be rendered.

This is the task to which I have set myself and this is the task which I propose to finish, regardless of the forces attempting to stifle and discredit, the investigatory powers of this legislative body.

If I have seemed to have been silent under this abuse for too long a time, it is because I am confident that in the end the truth will prevail.

In summing up, I would like to speak with more bluntness than is my usual custom. This committee has been subjected to various and strange pressures and harassments. It began to be reviled

from many directions very early in its career.

A steady procession of condemnatory resolutions emanating from a puzzling assortment of organizations have followed its work. As I mentioned before, several of the major newspapers—notably the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post and Times Herald—have joined with the Daily Worker in a steady, constant, almost daily campaign of savage attacks, both in editorials and what purported to be news reports.

These savage attacks have been of a nature so venomous and untruthful as to eliminate any explanation but one.

The attitude of the committee and of its staff and the occurrences at the hearings have been deliberately misrepresented to the public with such obviously intended malice that no explanation seems rational but that the power of some of the major foundations and their sycophants is truly great.

It has been said that the foundations are a power second only to that of the Federal Government itself. Perhaps this statement should be modified because it seems to have become an affront for a congressional committee to dare to subject foundations to criticism. Perhaps the Congress now should admit that the foundations have become more powerful in some areas at least, than the legislative branch of the Government.

314514—51872

Not printed at Government expense)

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Remarks of Carroll Reece, National Press Club Luncheon, February 23, 1955, Made in Reply to Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me at the National Press Club luncheon, February 23, 1955, in reply to Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins:

I

Four weeks ago, many of us gathered here today were honored by the presence of Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, one of the Nation's most publicized educators—now the president of a large tax-exempt foundation. As this man of wisdom spoke, I was somewhat reminded of Elbert Hubbard's definition of egotism. He defined egotism as "the anesthetic that nature gives to deaden the pain being a damn fool."

As he moved into his address, his evaluation of me became quite evident, but, after 34 years in public life, I do not feel at either my patriotism or intellectual integrity are diluted by Dr. Hutchins disassociating himself from me.

We seem to have only one thing in common: Once, he was heralded as the "Boy Wonder." Once, after obtaining leave of absence from New York University to run Congress, I was heralded as "The Boy Congressman." Now I am no longer a boy, either is he any longer a boy or a wonder. As this great and dedicated man rose to dress us, an aura of academic distinction radiated from his person, an aura reinforced by the soft effulgence which radiates from wealth and power which support him.

Indeed, it seemed to me that there stood before us a knight in golden armor whose purpose well might be to save a spot of maiden from a foul and fire breathing monster.

II

Alas, our knight in golden armor chose not to draw the 2 edged sword of truth and facts, but rather, in anger and acrimony, brought forward the mace of demagogery, studded with spikes of vituperation.

We were treated to the horrors of a political abattoir in which personality, character, and integrity are destroyed. It seemed a strange cacophony.

Why should he regale us with obiter dicta—if not in an effort to use you to bolster his case in the press of the Nation? Why stoop to public obfuscation when facts and reason are available.

Testimony and facts developed under oath by a duly constituted committee of Congress cannot be set aside by ridiculing their source or content.

Such factual testimony deserves full consideration and objective analysis.

This point of view was emphasized by Mr. Justice Frankfurter when he said in an opinion in the Rumley case:

"Our Republic will have lost its vitality when the people are no longer permitted to hear the information developed by their legislators. And our scholars, our intellectuals, our great educators hardly justify the confidence reposed in their integrity when they resort to ad homineum arguments and obiter dicta to suppress and discredit information of which they personally disapprove."

Again Woodrow Wilson said, "The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

What a great shock, a distinguished academician turning politician, before our very eyes. His utterances appear as endless rewrites of a central theme of the professional intellectuals found in the foundations. The artful propagandists, dressed in the attire of an intellectualist, rides again.

III

As a rather reluctant dragon, I come before you today through the courtesy and spirit of fair play of the National Press Club—so characteristic of the members of the press and radio of our Nation.

It appeared to me that you, the purveyors of facts, might prefer me to answer in a more moderate and objective tone. Perhaps if an eminent scholar can turn politician for a day, you will permit me, a politician with some experience, to turn educator again for a day within the limits of my ability.

"Let me say that in advocating a return to reason I do not advocate abandonment

of our interest in facts. I proclaim the value of observation and experiment. I would proclaim also the value of rational thought and would suggest that without it, facts may prove worthless, trivial and irrelevant—rational thought is the only basis for education," so said a great scholar.

In this spirit let us examine the speech of this knight in golden armor who came to slay, and to save the virtue of tax-exempt foundations.

Most psychologists, teachers, and advertising men know that repetition fixes an idea or symbol in the mind.

## IV

Despite Dr. Hutchins' fervent disclaimer, in the title and first paragraph of his speech, *Fund for the Republic* is repeated four times, once more than the number of times the sponsor's product needs to be mentioned in a radio commercial.

This disclaimer hardly balances the impression, and, by the way, if he was speaking without even consulting his trustees, he reduces them to the level of impotent window dressing.

He avers, however, that the foundations have been doing a good deal of talking lately. Does he mean through their presidents and without consulting their trustees? Does this concerted activity indicate the overt evidence of a hitherto covert condition?

In view of his disclaimer, I wonder who paid for mimeographing his speech, who paid his expenses to Washington—and, you will recall, when a member of the club asked in one of the questions the amount of his salary he said he could not hear him. By the power of subpoena, it would have been easy for us to have obtained his salary and that of all other foundation officials.

Since tax-exempt foundations are by nature public trusts, the public does have a right to know the salaries and expenses of officials but our committee was interested in getting more significant information. However, if Dr. Hutchins, due to the complexity of figures involved, should forget what his salary is, I shall be glad to inform him.

## V

Parenthetically, I might say I received no extra compensation for my laborious assignment, nor did I charge any of my considerable expenses to the committee, except a very few telephone calls.

My efforts were purely a labor of love—if any. Although, I realize the difficulty Dr. Hutchins may have in agreeing that any Member of Congress with whom he may disagree is interested only in doing a good job.

After 34 years of public service, what other purpose would he expect a man of my age to have.

Much of Dr. Hutchins' attack was directed at me personally, as though the whole investigation had been my personal plot against Foundations.

The fact is, as painful as it may be to him, the resolution directing the investiga-

tion was passed by the House of Representatives by a strong majority vote, both Republicans and Democrats voting for it.

There are some 7,000 foundations at the present time. Their aggregate funds amount to about \$7½ billion and they have annual income in excess of \$600 million.

The foundations of \$10 million capital, or over, comprise 7 percent of the foundations but comprise 56 percent of the total endowment and 32 percent of the annual income.

The origin and nature of foundations, as well as their effect on our tax structure, gives the Congress ample basis for an investigation of them.

Due to the nature of our tax laws, the birthrate of foundations is increasing at an alarming rate. The possibility exists that a large part of American industry may eventually find its way into foundations.

## VI

Because of the tax exemption granted them, foundations are public trusts and must be dedicated to public purposes. Through these tax exemptions an additional tax burden is put on the American taxpayer.

The rest of the people must pay heavier taxes, for example, because the Ford family was relieved of estate taxes upon the creation of the Ford Foundation, and because the foundation itself pays no income tax or 90 percent of the profits of the Ford Motor Co. it receives in dividends.

The duty follows, in Congress, to make certain funds thus provided are not diverted to either unlawful enterprises or any enterprise outside of tax exemption privileges.

Citizens with their own money may promote any cause, good or bad, not forbidden by law, but tax-exempt funds should not be used to propagandize for the theories of either Karl Marx or Mark Hannah.

For instance, the Fund for the Republic is now distributing a one-hour edition of Mr. Edward R. Murrow's teleshow with Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. This would be a perfectly legitimate thing for an individual to do with his own money, but it is not understandable how the tax-exempt foundation gets into it since it is obvious that Mr. Murrow's program was not designed to be an objective study, but an opportunity for Dr. Oppenheimer to make a defense of his conduct.

The directive of the enabling resolution setting up the committee was to "determine if any foundations or organizations are using their resources for purposes other than purposes for which they were created."

This language gives full faith and credit to the high purposes for which the foundations were organized.

The investigation was not directed against foundations as an institution in American life.

I feel honored to have been selected for the presidency of a foundation—now a small one, but which gives every promise of becoming an important one. This foundation



so long as I am connected with it, will always be open to inquiry.

## VII

Dr. Hutchins' remarks were intended to convey the impression that the committee had concluded that foundations had contributed nothing of consequence to the public.

Either he had not read the report or he purposely suppressed the statement to be found on page 3 of the report and italicized for emphasis, reading as follows: "The committee was and is well aware of the many magnificent services which foundations have rendered to the people of the United States in many fields and areas, particularly in medicine, public health, and science. Nothing has occurred to change its initial conviction that the foundation as an institution is desirable and should be encouraged. If little time is spent in this report reciting the good which the foundations have done, it is not because this committee is unaware of it or in any way reluctant to acknowledge it. Rather, this committee considers that it is necessarily concerned with the evaluation of criticisms. A fair judgment of the work and the position of foundations in our society must obviously take into account the great measure of benefit for which they have been responsible. At the same time, the power of these foundations is so great that a proper evaluation must give great weight to the dangers which have appeared in their operations in certain areas of activity."

The report makes utterly clear it is not an attack upon foundations as such, and that it is, in general, in one broad area of activity that foundations have been widely criticized, that of the so-called social sciences.

In this area criticism comes from highly reputable and qualified persons.

On the nature of these criticisms, Dr. Hutchins spent no time, satisfying himself to toss off the report with nasty personal insinuations and attack by epithet.

## VIII

No reasonable man can accept Dr. Hutchins' unctuous suggestion that our inquiry at once brands the esteemed and highly placed directors of all the foundations as either fools or knaves. We all know as a matter of routine these operations are carried on by the paid administrative staffs.

The directors never presume to be in intimate daily touch with administrative decisions. I might say, primarily for Dr. Hutchins' benefit that the Ford Foundation trustees by resolution specifically relieved themselves of this responsibility by organizing in such a manner as to expressly exclude themselves from the detail of selection and men said: "The founders of at least two larger American foundations intended their trustees to devote a major part of their time to the actions and conduct of foundation affairs. Usually this arrangement has not proved practicable \* \* \* for the program of

a foundation may be determined more certainly by selection of its top officers than by any statement of policy or by any set of directions."

We cannot escape the conclusion that the trustees of this foundation abdicated their trust responsibility in assenting to this plan of operation under which everything except possibly the establishment of glittering generalities could be left to the employees.

Dr. Hutchins accused the committee of being guilty of fraud, absurd charges, scandalous conduct, wild and squalid presentation, and in a climatic obiter dictum he said the Reece investigation in its inception and execution was a fraud.

These are phrases one hardly expects to hear uttered before such a discriminating audience. Such arrogance does not reflect credit upon academicians.

These blanket charges impugn the integrity of, not only a duly constituted committee and its members, but the integrity of the House of Representatives itself, and I am glad to address myself to these charges and give you an account of the work of the committee so far as time may permit.

## IX

In a spirit of fairness, our committee began with what turned out to be a mistake in this instance: We decided to follow one of America's fundamental concepts of justice and procedure, namely, to make known the nature of the inquiry before the hearings began.

The evidence that had been gathered by the staff pointed to one simple underlying situation, namely, that the major foundations by subsidizing collectivistic-minded educators, had financed a socialist trend in American Government.

We informed the foundations in advance that our findings suggested that the foundations had for a long time been exercising powerful, although sometimes indirect political influence in both domestic and foreign policy, predominantly toward the left—to say nothing of the support by the foundations of the Institute of Pacific Relations which lead the movement to turn China over to the Communists and which was admittedly Communist dominated.

The doubts and reservations concerning the validity of the complaints against the large foundations were largely dispelled by the almost hysterical reaction of the foundations to the summary presented to the committee by the committee staff on the opening day of the hearings.

The excitement bordered on panic; as was observed by the demonstrations through the public relations channels of the large foundations and this convinced me, and others of the American public, judging from the letters received and which are still being received in my office, that the general picture which had taken shape, was not very far from the truth.

The foundations, being well aware of the nature of the duties and responsibilities of the committee, set up what might be termed a defensive barrage. This barrage was successful to a degree in smearing the committee and preventing the full facts from getting into the public press.

Concerning the difficulty of our task, John O'Donnell wrote in the New York Daily News:

"From the very start the special House committee created to investigate our Nation's multibillion tax-exempt foundations faced an almost impossible task. This was to tell the taxpayers that the incredible was, in fact, the truth.

"The incredible fact was that the huge fortunes piled up by such industrial giants as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, etc., were today being used to discredit the free-enterprise system which gave them birth."

x

There is no doubt but that the large foundations and their satellites knew far better than did the committee where the bodies of their collectivism were buried, and as a result, their champion on the committee, the ranking minority member, could be thoroughly briefed on how to frustrate and discredit the various witnesses called before the committee.

The number of interruptions and the intensity of the vituperations heaped upon these witnesses by the ranking minority member was without precedent in the history of congressional investigations.

And is it not astonishing that Dr. Hutchins, who poses as the great champion of civil liberties and whose fund for the republic was set up as a defender of witnesses before congressional committees, if not to investigate the investigational processes of Congress, has not offered one word of criticism of the conduct of Mr. Hays?

Contrast this silence with his slanderous personal attacks upon the committee majority.

On the contrary, Dr. Hutchins joined with Congressman Hays in slandering the critical witnesses, referring to them as "witnesses of dubious standing."

By dubious did he mean Professor Emeritus Briggs, of Columbia; Professor Hobbs, of Pennsylvania; Professor Rowe, of Yale; and Professor Colgrove, formerly of Northwestern?

Did he mean to include also Professors Sorokin and Zimmerman, of Harvard, and Boasard, of Pennsylvania, who gave highly critical testimony by letter?

I suppose the answer is that anyone who resists the foundations' intellectual straight-jacket is of dubious standing and should be publicly discredited.

When the pattern of the opposition tactics became obvious, I, as chairman, made up my mind that the only thing to do was to try to conquer discourtesy with courtesy, and

throughout the hectic hearings I tried un- successfully to persuade Congressman Hays to a reasonable pattern of behavior.

Mr. HAYS repeatedly vilified other members of the committee and questioned the good faith. He publicly, from the rostrum accused the chairman of lying and being coward, and accused the genteel Mr. Goodwin of duplicity and cowardice.

xi

The following excerpt which I, as chairman, had deleted from the printed record in an effort to maintain the dignity of the committee, is illustrative of the violent and abusive remarks, exceeding in impropriety remarks for which a Senator was recent brought up on charges:

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure, is not going to get anybody worked up or irritated here. If he has that in mind he might just as well subside, because the chairman for one has made up his mind that he is not going to let anybody get him out of temper. That would impair the usefulness of this committee. \* \* \*

"Mr. HAYS. I will say this to the gentleman, that out where I come from we have saying that if a man doublecrosses you once that is his fault; if he doublecrosses you twice, that is your fault. I just want you know you won't get the second opportunity

"The CHAIRMAN. Even that statement not going to provoke the chairman, but the is no living man can justifiably say that the chairman—that this man who happens to be chairman at this time—has ever doublecrossed anybody or he had failed to keep his word.

"Mr. HAYS. I am saying both.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is all right.

"Mr. HAYS. Is that clear enough? There is no inference there is there?

"The CHAIRMAN. That does not disturb me a particle.

"Mr. HAYS. I know, you are pretty hard to disturb. I thought they had more guts in Tennessee.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are not going to provoke me. You need not worry; I have already made up my mind on that."

I am told that I demonstrated considerable forbearance, and I believe I did, although that was a difficult moment when Mr. Hays impugned not only my personal integrity but my physical courage.

I was tempted to compare military records with him, but that would not have been very adult impulse to follow.

xii

By this time most of you gentlemen are probably familiar with the world's record which Mr. Hays has set for marathon interruptions of a witness.

In the case of one highly respected witness who was endeavoring to give the committee some information, Mr. HAYS interrupted 2 times in 185 minutes.

And even though the committee passed a rule that a witness should be permitted to finish his presentation before being questioned and cross-questioned, Mr. HAYS angrily declared in public session that he would interrupt whenever and wherever he pleased, and to say that he made good his word is an understatement.

Eminent professors among the witnesses were referred to publicly by Mr. HAYS during the hearings as "crackpots" and as having been "dredged up by the committee staff," statements now echoed by Dr. Hutchins here.

An eminent Catholic scholar, Sister Margaret McCarran, was characterized by Mr. HAYS as incompetent and as having secured her doctorate degree through political influence, presumably that of her father, the then senior Senator from Nevada.

The best answer to this remark which was manifestly made in an effort to discredit damaging testimony is a letter I received from Bishop Bryon J. McEntegart, rector of Catholic University, and which might be said was written with Cardinal Spellman's knowledge.

It is a long letter so I will quote only three sentences:

"It has come to my notice that at a hearing of your committee in early June, the assertion was made that a doctoral degree was granted at Catholic University of America as a result of pressure.

"On behalf of the University I wish to deny that allegation as completely false. \* \* \* If the unwarranted assertion referred to above is included in the record of your hearings, may I ask that this letter be given equal prominence in your record."

#### XIII

Mr. HAYS' technique of frustrating the testimony even included heckling the majority members of the committee during their questions and cross-examination.

It became apparent, therefore, that the appearances and testimony of the foundation representatives would be a farce because Mr. HAYS would never permit cross-examination, and there was nothing I could do about it because as you gentlemen know, there is no force which governs the behavior of members of congressional committees, except that of self-control and common courtesy.

The majority members of the committee therefore, decided that further hearings would be fruitless.

To those of you who may have been given the erroneous impression by Dr. Hutchins and others, that this cancellation was not a unanimous majority action and that Congressman GOODWIN did not concur, I refer you to page 945 of the committee hearings, which contains the following statement sent to me in writing, and I quote:

"I cannot be at the meeting on foundations tomorrow, and in the meantime I want you to know I think there should be

an immediate cancellation of all public hearings. Signed, Angier L. Goodwin."

Obviously, the cancellation of the formal testimony of the large foundations and their satellites was all to their advantage from a public opinion standpoint because virtually none of the evidence against them had appeared in public print and the self-cleansing statements which took the place of their testimony were printed verbatim plus favorable editorial comments in most of the important newspapers that came to my attention.

Dr. Hutchins' speech supports the false statement in Dean Griswold's fifth amendment to the effect that "After developing the case against the foundations, this committee closed its hearings without giving the foundations a chance to present their defense."

Now, here are copies of parts I and II of the hearings. In part I, pages 794 to 865 consist of foundation testimony and practically all of part II is foundations testimony.

In a single issue of the New York Times, July 25, the self-cleansing brief of the Ford Foundation was given 2 feature stories totaling about 4,000 words.

One story praised the Ford Foundation; the other smeared the committee.

I think you gentlemen will agree that that is thorough press coverage.

#### XIV

I now want to say a few words about America's large tax-exempt foundations—the ones who are at the center of this storm.

Dr. Hutchins, when he was here, ridiculed the committee opinion that these foundations were involved in an intellectual cartel and stated that the committee had indulged in "new wrinkles to the distortions that we have become accustomed to in congressional investigations."

This language of Dr. Hutchins is typical of the vituperation which has been poured on us by the professional operators of foundations.

Realizing the impossibility of controverting the massive evidence which we produced, they have resorted to smear and slander.

They cannot disprove the existence of the intellectual cartel which we so clearly disclosed—a cartel which, using public money, has so effectively influenced academic and public opinion both in the domestic and international fields.

Among many warnings concerning this cartel comes one from Prof. Carl O. Sauer, of the University of California:

"In American social science it has indeed become a dominant folkway to associate progress with putting the job inquiry into large-scale organizations, under formally prescribed methods, and with limited objectives. Having adopted the name 'science' we are impressed by the 'method of science' as inductive, quantitative, and experimental. We are even told that such is the only proper method."

Professor Sauer refers to the top social-science planners as "an elite, fashioning increasingly the direction and limits of our work" and says "a serious and delicate problem is posed by the growing role of the national research council and foundation, the last years having seen a continually increasing concentration of influence."

You know, these planners, of whom Dr. Hutchins is an outstanding example, have cleverly adopted a Communist tactic.

Communists charge that the rest of the world is aggressive.

Similarly, these planners accuse the Committee on Foundations of wishing to suppress freedom of thought.

The fact is that the intellectual cartel which they have created itself suppresses freedom of thought by expending vast millions of foundation money under their control to determine opinion, academic and public, in the leftish directions they favor. There is extensive testimony to this effect by most competent witnesses.

xv

The foundations have placed great stress upon the fact that the amount of money actually spent in the social sciences is not enough to finance an intellectual revolution.

But the fact remains that, working at the fountainhead, it does not take much money to exercise virtual control over the relatively small number of people and institutions who in turn can control huge areas of policy and public opinion.

This power to impose brainwashing at the key points is against everything America stands for.

Evidence of this power comes from Prof. Charles E. Merriam, of the University of Chicago, one of the Nation's most notable educators.

Professor Merriam, himself inclined toward collectivism, was, at one time, an important dispenser of foundation funds.

In discussing his experience in this capacity, Professor Merriam said to one of his colleagues: "Money is power and for the last few years I have been dealing with more power than a professor should ever have in his hands."

As proof of the atmosphere of fear in which the conservative educator lives and works today, I would like to mention that the most pertinent information the committee received concerning the close-shop that apparently is being imposed on educators came from men who refuse to risk retaliatory action but were willing to give me off-the-record information.

One of them, who is a celebrated classical educator and known to all of you, said: "It is sad but true that it would be a waste of time for any graduate student of mine, however brilliant, to apply for a scholarship from the powers that be. They simply do not conform to the new collectivistic order of modern social science in America today."

Another internationally known professor and economist told us that in the large university where he teaches, no assistant professor would dream of not being a follower of the Keynes theory of deficit spending and the monetization of a public debt because only a supporter of Keynes could hope for promotion to a full professorship.

One of the most brilliant and most courageous social scientists in the country today Dr. A. H. Hobbs of the University of Pennsylvania, is still merely an assistant professor.

He has been passed over for promotion and the University authorities have made it utterly clear, ever since he began to point out the limitations of social science as a guide to social reform and began warning against the effect of such efforts upon the American way of life.

xvi

Regarding the question whether the foundations are supporting actual or potentially subversive projects, Dr. Hutchins virtually defeated his own case when he was attempting to point out how absurd these suspicions were.

He said in his speech before you that according to the Reece committee's definition support of social planning by the foundations could be subversion.

This was said in derision because in Dr. Hutchins' opinion no rational man can take this statement seriously.

This shows the vast gulf between the rationality of Dr. Hutchins and that of the millions of Americans, Democrats as well as Republicans, who have come to realize that the planning of the social scientist reformers for their brave new world is actually or potentially subversive.

It is "subversive" because it seeks to introduce Fabian socialism into the United States.

The word "subversion" connotes a process of undermining; and these planners, these "social engineers" as they call themselves, who deem themselves entitled to lead us common people into better pastures, seek to undermine some of our most precious institutions, one being our unique system of enterprise of free management and free labor.

There is no need to doubt this.

They have been candid among themselves.

To some degree, they even have been candid with us common people.

They have set down their objectives as clearly as did Hitler in his *Mein Kampf*.

One of the documents which frankly discloses their plans is the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies, a call to American educators to teach collectivism to our youth.

This project was financed by the Carnegie Foundation.

In his statement on behalf of the Carnegie Foundation filed with the committee, its

president, Charles Dollard, sought to deny the socialist nature of this report which became an important influence in education.

He stated: "The worst that can be said is that the authors (of this report) not only reported this trend but appeared to accept it cheerfully. What they were accepting was not socialism—it was the New Deal.

But gentlemen, this was not the New Deal.

My authority is none other than Prof. Howard J. Laski, the top philosopher of the British Socialist Party, who said of these conclusions and recommendations: "At bottom and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America."

Yet, after the Conclusions and Recommendations was published, the president of the Carnegie Corp. stated that the public owed its authors a vote of thanks.

#### XVII

Those of you who were here when Dr. Hutchins spoke will remember his eloquent losing words: "The Fund for the Republic is a sort of fund for the American dream. I do not think the fund can make the American dream come true, but perhaps it can help keep it alive and clear."

I would like to give you my impressions of the American dream that is now occupying the attention of the foundation-financed intellectual cartel.

Ever since the world began, well-meaning people, lacking faith in the common man to conduct his own affairs, have promoted the idea of government by an elite.

Plato wanted his perfect society run by 11 powerful, allwise and, of course, incorruptible philosophers.

Francis Bacon wanted his world run by a group of top scientists answering to the same specifications.

Robert Hutchins and the other members of this self-appointed professional intellectual aristocracy dream of an America governed by social scientists, guided by their omniscient infallibility under a system which frees the people from the responsibilities of freedom.

Mr. Pendleton Herring, of the Social Science Research Council, wrote in 1947 concerning this matter: "One of the greatest needs in the social sciences is for the development of skilled practitioners who can use social data for the cure of social ills as doctors use scientific data to cure bodily ills." The degree to which this elite penetrated the Federal Government is indicated by the #7 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education.

I would like to give you a few extracts from that report.

"It will take social science and social engineering to solve the problems of human relations. Our people must learn to respect the need for special knowledge and technical training in this field as they have come to defer to the expert in physics, chemistry, medicine and the other sciences."

I would like to mention that by no valid definition can sociology and economics identify themselves as true science.

Seven years before this report was issued, one of the members of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Horace M. Kallen, wrote a magazine article entitled, "Can We Be Served By Indoctrination?"

I would like to quote two short paragraphs from that article:

"I find within the babble of plans and plots against the evils of our time one only which does not merely repeat the past; this is the proposal that the country's pedagogues shall undertake to establish themselves as the country's saviors."

After some elaboration, Dr. Kallen concludes, "Having taken power, the teachers must use it to attain the central purpose of realizing the American dream. They must operate education as the instrument of social regeneration. This consists of inculcating right doctrine."

Change the word "American" to "Fabian" and you are pretty close to the truth.

Another phase of this American dream might be found in another document for professional pedagogues entitled, "Molders of the American Mind," by Prof. Normal Woelfel.

Here is one of his admonitions: "The younger generation is on its own, and the last thing that would interest modern youth is the salvaging of the Christian tradition. The environmental controls which technologists have achieved and the operations by means of which workers earn their livelihood need no aid or sanction from God nor any blessing from the church."

And he adds this final touch: "In the minds of the men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions and of capitalist profit economy."

#### XVIII

I am sure that this particular audience is peculiarly aware of the difficulty of putting into a small number of words any discussion of a subject of the magnitude of this one, particularly because only portions of the ground have been properly explored.

I also realize that many in the audience know more about some aspects of this subject than I do, because it is their business to follow political and sociological trends.

Among these journalists are a number of very fine people who honestly disagree with me concerning the danger of Fabian socialism, and they are entitled to their opinion.

But I do not think that any informed observer of public affairs would disagree with me as to the evidence of its encroachment upon the American economy.

For this reason, it is my opinion that the great majority of the working newspapermen of the United States, were they in possession of all of the evidence concerning the opera-

tion of the large foundations, would agree with me that foundation grants have knowingly given very substantial aid and comfort to Fabian socialism in the United States and unknowingly, or otherwise, given aid and comfort to causes which are subversive in a more literal sense.

Whether this is good or bad is, of course, a matter of personal conviction, but in either case, it is not a proper activity for philanthropic foundations.

What are these foundation funds which this intellectual elite presumes to use for their own political purposes?

They are public funds, dedicated to the public and necessarily so because they are the product of tax exemption.

342685-54360

I submit that those who expend these public trust funds should be subjected to the highest fiduciary duty.

For my part, I am not willing to see foundations given tax exemption to enable them to promote ideologies detrimental to the public welfare.

Even with its several faults, the report of the committee is a competent one, and in many ways an historic document.


Long after the pious protestations of its adversaries have been forgotten, this record will stand as the first determined effort to alert the Nation to the presence of a force which, if allowed to persist and grow, could become stronger than the Government itself.

COMPOSITE INDEX  
TO  
HEARINGS, APPENDIX, AND REPORT  
OF THE  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND  
COMPARABLE ORGANIZATIONS  
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION  
ON  
H. Res. 217

[Index to Select Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations, Cox Committee,  
H. Res. 561, 82d Cong., is a supplement to this index. See p. 135.]



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1955





**COMPOSITE INDEX TO HEARINGS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND COMPARABLE ORGANIZATIONS**

*Key to symbols*

Symbol	Publication	Date	Pagination
<b>h</b> .....	Hearing, Part I.....	May 10, 11, 18-20, 24-26, June 2-4, 8, 9, 15-18, July 2, 9, 1954.	1-943
<b>a</b> .....	Appendix, Part II.....	June 21, 1954.....	945-1241
<b>r</b> .....	House Report No. 2681.....	Dec. 16, 1954.....	1-432
	Cox Committee Hearings Index prepared for Russell Sage Foundation by Sydney S. Spivack. <sup>1</sup>	Nov. 18 to Dec. 30, 1952.	1-16

<sup>1</sup> This index Supplement will be found at the end of the Composite Index.

1

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

## COMPOSITE INDEX

---

A	Page
AAA.....	r 400
ABA Committee.....	a 1054
ABA Journal.....	a 1054
Abbott, Leonard D.....	h 220
Abel, Theodore.....	a 1184, 1185
Aberle, S. D.....	a 1137
About the Kinsey Report (publication).....	h 131; r 69
Abraham Lincoln Brigade.....	h 223, 253-255, 286, 317-319, 597, 598, 603, 643; a 989; r 251, 261, 292, 294, 332, 333, 337, 347, 349, 385.
Abramovitz. (See Harrison & Abramovitz.)	
Abrams, Charles.....	h 779, 793; a 984, 990, 995
Abrams, Frank W.....	h 346, 349, 376; a 1021
Abt, John.....	r 287
Academic Freedom Rally.....	r 342
Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.....	h 838
Academy of Political Science.....	h 872
Academy of Sciences of the USSR.....	h 838, 847, 848
Acheson, Dean.....	h 893, 918
Across Africa on Foot (publication).....	h 927
Across the Gobi Desert (publication).....	h 927
Action Committee to Free Spain Now.....	r 228
ADA (Americans for Democratic Action).....	h 32, 41
Adamic, Louis.....	h 34; a 1174, 1216
Adams, Dr.....	h 855
Adams, Governor.....	h 590
Adams, Arthur S.....	a 1009, 1016
Adams, Gridley.....	r 351
Adams, Jane.....	h 223
Adams, John Quincy.....	h 405, 805
Adams, Samuel.....	h 311
Adams Memorial.....	h 223
Adams School for Social Science.....	r 349
Adamson, Ernie.....	r 227
Adler, David.....	h 74
Adler, Milton.....	h 351
Adler, Mortimer.....	h 42, 74; a 1042, 1043; r 162, 189, 227
Adult Education Association.....	a 1165
Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (film).....	r 164
Advertising Council, Inc.....	h 42; a 1031, 1043; r 221
Advisory Board (American Student Union).....	r 230, 353
Advisory Board (Film Audiences for Democracy).....	r 305, 306, 308
Advisory Board (Films for Democracy).....	r 305, 306, 308

	Page
Advisory Board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born	r 255
Advisory Board of Frontier Films	r 238, 327, 336
Advisory Committee (Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education)	r 23, 38, 162
Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policies	h 885, 888
Advisory Council of Soviet Russia Today	r 271
Athiopica (publication)	a 1241
Affiliated Schools for Workers	h 34
Africa (publication)	h 928
Africa: Facts and Forecasts (publication)	h 929
Africa in the War (pamphlet)	r 358
African Affairs Council	r 268
Afros, Jack L.	r 409
After Defense—What? (pamphlet)	r 131
After the War—Full Employment (pamphlet)	r 131
Agar, John G.	h 353
Agard, Walter R.	a 1009
Age of Jackson (publication)	r 363
Age of Roosevelt (publication)	r 363
Agee, James	r 189
Agenda of Democracy (publication)	r 132, 141
Agnes Scott College	h 360
Agricultural Relief Act administration, Effects of Sales Taxes (study)	r 128
Agriculture Exchange (publication)	r 233
Aid to China (Washington Committee)	r 289, 323
Aid to Individuals (publication)	h 832
Aid Which the Social Sciences Have Rendered and Can Render to National Planning (report)	h 473
Air War College	h 941
Akeley, Delia J.	h 927
Alabama Farmers Union	r 405
Alabama University	a 1218
Albright, Horace M.	h 352
Albright College	a 1229
Albu, Austen	a 984
Alderman, Edwin A.	h 358
Alderson Reporting Co.	a 1035
Aldrich, Winthrop W.	h 353, 358, 891
ALES (American Labor Education Service)	r 106-109
ALES-CIO World Affairs Institute	a 1161
ALES Annotated List	r 107
ALES Midwest Workers Education Conference	a 1159, 1160; r 106
ALES Philadelphia Center	r 106
Alexander, Robert J.	h 793; a 981, 984
Alexander, Wallace McK.	h 340
Alice in Wonderland, Or Through the Looking Glass (publication)	h 588
All American Anti-Imperialist League	h 222; r 229, 232, 307
All Eisler Program (Town Hall)	r 250
All Men Are Created Equal (poster)	a 1048
All-Union Party Congress	r 368

	Page
All-Union Society for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries (VOKS) .....	h 273; 275; r 158
All Union Travel Co. (Intourist) .....	r 158
All We Are and All We Have (publication) .....	h 929
Allahabad Agricultural Institute .....	a 1029
Allbaugh, Lelena G .....	a 1073
Allen, Devere .....	h 220
Allen, Edward W .....	h 552
Allen, Frederick Lewis .....	h 254, 289, 296, 301, 303, 346, 608
Allen, Raymond B .....	h 343, 552
Allen, Froude, Hilen & DeGarmo (law firm) .....	h 552
Allied Mission to Observe Elections in Greece .....	h 886
Allied Voters Against Coudert .....	a 1171
Allis-Chalmers .....	h 752
Allport, Alexander W .....	h 897
Allyn & Bacon .....	h 395
Alma Egan Hyatt Foundation .....	a 1241
Almack, John C .....	h 214
Altman Foundation .....	h 16
Altschul, Frank .....	h 347
Alumni Homecoming Dinner Sponsoring Committee (American Student Union) .....	r 306, 353
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America .....	a 977; r 287
Amerasia (publication) .....	h 557, 558
America (article) .....	a 1238
America: World Leader or World Led? (publication) .....	h 927; r 173
America and Asia (publication) .....	h 929; r 173
America in the Changing World (publication) .....	h 938
America Discovers Its Songs (article) .....	h 320
America First (organization) .....	h 787, 788
America and the New World (publication) .....	h 929
America and the Refugees (publication) .....	h 34
American (publication) .....	h 33; r 121
American Academy of Arts and Sciences .....	a 999
American Academy of Political Science .....	h 902
American Academy of Political and Social Sciences .....	h 74; r 51
American Advisory Organization .....	h 266; r 152, 157
American Affairs (publication) .....	h 36; a 1036
American Anthropological Association .....	h 32, 818; a 999
American Antiquarian Society .....	a 999
American Architect (publication) .....	h 496
American Association for Adult Education .....	h 674, 675
American Association for the Advancement of Science .....	r 171
American Association of International Conciliation .....	h 873, 906, 924; r 171
American Association of Junior Colleges .....	a 1147
American Association for Public Opinion Research .....	a 1036
American Association of School Administrators .....	h 74, 482; a 1147
American Association for Social Security .....	h 777, 778; a 990
American Association of Social Workers .....	h 32
American Association of the United Nations .....	h 381; a 984, 1162
American Association of University Professors .....	h 272, 275, 482, 681, 715; a 1239; r 142
American Bank Note Co .....	h 553



	Page
American Council of Learned Societies.....	h 21,
45, 48, 469, 470, 475, 476, 482, 525, 549, 556, 564, 569,	
570, 580, 584, 589-592, 601-603, 612, 618, 808, 809,	
894, 937; a 959, 998, 999, 1006, 1008, 1009, 1012, 1030,	
1081, 1128, 1129, 1189, 1222, 1223, 1225-1229; r 26,	
32, 39, 45, 47, 48, 53-57, 59, 81, 129, 137, 142, 171, 201	
American Council on Public Affairs.....	r 404
American Council on Race Relations.....	r 329, 399
American Council on Soviet Relations.....	h 222;
a 1173, 1176; r 253, 256, 259, 318, 375, 380	
American Delegation (UNESCO).....	r 108
American Dilemma (publication).....	h 49, 58, 578, 592; a 967, 969; r 125
American Diplomacy, 1900-1950 (publication).....	r 306
American Economic Association.....	h 32, 818, 838, 847; a 993, 998, 999
American Education Fellowship.....	h 34, 35,
388, 395, 397, 398, 493, 675; a 1149; r 146, 151, 152	
American Education Under Fire (pamphlet).....	h 327, 388, 397
American Educational League.....	h 322, 324
American Farm Bureau Federation.....	h 881, 920
American Federation of Labor (AFL).....	h 746,
750, 751, 776, 780, 781, 784, 788, 789, 792, 920;	
a 977, 981, 984, 995, 1159, 1169, 1233; r 97, 107, 396,	
397, 400, 403.	
American Federation of Teachers.....	a 985, 1159; r 106, 396
American Folklore Society.....	a 999
American Foundation for Political Education.....	r 221
American Foundations—Their Fields (publication).....	h 669; a 1235
American Friends of the Chinese People.....	h 222;
a 1216; r 230, 232, 234, 308, 354, 375	
American Friends Service Committee.....	h 389, 390;
r 186, 187, 211, 302, 351	
American Friends of the Soviet Union.....	a 1171; r 269, 317, 369
American Friends of Spanish Democracy.....	h 222;
a 1170, 1171; r 229, 232, 237, 238, 247, 254, 259, 301,	
304, 305, 308, 317, 318, 327, 331, 333, 335, 337, 350,	
353, 355, 364, 369, 371, 375, 390, 391, 409.	
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (Medical Bureau).....	r 237,
259, 277, 288, 292, 304, 317, 327, 337, 370, 371, 375	
American Fund for Public Service.....	h 222;
r 229, 241, 297, 308, 328, 395, 396	
American Geographical Society.....	h 286
American-German Review.....	a 1241
American Hawaiian Steamship Co.....	h 553
American Heritage Council.....	r 221
American Heritage Foundation.....	r 46
American Heritage Program of the National Library Associa- tion.....	r 221
American Heritage Project (American Library Association)....	r 164
American Historical Association.....	h 21,
32, 46, 58, 285-287, 469-471, 475, 476, 478-480, 488,	
506, 603, 612, 617, 697, 720, 818, 838, 847; a 967, 974,	
975, 999, 1081, 1112; r 45, 53, 129, 140, 141, 153, 171,	
425.	

	Page
American Historical Society	h 286, 400, 476, 894; r 32, 137
American Indian Federation	r 362
American Indians (article)	h 319
American Institute (Moscow University)	158, 159, 161
American Institute of Electrical Engineers	h 496
American Institute of Management (AIM)	h 370, 373, 377
American Intercontinental Peace Conference	r 273, 274
American International College	a 1230
American Investors Union, Inc	a 1171, 1176, 1216
American Journal of Economics and Sociology	a 1239
American Journal of International Law	h 556
American Journal of Psychiatry	h 123, 134
American Journal of Public Health	a 1238
American Judicature Society	h 196
American Labor Education Service	h 724;
	a 1158-1167, 1169; r 45, 106-109
American Labor Party	r 104,
	268, 285, 322, 344, 348, 386, 409
American Law Institute	a 1142
American League Against War and Facism	h 222;
	a 1170; r 230-232, 251, 253, 258, 259, 298, 318, 326,
	333, 335, 344, 348, 351-353, 376, 398, 415.
American League to Enforce Peace	h 926
American League for Peace and Democracy	h 222;
	a 1169, 1171, 1176; r 109, 160, 228, 231, 232, 234, 235,
	238-240, 251, 253, 254, 259, 260, 275, 276, 288, 292,
	314, 318, 326, 335, 349, 352, 369, 376, 390, 391, 398,
	411.
American League for Peace and Democracy (Theatre Arts Committee)	r 288, 289
American Legion	h 29, 40, 243; a 1156; r 338, 363
American Legion Magazine	a 1238
American Legion Subversive Activities Committee	r 338
American Library Association	h 327, 590; a 955, 1031; r 164, 166
American Locomotive Co	a 1048
American Management Association	h 495
American Medical Association	a 1156
American Mercury (publication)	h 222;
	a 1216, 1240, 1241; r 114, 202
American Mining Congress	h 495
American Mining Congress Journal	h 496
American Music Alliance of Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade	r 251
American Musicological Society	a 999
American Newspaper Publishers Association	r 9
American Numismatic Society	a 999
American Oriental Society	a 999
American Patriots, Inc	h 329
American Peace Crusade	h 223; r 274, 278, 285, 340, 356, 381, 402
American Peace Crusade Open Letter to the President	r 285
American Peace Crusader (publication)	r 274
American Peace Mobilization (APM)	r 237,
	336, 341, 356, 358, 395, 405



	Page
American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace	r 274, 278, 381, 382, 402
American Perspectives (publication)	a 1241
American Philological Association	a 999
American Philosophical Association	h 847, 854, 902; a 999; r 47
American Policy in the Far East, 1931- (publication)	h 928; r 173, 235
American Political Association	h 580
American Political Science Association	h 32, 556, 560, 564-569, 573, 585, 590, 617, 818; a 993, 999; r 26, 27, 91, 115, 117, 131, 200, 201.
American Political Science Review (publication)	h 556
American Progress Foundation	h 292, 302
American Progressives	h 792; r 313, 379
American Protective League	h 496
American Psychological Association	h 32, 818, 847
American Pushkin Committee	h 223
American Review of Reviews (publication)	h 361
American Round Table (organization)	a 1043
American Russian Institute	h 929; a 1215, 1222-1224; r 173, 174, 246, 256, 289, 320, 330, 333, 366.
American School in Japan	a 1197, 1205
American Senate and the Treaty-Making Power (publication)	h 556
American Sexual Behavior and the Kinsey Report (publica- tion)	r 68
American Slav Congress	a 1174; r 323, 340, 344, 348, 380, 382, 406
American Slave Congress (Report)	r 323
American Socialist Party	r 98
American Society for Aesthetics	a 999
American Society of Cinematographers	h 429
American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia	a 1176
American Society of International Law	h 556, 873
American Society of Mechanical Engineers	h 496
American Society of Public Administration	a 1209
American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy	r 259
American Sociological Review (publication)	r 77
American Sociological Society	h 32, 818; a 999
American Soldier (publication)	h 150, 151, 160, 161, 898; a 967, 972, 974
American Soldier project	r 74, 75
American-Soviet Cultural Conference	r 252
American Soviet secret police agency in the United States	r 356
American Sponsoring Committee (World Peace Congress)	r 273, 280
American Statistical Association	h 32, 495, 818; r 128
American Student Union	h 222; a 1173; r 230, 353; r 187, 232, 235-237, 277, 306, 308, 312, 326, 353, 380, 393, 394, 411, 415, 416.
American Student Union Invites You (leaflet)	r 306
American Technical Society	h 394
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	h 349, 354, 360, 446
American Textbook Publishers Institute	h 395, 396

	Page
American Theatre (article).....	h 320
American Trade Union Delegation.....	r 256
American University (Beirut).....	a 1029
American Vietnamese Foundation.....	a 983
American Way (publication).....	h 34
American Way of Business (pamphlet).....	r 155
American Women for Peace.....	r 382
American World Policies (publication).....	h 926
American Writers and Artists Committee.....	r 259
American Writers Congress... r 261, 282, 336, 341, 346, 348, 365, 391	
American Youth Commission.....	h 74, 696, 697; r 136
American Youth Congress.....	h 222;
a 1171, 1175, 1176; r 187, 230, 232, 236, 237, 276, 296	
302, 336, 355, 369, 377, 382, 394-396, 411-413, 413,	
415, 416.	
American Youth Congress (Fourth Annual Conference).....	r 276
American Youth For Democracy.....	r 296,
319, 333, 344, 348, 382, 394, 395	
Americanization Committee (National Society, Sons of the	
American Revolution).....	h 386, 387, 396; r 147
Americans for Democratic Action (ADA).....	h 32, 41; r 407
America's Future, Inc.....	h 322, 324, 731
America's Outposts (article).....	h 319
America's Second Crusade (publication).....	r 121
America's Stake in Britain's Future (publication).....	h 929
America's Struggle for Electric Power (publication).....	h 793
Amherst College.....	h 220, 350, 750; a 977, 1051, 1219; r 99
An Amiable Adventure (publication).....	h 927
Amster, I.....	r 258, 298
Amsterdam World Congress Against War.....	r 255, 318, 350, 398
An American Dilemma (publication).....	r 89, 91, 184
An Atlas of the Empire (publication).....	h 928
An Atlas of the U. S. S. R. (publication).....	h 929
An Invitation to American Labor to Participate in a Peace	
Congress (leaflet).....	r 274
And the Bravest of These (publication).....	h 929
Ander, Oscar Fritiof.....	a 1231
Anderson, Albin Theodore.....	a 1231
Anderson, C. Arnold.....	a 1184, 1187; r 62, 63
Anderson, Dillon.....	h 340
Anderson, Eleanor C. (Mrs. Sherwood Anderson).....	a 1159,
1170; r 106, 227, 228	
Anderson, Florence.....	h 340
Anderson, H. A.....	a 1237
Anderson, Howard R.....	h 64
Anderson, M. D.....	h 16
Anderson, Paul B.....	h 347
Anderson, Rachael Evans.....	h 64
Anderson, Mrs. Sherwood (Eleanor C. Anderson).....	a 1159, 1170
Anderson Foundation.....	h 16
Anderson, Wrenn & Jenks (law firm).....	h 554
Andrew Jackson High School.....	h 64
Andrews, E. Benjamin.....	h 358

	Page
Andrews .....	r 11, 22, 96
Andrews, F. Emerson .....	h 60; a 1117
Andrews, Fanny Fern .....	h 927
Andrews, Frank .....	a 1235-1237
Andrews, T. Coleman .....	h 418-
422, 442-448, 453, 454, 456-458, 460-463, 734, 735, 740, 786; a 1120.	
Angell, James R. ....	h 338, 339, 353, 358
Angell, Norman .....	h 927, 928; r 173, 228
Annual Report of the Fund for Adult Education (1951) .....	h 41
Answers for Americans (Facts Forum broadcast) .....	r 174
Anthony, Alfred W. ....	a 1235
Anti-Defamation League .....	h 21, 47
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith .....	h 388, 389; r 211, 432
Anti-Defamation League Bulletin (B'nai B'rith) .....	r 211
Anti-Lynching Bill .....	r 352
Anti-Nazi Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy .....	r 231
Anti-Soviet Slander Exposed as a Forgery (article) .....	r 389
Apotheker, Henry .....	r 409, 410
Appalachian Mountain Club .....	a 1209
Appell, Donald .....	r 301
Appleget, Thomas B. ....	h 357
Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. ....	h 394
Approach to Foundations (article) .....	a 1238
Aquinas, Thomas .....	a 1168
Arabic Works .....	a 1002
Arbuthnot, Thomas S. ....	r 338
Archaeological Institute of America .....	a 999
Are Our Teachers Afraid to Teach? (article) .....	h 490
Are We Being Talked Into War (pamphlet) .....	r 322
Arendtz, Herman F. ....	h 927
Arens, Herman J. ....	a 1229
Aristotle .....	h 805; a 1168
Arizona University .....	h 1230
Armstrong .....	h 346
Armstrong, Hamilton Fish .....	h 886, 928
Army Field Manual (publication) .....	r 97
Arndt, Christian O. ....	h 64, 390
Arnett, Trevor .....	h 353, 359, 362, 363
Arrangements Committee for the United States Congress Against War .....	r 230
Artef Theatre .....	r 292
Artists' Front To Win The War .....	r 251, 265, 344, 348
Artists and Writers Dinner Club .....	r 409
Arts and the American Craftsmen (article) .....	h 320
Ashbee, C. R. ....	h 926
Assignment in Utopia (publication) .....	h 928
Associated Hospital Service of New York .....	h 351
Associated Research Council .....	a 1006, 1162
Associated Women of the Federation .....	h 881
Association of American Colleges .....	h 268, 275, 681, 715, 874; a 1238, 1240

	Page
Association of American Geographers .....	a 999
Association of American Law Schools .....	h 32; a 1219
Association of American Universities .....	h 681, 715, 874; a 1113; r 335
Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities .....	h 482; r 143
Association Press .....	a 1235, 1236
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (NEA) .....	h 64, 388, 489; a 1150; r 190
Atheism (article) .....	r 92
Atherton, J. Ballard .....	h 552
Atlanta Constitution .....	h 349
Atlanta Federal Penitentiary .....	r 267, 392
Atlanta University .....	h 64
Atlantic (publication) .....	a 1237
Atlantic Monthly .....	a 1238, 1240
Atlantic Monthly Supplement .....	r 189
Atlas Engine Works .....	h 360
Atmono, S .....	a 984
Atomic Age (publication) .....	h 793
Atomic Age Opens (publication) .....	h 929
Attilio .....	h 929
Attlee .....	h 595
Auden, W. H. .....	r 189
Augustus College .....	a 1231
Ausable Club .....	a 1181
Austin, Eduardo .....	a 1229
Austin, Warren Robinson .....	h 65; r 191
Author Meets the Critic (television show) .....	a 981
Auto Workers Union, CIO (region 8) .....	r 399
Avalon Foundation .....	h 16
Axtelle, George E. .....	a 985
Aydelotte, Frank .....	h 343
Ayer, Fred C. .....	a 1149
Ayerbach, Mrs. George S. .....	a 1181
Ayers, Leonard .....	a 974, 1235

## B

Bach, Otto Karl .....	a 1231
Bachman, Dorothy .....	a 1165
Bachman, Frank P. .....	h 363
Background of African Liberation Struggles (seminar) .....	r 268
Bacon ( <i>see</i> Allyn & Bacon.) .....	
Bacon, Francis .....	h 805
Bacon, Robert .....	h 340; a 1057
Baehr, George .....	a 984
Baehr, Harry .....	h 901
Baghdad and Points East (publication) .....	h 927
Bagley .....	a 1145
Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York .....	r 278, 345, 350
Baird College .....	a 984
Baker, Frank E. .....	a 1216
Baker, Lawrence G. .....	a 1237
Baker, Newton D. .....	h 338; a 969
Bakke, E. Wright .....	a 983

	Page
Baldanzi, George	h 778; r 104
Baldwin, C. B.	a 1173
Baldwin, Roger	h 904; r 93, 228-231
Baldwin, William H.	h 359, 362; a 1181
<i>Ball v. Paramount Pictures</i> (case)	h 365
Ballantine, Arthur A.	h 340, 347
Ballantine, Joseph W.	h 553
Balleau, Frank A.	h 514
Ballou, Frank W.	h 286
Balokovic, Zlatko	a 1174
Baltimore Sun	h 795
Bancroft, Edgar A.	h 340
Bancroft, Thomas	r 363
Banani, Amin	a 1229
Bank Run (pamphlet)	a 1164
Banking (publication)	a 1044
Bar of the District of Columbia	h 724
Barbary Shore (publication)	r 343
Barbash, Jack	a 981, 990
Bar of the City of New York	a 1219
Bar of the Supreme Court	h 724
Bard, Harry	h 74
Bard College	a 984
Barkin, Solomon	a 979
Barnard, Chester I.	h 353, 357, 359, 362, 880; a 1084, 1236
Barnard, Chester I.	r 232
Barnard College	h 220, 524, 678, 706; r 94
Barnes	h 903
Barnes, A. S.	h 394
Barnes, Harry Elmer	a 1175; r 178, 179
Barnes, Joseph Fels	a 1223, 1228
Barnes, Kathleen	a 1223, 1228
Barnes, Mrs. Katrina McCormick	a 980
Barnes & Co.	h 394
Baron, Baronig	r 161
Baron, Murray	h 792
Barou, Noel	h 793
Barrett, Edward	h 904; a 1132, 1221
Barrows, David P.	h 340, 877, 918
Barsky, Edward K.	r 263, 321, 359, 384
<i>Barsky v. United States</i> (case)	r 263
Bartky, Dean John	a 1048
Baruch, Bernard	r 119
Barzun, Jacques	r 189
Basch, Antonin	h 891, 892; a 1230
Basic Facts About Carnegie Corporation of New York and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (publication)	h 675, 678
Basis of Durable Peace (publication)	h 926
Basis for Peace in the Far East (publication)	h 929; a 1216; r 173
Batelle Memorial Institute	r 46
Bates, Professor	h 846
Bates, Blanchard W.	a 1231

	Page
Battle of Consent (article)-----	r 146
Battle for Peace (publication)-----	r 271
Bauer, Fred B.-----	r 362
Bauer, Mrs. Fred B.-----	r 362
Bauer, John-----	h 793, 843
Bay Area Educational Television Association (San Francisco)-----	h 386
Bayard, Herbert-----	h 907
Bazar, Julia Older-----	r 160
Be Glad You're a Real Liberal (publication)-----	h 33; r 121
Beal, George J.-----	h 357, 363
Beard, Charles-----	h 32,
58, 286, 488, 516, 518, 519, 566, 573, 574, 576, 586, 595,	
697, 828; a 968, 975; r 28, 117.	
Beard, Charles Austin-----	r 89, 178
Beatty, Willard W.-----	h 265
Beauchamp, Mary-----	h 327
Beaumont, Louis D.-----	h 16
Beaumont Foundation-----	h 16
Beaverbrook, Lord-----	r 119
Bechterov-----	h 278
Beck, George T.-----	a 1229
Becker-----	h 848
Becker, Carl-----	a 1013
Becton-----	r 294
Bedacht, Max-----	r 298
Bedekar, S. K.-----	r 161
Beecroft, Eric Armour-----	a 1230
Bear, Max-----	h 31; r 92
Behavioral Sciences Division (Ford Foundation)-----	h 36,
481; r 24, 46, 49, 50, 81, 82	
Behlow, Robert-----	a 1024
Belding. (See Foote, Cone & Belding.)	
Belfrage, Cedric-----	r 280
Bell, Daniel-----	h 33; a 983
Bell, H. McClelland-----	h 343
Bell, Howard M.-----	h 697
Bell, James F.-----	h 340
Bell, Laird-----	a 961
Bell for Adano (publication)-----	h 553
Bell and Howell-----	r 165
Beltz, Edward W.-----	h 553
Ben Leider Memorial Fund-----	a 1171
Bendiner, Robert-----	h 793; a 1237; r 105
Benedict, Ruth-----	h 34,
139, 929; a 1215, 1216; r 165, 174, 232-234, 408	
Benes, Eduard-----	h 928
Benjamin, Harold-----	h 320, 321, 329-335, 388, 390
Benjamin, Herbert-----	r 253, 260, 314
Bennett, John C.-----	a 977
Bennington College-----	a 979
Benson, W. S.-----	h 394
Benson & Co.-----	h 394
Bentley, Elizabeth-----	h 303; r 262, 263, 287

	Page
Bentley, Harold W	h 345
Benton, William	h 893, 918
Berelson, Bernard	h 36; a 1035, 1036; r 189
Berg's Economic Geography of the U. S. S. R.	a 1003
Berkley, Charles C	h 779; a 990
Berkowitz, Fred	h 750; r 99
Berle, A. A. Jr.	h 629; r 92
Berlin, Rose	a 1055
Berlin University	h 31; a 1139; r 93
Bernard	h 848
Bernays Foundation	r 88
Bernays, Edward L.	r 88
Berninghausen, David K.	h 327
Berry, Catherine E.	a 1009
Bertram, James	h 338, 339
Besant, Anna	h 215
Bethesda Naval Hospital	h 90, 91
Bevan, Aneurin	h 143
Beveridge, William H.	h 775; a 989, 1140
Beveridge Report	a 989
Beyer, Otto S.	h 220
Bible	r 203
Bibliographical Society of America	a 999
Bibliography of the Soviet Union (publication)	r 264
Bidault	h 595; r 169
Biddle, Francis	r 252, 291, 310, 329, 364, 390, 394, 398, 400
Bidwell, Percy W.	h 892
Biedenkapp, Fred	r 298
Biennial Survey (publication)	a 1111
Big Farm (publication)	h 34
Big Sea (publication)	r 297
Bigelow, Paul	r 189
Biggerstaff, Knight	h 553
Bilbo, Senator	h 848
Bill of Grievances (publication)	r 147
Bill of Rights Conference	r 270, 373, 383
Billings	h 222
Bingham, Barry	h 349; a 974
Birchard, C. C.	h 394
Birchard & Co.	h 394
Birnbaum, Adele	r 161
Bisbee. ( <i>See</i> Rushmore, Bisbee & Stern.)	
Bishop, Bernice P.	h 553
Bishop, William Rowley	a 1229
Bishop Trust Co. (Honolulu)	h 553
Bisson, T. A.	h 928; a 1215; r 173, 174
Bituminous Coal Act	h 748
Bituminous Coal Code, Annotated (publication)	h 724
Black, Dr.	h 830
Black, Hugo L.	r 210
Black Folk Then and Now (publication)	r 271
Black Legion	h 312
Black Pit (pamphlet)	a 1164; r 107

	Page
Black Pit (play)-----	a 1164; r 347
Black Reconstruction (publication)-----	r 271
Blackmur, R. P.-----	r 189
Blackwell, Thomas E.-----	a 1238
Blair & Co.-----	h 360
Blaisdell-----	h 38
Blaisdell, Ballis Edwin-----	r 161
Blaisdell, Thomas C.-----	h 615, 621
Blakiston Co.-----	h 394
Bland, Hubert-----	h 215
Blanding, Sarah Gibson-----	h 348
Blandshard, Brand-----	a 983
Blanshard, Paul-----	h 135, 749, 751; r 100, 236
Blasser, Arthur Frederick-----	a 1230
Blegen, Theodore C.-----	a 1009
Bleicken, Gerhard D.-----	a 1238
Bliss ( <i>See Helvering v. Bliss.</i> )	
Bliven, Bruce-----	h 220; a 1238; r 110, 148, 236-239
Blocks (play)-----	a 1165; r 108
Bloor, Ella Reeve. h 223, 224; r 229, 247, 258, 302, 309, 313, 377, 384	
Blue Glamor (publication)-----	h 926
Blueprints for Action (article)-----	h 755; r 99
Blueprints of Action—a Handbook for Student Revolutionists (publication)-----	h 741
Blumer, Herbert-----	h 848; a 1184, 1188
BMT (NYC)-----	h 749
B'nai B'rith-----	h 388, 389; r 52, 211
Board of Education (California)-----	h 197; r 146, 147
Board of Education (San Francisco)-----	h 197, 255, 257, 260, 262; r 146, 150
Board of Foreign Scholarships-----	h 809
Bobbio, Nordberto-----	a 1194
Boble-----	h 346
Bobbs-Merrill Co.-----	h 394, 395
Bodman, Longley, Boble, Armstrong & Dahling (law firm)---	h 346
Bogardus-----	h 848
Bogolepov-----	h 471; r 197
Bohn, William E.-----	r 409, 410
Boffes, Blaire-----	h 897
Bolsheviks-----	h 746, 749, 927; r 98
Bolshevism (article)-----	r 92
Bolte, Charles G.-----	h 308
Bondfield, Margaret-----	a 989, 990
Bondy, Francois-----	r 189
Bontecou, Eleanor-----	a 1131, 1132
Book and Magazine Guild (United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 18)-----	r 239, 328, 371
Book House for Children-----	h 394
Book Shop Association-----	r 242, 368
Book Union-----	h 222; r 246, 261, 282, 376
Book Union Bulletin-----	r 261, 314
Bookplate (publication)-----	r 341
Books on the U. S. S. R. (publication)-----	r 242, 367, 388



	Page
Bookshopper (publication).....	r 341
Borden Co.....	a 1043
Borger, Cathrine.....	h 919
Borton, Hugh.....	h 553
Bossard, James H. S.....	a 1184, 1188; r 64, 65
Boston Retail Distribution Conference.....	h 495
Boston University.....	r 158
Botein, Bernard.....	a 984, 1146
Boushy, Theodore F.....	a 1229
Bovingdon, John.....	r 160, 161
Bovingdon, Louise.....	r 161
Bowen, Willis Herbert.....	a 1231
Bower.....	r 351
Bowles, Chester.....	h 353; a 1127, 1183; r 169
Bowling Green University.....	h 250
Bowman, Francis J. E.....	a 1231
Bowman, Isaiah.....	h 286, 885, 886, 889; a 975
Bowman, John G.....	h 345
Bowman, Leroy E.....	h 780, 789; a 990
Bowman, Raymond T.....	a 1025
Boycott Japanese Goods Conference.....	r 235, 240, 252
Brace.....	h 394
Braden, Spruille.....	a 1183; r 169
Bradley, Dwight.....	a 1174
Bradley, Justice.....	h 641
Brady, Diamond Jim.....	h 769
Brady, Dorothy.....	a 1025
Brady, Robert A.....	r 117-119, 239, 240
Brainwashing in Red China (publication).....	h 142
Brameld, Theodore.....	h 35, 327, 397; r 152, 240
Brandeis, Louis D.....	r 19
Brandeis University.....	r 290
Brandon Films.....	r 165
Brandt, Karl.....	h 892
Branscomb, Bennett Harvie.....	h 359; a 1041, 1048, 1128
Bratt, K. A.....	h 927
Braun, Madame Madeleine.....	a 1215; r 175
Bray, William G.....	a 1232
Brazil: An Interpretation (publication).....	h 929
Brazilian Communist Party.....	r 233, 239, 249, 254, 259, 328
Bread (play).....	a 1165
Breech, Ernest R.....	h 376
Breit, Harvey.....	r 189
Bretton Woods.....	a 1217
Briand.....	h 595
Briarcliffe Junior College.....	a 1232
Bribery by Tax Exemption (article).....	a 1238
Bricker, John W.....	h 59, 310, 511; a 1179
Bridges, Harry.....	h 222; a 1171; r 240, 251, 252, 291, 298, 310, 314, 319, 329, 336, 339, 347, 349, 364, 390, 394, 416
Bridges, Robertson, Schmidt Defense Committee.....	r 240, 339
Bridges, Styles.....	h 590

	Page
Brief Statement of the History and Activities of the American Council on Education (publication).....	r 52
Brierly, William W.....	h 368
Briggs, Thomas Henry.....	h 94-110, 113, 163, 414, 584, 585; a 959, 1075, 1089; r 21, 23, 27, 38, 127, 161, 162, 166, 167
Brigham Young University.....	h 729
Bring Daddy Home Clubs.....	a 973
Britain: Partner for Peace (publication).....	h 929; r 173
British Columbia International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.....	r 361
British Columbia University.....	h 874
British Conservative Party.....	h 572, 792
British Institute of Management.....	a 984
British Labor (publication).....	h 793
British Labor Party.....	r 98
British Labor on Reconstruction in War and Peace (publication).....	h 793
British Labor Socialist Party.....	h 42, 397, 746, 772, 774, 790; a 1044; r 132, 141, 203
British Liberal Party.....	h 792
British Writer Refutes Lies about Soviet Forced Labor (article).....	r 388
Brock, Stuart P.....	h 553
Broderick, Alan H.....	h 929
Brogan, D. W.....	a 1140
Bromley, Dorothy Dunbar.....	a 984
Bronk, Detlev W.....	h 359; a 1127, 1128
Bronk, Detlev W.....	h 353
Brookings, Robert S.....	h 340
Brookings Institution.....	h 17, 44, 93, 553, 629, 643, 879, 893, 894, 934-936, 941; a 962, 963, 970
Brooklyn College.....	a 976, 980, 981, 983, 988, 990, 1217, 1232
Brooks, Charles E.....	h 345
Brooks, Cleanth.....	r 189
Brooks, Thomas.....	a 983
Brookwood College.....	h 750; a 1159, 1164, 1169, 1170, 1175; r 99, 106, 107, 396, 397
Brookwoods Fifteenth Anniversary Review (publication).....	r 396
Brorby, Melvin.....	a 1181
Brotherhood of Man (film).....	r 165
Brothers Under the Skin (publication).....	r 341
Browder, Earl.....	a 1171, 1176, 1222, 1224; r 251, 261, 267, 281, 285, 287, 289, 291, 298, 330, 336, 351, 354, 392, 396
Brown, Bernice (Cronkite).....	h 874
Brown, Dyke.....	h 347
Brown, H. Clifford.....	h 553
Brown, Harcourt.....	a 1231
Brown, James Scott.....	h 877
Brown, Robert C.....	a 1238
Brown, Stanley D.....	r 9
Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.....	h 355; a 1127
Brown University.....	h 874; a 1231
Browne, William.....	r 338

	<b>Page</b>
Brownell, Mr.....	<b>h</b> 310
Brownell, Lincoln C.....	<b>h</b> 553
Browning, Robert.....	<b>h</b> 567
Brownlee, James F.....	<b>h</b> 346, 350, 351; <b>a</b> 1021, 1051
Broyles, Paul.....	<b>r</b> 299
Bruce, Howard.....	<b>h</b> 348
Bruch, Hilde.....	<b>r</b> 72
Brudney, Victor.....	<b>a</b> 1116
Bruner, Herbert.....	<b>h</b> 327
Bruner, Joseph.....	<b>r</b> 362
Bryan, Malcolm.....	<b>h</b> 350; <b>a</b> 1051
Bryan, William L.....	<b>h</b> 343
Bryce, James.....	<b>h</b> 577
Bryce, Lord.....	<b>a</b> 969
Bryn Mawr College.....	<b>h</b> 268; 275
Buchanan, Norman S.....	<b>h</b> 891
Buck, Pearl S.....	<b>h</b> 927; <b>r</b> 173, 241-244
Bucknell University.....	<b>a</b> 1184
Budenz, Dr. Louis F.....	<b>h</b> 34, 39, 135, 471, 513; <b>r</b> 197, 338
Buell, Raymond Leslie.....	<b>h</b> 926; <b>a</b> 1177; <b>r</b> 173, 244
Buffalo University.....	<b>a</b> 1114
Bugas, John S.....	<b>h</b> 376
Buhl Foundation.....	<b>h</b> 16
Buhler, Curt F.....	<b>a</b> 1009
Building America Textbooks.....	<b>h</b> 197, 287, 309, 310, 313, 315, 316, 320, 719; <b>a</b> 1149, 1150; <b>r</b> 121, 136, 147, 154-156.
Building for Peace at Home and Abroad (publication).....	<b>h</b> 33; <b>r</b> 121
Building a Power Winning Organization (conference theme).....	<b>h</b> 750; <b>r</b> 99
Building a Science of Society for the Schools (pamphlet).....	<b>h</b> 255
Building the World Society (publication).....	<b>h</b> 927; <b>r</b> 173
Bukharin.....	<b>r</b> 404
Bullis, Harry A.....	<b>h</b> 348
Bullitt, William Marshall.....	<b>h</b> 340
Bunche, Ralph J.....	<b>h</b> 349, 763, 781, 791; <b>a</b> 977
Bundy, Harvey H.....	<b>h</b> 340
Bunting, Earl.....	<b>h</b> 33, 34; <b>r</b> 121
Burdett Co.....	<b>h</b> 394
Burdock, Eugene I.....	<b>h</b> 340
Bureau of Academic Freedom.....	<b>r</b> 241, 270, 299, 332, 385
Bureau of Adult Education, New York State.....	<b>h</b> 780, 789
Bureau of Educational Research (Ohio State University).....	<b>h</b> 267, 274
Bureau of the Representative in the United States of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic (Department of Information).....	<b>r</b> 110
Bureau of Research and Statistics.....	<b>a</b> 990
Bureau of Social Hygiene.....	<b>a</b> 1137
Bureaucracy (article).....	<b>r</b> 92
Bureaucracy and Trusteeship in Large Corporations (publi- cation).....	<b>r</b> 45
Burgess, John W.....	<b>h</b> 572-574
Burgess, Robert M.....	<b>a</b> 1231

	Page
Burgess, W. Randolph	h 338; a 974
Burke, Earl	a 1238
Burke, Edmund	h 572; r 117
Burke, Kenneth	r 190, 245
Burke, Thomas	h 340
Burling	h 350
Burns, Arthur F	h 785; a 963, 980
Burns, Arthur R	h 785
Burns, Eveline M	h 615, 621, 622, 777, 785; a 990, 995
Buros, H. R	r 161
Bursler, Norman	r 288
Burton, M. LeRoy	h 343
Bush, Vannevar	h 338; a 949, 962, 965, 967
Bushby	h 347
Business and Politics in the Far East (publication)	h 927; r 173
Business of Giving (article)	a 1237
Business of Giving Money Away (article)	a 1238
Business Reports (publication)	a 1235
Business as a System of Power (publication)	r 118
Business Week (publication)	h 375; a 1044, 1238
Buss, Claude A	h 874
Butler ( <i>see United States v. Butler.</i> )	
Butler	h 56
Butler, Nicholas Murray	h 338-340, 343, 556, 573, 584, 588, 873, 875, 876, 881, 882, 891, 894, 907, 918, 920, 924, 926, 928, 929; a 1057, 1062, 1063; r 26, 171, 233, 331, 354.
Butler University	a 1232
Butterfield, Victor L	a 1041
Buttrick, Ernest A	h 363
Buttrick, Wallace	h 353, 359, 362, 363
Byrnes, Governor	r 101
Byrnes, James F	h 563, 593, 643, 893, 918

## C

Cacchione, Peter V	r 267
Cadbury, Henry J	r 187
Cadwalader, John L	h 340
Caetani, Marguerite	r 189
Cairns, Huntington	h 350; a 1051
Calderwood, James	a 1161
Caldwell, Erskine	a 1216
California Committee on Education	h 315, 316
California Department of Education	r 155
California Institute of Technology	a 1124, 1219
California Labor School	r 344, 348, 354
California Legislature	h 313, 315, 319, 320
California schools	r 154, 155
California Senate Investigating Committee on Education	h 315, 316; r 154, 155
California Senate Un-American Activities Committee	r 116
California Society, Sons of the American Revolution	h 197; r 146, 147
California Sponsoring Committee, Northern Division (Harry Bridges)	r 240

	Page
California State Bar.....	h 196
California State Board of Education.....	h 197; r 146, 147
California State Department of Education.....	h 387, 396; a 1149
California Tenney Committee Report.....	r 338
California University.....	h 19, 196,
255, 257, 356, 361, 395, 496, 553, 694, 723, 877, 904,	
937, 940; a 1014, 1025, 1127, 1128, 1132, 1139, 1184,	
1188, 1221, 1230; r 42, 81, 83, 150, 184, 236, 240, 292,	
301, 324, 334, 363.	
California University Press.....	h 395
California University Provost.....	r 150
Calkins, Robert D.....	h 362, 363
Call to Action, American Congress for Peace and Democracy (leaflet).....	r 231
Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America (leaflet).....	r 227
Call to a Conference on Women of the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. in the Post-War World (leaflet).....	r 228
Call to a National Congress for Unemployment (leaflet).....	r 230,
	260, 314
Call to the Second U. S. Congress Against War and Fascism (article).....	r 230, 253
Call to the Teachers of the Nation (paraphlet).....	h 265, 484; r 143, 151
Call to the Third Annual Conference (American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born).....	r 255
Call To the U. S. Congress Against War (publication).....	r 312
Call Upon the Film Industry to Revoke Blacklist (signed Statement).....	r 342
Cambridge University.....	r 158
Cameron, Barney.....	r 9
Cameron, Colin.....	a 983
Cameron, George T.....	h 553
Caminita, Mrs. Fanny Sessions Mittell.....	a 1233
Campbell, Doak S.....	a 1149
Campbell, James W.....	h 340
Campbell, Wallace J.....	h 308; a 979
Campus Rebels, a Brief History of the Student League for Industrial Democracy (publication).....	h 740
Campsall, Frank.....	h 346, 347
Can America Stay Neutral?.....	h 928
Can Science Save Us? (publication).....	h 149
Can We Be Neutral? (publication).....	h 928
Can We Be Saved by Indoctrination? (article).....	h 484; r 143
Canada and the United States (publication).....	h 926
Can You Name Them (publication).....	r 335, 363
Canada's Fabian Party.....	h 788
Canadian Congress of Labor.....	h 784, 792
Canadian Parliament.....	h 764, 783
Canadian Peace Conference.....	r 274
Canadian Progressives on the March (publication).....	h 793
Canadian Socialist Party.....	h 764
Canadians Find Security With Freedom (publication).....	h 793
Canby, Dean C.....	a 1025

	Page
Canning, William M.....	h 42; a 1041
Capen, Samuel P.....	h 343
Capitalism (article).....	h 32; r 92
Capps, Edward.....	h 358, 363
Cardozo, Justice.....	a 1080
CARE Mission in Israel.....	a 985
Carey, Mrs. Andrew Galbraith.....	a 1181
Carey, James B.....	h 766, 767; a 996
Carl Shurz Memorial Foundation.....	a 1241
Carleton College.....	h 347; a 1021
Carlson, Evans.....	a 1224; r 359
Carlson, John Roy.....	a 1173
Carman, Harry J.....	a 993
Carmichael, Leonard.....	a 1048
Carmichael, Oliver C.....	h 338, 340, 343, 345
Carnegie, Andrew.....	h 338, 339, 359, 378, 586, 669, 671, 675, 679, 714, 717, 852, 853, 873, 912; a 951, 952, 954, 956, 963, 1056-1058, 1065; r 27, 116, 134, 170.
Carnegie, Mrs. Andrew.....	h 338
Carnegie, T. Morrison.....	h 343, 345
Carnegie Corporation.....	h 13, 16, 32, 43, 49, 55, 58, 59, 65, 132, 136, 240, 241, 286, 337, 338, 400, 472, 474, 476, 479, 519, 527-529, 577, 592, 668-670, 675, 678-681, 684, 710, 711, 713, 714, 717, 721, 795, 854, 869, 893, 898, 904, 905, 939, 943; a 949-955, 957, 958, 962-965, 967, 969, 974, 975, 1000, 1000, 1006, 1063, 1189, 1236, 1238; r 29, 34, 41, 42, 45-47, 74, 85, 86, 89, 91, 117-121, 134, 135, 137, 140, 141, 170, 176, 178, 179, 182, 191.
Carnegie Corporation of New York.....	h 16, 49, 65, 337, 400, 474, 479, 668, 675, 678, 681, 710, 854, 869, 904, 905; a 949-955, 957, 958, 962-965, 967, 969, 974, 975, 1000, 1006, 1063, 1189, 1236; r 47, 51, 52, 82, 86, 89, 91, 117-121, 134, 135, 137, 141, 179, 182, 191.
Carnegie Corporation Report (1949).....	r 120
Carnegie Educational Pension Fund.....	h 680
Carnegie Endowment History (publication).....	h 873
Carnegie Endowment to the International Mind Alcoves.....	r 174
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.....	h 16, 52, 54-57, 64, 301, 337-339, 472, 474, 529, 584, 588, 668, 670, 869, 870, 874, 884, 889, 891-894, 898, 905- 913, 915, 916, 918-920, 923, 924, 926, 929, 930; a 951, 983, 1056, 1060, 1063-1065, 1104, 1176, 1183, 1215-1217, 1238, 1241; r 24, 26, 45-46, 52, 54, 134, 166, 169-179, 181-185, 199, 220.
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Yearbook.....	h 905-913, 915, 918, 920; r 177, 178, 183
Carnegie Endowment reports.....	r 172
Carnegie Fellowships.....	a 1058

	Page
Carnegie Foundation.....	h 2,
8, 20, 28, 31, 43, 51, 52, 56, 60, 64, 212, 266, 286,	
336-338, 401, 535, 559, 672-681, 689, 703-705, 710-	
712, 714, 717, 870, 873, 876, 885, 887, 890; a 950,	
985, 1034, 1105, 1119, 1156; r 47, 52, 54, 117, 118,	
134-136, 140, 156, 169, 425, 426.	
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education.....	h 680; r 135
Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching.....	h 16,
101, 338, 339, 474, 567, 668, 670, 675, 677, 679, 681,	
689, 693, 702, 705, 710, 711, 714, 717, 854, 874;	
a 951, 952, 954, 955, 1241; r 47, 52, 117, 118, 134.	
Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.....	h 338, 339, 668; a 951
Carnegie Institute.....	h 338, 669
Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh.....	h 668; a 951
Carnegie Institute of Technology.....	h 677, 679; a 1025
Carnegie Institution.....	h 16, 668
Carnegie Institution of Washington.....	h 338,
339, 360, 668; a 949, 951, 962	
Carnegie Professional Pension Fund.....	h 680
Carnegie Tech.....	r 81
Carpenter, Colonel.....	h 562
Carr, Dr.....	h 106
Carr, Robert.....	a 1131, 1132
Carr, William G.....	h 697; a 1151, 1158
Carr-Saunders, Alexander.....	a 1140
Carroll, Professor.....	r 81
Carroll, Thomas D.....	a 1229
Carroll, Thomas H.....	h 347
Carruth, Hayden.....	h 351
Carter, A. C.....	h 16
Carter, Edward C.....	h 553, 558-560, 927; a 1228; r 173, 180, 246
Carter Foundation.....	h 16
Carter, Raymond.....	a 1212
Carter, William S.....	h 358
Cartwright, Morse A.....	h 339
Carty, John J.....	h 338
Carver School.....	r 359
Casady, Lauren W.....	a 1230
Case, Clifford P.....	h 350, 351; r 111, 114, 432
Case Study of an Underdeveloped Area.....	a 1073
Casey, Robert J.....	h 927
Casey, William J.....	h 351; a 1235
Caswell, H. L.....	a 1149
Catholic Church.....	h 607; a 947; r 425
Catholic University of America.....	h 231, 244, 723; a 945-947, 1231
Catholic veterans organizations.....	h 29
Catlin, Daniel K.....	h 340
Caucus for Peace (postal card).....	r 323
Cavanaugh, John J.....	h 348
CBS (Columbia Broadcasting System).....	h 40
Censored News (leaflet).....	r 340
Center for International Understanding (Los Angeles).....	h 874

	Page
Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.....	h 672
Central Committee Plenum.....	r 404
Central Conference of American Rabbis.....	a 990
Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.....	a 1236
Central Michigan College.....	a 982
Central Pedagogical Institute.....	r 159
Centralia mine disaster (film).....	r 293
Century Co.....	a 1071, 1236
Century of the Common Man (quote from Hoover speech)....	r 203
Certificate of Incorporation (Peoples Radio Foundation)....	r 319
Chaffin, William H.....	a 1127
Challenge (film).....	r 165
Challenge of Red China (publication).....	a 1216
Challenge of International Communism (speech).....	a 980
Challenge of Isolation, 1937-40 (publication).....	h 884
Challenge of Life Time Learning (publication).....	a 1236
Challenge of Soviet Power (publication).....	r 306
Challenge of Youth (publication).....	r 414
Chamber of Commerce (New York State).....	h 892
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.....	h 495, 920; a 1044; r 158
Chamberlain, Joseph P.....	h 553
Chamberlain, Lawrence H.....	a 1132
Chamberlain, William Henry.....	r 121
Chambers.....	r 287
Chambers, Lawson P.....	a 1232
Chambers, Merritt M.....	a 1235
Champion of Youth (publication).....	h 223; a 1176
Chancellor Hutchins in the Witchhunter's Den (article)....	r 299
Chandler, O. K.....	r 362
Changing Conditions in Public Giving (article).....	a 1235
Changing Times (article).....	a 1240
Channing.....	a 1080
Chapin, W. W.....	h 340, 918
Chapman, John F.....	a 1181
Chapman, Oscar L.....	h 763; a 977
Chappell, Winifred.....	r 298
Character Assassination (book).....	h 39
Character Education in the Soviet Union (publication)....	h 287
Characteristics of the American Negro (publication).....	r 312
Charitable Community Trusts, with Special Reference to New Haven Foundation (article).....	a 1238
Charitable Corporation and the Charitable Trust (article)....	a 1238
Charitable Foundations and Related Matters Under the Reve- nue Act (article).....	a 1238
Charitable Foundations Tax Avoidance and Business Expe- diency (article).....	a 1238
Charitable Trusts for Political Purposes (article).....	a 1238
Charitable Organizations & Federal Taxation (article).....	a 1239
Charles Hayden Foundation.....	h 13, 16; a 1235
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.....	h 16
Charter-Jobs for All (speech).....	h 920
Charters, W. W.....	h 267, 274
Charts.....	h 644-665b



	Page
Chase, Chief Justice	h 640
Chase, Harry Woodburn	h 267, 268, 274, 359
Chase, Stuart	h 74, 132-140, 144, 146-150, 162, 170, 186, 839, 848, 897, 927; a 967, 972; r 85-89, 110, 121, 125, 157, 247-249
Chase National Bank	h 346, 353-355, 358, 920; a 1021, 1127
Chatham House (England)	h 897, 911
Chattanooga Times	r 400, 402, 403
Chedney Press	a 1236
Cheek, Mary A.	a 1041
Chekhov Publishing House	h 348
Chemadanov, V.	r 370
Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering (publication)	h 496
Chen, Stephen	h 929
Cherokee Indian Eastern Band	r 362
Cherrington, Ben M.	h 64, 340, 888, 918
Cherry, H. Dicken	a 1229
Chevrolet Co.	h 373-375
Chicago All-American Anti-Imperialist League	h 222
Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.	h 553
Chicago Committee For the Struggle Against War	h 223
Chicago Congress (Student Congress Against War)	r 255
Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship	r 165
Chicago Council on Foreign Relations	h 555
Chicago Daily News	h 825
Chicago Defender (publication)	r 293
Chicago Maroon (publication)	h 33
Chicago Stock Exchange	h 496
Chicago Sun-Times	h 350; a 1051
Chicago Tribune	h 144; a 1044, 1217
Chicago University	h 19, 32, 33, 36-39, 41, 60-62, 268, 275, 286, 355, 356, 360, 395, 523, 524, 565, 581-583, 672, 674, 675, 694, 701, 703-705, 713, 719-721, 880; a 955, 961, 1009, 1025, 1035, 1036, 1081, 1114, 1115, 1124, 1195, 1196, 1229, 1235; r 11, 37, 80, 81, 83, 133, 135, 155, 158, 163, 255, 299, 301, 318, 351.
Chicago University Law School	a 1132
Chicago University Press	h 395; a 1235
Chicago University Roundtable	h 32, 41, 581
Chicago University Roundtable Broadcasts	r 133
Chicago World Congress Against War	r 318
Children and Families in the Courts of New York City (pub- lication)	a 1219
Children in Concentration Camps (pamphlet)	r 259, 309, 337
Childs, John L.	h 308, 780, 789; a 985, 990, 1174
China (article)	h 319
China Aid Council (American League for Peace and Democ- racy)	r 352, 376
China Aid News (leaflet)	r 289, 301
China Among the Powers (publication)	h 524
China in Revolution (publication)	h 927
China Today (publication)	r 375

	Page
Chinese Eastern Railway.....	h 772
Chinlund, Edwin F.....	a 1181
Choate, Joseph H.....	h 340; a 1057; r 170
Chodorov, Frank.....	a 1238
Christian Century (publication).....	r 243
Christian Socialist Party.....	r 400
Christian Science Monitor (publication).....	a 1059
Christie, Harry I.....	h 257
Christopher, Paul R.....	r 399
Chrysanthemum and the Sword (publication).....	h 929
Chrysler Corporation.....	h 371, 374, 376; r 7
Chudson, Walter A.....	a 1230
Church, Edgar M.....	a 1181
Church, Samuel Harden.....	h 338
Church Peace Union.....	h 679
Churchill, Winston.....	h 595; r 169
CIO (Congress of Industrial Organizations).....	h 553, 767, 776, 778-780, 784, 788, 792, 920; a 977, 984, 1168; r 104, 165, 232, 239, 399, 403, 409.
CIO-PAC.....	r 399
CIO Steelworkers Union.....	r 399
CIO War Relief Committee.....	r 232
Citizen Writer (publication).....	r 345, 348
Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges.....	h 222; a 1171; r 251
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder.....	a 1171, 1176, 1222, 1224; r 267, 289, 291, 354, 392
Citizens Committee for Robert Thompson and Benjamin J. Davis.....	r 358
Citizens Housing and Planning Council.....	a 984
Citizens for a New World (publication).....	h 928; r 173
Citizens Rally (leaflet).....	r 228, 254
Citizens Union.....	r 267
Citizenship Education Project.....	r 120
City Art Museu (St. Louis, Mo.).....	a 1231
City College of New York.....	h 268, 275, 390; a 976, 1041, 1229
City Government of San Francisco.....	r 338
City Manager League of Toledo, Ohio.....	a 1197
Civic Responsibility (article).....	h 318
Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS).....	a 1001
Civil Liberties (article).....	h 306, 318, 320
Civil Liberties Conference Program.....	r 407
Civil Liberties in Maryland Are at Stake (leaflet).....	r 365
Civil Responsibilities (article).....	h 320
Civil Rights Congress.....	h 26; r 266, 270, 271, 278, 283, 284, 302-304, 329, 332-334, 339, 340, 343, 344, 347, 348, 350, 358, 359, 364, 383, 406, 407.
Civil Rights Congress (Los Angeles Chapter).....	r 334
Civil Rights Congress of New York.....	r 278, 332, 345, 347, 350
<i>Civil Service v. Merit</i> (article).....	a 1208
Civil Service at the Crossroads (article).....	a 1208
Cizek, Elizabeth H.....	a 1009
Claessens, August.....	h 766; r 101

	Page
Claffin, William H., Jr.....	h 353
Clague, Ewan.....	a 1235
Clapp, Gordon R.....	h 904
Clapp, James Gordon.....	a 1232
Clapp, Margaret.....	h 340
Clark (See Kimberly-Clark Corp.)	
Clark, Clinton.....	r 505
Clark, Evans.....	h 220, 928; a 1215; r 109, 110, 148, 166, 174, 249
Clark, Gordon H.....	a 1232
Clark, Grover.....	h 927
Clark, Joseph.....	r 388
Clark, Gen. Mark W.....	r 183
Clark, Tom.....	a 1200, 1215, 1216, 1224; r 394, 398
Clark University.....	h 220, 583; r 80
Clarke, C. M.....	a 1238
Clarke, Dwight L.....	h 553
Clarke, John H.....	h 907
Classifications for Surveys of Highly Trained Personnel (publication).....	a 1004
Clausen, Clarence Arthur.....	a 1231
Clayton, Frank L.....	a 1217
Clayton, W. L.....	h 920
Clement, E. W.....	h 926
Clement, Rufus E.....	h 64
Cleve, Felix M.....	a 1232
Cleveland Council on World Affairs.....	h 57
Cleveland Plain Dealer.....	h 42; a 1042
Cleveland Trust Co.....	h 665a
Clevenger, Hon. Cliff.....	h 37
Clinic for the Social Adjustment of Gifted Children (New York University).....	h 275
Clise, Charles F.....	h 553
Clothing (article).....	h 310
Clough, Ernest T.....	a 1181
Clurman, Morton.....	r 63
Cochran, M. Frances.....	a 1009
<i>Cochran v. Commissioner</i> .....	h 432
Coffman, Harold C.....	a 1235
Coffman, Lotus Delta.....	h 338, 343
Cohen, Edward M.....	h 793
Cohen, Felix S.....	h 748, 749; a 980; r 98
Cohen, Louis.....	r 161
Cohen-Portheim, Paul.....	h 927
Cohn, Jack.....	r 161
Cohn, Roy M.....	h 43
Coil, E. J.....	h 779; a 990
Coit, Eleanor G.....	a 1163, 1165
Coldwell, M. J.....	h 783, 784, 791-793; a 977, 984, 991
Cole, Charles W.....	h 350; a 1051
Cole, David L.....	h 340
Cole, Fred C.....	a 1041
Cole, G. D. H.....	h 31, 32, 307; r 92, 93
Cole, Margaret.....	a 985

	Page
Colegrove, Prof. Kenneth	h 242,
	555-599, 874, 876, 926, 929; a 967, 1210, 1211; r 26-28,
	37, 47, 57, 77, 80, 91, 116, 117, 125, 168, 173, 176, 194,
	200, 225.
Colin, Ralph F	h 352
Collected Poems (publication)	r 392
College Art Association of America	a 999
College of Education (University of Illinois)	h 390
College of Education (University of Maryland)	h 390
College de France	a 1139
College Entrance Examination Board	h 681,
	682, 688, 689, 704, 705, 714; a 1081
College of the Holy Names	a 947
College of Letters and Science (University of California)	a 1041
College of Letters and Science (University of Oregon)	a 1041
College of Literature, Science and the Arts (University of Michigan)	a 1129
College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University	r 72
Coolidge, President	a 1063
Coolidge, T. Jefferson	a 1128
College of the City of New York	h 268, 275, 390; a 976, 1041, 1229
Collier, P. F	h 394
Collier & Son Corp	h 394
Colliers (publication)	a 1238, 1241
Collyer, John L	h 348
Colony Trust Company	h 359
Colorado University	h 395
Colorado University Press	h 395
Colum, Padraic	h 927
Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS)	h 40, 386
Columbia University	h 19,
	33, 36, 40, 74, 94, 219, 220, 224, 252-255, 263, 268,
	272-275, 285, 286, 288, 318, 347, 355, 390, 395, 400,
	468, 484, 485, 492, 495, 496, 518, 524, 538, 553, 556,
	572-574, 599, 643, 672, 674, 675, 677, 678, 694, 696,
	697, 700, 701, 703-706, 713, 719-721, 776, 781, 789,
	791, 886, 893, 903, 904, 912, 928, 933, 934, 936, 937,
	941; a 955, 977, 980, 983-985, 990, 993, 996, 1009,
	1033, 1037, 1059, 1081, 1114, 1124, 1127, 1130-1133,
	1139, 1145, 1146, 1148, 1174, 1183, 1184, 1193, 1208,
	1215, 1216, 1218, 1224, 1229-1231; r 21, 42, 51, 60,
	72, 77, 81, 118, 120, 121, 132, 135, 136, 149, 157, 158,
	173, 174, 184, 250, 256, 257, 275, 288, 307, 311, 330-
	333, 335, 366, 372-374.
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons	r 72
Columbia University Law School	a 1131, 1132, 1218; r 68
Columbia University Teachers College	h 33,
	64, 65, 74, 94, 252, 253, 263, 268, 272-275, 285, 286,
	288, 390, 400, 484, 485, 553, 674, 675, 677, 694, 696,
	697, 700, 701, 703-705, 713, 719, 720, 780, 789, 912,
	928, 938; a 1081, 1115, 1144-1146, 1149, 1217, 1230,
	1236; r 120, 121, 149, 157, 173.
Columbia University Press	h 395, 485; a 1236; a 118
Columbia University Russian Institute	h 36,
	886 933 934 936 941 a 1130

	Page
Columbus.....	h 317
Columbus University (Wash., D. C.).....	h 723
Comberbatch, Muriel J.....	a 998
Cominform.....	h 757
Comintern.....	r 404
Coming of the New Party (publication).....	h 492
Commager, Henry Steele.....	r 250
Commentary (publication).....	r 63
Commercial and Financial Chronicle (publication).....	h 496
Commercial and Tariff History and Research in International Economics by Federal Agencies (publication).....	h 891
Commercial Policy for the United Nations (publication).....	h 892
Commission for Academic Freedom.....	r 299
Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.....	h 936
Commission on Financing Higher Education.....	a 113, 1235
Commission on the Freedom of the Press.....	h 902
Commission on Higher Education (Truman).....	r 108
Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training.....	h 809
Commission on Human Rights (United Nations).....	h 67; r 192
Commission on Latin America.....	r 234
Commission on Secondary School Curriculum.....	h 698
Commission on Social Studies.....	h 476, 481, 482, 494, 506, 513, 514, 612; a 974; r 129, 131, 137, 141
Commission on Social Studies (Report of Conclusions and Rec- ommendations).....	r 137
Commission to Study the Organization of the Peace.....	h 74, 874, 890, 891, 893, 911, 912, 916, 917, 928; a 1064
Committee on Africa.....	h 928
Committee to Aid China.....	a 1225, 1228
Committee to Aid the Striking Fleischer Artists.....	a 1170
Committee on Art in American Education and Society (publi- cation).....	h 918
Committee For a Boycott Against Japanese Aggression.....	h 222; a 1216
Committee on Cartels and Monopoly.....	a 1172
Committee for Constitutional Government.....	h 322, 324, 730, 754
Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts.....	r 275
Committee to Defend Alexander Tractenberg.....	r 266
Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War.....	h 322
Committee to Defend V. J. Jerome.....	r 266
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.....	a 1174; r 235, 269, 303, 308, 324, 341, 374, 376, 377, 380, 383
Committee for Economic Development.....	h 47; a 996
Committee on Education (California Legislature).....	h 315, 316; r 154, 155
Committee on Education (National Council of American- Soviet Friendship).....	r 264
Committee for Free Political Advocacy.....	r 344
Committee on Government Statistics and Information Serv- ices.....	r 128
Committee of History and Other Studies in the Schools (Car- negie Corp.).....	h 476
Committee on Intellectual Freedom.....	h 327
Committee on International Economic Policy.....	h 916

- |   | Page  |
|---|---|
| Committee on International Exchange of Persons.....   | a 1162  |
| Committee on International Relations.....   | h 64; r 191   |
| Committee for Israel Amter's Candidacy for President.....   | r 245   |
| Committee on Labor Law and Social Legislation.....  | r 340   |
| Committee for the Nations Health.....   | a 983   |
| Committee of One Hundred and Two Writers and Artists.....   | r 275   |
| Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation.....  | r 276   |
| Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact.....   | r 240,<br>297, 321, 331, 333, 378   |
| Committee on Political Research (American Political Science<br>Association).....                                    | r 131   |
| Committee of Professional Groups for Earl Browder and James<br>W. Ford.....   | r 245, 251, 285, 289  |
| Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born.....   | h 222,<br>223; a 1171, 1173   |
| Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act.....   | r 333   |
| Committee for Research in Problems of Sex (National Re-<br>search Council of the National Academy of Sciences)..... | h 123   |
| Committee to Save Spain and China.....  | h 222   |
| Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.....  | r 262, 387  |
| Committee on Social Studies (American Historical Associa-<br>tion).....   | h 286; r 425  |
| Committee of Trustees on Experimental Programs.....   | h 854; r 47   |
| Committee on Un-American Activities (California).....   | r 116   |
| Committee of Welcome for the Red Dean of Canterbury.....  | r 250   |
| Committee to Win the Peace.....   | r 376   |
| Common Cause (publication).....   | r 162   |
| Commons, John B.....  | a 993   |
| Commonwealth College.....   | a 1169; r 255, 371, 402   |
| Commonwealth Foundation.....  | h 13  |
| Commonwealth Fund.....  | h 16, 854; r 45, 47   |
| Commonwealth or Anarchy (publication).....  | h 928   |
| Communism (article).....  | r 92  |
| Communist (publication).....  | a 1212  |
| Communist District Bureau of Tennessee.....   | r 401   |
| Communist International.....  | h 903;<br>r 234, 239, 245, 249, 254, 256, 257, 259, 293, 315,<br>326, 328, 343, 350, 351, 404.  |
| Communist Labor Party.....  | h 467   |
| Communist Manifesto.....  | h 33, 749   |
| Compass (publication).....  | a 1238  |
| Communist Party.....  | h 17,<br>25-43, 93, 135, 136, 141, 156, 158, 221, 223, 224, 261,<br>271, 288-290, 301, 303, 313, 315, 316, 326, 327, 336,<br>387, 390, 393, 396, 397, 400, 401, 467, 499, 512, 513,<br>517, 535, 536, 538, 557, 561, 562, 576, 606, 762-764,<br>770-773, 782, 790, 838-840, 847, 848, 901-904, 940;<br>a 1035, 1037, 1041, 1157, 1171, 1172, 1174, 1176, 1183,<br>1215, 1216; r 21, 24, 29, 32, 41, 54-57, 87, 89, 92, 93,<br>103, 106, 108-110, 113-115, 118, 119, 121, 127, 131,<br>132, 148, 151-153, 155, 157, 158, 160, 161; 163-165,<br>169, 173-176, 179, 180, 183, 186, 187, 190, 195-205,<br>220, 222, 228, 229, 239, 249, 254, 259, 312, 328, 386,<br>413, 414. |

	Page
Communist Party (Cultural Commission) .....	r 266
Communist Party Workers School .....	h 224; r 237, 247, 268
Communist Party Yearbook (1937) .....	r 293
Communist Workers Bookshop .....	r 312
Communist Youth Ask for Unity (article) .....	r 395
Communist Youth League .....	r 395
Community Chests .....	r 97
Community Chests .....	h 745
Community Church (New York) .....	a 996
Community Planning (article) .....	h 319
Community Trusts—the new look in Charitable Giving (article) .....	a 1237
Company Gifts: Bars Go Down .....	a 1238
Compton, Arthur H. .....	h 343; a 1041, 1148
Compton, F. E. .....	h 394
Compton & Co. .....	h 394
Compton, Karl T. .....	h 346, 347, 353, 359
Compulsory Arbitration (publication) .....	h 927
Comstock, Ada .....	h 286
Conant, James B. .....	h 343, 678, 705; a 1133, 1148
Conant, Kenneth .....	r 157
Conclusions and Recommendations (American Historical Association Report) .....	h 285, 286
Concordia Seminary (St. Louis) .....	r 293
Condliffe, John B. .....	h 888, 891, 892; a 1230
Condon, E. U. .....	h 74
Condon, Edward J. .....	h 352
Cone (See Foote, Cone & Belding.)	
Cone, Fairfax M. .....	a 1043
Conference on Africa (NYC) .....	r 359
Conference on American Policy (article) .....	h 893
Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East .....	r 235
Conference Board of Associated Research Councils .....	h 808; r 53
Conference Board Committee on International Exchange of Persons .....	a 1227
Conference on China and the Far East .....	r 376, 372
Conference on Constitutional Liberties .....	h 222;
	a 1170; r 227, 332, 345, 348, 400, 402
Conference on Democratic Rights (pamphlet) .....	r 323
Conference for Education in the South .....	h 706
Conference on Pan American Democracy .....	a 1170, 1173, 1216;
	r 227, 233, 238, 249, 254, 259, 327, 349, 369, 370, 376
Conference on Peaceful Alternatives .....	r 269
Conference for Progressive Labor Action .....	r 397
Conference to Safeguard the Welfare of Our Children and Our Homes .....	r 382
Conference on World Cooperation and Social Progress in 1951 .....	a 991
Conflict (publication) .....	h 927
Congress (article) .....	h 319
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers .....	r 245, 260, 281, 290
Congress of American Soviet Friendship .....	r 242,
	246, 252, 289, 296, 320, 346, 360, 384
Congress of American Soviet Relations .....	r 269

	Page
Congress of American Women	a 1215; r 175, 264, 381, 383, 384, 408
Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO)	h 553, 767, 776, 778-780, 784, 788, 792, 920; a 977, 984, 1168; r 104, 165, 232, 239, 399, 403, 409; r 104, 165, 232, 239, 399, 403, 409.
Congress for the Peoples for Peace (Vienna)	r 280
Congress of Youth	r 302
Congressional Record	h 29, 30, 88, 92, 152, 235, 289, 305, 468, 480, 500, 628, 643, 840; a 1044, 1238-1240; r 132, 233, 234, 236-238, 241, 242, 245, 246, 248, 249, 260, 267, 271, 272, 275, 277, 281, 282, 286, 291, 295-298, 302, 305, 309, 310, 315, 317-319, 321, 324, 327-329, 336, 351-353, 358, 360, 361, 366, 367, 379, 380, 385, 386, 388, 390, 391, 394, 402, 405-407, 415, 416, 428.
Connecticut Bar Journal	a 1238
Connecticut State Medical Society	a 983
Connecticut University	h 388
Connolly, Cyril	r 189
Conquest of the Past (publication)	h 928
Conrad, Arthur	h 93; a 947
Conservation (article)	h 310, 319
Constitutional Education League	h 322, 324
Constitutional Imperialism in Japan (publication)	h 926
Constructive Philanthropy (publication)	a 1236
Consumers Cooperative Services	h 779; a 990
Consumers National Federation	a 1170, 1172, 1216; r 227, 230, 232, 239, 249, 254, 306, 312, 328, 353, 370, 371
Consumers Union	r 236, 301
Container Corporation of America	h 349
Contemporary American Bourgeois Sociology in the Service of Expansionism (publication)	h 838, 848
"Contribution of Labor in Rebuilding Democratic Society" (conference theme)	r 106
Coolidge, Calvin	h 298
Coolidge, T. Jefferson	h 359
Coombs, Philip H	h 350
Coon, Horace	a 1235
Coons, Alvin E	r 100, 161
Coons, Arthur G	h 553; a 1041
Cooper, James W	a 1238
Cooper, W. Mansfield	a 1219
Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada	h 780, 783, 784, 788, 791, 792
Cooperative Educational Testing Commission	h 688
Cooperative League	a 979
Cooperative Study of General Education (publication)	h 706
Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards (publication)	h 706
Cooperative Test Service	h 674, 682, 686-689, 701, 704, 705, 713
Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo	a 1170, 1172, 1176; r 227, 237, 238, 242, 244, 251, 255, 275, 305-308, 312, 327, 337, 350, 353, 354, 370, 377.



	Page
Copenhaver, Eleanor	a 1170
Copland, Aaron	r 189, 190, 250, 251, 253
Copperfield, David	h 500
Corbett, Percy E.	h 929; r 173
Corey, Lewis	r 93
Cornell Liberal Club	r 99
Cornell University	h 36, 40, 355, 361, 395, 495, 496, 514, 553, 679, 694, 750, 898, 900, 901, 903; a 954, 1055, 1124, 1127, 1130, 1131, 1141, 1148, 1220, 1221, 1230; r 8199, 114, 367
Cornell University Press	h 395
Corner, G. W.	a 1137
Cornish, George	r 9
Coronet (publication)	a 1239
Corporate Director (publication)	h 370, 373; r 7
Corporation (article)	r 92
Corwin, Norman	a 1174
Cory, Ellen	h 927
Cosentini, John Walter	a 1231
Cosmos	h 926
Costello	a 1172
Cotrell	r 49
Coughlin	r 404
Coughlin, Father	h 330
Council on African Affairs	r 242, 268, 358, 361, 384, 385
Council of American Learned Societies	h 369
Council of American-Soviet Friendship	a 1173
Council of American-Soviet Friendship (Chicago)	r 165
Council on Foreign Relations	h 57, 475, 677, 879, 884, 885, 894, 895, 897, 900, 921, 924, 931, 933, 936, 938, 940; a 1030, 1064, 1132, 1133; r 170, 176-178, 181, 182, 184.
Council on the Future of Germany and World Peace (symposium)	r 320
Council for Pan-American Democracy	r 233, 254, 312, 332, 376
Council for Social Action	a 1163
Council on World Affairs	a 1182; r 184
Countryman, Verne	a 1132
Counts, George S.	h 263-266, 268, 273-275, 285-289, 303, 390, 400, 484, 488, 904; a 980, 984, 985, 996, 1145, 1146; r 92, 143, 145, 149, 151-153, 157, 253-258.
Courier-Journal (Louisville, Ky.)	h 347, 349
Courtis, Stuart A.	r 63
Couzens	h 372
Covington & Burling	h 350
Cowles, John	h 346, 376; a 1021
Cowley	a 1145
Cowley, Malcolm	r 189, 190, 258, 262
Cowling, Ellis	h 779; a 990

	Page
Cox, Eugene-----	h 2,
6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26-28, 43, 44, 60, 62,	
75, 79, 82, 92, 93, 167, 187, 189-194, 204, 293, 301,	
304, 305, 366, 471, 472, 510, 701, 703, 721, 840, 880;	
a 950, 959, 1006, 1007, 1038-1040, 1056, 1060, 1069,	
1071, 1077, 1082, 1084, 1095, 1096, 1118, 1120, 1131,	
1134-1136, 1140, 1141, 1210, 1214, 1220; r 1, 2, 11,	
13, 15, 19, 23, 24, 30, 32, 37, 44, 54, 55, 147, 180, 181,	
187, 196, 197, 421, 422.	
Cox Committee-----	h 2,
6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26-28, 43, 44, 60, 75,	
79, 82, 92, 93, 167, 187, 189-194, 204, 293, 301, 304,	
471, 472, 510, 701, 721, 840, 880; a 950, 959, 1006,	
1007, 1038-1040, 1056, 1060, 1071, 1077, 1082, 1084,	
1095, 1096, 1118, 1120, 1131, 1134-1136, 1140, 1141,	
1210, 1214, 1220; r 1, 2, 11, 13, 15, 19, 23, 24, 30, 32,	
37, 44, 54, 55, 147, 180, 181, 187, 196, 197, 421, 422	
Coyne, Robert W-----	h 920
CPUSA-----	a 1037
Craig, B. J-----	h 346, 347
Craighead, Edwin B-----	h 343
Cranbrook Institute of Science-----	a 1241
Crapster, Basil Long-----	a 1229
Craven, Avery O-----	h 286
Crawford, William H-----	h 343; r 399
Creel, George-----	a 1216; r 174
Creighton University-----	a 1229
Cressey, George B-----	h 553
Crisafulli, Alessandro-----	a 1231
Crisis in American and World Resources (speech theme)-----	h 762
Crisis Papers (publication)-----	r 284
Criticism, Social (article)-----	r 92
Crocker, Henry G-----	h 878
Cromwell, Oliver-----	h 565
Cromwell. (See Sullivan & Cromwell.)	
Cronkite. (See Bernice Brown.)	
Cross, Samuel H-----	r 157
Cross Roads in Ireland (publication)-----	h 927
Crouch, Paul-----	r 400, 401, 403
Crowell, Thomas Y-----	h 394
Crowell Co-----	h 394
Crown Zellerbach Corp-----	h 350; a 1051
Cruising the Mediterranean (publication)-----	h 928
Crusoe, L. D-----	h 375, 376
Cubberley-----	a 1145
Cullen Foundation-----	h 16
Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace-----	h 223;
a 1174; r 241, 252, 264, 274, 304, 311, 321, 332, 333,	
341, 342, 347, 349, 380, 385.	
Cultural Commission of the Communist Party, U. S. A-----	r 266
Cultural Workers-----	r 241, 343, 386
Culture Affecting Education (article)-----	h 490
Culture and Crisis (publication)-----	r 258, 289, 303, 393

	Page
Culture and Life (publication).....	h 839, 841, 848
Cumington Story (publication).....	r 164
Cumulative List of Organizations that are Eligible for Tax- Exempt Contributions (publication).....	h 734
Curie, Enid.....	h 131; r 69
Current Digest of the Soviet Press.....	a 1003
Curriculum Problems (publication).....	h 94
Currie, Sir Arthur W.....	h 343
Currie, Lauchlin.....	r 262, 263
Curry, J. L. M.....	h 359
Curt, Merle E.....	h 265
Cushman, Robert E.....	h 898, 901-904; a 1131, 1132, 1221; r 263
Customs Union Issue (study).....	h 887
Cuthbertson, Kenneth E.....	r 204
Cutright, Prudence.....	a 1149
Cvetic, Matthew.....	r 290, 343, 362

## D

Dahling.....	h 346
Daily People's World (publication).....	h 223; r 236, 242, 244, 248, 249, 267, 269-274, 277, 278, 280, 285, 294, 298, 299, 302, 306, 314, 316, 320, 322-324, 334, 338-348, 352, 354, 361, 365, 367, 379, 381, 383, 401, 413
Daily Worker.....	h 39, 223, 224, 903; a 1174, 1212, 1216, 1221; r 165, 228- 238, 244-254, 256-261, 264-281, 283-286, 288-295, 297, 299, 301-305, 308-314, 316-325, 327-333, 335- 350, 352, 354, 362, 365, 369-371, 373-391, 393, 395, 401-406, 411, 413, 415, 428
Dallin, David J.....	a 1216; r 388
Dana, Henry W. L.....	r 158, 198
Danforth Foundation.....	h 16
Daniel, Franz.....	h 751; r 99
Dante.....	a 1168
Darcy, Sam Adams.....	r 252, 310, 330, 340
Darden, Colgate W., Jr.....	h 874
Dare Progressive Education be Progressive (pamphlet).....	h 263
Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order (pamphlet).....	h 262, 285, 484; r 143, 151, 153
Darrow, Clarence S.....	h 220; a 993
Dartmouth College.....	h 353, 354, 360, 395, 941; a 1127
Dartmouth College Press.....	h 395
Darwin.....	a 1168
Das Abendblatt (publication).....	r 409
Dashiell, Lefferts M.....	h 357, 363
Daugherty, D. H.....	a 1009
Daughters of the American Revolution.....	a 1204; r 114, 237, 247, 259
Davenport, Donald H.....	a 990
David, Donald K.....	h 346, 376; a 1021
Davidson, Carter.....	h 343
Davidson, Gert.....	r 161
Davidson, Jo.....	a 1173; r 279

	Page
Davidson, Lillie.....	r 161
Davidson, Thomas.....	h 215
Davies, E. C.....	h 928
Davis, Benjamin J., Jr.....	r 266, 357, 358, 361
Davis, Chester C.....	h 42, 347
Davis, Elmer.....	r 108
Davis, Hallie Flanagan.....	r 189
Davis, Harold T.....	h 582
Davis, Herbert.....	a 1216
Davis, Horace B.....	r 93
Davis, Howard.....	r 9
Davis, J. R.....	h 376
Davis, Jackson.....	h 362, 363
Davis, Jerome.....	h 39, 903; a 1175
Davis, John Mills.....	r 409
Davis, John W.....	h 341, 353, 359, 889; a 1060
Davis, Joseph S.....	h 892
Davis, Malcolm W.....	h 918, 919; a 1238
Davis, Norman H.....	h 341
Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl (law firm).....	h 353, 359; a 965
Davison, Emmett C.....	a 1232, 1233
Day, Edmund E.....	h 286, 358, 363, 514; a 1148
Day, George N.....	r 158
Day, John (publisher).....	h 263, 265, 395
Day After the Revolution (conference theme).....	h 751; r 100
Day Co. (publishers).....	h 263, 265, 395
DeBoer, John J.....	h 34; r 151
DeGarmo. (See Allen, Froude, Hilen & DeGarmo.)	
DeHuszar, George.....	h 193
De Kadt, Jacques.....	a 984
De Kiewiet, C. W.....	a 1009
De la Rue, Sidney.....	h 926
De Madariga, Salvadore.....	h 927; r 173
DeMille, Agnes George.....	r 265
DeTocqueville.....	a 969; h 852
DeToledano, Ralph.....	a 1216
DeVane, William C.....	h 359; a 1041, 1128
DeVoto, Bernard.....	r 266
Dead Reckoning (publication).....	r 245
Deak, Francis.....	h 888
Dean, Arthur H.....	h 343, 552, 553
Dean, Vera Micheles.....	h 74, 874, 882, 883, 897, 901, 928; a 1179, 1180, 1215, 1229; r 175, 176, 264.
Deant, Albert W.....	a 1041
Dearmont, Russell L.....	h 350; a 1051
Declaration of the Rights of Youth.....	r 276
Defense of the Empire (publication).....	h 928
Delano, Frederic A.....	h 341
Delaware State College.....	a 1231
Delaware Univeristy.....	a 1229
Delegates Assembly for Peace.....	r 274

	Page
Delson, Max	a 980
Deming, W. Edwards	a 1025
Democracy (article)	r92
Democracy and Education (publication)	h 265
Democracy and You (publication)	h 397
Democracy Today and Tomorrow (publication)	h 928
Democracy Versus Dictatorship (publication)	h 773
Democratic Manifesto (publication)	h 929
Democratic Party	h 212, 213, 227, 333, 382, 386, 492, 513, 737, 751, 784; r 61, 162, 198, 223, 280, 281, 355, 357.
Democratic Platform Committee	r 280, 355
Democratic Socialism (publication)	h 467, 793
Dennett	h 558; a 1212, 1213
Dennis, Eugene	r 266, 271, 315, 344, 345, 358, 361
Denny, George H.	h 343
Denver Art Museum	a 1231
Denver Post	h 862
Denver University	h 64, 888, 941; a 955
Department of Education (California)	r 165
Department of Education and Research (CIO)	h 784
Department of Secondary School Principals	h 696, 697; r 136
Department of Superintendents (National Education Association)	r 85, 140
Deperon, Paul	h 892
Der Arbeiter (publication)	r 409
Derby, Albert LeForest	h 345
Des Moines Register and Tribune	a 1021
Des Moines University of Lawonomy	h 457, 458
Descartes	h 805
Descendants of the American Revolution	r 237, 247, 259, 308, 370
Design for America (publication)	h 397
Design for Giving	a 1239
Desmond, Alice Curtis	h 927
Deutsch, Albert	h 131; r 71
Deutsch, Monroe	h 255, 257
Dewey, Charles S.	h 920
Dewey, John	h 21, 203, 217-219, 224, 265, 268, 274, 308, 309, 324, 327, 488, 516, 518, 573, 781, 782, 791; a 977, 980, 1145; a 1012; r 45, 117, 149, 156.
Dewey Society	h 21, 46, 309, 388, 390; a 1012; r 45
Dewey, Thomas E.	h 149; a 1045, 1189; r 309, 347
Dewey Laboratory School (University of Chicago)	h 216
Dewhurst, J. Frederick	h 137; r 86
Dickey, Charles D.	h 349
Dickey, John S.	h 353; a 1127
Dickinson, R. L.	h 131; r 68
Dictatorship in the Modern World (publication)	h 928
Dictionary of American Biography	a 1001, 1007
Dies, Hon. Martin	h 40, 135, 904; a 1159, 1169-1172, 1174, 1175, 1220; r 93, 109, 110, 197, 263, 381, 405.

	Page
Dies Committee.....	h 904; a 1159, 1169-1172, 1174, 1175, 1220; r 93, 109, 110, 381
Dies Committee Press Releases.....	r 381
Dies Committee Reports (1944).....	r 93
Dilworth Committee.....	h 315, 318-320, 389; r 154, 155
Dillard, Hardy C.....	h 874
Dillard, James H.....	h 359; a 1235
Dillard University.....	a 1041
Dillingham, Walter F.....	h 552, 553
Dilworth, Nelson.....	h 315, 318-320, 335, 389
Dilworth report.....	h 319, 389
Dimitrov, Georgi.....	r 365
Dinwiddie, Albert B.....	h 343
Diogenes (publication).....	r 189
Diplomatic Immunities and Privileges of Agents and Staff Members of the International Organization (publication)....	h 915
Dirba, Charles.....	r 356
Direction (publication).....	r 286, 346, 391
Directory of Agencies in Intergroup Relations for 1948-1949 (publication).....	r 399
Directory of Fellowship Awards for Years 1917-1950 (publica- tion).....	a 1236
Directory of Social Sciences Research Organizations in Univer- sities and Colleges (publication).....	h 808, 855
Dirksen.....	a 1189
Disarmament (publication).....	h 927; r 173
Discriminations and Preferences in International Trade (publi- cation).....	h 892
Disraeli.....	h 571
District of Columbia Bar.....	h 724
District of Columbia Schools.....	r 362, 363
Dixon, Dean.....	a 1174
Dobb, Maurice.....	h 31, 32; r 92
Doctor Counts is Afraid (editorial).....	r 257
Documentary Film (seminar).....	r 334
Dodd, Norman.....	h 5-81, 89-94, 195, 736, 796, 803, 804, 810, 834, 844; a 1046- 1048.
Dodd, Paul A.....	a 967, 1041
Dodd, William.....	a 1224
Dodd, Mead & Co.....	a 1219
Dodds, Harold W.....	h 343, 353, 359
Dodge, Cleveland H.....	h 341
Dold, Charles C.....	h 351
Dollard, Charles.....	h 132, 135-137, 338-340; a 949, 950, 965, 967, 972; r 46, 51, 82, 85, 86, 89, 120, 140.
Dombrowski, James A.....	r 107, 399-403
Donner Foundation.....	h 16
Dorner, Hannah.....	a 1173
Dorville Corp. (Campus publishing division).....	h 395
Dostoevski (publication).....	r 367
Doubleday Page & Co.....	h 361, 395, 921

	Page
Dougherty	h 297
Douglas, Helen Gahagan	a 996
Douglas, James H., Jr.	h 349
Douglas, Lewis W.	h 353, 359; a 1127, 1128
Douglas, Paul H.	h 220, 227, 231, 239, 242, 243, 492, 763, 781-783, 791; a 977; r 110, 148, 432.
Douglas, Thomas C.	h 763, 764, 793; a 977, 991
Douglass, Harl.	h 697
Down the Tiber and Up to Rome (publication)	h 926
Downes, Olin	a 1174
Dragoicheva, Tsola N.	a 1215; r 175
Drake University	a 1230
Draper, Edgar	a 1149
Dressmakers Union, ILGWU	a 977
Driving a Ford Across Soviet Russia (publication)	h 273
Dubinsky, David	h 309; a 977; r 104
DuBois, W. E. B.	h 34, 35, 74; r 151, 266-274
DuBridge, Lee A.	h 341; a 1219; r 46
Dudley, Tilford E.	h 792
Duffett, W. E.	h 928
Duffy, Irving A.	h 376
Duggan, Stephen P.	h 268, 273, 274, 897; r 157, 159, 412
Duke Foundation	h 13, 16, 366, 367, 377, 440; r 6
Duke University	h 61, 367, 395; a 1230
Duke University Hospital	h 367
Duke University Press	h 395
Duling, G. Harold	a 1238
Dulles, Allen W.	h 928; a 1133
Dulles, John Foster	h 57, 341, 353, 357, 359, 362, 889, 918; a 1044, 1057, 1084; r 24.
Dumbarton Oaks Conference	h 886, 890, 916-918
DuMont Broadcasting Co.	h 386
Duncan, Charles T.	h 351
Dunford House Association	h 909
Dunjee, Roscoe	r 266
Dunn, Frederick S.	h 341, 874, 928
Dun's Review	a 1239
DuPont Co.	h 375
Durrell ( <i>see also</i> Smith & Durrell)	h 395
Dutcher, George Matthew	h 926
Dutton, E. P.	h 395
Dutton, William S.	a 1238
Dutton & Co.	h 395

## E

E in UNESCO (pamphlet)	h 379
Eagan, Leo	r 4, 30
Earle, Ken	h 725-793; a 976, 978, 985, 986, 989-998; r 96, 99-103, 105
Early Days of Christian Socialism in America (publication)	r 400
East Asian Institute (Columbia University)	h 553

	Page
East European Fund, Inc. . . . .	h 36, 50, 346; a 1027, 1036, 1047; r 24, 47
East Indies (article) . . . . .	h 319
East and West Association . . . . .	r 408
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians . . . . .	r 362
Eastern Illinois State Normal School . . . . .	h 94
Easton, Charles L. S. . . . .	h 265
Easton, Stewart C. . . . .	a 1229
Eaton, Berrien . . . . .	a 1238
Eberlein . . . . .	h 926
Eberstadt, Ferdinand . . . . .	r 9
Economic Bases of Peace (publication) . . . . .	h 928
Economic and Financial Organization of the League of Nations (publication) . . . . .	h 915
Economic and Financial Problems (study) . . . . .	r 177
Economic Geiger Counters (editorial) . . . . .	h 849
Economic Imperialism (publication) . . . . .	h 926
Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States (publication) . . . . .	h 573
Economic Organization of Welfare (publication) . . . . .	h 890
Economics and the Public Interest (study) . . . . .	h 19, 51, 625; a 1079
Economic Relations With the U. S. S. R. (pamphlet) . . . . .	h 891
Economic Rivalries in China (publication) . . . . .	h 927
Economic and Social Council (United Nations) . . . . .	h 67, 71, 769
Economic and Social History of the World War . . . . .	a 1058
Economic Trends and the New Deal in the Caribbean (pam- phlet) . . . . .	r 380
Economics in One Lesson (publication) . . . . .	r 122
Economics and the Public Interest (report) . . . . .	r 132
Economy of Abundance (publication) . . . . .	h 134
Economy Co. . . . .	h 394
Edelson, Louise M. . . . .	r 161
Edison . . . . .	a 1168
Edison, Thomas . . . . .	r 203
Editorial Committee ("Soviet Summer") . . . . .	r 160
Editorial Council of Equality . . . . .	r 345
Editorial Research Reports . . . . .	a 1240
Edman, Irwin . . . . .	h 309; a 1009; r 189, 274, 275
Edmondson, J. B. . . . .	a 1148
Edsall, David L. . . . .	h 354
Educating for the Abolition of Want (speech) . . . . .	h 780
Educating for Tomorrow (publication) . . . . .	h 488
Education and the Social Order (publication) . . . . .	h 308
Education, History (article) . . . . .	r 92
Education for International Understanding in American Schools (publication) . . . . .	a 967, 970; r 191
Education for the New America (publication) . . . . .	h 35; r 141
Education for Tomorrow (publication) . . . . .	h 516
Education for a World Society (publication) . . . . .	h 390
Education in Haiti (pamphlet) . . . . .	h 619
Education Through Indoctrination (pamphlet) . . . . .	h 263
Educational Exchange (United States Advisory Commission) . . . . .	r 108
Educational Foundations and Progress (article) . . . . .	a 1239
Educational Foundations and the Quality of Higher Education (article) . . . . .	a 1239



	Page
Educational Institute of Scotland.....	h 74
Educational Policies Commission.....	h 74, 697; a 1147
Educational Record (publication).....	a 1237, 1238
Educational Records Bureau.....	h 674, 688, 701, 704, 705, 713
Educational Research Department (Teachers College).....	r 149
Educational and Social Planning in the Soviet Union (article).....	r 255
Educational Testing Service.....	h 705
Educational Yearbook.....	a 1146
Educator, The New Deal, and Revolution (article).....	h 487; r 145
Edward L. Bernays Foundation.....	r 88
Edwards, Joel.....	a 1238
Edwards, Marvin Louis.....	a 1229
Edwards, Violet.....	r 408
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children.....	h 16
Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services (publication).....	h 473
Egerton, J.....	r 263
Egghead Clutch on the Foundations (article).....	h 222; r 114, 202
Eichelberger, Clark M.....	h 881,
890, 917, 918, 927; a 984; r 173, 275, 276, 277	
(Eichelberger) Commission To Study the Organization of the Peace.....	h 74
Eiges, Helen.....	r 161
Eiges, Herberg.....	r 161
Eight-Year Study (publication).....	h 706
Eighth American Scientific Congress.....	h 912
Eisenhauer, Alice.....	r 263
Eisenhower, Dwight D.....	h 152,
243, 341, 343, 380, 381, 512, 643, 766, 940; a 987, 1015,	
1043, 1052, 1057, 1061, 1079, 1081, 1130, 1148, 1158,	
1204, 1208; r 132, 133, 195.	
Eisenhower, Milton S.....	h 348
Eisler, Gerhart.....	h 223; r 266, 339, 345, 358
Eisler, Hanns.....	a 1165; r 108, 190, 250, 253, 261, 301, 309, 383
Eisler, Robert.....	r 93
El Pomar Foundation.....	h 16
Eldridge. (See Hinds, Hayden & Eldridge.)	
Electronized Chemical Corp.....	h 553
Eleven Communist leaders.....	r 373
Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps (Reader's Digest article).....	h 408
Eliot, Charles W.....	h 341, 343, 352, 354, 359; a 1071
Eller, Edouard D.....	h 363
Elliott, Edward C.....	h 343
Elliott, Edward D.....	a 1235
Ellis. (See Wilbur-Ellis Co.)	
Ellis, Albert.....	h 130; r 71
Ellis, Howard.....	h 940; a 1230
Ellis, M. H.....	h 926
Ellsworth, Paul Theo.....	a 1230
Elmore, James.....	r 405
Elting and Gossett.....	h 33
Embree, Edwin R.....	h 357; a 1238
Emeny, Brooks.....	h 553, 874, 897; a 1177, 1181

	Page
Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.....	r 277, 322
Emerson.....	a 1168
Emerson, Rupert.....	h 553
Emerson, Thomas I.....	h 39
Emory University.....	a 955, 1041, 1124
Empire in the World (publication).....	h 928
Emporia Gazette.....	h 356
Encyclopedia Americana.....	h 394
Encyclopedia Britannica.....	h 308, 394; r 164
Encyclopedia of Social Sciences.....	h 31,
	33, 894; a 1236; r 49, 92, 93, 198
End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace (pamphlet).....	r 269, 331
Endowments and Foundations (publication).....	a 1236
Engels.....	r 129, 414
England, the Unknown Isle (publication).....	h 927
Engle-Janosi, Friedrich.....	h 244
Episcopal Academy in Virginia.....	a 969
Epstein, Abraham.....	h 220
Epstein, Henrietta.....	h 777, 778; a 990
Equal Access to Health (article).....	h 614, 615
Equal Justice (publication).....	r 260
Equal Rights for Negroes in the Arts, Sciences, and Profes- sions (conference).....	r 279
Equality (publication).....	r 345, 348
Equitable Life Assurance Society.....	h 355, 361
Escher, Franklin.....	h 927
Espionage Act.....	r 409
Essex, Martin.....	a 992
Essex County jail (New Jersey).....	r 229
Estate Planning in a Changing World (publication).....	h 186
Ethnogeographic Board.....	a 1226
Ethridge, Mark.....	h 347; a 1021
Etting.....	r 121
Ettinger, Karl E.....	a 1183, 1193
Euclid.....	h 142
Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation.....	r 10
Eurich, Alvin C.....	h 349
Europe Today (Dinner-Forum).....	r 305, 318, 377, 378
Europe and the U. S. (publication).....	h 901
European Advisory Commission.....	h 886
European Summer (publication).....	h 928
Evans, Lawton B.....	h 341
Evans, Melbourne G.....	a 1232
Evans, Roger.....	h 538, 540; r 28
Evening Moscow (publication).....	r 253
Evening Star (Washington).....	r 243,
	270, 274, 278, 283, 322, 323, 325, 344, 350, 383
Everett, Samuel.....	h 390; a 1149
Every Man's United Nations, a Ready Reference to the Struc- ture and Functions of the Work of the United Nations and Its Related Agencies (pamphlet).....	h 385
Evolution of the Philanthropic Foundation (article).....	a 1238
Ewert.....	h 903

	Page
Ewing, Oscar R.-----	h 308, 757; a 995
Executive Order No. 10450-----	h 434;
r 237-239, 242, 243, 246, 248, 268-271, 279, 283, 284,	
288, 305, 310, 324, 329, 334, 352, 353, 366, 373, 414,	
416.	
Existentialism the Philosophy of Decadence (publication)-----	a 1194;
r 76	
Exiled Writers Committee (League of American Writers)-----	r 248,
305, 318, 375, 377, 378	
Experience in International Administration (publication)-----	a 1241
Experiment in the Eradication (publication)-----	a 1073
Exploitation (article)-----	r 92
Export Policy (publication)-----	h 892
Express to Hindustan (publication)-----	h 926

## F

Fabian News (publication)-----	h 215
Fabian Party (Canada)-----	h 788
Fabian Publications, Ltd-----	h 308
Fabian tract No. 288-----	h 308
Fabian Society-----	h 31, 46,
202, 205, 214, 215, 221, 245, 307, 319, 573; a 984, 985	
Fabian Socialists-----	h 236-237, 297,
307, 319, 393; r 57, 117, 132, 148, 155, 156, 426, 430	
Fabianism (article)-----	r 92
Fabianism in Great Britain (publication)-----	r 148, 155
Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain (publication)-----	h 215,
243, 244; a 946, 947	
Fabulous Ford Foundation (article)-----	a 1239
Fackenthal, Frank D-----	h 309
Facts Forum-----	h 52, 53, 54, 137, 185, 725
Facts Forum broadcasts-----	r 133, 174
Facts Forum News (publication)-----	r 174
Faculty Research Fellowships (SSRC pamphlet)-----	r 61
Fads and Delusions in Modern Sociology, Psychology, Psy-	
chiatry, and Cultural Anthropology (publication)-----	r 78
Fahs, Charles B-----	h 358, 561; r 201
Fainsod, Merle-----	h 347
Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC)-----	r 101
Fair Labor Standards Act-----	a 1206
Fairbank, John K-----	h 553
Fairchild, Henry P-----	h 488, 516; a 1174, 1216; r 277-281
Fairman, Charles-----	h 874
Falconer, Sir Robert-----	h 343
Falk, I. S-----	h 777; a 985, 990
Falk, Laura-----	h 16, 854; r 45, 47
Falk, Maurice-----	h 16, 854; r 45, 47
Falk Foundation-----	h 16, 854; r 45, 47
Fall-----	h 297
Falnes, Oscar J-----	a 1231
Family Foundation (article)-----	a 1239
Family Life (article)-----	h 320
Family of Nations (publication)-----	h 928

	Page
Far East Spotlight (publication) ..	r 235, 236, 269, 308, 376, 379, 380
Far Eastern Affairs (publication) ..	h 524
Far Eastern Association ..	a 999
Far Eastern International Relations (publication) ..	h 927
Far Horizons (publication) ..	h 927
Farmer, James ..	a 979, 982, 983
Farmer-Labor Party ..	h 790, 791; a 1163
Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America ..	r 405
Farmers Union ..	r 187
Faris, Ellsworth ..	a 1235
Farrand, Livingston ..	h 343; a 1220
Farrar Straus & Co., Inc ..	h 395
Farrell, James T ..	r 189, 281, 282
Farrell, John T ..	h 244
Facism, Colonialism, and World Peace (speech) ..	r 385
Facism and National Socialism (publication) ..	h 928
Facist Central Bureau ..	r 396
Facist Goat Glands for Capitalism (article) ..	h 744
Fascist Party ..	h 222,
	223, 308, 330, 335, 382, 504, 604, 744, 746, 762, 771,
	773, 788, 847; r 21, 87, 98, 220, 240, 251, 259, 265,
	276, 318, 326, 329, 332, 333, 335, 344, 347, 348, 351-
	353, 357, 374, 380, 396, 398, 412.
Fast, Howard ..	h 33; r 121, 282, 283, 284, 285, 297, 356
Faulkner, Ray Nelsen ..	a 1231
<i>Faulkner v. Commissioner</i> (case) ..	h 433
Faust, Dr ..	h 111
Faust, C. H. ..	h 348, 349; a 1238
Fearing, Kenneth ..	r 245, 285-287
Federal Council of Churches ..	a 990; r 432
Federal Council of Churches of Christ ..	a 1156, 1235
Federal Government and You (publication) ..	h 397
Federal Loyal-Security Program (study) ..	a 1132
Federalist (publication) ..	h 593, 928
Federation for the Repeal of the Levering Act ..	h 390
Feinberg, Israel ..	h 762; a 995
Fellows of the Social Science Research Council 1925-1951 (publication) ..	r 62
Fellowship (publication) ..	r 397
Fellowship of Reconciliation ..	r 187, 397-399, 412
"Fellowships and Grants" (SSRC pamphlets) ..	r 61
Fels, Samuel S ..	h 16
Fels Fund ..	h 16
FEPC (Fair Employment Practices Commission) ..	r 101
Ferguson, Francis ..	r 189
Fergusson, Erna ..	h 928
Ferguson, Homer ..	h 552; a 1200
Ferry, Frederick C ..	h 343
Ferry, W. H. ..	h 351; r 189
Few of the One Hundred and Eighty-One Who Have Led Groups Served by the Open Road (publication) ..	r 313
Field, Frederick V ..	h 560; a 1222, 1224, 1225; r 408
Field, Marshall ..	h 16, 28, 471, 472; r 54

	Page
Field Enterprises, Inc.....	h 394
Field Foundation.....	h 16, 28, 471
Fields.....	h 903
Fields of Wonder (publication).....	r 297
Fifteen Facts on the Proposed British Loan (publication).....	h 920
Fifteen Million Dollars to Study Peace (article).....	a 1238
Fight (publication).....	r 228, 230, 231, 258, 298, 376, 377
Fight War (pamphlet).....	r 318
Filene, Edward H.....	r 109
Film Audiences For Democracy.....	h 222; r 371
Film Audiences for Democracy (Advisory Board).....	r 305, 306, 308
Film Council of America.....	r 166
Film Survey (publication).....	r 305, 308, 371
Films for Democracy (publication).....	r 308, 371
Financing of International Administration (publication).....	h 915
Finch, George A.....	h 341, 873, 878, 881, 887, 888, 890, 918
Fine Arts in Philanthropy (publication).....	a 1236
Finer, Herman.....	h 33, 929; a 1140
Finkelstein, Maurice.....	a 1238
Finkelstein, Moses.....	h 42
Finley, Professor.....	h 42
Finley, Moses (Finkelstein).....	a 1041, 1042
Finnegan, Richard.....	h 350; a 1051
Finney General Hospital (Thomasville, Ga.).....	h 920
Firestone Foundation.....	h 16
Firing Line (newsletter).....	h 40
First American Delegation to U. S. S. R.....	r 247
First American Writers Congress (Mecca Temple, NYC).....	r 281
First Boston Corp.....	h 351
First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American People of the United States.....	r 370
First Kinsey book.....	r 71
"First of May" (song).....	r 190, 253
First Russian Seminar and Near East Cruise (1933).....	r 157, 158
First United States Congress Against War.....	r 318, 351, 353, 398
Fischer, George.....	h 348
Fish Committee.....	r 229
Fisher, G. W.....	h 553
Fisher, Helen.....	h 751; r 99
Fisher, John.....	r 161
Fisher, Joseph L.....	h 352
Fitch, John A.....	r 93
Flanagan, Hallie F.....	h 268, 275
Flannigan.....	h 218
Fleischman, Max C.....	h 16
Fleischman Foundation.....	h 16
Fleming, Frank.....	h 74
Fletcher, Arnold Charles.....	a 1229
Fletcher, C. Scott.....	h 348, 349
Flexner, Abraham.....	h 62, 98, 101, 250, 252, 287, 345, 359, 363; a 950, 955, 1145, 1196, 1235, 1238; r 44.
Flexner, Simon.....	h 354

	Page
Flick, Friedreich	r 119
Flood, Hon. Daniel J	h 37
Florinsky, Michael T	h 928
Flower, B. O	h 220
Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley	h 224; r 373
Flynn, John T	h 731; r 121, 122
Flynn, Kathleen T	a 1009
Flynn, Leone	h 402
Foley, William	h 329
Folger, J. Clifford	h 891
Folkways (publication)	a 972; r 83
Follett, Helen	h 929
Food and Agriculture Organization	a 1103; h 66, 67, 71
Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America	r 406
Foote, Cone & Belding	a 1043
For a New Africa (pamphlet)	r 359, 384, 385
For the Rescue of Refugees (publication)	r 309, 335
For the Right to Liberty (article)	h 320
For This We Fought (publication)	h 134
Forbes, Rose D	h 429
Forbes, Rosita	h 927
Forced Labor in the Soviet Union (publication)	r 388
Forces Affecting American Education (publication)	h 489, 490, 494
Ford, Benson	h 346, 376; a 1021, 1023
Ford, Edsel	h 346, 347; a 1021
Ford, Guy Stanton	h 286, 928; a 975
Ford, Henry	h 25, 40, 101, 249, 250, 372, 375, 586, 848; a 1021; r 27, 116, 167
Ford, Henry II	h 39, 250, 346, 347, 376; a 1021, 1039
Ford, James W	r 245, 251, 258, 285, 289, 303, 393
Ford, William C	h 376
Ford Behavioral Science Foundation	h 36, 481; r 24, 46, 49, 50, 81, 82
Ford East European Fund	r 24, 47
Foreign Economic Administration	r 263
Ford estates	r 7
Ford family	r 7, 9, 10
Ford Foundation	h 2, 13, 16, 18, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 36, 38-43, 50, 54, 93, 96, 97, 104-106, 108, 212, 246, 250, 333, 336, 337, 346, 363, 370, 372, 375, 376, 379-381, 384, 400, 401, 459, 474, 480, 481, 519, 549, 732, 840, 854; a 1103, 1016-1018, 1021, 1023-1027, 1029-1036, 1038-1050, 1052, 1053, 1055; 1119, 1156, 1168, 1183, 1197, 1204, 1227, 1229, 1230, 1235, 1238, 1239, 1241; r 4, 6, 7, 21, 23-28, 31-33, 41, 45, 46, 48, 59, 81, 94, 107, 111-114, 116, 123, 156, 161, 162, 169, 170, 176, 177, 186-189, 226, 299, 300, 426.
Ford Foundation (breakdown chart)	r 24
Ford Foundation Arkansas Experiment	a 1238
Ford Foundation Reports	h 42, 375; r 25
Fund for Adult Education (Ford)	r 52, 53, 107, 108, 162, 164, 166, 176

	Page
Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education.....	h 584;
	r 23, 27, 38, 127, 161, 162, 166, 167
Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education (Advisory Com- mittee).....	r 23, 38, 162
Ford Institutional Exchange Program.....	r 24
Ford Millions for Education (article).....	a 1237
Ford Motor Company.....	h 39, 41, 42, 346, 370-377; a 1021; r 6, 7, 111
Ford's New Venture (article).....	a 1238
Foreign Policy Association.....	h 36,
	57, 74, 475, 553, 874, 877, 879, 881-884, 894, 895, 897,
	900, 901, 921, 924, 931, 933, 941; a 1036, 1037, 1064,
	1133, 1156, 1176, 1177, 1179-1182, 1215, 1229; r 170,
	171, 174-176, 182, 184, 235.
Foreign Policy Bulletin.....	a 1179; r 174
Foreign Trade (article).....	h 319
Foreman, Clark Howell.....	r 401
Forging A New China (publication).....	h 901
Foresman, Scott.....	h 394
Foresman & Co.....	h 394
Form 990 A.....	r 214
Formal Grammar as a Discipline (publication).....	h 94
Formation of the Communist Party, 1919-1921 (article).....	r 414
Forest, Wilbur.....	r 9
Forstall, James J.....	h 433
Forsyth, Margaret.....	r 298
Fortnightly (publication).....	a 1239, 1241; r 371, 402
Fortune (publication).....	a 983, 1239; r 363
Fortunes, Private, Modern Period (article).....	r 92
Forty-five years of the Carnegie Foundation (publication).....	a 1236
Forty Years of Carnegie Giving (publication).....	h 669; a 1236
Forty Years of Education (publication).....	h 308, 793
Forty Years of Social Work Leadership (article).....	a 1238
Forward March of American Labor (publication).....	h 781,
	791; a 981, 988, 997
Fosdick, Harry Emerson.....	h 354
Fosdick, Raymond B.....	h 136,
	354, 360, 362, 669, 879, 880, 893, 896, 919, 942; a 1073,
	1082, 1084, 1090, 1117, 1130, 1140, 1235; r 19, 20, 30,
	32, 88.
Foss, Martin.....	a 1232
Foster.....	r 258, 393
Foster, Arthur William.....	h 341
Foster, Bill.....	r 361
Foster, John W.....	h 341; a 1057, 1200, 1023
Foster, William Z.....	r 258, 271, 303, 315, 325, 357, 414
Foundation for Economic Education.....	a 997
Foundation for Foreign Affairs.....	a 1241
Foundation: Its Place in American Life (publication).....	a 1236; r 30
Foundation Program and Public School Finance (article).....	a 1240
Foundation Racket (article).....	a 1239
Foundations and Endowments in Relation to Research (pub- lication).....	a 1236

	Page
Foundations for Health (article).....	a 1238
Foundations, a modern Maecenas (article).....	a 1237
Foundations and Public Service (article).....	a 1238
Foundations and Their Support of Scholarly Publishing (article).....	a 1239
Foundations on Trial (article).....	a 1238
Four-H Clubs.....	h 881
Fourth American Writers Congress.....	r 341, 346
Fourth Annual Conference (American Youth Conference).....	r 276
Fowler, Codey.....	r 185
Fox, Austen G.....	h 341
Fox, Bertrand.....	a 1025
Fox, Dixon Ryan.....	h 343
Fox, G.....	a 1181
Fox & Co.....	a 1181
Fox, Mary.....	h 220
Fraekel, Osmond K.....	h 39
Frame, Donald Murdoch.....	a 1231
France (New Plans for Education) publication.....	h 397
France, Short History (publication).....	h 929
Francis, Clarence.....	h 348; a 1028
Franck, Peter Goswyn.....	a 1230
Franco.....	r 321, 333, 345, 374, 385
Frankenberg, Lloyd.....	r 309
Frankenstein, Alfred V.....	a 1231
Frankfort University.....	h 31; r 92
Frankfurter, Alfred M.....	r 189
Frankfurter, Felix.....	h 309; a 1232
Franklin, Benjamin.....	h 805, 846, 859
Franklin, Francis.....	a 1175
Franklin Institute (Philadelphia).....	h 845
Franks, Robert A.....	h 338, 339, 341, 343, 345
Franzwa, Elmer.....	h 379; r 188
Fraser, Alexander.....	h 348
Fraser, Leon.....	h 341, 891
Fratres, Corda.....	h 876
Frazar & Hansen Import-Export Co.....	h 553
Frazer, Keener C.....	h 874
Frazier, Lynn J.....	a 1175
Frazier, Bill.....	r 186
Fred, Edwin B.....	h 343
Free, Henry John.....	a 1229
Free Cedric Belfrage (handbill).....	r 280
Freedom in an Age of Danger (broadcast).....	h 33
Freedom Crusade (Civil Rights Congress).....	r 270, 343, 383
Freedom, Culture, and Social Planning, and Leadership (pam- phlet).....	h 263
Freedom From Want (pamphlet).....	h 779; a 989, 997
Freedom of Speech and of the Press (article).....	r 93
Freedom and the Welfare State (publication).....	r 100, 103
Freedom and the Welfare State Today (symposium).....	h 308, 755, 756, 762, 773



	Page
Freedom's Charter, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (publication)-----	h 884
Freedom's Choice, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (publication)-----	r 176
Freegood, Anne G-----	r 70
Freeland, Ronald-----	h 351
Freeman, David F-----	h 350, 351
Freeman, Douglas S-----	h 341, 354, 360
Freeman, Edwin Ruthven-----	a 1229
French, Mrs. John-----	a 1181
French Canadian Outlook (publication)-----	h 929
Frew, William N-----	h 338
Frey, John P-----	r 403
Freyre, Gilberto-----	b 929
Frick, Henry Clay-----	h 16
Frick Educational Commission-----	h 16
Friedman, Robert-----	r 322, 323, 343
Friedman, Samuel H-----	a 1165
Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade-----	r 251, 261, 292, 337
Friends Committee on National Legislation-----	r 187
Friends of Democracy-----	a 1173
Freedom and Welfare State-----	a 994, 995
Friends of the Public Schools-----	h 322, 324, 326
Friends Service Committee (Philadelphia)-----	r 302
Friends of the Soviet Union-----	h 222;
	a 1175; r 235, 247, 248, 256, 259, 317, 330, 377
Frisch, Rabbi Ephraim-----	a 990
Frissell, Hollis B-----	h 360
Fritchey, Clayton-----	a 1181
Frontier Films-----	a 1172;
	r 230, 232, 238, 251, 259, 327, 332, 333, 336, 345, 370
Frontiers of Democracy (publication)-----	h 468; r 146, 168
Froude ( <i>See</i> Allen, Froude, Hilen & DeGarmo.)	
Fruit of an Impulse—45 Years of Carnegie Foundation—1905—1950 (Publication)-----	h 378, 669, 680; a 1236
Fruits of Philanthropy (article)-----	a 1240
Fry, Varian-----	h 928
Fuchs, Klaus-----	r 56
Fulbright, Senator-----	a 1059, 1157
Fuller, Richard E-----	h 553
Fulton, William-----	a 1238
Funaroff, S-----	r 392
Fund for Adult Education (Ford)-----	h 41, 346,
	349, 379, 883; a 1027, 1028, 1040, 1236
Fund for the Advancement of Education-----	h 96, 98-
	100, 103, 106, 107, 109, 346, 349, 350, 480; a 1027, 1028, 1041, 1042, 1048.
Fund for American Leadership, Inc-----	h 197
Fun For The People (show)-----	r 365
Fund for the Republic, Inc-----	h 346, 350;
	a 1027, 1031, 1040, 1050, 1051, 1053, 1054, 1055; r 24, 111, 114, 116, 198.

	Page
Funds and Foundations (publication).....	h 62; a 1235, 1239; r 44
Funk and Wagnall.....	a 978, 1236
Furth, J. Herbert.....	a 1230
Furst, Clyde.....	h 345
Future, Inc.....	h 351
Future Supply of Human Resources (article).....	a 1239

## G

Gadler, Steve.....	r 293
Gailmor, William S.....	a 1174
Gaines, Francis Pendleton.....	h 341
Gaither, H. Rowan.....	h 38, 346, 347, 376; a 1016, 1039; r 46
Gale, Samuel C.....	a 1043
Galio, John.....	r 161
Gallaghan, Edward F.....	r 399
Galloway, George.....	h 567, 569
Gallup, Dr.....	h 148-150
Gallup poll.....	h 148, 149; r 61
Gamble, Charles K.....	h 553
Gamble, Ted R.....	h 920
Gambs, John S.....	h 265
Gardner, John.....	h 137, 338-340, 527; a 965; r 34, 86
Garett, Garet.....	a 1036; h 36
Garfield.....	a 1220
Garfinckel, Julius.....	a 1232
Garfinckel Co.....	a 1232
Garland Fund.....	h 223,
	399, 400, 457, 458, 471; r 54, 197, 201, 229, 247,
	395, 396
Garside, Charles.....	h 351
Gasser, Gerbert S.....	h 354; r 9
Gates, Mr.....	r 30
Gates, "Bet a Million".....	h 769
Gates, Frederisk T.....	h 354, 360, 362
Gates, Johnny.....	r 361
Gates Papers.....	r 30
Gatti, Allen.....	h 929
Gaylord, Robert M.....	h 891
Gebhart, Paul H.....	h 123
Geddes, Donald Porter.....	h 131
Gellhorn, Walter.....	h 28, 40, 898, 903; a 1131, 1132, 1218, 1219, 1222
General American Investors Co., Inc.....	h 347
General Corporation Act of Michigan.....	a 1049
General Education Board (Rockefeller Foundation).....	h 16,
	34-36, 104, 119, 226, 250, 251, 287, 337, 353-356, 359-
	361, 400, 474, 475, 525, 546, 548, 668, 669, 672, 677,
	690-693, 697, 702, 706, 710-713, 716, 718-721, 854,
	939, 1066-1075, 1083, 1084, 1094-1096, 1099-1101,
	1107-1110, 1113, 1122, 1127, 1128, 1141, 1144-1149.
General Electric Co.....	h 98,
	349, 357, 362; a 979, 1021, 1044, 1136
General Foods Corp.....	a 1028, 1043
General International Organization—Its Framework and Functions (publication).....	h 890

	Page
General Mills	h 98; a 1943, 1044
General Motors (GM)	h 98, 370, 371, 374-376; a 989, 1044; r 7
Gearhart, Bertrand	r 351
Gearing, Kenneth	r 190
Geddes, Donald Porter	r 69
Gelders, Joseph S.	r 400
Gellhorn, Walter	r 288
General Education Board (Rockefeller)	r 47, 52, 59, 136, 149, 154, 156
General Education Board Annual Report, 1940 (Rockefeller)	r 154, 198
George Washington Carver School	r 359
George Washington University	h 590, 723
Georgetown University	h 729; a 1055, 1229
Georgetown University Law School	h 729
Gerbode, Martha A.	h 553
Gerhard, Wm. Arthur	a 1232
German-American Bund	h 330
Germany Is Our Problem (publication)	h 929; a 1216
Gerschenkron, Alexander	h 891
Gerson, Simon W.	r 240, 258, 267, 275, 327, 343, 370
Gerth, Donald Rogers	a 1229
Gettysburg College	a 1229
Getz Bros.	h 553
Ghaller, L. O.	r 161
Ghosh, Suprakas	a 1229
Giannini Foundation	a 1238
Gideonse, Dr. Harry D.	a 1217
Gifford, Walter S.	h 349, 354, 360
Gilbert, Walter M.	h 345
Gilchrist, Huntington	h 920
Gildersleeve, Virginia C.	h 917, 919
Gillette, H. Malcolm	h 357, 363
Gilliat	a 1228
Gillman, Charles	r 399
Gilman, Charlotte Perkins	h 220
Gilman, Daniel C.	h 360
Gilmore, Eugene A.	h 343; a 1230
Gimbel, Dwight S.	a 1174
Ginn & Co. (Boston)	h 394
Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank (Philadelphia)	h 356; a 1127
Gitlow, Benjamin	r 248, 256
Givens, Willard E.	h 35, 74, 385, 405, 409, 482; r 141
Gladieux, Anna Cook	a 1204
Gladieux, Bernard Louis	h 36, 37, 38; a 1038, 1197, 1198, 1204, 1238
Gladieux, Mrs. Bernard L.	a 1205, 1209
Gladieux, Victor Modest	a 1204
Gladstone	h 571
Glasser, Carrie	h 747
Glasser, Harold	r 197, 287, 288
Glazer, Joseph	a 981, 988
Glazer, Nathan	h 162

	Page
Gleason, William Everett.....	h 884
Glebov's History of Russian Music.....	a 1003
Gleickman, H. H.....	r 161
Glenn, John M.....	a 1236, 1238
Glueck, Eleanor.....	h 175
Glueck, Sheldon.....	h 175
GM (General Motors).....	h 98, 370, 371, 374-376; a 989, 1044
Godfrey M. Hyams Trust.....	h 16
Godkin Lectures.....	a 970
Goebbels.....	r 322
Goerring, Hermann.....	r 119
Goetz, Delia.....	h 897
Goff, Mr.....	a 1175
Gold, Ben.....	r 356
Gold and Prices (publication).....	h 639
Golden, Clinton S.....	h 348
Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union.....	h 222; a 1171, 1215; r 175, 260, 264, 269, 290, 304, 312, 327, 331, 333, 391.
Golden Rule Foundation.....	a 1236
Goldner, Werner Ernst.....	a 1229
Goldsmith, Robert.....	h 926
Goldsmith Memorial Award.....	a 1219
Goldthorpe, John H.....	a 1236
Golos, Jacob.....	r 287, 356
Gomme, A. W.....	h 929
Good Earth (publication).....	h 927; r 173
"Goodbye Christ" (published poem).....	r 121, 151
Goode, John.....	r 356
Goodell, Jane.....	h 929
Goodman, Sarah.....	r 161
Goodrich, Carter.....	h 776, 917; a 990
Goodrich, L. Carrington.....	h 553
Goodwin, Angier L.....	a 1120
Gordon, Alvin.....	h 929
Gordon, Darley.....	h 929
Goslin, Willard L.....	h 320, 325, 330, 389, 404, 409
Gosplan.....	h 31; r 130
Gossett.....	r 121
Gossett, William T.....	h 376
Gossman, Norbert Joseph.....	a 1229
Gottingen University.....	a 1139
Gould, Edwin.....	h 16
Gould, Kenneth M.....	a 1175
Gould, Laurence M.....	h 347; a 1021
Gould Foundation for Children.....	h 16
Government, Soviet Russia (article).....	r 93
Governmental Research Association.....	a 1209
Grace, W. R.....	h 346, 376; a 1021
Grace & Co.....	h 346, 376; a 1021
Graduate Library School (Chicago University).....	a 1036
Graduate Record Service.....	h 688, 689, 704, 705
Graduate School (University of Minnesota).....	h 286

	Page
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (Catholic University of America).....	h 244
Graduate School of Business Administration (Harvard University).....	h 346; a 1025
Graduate School of Education (Harvard University).....	a 1041
Graduate School of Public Health (University of Pittsburgh).....	h 355; a 1127, 1128
Graebner, Theodore.....	r 293
Graham, Frank P.....	h 268, 275, 343; r 399
Graham, Martha.....	r 290, 288
Graham, Philip L.....	a 1043
Gramp, Professor.....	r 159
Grandmother Drives South (publication).....	h 929
Grant, Frances R.....	a 985
Grant, Ulysses S.....	h 43
Grant Foundation.....	h 854; r 47, 52
Grants-in-Aid of Research (SSRC pamphlet).....	r 61, 62
Grassi.....	a 1105
Grattan, C. Hartley.....	a 1175
Gravediggers of America (publication).....	a 1216
Graves, John Temple, Jr.....	h 220; r 148
Graves, Dr. Mortimer.....	a 1009, 1222, 1223, 1227, 1229; r 55, 56, 289, 363
Graves, Kizer & Graves (law firm).....	h 553
Gravit, Francis West.....	a 1231
Gray, George.....	h 341; a 1057
Gray, Gordon.....	a 1181
Gray, Herman A.....	h 779; a 990
Great Books Foundation.....	r 221, 351
Great Britain, an Empire in Transition (publication).....	h 928
Great Collapse and Government Ownership (publication).....	r 409
Great Investment (publication).....	h 94
Great Technology (publication).....	r 363
Greater Boston Peace Strike Committee.....	h 223
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights.....	a 1176; r 301, 306-310, 349, 377
Greece (publication).....	h 929
Greek-American Council.....	r 269
Green, Abner.....	r 267, 290, 381
Green, Gilbert.....	r 298, 361
Green, William.....	h 781, 920; a 991, 997
Greenacres Association.....	a 1209
Greenbacks (organization).....	h 515
Greene, Jerome D.....	h 354, 357, 360
Greene, Katrine R. C.....	h 552
Greene, Roger S.....	h 357
Greenfield, Mrs. Albert M.....	a 1181
Greenwood, Arthur.....	h 774, 775, 776; a 989
Gregg, Alan.....	h 357, 358, 363
Gregg Publishing Co.....	h 394
Gregory, George D.....	h 879
Gregory, Horace.....	r 190, 289
Grether, Dean E. T.....	a 1025

	Page
Grew .....	h 769
Grierson, John .....	r 165
Griffen, Bill .....	r 186
Griswold, A. Whitney .....	h 343
Griswold, Erwin N .....	h 350; a 1051, 1052
Grizodubova, Valentina .....	r 241
Grolier Society, Inc. ....	h 309, 310, 394
Gromov, Antoli .....	a 1223, 1228
Grosberg, Marian .....	r 161
Gross, Ernest A .....	h 341
Gross, Felix .....	a 983
Grossman, Mordecai .....	h 488
Group Health Association of Washington, D. C. ....	a 1209
Group Leader's Guide .....	a 1049
Grover, Elizabeth S. ....	a 1065
Grubstakers (article) .....	a 1238
Grubstaking the Best Folks (publication) .....	a 1240
Guardians of American Education, Inc. ....	h 261, 262
Guardians of Liberty .....	r 280
Guerard, Albert .....	h 929; r 189, 190, 290, 291
Guggenheim, John Simon .....	h 16,
60, 355, 471, 472; a 1127, 1240; r 24, 54, 197, 198	
Guggenheim Memorial Foundation (John Simon) .....	h 16,
60, 355, 471, 472; a 1127, 1240; r 24, 54, 197, 198	
Guggenheim, Solomon R. ....	h 16
Guggenheim (Solomon) Foundation .....	h 16
Guggenheim Fellowship .....	r 363
Guide to the Practice of International Conferences (study) .....	h 887
Guide to Public Affairs Organizations (publication) .....	r 404
Guide to Reading on Communism .....	r 297, 315
Guide to Soviet Education (publication) .....	h 397
Guide to the Study of Medieval History (publication) .....	h 831
Gulick, Robert L. Jr. ....	h 891, 892, 920
Gumbo (play) .....	a 1164
Gunn, Selskar M. ....	h 357
Gustavson, R. G. ....	h 344, 352
Guthrie .....	a 974
Gwinn, Ralph W. ....	h 292, 302, 643; 132

## H

Haas, William S. ....	h 929
Haber, David .....	h 39
Hacker, Prof. Louis M. ....	a 998
Haddad, Jamal .....	a 1229
Hadley, Arthur T. ....	h 344
Hadley, Herbert Spencer .....	h 354
Hadley, Morris .....	h 338; a 965
Haigler, Carey .....	r 399
Haines, Aubrey B. ....	a 1238
Hakmon, Frances B. ....	a 1232
Hale, E. M. ....	h 394
Hale & Co. ....	h 394
Half-Billion for Humanity (article) .....	a 1238

	Page
Hall, Bascom	a 964
Hall, Gus	r 361
Hall, Helen	a 984
Hall, Rob F	r 324
Hall, S. S., Jr	h 340, 345
Hall Brothers Foundation	h 16
Halla, Philip J	a 1229
Halperin, Maurice	a 1223, 1228
Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American (handbill)	r 279
Hambro, C. J.	h 982, 929
Hambuechen, Joseph W	h 351
Hamilton	h 875
Hamilton, Alexander	h 593, 805, 928
Hamilin, Charles S	h 341
Hammond, C. S.	h 394
Hammond & Co	h 394
Hampton Institute (Hampton, Va.)	h 360
Hampton University	h 694
Hancox, Robert O.	h 348
Hand, Mrs. Learned	a 1182
Handbook on International Understanding	h 893
Handbook for Latin American Studies	h 895
Handbook of the National Education Association	r 136
Hankamp, Gertrude A	h 64
Hanna, Hugh H	h 360
Hanna, Mark	h 136
Hanna, Dr. Paul R	a 1145, 1150
Hansen, Alvin H	h 74
Hansen, O. C.	h 553
Harcourt, Brace & Co	h 394; a 1236
Harder, D. S.	h 376
Harding, Clifford H	a 1229
Harding, Warren G	h 297; a 1063
Hardman, J. B. S	r 93
Hardware Age (publication)	h 496
Harger, Alice M	a 1009
Harley, J. Eugene	h 874
Harper	h 583; r 80
Harper, Heber	h 266, 274, 275; r 157
Harper, Samuel G	h 927; r 158
Harper, William R	h 344, 360
Harper & Bros	h 346, 390, 394; r 85
Harper's (publication)	h 131, 132, 346; a 1235, 1238, 1239; r 70, 210, 250
Harriman, Henry L	r 158
Harriman, W. Averell	a 1197, 1198, 1200, 1207
Harriman. (See Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.)	
Harris, Abram	h 33
Harris, Gerald	r 405
Harris, Helen	a 984
Harris, Rufus C	h 344
Harris, Seymour E	h 468, 468, 497, 508, 628, 793; a 981
Harrison, Charles C	h 344

	Page
Harrison, Earl Grant	h 341
Harrison, Selby M	h 60; a 1236, 1238
Harrison, Wallace K	h 354; a 1127
Harrison & Abramovitz (architects)	h 354; a 1127
Harrison-Black bills	r 411
Harsha, E. Houston	a 1132
Harshorn, Merrill F	h 64
Hart, Henry C	a 1229
Hart, Schaffner & Marx	h 350; a 1051
Hartford Courant (publication)	r 160
Hartford, John A	h 16
Hartford Foundation	h 16
Hartman, George W	h 467; r 411
Hartsville School	a 1229
Harvard Business Review	h 496; a 1240
Harvard Class of 1905 Thirtieth Anniversary Report	r 231
Harvard Law Review	h 903; a 1219, 1240
Harvard Law School	h 350; a 1051, 1055, 1180
Harvard Medical School	h 354
Harvard School of Business Administration	h 376; a 1021
Harvard School of Public Health	h 354
Harvard University	h 19, 32, 62, 63, 220, 224, 346, 347, 354, 359-361, 376, 404, 468, 525, 553, 574, 599, 617, 628, 678, 694, 705, 795, 830, 840, 892; a 970, 981, 993, 1009, 1021, 1071, 1124, 1133, 1139, 1145, 1148, 1184, 1191, 1193, 1196, 1219; r 45, 64, 75, 77, 81, 157, 158, 178, 231, 248, 263, 306, 363, 364, 366, 367.
Harvard University Press	h 482, 617
Hassell, James Woodrow, Jr	a 1231
Hastings College of Law	h 196; a 1230
Hat Worker (publication)	a 989
Hatami, Abolghassen J	a 1229
Hatcher, Harold O	a 1163
Hathaway, Clarence	r 298
Hauser, Dr. Philip M	h 37; a 1203; r 83
Haverford College	a 954, 995, 1230, 1232
Havighurst, Robert J	h 36, 363, 696-698
Hawaii University	h 553
Hawes, Elizabeth	r 403
Hawkes, Albert W	r 298
Hawkes, Herbert E	h 687
Hay, Clara E	h 398, 405
Hayden ( <i>See</i> Hinds, Hayden & Eldridge.)	
Hayden, Charles	h 13, 16; a 1235
Hayden Foundation	h 13, 16; a 1235
Haydn, Hiram	r 189
Hayek, Frederick A	h 33, 494; r 121
Hayes, A. J	h 791, 792; a 977, 979
Hayes, Brooks	a 1120
Hayes, Carlton J. H	h 286, 926; a 975
Hayes, Ellen	h 483
Hayes, Samuel Perkins, Jr	a 1230



	Page
Haym Solomon (publication)-----	r 285
Hays, Arthur Garfield-----	h 902
Hays, Will-----	h 297
Hazen, Edward W-----	a 1235, 1241; r 52
Hazen Foundation-----	a 1235, 1241; r 52
Hazen Pamphlets-----	a 1241
Hazlitt, Henry-----	r 122
Headline Books-----	h 883, 900, 901; a 1215; r 174, 176
Headline Series Booklet-----	a 1179, 1180
Heald, Henry T-----	a 1048
Health Care for Americans (publication)-----	h 34
Health Insurance Our Next Forward Step (speech)-----	h 778
Hearst-----	h 223, 267; r 238, 260, 377
Heath, D. C-----	h 394
Heath & Co-----	h 394
Hebrew University-----	a 1139
Heckscher Foundation-----	h 471; r 54
Hedin, Sven-----	h 927
Heffernan, Helen-----	a 1149
Heilbronner, Robert L-----	a 1239
Heinrichs, Waldo Huntley-----	a 1230
Heinz, H. J-----	h 351
Heinz, H. J., II-----	h 351
Heinz, Howard-----	h 341; a 1236
Heinz Co-----	h 351
Held, Adolph-----	h 517, 763
Heller-----	r 410
Heller, A. A-----	r 298
Hellman, Lillian-----	a 1174
Helms, Paul H-----	h 348
Help China (handbill)-----	r 375
Helper, Dr-----	h 332
<i>Helvering v. Bliss</i> (case)-----	h 429
<i>Helvering v. Davis</i> (case)-----	a 1080
Henderson-----	h 397
Henderson, Donald-----	r 161, 298
Henderson Memorial Prize-----	a 1219
Hendrick, V. J-----	h 669
Henley, Constance Jordan-----	h 929
Hennig, Elmer-----	h 352
Henry, Patrick-----	h 311
Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation-----	h 16
Henry Street Settlement-----	a 984
Hepburn, Alonzo B-----	h 354
Herald-Journal (Syracuse, N. Y.)-----	r 352
Herbert, John E-----	h 352
Herbison, Margaret-----	a 995
Here Is Africa (publication)-----	h 929
Heritage Foundation (publisher)-----	h 243, 246; a 945-947
<i>Hernandez v. Texas</i> (case)-----	h 364
Herndon, Angelo-----	h 306; a 1175; r 154
Herndon Bail Fund-----	r 314
Herod, W. R-----	h 553

	Page
Herodotus.....	a 960
Herring, Hubert.....	a 1163
Herring, Pendleton.....	h 137, 340, 794-865; r 48, 49, 86, 115, 126-127, 226, 423, 426, 427, 429
Herron, George D.....	r 400
Hershey, Amos S.....	h 878
Hersey, John R.....	h 553
Heydt, Charles O.....	h 354
Hibben, John G.....	h 344
Hickey, Margaret A.....	h 920
Hicks, A. R.....	h 928
Hicks, Granville.....	r 372
Higgins, Eugene.....	h 16
Higgins Scientific Trust.....	h 16
Higginson, Thomas Wentworth.....	h 220; a 993
High, Stanley.....	a 1239
Higher Education (article).....	a 1240
Higher Education and American Business (publication).....	a 1235
Higher Education, Philanthropy and Federal Tax Exemption (publication).....	a 1236
Higher Education in France (pamphlet).....	h 619
Highlander Folk School.....	a 1164; r 107, 399-403
Hilen ( <i>See</i> Allen, Froude, Hilen & DeGarmo.)	
Hill, David Jayne.....	h 341
Hill, David Spence.....	h 345
Hill, Louis.....	h 16; a 1227, 1231; h 16
Hill, Maud.....	h 16; a 1227, 1231; h 16
Hill Family Foundation.....	h 16; a 1227, 1231; h 16
Hilddring, General.....	h 560, 579, 580
Hillman, Sidney.....	a 1172
Hinds, Hayden & Eldridge, Inc.....	h 395
Hindus, Maurice.....	h 927; r 173
Hiroshima (publication).....	h 553
Hirsch, Rudolf.....	r 189
Hiss, Albert R.....	h 344
Hiss, Alger.....	h 56, 193, 194, 301, 303, 543, 872, 893, 918; a 997, 1060, 1217; r 24, 54, 172, 175, 184, 185, 196, 197, 261, 277, 287, 350.
Historical Blackout (publication).....	r 178, 179
Historical Outlook (publication).....	h 478; r 140
History of the Communist Party of the United States (pub- lication).....	r 414
History of League of Nations (publication).....	h 397
History of Political Ideas (publication).....	h 831
History of the English Speaking Peoples (publication).....	h 929
History of the Far East in Modern Times (publication).....	h 928
History of Science Society.....	a 999
History of the Standard Oil Company (publication).....	h 219, 669
Hitchcock, Henry Russell.....	r 189
Hitchcock Memorial Presbyterian Church.....	a 1209
Hitler.....	h 141, 248, 771, 778, 901, 928; a 1015, 1225; r 42, 118, 119, 277, 322, 326, 352, 356.

	Page
Hitler-Stalin pact.....	a 1225
Hitti, Philip K.....	a 1230
Hi-Y Club.....	a 1204
Hobbe.....	h 581
Hobbs, Dr. A. H.....	h 114-187, 414, 811, 812; r 31, 60, 63, 64, 66, 68-69, 71, 72, 74- 79, 85-88, 94, 125, 204, 225.
Hobbs Bill.....	r 265, 267, 321, 373
Hobby, Oveta Culp.....	h 777, 786; r 9
Hobson, J. A.....	h 926
Hochman, Julius.....	h 308
Hoetzsch, Otto.....	h 31; r 93
Hoffman, Alice.....	h 309
Hoffman, Paul G.....	h 26, 38, 39, 42, 346, 347, 350, 351, 363, 379-382, 384, 385, 891; a 1039, 1049-1053, 1055, 1208, 1239; r 111, 114-116, 166, 188, 432.
Holcombe, A. N.....	a 993
Holcombe, Arthur W.....	h 919
Holland, William.....	a 1228
Holland, William J.....	h 338
Holland, William L.....	h 553
Hollins College.....	h 874
Hollis, Ernest Victor.....	h 58, 479, 669-674, 678, 681, 684, 702, 707, 711-714, 716, 722; a 1236, 1239; r 134-136.
Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.....	r 292, 334, 362
Hollywood Quarterly (publication).....	r 240, 292, 334
Hollywood Ten.....	h 224; r 313, 391
Hollywood Writers Mobilization.....	r 240, 292, 324, 334
Holman, Alfred.....	h 341
Holmes, John Haynes.....	h 309; a 977, 996
Holt, Henry.....	h 394; a 1001
Holt & Co.....	h 394; a 1001
Holy Land Under Mandate (publication).....	h 927
Hook, Sidney.....	h 265, 488, 516-519; a 977, 996; r 190, 257
Hooven-Owens-Rentschler Co.....	h 346
Hoover, Glenn E.....	h 255, 258, 259
Hoover, Herbert.....	h 197, 231, 745, 778, 850, 851; a 1063, 1080, 1220; r 97, 103, 195, 202
Hoover, J. Edgar.....	r 114, 115, 266
Hoover Commission.....	h 617; a 1208
Hoover Institute.....	h 231; a 1030, 1229; r 147
Hoover Institute Library.....	h 197
Hoover's speech.....	r 202
Hopkins, Ernest M.....	h 354, 360, 362
Hopkins, Harry.....	h 300
Hopper, Bruce C.....	r 158
Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, Teacher's College, Columbia University.....	h 74
Horn, Ernest.....	h 286
Horn, John L.....	h 255

	Page
Horn, Robert	h 33
Hornbeck, Stanley K	h 929
Horne, Ernest	h 514
Horrabin, J. F	h 928
Horsley, G. William	h 38
Horton, Mrs. Douglas	h 349
Horton, Myles	r 107, 399-401, 403
Horton, Zylphia	r 401
Hoselitz, Bert H	r 163
Hosiery Workers Union	r 399
Houghton, Alanson B	h 341
Houghton Mifflin Co	h 394
House that Hitler Built (publication)	h 928
House I Live In (publication)	r 165
Houseman, John	r 190, 292
Houser, George M	r 399
Housing Program for America (publication)	h 306, 793
Housman, Laurence	r 411
Houston, David F	h 338
Houston, William V	h 344
Houston Chronicle	a 1044
Houston Endowment	h 16
Hovde, Dr. Bryn J	a 977, 995, 1231
How Children Learn About Human Rights (pamphlet)	h 619
How Discriminatory are College Admissions? (article)	r 63
How to End the Cold War and Build the Peace (pamphlet)	r 253, 268, 320, 346
How Fare American Youth? (publication)	h 697
How Free Is Free Enterprise? (conference theme)	h 785, 793; r 105
How May Power Be Won (conference theme)	h 750; r 99
How Science Aids the Golden Rule (article)	a 1241
How Tax Laws Make Giving to Charity Easy (publication)	a 1236
"How This Book Came To Be Written" (article)	h 132
How To Evaluate a Secondary School (publication)	h 706
How To Give Money Away (article)	a 1241
How To Have Your Own Foundation (article)	a 1239
How To Think About War and Peace (publication)	a 1043; r 227
How To Win the Peace (publication)	h 928, 929
Howard, Donald S	h 779; a 990
Howard, Martha C	h 348
Howard, William M	h 341
Howard Heinz Endowment	a 1236
Howland, Charles P	h 354, 360; a 969
Hu Shih	h 309
Hubbard, Frank W	h 491, 495, 501, 502, 505
Hudson, J. L	h 346
Hudson, Manley	h 74, 927
Hudson, Roy	r 298
Hudson, Shirley D	a 1009
Hudson Co	h 346, 374, 376
Huff	h 927
Huffman, Paul G	a 1197
Hughes, Charles Evans	h 219, 354, 879

	Page
Hughes, Edwin H	h 344
Hughes, Frank	a 1217
Hughes, Langston	h 34, 35; a 1216; r 121, 151, 293-298
Hugins, Roland	h 926
Hull, Cordell	h 226, 885, 916; a 1132; r 233, 331, 332, 411
Hullfish, H. Gordon	h 327-329, 332, 335, 388
Human Events (article)	a 1238
Humanity Uprooted (publication)	h 927; r 173
Numé	a 1168
Humphrey, Bob	h 298
Humphrey, George M	h 348
Humphrey, Hubert H	a 977
Humphrey, John R	h 874
Humphreys, Alexander C	h 344
Hunt	h 137
Hunt, Erling M	h 54, 65, 912, 928; r 173
Hunt Foundation	h 137
Hunter	h 269
Hunter, Edward	h 142
Hunter, Frederick M	a 1148
Hunter, Robert	h 219
Hunter College	h 350; a 1051, 1232
Hurewitz, Jacob C	a 1230
Hurley, Gen. Patrick	h 559
Hutchins, Clayton D	a 1239
Hutchins, Judd	a 1145
Hutchins, Robert Maynard	h 38-40, 268, 275, 347, 350, 351, 490, 491, 498, 499, 501-504; a 1038, 1039; r 111, 114, 155, 190, 198, 299-301, 323.
Hutchison, Bruce	h 929
Hyams Trust	h 16
Hyams, Godfrey M	h 16
Hyatt Foundation	a 1241
Hyde, Walter W	r 158
Hyneman, Charles S	a 1184, 1191; r 39

## I

I Take My Stand For Peace (pamphlet)	r 271
IBM	h 130; r 63
Ickes, Harold	h 300; r 132
Ickes' Diary	r 132
Idaho University	h 553
Ideologists of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie (publication)	h 838, 847
Idle Men, Idle Money (publication)	h 134
ILGWU (International Garment Workers Union)	h 762, 779, 780, 789, 792, 793; a 977, 983, 996, 1167; r 104, 108
Ilich, Vladimir	r 92
Ilin, M	h 927
Ilin, U	h 927
Illinois Legislature	r 300
Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission	h 38; r 299, 323
Illinois University	h 220, 388, 390, 395, 495

	Page
Illinois University Press.....	h 395
Ilma, Viola.....	r 412
Import Capacity of the United States (publication).....	h 892
Imprecorr (publication).....	r 243
In Battle for Peace (publication).....	r 272
In the Case of Morris U. Schappes (pamphlet).....	r 253
In Defense of American Activities (article).....	a 1221
In Defense of Culture (leaflet).....	r 315, 341, 346
In Egypt (publication).....	h 927
In Fact (publication).....	h 34; r 407
In Search of Ireland (publication).....	h 927
In Search of Scotland (publication).....	h 927
In Search of Wales (publication).....	h 927
Income and Economic Progress (publication).....	h 34
Income Tax Deductions for Donations to Allegedly Subversive Groups (article).....	a 1239
Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.....	r 241, 265, 334, 336
Independent Communist Labor League of America.....	r 187, 404
Independent Labor League of America.....	r 404
Index to Labor Articles (publication).....	r 408
India Today (publication).....	h 928
Indiana Text Book Commission.....	h 490, 499
Indiana University.....	h 937; a 1137, 1138, 1229, 1231
Individualism and Capitalism (article).....	h 32
Industrial Foundations and Community Progress (article).....	a 1240
Industrial Price Policy (publication).....	h 34
Industrial Property in Europe (pamphlet).....	h 891
Industrial Workers of the World (I. W. W.).....	r 229
Industrialism (article).....	r 92
Industry Support for our Colleges—moral and financial (article).....	a 1240
Inkeles, Alex.....	h 840, 846
Inman, Samuel Guy.....	h 929
Inner Asian Frontiers to China (publication).....	r 323
Institute for Adult Education (Columbia).....	h 677
Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton, N. J.).....	h 16, 356, 359, 360, 361
Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton University).....	h 347
Institute of Current World Affairs.....	a 1230
Institute of Educational Research.....	h 677; r 136
Institute of International Education.....	h 74, 268, 269, 273-275, 282, 475, 674, 675, 702-705, 713, 894, 924; a 1064, 1081, 1113, 1162; r 135, 136, 157, 158, 160, 161, 171, 182, 221.
Institute of International Relations (Forum).....	r 351
Institute of International Studies (Yale).....	h 524, 843, 893, 932
Institute of Management and Labor Relations.....	a 1166
Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR).....	h 26, 43, 57, 475, 529, 535-545, 547, 548, 553, 557-561, 564, 580, 879, 883, 888, 892-894, 897, 909, 921, 927, 929, 935, 940; a 1060, 1134-1136, 1180, 1210-1215, 1223, 1228; r 19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 41-45, 54, 56-59, 170-174, 179-182, 198-201.

	Page
Institute of Philosophical Research.....	h 42; a 1042; r 162
Institute of Public Affairs (Seattle).....	h 874
Institute of School Experimentation.....	a 1146
Institute of Sex Research.....	a 1138
Institute for the Study of Law (Johns Hopkins).....	h 286
Institutional Exchange Program (Ford).....	r 24
Institutional Research Policy Committee (American Council on Education).....	r 52
Insull, Samuel.....	h 373
Intellectuals World Congress for Peace.....	r 234
Intelligence and Politics (pamphlet).....	h 907
Intelligent Philanthropy (publication).....	a 1235
Intelligent Student's Tour of Socialism.....	r 313
Inter-American Bar Association.....	h 912
Inter-Relationships Between Foundations, Education, and Government (chart).....	r 53
Intercollegiate Council.....	a 986
Intercollegiate Socialist (publication).....	h 483
Intercollegiate Socialist Society.....	h 46, 134, 135, 205, 219, 220, 221, 492, 740; a 993; r 85, 97, 148, 163, 414.
Intercollegiate Student Council.....	h 741, 751; r 96
Intercontinental Peace Conference (Rio De Janiero).....	r 362
Intercultural Publications, Inc.....	h 346, 351; a 1027; r 188, 189
Inter-University Labor Education Committee.....	r 162, 163
International Agreement to Ban Use of Atomic Weapons (statement).....	r 331, 378
International Education Board.....	r 149
International Education Institute.....	149, 156
International Assembly of Women (Kortright, N. Y.).....	r 264
International Association of Machinists.....	h 791; a 977, 979, 1232
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.....	h 67, 71; a 1230
International Cartels (publication).....	h 892
International Cases (publication).....	h 926
International Chamber of Commerce.....	h 881, 891, 916, 920
International City Manager's Association.....	a 1209
International Commodity Agreements (publication).....	h 892
International Conciliation (article).....	a 1241
International Conferences and Their Technique (conference Memoranda).....	h 891, 914, 915
International Control of Aviation (publication).....	h 556
International Congress of Writers (Madrid).....	r 261
International Cost Accounting Conference.....	h 495
International Democratic Women's Federation.....	r 384
International Double Taxation (publication).....	h 892
International Drug Control (study).....	h 887, 915
International Economic Handbook.....	h 891
International Economic Outlook (pamphlet).....	h 891
International Education Board.....	h 353, 355, 359, 361, 690
International Education Fund (Rockefeller fund).....	h 255
International Education Institute.....	h 337

	Page
International Federation of Workers' Educational Associations.....	a 1159
International Fellowship of Reconciliation.....	r 412
International Fur and Leather Workers Union.....	r 234, 354
International General Electric Co.....	h 553
International Geographical Union.....	h 286
International Health Board.....	h 355, 357, 361
International Health Commission.....	h 357
International Institute of Child Psychology.....	r 72
International Institute of Columbia.....	h 285, 288; a 1146
International Institute of Teachers College (Columbia University).....	r 256
International Juridical Association.....	h 903; a 1221; r 239, 288, 370
International Juridical Association Monthly Bulletin.....	r 370
International Labor Defense (National Committee).....	h 223;
r 230, 232, 251, 254, 260, 271, 282, 294, 314, 332-334,	
340, 358, 364, 370, 383.	
International Labor Defense (Prisoners Relief Fund).....	r 230, 260
International Labor Office.....	h 776, 913; a 990
International Labor Organization (United Nations).....	h 67,
71, 776, 911, 922, 923	
International Ladies' Garment Workers.....	a 995; r 165, 371, 409
International Law and International Relations (publication).....	h 926;
r 173	
International Law of the Future, Postulates, Principles, and Proposals (study).....	h 887
International League for the Rights of Man.....	r 231
International Literature (publication).....	r 262
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.....	r 339
International Mind Alcoves (Carnegie Endowment).....	h 55, 56,
882, 930; a 1063; r 171, 173, 174	
International Monetary Fund.....	h 66, 67, 71; a 1230, 1231
International Organization in European Air Transport (publication).....	h 888
International Parliamentary Union.....	r 171
International Peace Prize.....	r 273
International Polity Clubs.....	h 876, 924, 925, 926
International Press Correspondence (publication).....	r 317
International Press Institute (Zurich, Switzerland).....	r 133
International Publishers.....	r 261, 315, 345, 348, 370, 372, 392
International Publishing Company.....	r 410
International Relations (publication).....	h 926; r 173
International Relations Club.....	a 1215-1217; r 171, 173, 174, 175, 184
International Relations Club Handbook, 1926.....	h 876
International Relations Clubs.....	h 876, 882, 883
International Secretariat (study).....	h 887
International Security (publication).....	h 884
International Social Science Research Council.....	r 184, 185
International Socialist League.....	h 513
International Studies Conference.....	h 897
International Trade Organization (United Nations).....	h 66, 67, 71
International Tribunals, Past and Future (study).....	h 887
International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers (British Columbia).....	r 361



	Page
International Union of Revolutionary Writers.....	r 245, 262
International Woman's Day.....	r 241
International Women's Congress Against War and Fascism.....	a 1170
International Workers Order (IWO).....	h 223;
r 246, 295, 340, 345, 348, 360	
International Workers of the World (IWW).....	h 512; a 1165-
IWW (International Workers of the World).....	h 512; r 229-
International Year Book of Experimental Education.....	h 397
Interparliamentary Union.....	h 909-
Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance.....	a 1173, 1175-
Intourist (Russian Travel Company).....	h 273,
275, 279, 281, 282; r 158, 313	
Introduction to American Civilization (publication).....	r 362
Investigation of Certain Educational and Philanthropic Founda- tions (article).....	a 1238
<i>Interstate Circuit, Inc. v. United States</i> (case).....	h 365
Into the Valley (publication).....	h 553
Introducing Teachers College (pamphlet).....	h 255, 273
Iowa University.....	h 286, 395
Iowa University Press.....	h 395
Iran (publication).....	h 929
IRC.....	a 1217
Islands on Guard (publication).....	h 929
Isaacs, Harold R.....	r 32
Isaacs, Stanley M.....	a 984; r 240
Italian Americans (article).....	h 319
Italy From Within (publication).....	h 929
Items (publication).....	r 51, 81, 126
Ives Law.....	h 489
Ivy College.....	h 830
IWW (International Workers of the World).....	h 512; a 1165

## J

Jackson, Ada B.....	r 386
Jackson, Andrew.....	h 64; r 363
Jackson, Attorney General.....	r 234, 305, 325, 354
Jackson, Hon. Donald L.....	h 40, 41
Jackson, Joseph Henry.....	h 928
Jackson High School.....	h 64
Jacoby, Dr. Neil H.....	a 1025
Jaffe, Philip.....	h 558
James, Henry.....	h 338
James, William.....	h 574; r 77
James Foundation of New York.....	h 16
Jane Addams Memorial.....	h 223
Janowsky, Oscar I.....	h 917
Jansen, Dr. William.....	a 985
Janski, Oscar.....	r 93
Japan: An Economic and Financial Appraisal (publication).....	h 927
Japan in China (publication).....	r 235
Japan International Christian University.....	a 1209
Japan Public Administration Clearing House.....	h 942
Japan's War Economy (publication).....	r 235

	Page
Jarvis, Rebecca	r 409
Jaszi, Oscar	h 31; r 92
Javits, Jacob J	h 763; a 980, 996
Jay	h 593
Jeanes Foundation	h 359
Jefferson, Thomas	h 318, 319, 597, 598, 805; a 1015, 1031, 1061; r 155
Jefferson School of Social Science	h 34, 224; r 268, 291, 319, 345, 348
Jemison, Alice Lee	r 362
Jenkins, Edward C	a 1236
Jenks. (See Anderson, Wrenn & Jenks.)	
Jenner Committee	r 165, 197
Jerome, V. J	r 266
Jessup, Dr	h 914
Jessup, Morris K	h 360
Jessup, Philip C	h 36, 74, 98, 341, 874, 884, 886, 888, 889, 918; a 1037
Jessup, Walter A	h 338, 339, 344, 345, 567, 568
Jewish Labor Committee	h 763
Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order (International Workers Order)	r 345
Jewish veterans organizations	h 29
Jewkes, John	r 122
Job-Hunting (pamphlet)	a 1164; r 107
Job to be Done (leaflet)	r 358
John A. Hartford Foundation	h 16
John Reed Club Writers School	r 245
John Reed Clubs	r 260, 282, 286
John F. Slater Fund	h 359
Johns Hopkins Institute (School of International Affairs)	r 323
Johns Hopkins University	h 61, 220, 286, 360, 395, 485, 553, 677, 874, 938; a 975, 1009, 1113, 1124, 1227, 1231, 1232; r 323.
Johns Hopkins University Press	h 395, 794, 936
Johnson, Alva	h 31, 668, 877, 883; a 984, 1175; r 92, 198, 301
Johnson, Eldon L	a 1041
Johnson, F. Ernest	a 990
Johnson, Henry	h 286
Johnson, Hewlett	h 36; a 1035
Johnson, Joseph E	h 340, 923; a 1056, 1065; r 185
Johnson, Lee F	a 979, 984
Johnson, Manning	h 471; r 197, 198, 356
Johnson, Oakley	r 160, 161
Johnson, Hewlett (Red Dean of Canterbury)	r 250
Johnston, Eric A	h 891, 920
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee	a 1176; r 278, 279, 283, 296, 301, 321, 323, 332, 333, 345, 347, 359, 374, 385.
Joint Committee on Research of the Community Council of Philadelphia and the Pennsylvania School of Social Work	a 1235
Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities (New York State)	h 467; r 249
Joliot-Curie, Madame Irene	r 324
Jones, Amy Heminway	h 927
Jones, Arthur Creech	h 308

	Page
Jones, Lauder W.....	h 358
Jones Rufus M.....	r 302, 303
Jones, William Thomas.....	a 1232
Jordan, David S.....	h 344, 875
Josephs, Devereaux C.....	h 338, 339, 344, 345; a 965
Josephson, Emanuel Mann.....	a 1236
Josephson, Leon.....	r 345, 358
Josephson, Matthew.....	r 303
Journal of Educational Sociology.....	a 1166
Journal of Genetic Psychology.....	h 847
Journal of Social Psychology.....	h 847
Journal of Teacher Education.....	a 1238
Journey to the Missouri (publication).....	h 524
Journey of Simon McKeever (publication).....	r 346, 348
Journeys Behind the News (article).....	a 1238
Joyce, William H. Jr.....	h 350, 379; a 1051, 1052; r 188
Joyce, Inc.....	h 350; a 1051
Judd, Charles H.....	h 268, 275
Judiciary (article).....	r 92
Judson, Harry Pratt.....	h 355, 360
Julliard Musical Foundation.....	h 16
Julius Rosenwald Fund.....	h 471, 472, 854; r 47, 54, 198
July, Robert W.....	h 363
Jungle Portraits (publication).....	h 927
Junior Farmers Union.....	h 881
Junior High School (publication).....	h 94

## K

Kahin, George McT.....	a 1230
Kahn, Albert.....	r 356
Kai-shek, Chiang.....	h 546, 547, 558, 560, 597, 929; a 1224; r 324, 362
Kai-shek, Madame.....	h 929
Kaiser, Henry J.....	h 16
Kaiser Co.....	h 374
Kaiser Family Foundation.....	h 16
Kalder, Nicholas.....	h 939
Kaljarvi, Thorsten.....	h 874
Kalinin, President.....	r 269
Kallen, Horace M.....	h 484; r 93, 143, 304-306
Kamehameha Schools (Honolulu).....	h 553
Kandel, I. L.....	h 268, 275, 345; a 970; 1145, 1239
Kant, Immanuel.....	h 565, 575, 597, 929
Kantor, Theresa.....	r 401
Katayev, Ivan.....	r 257
Kate Macy Ladd Fund.....	h 16
Katona, George.....	a 1025
Kattenburg, Paul M.....	a 1230
Katz, Milton.....	h 347
Kaufmann, Walter A.....	a 1232
Kazemzadeh, Firuz.....	a 1230
Kazin, Alfred.....	r 189
Keatley, V. B.....	a 1239
Keel.....	h 508

	Page
Keele, Harold	h 190-194; a 950, 1118
Keeney, Mary Jane	a 1223, 1228
Keeney, Philip O	r 236
Keenleyside, H. L.	h 783, 791, 926; a 991
Kelley, Nicholas	h 338; a 965
Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes	a 965
Kellogg, Paul	a 1182
Kellogg, Vernon L.	h 355
Kellogg, W. K.	h 16
Kellogg Foundation	h 13, 16
Kelly, Robert L.	h 268, 275
Kennan, George F.	h 347, 348; r 190, 306
Kennan, Richard Barnes	h 327, 388
Kennedy, Raymond	h 553
Kennedy-Coughlin forces	r 404
Kent, Fred I.	h 891
Kent, Rockwell	a 1168, 1216
Kent State University	h 250
Kentucky University	a 1184, 1185, 1187, 1230, 1232; r 62
Kenwood Golf and Country Club	a 1209
Keppel, Dr.	h 98
Keppel, Frederick P.	h 338, 339, 669, 875, 943; a 969, 975, 976, 1041, 1236, 1239; r 21, 30, 38, 118
Kerr, Charles H.	h 395
Kerr & Co.	h 395
Kerrison, Irvine L. H.	a 1166
Kestnbaum, Meyer	h 350; a 1051
Key to Peace (publication)	h 243, 246; r 121
Kiendl. (See Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl.)	
Killian, James R., Jr.	a 1218
Kilpatrick, William	h 309, 320, 324, 327, 484; a 977, 985, 1145; r 307
Kimball, Lindsley F.	h 357, 362
Kimberly, John R.	h 355; a 1127
Kimberly-Clark Corp.	h 355; a 1127
Kimmel, W. G.	h 478
Kinfolk (publication)	r 243
King	h 397
King, Henry C.	h 344
Kingdom, Frank	a 1173, 1174
Kings Crown Press (Columbia University)	h 395
Kingsbury, John A.	h 268, 275; r 157
Kingsbury, Susan M.	h 268, 275
Kinney, Anne (also known as Jane Howe)	337
Kinsey, Alfred C.	h 117, 118, 123-134, 140, 144, 146, 147, 150, 165, 166, 179, 266, 839, 840; a 1137-1139; r 24, 51, 67-71.
Kinsey Report	h 117, 123-134, 144, 165, 166, 266, 839, 840; a 1137; r 24, 51, 67-71
Kiplinger Washington Agency	a 1236
Kirchwey, Freda	h 220; r 110, 148, 307
Kirchwey, George W.	h 875
Kirk, Grayson L.	h 341, 344, 886, 920; r 51
Kirk, Robert H.	h 357

	Page
Kirkland, James H	h 344
Kirshom, Vladimir	a 1165
Kise, Joseph	h 74
Kitasato	a 1105
Kizer, Benjamin H	h 553
Klapper, Paul	h 268, 275
Klein, Philip	r 93, 309, 311
Kline, Alan B	h 348
Klineberg, Otto	h 848; r 184, 311, 312
Knopf, Alfred A	h 351
Knopf, Inc	h 351
Know Nothing Party	h 318, 515
Knowland, Senator	h 590
Knudsen, Mr	r 119
Koch, Arnold	a 1105; r 222
Kohlberg, Alfred	h 389, 557-559; a 1135, 1210-1214, 1227, 1228; r 23, 24, 32, 180, 181
Kohn, Hans	h 929
Koopman, O. Robert	a 1149
Korean-English Dictionary	a 1003
Korean Independence (publication)	r 231
Kornilov	r 257
Koshland, Daniel E	h 553
Kotschnig, Walter	h 917
Kravchenko	r 389
Kremlin Prepares a New Party Line (article)	r 367
Kresge Foundation	h 13, 16
Krey, A. C	h 286
Kriz, Miroslav A	a 1230
Kruse, William F	r 165, 405
Ku Kux Klan	h 307, 308, 746
Kuhn, Fritz	h 330
Kultura (publication)	r 189
Kvale	r 411
Kwiat, Joseph J	a 1231
Kyrilov	r 257

## L

Labor Bureau, Inc	r 248
Labor-Capital Co-Operation (article)	r 93
Labor Defender (publication)	r 230, 232, 260
Labor Government at Work (publication)	h 793
Labor in America (publication)	a 983
Labor Looks at Education (publication)	a 1167; r 108, 109
Labor Parties of Latin America (publication)	h 793
Labor Research Association	r 377, 378
Labor Spy (pamphlet)	a 1164
Labor Unions in Action (publication)	a 981
Labor's Stake in World Affairs (publication)	r 163
Lacin, Mahmut N	a 1230
Ladd Fund	h 16
Ladd, Kate Macy	h 16
LaFollette, Senator	h 569

	Page
LaGuardia .....	a 996
Laidler, Harry W .....	h 135,
219, 305, 306, 308, 309, 756, 765, 767-770, 780, 782,	
789, 790, 793; a 976-977, 984, 998, 1163; r 100-105,	
107, 154, 312.	
Laissez Faire (article) .....	h 32; r 93
Lake Forest College .....	h 941
Lamb, Lawrence C .....	h 325, 403, 405
Lamont, Corliss .....	a 1215, 1216; r 174, 313-322
Lamont, Thomas S .....	h 344
Lamont, Thomas W .....	h 344
Lamp (publication) .....	a 972
Lancaster, William W .....	a 1181
Land of the Pepper Bird (publication) .....	h 926
Land of the Soviets (publication) .....	r 313
<i>Land of Soviets</i> (Russian plane) .....	r 247
Land of the Sun-God (publication) .....	h 926
Land Problems and Policies in the African Mandates of the British Commonwealth (publication) .....	h 927
Landon, Alfred M .....	h 150
Landsteiner .....	a 1105
Lane, Clayton .....	h 552, 553
Lane, Franklin K .....	h 360
Lang, Paul Henry .....	r 189
Lange, Oscar .....	h 35, 39, 779; r 155, 323
Langer, William L .....	h 884; r 178
Langmuir, Charles R .....	h 345
Laniel .....	h 595; r 169
Lanks, Herbert C .....	h 929
Lansing, Robert .....	h 341; a 1057
Lapham, Lewis A .....	h 553
Laprade, William T .....	a 1239
Lardner, Ring Jr .....	r 160
Large Scale Production (article) .....	r 93
Larsen, Roy E .....	h 349, 699
Larson, Duke of Mongolia (publication) .....	h 926
Larson, Emanuel .....	a 1222, 1225
Larson, Frans August .....	h 926
Laserson, Max M .....	h 888
Laski, Harold J .. h 31, 32, 480, 506, 507, 926; a 1139; r 92, 141, 173	
Laski, Victor .....	r 121
Lasky, Melvin J .....	r 189
Lasser, J. K .....	a 1235, 1236, 1239; r 11
Lasser Tax Reports .....	r 11
Lasswell, Professor .....	r 81
Lasswell, Harold .....	h 848
Latcham, Franklin C .....	a 1239
Latin America: Its Place in World Life (publication) .....	h 929
Latin American Information Service .....	h 932
Latin American Studies Committee .....	r 44
Lattimore, Owen .....	h 313,
543, 544, 553, 929; a 1215, 1216, 1222-1225, 1228;	
r 173, 174, 323-325.	

	Page
Laughlin, James	h 351
Lauchlin Currie & Co.	r 263
Laura Spellman Rockefeller Foundation	h 102,
565, 668, 690, 691, 698, 701, 702, 718, 721, 854, 879,	
896; a 1083, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1113, 1125, 1134, 1139,	
1145; r 47, 87, 134.	
Laurie, Arthur Bruce	a 1230
Lawrence, Alton	r 403
LaVine, Janice B.	a 1204, 1209
Lavoisier	a 1092
Law and Contemporary Problems (article)	a 1241
Lawler, Vanett	h 64
Lawrence College	h 875; a 1041
Lawson	h 458
Lawson, John Howard	r 241, 339, 343, 348, 386, 391
Lawson-Trumbo case	r 348
Lawyers Guild Review	r 340
Lazarsfeld, Professor	r 81
Leach, Mrs. Henry Goddard	a 1181
Leader. (See Little, Leader, LeSourd & Palmer.)	
League Against Fascism	r 409
League of American Writers	h 223; a 1171,
1173, 1176, 1216; r 234, 245, 248, 249, 260, 261, 275,	
281, 282, 286, 290, 295, 304, 305, 314, 318, 327, 332,	
333, 336, 341, 346, 348, 355, 366, 370, 375, 377, 378,	
380, 391.	
League of American Writers Bulletin	r 260, 286,
295, 336, 346, 355, 366, 380	
League to Enforce Peace (publication)	h 926
League of Free Nations Association	a 1177
League for Industrial Democracy (LID)	h 21, 46,
47, 134, 136, 219, 221, 305, 306, 308, 309, 327, 467, 492,	
724, 728-737, 740, 741, 743, 744, 747, 751, 754-757,	
762-768, 770-793; a 976-981, 983, 984, 985, 986-989,	
990, 993, 994, 997, 1163, 1164, 1167; r 45, 85, 96-108,	
123, 148, 154, 167, 313, 409, 412.	
League for Industrial Democracy: Definition of "Democracy"	
(article)	h 467
League for Mutual Aid	h 223; a 1176
League of Nations	h 71, 396,
397, 875, 878, 879, 881, 886, 887-890, 913-917, 922,	
923, 927, 933; a 1103; r 182, 193.	
League of Nations Mandate System (publication)	h 915
League of Nations Secretariat (publication)	h 915
League on Power Control	a 998
League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford	r 258, 303, 393
League of Professional Groups in support of Communist Party	
Elections	r 365
League of Women's Shoppers, Inc.	a 1170; r 228, 308, 346, 348, 355
League of Women Voters	h 390; a 1202
League of Workers Theaters	r 264
Leander, Gunnar	r 299
Learned, William S.	h 339, 345

	Page
Leavell, Ullin W.....	a 1236
Lee, Algernon.....	h 308; r 409, 410
Lee, C. Herbert.....	h 339, 340, 345
Lee, Canada.....	a 1174
Lee, Dwight E.....	h 886
Lee, Governor.....	a 1179
Lee, Ivy.....	h 400
Lee, Michael E.....	a 1198, 1201, 1202
Lee, Michael J.....	h 37
Lee, Rensselaer.....	a 1009
Lee, Robert E.....	h 354
Lefebure, Victor.....	h 927
Lefferts, Barent.....	h 340
Leffingwell, Russell.....	h 338, 339; a 965
Lefkowitz, Abraham.....	h 767; a 984, 996
Legislative Investigation or Thought-Control Agency? (speech).....	r 347
Lehman, Herbert H.....	h 308, 489, 893, 914, 918; a 977, 995, 1197, 1207
Lehman, Willie.....	r 298
Lehman amendment (Immigration Act).....	r 187
Leibnitz.....	h 805
Leiden, Carl.....	a 1230
Leider, Ben.....	a 1171
Leider Memorial Fund.....	a 1171
Leigh, Robert D.....	h 929
Leighton, Comdr. Alexander.....	h 137
Lenczowski, George.....	a 1230
Lend-Lease (article).....	h 319
Lenger, Joyce.....	r 161
Lenn.....	h 31,
	278, 745, 771, 841, 842, 847; r 97, 151, 294, 310, 390,
	402, 406, 414.
Leningrad (publication).....	a 1216
Leonard, Harold B.....	a 1122, 1144, 1150, 1214
Leonard, J. Paul.....	a 1149
Lerner, Abba P.....	h 35; r 155
Lerner, Max.....	h 74,
	883, 884, 928; a 1159, 1171, 1172, 1179, 1181; r 93,
	106, 325-328.
LeSourd. (See Little, Leader, LeSourd & Palmer.)	
L'Esprit International: the International Mind (publication).....	a 1241
Lester, Robert M.....	h 339, 345, 669; a 1236
Let's look at our Foundations (article).....	a 1238
Let's Talk It Over (leaflet).....	r 280
Letters from Readers (column in New Masses).....	r 392
Leubsker v. Commissioner (case).....	h 432
Levin, Harry.....	r 189
Levenstein, Aaron.....	h 793; a 979
Lewis, Alfred Baker.....	r 103, 329
Leviathan (publication).....	h 581
Levinson, Ronald B.....	a 1232
Levitt, Al.....	a 1175
Levy, Beryl Harold.....	h 917
Levy, Jean.....	a 983



	Page
Lewack, Harold.....	h 740
Lewey, John.....	h 484
Lewis, Alfred Baker.....	h 771, 772, 778; a 981, 987, 990, 997
Lewis, Elizabeth Foreman.....	h 928
Lewis, Fulton.....	h 738
Lewis & MacDonald.....	a 1181
Lewis, Strong & Earl (law firm).....	h 729, 762
Libbey, E. D.....	h 16
Libbey Trust.....	h 16
Liberal Party.....	h 571; r 257
Liberalism and Sovietism (pamphlet).....	h 771; a 987, 997
Liberator (publication).....	r 249, 393
Liberty (article).....	h 32; 92
Libton, Ralph.....	r 86
Lichtenberger, Henri.....	h 928
LID.....	h 765; a 977; r 99, 100, 103-105
Lie, Trygve.....	a 977
Liebers, Otto H.....	h 352
Liebesny, Herbert J.....	a 1230
Life (publication).....	r 363
Life of Andrew Carnegie (publication).....	h 669
Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain (publication).....	r 308
Lilienthal, Alfred M.....	h 389
Lilienthal, David.....	h 300
Lillico, Stuart.....	r 378
Lilly Endowment.....	h 16
Linbergh, Charles E.....	h 788
Lincoln, Abraham.....	h 223, 253-255, 286, 317-319, 597, 598, 603, 643; r 251, 261, 292, 294, 305, 332, 333, 337, 347, 349, 385; a 989; r 155, 203, 251.
Lincoln Brigade.....	h 223; r 251, 261, 292, 294, 332, 333, 337, 347, 349, 385
Lincoln-Mercury Division (Ford Motor Co.).....	h 376
Lincoln Experimental School.....	h 253-255, 286, 674
Lincoln School.....	h 700, 701, 705, 713, 719, 720; a 1081, 1114, 1144-1146; r 136, 149
Lindeman, Edward C.....	a 1159, 1175, 1176, 1236; r 106, 122
Lindgren, Raymond E.....	a 1231
Lindley, Ernest H.....	h 344
Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada.....	a 1002
Linguistic Society of America.....	a 999
Linton, M. Albert.....	h 350; a 1051
Linton, Ralph.....	h 137
Lions International Organization.....	a 1156
Lippmann, Walter.....	h 349, 928
Lipsit, S. Martin.....	a 983
Lipsky, Celia.....	r 161
Literary Digest.....	h 148, 150
Littauer, M.....	h 795
Littauer Center of Public Administration (school).....	h 795
Litterick, William.....	a 1048
Little, Clarence C.....	h 344

	Page
Little, Herbert S.....	h 553
Little, Brown & Co.....	h 348, 395; r 324
Little, Leader, LeSourd & Palmer (law firm).....	h 553
Litvinov.....	r 379
Liveright, A. A.....	r 329
Lizitzky, Gene.....	r 161
Llewellyn, Professor.....	r 68
Llewellyn, Carl.....	h 220
Lobbying.....	r 220
Locke.....	a 1168
Locke, John.....	h 581, 804, 805; r 66
Lockwood, William W.....	h 553
Lodge, Nucia P.....	h 303
Loeb, Robert A.....	h 355
Loeb, Robert F.....	a 1127
Logan, Dr. John A.....	a 1073
London, Jack.....	h 206, 219, 220; a 993; r 148
London, Leopold.....	r 161
London County Council.....	a 985
London School of Economics.....	h 215, 615, 620-622, 674, 703-705, 713, 939; a 1081, 1139; r 57
London University.....	r 263
Long Island Railroad Co.....	h 359
Longley, Clifford B.....	h 346, 347
Longmans, Green & Co.....	h 394; a 1235
Look (publication).....	h 490, 491, 495, 502, 503
Lord, Walter.....	a 1235
Lorimer, Frank L.....	h 917
Lorwin, Lewis L.....	r 92
Los Angeles Board of Education.....	h 379-382; r 188
Los Angeles City School Department.....	h 379, 384; r 188
Los Angeles Times.....	h 379, 382
Louis and Maud Hill Family Foundation.....	h 16; a 1227, 1231; h 16
Louisiana Farmers Union.....	r 405
Louisiana University.....	h 61
Louisiana State University.....	h 831; a 1231
Louisville Courier-Journal.....	a 1021
Louisville Times.....	h 347; a 1021
Lovestone, Jay.....	r 404
Lovett, Robert A.....	h 344, 355, 360; a 1127
Lovett, Robert Morse.....	h 135, 221-224, 305; a 1175; r 92, 148
Low, Bela.....	r 409
Low Memorial Library.....	a 1184, 1193
Lowden, Frank O.....	h 341
Lowell, Abbott Lawrence.....	h 344, 574
Lowenstein, Prince Hubertus Zu.....	h 928
Lowrie, Donald A.....	h 348
Lowry, Howard F.....	h 344
Loyalty and Legislative Action (publication).....	a 1132
Loyalty Review Board.....	r 237, 238, 242, 243, 248, 255, 256, 276, 278, 281, 282, 284, 303, 305, 307, 311, 318, 319, 321, 326, 327, 329, 334, 335, 352, 353, 366, 367, 381-385, 388, 394, 401, 402, 406, 414, 416.

	Page
Loyola University Press	h 394
Lubin, Isadore	h 220, 242, 769; a 1161; r 102, 148, 330
Lucas, Scott W	a 1239
Luckmann, Lloyd	h 255
Lundborg, F	h 848
Lunberg, George	h 149
Lundborg, Louis B	a 1239
Lurie, Leonard	h 750; r 99
Lusk Committee (New York Legislature)	h 253, 286, 296, 297, 400, 467
Lusk Report	h 286, 296
Lustig, Alvin	r 189
Luther	a 1168
Luthringer, George F	a 1230
Lynch Terror Stalks America (handbill)	r 383
Lynd, Robert S	a 1216; r 110, 118, 330-333, 335
Lyons, Eugene	h 928; r 122

## M

Mabie, Hamilton Wright	h 875
MacArthur, General	h 556, 560-563, 579, 874; r 183, 201, 250
MacCauley	h 108
MacCracken	a 1220
MacCracken, Henry M	r 412
MacDonald, Dwight	h 33
MacGowan, Kenneth	h 220; r 148, 334
Machinery for Foreign Relations (article)	h 319
MacIver, Professor	r 68
MacIver, R. M	h 929; r 173, 335
Mackall, Lawton	h 927
Mackenzie, Gordon N	h 64
MacKenzie, Norman A. M	h 344, 874
MacLeish, Archibald M	r 190, 335-337
MacMahon, Prof. Arthur	a 1208
MacManus, Seumas	h 928
Macmillan Co	a 1236; h 394
MacMurray	h 910
MacNair, Harley F	h 927
MacNaughton, E. B	h 352
Macy, Josiah	h 16
Macy Foundation	h 16
Madison	a 1080
Madison, James	h 593, 597
Madison Square Garden	r 268, 276, 320, 357, 360
Magazine Publishers Association	a 1156
Magdoff, Harry Samuel	h 37; a 1202, 1203
Maker of Swords (play)	r 108
Mailer, Norman	r 190, 342
Main, John H. T	344
Maine University	a 1232
Mainstream (publication)	r 297, 346
Maisel, Albert Q	h 929
Maker of Swords (play)	a 1164

	Page
Making Bolsheviks (publication).....	h 927
Malenbaum, Wilfred.....	a 1230
Malkin, Maurice.....	h 471; r 196
Mallory, Walter H.....	h 886, 929
Malone, George W.....	h 37; a 1179, 1197, 1198, 1201, 1202
Maltz, Albert.....	a 1164; r 107, 165, 343-348, 391
Management-Employee Relations, Inc.....	h 553
Manchester University.....	a 1219
Mandates, Dependencies, and Trusteeships (study).....	h 887
Manhattan Center (New York, N. Y.).....	r 242, 323, 346
Manifesto and a Call to the National Writers Congress.....	r 370
Manion, Clarence.....	h 243, 245, 246, 254; r 121
Mann, A. R.....	h 362, 363
Mann, Charles R.....	h 269, 275; r 157
Manning, Richard I.....	h 341
Manual Arts Press.....	h 394
Manual of Corporate Giving.....	a 1236
Mao Tsetung.....	r 235
Marcantonio, Vito.....	h 223;
	r 238, 241, 252, 288, 301, 303, 322, 328, 377
March of Treason (study).....	h 223; r 285, 356, 382
Marine Trust Co.....	h 731
Maritime Trade of Western United States (publication).....	h 888
Markel, John.....	h 16, 854; r 47
Markel, Lester.....	h 884; a 1048
Markel, Mary.....	h 16, 854; r 47
Markle Foundation.....	h 16, 854; r 47
Marks.....	h 926
Marquat, General.....	h 562
Marquette University.....	a 1232
Marriott, John A. R.....	h 928
Marshall, George.....	h 151, 338; a 973, 1216
Marshall, John.....	h 6
Marshall, Leon C.....	h 286
Marshall, Robert.....	h 40,
	41, 457, 458, 471, 472; r 54, 107, 197, 201, 360, 399,
	400, 405.
Marshall College.....	a 1230
Marshall Field & Co.....	a 1232
Marshall Field Foundation.....	h 16, 28, 471, 472; r 54
Marshall Foundation.....	h 40, 41, 457, 458, 471, 472; r 54, 107
Marshall Plan.....	r 163
Marston, Edgar L.....	h 360
Martens, Ludwig C. K. A.....	a 1216
Martin Adele C.....	r 161
Martin, Boyd A.....	h 553
Martin, Carloyn E.....	a 1182
Martin, Charles E.....	h 553, 874
Martin, Clyde E.....	h 123
Martin, Leslie John.....	a 1230
Martin, Prof. Oliver.....	a 1184
Martin, Speaker.....	h 590
Marvel, William W.....	h 340

	Page
Martinsville Seven	r 284
Marx, Karl	h 27,
	32, 41, 217, 219, 277, 278, 315, 467, 551, 571, 573-576,
	595, 612, 746, 749, 768, 770, 788, 801, 802, 821, 847;
	a 1167; r 73, 92, 108, 117, 119, 124, 149, 151, 152,
	155, 202, 203, 272, 294, 361, 368, 409, 411, 412, 414
Marxist (quarterly)	r 272, 361
Maryland Association of Democratic Rights	r 323
Maryland Citizens Committee Against Ober anti-Communist law	r 365
Maryland University	h 333, 390
Mask for Privilege (publication)	h 33; r 121, 341
Mason, Lucy Randolph	r 399
Mason, Ma	h 360
Mason, Max	h 355, 357, 358, 363
Massachusetts Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts	r 275
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	h 346,
	353, 359, 395, 679; a 1033, 1216, 1218; r 248
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press	h 395, 933
Massachusetts Legislature	h 571
Masses and Mainstream (publication)	r 272,
	286, 297, 343, 346, 348, 361
Masses and Terrorism (article)	r 93
Massock, Richard G	h 929
Mathematical Association of America	a 1112
Mather, Samuel	h 341
Mathers	h 394
Matson, Wallace Irving	a 1232
Matthew-Bender	a 1235, 1236
Matthews, J. B	a 987, 1173, 1175; r 397, 398
Mattocks, Raymond L	h 345
Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation	h 16, 84; r 45, 47
Max C. Fleischman Foundation	h 16
Maxwell School of Citizenship	a 1205
May, Herbert L	a 1182
May, Oliver	h 347
May, Rene A	h 553
Mayer, John	a 1048
Mayer, Milton	h 32; r 351, 352
Mayflower Pact	r 250
McBride, Robert M	h 927
McCain, James R	h 360
McCallum, Revell	h 854; r 47
McCarran, Pat	h 33,
	43, 215, 256, 529, 537, 539, 547, 557-560, 564, 883,
	901, 927, 929; a 1060, 1136, 1215; r 29, 41, 148, 173,
	174, 180, 181, 187, 225, 250, 265, 267, 281, 290, 291,
	333, 355, 373.
McCarran, Sister Margaret Patricia	h 215,
	244; a 945-947; r 148, 225
McCarran Committee	h 33,
	43, 529, 537, 539, 547, 557-560, 564, 732, 883, 901,
	927, 929; a 1060, 1136, 1215; r 29, 41, 173, 174, 180,
	181, 250, 265, 267, 281, 333, 355.

	Page
McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.....	r 187
McCarthy, Joseph.....	h 33, 74, 208, 267, 269, 311, 732, 766; a 1166; r 101, 111, 197
McCarthy, Henry L.....	a 984
McClelland, Thomas.....	h 344
McCloy, John J.....	h 346, 355; a 1021, 1127
McCormick, Colonel.....	h 787
McCormick, Medill.....	a 980
McCormick, Ruth Hanna.....	a 980
McCormick, Samuel B.....	h 344
McCormick-Mathers Publishing Co.....	h 394
McCoy, Maj. Gen. Frank R.....	a 1177, 1180
McCutcheon, Roger P.....	a 1009
McDaniel, Joseph M. Jr.....	h 347, 348; a 1239
McDonald, Hon. James G.....	a 1177, 1182
McDougall, Archibald.....	a 1230
McDougall, Curtis.....	h 35
McEntegart, Bryan J.....	a 946
McFerren, Darel D.....	a 1230
McGee, Theodore.....	h 517; a 984
McGill, James H.....	a 1172
McGill, Ralph.....	h 349
McGill University.....	h 874; a 1139
McGovern, Prof. William M.....	a 1184
McGrath, J. Howard.....	r 270, 278, 319, 344, 345, 350, 383
McGraw-Hill Book Co.....	h 394
McIver, Professor.....	h 131
McKeever, Simon.....	r 346, 348
McKeon, Richard P.....	r 189
McKinley, William.....	h 43, 136, 333
McKinley Republican.....	h 333
McKinnon, Mr.....	r 150
McKinnon, Harold R.....	h 256, 259
McMullen, Laura W.....	h 927; r 173
McMurray.....	h 879
McNiece, Thomas M.....	h 467-521, 601-666, 844
McNutt, Gov. Paul V.....	a 1232
McPeak, William H.....	h 347
McPherson, Aimee.....	r 294
McWilliams, Carey.....	h 33, 34; r 121, 337-341
Meaning of Democracy (publication).....	h 94
Means, Gardner C.....	r 92
Meany, George.....	h 308, 784; a 977, 980, 995
Mears, Elliott G.....	h 888
Mediaeval Academy of America.....	a 999
Medical Aid Division (Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign).....	r 337
Medical Education in the United States and Canada (report).....	a 955
Medina, Judge Harold R.....	a 1219; r 330
Meeker, Dr. D. Olan.....	a 983
Meet the Germans (publication).....	h 926
Meet the Japanese (publication).....	h 927
Meet the People of the Progressive Theater (leaflet).....	r 264
Meharry Medical College.....	a 1124

	Page
Meier, Arthur.....	r 363
Meiklejohn, Dr. Alexander.....	a 977
Mein Kampf (publication).....	r 132
Melby, Ernest O.....	h 327, 388, 397
Melby, Hilda H.....	a 1009
Melch, Holmes.....	a 1239
Melcher, F. G.....	a 1239
Mellett, Lowell.....	h 74
Mellon, Mr.....	h 297
Mellon, Paul.....	h 349
Mellon, A. W.....	h 16; a 1235
Mellon, R. K.....	h 16
Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.....	h 16; a 1235
Mellon Foundation.....	h 16, 42; a 1042
Mellon Institute of Industrial Research.....	h 16
Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.....	a 1048
Memorandum on the Composition, Procedure, and Functions of the Committees of the League of Nations (mimeographed study).....	h 915
Men and Machines (publication).....	h 134
Men on Bataan (publication).....	h 553
Men of the Ford Foundation (article).....	a 1239
Men's Club of Hitchcock Memorial Church.....	a 1209
Menshikov, Chief Michail A.....	a 1207
Merchant of Venice (publication).....	h 500
Meredith, Elizabeth.....	h 348
Merriam, Professor.....	r 57
Merriam, Charles E.....	h 286, 514, 565, 566, 573, 581, 596, 616-619
Merriam, Charles K.....	131, 141
Merriam, John C.....	h 338
Merrick, Lectures, 1945.....	h 929
Merrill, Charles E.....	h 394
Merrill Co.....	h 394
Merton, Professor.....	r 81
Messersmith, George S.....	r 261
Metchnikoff.....	a 1105
Methodist Federation of Social Action.....	h 38
Methodist Federation for Social Service (youth section).....	r 187
Methods and Problems of Medical Education (article).....	a 1241
Meusel, Alfred.....	r 93
Mexico (publication).....	h 927
Mezerik, A. G.....	a 1239
Meyer, Agnes E.....	r 10
Meyer, Eugene.....	r 10
Meyer Foundation (Eugene and Agnes E.).....	r 10
Miami University.....	h 250
Miami University (Oxford, Ohio).....	a 1231
Michigan Civil Rights Federation.....	a 1172
Michigan Department of Public Instruction.....	a 1149
Michigan Law Review.....	a 1238
Michigan University.....	h 250,
	286, 395, 524; a 1001, 1025, 1029, 1129, 1149
Michigan University Press.....	h 395

	Page
Mid-Century Conference.....	a 1032; r 240, 321, 322
Mid-West Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.....	r 267
Middlebury College.....	a 1230
Middlebush, Frederick A.....	h 344
Middleman (article).....	h 32
Middletown (publication).....	r 204
Midkiff, Frank A.....	h 553
Milbank Memorial Fund.....	h 16, 268, 275; a 1241; r 157
Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly.....	a 1241
Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley.....	a 965
Miller, Spencer Jr.....	r 396
Miles.....	a 974
Militarism in Japan (publication).....	h 556
Mill, Edward W.....	a 1230
Miller, A. V.....	r 9
Miller, David Hunter.....	h 878
Miller, J. L.....	h 928
Miller, James R.....	a 1239
Miller, Leslie A.....	h 352
Miller, M. S.....	h 928
Miller, Margaret Carnegie.....	h 338; a 965
Miller, Perry.....	r 189, 190, 349
Miller, Spencer, Jr.....	r 928
Miller, William Marion.....	a 1231
Millis, John S.....	h 344
Mills, C. Wright.....	a 983
Mills College.....	h 554; r 150
Milne High School, New York State College for Teachers (Albany, N. Y.).....	h 65
Milton.....	a 1168
Miltwyck School.....	a 985
Mims, Edwin.....	h 360
Minary, John S.....	h 352
Ming, William R., Jr.....	h 33
Minimum of Education (article).....	h 483
Minkoff, Nathaniel.....	h 779; a 977, 990; r 104
Minneapolis Public Schools.....	a 1149
Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.....	h 346, 376; a 1021
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.....	h 375
Minnesota University.....	h 286, 362, 395; a 953, 975, 1009, 1231; r 74, 82, 424
Minnesota University Press.....	h 395
Minor, Clark H.....	h 891
Minor Foundation.....	h 16
Minor, William H.....	h 16
Miracle of America (publication).....	h 42; a 1043, 1044
Misner, Paul J.....	a 1149
Missouri University.....	a 1139
Mitchell, Broadus.....	h 220
Mitchell, George.....	r 339
Mitchell, N. P.....	h 927
Mitchell, Wesley C.....	h 813, 848-850; a 998
Mittell, Sherman.....	a 1232, 1233



	Page
Mobilizing our Forces, Economic, Political, Cultural, In Behalf of the New Freedom (pamphlet)-----	r 105
Mobilizing Our Forces, Economic, Political, Cultural, in Behalf of the New Freedom (roundtable)-----	h 780, 789
Mobilizing Our Forces in Behalf of the Third Freedom (conference theme)-----	h 779
Modern Atheism (article)-----	r 92
Modern Foreign Exchange (publication)-----	h 927
Modern History (publication)-----	r 362
Modern Language Association of America-----	a 999
Modern Philanthropic Foundation-----	a 1239
Modigliani, Prof. Franco-----	a 1025
Moe, Henry Allen-----	h 355; a 1127, 1240; r 24, 198
Mohan, Pearey-----	a 1230
Molders of the American Mind (publication)-----	h 485; r 143
Molyneaux, Peter-----	h 341
Money to Burn (publication)-----	a 1235
Monroe, Parker-----	h 340, 345
Monrone, Mike-----	h 569
Monsanto Chemical Co-----	a 965
Monserrat, Joseph-----	a 984
Monson, Ronald A-----	h 927
Montague, Andrew J-----	h 342
Montague, William Pepperell-----	h 309
Montana State University-----	a 1231
Montgomery, George-----	r 122
Moon is Down (publication)-----	r 241
Mooney, Tom-----	h 222, 223, 741; r 230, 232, 255, 306
Mooney Committee-----	r 230
Moore, Dr. Geoffrey H-----	a 980
Moore, Harriet (Gelfan)-----	a 1223, 1228; r 324
Moore, Warner R-----	r 9
Moral Awakening in America (symposium)-----	h 766; a 996
Morals (article)-----	r 93
Morford, Richard-----	r 322
Morgan, Arthur-----	h 300; a 1175
Morgan, H. A-----	h 300
Morgan, J. P-----	h 347, 349; a 965; r 317
Morgan, Joy Elmer-----	h 309
Morgan & Co-----	h 347, 349; a 965
Morgens, Howard J-----	a 1043
Morgenthau, Henry Jr-----	h 929; a 1216
Morley, Felix-----	h 927
Morning After the Revolution (conference theme)-----	h 750; r 99
Morphet, Edgar L-----	a 1240
Morrill, J. L-----	a 953; r 424
Morrill, Justin P-----	a 1116
Morris, Britton-----	r 161
Morris, Edward S-----	a 1181
Morris, Newbold-----	h 308, 309
Morris, Roland S-----	h 342
Morrisette, Bruce A-----	a 1231
Morrow, Dwight W-----	h 342

	Page
Morse	h 927
Morse, Wayne	h 784; a 977, 980
Mortimer, Charles G	a 1043
Morton, H. V	h 927
Moscow Art Theatre	r 389
Moscow Institute	r 378
Moscow Izvestia (publication)	r 412
Moscow News	r 134, 378, 408
Moscow Trials	r 313, 333, 343, 379
Moscow University	h 266, 267, 273-276, 279-282; r 152, 157-159, 160, 161, 412
Moscow War Diary (publication)	r 388
Mosely, Philip E.	h 38, 347, 348, 885, 897; a 1036, 1037; r 46
Most, Amicus	h 749; a 984; r 99
Mother (publication)	h 927
Mother Bloor Celebration Committee	r 258
Motherwell, Robert	r 189
Motion-Picture Direction Course (Peoples Educational Center)	r 334
Motlow, John D.	a 1229
Mott, Charles Stewart	h 16
Mott Foundation	h 16
Moulton, Rev. Arthur W.	r 291
Moulton, Harold G	h 629, 643, 927
Mount Holyoke College	h 555, 750, 831; r 99
Mount Vernon Mortgage Co	a 1232, 1233
Mount Vernon Trust Co	a 1232, 1233
Mountjoy, Helen S	a 1217
Movies (article)	h 310
Mowat, R. B.	h 929
Mowitz, Robert J	a 1132
Mudd, Harvey S	r 46
Mudd Foundation	r 46
Muhlenberg College	a 1229, 1232
Muir, Ramsay	h 926
Mumford, Lewis	h 848; r 100
Mumford, Milton C	a 1048
Mundt, Karl	h 37, 762, 902; a 1157; r 339, 380, 383, 405
Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill	h 762, 902
Mundt-Nixon bill	r 299, 380
Munford, David C	h 348
Munro, Dana Carleton	a 975
Munro, Henry F	h 926
Murphy, Frank	a 1206
Murphy, Gardner	r 190, 349
Murphy, Prof. Jay	a 1218
Murphy, Starr J	h 355, 360, 363
Murray, H. A.	h 137; r 86, 190, 350
Murray, James E	r 407
Murray, Philip	h 766, 920
Murray, Walter C	h 344
Murrow, Edward R	h 267, 270, 271, 275, 307, 332, 342; r 157-159, 432

	Page
Music Educators National Conference.....	h 64
Musicians Committee (National Council of American-Soviet Friendship).....	r 252
Muslim Religion.....	a 1002
Mussolini.....	r 119
Mustapha Kemal of Turkey (publication).....	h 927
Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York... h 353, 359; a 1127, 1128	
Mutual Telephone Co.....	h 552
Muzzey, Professor.....	r 28
Myers, Dean.....	r 30
Myers, Louis G.....	h 357, 363
Myers, William I..... h 355, 361; a 1127, 1128, 1141	
Myers, Prof. William Starr.....	r 43
Myrdal, Alva.....	r 184
Myrdal, Gunnar.....	h 49
	58, 577, 578, 592, 593, 939; a 967-970; r 89, 91, 124, 184
Myth of Good and Bad Nations (publication).....	h 186

## N

Nabrit, S. M.....	a 1240
Naft, Stephen.....	r 408, 409
Naked and the Dead (film adaption, War Department).....	r 343
Naked and the Dead (publication).....	r 341, 342
NAM (National Association of Manufacturers).....	r 103, 119, 121
Nankai University (Tientsin).....	h 930, 931
Narodna Volya (Bulgarian Communist publication).....	r 339, 344
Nash Co.....	h 374
Nason, John W.....	a 1177, 1181
Nation (publication).....	h 784,
	793; a 1172, 1240; r 311, 326, 376, 379, 388, 389
National Academy of Sciences.....	h 123,
	470, 471, 475, 618, 894; r 45, 53
National Action Conference for Civil Rights.....	r 345
National Advisory Committee.....	a 1176
National Advisory Committee (American Youth Congress)....	r 230
National Advisory Council.....	h 267, 268, 275; r 157
National Advisory Council on Radio in Education.....	h 675, 713
National Americanism Commission (American Legion).....	r 363
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).....	a 984
National Association of Cost Accountants.....	h 495
National Association of Educational Broadcasters.....	a 1032
National Association of Manufacturers... h 33, 34, 778; r 103, 119, 121	
National Association of School Superintendents.....	h 74
National Association of Secondary School Principals.....	h 35,
	94, 105; a 1147
National Automobile Dealer's Association.....	h 375
National Better Business Bureau.....	r 213
National Broadcasting Co.....	h 386; a 1031-1032
National Bureau of Economic Research.....	h 605,
	641, 849, 894-896; a 962, 963, 979, 980, 998, 1124, 1140
National Central University (China).....	h 930
National CIO War Relief Committee.....	r 232

	Page
National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.....	h 675, 698, 699, 701, 703-705; a 955, 1157; r 221
National Citizens' Political Action Committee.....	a 1170-1174
National City Bank of New York.....	h 346
National Civil Rights Legislative Conference.....	r 343, 383
National Civil Service League.....	a 1031
National Coal Board (publication).....	h 307
National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA.....	h 320, 321, 323-325, 327, 333, 388, 407
National Commission on History and Geography of the United States.....	h 61
National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax.....	a 1170
National Committee to Aid the Victims of German Fascism....	h 223
National Committee of the American Committee for Democ- racy and Intellectual Freedom.....	r 233
National Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy.....	r 231, 239
National Committee of the Communist Party.....	r 266
National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill.....	r 299, 355, 365
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners....	h 233; a 1170; r 251, 254, 260, 282, 303, 377
National Committee on Maternal Health.....	a 1139
National Committee for Peoples Rights.....	h 223; a 1170; r 251, 254, 260, 290, 303, 371, 377
National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act.....	r 333
National Committee on Research in Secondary Education....	h 94
National Committee of the Student Congress Against War..	r 255, 318
National Committee on Teachers Examinations.....	h 688
National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims..	h 224; r 266, 277, 344
National Committee to Win the Peace.....	r 269, 359, 377, 381
National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East.....	r 235, 303, 346, 348, 374, 383
National Conference of Christians and Jews.....	r 52
National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress.....	r 358, 383
National Conference for Constitutional Liberties.....	r 400
National Conference on Foreign Relations of the United States..	h 872
National Conference for Mobilization of Education.....	h 74
National Conference to Repeal the Walter-McCarran Law and Defend Its Victims.....	r 291, 373
National Conference on Social Work.....	r 310
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.....	a 1156
National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance..	r 230, 232, 253, 260, 314
National Council for American Education.....	h 322, 324
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.....	h 36; a 988, 1035, 1036, 1170, 1216; r 175, 228, 250, 254, 264, 268, 279, 288, 289, 296, 302, 319, 320, 322, 323, 331, 333, 346, 348, 360, 366, 377, 384.
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (Committee on Education).....	r 264, 265, 289, 320, 331, 366
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (Committee on Education Bulletin).....	r 289, 366

	Page
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (report).....	r 252
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (Southern California Chapter).....	r 270, 347
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (Theatre Division).....	r 342, 347
National Council of Education.....	r 151
National Council of Parent Education.....	h 696; r 136
National Council on Social Studies.....	h 35,
	64, 478; a 1115; r 153, 190
National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.....	h 38,
	223, 224; a 1174; r 241, 252, 257, 264, 270, 274, 279,
	280, 282, 283, 297, 299, 304, 311, 321, 332, 333, 341,
	342, 347-350, 367, 374, 380, 385, 386, 391, 392.
National Council of Churches.....	h 47
National Council of Education.....	h 263
National Defense Advisory Commission.....	a 1206
National Delegates Assembly for Peace.....	h 223
National Democratic Committee.....	a 1181
National Education Association (NEA).....	h 21,
	32, 34, 35, 46, 47, 63-65, 74, 94, 104-106, 109, 135,
	224, 230, 267, 313-315, 320, 321, 323, 325-327, 329,
	330, 334, 382, 385, 388, 395, 396, 398, 405, 407, 409,
	470, 475, 478, 482, 489-491, 494, 501, 505, 514, 516,
	674-676, 679, 682, 686, 689, 696-698, 701, 703-705,
	713, 714, 716, 720, 722, 893, 925; a 967, 970, 992,
	1081, 1112, 1115, 1146, 1147, 1150-1158; r 45, 53,
	85, 135, 136, 140, 141, 145, 146, 149, 154-156, 191,
	199, 432.
National Education Association (Department of Superintendents).....	r 85, 140
National Education Association Handbook.....	h 74, 704; r 138, 146
National Education Association Journal (publication).....	h 135; a 1240
National Emergency Conference.....	h 223;
	a 1172, 1173; r 307, 309, 310, 332, 377, 380
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.....	h 223;
	a 1172, 1173, 1176; r 288, 303, 307-310, 312, 323, 326,
	328, 332, 371, 377, 380.
National Executive Committee (American League Against War and Fascism).....	r 253
National Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America.....	h 881
National Farmers Union.....	h 780, 788; r 404-407
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.....	h 920
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.....	h 223;
	a 1170, 1171, 1173; r 233, 252, 271, 284, 291, 306-308,
	310, 312, 319, 329, 332-334, 339, 340, 345, 348, 349,
	358, 364, 367, 383, 390, 402, 406.
National Film Board of Canada.....	r 166
National Free Browder Congress.....	r 267
National Grange.....	h 881
National Guardian (publication).....	r 280
National Health Insurance (publication).....	h 793; a 981

	Page
National Home Library Foundation of Washington, D. C. ....	a 1232, 1233, 1234
National Housing Conference .....	a 979, 983
National Industrial Conference Board .....	r 119; h 495
National Institute of Public Affairs .....	h 899, 931, 937
National Interest (publication) .....	h 595
National Lawyers Guild .....	h 39, 903; a 1220; r 288, 340, 347, 349
National League of Women Voters .....	h 920
National Library Association .....	r 221
National Manpower Council .....	a 1033
National Mooney Council of Action .....	h 223
National Municipal League .....	a 1031, 1209
National Negro Congress .....	r 359, 360, 385
National Non-Partisan Committee to Defend the Rights of the Twelve Communist Leaders .....	r 266, 344, 386
National Peace Conference .....	h 881, 890; r 172
National Peoples Committee Against Hearst .....	h 223; r 238, 260, 308, 314, 377
National Planning Association .....	h 779; a 990, 1236
National Planning Board .....	h 473, 612, 613, 616, 625; r 50, 53, 129-132
National Planning Board (1933-34 report) .....	r 50
National Productivity Since 1869 (publication) .....	h 656
National Public Housing Conference .....	h 779
National Reception Committee for Madame Irene Joliot- Currie .....	r 321
National Recovery Act administration and Government Financial Policy (study) .....	r 128
National Religion and Labor Foundation .....	a 1170
National Republic (publication) .....	a 1215; r 408
National Research Council (NRC) .....	h 21, 45, 47, 123, 355, 482, 808, 809, 816, 879, 894; a 1005, 1124, 1137-1139; r 45, 47
National Resources Committee .....	r 130, 132
National Resources Development Report (1942) .....	r 131
National Resources Planning Board .....	a 990; r 53, 130-132, 141
National Right-To-Work Congress .....	h 223
National Science Foundation .....	h 48; a 1004, 1240; r 45, 46, 49
National Security Committee (American Coalition of Patri- otic, Civic and Fraternal Societies) .....	r 408
National Selection Committee .....	a 1042
National Selection Committee on Workers' and Adult Educa- tion .....	a 1162
National Social Welfare Assembly .....	a 1162
National Society, Sons of the American Revolution .....	h 190, 197, 261, 327, 335, 336, 368, 387, 393, 396, 403; r 147
National Student Federation of America .....	r 355, 412
National Student League .....	r 255, 260, 318, 393, 394
National Union Farmer (publication) .....	r 405
National University of Mexico .....	h 61
National War College .....	h 524, 874, 941
National Writers Congress .....	h 223; r 370

	Page
Nationalism and Internationalism (publication).....	h 926
Nationalist Party (China).....	h 560
Nations Business (publication).....	a 1241
NATO.....	r 9
Nature of Intellectual Freedom (speech).....	r 270
Naumoff, Benjamin.....	a 984
Navarre School.....	a 1204
Nazi Party.....	h 32, 146, 248, 292, 504, 771, 778, 788; r 92, 103, 118, 153, 231, 296, 312, 353, 380
Nazi press.....	r 153
NEA Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom.....	h 501, 502
NEA Handbook.....	h 74
Nebraska University.....	h 358; a 1231
Negro in America (publication).....	h 34; a 9969
Negro Leader's Plea to Save Rosenbergs (article).....	r 272
Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (study).....	a 967
Nehru, Jawaharlal.....	h 309
Neilson, William Allan.....	h 269, 272, 275, 344
Nelson, Donald M.....	h 553; a 1197, 1207
Nelson, Otto L., Jr.....	h 342
Nelson, William Rockhill.....	h 16
Nelson Trust.....	h 16
Neruda, Pablo.....	r 267, 275, 386
Neutrality Act.....	r 304, 364
New Appraisal (publication).....	a 981
New Brunswick University.....	h 874
New Century Publishers.....	r 271, 315, 348, 349
New Concepts in Education (paper).....	r 63
New Dance League.....	r 347
New Deal Party.....	h 301; r 92, 117, 145, 162
New Democracy and the New Despotism (publication).....	h 619; r 132
New Education Fellowship.....	h 493
New Fabian Essays (publication).....	r 132
New Frontiers (publication).....	h 467; r 167
New Jersey League of Women Shoppers.....	r 228, 308
New Jersey State Teachers College.....	a 1215, 1217
New Man in Soviet Psychology (publication).....	h 843
New Masses (publication).....	a 1212; r 230, 232, 233, 236, 237, 241, 245, 249, 251, 252, 259, 264, 271, 272, 276, 282, 286, 290, 295-297, 301, 304, 308, 309, 312-314, 316-318, 326-328, 332, 336, 340, 341, 345, 346, 349, 355, 361, 366, 367, 369-371, 375- 377, 379, 390, 392, 393, 402, 408.
New Masses Letter to the President.....	h 223; r 371, 377
New Masses Symposium.....	r 282, 346
New Masses Theatre Night (symposium).....	r 346
New Philosophy of Public Debt (publication).....	h 643
New Pioneer (publication).....	r 369
New Policy for the AEF (article).....	h 35; r 152
New Protectionism (publication).....	h 926
New Republic (publication).....	h 135; a 1176; 1238-1240; r 190, 236, 239, 262, 269, 370, 371

	Page
New Restrictions on Charitable Exemptions and Deductions for Federal Tax Purposes (article).....	a 1238
New Russian Primer (publication).....	h 285, 927
New School for Social Research.....	h 31, 553, 894, 917; a 1160; r 106, 300, 304, 396
New Standard Dictionary.....	a 978
New Statesmen and Nation (publication).....	r 388
New Testament.....	h 130; r 71
New Theater (publication).....	r 264, 349
New Theater League.....	r 264, 292, 347, 349
New Threats to American Freedom (pamphlet).....	h 902
New Times (publication).....	r 243
New Trends in Corporate Giving (article).....	a 1237
New World Review.....	r 271, 307, 316
New York Central Railroad.....	h 756
New York City Board of Aldermen.....	r 258
New York City Board of Higher Education.....	a 993
New York City College.....	h 268, 275, 390; a 976, 1041, 1229
New York City Council.....	a 976, 984
New York City Sponsoring Committee.....	r 253
New York Committee on Discrimination in Employment.....	h 779; a 990
New York Committee to Win the Peace.....	r 269, 359
New York Conference for Inalienable Rights.....	r 234, 265, 354
New York Council of Arts.....	r 270, 284
New York Foundation.....	h 16
New York Herald Tribune.....	h 77; a 1180, 1216, 1238; r 8-10, 88, 428, 429
New York Law Society.....	a 1219
New York League of Women Shoppers.....	r 308
New York Legislature.....	h 253, 286, 296, 297, 400, 701
New York Life Insurance Co.....	a 965
New York Memorial Cancer Hospital.....	h 582
New York Post.....	r 325
New York Public School System.....	h 283; r 234, 319
New York School for Social Research.....	a 995
New York School of Social Work.....	a 995, 1175, 1205; r 310
New York Star (publication).....	r 342, 408
New York State Board of Regents.....	h 698
New York State Chamber of Commerce.....	h 892
New York State College of Agriculture.....	h 355; a 1127, 1128, 1141; r 30
New York State College for Teachers, Milne High School (Albany, N. Y.).....	h 65
New York State Conference on National Unity.....	a 1176
New York State Council of the Arts and Sciences.....	r 342
New York State Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities.....	r 249
New York State Unemployment Insurance Advisory Com- mittee.....	h 779; a 990
New York Telephone Co.....	h 749



	Page
New York Times-----	h 41,
89, 165, 166, 300, 330, 356, 400, 404, 409, 630, 750, 751,	
849, 862, 901; a 973, 980, 1002, 1045, 1048, 1127, 1130,	
1159, 1187, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1240; r 5, 30, 32, 33, 72,	
93, 116, 174, 176, 183, 195, 202, 231, 250, 253, 267, 275,	
277, 286, 300, 306, 309, 324, 331, 340, 347, 357, 362,	
365, 368, 373, 386, 399, 428, 429.	
New York Times Book Review-----	h 148, 166; a 1216; r 324
New York Times (magazine)-----	h 39; a 1237; r 116, 250
New York Tom Mooney Committee-----	r 230
New York University-----	h 64,
254, 268, 272-274, 327, 359, 361, 390, 395, 495, 517,	
677, 697; a 976, 977, 983, 985, 995, 996, 1009, 1025,	
1048, 1231, 1236; r 278.	
New York University Press-----	h 395
New York World Telegram and Sun-----	a 1237
New York Yankees-----	h 371, 589
New Zealand (publication)-----	h 929
New Zealand House of Representatives-----	h 790
New Zealand's Labor Government at Work (publication)-----	h 736
Newark College of Rutgers University-----	a 1041
Newcomb, John L-----	h 344
Newlan, Jesse H-----	h 265, 286
News-Letter-----	r 288
News Releases by American Heritage Foundation-----	a 1241
News You Don't Get (publication)-----	r 238,
251, 254, 259, 260, 290, 303, 349, 369, 371, 376, 377	
Newson & Co-----	h 394
Newton-----	a 1092, 1168
Newton, Ray-----	r 350
Niebuhr, Reinhold-----	h 751; r 99, 190, 353-354
Nimitz, Admiral-----	a 973
Nineteen Eighty Four "1984" (publication)-----	h 141
Nirvana-----	r 139
Nisselson, Michael M-----	a 1173
Nitze, Paul-----	a 1161
Nixon-----	r 299, 762, 902
Nixon, J. W-----	r 161
Nixon, Richard-----	r 351, 381
NKVD (Soviet Military Intelligence)-----	r 287
Nobel-----	h 930
Nobel, Mary E-----	a 1229
Nobel Prize-----	a 991, 1101, 1103; r 242
Nolde, O. Frederick-----	h 342, 884; a 1181; r 176
Non-Partisan Committee to Defend Communist Leaders-----	r 361
Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman	
Vito Marcantonio--	h 223; r 238, 241, 252, 288, 231, 303, 328, 377
Noon, John W-----	a 1182
Nordberto Bobbio (publication)-----	r 76
Norgenstern, George-----	r 121
Norlin, George-----	h 344
Norman, Dorothy-----	r 189

	Page
North, Joseph .....	r 266
North, Professor Robert C .....	r 32
North Africa (publication) .....	h 929
North African Affairs Committee (Algiers) .....	r 287
North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy .....	r 230, 232, 237, 238, 259, 277, 288, 292, 309, 337, 350, 371, 378
North Atlantic Defense Pact .....	r 273, 280, 283, 411
North Carolina University .....	h 268, 272, 275, 395, 874; a 955 1181, 1232; r 81, 399
North Carolina University Press .....	h 395
Northwest Commission to Study the Organization of Peace .....	h 874
Northwest Farmers' and Workers' Education Conference .....	a 1166
Northwestern University .....	h 242, 555, 582, 831; a 1041, 1149, 1184, 1191, 1229, 1231, 1232; r 26, 39
Northwestern University Press .....	h 395
Norton, Edward L. ....	h 361; a 1128
Norton, Helen G. ....	r 397
Norton, Thomas James .....	r 122
Norton, W. W. ....	h 394
Norton & Co. ....	h 394
Norwegian Government Disability Services .....	h 778; a 990
Not Without Laughter (publication) .....	r 297
Notes on a Drum (publication) .....	h 928
Notre Dame University .....	h 831; a 1014
Nourse, Dr. Edwin .....	a 963
Now the Foundations (article) .....	a 1240
Nowak, Frank .....	r 158
Nowell, William .....	r 394
Nunez, Rev. Benjamin .....	a 985
Nursery Schools (pamphlet) .....	h 289
Nurske, Ragnar .....	a 1231
NYA Air Pilot Schools .....	r 416
Nye-Kvale .....	r 411
Nystrom, J. Warren .....	a 1181

## O

Oahu Railway & Land Co. ....	h 553
Oakeshott, Michael B. ....	a 1140
Ober Act of the State of Maryland .....	a 1132
Oberlin Alumni Club of Washington, D. C. ....	a 1209
Oberlin College .....	h 220, 272, 275; a 1197, 1204, 1205, 1209
O'Brian, John Lord .....	h 350
Occasional Papers No. 3, A Modern School (publication) .....	h 250, 251, 287
Occidental College .....	h 553; a 1041; r 158
Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California .....	h 553
Occupation of Japan (publication) .....	h 901
Odegaard, Dr. Charles E. ....	a 1129
Odegaard, P. H. ....	r 184
Odets, Clifford .....	a 1164
O'Dowd, Lt. Paul, Jr. ....	h 291
Odum, Howard W. ....	h 272, 275
O'Dwyer, Mayor .....	r 267

	Page
Of Human Rights (film).....	r 165
Office of Education Directory.....	h 674
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	a 1206
Ogburn.....	h 848
Ogden, David L.....	a 1230
Ogden, Miss Esther G.....	a 1182
Ogden, Robert C.....	h 361, 362
Ogg, Frederic A.....	h 567; a 1236
Oglethorpe University.....	h 831; a 1230
Ogura.....	r 119
Ohio Education Association.....	h 504
Ohio Marches Toward Peace and Progress (article).....	r 293
Ohio State.....	h 504, 506
Ohio State University.....	h 107, 250, 267, 274, 310, 327-329, 395, 489, 518; a 1139, 1232; r 424
Ohio State University Press.....	h 395
Oil (article).....	h 319
Oklahoma University.....	a 1231
Old Deal (article).....	h 468
Old Colony Trust Co.....	a 1128
Old Dominion Foundation.....	h 16, 349; a 1042; r 162
Olden, Rudolf.....	h 926
Older, Andrew.....	r 160
Older, Julia.....	r 160
Olds, Leland.....	a 977, 996
Olds, Robert E.....	h 342
Olin Foundation.....	h 16
Oliver, Alfred Richard.....	a 1231
Oliver, Sydney.....	h 215
Olmsted, Shirley.....	r 161
Olmsted, Sterling.....	a 1164
Omnibus (television program).....	a 1029
On the Abyss (publication).....	h 927; r 173
On the Agenda of Democracy (publication).....	h 482, 617
On the Picket Line (pamphlet).....	r 107
On Understanding Soviet Russia and Socialist Planning in the Soviet Union (pamphlet).....	r 315
One Hundred Questions to the Communists (publication).....	r 408
One Worlders (Syracuse).....	r 351
O'Neal, Edward A.....	h 920
O'Neal, Emmet.....	h 553
O'Neil, Charles Joseph.....	a 1232
Only Way for Writers (speech).....	r 342
Only Yesterday (publication).....	h 254, 303
Open Letter to American Liberals.....	h 223; a 1172; r 314, 328, 333, 340, 378
Open Letter to the American People (National Council of American-Soviet Friendship).....	r 331
Open Letter to the American People in Opposition to the Hobbs Bill.....	r 373
Open Letter for Closer Cooperation With the Soviet Union.....	h 223; a 1172, 1173; r 235, 240, 287, 289, 304, 314, 327, 355, 366, 378, 380, 391

	Page
Open Letter of the Council for Pan-American Democracy.....	r 332
Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges.....	r 314
Open Letter of the League of American Writers.....	r 332
Open Letter to J. Howard McGrath.....	r 270, 278, 344, 350
Open Letter to New Masses.....	r 328, 379
Open Letter to Nicholas Murray Butler.....	r 331, 354
Open Letter to the President of Brazil.....	r 233, 312, 370, 376
Open Letter to the President on Franco Spain.....	r 321, 345, 374
Open Letter to the President of the United States (in re Harry Bridges).....	r 252, 347, 349, 390
Open Letter to the President by The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.....	r 389
Open Lettter Protesting the Ban on Communists in the Amer- ican Civil Liberties Union.....	h 223
Open Road, Inc.....	a 1120, 1220; r 313
Opportunities and Dangers of Educational Foundations (arti- cle).....	a 1239
Opus 21 (publication).....	h 147
Ordeal by Planning (publication).....	r 122
Oregon University.....	h 349; a 1040, 1148
Organization of Public Health and Socialized Medicine (educa- tional course).....	h 279
Orlov.....	r 257
Orton, William A.....	a 1236
Orwell, George.....	h 141
Osborn, Fairfield.....	h 352
Osborn, Frederick.....	h 338; a 965; r 74, 82
Osborne, Brig. Gen. Frederick H.....	h 151, 157
Our Changing Industrial Incentives (publication).....	h 793
Our Constitution (article).....	h 310, 311, 318, 320
Our Federal Government (article).....	h 319
Our Land Resources (article).....	h 319
Our Mightiest Ghost (article).....	a 1238
Our Neighbors in North Africa (article).....	h 319
Our Son, Pablo (publication).....	h 929
Our Sunday Visitor (publication).....	a 1044
Our Water Resources (article).....	h 319
Outline of Modern Russian Literature (publication).....	r 367
Outlook (publication).....	r 153
Overstreet, Harry A.....	h 308, 763
Owen, Charlotte.....	r 161
Owens.....	h 346
Ox Bow Incident (publication).....	r 164
Oxford.....	h 215
Oxford Pledge.....	r 416
Oxford University Press.....	h 394
Oxnam, Bishop.....	h 261, 327

## P

Pabelford, Norman J.....	h 920
Pacific Spectator (publication).....	a 1240
Pacific National Bank (San Francisco).....	h 376
Paepcke, Walter P.....	h 349; a 1240

	Page
Page, Arthur W. ....	h 338; a 965
Page, Robert Newton.....	h 342
Page, Walter Hines.....	h 361, 553
Paine, Rear Adm. Roger W.....	a 1219
Painter, Sidney.....	a 1009
Paley, William S.....	h 352
Palmer.....	h 347
Palmer, Frank.....	a 1175
Palmer. ( <i>See Little, Leader, LeSourd &amp; Palmer.</i> )	
Pan American Highway Through South America (publication).....	h 929
Pan-American Petroleum and Transport Co.....	h 360
Pan American Union.....	h 64, 912
Panamanian Conference on History and Geography.....	h 61
Panal on Pan-American Affairs.....	r 334
Papanek, Dr. Ernst.....	a 984
Paramount Pictures. ( <i>See Ball v. Paramount Pictures.</i> )	
Parent-Teachers Association.....	h 47; a 1209; r 432
Pares, Bernard.....	h 929; a 1216
Paris, Ellsworth.....	r 77
Parker, Dorothy.....	a 1174
Parker, Edwin B.....	h 342
Parker, William A.....	a 1009
Parker, William R.....	a 1009
Parkin, G. R.....	h 928
Parkinson, Thomas I.....	h 355, 357, 361
Parmer, Charles B.....	h 928
Parran, Thomas.....	h 355, 361; a 1127, 1128
Parsons, Geoffrey.....	r 9
Parsons, Talcott.....	h 137, 848; r 86
Parsons, Wilfred.....	h 244
Parten, Jubal R.....	h 350; a 1051, 1052
Participation of Observers in International Conferences (publi- cation).....	h 915
Partisan Review.....	r 282, 286
Parton, James.....	r 9
Pasadena Board of Education.....	h 403, 405
Pasadena School Board.....	h 325, 405
Pasternak, Boris.....	r 257
Pasteur.....	a 1105
Pasvolsky, Leo.....	h 927, 934-936, 941
Patch, Buel W.....	a 1240
Path to Peace (publication).....	h 926
Patrick, Mary Mills.....	h 926
Patriotic Education, Inc.....	h 261
Patterns of Culture (publication).....	h 139
Patterns of Social Reform in North America (conference).....	a 983
Patterson, Elmore C.....	h 342
Patterson, Ernest Minor.....	h 927, 928; r 173, 354
Patterson, Gardner.....	a 1231
Patterson, Grove.....	r 158
Patterson, William A.....	h 348
Patton, James.....	r 404-407
Pavlov.....	h 142, 278, 283; r 87

	Page
Payne, Robert .....	h 929
Payne, Roger .....	h 467
Payne Fund .....	r 52
Peabody, George Foster .....	h 361, 363, 694, 706
Peabody, Stuart .....	a 1043
Peabody Board .....	h 706
Peabody College for Teachers .....	h 694; a 1145, 1149, 1236
Peabody Education Fund .....	h 359
Peace Aims Group .....	h 885, 886; r 177
Peace Atlas of Europe (publication) .....	h 929
Peace Ballot Commission .....	r 367
Peace Information Center .....	r 273
Peace Pilgrimage .....	r 356
Peace We Want (pamphlet) .....	h 917
Peace with the Dictators? (publication) .....	h 928; r 173
Peaceful Change (publication) .....	h 927, 928; r 173
Peake, Cyrus .....	h 580
Pearce .....	h 942
Pearce, Richard M. ....	h 358
Pearl Harbor (publication) .....	r 121
Pearson .....	h 639
Pearson, Norman Holmes .....	r 189
Pease, Edward R. ....	h 215
Peattie, Donald Culross .....	a 1240
Peekskill USA (publication) .....	r 284
Peers, E. Allison .....	h 928
Peffer, Nathaniel .....	h 929; a 1215, 1216; r 173, 174
Pell, Orlie A. H. ....	a 1163, 1165
Penn State University .....	h 114
Penniman, Josiah H. ....	h 344
Pennsylvania Railroad Co. ....	h 373
Pennsylvania State General Education Board .....	h 687
Pennsylvania University .....	h 114,
138, 165, 272, 275, 355, 395, 811, 846; a 1024, 1025,	
1139, 1184, 1187; r 26, 31, 158, 204, 354.	
Pennsylvania University Law Review .....	a 1239
Pennsylvania University Press .....	h 395
People vs. H. C. L. (pamphlet) .....	r 227,
230, 247, 249, 254, 306, 312, 328, 353, 371	
“People Of The World—A Day In Their Lives” (article) .....	r 163
People Write a World Charter (speech) .....	h 919, 920
Peoples Educational Center .....	r 334, 365
Peoples Front For Peace .....	h 223
People’s Institute of Applied Religion .....	a 1170; r 341, 347, 349, 401
Peoples Party .....	r 409
Peoples Radio Foundation (certificate of incorporation) .....	r 319
Peoples of the Soviet Union (publication) .....	r 316
Peoples Speaking to Peoples (publication) .....	h 929
People’s Peace (publication) .....	h 929
Peoples World (publication) .....	r 160
Pepperdine College .....	h 379; r 188
Percy, Charles H. ....	h 348
Percy, LeRoy .....	h 342

	Page
Perelamn, Norman	h 793
Perlo, Victor	r 287
Perkins	h 669
Perkins, George W	h 342; a 1181
Perkins, James A	h 339, 340
Perlman, Mildred	h 784, 792
Permanent Charity Fund	h 16
Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress	r 273, 280, 284, 389, 403
Permanent Court of International Justice	h 922
Perpetual Peace (publication)	h 929
Perry, Ernest J	h 351
Perry, Ralph Barton	h 309
Persians (publication)	h 927
Perspective of India (publication)	r 189
Perspective, U. S. (publication)	r 189
Pescatello, Michael	h 340
Peters, William A	h 342
Peterson	h 394
Peterson, Sir William	h 344
Pew Foundation	h 13, 16
Peyre, Henri	a 1009
Pfeiffer, Timothy	h 794, 837
Phelps Stokes Fund	h 471; r 54
Phi Beta Kappa	a 1205, 1221
Philadelphia Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder	r 354
Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine	a 1240
Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education (publication)	h 58, 479, 669-671, 684, 702, 707, 711; a 1236, 1239; r 134
Philanthropy in America (publication)	a 1236
Philanthropy Faces a Change (article)	a 1240
Philanthropy and Learning (article)	a 1236
Philanthropy in Negro Education (publication)	a 1236
Philanthropy Uninhibited (article)	a 1239, 1241
Philanthropy's Venture Capital (article)	a 1237
Philippines—Problems of Independence (publication)	h 901
Phillips, Duncan	r 189
Phillips, Ellis L	r 52
Phillips, George	r 383
Phillips, Henry A	h 926, 927
Phillips, John Marshall	a 1231
Phillips Foundation	r 52
Philosophical Research Institute (San Francisco)	h 42; a 1042; r 162
Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism (educational course)	h 279
Phylon	a 1240
Pickett, Clarence E	r 187
Pierpont Morgan Library	a 1009
Pike, H. Harvey	a 1182
Pilgrim Lutheran Church	a 1209
Pilnyak	r 257
Pincus, John A	a 1230
Pinkevitch, Albert P	h 285
Pioneer Youth	r 412

	Page
Pioneer's Progress (book)-----	h 31; r 92
Pitirim, Professor-----	r 64
Pitman Publishing Corp-----	h 394
Pittsburgh University-----	h 220, 355, 361; a 1238
Pittsburgh University Law Review-----	a 1238
Planning Committee on Board of Education of Scarsdale, New York-----	a 1209
Planning Foundation Programs (article)-----	a 1239
Plantz, Samuel-----	h 344
Plastires, Premier-----	r 358
Platform for All Americans (article)-----	h 42
Plato-----	a 1168
Plays for Children Contest (International Workers Order)-----	r 345
Plymouth Co-----	h 374
Pocono Conference-----	h 65, 68
PM (publication)-----	a 1171; r 283, 346
Poetry of the Negro (publication)-----	r 297
Poggioli, Renato-----	r 189
Poland Today (booklet)-----	r 387
Policy Committee (African Affairs Council)-----	r 268
Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950 (leaflet)-----	r 270, 347
Polish Research and Information Service-----	r 387
"Political Action for Labor" (conference theme)-----	r 106
"Political Action Techniques" (conference theme)-----	r 106
Political Affairs (publication)-----	r 341, 414
Political Affairs and the Constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A. (publication)-----	r 315
Political and Civil Rights in the United States (book)-----	h 39
Political and Social History of Modern Europe (publication)-----	h 926
Political Awakening of the East (publication)-----	h 926
Political Handbook of the World, 1946 (publication)-----	h 929
Political Offenders (article)-----	r 93
Political Police (article)-----	r 93
Political Problems (study)-----	r 177
Political Quarterly-----	a 1219
Political Research Committee (American Political Science Association)-----	r 131
Political Science and Comparative Law-----	h 572
Politics (article)-----	h 319
Politics and Economics (article)-----	h 748
Politz, Alfred-----	a 1025
Politz Research, Inc-----	a 1025
Polk. ( <i>See</i> Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl.)	
Pollard, John A-----	a 1240
Pomeroy, Wardell B-----	h 123
Pomona College-----	a 1232
Pool, Rabbi David De Sola-----	r 265
Poole, D. C-----	r 158
Pope Arthur Upham-----	a 1216
Pope Leo XIII-----	h 607; r 425
Pope Pius XI-----	h 607; r 294, 425
Population Council, Inc-----	a 965



	Page
Populists	h 515
Porter, Paul R.	h 135, 744-747, 750, 751, 763, 765, 784, 791; a 977, 991; r 97, 99
Portland Police Department	r 338
Portraits from a Chinese Scroll (publication)	h 928
Portugal for Two (publication)	h 927
Possible Peace (publication)	h 926
Post Standard (Syracuse, N. Y.)	r 351, 352
Postwar Planning, etc. (pamphlet)	r 131
Potash, Irving	r 361
Potomac Appalachian Trail Club	a 1209
Pound, Roscoe	h 897; a 1180
Poverty (publication)	h 219
Power of Freedom (publication)	a 1240
Power Industrial (article)	r 93
Powers, H. H.	h 926
Powers, William H.	r 351
Poynton, John A.	h 338
Poyntz, Juliet Stuart	r 410
Pragmatism and Pedagogy (publication)	h 94
Prang Co.	h 394
Pravda (publication)	h 32, 848
Precedents for Relations Between International Organizations and Nonmember States (conference memoranda)	h 891, 914
Prejudice in Textbooks (pamphlet)	r 408
Prendergast, William B.	h 904 a 1132, 1221
Prentice-Hall, Inc.	h 394
Presenting the American Student Union (pamphlet)	r 230, 255, 308, 353
President Truman's Commission on Higher Education	r 108, 142, 143
President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	r 184
President of the United States	h 35, 41, 74, 152, 153, 212, 213, 216, 223, 298, 311, 317-319, 360, 438, 482-484, 512, 531, 536, 537, 573, 574, 581, 590, 603, 604, 607, 617, 643, 741, 745, 757, 766, 785, 786, 790, 809, 849, 850, 872, 901, 911; a 1063, 1207; r 20, 21, 58, 65, 97, 103, 108, 121, 126, 131-133, 142, 143, 148, 155, 162, 178, 179, 185, 187, 195, 202, 234, 240, 245, 247, 250, 261-263, 265, 266, 269, 272, 274, 277-279, 285, 291, 304, 305, 309, 311, 313, 317, 321 325, 331-333, 343-345, 347, 354, 357, 361-364, 371, 374, 381, 385, 390, 392, 402, 405, 412, 415.
Presidential Leadership (publication)	h 795
President's Commission on Administrative Management	h 617
Presidents Commission on Higher Education	h 482, 484; a 1167; r 142
President's Committee on Civil Rights	a 1131
President's Council of Economic Advisers	h 777, 849; a 963, 980, 1025
President's Research Committee on Social Trends	h 850
President's Review (printed reports)	a 1072
Press releases of Attorney General (June 1, Sept. 21, 1948)	r 234

	Page
Prestes Defense Committee.....	r 238, 239, 249, 328
Prestes, Luiz Carlos.....	r 233, 238, 239, 249, 254, 259, 312, 328, 332, 370, 376
Preston, Hon. Prince H., Jr.....	h 37
Price, Don K.....	h 137, 347; r 86
Price, Governor.....	a 1206
Price, Gwilym A.....	h 338; a 965
Price Control in the Postwar Period (pamphlet).....	h 891
Price, Waterhouse & Co.....	a 1182
Primer on Charitable Foundations and the Estate Tax.....	a 1240
Princeton office of population research.....	h 133
Princeton University.....	h 151, 220, 347, 353, 356, 359, 362, 395, 495, 553, 832, 933; a 1209, 1230, 1231, 1232; r 43, 73, 158.
Princeton University Press.....	h 395; r 73
Principles of the Collective and Socialist Society (educational course).....	h 279; r 159
Principles of Exchange Stabilization (publication).....	h 892
Principles of Giving (publication).....	a 1240
Principles of Philanthropy as a Science and Art (memo-randum).....	r 30
Prisoners Relief Fund (International Labor Defense).....	r 230
Pritchett, Henry S.....	h 339, 342, 344, 345, 671, 679-682, 689, 714; a 1240
Private Fortunes and Public Future (article).....	a 1238
Privileges of American Citizenship (publication).....	r 121
Pro America (organization).....	h 322, 324, 326
Problem of Financing the Medical Schools (article).....	a 981
Problems of Leadership and Control in Soviet Literature (pub-lication).....	r 367
Problems of Philosophy (publication).....	h 847
Procter & Gamble Co.....	a 1043
Program for Labor and Progressives (publication).....	h 793
Program for Modern America, Concentration of Control in American Industry (publication).....	a 998
Progress in International Organization (publication).....	h 927
Progressive (publication).....	h 468, 628
Progressive Citizens of America.....	a 1173, 1174
Progressive Citizens Association.....	r 399
Progressive Education (publication).....	h 34, 291, 303, 484, 487, 488, 493; r 143, 145, 146, 151, 153
Progressive Education Association.....	h 21, 34, 35, 46, 47, 263, 265, 292, 397, 475, 488, 493, 674- 676, 679, 682, 686, 689, 696-698, 701, 703-705, 713, 714, 716, 720, 722; a 1081, 1112, 1147-1149, 1175; r 45, 135, 136, 146, 151-153, 362.
Progressive Education Journal (publication).....	h 285; r 152
Progressive Education Society.....	h 285
Proletarian Literature in the United States (Publication).....	r 282
Proletarian Youth League of Moscow.....	r 393
Proletariat (article).....	r 93
Prominent Americans Call For * * * (pamphlet).....	r 280, 374, 387, 403

	Page
Promise of Sociology (publication).....	r 77
Proper Study of Mankind (publication).....	h 132-134, 170, 176; a 967, 972; r 85-87, 89, 125
Prospects for Democracy in Japan (publication).....	r 236
Protest Against Attack on Right of Communist Party to Use Ballot (Daily Worker).....	r 258
Protest Brutal Nazi Persecutions (handbill).....	r 353
Protestant Digest (publication).....	r 302
Protestant Digest Association.....	r 302
Protestantism Answers Hate (dinner-forum).....	r 302
Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.....	h 350; a 1051
Provisional Committee for a United Labor and Peoples May Day.....	r 387
Provisional International Social Science Council.....	r 184
Provisional Sponsoring Committee (National Emergency Conference).....	r 332
Provisional United Labor and Peoples Committee for May Day.....	r 359
Psychological Abstracts (publication).....	h 847
Public Accountability of Foundations and Charitable Trusts (publication).....	a 1236, 1240
Public Administration Clearing House.....	h 894, 896, 942; a 1031, 1141, 1142; r 221
Public Administration Clearing House of Chicago.....	h 942
Public Administration Committee.....	h 933
Public Administration and the Public Interest (publication).....	h 795
Public Administration Review.....	a 1208
Public Affairs Committee, Inc.....	h 34, 74; r 408
Public Affairs Pamphlets.....	r 134, 376, 379, 408
Public Benefactions of Andrew Carnegie; Carnegie Corp.; The Foundation (publication).....	h 669
Public Debt and Taxation in the Postwar World (publication).....	h 793
Public and International Affairs (Princeton).....	r 158
Public Opinion and Foreign Policy (publication).....	h 884
Public Opinion and Propaganda Studies (publication).....	h 524
Public School System (New York, N. Y.).....	h 283; r 234, 319
Public Use of Arts Committee.....	r 247, 301
Publishers' Weekly.....	a 1237, 1239
Pulitzer Prize (1946).....	r 363
Punahou School (Honolulu).....	h 553
Puner, Morton.....	h 388
Pupils of the Soviet Union (publication).....	r 174
Purpose of Education in American Democracy (publication).....	h 697
Pusey, Nathan M.....	h 344; a 1041
Pushkin, Alexander.....	r 361, 367
Pushkin (publication).....	r 367
Pushkin Committee.....	h 223

## Q

Queens College.....	h 555; r 319
Quigley, Harold.....	h 580
Quigley, Hugh.....	r 93
Quiet Revolution (article).....	r 162

	Page
Quill, Eleanor .....	a 1016
Quinn, Theodore .....	a 979

## R

Race Differences (publication) .....	r 312
Races of Mankind (publication) .....	h 34; a 1215; r 165, 232, 408
Radcliffe College .....	h 286, 874
Radford, Betty .....	r 161
Radin, Paul .....	r 354
Radius, Walter A. ....	a 1231
Ragan, Philip H. ....	a 1240
Raiguel .....	h 927
Railroad Brotherhoods .....	h 788
Rainey, Homer P. ....	h 697
Rakosi, Matthias .....	r 413
Rand Corp. ....	a 1047, 1049; r 46, 49, 81
Rand, McNally & Co. ....	h 394
Rand School Press .....	a 1165; r 408
Rand School of Social Science .....	r 110, 408-410
Randolph, A. Phillip .....	r 385
Randolph, Bessie C. ....	h 874
Random House .....	h 395
Rankin, Congressman .....	r 263
Ransom, John Crowe .....	r 189
Rapp-Coudert Committee .....	r 234
Rathbone, Perry I. ....	a 1231
Rau, Professor .....	h 242
Rauh, Joe .....	h 41
Rausenbush, Carl .....	a 1164
Raw Materials in Peace and War (publication) .....	h 928
Ray, Annada Sankar .....	r 189
Raymond, Harold Bradford .....	a 1229
Raymond Rich Associates .....	a 1235
Read, Elizabeth F. ....	h 926; r 173, 355
Readers Digest .....	h 408, 569
Rearmament—How Far? (Fabian tract) .....	h 308
Rebel Song Book .....	a 1165; r 108
Recent Developments in Britain (speech) .....	a 984
Recent Social Trends in the United States (report) .....	h 850
Recent Trends in British Trade Unionism (publication) .....	h 793
Reception Committee (Soviet flyers, Moscow to New York 1929) .....	r 247
Recommendations of the President to the Trustees (document) ..	h 56; r 183
Recovery, the Second Effort (publication) .....	h 927; r 173
Red Cross .....	h 586, 679, 731; r 27
Red Decade (publication) .....	r 122
Red Network .....	a 1175
Red Tiger (publication) .....	h 926
Redefer, Frederick .....	h 265
Redfield, Robert .....	h 926; a 1009; r 189, 355
Reed, Alfred Z. ....	h 345
Reed, John .....	r 245, 260, 282, 286, 313, 392

	Page
Reed, Philip D.....	h 342, 349, h' 920
Reed, Vergil D.....	a 1025
Reed Club Writers School.....	r 245
Reed Clubs.....	r 260, 282, 286
Reed College.....	a 1227
Refugees Behind the Iron Curtain.....	r 231
Regenery, Henry.....	h 389, 395; a 1192
Regenery Co.....	h 389, 395; a 1192
Regional Accrediting Associations.....	a 1147
Regional Farmers Union.....	r 399
Registration of Aliens (publication).....	r 307, 311, 340, 349
Rehearsal (pamphlet).....	r 107
Rehearsal (play).....	r 345
Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary (advertisement).....	r 253
Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee.....	r 365
Reid, Chandoe.....	h 74
Reid, Helen Rogers.....	r 9
Reid, Hollis.....	r 399
Reid, Ira.....	r 28
Reid, Ogden M.....	r 8-10
Reid, Stephen.....	a 983
Reid, Whitelaw.....	r 9
Reid Foundation.....	r 8-10, 429
Reisman, David.....	h 848
Reither, Wm. Harry.....	a 1232
Relief For The Alert Citizen.....	r 216
Relation Between International Commercial Policy and High Level Employment (publication).....	h 892
Relations Between International Organizations and Nonmem- ber States (publication).....	h 915
Religion in Soviet Russia (publication).....	r 315
Remington, William W.....	h 36, 41; a 1199-1201, 1223, 1228
Remsen, Ira.....	h 344
Rennie, Wesley F.....	a 980, 996
Rentschler, Gordon S.....	h 346
Report of the Commission on the Social Studies—Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission (publication).....	h 476; a 967
Report on the Enemy (publication).....	h 320
Report on the Ford Foundation.....	a 1237
Report on Foundations.....	a 1240
Republican Platform Committee.....	r 280, 355
Report on President's Commission.....	a 981
Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program.....	a 1235
Reporter (publication).....	a 1241
Repplier, M. T.....	a 1043
Republic (Ford Foundation Agency).....	h 26; a 1054-1055
Republic (publication).....	h 576
Republic Steel.....	a 1044
Republican National Committee.....	h 298, 334, 737
Republican Party.....	h 227, 298, 328, 333, 334, 380, 386, 511, 513, 624, 737, 751, 762, 784; a 989; r 61, 198, 223, 281, 355, 357
Research Institute of America.....	a 979

	Page
Research on the Organization of Medieval Trade (publication)	h 831
Research Policy Committee (American Council on Education)	r 52
Resources for the Future, Inc.	h 346; a 1027, 1032
Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, CIO	h 779; r 104
Reticence of Mr. Mellon (subtitle)	h 297
Return of Adam Smith (publication)	r 122
Reuter	h 848
Reuther, Victor	a 1161
Reuther, Walter P.	h 42, 308, 309, 757, 766; a 995-997, 1161
Review and Evaluation Committee (Inter-University Labor Education Committee)	r 163
Review of Legal Education in the United States and Canada (publication)	a 1241
Revenue Act of 1938	a 979
Revenue Act of 1950	a 1238
Reves, Emery	h 929
Review (publication)	h 930
Revise the Neutrality Act (speech)	r 275
Revolt (publication)	h 740, 743, 744, 747-751; a 986, 993; r 97-99
Revolutionary Radicalism (pamphlet)	r 249
Revolutionary Youth (organization)	r 411
Rexroth, Kenneth	r 189
Reynolds, James J.	a 1048
Reynolds, Z. S.	h 16
Reynolds Foundation	h 16
Rhees, Rush	h 344
Rhind, Flora M.	h 357, 363
Rhode Island University	a 1184
Rhodes Scholarship Trust	a 1183; r 169
Rhodes School	h 901
Rhys, Albert	h 315; r 154
Rice, Mollie	r 161
Rice Institute	a 1227, 1229
Rich, Raymond	a 1235
Rich, Hon. Robert Fleming	h 134, 501
Rich Land, Poor Land (publication)	h 134; r 121
Richards, Alfred N.	h 355
Richards, Charles R.	h 363
Richmond News Leader	h 354, 360
Right to be in Error (speech)	h 984
Right to make Mistakes (pamphlet)	a 980
Rinehart & Co.	h 394
Rinehart	r 343
Ring and the Book (publication)	h 567
Rippy, Prof. J. Fred	h 60, 62; a 1195, 1196; r 37, 44
Rise of Liberalism (article)	h 32; h 92
Road Ahead (publication)	h 793; r 122
Road to the Grey Pamir (publication)	h 927; r 173
Road to Serfdom (publication)	h 33, 594; r 121
Robbins, Lionel	a 1140
Robbins, Y. L.	r 159

	Page
Robert Marshall Foundation.....	h 40,
41, 457, 458, 471, 472; r 54, 107, 197, 201, 360, 399,	
400, 405.	
Roberts, Allen.....	h 315; r 154
Roberts, George.....	a 1182
Roberts, Katharine.....	h 929
Roberts, Owen J.....	h 349, 642; a 1028
Roberts, Stephen H.....	h 928
<i>Roberts Dairy Co. v. Commissioner</i> (case).....	h 430
Robertson, J. R.....	r 39
Robeson, Paul.....	h 34; r 121, 356-362
Robinson, Edgar E.....	h 256
Robinson, Edward.....	h 357, 363
Robinson, Geroid T.....	r 158
Robinson, Richard Dunlop.....	a 1230
Robinson, William E.....	r 9
Rochester University.....	h 356,
362, 395; a 1009, 1124, 1139, 1227, 1230, 1231	
Rochester University Press.....	h 395
Rockefeller, David.....	h 342
Rockefeller, John D.....	h 2,
8, 13, 16, 20, 28, 31, 34, 35, 36, 40, 42, 43, 51, 64,	
102, 123, 212, 219, 226, 250, 254, 293, 354, 355, 360,	
586, 669, 690, 692, 701, 703, 721, 848, 854; a 1068,	
1070, 1073, 1081, 1083, 1094, 1095, 1123; r 20, 27, 28,	
30, 47, 116, 134, 149.	
Rockefeller, John D. Jr.....	h 255, 355, 357, 361, 362; a 1084, 1095; r 47
Rockefeller, John D. III.....	h 355, 357, 361, 362;
a 1066-1067, 1084, 1095, 1127, 1128, 1182	
Rockefeller, Nelson.....	a 1208
Rockefeller, Winthrop.....	a 1240
Rockefeller Agency.....	a 1105
Rockefeller Brothers.....	h 854; r 47
Rockefeller Corporation.....	h 589
Rockefeller Foundation.....	h 2,
8, 13, 16, 20, 28, 31, 34-36, 40, 42, 43, 51, 64, 123,	
212, 219, 226, 241, 250, 273, 286, 288, 293, 309, 310,	
317, 336, 337, 353-356, 359-362, 400, 401, 472-475,	
508, 523, 525, 535, 537, 538, 544, 546, 557-559, 567,	
584, 595, 602, 615, 620-622, 668-670, 674, 690-693,	
701, 704, 705, 710, 711, 717, 718, 720, 854, 869-871,	
879, 880, 883-885, 889, 892-894, 898, 901, 904, 905,	
930-934, 936, 938-943; a 950, 1001, 1004, 1006, 1034,	
1044, 1063, 1066-1075, 1082-1084, 1086-1088, 1090,	
1092, 1094-1095, 1096, 1099-1105, 1107-1110, 1113,	
1116-1135, 1137, 1139-1146, 1176, 1183, 1210-1211,	
1214, 1218, 1226, 1241; r 4, 19, 23, 24, 26-30, 33, 41,	
42, 45, 46, 52, 54, 58, 68-71, 79, 87, 88, 91, 114, 116,	
128, 133-136, 149, 154-156, 169, 170, 176-182, 190,	
198, 199, 209, 426, 429.	
Rockefeller Foundation Report.....	a 1105; r 169, 176
Rockefeller Foundation Story.....	a 1238

	Page
Rockefeller General Education Board	r 47,
	52, 59, 134, 136, 149, 154, 156
Rockefeller General Education Board Report, 1940	r 154, 198
Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research	h 353,
	354, 359, 668, 690, 718; a 1127, 1128
Rockefeller, "internationalist" the man who misrules the world (publication)	a 1236
Rockford College	a 1041
Rocky Road to Dublin (publication)	h 928
Rodman, Selden	r 189
Rodriguez, Dr. Balmore	a 985
Rogin, Larry	a 1166
Role of the Foundation in Education (publication)	a 1238, 1240
Role of Foundation in Public Affairs (publication)	a 1240
Role of the Foundation in Postwar Planning (publication)	a 1240
Role of Workers' Education in Political Action (conference theme)	a 1160
Roll Call for Peace (Daily Worker)	r 268
Rollins, Prof. Carlton R.	a 983
Romantic Czechoslovakia (publication)	h 927
Romualdi, Serafino	a 984
Ronald Press Co	h 395
Rooney, Hon. John J.	h 37
Roosevelt, Eleanor	h 308, 309, 763; a 977; r 399
Roosevelt, Franklin D.	h 35,
	41, 74, 153, 212, 570, 573, 581, 741, 745, 790, 901;
	a 1063, 1205; r 97, 121, 162, 178, 234, 263, 272, 305,
	325, 332, 347, 351, 354, 357, 363, 364, 392, 415.
Roosevelt, Theodore	h 409, 679
Roosevelt College	h 395
Roosevelt College Press	h 395
Roosevelt Myth (publication)	r 121
Root, Ballantine, Bushby & Palmer (law firm)	h 347; a 965
Root, Elihu	h 339, 342, 584, 588, 877, 879, 889; r 26
Root, Elihu, Jr.	h 339; a 965, 1057
Roper, Elmo	h 350; a 1051
Roper polls	h 149
Ropes, Ernest	a 1224
Rorty, James	a 996
Rose	h 942
Rose, Arnold	h 49
Rose, Wickliffe	h 355, 361, 362
Rosenberg, Ethel	h 33; r 257, 258, 272, 285, 309, 387
Rosenberg Julius	h 33; r 257, 258, 272, 285, 309, 387
Rosenberg Foundation	h 16
Rosenbergs	a 997
Rosenman, Samuel L.	a 1207
Rosenwald, Julius	h 355, 471; a 1237, 1240; r 47
Rosenwald Fund	h 471, 472, 854; r 47, 54, 198
Rosinger, Lawrence K.	h 897, 901; a 1180
Ross	h 848
Ross, Professor	r 77
Ross, Andrew	a 1222, 1225



	Page
Ross, E. Denison	h 927
Ross, Milton	a 1240
Rossiter, Prof. Clinton	a 1055
Rotary Clubs	h 379; r 188
Roth, Andrew	a 1225, 1226
Roth, Esther	r 362
"Round Trip" (film)	r 165
Roundtable Broadcasts (University of Chicago)	r 133
Rousseau, Jean Jacques	r 21
Row, Peterson & Co.	h 394
Rowe, David Nelson	h 417, 523-553, 597; a 1135, 1136, 1214; r 28, 29, 34, 35, 41-44, 50, 52, 54, 58, 59, 65, 66, 79, 123, 124, 199, 200, 213.
Royal Institute of International Affairs	h 894, 933, 936; r 170
Rubber (article)	h 319
Rubenstein, Jack	r 411
Rubenstein, M.	h 841, 842
Rubin, R. N.	r 161
Rudd, Colonel	h 261, 262
Rude Pravo (Publication)	r 389
Rugg, Harold	h 197, 254-256, 258-262, 264, 468, 484; a 1146, 1175; r 146, 149-151, 153, 168, 362, 363
Rugg pamphlets	r 150
Rugg Social Science textbooks	h 259; r 150
Rugg textbooks	h 197, 255, 256, 258, 259; r 149, 150, 363
Ruggles, Melville J.	h 348
Ruml, Beardsley	h 339, 352, 879, 880; a 1236; r 49, 87
Rushmore, Bisbee & Stern (law firm)	h 354, 360
Rusk, Dean	h 240- 242, 356, 357, 361, 362, 391, 415, 668; a 1066, 1067, 1084, 1121, 1122, 1127, 1131, 1144, 1150, 1210, 1211, 1214; r 180, 198, 209
Ruskin College Scholarships	a 1162
Russell, Dr.	h 700
Russell, Bertrand	h 926
Russell, Frederick F.	h 357
Russell, James Earl	a 1230
Russell, John M.	h 339
Russell, Phillips	h 926
Russell, William F.	h 64, 272, 275
Russell Sage Foundation	h 9, 16, 31, 60, 472, 473, 779, 854; a 990, 1117, 1235, 1236, 1239-1241; r 14, 45, 47, 91, 184
Russia (publication)	h 319, 929
Russia at War (publication)	h 883
Russia—Democracy or Dictatorship (pamphlet)	h 307
Russia and Russia and the Peace (publication)	a 1216
Russian Institute, Columbia University	h 36, 347
Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc.	h 222; r 229, 232, 247, 302
Russian Research Center (Harvard University)	h 840
Russian State Travel Co. (Intourist)	h 275, 281; r 158
Russian-Telegu Dictionary	a 1030

	Page
Russian War Relief, Inc.....	h 222; a 1171; r 246
Russia's Race for Asia (publication).....	a 1216; r 174
Rustin, Bayard.....	r 399
Rustow, Dankwart A.....	a 1230
Rutgers University.....	h 42; a 981, 984, 991, 1041, 1042, 1166
Ruttenberg, Stanley.....	h 352, 784, 792; a 1161
Ryan, W. Carson.....	h 345
Ryerson, Edward L.....	h 342
Ryerson, Martin A.....	h 356
Ryhd, Hanna.....	h 926

## S

Saarinen, Eero.....	r 189
Sacks, Milton.....	a 983
Sacramento Defense Committee.....	r 154
Sacramento State College.....	a 1229
Sadlier, William H.....	h 394
Saerchinger, Cesar.....	h 928
Saidler, Inc.....	h 394
Safety (article).....	h 310
Sage, Russell.....	h 9,
16, 31, 60, 472, 473, 779, 854; a 990, 1117, 1235, 1236,	
1239-1241; r 14, 45, 47, 49, 91, 184.	
Sage Foundation.....	h 9,
16, 31, 60, 472, 473, 779, 854; a 990, 1117, 1235, 1236,	
1239, 1240, 1241; r 14, 45, 47, 49, 91, 184.	
Saint Aimee McPherson.....	r 294
Saint Becton.....	r 294
St. Louis Post Dispatch.....	r 279, 332, 392
Saint Pope Pius.....	r 294
Sale, Chic.....	h 829
Salem Lutheran Home Association.....	h 429
Sales Management (publication).....	h 496
Salt, Waldo.....	r 164
Salter, Arthur.....	h 927, 928; r 172
Saltzman, Charles E.....	a 1182
Saltzman, Lee.....	r 161
Samokhvalova, Miss.....	r 159
Samuel Adams School for Social Science.....	r 349
Samuel J. Tilden High School.....	h 767; a 984
San Francisco Bar.....	h 256
San Francisco Board of Education.....	h 197,
255, 257, 260, 262; r 146, 150, 363	
San Francisco Chronicle.....	h 553, 624, 625; a 1231
San Francisco City Board of Education.....	h 197, 255, 257, 260, 262
San Francisco City Government.....	r 338
San Francisco Schools.....	h 257, 258
San Francisco University.....	h 256; r 150
Sanborn, Benjamin H.....	h 394
Sanborn & Co.....	h 394
Sanders, Dr. Theodore.....	a 983
Sante Cream Cheese Co.....	a 1171
Santa Anita Foundation.....	r 46

	Page
Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation.....	h 16
Sardinian Project (publication).....	a 1073
Sargent, Aaron M.....	h 187,
189-233, 236, 242-409, 492, 608, 624, 863; a 1049;	
r 7, 146-149, 153-156, 188, 225, 426.	
Sassoon, Philip.....	h 926
Sattgast, Charles R.....	a 1236
Saturday Evening Post.....	h 320; a 1239
Saturday Evening Post.....	r 293
Saturday Review.....	a 1238, 1240
Saturday Review of Literature.....	a 1216
Sauer, Carl O.....	r 83
Saunders, W. B.....	h 166; a 1137
Saunders Company (book publishers).....	h 166; a 1137
Savage Howard J.....	h 345, 378, 669, 681, 689, 717; a 1236
Sawyer, Charles.....	h 37; a 1197, 1199, 1200-1202, 1207
Sawyer, Wilbur A.....	h 357
Sayre, A. Monell.....	h 345
Sayre, John Nevin.....	r 398, 412
Scaife, Sarah Mellon.....	h 16
Scaife Foundation.....	h 16
SCAP.....	a 1216
SCFOTO (Soviet propaganda organization).....	h 316
Schaeffer, Barbara.....	r 322
Schapiro, Meyer.....	r 189, 190
Schapiro, Theodore.....	r 408, 410
Schappes, Morris U.....	r 253, 309, 347, 349
Schappes Defense Committee.....	r 253, 309, 347, 349
Scheiner, Leo.....	r 401
Scherer, Paul.....	h 344
Schieffelin, W. J. Jr.....	h 342; r 267
Schine, G. David.....	h 43
Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr.....	h 32, 41; a 1040; r 189, 190, 363-365
Schlesinger, Cecelia.....	a 1222
Schlossberg, Joseph.....	a 977; r 409
Schmidlapp, Jacob G.....	h 342
Schmidt, Henry.....	r 339
Schnabel, Joseph H.....	h 351
Schneider, Isidor.....	r 387
Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee.....	r 340
Schodt, Eddie W.....	a 1231
Schoeck, Dr. Helmut.....	a 1184, 1191
Scholastic Magazines.....	h 394
School of Business Administration (University of Michigan).....	h 286
School for Democracy.....	h 224; r 233, 268, 319
School of Education (College of the City of New York).....	h 275
School of Education (University of Chicago).....	h 275
School of Education (New York University).....	h 272, 275, 390, 517
School of Education (Stanford University).....	h 912
School for General Studies.....	a 998
School of Industrial Administration (Carnegie).....	a 1025
School of International Affairs (Columbia University).....	h 893,
933, 934, 936, 941	

	Page
School of Public Welfare (University of North Carolina).....	h 275
School and Society (publication).....	97, 110; a 1239, 1240
School Review.....	a 1237, 1240
Schools of Arts and Sciences (Tulane).....	a 1041
Schools of Washington, D. C.....	h 286, 514; r 362
Schorer, Mark.....	r 189
Schrader, George A., Jr.....	a 1232
Schulgen, General.....	h 579, 580
Schultz, Rabbi Benjamin.....	h 389; r 239
Schultz, Prof. Theodore.....	a 1025
Schurman, Jacob Gould.....	h 344
Schuster. ( <i>See</i> Simon & Schuster.)	
Schwartz, Delmore.....	r 189
Schwarz, Marjorie.....	r 161
Science (publication).....	a 1239
Science Research Associates.....	h 394
Science and Society (publication).....	h 223; r 152, 245, 355
Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace.....	h 224; a 1174, 1175; r 270, 283, 297, 349, 350, 386
Science in the U. S. A. in the Service of Monopolies and Mili- tarists (article).....	h 841, 842
Scientific Disarmament (publication).....	h 927
Scientific Monthly.....	h 131; r 71
Scotland Educational Institute.....	h 74
Scott, Agnes.....	h 360
Scott, Austin W.....	a 1240
Scott, Frank.....	h 308
Scott, Hugh.....	a 1240
Scott, James Brown.....	h 342, 879, 889
Scott, Masha.....	r 242
Scott, Roland A.....	a 1231
Scott College.....	h 360
Scott Foresman & Co.....	h 394
Scottsboro Negroes.....	r 411
Screen Writer (publication).....	r 240
Scribner, Charles.....	h 395
Scribners (publication).....	h 476; a 1236
Scribner's Sons.....	h 395
Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems.....	h 854; r 47
Scudder, Stevens and Clark.....	a 1236
Scudder, Vida D.....	a 977
Seaman, Bernard.....	a 989
Sears, Henry.....	a 1182
Sears & Co.....	a 1182
Seattle Art Museum.....	h 553
Second Annual North Dakota Conference of Farmers and Workers.....	a 1161
Second biennial American Writers Congress.....	r 282
Second State University of Moscow.....	h 285
Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism.....	a 1175; r 230, 232, 253, 376
Second World Peace Conference.....	r 273, 280

	Page
Second World Youth Congress.....	r 412
Secondary Education (publication).....	h 94
Secondary Education for Youth in America (publication).....	h 697
Secunding by International Organizations and From National Services to International Agencies (conference memoranda).....	h 914
Securities Exchange Act.....	a 995
Security and Armaments Problems (study).....	r 177
Security Council (United Nations).....	h 67; a 1059; r 192
Security, Loyalty, and Science (publication).....	a 1132, 1218, 1219; r 288
Security and World Organization (publication).....	h 890
Seditious Activities Investigation Commission (State of Illi- nois).....	h 38; r 299, 323
Seditious Activities Committee (New York State).....	h 467
Seeber, Edward D.....	a 1231
Seeds of Treason (publication).....	r 121
Seeing America (article).....	h 319
Seeing is Believing—Here is the Truth About South Africa (pamphlet).....	r 358, 384
Seelye, L. Clark.....	h 344
Seidman, Joel.....	h 307
Seidman, Dr. Joel.....	a 988, 1163
Selassie, Emperor Haile.....	h 874
Selberstein, Robert.....	a 1223, 1228
Selby, Walter Owens.....	r 292
Seldes, George.....	h 34, 902
Seldes, Gilbert.....	r 189, 190, 365
Seligman, Edwin R. A.....	h 907; a 993
Seligman, Eustace.....	a 1182
Seligman, J.....	h 356
Seligman, W.....	h 356
Seligman & Co.....	h 356
Sellin, Theodore.....	a 1016
Selsam, Howard.....	r 237, 247
Senate Investigating Committee on Education (State of Cali- fornia).....	h 315, 316; r 154, 155
Sender, Toni.....	a 995
Senior, Clarence.....	h 765; a 977; r 100
Sergeyeva, N.....	r 243
Service, John Stewart.....	h 40; a 1222, 1225
Sevareid, Eric.....	h 40
Seven Great Foundations (publication).....	a 1235
Seven and a Half Million Speak for Peace (pamphlet).....	r 228, 231, 234, 239
Seventh Annual Institute on Federal Taxation.....	a 1236
Severance, Cordenio A.....	h 342
Sex Life of the American Woman and the Kinsey Report (pub- lication).....	h 130; r 71
Sexual Behavior in the Human Female (publication).....	h 123, 124, 140, 165, 166
Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (publication).....	h 123, 124, 140, 144
Seybold, Geneva.....	a 1240

	Page
Seyfert, W. C.....	a 1240
Seymour, Charles.....	h 344; r 9
Seymour, Whitney North.....	a 1052, 1054
Shafer, Congressman.....	r 85, 141
Shafer, Paul W.....	h 134, 480, 507
Shah, Hiru Chhotal.....	a 1230
Shahn, Tillie G.....	h 552
Shakespeare in Harlem (publication).....	r 297
Shall Our Government Cancel the War Loans to the Allies? (pamphlet).....	h 907
Shall Strikes Be Outlawed? (publication).....	a 1163
Shame of the Cities (publication).....	h 219
Shane, Theodore King.....	a 122 <sup>c</sup>
Shapiro, Karl J.....	r 189, 190, 365
Shapiro, Meyer (Schapiro).....	r 365
Shapley, Harlow.....	r 257
Sharer, Ena Lu.....	r 161
Sharkey, Joseph T.....	r 267
Sharp, Walter R.....	h 886; a 983
Shaw, Albert.....	h 361
Shaw, George Bernard.....	h 215
Sheffield, James R.....	h 342
Shea.....	h 311
Sheng-Cheng.....	h 926
Shepardson, Whitney H.....	h 340, 363
Sherman, John.....	h 641
Sherman, Maurice S.....	h 342
Shih, Hu.....	h 309
Ship of State.....	r 203
Shishkin, Dr. Boris.....	a 980, 991
Shoemaker, James H.....	h 553
Shotwell, James T.....	h 64, 342, 588, 877, 885, 888, 890, 907, 918, 919, 927, 928; a 1058; r 173, 177, 185.
Should Labor Unions be Regulated? (publication).....	a 1163
Shuck, Luther Edward, Jr.....	a 1230
Shumlin, Herman.....	a 1173
Shurz, Carl.....	a 1241
Shurz Memorial Foundation.....	a 1241
Shuster, George N.....	h 342, 350; 351; a 1051
Sibley.....	h 832
Sibley, Elbridge.....	r 83
Sibley Harper.....	h 342, 918
Sides, Virginia V.....	a 1240
Signet Special (publication).....	r 69
Silence of Colonel Stewart and Others (publication).....	h 297
Sillen, Samuel.....	r 250
Sills, Kenneth C. M.....	h 344
Silver Burdett Co.....	h 394
Silver Lake Lodge No. 488 (IWO).....	r 345
Silvermaster, N. Gregory.....	r 263, 287
Silvermaster-Perlo Groups.....	r 287
Simmons, Ernest J.....	h 36; a 1037; r 366, 367

	Page
Simon, Professor .....	r 81
Simon, Abbot .....	a 1175
Simon & Schuster Inc .....	h 395
Simons, Hans .....	h 917
Simonson, Rebecca C .....	h 309; a 985
Simpson, Richard M .....	a 1120
Sinclair, Frances .....	a 1232
Sinclair, Upton .....	h 220, 308, 740; a 993; r 97, 148
Singer, L. W. ....	h 394
Singer Co., Inc .....	h 394
Sirota, Alex .....	r 356
Sister Margaret Patricia McCarran .....	h 215, 244; a 945-947; r 148, 225
Sisters of the Holy Name .....	h 244
Situs of International Organizations (publication) .....	h 915
Situation in Asia (publication) .....	r 324
Sixth Annual Institute on Federal Taxation (report) .....	a 1235
Six Hundred Prominent Americans Ask President to Rescind Biddle Decision (pamphlet) .....	r 252, 291, 310, 345, 364, 390
Skaife, Mr .....	h 321
Skaug, Arne .....	h 778; a 990
Skilliter, Persis Emma .....	a 1204
Slater, John F .....	h 359
Slater Fund .....	h 359
Slavic-American (publication) .....	r 382
Slayden, James L .....	h 342
<i>Slee v. Commissioner</i> (case) .....	h 431
Slichter, Sumner H .....	h 892
Sligh, Charles R., Jr. ....	a 1240
Sloan .....	a 1118
Sloan, H. S. ....	a 1240
Sloan Experiment in Applied Economics (article) .....	a 1240
Sloan, Alfred P .....	h 16, 28, 32, 34; a 1241; r 52, 133, 134
Sloan Foundation .....	h 16, 28, 32, 34; a 1241; r 52, 133, 134
Slocum, William F .....	h 344
Slosson, Preston .....	h 929
Small Farm (publication) .....	h 34
Smedley, Agnes .....	r 298
Smiley, Albert K .....	h 342
Smiley, Joseph Royall .....	a 1231
Smith, Gen. Bedell .....	a 1198
Smith, Corley .....	a 995
Smith, Edgar F .....	h 344
Smith, Edwin S .....	h 41
Smith, Francis A .....	h 731
Smith, Geoffrey S .....	h 356; a 1127
Smith, Gerald L. K .....	h 330
Smith, Hon. H. Alexander .....	a 1182
Smith, Harold D .....	a 1203, 1206, 1207
Smith, Hilda .....	r 109
Smith, Hilda K .....	r 369
Smith, Hilda W .....	a 1169; r 369
Smith, Jeremiah, Jr. ....	h 342

	Page
Smith, Jessica	r 241, 306
Smith, John B.	a 1231
Smith, Rebecca M.	h 393
Smith, S. Edwin	a 1173
Smith, T. V.	a 971
Smith, Tredwell	r 158
Smith Act	h 33, 39, 224, 902; r 240, 266, 277, 285, 291, 344
Smith College	h 272, 275
Smith & Durrell	h 395
Smith-Hughes Act	a 1116
Smithsonian Institution	a 1226
Snader, Lyle O.	h 6
Snee, Father Joseph M.	a 1055
Snow, John Howland	h 134, 507; r 85, 141
Snyder, Franklyn B.	h 344
Social Contract (article)	r 92
Social Democratic Federation	h 766; r 101, 409
Social Democratic Labor Party (Sweden)	a 969
Social Democrats	r 415
Social Economic Movements (textbook)	a 998
Social Frontier (publication)	h 468, 488, 489; r 145, 146, 168, 255
Social Problems and Scientism (publication)	h 114, 133, 144; r 31, 63, 68, 71, 72, 204
Social Reform and the Communication of Ideas (conference theme)	a 983
Social Reform and the Conflict of Rural and Urban Values (roundtable discussion)	a 983
Social Science Division (Rockefeller Foundation)	h 538
Social Science Foundation	h 64
Social Science in Modern Society (article)	r 127
Social Sciences Publishers, Inc.	h 395
Social Science Research Center (University of Minnesota)	r 82
Social Science Research Council	h 21, 45, 47, 50, 132, 133, 136, 150, 154, 169, 170, 173, 184, 469-471, 473, 475, 482, 548, 549, 565, 566, 569, 570, 584, 590, 601, 612, 617, 618, 620, 794, 800, 806-811, 813, 814, 816, 820, 825, 832, 837, 848, 855, 879, 888, 889, 894, 898, 901, 904, 932; a 959, 998, 1003, 1005, 1012, 1026, 1093, 1124, 1142, 1186, 1189, 1190, 1228; r 4, 26, 39, 45, 47-53, 59, 61, 62, 66, 73, 74, 79, 81-83, 85, 89, 115, 118, 125-129, 131, 141, 184, 185, 218, 226, 426, 427.
Social Science Research Council Reports	r 53, 126, 128
Social Sciences (publication)	r 140
Social Sciences at Mid-Century (publication)	r 82
Social Security (article)	h 310, 319
Social Security Act	h 232; a 995, 1080
Social Service Review	a 1238, 1239, 1240
Social Studies (publication)	h 478
Social Studies Commission	h 58, 400, 479
Social Work Journal	a 1237
Social Work, General Discussion, Social Case Work (article)	r 93
Social Work Today (publication)	r 310, 311, 329



	Page
Social Work Yearbook	a 1241
Social Workers Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy	a 1176
Socialism (article)	r 93
Socialism of Our Times (publication)	h 750, 751; r 99, 409
Socialism in the United States (publication)	h 306, 793
Socialist and Labor Songs (publication)	r 108
Socialist Call (publication)	h 468
Socialist Labor Party	h 467
Socialist Party	h 25,
	27, 29, 31-33, 35, 36, 40, 136, 201, 202, 210, 214,
	219-221, 224, 227, 279, 288, 306, 314, 319, 393, 400,
	401, 467, 468, 492, 506, 512-514, 577, 612, 737, 746,
	747, 751, 762, 764, 765, 780, 790-792, 901; a 990; r 98,
	100, 105, 129, 131, 147, 155, 163, 187, 202, 203, 205,
	393, 394-397, 400, 401, 402, 409, 410, 412, 414-416, 422
Socialist Party of America	r 98
Socialist Workers Party	r 414-416
Socialist Workmen's Circle	r 409
Society of American Chemists	h 603
Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis	a 999
Society for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries (VOKS)	r 158,
	159, 161, 313
Society for Cultural Relations Between Soviet Union and Foreign Countries	r 158, 313
Society for Curriculum Study	h 310; a 1112, 1149, 1150
Society of Nations (publication)	h 927
Sociology and Social Research (publication)	r 205
Solidarity (publication)	r 416
Soledad Sugar Co.	h 353; a 1127
Soljak, Philip L.	h 929
Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation	h 16
Solution in Asia (publication)	r 324
Sombart, Werner	h 32; r 92
Some Notes on War and Peace (publication)	h 928
Some Trends in Adult Education (publication)	a 1165
Son of China (publication)	h 926
Songs Useful for Workers Groups (pamphlet)	a 1165, 1169; r 108
Sons of the American Revolution	h 190,
	197, 261, 327, 335, 336, 368, 387, 393, 396, 403; r 147
Sons of the American Revolution (California Society)	h 197;
	r 146, 147
Sons of the American Revolution (Americanization Commit- tee)	r 147
Sorensen, Roland A.	a 1231
Sorokin, A.	r 64, 78
Sorokin, Prof. Pitirim A.	a 1185, 1192
Soul of Black Folk (publication)	r 272
Soule, George	h 929; a 979; r 93, 110, 369
South is Closer Than You Think (leaflet)	r 360
South by Thunderbird (publication)	h 928
South Carolina University	a 1231
Southeast International Relations Clubs Conference	h 876
South-Western Publishing Co.	h 394

	Page
Southern California Chapter (National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions).....	r 270
Southern California Country (publication).....	r 341
Southern California University...h 395, 523, 874; a 983, 1229; r 363	
Southern California University Press.....	h 395
Southern Conference on Human Welfare.....	h 903; a 1174, 1219, 1220; r 107, 309, 360, 380, 399-401, 403, 408
Southern Council on International Relations.....	h 874
Southern Education Board.....	h 706
Southern Farmer (publication).....	r 399
Southern Methodist University.....	a 1014
Southern Negro Youth Congress.....	r 401, 411, 415
Southern Patriot (publication).....	r 403
Southern Summer School.....	a 1164; r 107
Southwestern University.....	h 60
Soviet Academy of Sciences.....	r 361
Soviet Challenge to America (publication).....	h 285; r 152
Soviet Civilization (publication).....	r 322
Soviet Literary Gazette.....	h 847
Soviet-Nazi Pact.....	r 296, 312
Soviet Russia and the Postwar World (pamphlet).....	r 315
Soviet Russia Today (publication).....	h 223, 901; a 1172, 1222, 1225; r 175, 228, 235, 240-242, 246, 247, 252, 259-261, 264, 269, 271, 287, 289, 290, 304, 312, 314-317, 324, 327, 328, 331, 333, 340, 347, 355, 356, 366, 371, 377, 378, 380, 385, 387, 391.
Soviet Russia Today Book Club.....	r 316
Soviet Russia Today Lecture Bureau.....	r 316
Soviet Scholarship and Tolstoy (article).....	r 367
"Soviet Summer" (publication).....	r 160
Soviet Union and Present World Affairs (Carter's speech).....	r 246
Soviet Union State Scientific Council.....	r 153
Soviet Union Today, An Outline Study (publication).....	h 929; r 173
Soviet Women (publication).....	r 384
Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee.....	r 241
Spanish Loyalists.....	r 238, 247, 294, 317, 327, 335, 337, 355, 364, 385, 391
Spanish Refugee Appeal (Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee).....	r 278, 296, 321, 332, 333, 345, 347, 359, 374, 384
Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign.....	r 259, 301, 309, 337, 341
Spanish Republicans.....	h 902
Spanish Speaking People (article).....	h 320
Spanish Tragedy (publication).....	h 928
Spaulding, Francis T.....	h 96, 361
Spaulding, Frank E.....	h 361
Speaking for Peace (report).....	r 270, 342, 385
Speier, Hans.....	r 46
Spellman, Laura.....	h 102, 565, 668, 690, 691, 698, 701, 702, 718, 721, 854, 879, 896; a 1083, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1113, 1125, 1134, 1139, 1145; r 47, 87, 134.

	Page
Spellman Rockefeller Memorial .....	h 102, 565, 668, 690, 691, 698, 701, 702, 718, 721, 854, 879, 896; a 1083, 1089, 1090, 1095, 1113, 1125, 1134, 1139, 1145; r 47, 87, 134.
Spencer, John H. ....	h 874
Spero, Prof. Sterling .....	a 995
Spider and the Clock (publication) .....	r 392
Spillane, Mickey .....	h 146
Spinney, Ann C. ....	h 348
Spinoza .....	h 805
Spirit and Structure of German Fascism (publication) .....	r 240
Spoehr, Herman A. ....	h 358, 363
Spofford, Charles M. ....	h 339; a 965
Sponsoring Committee (World Peace Congress) .....	r 273
Spotlight on the Far East (publication) .....	r 235, 236, 296, 324, 376
Spragens, Thomas A. ....	h 350
Sprague, Charles A. ....	h 342
Sproul, Robert Gordon .....	h 344, 356, 361, 552, 553; a 1127, 1128
Stachel, Jack .....	r 361
Stackpole, Stephen H. ....	h 339, 340
Staley, Eugene .....	h 881, 884, 889, 900, 921, 928
Stalin .....	h 141, 278, 314, 318, 319, 745, 773, 901; a 1015; r 97, 103, 151, 197, 252, 274, 276, 294, 326, 331, 352, 356, 404, 413, 414.
Stalin-Hitler Pact .....	r 276, 326, 352, 356
Stamm, Robert .....	a 1171
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) .....	h 346, 349, 276; a 972, 1021
Standard Oil of California .....	a 1044
Standard-Vacuum Oil Co. ....	h 553
Stanford Law Review .....	a 1219
Stanford University .....	h 196, 197, 220, 231, 256, 356, 362, 395, 524, 554, 562, 672, 874, 892, 912, 934, 941; a 1030, 1113, 1115, 1145, 1149, 1150, 1229, 1231; r 81, 135, 147, 150, 291.
Stanford Research Institute .....	h 524; a 1231
Stanford School of Education .....	h 214; a 1048
Stanford University Press .....	h 395
Starling, Thomas .....	r 399
Starnes, Joe .....	r 273
Starobin, Joseph .....	r 324, 388
Starr, Mark .....	h 308, 780, 785, 789, 793; a 977, 979, 983, 985, 990, 996, 1167, 1168, 1169; r 108, 371.
Stassen, Harold E. ....	h 919
State Bar of California .....	h 196
State Bar Journal of California .....	a 1237
State Board of Education of California .....	h 197; r 146, 147
State Department of Education (Sacramento, Calif.) .....	r 146, 147
State Normal School (Buffalo, N. Y.) .....	h 485
State of Our National Finances (pamphlet) .....	h 907
State Publishing House (Moscow) .....	r 262

	Page
State Scientific Council.....	h 285
State Travel Co. (Russian).....	h 275, 281; r 158
State University of Iowa.....	h 555, 567, 568; a 1229
Statement of American Proposals for a New World Order (publication).....	h 890
Statement by Negro Americans (article).....	r 266, 357
States and Subversion (study).....	a 1132
Status of Observers at International Conferences (conference memoranda).....	h 914
Statutes of Mortmain.....	r 11
Stauffer, Samuel.....	h 137
Steamboat Inspection Service.....	h 846
Steck Co.....	h 394
Steel (article).....	h 310
Steele, Walter S.....	h 400; a 1170, 1173, 1215; r 175, 228, 245, 249, 252, 256, 264, 265, 281, 292, 349, 364, 384, 394, 395, 399, 400, 408, 409, 411.
Stefan, Hon. Karl.....	37
Steffens.....	h 219
Stegner, Wallace.....	r 189
Stein, Guenther.....	a 1216
Steinbeck, John.....	r 241
Steiner, Jesse F.....	h 286
Stembridge, Jasper H.....	h 929
Stephan, Frederick F.....	r 46
Stephens College.....	h 350; a 1048
Stern, Alfred.....	a 1174
Stern, Anna.....	a 1009
Stern, Bernhard J.....	r 93, 372-375
Stern. ( <i>See</i> Rushmore, Bisbee & Stern.)	
Sterne, Emma Gelders.....	h 928
Sterner, Richard.....	h 49
Stetson University.....	h 94
Stettinius, Edward R., Jr.....	h 917; r 119
Stevens, Bennett.....	r 372, 375
Stevens, David H.....	h 358, 362, 363
Stevens, Harry R.....	a 1230
Stevens, J. P.....	h 356
Stevens, Robert T.....	h 74, 142, 208, 356
Stevens & Co.....	h 356
Stevens Institute of Technology.....	h 495
Stevenson, A.....	a 1190
Stevenson, Mrs. Eleanor B.....	h 350; a 1051
<i>Steward Machine Co. v. Davis</i> .....	a 1080
Stewart, Colonel.....	h 297
Stewart, Albert Edward.....	r 298
Stewart, Alice.....	r 161
Stewart, Marguarite Ann (Mrs. Maxwell Stewart).....	h 897, 901
Stewart, Maxwell S.....	h 33, 34, 74, 897, 903; a 1180, 1216; r 121, 134, 375, 408
Stewart, Walter W.....	h 356, 357, 361, 362; a 1084
Stewart-Warner Corp.....	h 32

	Page
Stickler, Issac .....	h 351
Stine, Russell Warren .....	a 1232
Stinmetz, Charles P .....	h 135
Stock, J. Stevens .....	a 1025
Stockholm University .....	a 970, 1139
Stockholm World Appeal To Outlaw Atomic Weapons .....	r 273
Stoddard, George D .....	a 1148
Stokes, Anson Phelps .....	h 356, 361
Stokes, Phelps .....	h 220, 471; a 993; r 54
Stokes Fund .....	h 471; r 54
Stone, Chief Justice Harlan .....	h 573; a 1220
Stone, Donald .....	h 74
Stone, Peter .....	r 232
Stone, William T .....	h 927; r 173
Stop Shipments to Japan (leaflet) .....	r 289, 323
Storen, Helen Frances .....	h 64
Story of the Dutch East Indies (publication) .....	h 929
Story of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1915-35 (publica- tion) .....	r 398
Story of the Rockefeller Foundation (publication) .....	h 669, 879, 893, 942; a 1073, 1090, 1091, 1117, 1130, 1235; r 19.
Stouffer, Professor .....	r 81
Stouffer, Samuel A .....	h 154; a 967, 972
Stout, George Leslie .....	a 1231
Stowe, Harriet Beecher .....	h 455
Stowell, Ellery C .....	h 926
Stranger at Coney Island (publication) .....	r 286
Strategy for Advancing the Social Sciences (article) .....	r 51
Straus, Donald B .....	h 552, 553
Straus, Nathan .....	a 1206
Straus, Oscar S .....	h 342
Strauss, Anna Lord .....	h 348, 897, 920; a 1180, 1182
Strauss, Frederick .....	h 356
Strauss, Levi .....	h 553
Strauss & Co .....	h 553
Strawn, Silas H .....	h 342
Strayer, George D .....	h 697
Street, C. J. C .....	h 926
Streetcar Named Desire (publication) .....	r 389
Streit, Clarence K .....	h 928; r 173
Stresemann (publication) .....	h 926
Strikes and Lockouts (article) .....	r 93
Stripling, Robert E .....	a 1172
Strobell, George H .....	h 740; r 97
Strode, George K .....	h 357, 358; a 1073
Strode, Hudson .....	h 928
Strong, Anna Louise .....	h 315, 927; r 154, 160, 173
Strong. ( <i>See</i> Lewis, Strong & Earl.)	
Strong, Edward .....	a 1175
Strubbe, Charles F .....	r 351
Structure of Education in American Democracy (publication) ..	h 697
Struggle Against the Historical Blackout (publication) .....	r 178

	Page
Struggle Against War (publication) . . . . .	r 230, 258, 312, 318, 350, 415
Struik, Prof. Dirk . . . . .	a 1215; r 349
Stubbs, Roy Manning . . . . .	a 1230
Studebaker, J. W. . . . .	a 1148
Studebaker Corp. . . . .	h 346, 350, 374
Student Advocate (publication) . . . . .	r 236, 306, 312, 394
Student Almanac, (publication) . . . . .	r 230, 235, 277, 326, 353, 380
Student Congress Against War . . . . .	h 223; a 1170; r 255, 318
Student League for Industrial Democracy . . . . .	a 982, 983; r 393, 394
Student Outlook (publication) . . . . .	h 751, 755; r 99
Student Peace Service Committee . . . . .	r 187
Student Strike (Philadephia) . . . . .	r 379
Students in the Class Struggle (article) . . . . .	h 749
Studies in Income and Wealth (publication) . . . . .	h 641
Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty (publication) . . . . .	h 926; r 173
Studies in the Scope and Method of the American Soldier (pub- lication) . . . . .	h 161
Studies in Social Psychology in World War Two (article) . . . . .	h 150
Study of American Public Library (publication) . . . . .	h 898
Study of the Conditions of Political Freedom (publication) . . . . .	h 831
Study of the Influences in Roman Life and Law (publication) . . . . .	h 831
Study of the Latin American Philosophy of Law (publication) . . . . .	h 831
Study of Secondary School Curriculum (publication) . . . . .	h 706
Sture, Ernest . . . . .	a 1231
Sugarman, Norman . . . . .	h 417-420, 422, 435-461, 734, 735, 786; a 1101, 1102, 1106; r 22, 96
Sullivan & Cromwell (law firm) . . . . .	h 353, 359, 553
Sulzberger, Arthur Hays . . . . .	h 356; a 1127; r 33, 428
Sumner, William Graham . . . . .	a 972
Sun Yat-sen (publication) . . . . .	h 929
Sunday Worker (publication) . . . . .	r 242, 297, 303, 394, 411
Sunderland. (See Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl.)	
Supporters of Anti-Nazi Seamen (organization) . . . . .	a 1172
Surdna Foundation . . . . .	h 16
Survey of Education in the U. S. S. R. (educational course) . . . . .	h 279
Survey Graphic (publication) . . . . .	a 1240
Survey of Psychological Research (educational course) . . . . .	h 279
Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan . . . . .	a 974
Survey of University and College Endowment Funds (publi- cation) . . . . .	a 1236
Sutch, W. B. . . . .	h 736
Sutherland, Arthur E. . . . .	a 1055
Sutherland, George . . . . .	h 342
Suzzalo, Henry . . . . .	h 339, 344, 345, 877
Svadkovsky, Professor . . . . .	r 159
Svennilson, Ingvar . . . . .	h 942
Swarthmore College . . . . .	a 1177
Swedish Institute of International Affairs . . . . .	h 933
Swift, Harold H. . . . .	h 356, 361
Swift & Co. . . . .	h 356, 361
Swing, Raymond Gram . . . . .	a 1213
Swope, Gerard . . . . .	a 1136

	Page
Syracuse Herald-Journal .....	r 352
Syracuse Peace Council .....	r 351
Syracuse Post Standard .....	r 351, 352
Syracuse University .....	h 395, 553, 555; a 1197, 1205, 1232
Syracuse University Press .....	h 395

## T

Taft, Robert A .....	h 210, 342, 574, 590, 591, 595, 766, 889; a 1057, 1157
Taft, William Howard .....	h 910; a 1057; r 20
Taft-Hartley Act in Action (pamphlet) .....	a 981
Taft-Hartley labor bill .....	a 1160, 1166
Talbot, Phillips .....	a 1230
Talk About Russia With Masha Scott (publication) .....	r 242
Taney, Chief Justice .....	h 318
Tarbell .....	h 219, 669
Tate, Allen .....	r 189
Tawney, R. H. .....	a 1140
Tax Exempt Charitable Corporations (publication) .....	a 1238
Tax Exempt Foundations (publication) .....	a 1236, 1240
Tax Planning for Foundations and Charitable Giving (pub- lication) .....	a 1235
Taxes (publication) .....	a 1240
Taylor, Cecil Grady .....	a 1231
Taylor, Charles L. .....	h 339, 342
Taylor, Eleanor K. .....	a 1236, 1240
Taylor, George .....	h 538, 553
Taylor, Glen H. .....	h 35
Taylor, James M. .....	h 344
Taylor, Wallace W. .....	h 65
Teacher Tenure Act .....	h 505
Teachers College (Columbia University) .....	h 33, 64, 65, 74, 94, 252, 253, 263, 268, 272-275, 285, 286, 288, 390, 400, 484, 485, 553, 674, 675, 677, 694, 696, 697, 700, 701, 703-705, 713, 719, 720, 780, 789, 912, 928, 938; a 1081, 1115, 1144-1146, 1149; r 120, 121, 136, 149, 157, 173, 257.
• <i>Teachers College v. Goldstein et al.</i> (case) .....	a 1146
Teachers College Faculty Committee .....	h 94
Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association .....	a 954
Teachers Union of New York .....	r 281
Teapot Dome and Elk Hill (subtitle) .....	h 297
Television and Education in the United States (pamphlet) .....	h 385
Temple University .....	a 1229
Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) .....	r 15, 39, 45
Ten Years of Workers Education (publication) .....	r 397
Ten Years of World Cooperation (publication) .....	h 927
Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) .....	r 100, 101
Tennessee Williams .....	r 189, 389
Tenney Committee .....	h 904; a 1132, 1221
Tenney Report .....	h 315
Tepoztlan, Mexico (publication) .....	h 926
Terlin, Rose .....	a 1175

	Page
Territorial Problems (study).....	r 177
Tewkesbury, Donald G.....	h 553
Texas University.....	h 395; a 1149
Texas University Press.....	h 395
Text of the Trustees of the Ford Foundation's Plans To Aid World Welfare (article).....	a 1240
Textile Mills Securities Corp. (case).....	h 429, 437
Textile Workers Union of America.....	h 778; a 979, 1166; r 104
Textile Workers Organization Committee.....	r 403
Thacher, Judge Thomas D.....	a 1220
Thanh, N. Duc.....	a 983
That Next War? (publication).....	h 927
Thatcher, Mollie Day.....	a 1165
Theatre Division (National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions).....	r 342, 347
Theoretical Study of Ethnic Groups (publication).....	h 831
These Americans Say: Lift the Embargo Against Republican Spain (booklet).....	r 227, 242, 244, 251, 255, 275, 305, 308, 312, 327, 350, 353, 377.
They Sent Me to Iceland (publication).....	h 929
They Tried To Get Me, Too (article).....	r 197
They Work to Give Millions Away (article).....	a 1239
Things Men Fight For (publication).....	h 926
Third American Slav Congress (Manhattan Center, NYC).....	r 323
Third American Writers Congress.....	r 261, 286, 346, 391
Third Freedom (conference).....	a 989, 994
Third Freedom, Freedom From Want (publication).....	h 774, 777
Third Reich (publication).....	h 928
Third Route (publication).....	h 926
Thirty Pieces of Silver (play).....	r 284
Thirty Year Catalogue of Grants (publication).....	h 669; a 1236
Thirty-Five Years of Educational Pioneering (pamphlet).....	h 219
This Happened in Passadena (publication).....	h 408
This Is One Way to Sell Radicalism (article).....	h 755
This Is Russia (publication).....	h 927
This Week Magazine.....	a 1239
Thomas.....	a 1172, 1175
Thomas, Charles Allen.....	h 339; a 965
Thomas, E. P.....	h 891
Thomas, Elbert D.....	h 929; r 399
Thomas, Norman.....	h 135, 306-309, 512, 513, 762, 765, 773, 793; a 981, 983, 984, 988, 995; r 103, 105
Thomas, R. J.....	h 776
Thomas, Steven Alexander.....	a 1230
Thomas, Valentine.....	h 927
Thomas Committee.....	h 256
Thomas for President Club.....	h 751
Thomas Jefferson: World Citizen (publication).....	h 929
Thomas Masaryk of Czechoslovakia (publication).....	h 926
Thompson, J. Walter.....	a 1025
Thompson, Norma S.....	h 357
Thompson, Robert.....	r 358, 361, 386



	Page
Thompson Co.....	a 1025
Thorndike, E. L.....	h 677
Those Subversive Foundations (article).....	a 1239
Thut, Professor.....	h 388
Thwing, Charles F.....	h 344
Tilden, Samuel J.....	h 767; a 984
Tilden High School.....	h 767; a 984
Tilt, James T.....	a 1237
Time (publication).....	h 199, 349; a 1238
Timid Billions (article).....	a 1238
Tiner, Hugh M.....	h 379; r 188
Tinsley, Ted.....	r 249
To Safeguard These Rights (leaflet).....	r 241, 270, 299, 332, 385
To the Ultimate Benefit of Mankind (publication).....	a 1235
To Insure the End of Our Hysteria (article).....	r 116
Todes, Charlotte.....	r 373
Tokyo Bureau of Municipal Research.....	h 942
Tokyo Community Church.....	a 1209
Toledano, Ralph.....	r 121
Toledo Blade (publication).....	159
Toledo University.....	h 831
Tolstoy.....	a 1168
Tom Mooney Committee (New York).....	r 230
Tomb, Lawrence C.....	h 888
Tomorrow's Food (publication).....	a 996
Toronto University.....	h 496, 780, 788; a 990
Toward an Abiding Peace (publication).....	h 929; r 173
Toward a Farmer-Labor Party (pamphlet).....	h 780, 789; a 988, 997, 1163; r 105, 107
Toward Greater Freedom: Problems of War and Peace (pam- phlet).....	h 912, 917
Toward Higher Ground (pamphlet).....	h 907
Toward Independent Labor Politics in Britain (publication).....	h 793
Toward Nationalization of Industry (pamphlet).....	h 767, 768; a 988, 997; r 102
Towards a Policy (publication).....	h 921, 922
Toward Social Security (publication).....	a 990
Toward an Understanding of the U. S. S. R. (publication).....	h 928
Tower, Charlemagne.....	h 343
Tower Press.....	h 395
Town Club of Scarsdale, N. Y.....	a 1209
Town Hall (All Eisler program).....	r 250
Toynbee, Arnold J.....	h 575, 936; a 1140
Trachtenberg, Alexander.....	h 513; r 372, 409, 410
Tragedy of Waste (publication).....	h 134; r 248
Transitional Period (publication).....	h 890
Travel Grants for Area Research (SSRC pamphlet).....	r 61, 62
Travis, Maurice.....	r 356
Treatise on Civil Government (publication).....	h 581
Trexler, Harry C.....	h 16
Trexler Estate (foundation).....	h 16
Triggs, Oscar Lovell.....	h 220
Trilling, Lionel.....	r 189

	Page
Trinity Episcopal Church.....	a 1204
Trotsky, Leon.....	r 98, 328, 379, 397, 404, 414
Trow, William Clark.....	h 287
Trowbridge, Augustus.....	h 356, 362
Truman, President.....	h 757; a 1158, 1204; r 108, 162, 187, 240, 265, 266, 269, 274, 277-279, 285, 331, 344, 345, 357, 374, 381, 383.
Truman's Commission on Higher Education.....	r 108, 142, 143
Trumbo, Dalton.....	r 241, 339, 343, 348, 386, 391
Trustees of the Bail Fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York.....	r 350
Trusts for Charitable and Benevolent Purposes (article).....	a 1240
Tsetung, Mao.....	r 235
Tsurumi, Yusuko.....	h 927
Tufts College.....	a 1048
Tulane University.....	a 1009
Tunis, John R.....	a 1175
Turkey at the Straits (publication).....	h 888
Turner, Betty.....	r 161
Turner, Ralph E.....	r 189
Turning of the Tides (publication).....	h 134, 136, 480, 507; r 85, 141
TV-Radio Workshop.....	h 41; a 1040
TV station, Jacksonville, Fla. (Washington Post Co.).....	r 10
TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority).....	r 100, 101
Twelve Communist leaders.....	r 266, 357
Twelve Communist Leaders (National Non-Partisan Com- mittee to Defend the Rights of).....	r 266, 344, 386
Twentieth Century Capitalist Revolution (article).....	r 92
Twentieth Century Fund.....	h 16, 724, 854; a 1172, 1216, 1235; r 4, 24, 47, 50, 109, 110, 118, 166, 174
Twentieth Century Fund; Philanthropy and Learning (publication).....	h 669
Twenty-Five Years of Sex Research (article).....	a 1137
Twenty-year Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.....	a 1235
Tyler, Professor.....	r 81
Tyler, Gus.....	h 792
Tyler, H. W.....	h 272, 275

## U

UAW-CIO.....	a 990, 995
UCLA.....	r 334
Ulyanov (article).....	r 92
Umscheld, Arthur George.....	a 1229
Un-American Activities Committee (California).....	r 116
Un-American Activities Reports.....	r 233
Un-American Activities in the State of Washington (study).....	a 1132
Uncle Tom's Cabin (publication).....	h 455
Under Five Sultans (publication).....	h 926
Underground Stream (publication).....	r 343
Underhill, Professor.....	a 990
Underhill, Frank H.....	h 780, 788
Undermining the Constitution (publication).....	r 122
Undermining Our Republic (pamphlet).....	h 260

	Page
Unemployment Insurance Review (publication) .....	r 230, 260
UNESCO in Focus (publication) .....	h 397
Unified Polytechnical School .....	h 277
Union Carbide Co. ....	h 375
Union Carbide & Carlson .....	a 1044
Union Casualty Co. ....	a 981, 990
Union of Concerted Peace Efforts (pamphlet) .....	r 309, 406
Union for Democratic Action (Washington Chapter) .....	r 407
Union Leadership Project (University of Chicago) .....	r 163
Union Now (publication) .....	h 928; r 173
Union Theological Seminary .....	h 74, 361, 362; a 977, 1127, 1128
Unique Function of Education in American Democracy (publi- cation) .....	h 697
United American Spanish Aid Committee .....	r 248, 249, 305, 318, 319, 375, 377, 378
United Automobile Workers of America (CIO) .....	h 41, 42, 776; a 977; r 165
United Educators, Inc. ....	h 394
United Fruit Co. ....	h 359; a 1128
United Kingdom Delegation to the United Nations .....	a 995
United Mine Workers .....	r 228
United Nations .....	h 28, 33, 35, 39, 42, 56, 57, 65-67, 69-71, 74, 349, 380-382, 384, 385, 396, 397, 619, 769, 772, 781, 784, 789, 791, 872, 874, 875, 881, 884, 886, 887-893, 914, 916, 918- 921, 929, 934, 935, 939, 942; a 970, 977, 984, 985, 991, 1021, 1049, 1050, 1057, 1059, 1094, 1103, 1157, 1158, 1161, 1162, 1167, 1179, 1217, 1229, 1230; r 19, 101, 102, 104, 108, 155, 160, 165, 174, 176, 182-185, 187, 188, 191, 192, 251, 268, 278, 323, 326, 333, 362, 380.
United Nations Charter .....	h 69; a 1059, 1062
United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (pamphlet) .....	h 619
United Nations News (publication) .....	a 1241
United Nations Organization films .....	r 166
United Nations Studies (publication) .....	a 1241
United Negro College Fund, Inc. ....	a 1031
United Neighborhood Houses .....	a 984
United Office and Professional Workers of America (UOPWA) .....	r 239, 328, 329, 371
United Productions of America .....	r 165
United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America .....	a 981
United Services Organization (USO) .....	h 34; r 232
United States Advisory Commission on Educational Ex- change .....	a 1167
United States Committee of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom .....	a 985
United States Congress Against War .....	r 232, 335, 350, 352, 398, 415
<i>United States v. Butler</i> .....	a 1080, 1081
United States Chamber of Commerce .....	h 495, 920; a 1044; r 158
United States Citizens in World Affairs (publication) .....	a 1158
United States and the Far East (publication) .....	h 929
United States Flag Foundation .....	r 351

	Page
United States News and World Report.....	r 197, 210
United States and Russia (publication).....	r 264
United States News and World Report.....	a 1238
United States Vice President.....	r 245
United States Workers' Theater.....	r 264
United Student Peace Committee.....	r 393, 411
Universal Declaration of Human Rights.....	r 165, 188
University radio station, Ann Arbor, Mich.....	a 1230
University of Alabama.....	a 1218
University of Arizona.....	a 1230
University of Atlanta.....	h 64
University of Berlin.....	h 31; a 1139; r 93
University of Boston.....	r 158
University of British Columbia.....	h 874
University of Buffalo.....	a 1114
University of California.....	h 19,
196, 255, 257, 356, 361, 395, 496, 553, 694, 723, 877,	
904, 937, 940; a 1014, 1025, 1127, 1128, 1132, 1139,	
1184, 1188, 1221, 1230; r 42, 81, 83, 150, 184, 236, 240,	
292, 301, 324, 334, 363.	
University of California Press.....	h 395
University of California Provost.....	r 150
University of Cambridge.....	r 158
University of Chicago.....	h 19,
32, 33, 36-39, 41, 60-62, 268, 275, 286, 355, 356, 360,	
395, 523, 524, 565, 581-583, 672, 674, 675, 694, 701,	
703-705, 713, 719-721, 880; a 955, 961, 1009, 1025,	
1035, 1036, 1081, 1114, 1115, 1124, 1195, 1196, 1229,	
1235; r 11, 37, 80, 81, 83, 133, 135, 155, 158, 163, 255,	
299, 301, 318, 351.	
University of Chicago Law School.....	a 1132
University of Chicago Press.....	h 395; a 1235
University of Chicago Roundtable.....	h 32, 41, 581
University of Chicago Roundtable Broadcasts.....	r 133
University of Chicago Union Leadership Project.....	r 163
University of Colorado.....	h 395
University of Colorado Press.....	h 395
University of Connecticut.....	h 388
University of Delaware.....	a 1229
University of Denver.....	h 64, 888, 941; a 955
University of Frankfurt.....	h 31; r 92
University of Gottingen.....	a 1139
University of Harvard.....	h 19,
32, 62, 63, 220, 224, 346, 347, 350, 354, 359-361, 376,	
404, 468, 525, 553, 574, 599, 617, 628, 678, 694, 705,	
795, 830, 840, 892; a 970, 981, 993, 1009, 1021, 1071,	
1124, 1133, 1139, 1145, 1148, 1184, 1191, 1193, 1196,	
1219; r 45, 64, 75, 77, 81, 157, 158, 178, 231, 248, 263,	
306, 363, 364, 366, 367.	
University of Hawaii.....	h 553
University of Idaho.....	h 553
University of Illinois.....	h 220, 388, 390, 395, 496
University of Illinois Press.....	h 395

	Page
University of Indiana	h 937; a 1137, 1138, 1229, 1231
University of Iowa	h 286, 395
University of Iowa Press	h 395
University of Kentucky	a 1184, 1185, 1187, 1230, 1232; r 62
University of Louisiana	h 61
University of London	r 263
University of Maine	a 1232
University of Manchester	a 1219
University of Maryland	h 333, 390
University of Michigan	h 250,
	286, 395, 524; a 1001, 1025, 1029, 1129, 1149
University of Michigan Press	h 395
University of Minnesota	h 286,
	362, 395; a 953, 975, 1009, 1231; r 74, 82, 424
University of Minnesota Press	h 395; r 82
University of Missouri	a 1139
University of Moscow	h 266, 267,
	273-276, 279-282; r 152, 157-161, 412
University of Nebraska	h 358; a 1231
University of New Brunswick	h 874
University of New York	h 64, 254,
	268, 272-274, 327, 359, 361, 390, 395, 495, 517, 677,
	697; a 976, 977, 983, 985, 995, 996, 1009, 1025, 1048
	1231, 1236; r 278.
University of North Carolina	h 268, 272,
	275, 395, 874; a 955, 1181, 1232; r 81, 399
University of North Carolina Press	h 395
University of Notre Dame	h 831; a 1014
University of Oklahoma	a 1231
University of Oregon	h 349; a 1041, 1148
University of Pennsylvania	h 114, 138,
	165, 272, 275, 355, 395, 811, 846; a 1024, 1025, 1139,
	1184, 1187; r 26, 31, 158, 204, 354.
University of Pennsylvania Law Review	a 1239
University of Pennsylvania Press	h 395
University of Pittsburgh	h 220, 355, 361; a 1238
University of Pittsburgh Law Review	a 1238
University of Princeton	h 151,
	220, 347, 353, 356, 359, 362, 395, 495, 553, 832, 933;
	a 1209, 1230, 1231, 1332; r 43, 73, 158.
University of Rhode Island	a 1184
University of Rochester	h 356,
	362, 395; a 1009, 1124, 1139, 1227, 1230, 1231
University of Rochester Press	h 395
University of San Francisco	h 256; r 150
University of South Carolina	a 1231
University of Southern California	h 395, 523, 874; a 983, 1229; r 363
University of Southern California Press	h 395
University of Stanford	h 196,
	197, 220, 231, 256, 356, 362, 395, 524, 554, 562, 672,
	874, 892, 912, 934, 941; a 1030, 1113, 1115, 1145,
	1149, 1150, 1229, 1231; r 81, 135, 147, 150, 291.
University of Stockholm	a 970, 1139

	Page
University of Texas.....	h 395; a 1149
University of Texas Press.....	h 395
University of Toledo.....	h 831
University of Toronto.....	h 496, 780, 788; a 990
University of Utah.....	a 1041
University of Virginia.....	h 358, 874; a 1139
University of Washington.....	h 61, 286, 395, 530, 531, 538, 552, 553, 974, 877; a 1143; r 79.
University of Washington Press.....	h 395
University of Washington's Far Eastern Institute.....	a 1143
University of Wisconsin.....	h 220, 395, 694; a 964, 990, 993, 1009, 1139, 1229, 1231
University of Wisconsin Press.....	h 395
University of Yale.....	h 220, 242, 353, 358, 359, 361, 417, 523, 524, 526, 527, 529, 540, 546, 553, 843, 893, 932, 937; a 983, 1009, 1025, 1041, 1124, 1128, 1139, 1194, 1188, 1191, 1231, 1232; r 28, 34, 35, 41, 42, 81, 199.
University of Yale Press.....	h 395, 524
University Center (Atlanta).....	h 677
University Publishing Co.....	h 394
USO (United Services Organization).....	h 34; r 232
<i>United States v. Butler</i> (case).....	h 642
United States Army in World War II, the Army Ground Forces (publication).....	h 161
Unknown Country (publication).....	h 929
Unseen Assassins (publication).....	h 927; r 173
Untermyer, Samuel.....	r 19
Upjohn, W. E.....	h 854; r 47
Upjohn Unemployment Trustee Corp.....	h 854; r 47
Upper Iowa University.....	h 568
USA-USSR (pamphlet).....	r 360
Use and Abuse of Endowments (article).....	a 1240
Use of Charitable Foundations for Avoidance of Taxes (article).....	a 1238
Use of the Foundation in your Estate Planning (report).....	a 1235
USSR (publication).....	h 36
USSR; a Concise Hand book.....	r 316, 367
USSR Foreign Policy (publication).....	r 367, 379
Utah University.....	a 1041
Utley, Freda.....	a 1216

## V

Valentine, Alan.....	h 344
Van Dusen, Henry P.....	h 356, 362; a 1127, 1128
Van Dyke, John C.....	h 927
Van Fleet, General.....	h 156, 163; r 183
Van Hise, Charles R.....	h 344
VanNostrand, D.....	h 394
VanNostrand Co.....	h 394
Van Sant, Edward R.....	a 1231
Van Till, William.....	h 388, 390

	<b>Page</b>
Van Valkenburg, Samuel	h 929
Vandenbosch, Army	a 1230
Vanderbilt, Commodore	h 769
Vanderbilt Law Review	a 1218
Vanderbilt University	h 60, 359, 360, 395; a 1041, 1048, 1124, 1128, 1231
Vanderbilt University Press	h 395
Vanderlip, Frank A.	h 344, 345
Varieties of Religious Experience (publication)	h 574; r 77
Variety (publication)	r 342
Varney, Harold Lord	h 222; r 114, 202
Vassar College	h 220, 268, 275, 901; a 1220; r 277, 302, 394, 412, 413, 415
Vassar Experimental Theater	a 1165; r 108
Vatican Library	a 1058
Vaughn, Kenneth W.	h 345, 688
Veblen	a 1167; r 108
Velde, Hon. Harold H.	h 25, 40
Velie, L.	a 1241
Venezuela (publication)	h 928
Vernon, Raymond	a 1231
Vested Interests (article)	r 93
Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade	h 223; r 261, 294, 305, 332, 333, 347, 349, 385
Veterans Against Discrimination of the Civil Rights Congress of New York	r 347, 349
Veterans' Bureau Scandals (subtitle)	h 297
Veterans of Foreign Wars	h 29
Viallate, Schille	h 926
Vice President of the United States	r 245, 285, 289
Viekke, Bernard H. M.	h 929
Viking Fund (publication)	a 1236
Viking Press	h 395
Villard, Oswald Garrison	h 781, 790; a 1175
Vinacke, Harold M.	h 928
Vincent, George E.	h 356, 357, 362
Viner, Jacob	r 190, 379
Vinson, Robert E.	h 345
Virginia Law Review	a 1238
Virginia University	h 358, 874; a 1139
Vishinsky's Law of the Soviet State (publication)	a 1003
Vital Speeches (publication)	h 325, 405
Viton, Albert	h 928
Vladeck, William C.	a 984
Voice of Alabama (WAPI, WAFM-TV)	h 361; a 1128
Voice of Freedom Committee	r 228
Volunteer for Liberty (publication)	r 294
VOKS (All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries)	h 273, 275; r 158, 159, 161, 313
Volker, William	h 16
Volker Charities	h 16
Von Hayek, Friedrich	a 1140
Von Mises, Ludwig	h 254; a 1192; r 149

W		Page
Wade, Mason	-----	h 929
Wadsworth, Senator	-----	r 99
Wadsworth, Eliot	-----	h 343, 891
Wadsworth, Philip Adrian	-----	a 1232
WAFM-TV (Voice of Alabama)	-----	h 361
Wagner, Ellasue	-----	h 927
Waite High School	-----	a 1204
Waiting for Lefty (play)	-----	a 1164
Wakefield, Lyman E.	-----	h 343
Waksman, Dr. Selman A.	-----	a 977, 991
Waldman, Louis	-----	r 409
Waldrom, Webb	-----	h 926
Waldrop, Frank	-----	r 362
Walker, Everett	-----	r 9
Walker, Gordon S.	-----	a 949
Walker, Sydnor H.	-----	h 358
Wallace, DeWitt	-----	h 569
Wallace, Henry A.	-----	h 35, 36, 37; a 1174, 1197, 1203, 1207; r 252, 268, 304, 320, 342, 347, 367, 405
Wallace, Robert C.	-----	h 345
Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin	-----	r 268, 320
Walling, William English	-----	h 220
Wallis	-----	h 926
Walsh, J. Raymond	-----	h 778; a 1159, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175; r 106, 379
Walsh, Robert K.	-----	h 735
Walsh investigation (1917)	-----	r 19
Walter Hines Page School	-----	h 361, 553
Walter-McCarran law	-----	r 290, 291, 373
Walton, Eda Lou	-----	r 286
Wambaugh, Sarah	-----	h 917
WAPI (Voice of Alabama)	-----	h 361
War in China (publication)	-----	h 928
War of the Classes (publication)	-----	h 219
War Debts and World Prosperity (publication)	-----	h 927
War and Peace Studies	-----	h 885, 886; r 177
War, Peace and Revolution (research project)	-----	r 147
War and the Private Investor (publication)	-----	h 900, 921
War Resisters International Council	-----	r 411, 412
War Resisters League	-----	r 187, 411, 412
War and the Working Classes (publication)	-----	r 243
Ward, H. F.	-----	r 298
Ward, Dr. L. F.	-----	r 30, 31
Ward, Robertson D.	-----	h 339
Wardwell. (See Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl.)	-----	
Ware	-----	h 301
Ware, Edith E.	-----	h 927; r 173
Ware, Harold	-----	r 247, 302
Warne, Colston	-----	h 750, 751; r 99
Warren	-----	h 639
Warren, Chief Justice	-----	h 364
Warren, Andrew J.	-----	h 358
Warren, Robert Penn	-----	r 189



	Page
Wartime Facts and Postwar Problems (publication).....	h 928
Washburn, Gordon Bailey.....	r 189
Washburne, Carleton.....	a 1175
Washington, George.....	h 52, 354, 598, 805; a 1061; r 169, 203
Washington Book Shop Association.....	r 341
Washington Committee to Aid China.....	a 1222, 1224, 1225
Washington and Jefferson College.....	a 1231
Washington and Lee University Law School.....	a 969
Washington Committee for Aid to China.....	r 289, 323
Washington Cooperative Book Shop.....	r 242,
	243, 271, 324, 355, 367, 369, 388
Washington Evening Star.....	r 243, 270, 274
Washington Post.....	a 1043,
	1224; r 283, 289, 313, 330, 338, 348, 357, 391, 428
Washington Post Co.....	r 10
Washington Post Co. common stock.....	r 10
Washington Post and Times-Herald.....	a 1043; r 10, 325, 428
Washington Securities Co. (Seattle).....	h 553
Washington Square College (New York, N. Y.).....	r 412
Washington Star (publication).....	h 735
Washington Times-Herald.....	r 10, 325, 350, 375
Washington University (St. Louis, Mo.).....	h 354, 356, 395;
	a 1041, 1124, 1127, 1143, 1144, 1148, 1149, 1231, 1232
Washington University Law Quarterly.....	a 1238
Washington University Press.....	h 395
Washingtons Birthday Workers Education Conference.....	a 1159; r 106
Washington's Farewell Address.....	r 169
Wasson, R. Gordon.....	h 347, 348
Watkins, Myron W.....	r 93
Watkins, Senator.....	a 1179
Watson, Goodwin.....	h 265, 488, 516; a 1174
Watson, John B.....	h 142
Watson, Thomas J.....	h 343, 891
Watt, Robert J.....	h 776; a 990
Way Out of Depression (publication).....	h 927
Way Out of War (publication).....	h 928
Way Things Are (publication).....	r 348
Wayfarer in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (publication).....	h 928
Wayland College.....	a 1229
Waymack, W. W.....	h 343
Wayne University.....	a 1132
We Americans (article).....	h 319
We Are Moving Away From Americanism (article).....	r 250
We Are the Government (publication).....	h 33; r 121
We Chinese Women (publication).....	h 929
We Consumers (article).....	h 310
We Have Seen America (pamphlet).....	r 320
We Hold These Truths (pamphlet).....	r 234, 346
We Join Black's Dissent (reprint of article).....	r 279, 332, 391
We Uphold the Right of All Citizens to Speak for Peace (signed statement).....	r 279
Wealth and Culture (publication).....	a 1236; r 122
Weary Blues (publication).....	r 297

	Page
Weaver, Warren.....	h 358, 363
Webb, Beatrice.....	h 319, 573; r 155
Webb, Paul.....	h 345
Webb, Sydney.....	h 215, 319, 573; a 1139; r 155
Webber, James B., Jr.....	h 346, 376
Webbink, Paul.....	h 137, 794, 837; r 48, 86
Webster, Bethuel M.....	a 1052
Webster, Sir Charles.....	a 1140
Webster Publishing Co.....	h 394
Webster's New International Dictionary.....	a 976
Wechsler, James.....	a 1175
Wedemeyer, General.....	h 548
Weil, Richard, Jr.....	h 351
Weinberg, Bernard.....	a 1232
Weininger.....	h 848
Weiss, John K.....	h 349
Weissman, Bessie.....	r 242, 367, 388
Welch, Holmes.....	a 1241
Welch, John.....	a 983
Welcome, Land of Soviets (pamphlet).....	r 247
Wellemeier, J. F., Jr.....	h 473; a 1009, 1227
Welles, Sumner.....	h 554, 916, 929; a 1216
Wellesley College.....	h 349; a 977
Wells, Herman B.....	h 345
Wells College.....	h 831
Weltfish, Gene.....	h 34; a 1215; r 165, 174, 381-387, 408
Werner, Morris R.....	a 1237
Werth, Alexander.....	r 174, 190, 387-389
Wesleyan University.....	h 224; a 1041
West, Charles.....	h 874
West, Reed.....	h 590, 591
West Indian Odyssey (publication).....	h 928
Western Electric.....	a 1044
Western Reserve University.....	a 955
Western Reserve University Law Review.....	a 1239
Westinghouse Electric Corp.....	a 965
WEVD.....	a 985
Weybright, Victor.....	r 189
Weyl, Walter E.....	h 926
Weyl v. Commissioner (case).....	h 432, 734; a 978, 994; r 96
Wharton School of Finance and Commerce (University of Pennsylvania).....	a 1024, 1025, 1032, 1187
What About Communism? (publication).....	h 41, 397
What About Our Japanese-Americans? (publication).....	h 34
What Is the Congress of American Women? (leaflet).....	r 384
What Is Communism? (broadcast).....	h 32, 41
What Germany Forgot (publication).....	h 928
What is the I. J. A.? (leaflet).....	r 288
What the I. L. O. Means to America (publication).....	h 928
What of Africa's Peace in Tomorrow's World (leaflet).....	r 358
What of Germany, France, and England?.....	h 907
What Great American Philanthropic Foundations do with their Money (publication).....	a 1235

	Page
What Price Israel (publication) .....	h 389
What Price Telephones (publication) .....	h 793
Wheeler, George Shaw .....	a 1223, 1228
Wheeler, Monroe .....	r 189
Where is the Money Coming From? (publication) .....	h 134
Whidden, Howard P .....	h 892
Whig Party .....	h 318
Whipple, George H .....	h 356, 362
White, Andrew D .....	h 343
White, Gilbert .....	a 954
White, Goodrich C .....	a 1041
White, Harry Dexter .....	r 89, 115, 197
White Llewellyn .....	h 929
White, Lynn T. Jr .....	h 554
White, Walter .....	a 984
White, William Allen .....	h 356
White House picket line .....	r 237, 276, 336, 356, 395
Whitehead, Alfred North .....	h 118; a 1114
Whitelaw, Wm. Menzies .....	a 1230
Whitney, General Courtney .....	h 562, 563
Whitney, J. H .....	h 346, 350; a 1021
Whitney, William C .....	h 16, 472; r 198
Whitney Foundation .....	h 16, 472; r 198
Whitney & Co .....	h 346, 350; a 1021
Whittemore, Arthur E .....	a 1182
Whittier .....	r 352
Whiting, B. J .....	a 1009
Who Is Loyal To America (article) .....	r 250
Who's Running the Ford Foundation? (article) .....	a 1241
Who's Who .....	h 60, 74, 785, 873; a 1222, 1223; r 9
Who's Who in America (1936-37) .....	r 363
Why Men Fight (publication) .....	h 926
Why War? (publication) .....	h 928
Wibel, Mary E .....	a 1158
Wickens, Mrs. Arynness J .....	a 1024
Wickersham, George W .....	r 20
Wickliffe, Rose .....	h 357
Widener, Alice .....	a 1241
Wiggins, A. L. M .....	h 891
Wilbur, Brayton .....	h 554
Wilbur, Ray Lyman .....	h 356, 362, 537, 552, 554, 559; a 1113
Wilbur, Wm. Cuttino, Jr .....	a 1229
Wilbur-Ellis Co .....	h 554
Wilcox, Clair .....	h 893, 918
Wilcox, Francis O .....	h 874
Wild, Dr. Payson S., Jr .....	a 1041
Wiley, Alexander .....	a 1241
Wiley, John .....	h 395
Wiley, William Leon .....	a 1232
Wiley & Sons, Inc .....	h 395
Wilkins, Ernest H .....	h 272, 275
Willert, Arthur .....	h 928
Willets, Dr .....	r 27, 180, 181

	Page
Willetts, Fred.....	a 1135
William H. Minor Foundation.....	h 16
William Rockhill Nelson Trust.....	h 16
William and Mary College.....	h 851
William Volker Charities.....	h 16
William C. Whitney Foundation.....	h 16, 472; r 198
Williams, Aubrey.....	r 399
Williams, Clement C.....	h 345
Williams, Clyde.....	r 46
Williams, John Sharp.....	h 343; a 1057
Williams, Lynn A.....	h 32
Williams, Robert W.....	a 1182
Williams, Tennessee.....	r 189, 389
Williams, Whiting.....	r 158
Williams, Wilbur Laurent.....	a 1231
Williams, William Carlos.....	r 190, 389-392
Williams College.....	a 1172, 1220; r 326, 327, 380
Williamson, Genevieve.....	r 161
Williamson, Johnny.....	r 361
Willits, Joseph H.....	h 358, 359, 567, 584, 585; a 1135, 1210-1214
Willkie, Wendell.....	h 595; r 168
Willoughby, General.....	h 561, 562
Willys Co.....	h 374
Wilshire-Ebell Theatre.....	r 365
Wilson, Charles E.....	h 346, 376; a 1021
Wilson, Edmund.....	r 190, 393
Wilson, Howard.....	64; a 1216
Wilson, Leroy A.....	h 339
Wilson, Luke I.....	a 1223, 1228
Wilson, M. L.....	h 352
Wilson, O. Meredith.....	h 349; a 1041
Wilson, Woodrow.....	h 345, 360, 531, 553; r 65, 162, 179
Wiltwyck School.....	a 984
Win the Peace Conference.....	a 1174; r 359, 381
Winning the War on the Spiritual Front (publication).....	h 918
Winslow, Charles Edward Amory.....	h 34, 917
Winston, Henry.....	r 361
Winston, John C.....	h 395
Winston Co.....	h 395
Winter, Carl.....	r 361
Winterich, J. Q.....	a 1241
Wirt, Dr. William A.....	h 299-301, 399
Wirth, Louis.....	h 33
Wisconsin University.....	h 220, 395, 694; a 964, 990, 993, 1009, 1139, 1229, 1231
Witch Hunt (publication).....	r 341
With These Hands (film).....	r 165
Withers, John W.....	h 272, 275
Wither, William.....	h 793
Witman, Shepherd L.....	a 1182
Wittfogel, Karl.....	h 538; a 1184, 1193
Wittmer, Felix.....	a 1215, 1217; r 174, 175
Woefel, Norman.....	h 292, 485, 487-490; r 143-146, 153

	Page
Wolchok, Samuel.....	h 779, 780, 788; r 104
Wolf, Charles, Jr.....	a 1230
Wolff, Kurt.....	r 189
Wolfson, Theresa.....	h 220, 308; a 980, 981, 988
Woman, Position in Society (article).....	r 93
Woman Power (publication).....	r 383
Woman Today (publication).....	r 309
Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.....	r 32
Women's International Democratic Federation.....	r 384
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.....	r 412
Women's Trade Union League.....	r 409
Wood.....	h 256
Wood, General.....	h 787
Wood, Ben D.....	h 687
Wood, John E. F.....	h 347
Wood, John S.....	a 1200
Wood, W. Barry, Jr.....	h 356; a 1127
Woodley, W. John R.....	a 1231
Woodley Petroleum Co.....	h 350; a 1051
Woodrow Wilson Foundation.....	a 1241
Woodrow Wilson school (Princeton University).....	h 553
Woods, Arthur M.....	h 356, 362
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute.....	a 1124
Woodward, Robert S.....	h 339, 343
Woody, Thomas.....	h 272, 275
Wooley, Mary B.....	r 412
Woolsey, Lester H.....	h 878
Wooster, J. W., Jr.....	a 1241
Worcester Art Museum (Worcester, Mass.).....	a 1231
Worker (publication).....	r 231,
	245, 248, 266, 271, 272, 286, 297, 316, 320, 325, 339,
	341-343, 345, 348, 354, 360, 362, 386, 404, 406.
Worker (Southern Edition).....	r 316, 339, 348
Worker's Book Shop (New York, N. Y.).....	r 271, 297, 315, 341, 348, 367
Workers Book Shop Catalog.....	r 341, 367
Worker's Education (article).....	a 1167
Workers Education Bureau of America.....	r 396, 397
Workers Education at the Cross Roads (publication).....	r 396
Workers Library Publishers.....	r 315
Workers Monthly.....	r 293
Workers Party of America.....	r 229, 415
Workers School.....	r 233, 319
Working Class Theatre.....	r 345
Workmen's Circle Call (publication).....	a 1167
Workshops on Education (publication).....	a 1159
World Affairs Council.....	h 57; r 184
World Affairs Council of Northern California.....	h 553
World and Africa (publication).....	r 271
World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1953.....	a 1237
World Appeal to Outlaw Atomic Weapons (Stockholm).....	r 273
World Armenian Congress.....	a 1173
World Bank.....	h 900
World Book Co.....	h 395

	Page
World Commercial Court.....	h 922
World Conference of the Teaching Profession.....	h 69
World Congress Against War (Amsterdam).....	r 255, 318, 350, 398
World Congress on Education for Democracy at Teachers Col- lege.....	h 94
World Congress of Intellectuals.....	r 235, 282, 283, 309
World Congress for Peace, Paris (leaflet).....	r 273, 280, 386
World Cooperation and Social Progress (pamphlet).....	h 781, 791; a 997
World Court.....	h 917, 927
World Court (publication).....	h 927
World Economy in Transition and Raw Materials in Peace and War (publication).....	h 884, 900
World Federation of Democratic Youth.....	r 413
World of the Four Freedoms (publication).....	h 929; a 1216
World of Great Powers (publication).....	h 883; a 1179; r 176
World Health Organization (United Nations).....	h 67; a 991, 1103
World Investment Bank.....	h 923
World Investment Commission.....	h 922
World Labor Today (publication).....	h 793; a 981
World News and Views (publication).....	r 243
World Order in Historical Perspective (publication).....	h 929
World Peace Appeal.....	r 280, 284, 374, 387, 389, 403
World Peace Conference.....	h 224
World Peace Congress (Paris).....	r 273, 282-284, 374, 386, 387, 389, 403
World Peace Council.....	r 273, 280
World Peace Foundation.....	h 74, 874, 876, 929
World Peace Prize.....	r 273
World Production and Consumption of Food (publication).....	h 892
World Student Association for Peace, Freedom and Culture.....	r 393, 394
World Today (publication).....	h 929
World Tomorrow (publication).....	r 397
World Tourists, Inc.....	h 273, 274; r 157, 356
World Trade and Employment (pamphlet).....	h 891
World Trade and Its Future (publication).....	h 928; r 173
World Wide Broadcasting Foundation.....	h 919
World Youth Congress.....	r 244, 277, 302, 405, 411-413, 415, 416
World Youth Festival.....	r 186, 413
Wormser, Rene A.....	a 1183, 1184, 1185, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1223; r 222.
Worth, Alexander.....	a 1215, 1216
Wortham, N. E.....	h 927
Woytinsky, W. S.....	h 938
Wreden, Nicholas.....	h 348
Wrenn, Heaton L. ( <i>see also</i> Anderson, Wrenn, & Jenks).....	h 554
Wright, Archie.....	r 404
Wright, Benjamin F.....	h 345
Wright, Louise L.....	h 554
Wright, Luke E.....	h 343
Wright, Orville.....	a 1062
Wright, Quincy.....	h 33, 74, 889, 917, 919
Wright, Ralph.....	h 784, 791
Wright, Wilbur.....	a 1062

	Page
Wriston, Henry M.-----	h 343, 345, 874, 889; a 1060
Writers and Artists Committee (American League for Peace and Democracy)-----	r 259, 335, 337
Writers Congress-----	r 292, 324, 334, 365
Writing and Publishing Forum of New York Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions-----	r 304
WTOP, Inc. (Washington Post Co. radio station)-----	r 11
Wu, Yuan-li-----	a 1231
Wuorinen, John Henry-----	a 1231
Wylie, Philip-----	h 147
Wyzenski, Charles E.-----	h 346, 376; a 1021

## X

Xavier University-----	h 42; a 1041
------------------------	--------------

## Y

Yagoda, Louis-----	a 985
Yale Executive Committee on International Relations-----	h 524
Yale Institute of International Studies-----	h 524, 874
Yale John Dewey Society-----	a 983
Yale Law Journal-----	a 1239
Yale Law School-----	a 1132
Yale University-----	h 220, 242, 353, 358, 359, 361, 417, 523, 524, 526, 527, 529, 540, 546, 553, 843, 893, 932, 937; a 983, 1009, 1025, 1041, 1124, 1128, 1139, 1184, 1188, 1191, 1231, 1232; r 28, 34, 35, 41, 42, 81, 199.
Yale University Press-----	h 395, 524
Yanks Are Not Coming Committee-----	r 367
Yard, Molly-----	r 411
Yavner, Louis E.-----	a 996
Year of Stalingrad (publication)-----	r 387
Yearbook of Philanthropy since the year 1920-----	a 1237
Yellow Fever (publication)-----	a 1072, 1183
Yergan, Max-----	a 1216
YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association)-----	h 347; a 1204, 1205; r 232, 396
YMCA Schools (New York, N. Y.)-----	a 1209
YMCA of Washington, D. C.-----	a 1209
Yntema, T. O.-----	h 376
Yoshida, Premier-----	h 572
Yotoku, Miyagi-----	r 298
You and Your U. S. A. (pamphlet)-----	a 1048-1049
Young-----	a 972
Young, Donald-----	h 132, 133, 135, 136, 137; r 48, 49, 85, 184, 185
Young, Ernest L.-----	h 348
Young, James W.-----	h 348, 349
Young, Owen D.-----	h 357, 362
Young, Dr. Ralph A.-----	a 1025
Young Circle League of the Workmen's Circle-----	r 409
Young Communist International-----	r 415
Young Communist League-----	a 1175; r 237, 277, 296, 306, 353, 358, 370, 382, 393, 396, 401

	Page
Young Democrat Clubs.....	h 784, 792
Young Europe (publication).....	h 927
Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA).....	h 347;
	a 1204, 1205; r 232, 396
Young Peoples Socialist League.....	r 187, 395, 396, 414-416
Young Republican Clubs.....	h 784, 792
Young Socialist (publication).....	r 415
Young Socialist International.....	r 415
Young Women's Christian Association.....	r 394, 396, 410
Young Worker (publication).....	r 395
Young Workers League.....	r 395
Youngren, Harold T.....	h 376
Youngville, U. S. A. (pamphlet).....	r 230, 236, 336, 369, 376
Your Money's Worth (publication).....	h 134
Youth Committee Against War.....	r 187
Youth Tell Their Story (publication).....	h 697
Y's Men's Club, YMCA (Toledo, Ohio).....	a 1209
Yu Pin, Paul.....	a 1224
Yugoslav-American Home (New York, N. Y.).....	r 320

## Z

Zabel, Morton D.....	r 189
Zablodowsky, D.....	r 161
Zell.....	a 1166
Zellerbach, James D.....	h 350; a 1051, 1183
Ziegner, William.....	a 1175
Zilberfarb, Johannson I.....	h 285; r 153
Zimmerman, Prof. Carle C.....	a 1184, 1194; r 64, 75, 76
Zimmerman, Charles.....	a 996
Zimmern School of International Studies (Geneva, Switzerland).....	a 1205
Zoll, Allen A.....	h 321, 329, 330, 335, 382
Zook, George F.....	h 482
Zorbaugh, Harry W.....	h 273, 275
Zorbaugh, Harvey.....	r 412



## COX COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT

**Index for Hearings Before the Select Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, on House Resolution 561, November 18 to December 30, 1952**

(Prepared by Sydney S. Spivack for Russell Sage Foundation, 505 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.)

	Page
A	
Abrams, Frank W.....	220, 245, 319
Abuses of tax exemption ( <i>see also</i> Tax exemption; Taxation).....	304,
400, 503, 561, 565, 649	
By educational institutions.....	662-663
By family foundations.....	775, 778
Extent unknown.....	788, r 6
Academic freedom.....	557
Accountability:	
Attitudes toward.....	45, 155-156, 304, 405-406,
412, 422-423, 440, 454, 464, 768, 792, r 6, 12-13	
Carnegie group.....	155, 340-341, 379, 572, 763
Ford Foundation.....	202-203, 230, 251-252, 286
Rockefeller Foundation.....	501-503, 557-558, 760
Russell Sage Foundation.....	48-49, 389
Sloan Foundation.....	454
Small foundations.....	633, 646, 649
Summary of report on public.....	786-792
Accumulation of funds.....	37, 641, 645-646
Unreasonable.....	29, 33, 59, 470, 764
Adamic, Louis.....	360, 536-537
Adler, Mortimer.....	295
Africa.....	180, 257
Agenda.....	328, 388
Agriculture.....	139, 150, 496, 770, 773
In foreign countries.....	231-232, 240, 242, 499
Alabama, University of.....	301
Aldrich, Malcolm Pratt.....	403-409
Aldrich, Winthrop W.....	563
Altruism.....	156
American Academy of Arts and Sciences.....	545
American Asiatic Association.....	665
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education ( <i>see also</i> Teacher-training).....	311, 312-313
American Association of Teachers' Colleges.....	311
American Bar Association.....	590, 736
American Bureau for Medical Aid to China.....	655

	Page
American Cancer Society.....	154, 771
American Chemical Society.....	127
American Chinese Policy Association.....	651
American Civil Liberties Union.....	607, 692, 736
American Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners.....	693
American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.....	594
American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.....	732
American Committee for Yugoslav Relief.....	446
American Council of Education.....	14, 15, 171, 173
American Council of Learned Societies.....	14, 122, 362, 507-508, 542-547, 664, 666
American Dilemma, An, (Myrdal).....	303
American Economic Association.....	545
American Federation of Art.....	170
American Federation of Teachers.....	614
American Foreign Policy. (See United States in World Affairs, The.)	
American Foundation for the Blind.....	14
American Foundations and Their Fields (Rich and Deardorff).....	86
American Foundations for Social Welfare (Harrison and An- drews).....	19
American Foundations Information Service.....	22, 451
American Fund for Public Service.....	692
American Historical Association.....	15, 545, 664
American Jewish Congress.....	447
American Jewish League Against Communism.....	651
American Labor Education Service.....	415
American Law Institute.....	777
American League for Peace and Democracy.....	588
American Library Association.....	169
American Medical Association.....	95
American Municipal Association.....	133, 146
American Peoples Fund.....	724
American Philological Society.....	15, 545
American Physical Society.....	200
American Political Science Association.....	545
American Public Health Association.....	88
American Relief Administration.....	692
American Rescue Ship Mission.....	741-743
American-Russian Institute.....	359, 427, 594
American Slav Congress.....	446
American Student Union.....	594
American Veterans' Committee.....	415, 782
American War Heroes Foundation.....	21
American Writers' Congress.....	698
American Youth Commission.....	173, 177
Amer, Isreal.....	698, 703
Andrews, F. Emerson.....	19-53, 83-85, 155, 386, 561
Anthropology.....	124
Appropriations. (See Grants.)	
Arabian American Oil Co.....	579

	Page
Area studies.....	132-133, 145-146, 343-346, 507-508
Africa.....	180
Burma.....	509
China.....	508-509, 521
Far East.....	344
India.....	508
Indochina.....	509
Indonesia.....	509
Japan.....	343, 508-509
Latin America.....	344, 508
M. I. T. Research Center for International Studies.....	181
Near East.....	508
Pakistan.....	250
Russia.....	180-181, 247-249, 282-283, 303, 344-346, 373-374, 394, 507- 508, 510-514; r 9
Scandinavia.....	771
Arkansas, University of.....	268, 310
Arkansas teaching experiment.....	41, 47, 53, 186-187, 238
Art, teaching of.....	169-170, 361
Ashford, Bailey K.....	92
Association of American Colleges.....	163, 169
Association of American Law Schools.....	745
Association of American Universities.....	106, 163, 171, 317
Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities.....	106
Association of State Universities.....	106
Association of the Bar of the City of New York.....	517, 736
Atherton, J. Ballard.....	426
Athletics, intercollegiate.....	112-113, 275-277
Atlanta University.....	366, 730
Atomic energy.....	151, 488-489, 535, 593
Attorney-General's List.....	291, 294
• Effect of citation on grants.....	297, 505, 518, 599
Australia.....	334, 355

## B

Babb, Jervis J.....	776-777
Bacon, Peggy.....	617
Bailey, Forrest.....	692
Baker, I. F.....	426
Baldwin, Roger.....	692
Ballantine, Arthur A.....	183, 569-570
Banting, Frederick.....	349
Barkin, Solomon.....	649-650
Barnard, Chester I.....	474, 515, 555-565
Barnes, Kathleen.....	428
Barnett, Robert W.....	541
Barrows, David P.....	576, 658, 660
Beadle, George W.....	539
Beals, Carlton.....	617, 698, 700
Beard, Charles A.....	597
Belknap, Chauncey.....	537
Bell, Laird.....	772-773

	Page
Benedict, Ruth	594-595
Benjamin, Herbert	698
Berea College	245
Berkeley Mill	84
Berle, Adolph A	658-659, 696, 785
Berlin, Free University of	231, 236, 258
Bessie, Alvah C	605, 698, 702, 721
Billingsley, Sarah Jane	r 14
Bingham, Barry	246
Birla, G. D	426
Bisson, Thomas A	364, 540, 657, 725
Black Mountain College	414
Blackstone Mill	84
Blair, Edwin F	607
Bloor, Mother	694
"Blue chips,"	45, 46, 50-51, 368, 396
Boas, Franz	733
Bødde, Dirk	362, 542
Bogolepov, Igor	673-688
Bohr, Niels	489
Bolin, Lazar	428
Bontecou, Elinor	424, 516
Borton, Hugh	527
Boulanger, Nadia	617
Bowman, Isaiah	374
Boyd, Mark J	90
Brady, William G	527
Brandeis, Louis D	294
Brandeis University	588
Branscomb, Harvie	169, 775-776
Branston, Louise	708, 725
Brodsky, Joseph	695
Bronk, Detlev W	541
Brookings Institution	138, 149, 682
Brown, Dyke	201
Brown, James, IV	447
Brown University	163, 332
Statement of Henry M. Wriston	163-193
Bryn Mawr College	344
Buck, Paul H	166
Budenz, Louis Francis	542,
	715-726, 729-730, 735, 743-745, 783-785
Bulova Foundation	27, 32
Bunche, Ralph J	246
Bundy, Harvey H	577, 600
Bureau for Intercultural Education	305
Burma	231, 233, 355, 509
Bush, Vannevar	51, 150-161, 324, 759
Business enterprises, foundation control of	304, 765; r 13
Butler, Nicholas Murray	369, 569, 573, 582
Buttrick, Wallace	299, 760-761, 765

## C

	Page
Cagney, James	702
California, State of	787
California, University of	302, 364, 536
California Committee on Un-American Activities	427
California Institute of Technology	477, 539
Canada	355
Cancer research	154, 455, 771
CARE	53
Carlsberg Foundation	497
Carmichael, Oliver C.	20
Carnegie benefactions	83, 370
Alleged infiltration from the left	697, 699
Libraries	48, 335
Number of foundations	14, 323-326
Relationships between foundations	323-325, 334
Teacher pensions	335
Carnegie Corporation of New York	15,
20, 25, 108, 164, 169, 170, 303, 323-382	
Testimony of Charles W. Dollard	323-369
Devereux C. Josephs	380-382
Russell Leffingwell	369-380
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	183,
306, 325, 676, 715, r 7, r 12	
Testimony of John W. Davis	569-572
Joseph E. Johnson	572-600
Alfred Kohlberg	657-662
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education	14,
24, 106, 108, 113, 150, 191, 325, 335	
Carnegie Hero Fund Commission	25, 325
Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh	323
Carnegie Institution of Washington	15, 123, 149-161, 324
Carnegie United Kingdom Trust	497
Carr, Robert K.	516
Carroll, James	91
Carroll, Thomas H.	200
Carter, Edward C.	526, 527, 652, 654, 657
Casey, William J.	649
Ceylon	355
Chamberlain, Joseph P.	527
Chambers, Whittaker	658-659, 661, 785-786
Chapin, W. W.	660
Chapman, John	428
Chartered foundations versus charitable trusts	3
Charters, foundation	36
Chekhov Publishing Co.	248, 252
Chiang Kai-shek	525, 652, 666
Chicago Tribune	302
Chicago, University of	114, 177, 244, 275-278, 306, 308
Child welfare	437, 442, 771
China	508, 509, 521, 609
China Aid Council	548
China Medical Board	303

	<b>Page</b>
China's Response to the West (Fairbank) .....	542
Chlorella, values of .....	334
Choate, Joseph H. ....	573
Chrysanthemum and the Sword, The (Benedict) .....	594, 595
Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder .....	544, 731
Civil liberties .....	514-517, 725, 736
Civil Rights Congress .....	614, 698
Classification of foundations:	
According to areas of activity .....	41-42, 134
As to type .....	24-30
Clerical Workers Industrial League .....	694
Cleveland Foundation .....	29
Coffin, Henry Sloane .....	607
College, definition of term .....	165
College Entrance Examination Board .....	165, 337
College Retirement Equities Fund .....	164
Collier, John .....	231
Columbia University .....	344, 394, 508, 513, 662-663, 678
Coming of the War (Langer and Gleason) .....	179
Commission for the Financing of Higher Education .....	106,
118, 166, 175-176, 179, 495	
Commission on Industrial Relations .....	789
Committee for Cultural Freedom .....	537
Committee for Economic Development .....	273
Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations .....	590-591
Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill .....	589
Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies .....	593
Common Council for American Unity .....	360
Common Good funds .....	30
Commonwealth College .....	359, 429
Commonwealth Fund .....	24, 115, 134, 299
Testimony of Malcolm P. Aldrich .....	403-409
Communication of results ( <i>see also</i> Reports) .....	405, 505
Communist, The .....	652
Communist infiltration, alleged .....	664-668,
677-678, 692-703, 707-712, 717-724, 762, 781, r 6-7	
Communist International .....	692
Communist Party .....	431, 435, 652, 699, r 7
Agitation Propaganda Cultural Commission .....	690-691
Cultural commission .....	717
Subcommission on foundations .....	717-724
"Under discipline" within, defined .....	723
Communist Workers Alliance .....	698
Community chests .....	35
Community trusts .....	29, 35
Composing for the Films (Eisler) .....	531
Compton, Arthur H. ....	426, 603
Compton, Karl T. ....	196, 220, 457
Conant, James B. ....	171
Congress of American Women .....	588

	Page
Congressional investigation:	
Answers to questionnaire.....	600
Apprehension as to results.....	45, 396-398, 547, 552
Constructive.....	192,
256, 259, 298, 380, 464, 473, 558-559, 575-576	
Fairness, assurance of.....	2
Recommended legislation.....	r 14-15
Report of Select Committee.....	r 1-15
Text of enabling resolution.....	1-2
Value in stimulating thinking.....	157, 367-368, 441
Connecticut College.....	301
Conroy, Jack.....	721
Contributions, charitable, reluctance to reduce level of.....	624, 627, 632
Control of foundations.....	177-178,
197-199, 203-204, 221-224, 311, 438, 454, 776; r 11	
Controversial areas.....	50, 486-487, 552-553, 761
Cooperation between foundations.....	257,
417-418, 451-452, 471-472, 499-501	
Copland, Aaron.....	617
Corbin, Arthur L.....	607
Cornell Medical Center.....	641
Cornell University.....	268, 336, 507, 511, 514, 725
Corporation contributions.....	27, 32-33, 35, 459
Business expense versus philanthropic expenditure.....	34, 459
Income fluctuations, effect on.....	28, 33
Interrelation between business and individual contribu- tion.....	624, 644
Corporation foundations.....	27-28, 624-632
Future of.....	458-459, 467-469, 764
Recent growth.....	32, 33
Cottrell, Frederick.....	151
Council of State Governments.....	133, 146
Council on African Affairs.....	445, 733
Council on Foreign Relations.....	179, 526, 564, 665, 669-670, 672
Correction by H. M. Wriston.....	781-782
Cowles, John.....	220
Cox, E. Eugene, Jr.....	ii, 216, 222, 225, 260; r 1
Craig, Burt J.....	196, 214
Craig, Charles F.....	92
Cressy, George.....	428
Criticism of foundations.....	r 5-6
Attitude toward.....	339-340, 346-347, 393, 397, 554
By grantee.....	189, 347
Reasons for.....	559, 597
Croly, Herbert.....	413
Cullen Foundation.....	299, 304
Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace.....	615
Cultural Relations Between the United States and the Soviet Union (Department of State).....	549, 618
Curie, Marie Sklodowska.....	761
Current Digest of the Soviet Press.....	508
Cushman, Robert.....	515, 725

## D

	Page
Daily Worker.....	365, 594, 617, 692, 699
Darling, Samuel T.....	92
Darnall, Carl R.....	91
Dartington Hall Trust.....	537
Dartmouth College.....	344
Das Kapital (Marx).....	333
David, Donald K.....	196, 220
Davis, Chester C.....	214, 240, 244
Davis, Hallie Flanagan.....	537, 698
Davis, John W.....	183, 569-572, 590, 593, 600
Day, Edmund Ezra.....	511
Dean, Arthur H.....	527
Dean, Vera Micheles.....	537, 588
Declinations.....	397, 504, 559-560
Negative value of.....	16, 504
Demography.....	124
Denmark.....	497-498
Dennett, Raymond.....	525
Dennis, Eugene.....	721
DeVane, William C.....	200
Dewey, John.....	270, 277
Dewey, Thomas E.....	295
Dickey, Charles D.....	246
Dodds, Harold.....	168
Dollard, Charles.....	301, 323-369, 396, 510, 762
Donor, benefits to ( <i>see also</i> Control).....	629
Douglas, James H., Jr.....	246
Douglas, William O.....	515
Draper, William H., Jr.....	527
DuBois, W. E. B.....	361, 722
Duke Endowment.....	37, 39, 299
Dulles, John Foster.....	184,
563, 569-571, 576, 590, 600, 658-662, 780, 785-786	
Dunn, Robert W.....	693
duPont Co.....	44-45

## E

East European Fund.....	247
Economics ( <i>see also</i> National Bureau of Economic Research).....	42,
143-145, 192, 461, 551-552	
Edison Institute.....	219, 221
Education ( <i>see also</i> Medical education; Public health).....	142, 188
Accreditation.....	170-171, 316-318, 337-338
Catholic.....	177, 190
Defeatism in.....	172-173
Dependence on government.....	189-190
Foundation services to.....	107-123, 372, 769
In the South.....	110, 306-307
Liberal.....	271-275
Ph. D. cult.....	267-270, 318-320
Progressive.....	277-280
Public versus private institutions.....	168
Testing.....	170-171, 317-318



	Page
Educational Testing Service.....	171, 303
Eisenhower, Dwight D.....	184, 344, 508
Einstein, Albert.....	489, 761
Eisler, Hans.....	288, 529-533, 701-702, 725, 744
Eliot, Charles W.....	267
Embree, Edwin R.....	46, 253, 283, 299-308, 347
Embree, John F.....	548
Emerson, Thomas I.....	606-616, 698, 723, 783-784
Emory University.....	102, 114, 166, 177
Encyclopedia Britannica.....	273
Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences.....	532
England, foundations in.....	260, 474, 497
English Charitable Trusts Acts.....	5, 790-791, r 6
English medical system.....	151
Ensminger, Douglas.....	234, 237
Ernst, Morris L.....	737
Erskine College.....	301
Eurich, Alvin C.....	266, 308-321
Europe, foundations in.....	159-160, 377, 497, 498
Evaluation of work of foundations.....	135, 262, 284, 347, 471, 563
Evans, Roger F.....	652
Evasion of taxation. (See Taxation.)	
Evergood, Philip.....	361
Evolution of the Philanthropic Foundation (Hollis).....	8-12
Ewing, Bayard.....	84
Exchange of persons.....	543, 573, 579
Exemption, tax. (See Tax exemption.)	
Expenditures, foundation.....	23, 175, 598, 625, 764
Overseas.....	488, 580, r 11
Experience, cumulativeness of.....	46, 773
Experimentation (see also Venture capital):	
Continuing need for.....	192, 257, 281-284, 376, 396
Discovery multiplies opportunities.....	456
Risks, in education.....	107, 115
Risks, in social sciences.....	376
Ezekiel, Mordecai.....	588

## F

Fairbank, John K.....	362, 542, 609, 723
Falk Foundation, Maurice and Laura.....	134, 777
Family foundations.....	25-26, 31, 396-397, 459-460, 763
Farm Research Bureau.....	693
Faust, Clarence H.....	246, 265
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	528, 661, 737
Feeney, Thomas J.....	r 14
Fellowships.....	48, 345, 350, 356-357, 488, 601-621, 769
Medicine.....	404
Public health.....	101
The arts.....	306, 606
Field, Frederick Vanderbilt.....	365,
	374, 425, 523, 657, 700, 713, 724, 783, r 7
Field, Marshall.....	436-452, 490, 783

	Page
Field Foundation.....	134, 299, 436-452, 694, 783
Testimony of Marshall Field and Maxwell Hahn.....	436-452
Fight.....	698
Financial statements. (See Reports, content of annual.)	
Findlay, Carlos.....	91
Flanagan, Hallie.....	537, 698
Fletcher, C. Scott.....	273
Flexibility.....	87, 363, 415, 501
Flexner, Abraham.....	111,
113, 150, 299, 338-339, 348, 486, 762-763, 765	
Flexner, Simon.....	90, 299, 338, 760
Florida, University of.....	463
Foerster, Friedrich.....	588
Food Research Institute, Stanford University.....	138, 149
Forand, Aime J.....	ii
Ford, Benson.....	196, 221
Ford, Edsel.....	196, 214
Ford Henry.....	196
Ford, Henry, II.....	196, 218-227
Ford Foundation.....	15, 16, 25, 41, 44,
47, 53, 134, 181, 184, 186-187, 205, 213, 299, 487, 581,	
664, r 12.	
Testimony of Alvin C. Eurich.....	308-321
Henry Ford II.....	218-227
H. Rowan Gaither, Jr.....	195-218
Paul Hoffman.....	227-262
Robert M. Hutchins.....	262-308
Ford Hospital, Henry.....	219, 221
Foreign operations, and tax exemption.....	237
Foreign Policy Association.....	306, 526, 537, 665, 713
Foreman, Clark.....	722, 784-785
Form 990A and Form 1041A (see also Information returns; Tax exemption):	
Available to the public under suitable restrictions.....	22
Forms unintelligible.....	392
Information return made available by Treasury Depart- ment for public inspection.....	59-60, 636-637
Lessen the danger of abuse.....	561
Processing of 990A forms.....	60, 61, 62
Fosdick, Raymond B.....	664, 759-762
Foster, John W.....	573
Foster, William Z.....	692
Foundation, The (Keppel).....	20
Foundations (see also Accountability; Expenditures; Funds; Investment policies; Personnel; Programs; Reports; Taxa- tion; and other items):	
Characteristically American.....	159
Classified according to type and areas of activity.....	24-30,
41-42, 134	
Control of.....	177-179, 197-199, 203-204

	Page
Corporation.....	27-28, 32, 33, 458-459, 467-469, 624-632, 764
Defined.....	13, 21
English.....	260, 474, 497
European.....	159-160, 377, 497-498
Evaluation of work of.....	135, 262, 284, 347, 471, 563
Exemption application for.....	65-68
Family.....	25-26, 31, 396-397, 459-460, 763
Future of.....	456-457, 465-467, 563
History of.....	5, 8-13, 371, 561, 643, r 3
National.....	30-31
Need for.....	356, 377, 447, 467, 495, r 4
Role of.....	16,
282, 395-397, 440, 454-458, 473, 490-493, 572, 765, r 3	
Scope size, and number of.....	4, 21, 25, r 2
Timidity on the part of.....	16, 299-309, 341, 347, 375-376, 765
Fowler, Cody.....	590
Franklin, Benjamin.....	12, 36
Franklin Technical Institute.....	12, 37
Franklin Union.....	12
Friends of the Soviet Union.....	693, 724
Frontier Films.....	425, 434
Fulbright fellowships.....	404, 543, 573, 579
Fund for Adult Education.....	247, 264, 273
Fund for the Advancement of Education.....	245, 246-247, 264, 308-321
Funds, foundation.....	34, 100, 392, 470, 629
Testamentary gifts to, limitation of.....	667

## G

Gaither, H. Rowan, Jr.....	195-218, 244
Garfield, James A.....	274, 278
Garfield, John.....	702
Garland Fund.....	430, 692, 711-712
Garrett, Ray.....	786
Garrison, Lloyd K.....	736, 785
Gates, Frederick T.....	284, 299, 349, 566, 765
Gay, Edwin F.....	148, 567
Gellhorn, Walter.....	515-517, 725, 735-746, 785
General Education Board.....	25, 89, 123, 166, 177, 301
Testimony of Dean Rusk.....	475-555
Genocide Convention.....	591-592
Germany.....	158-161, 231, 258, 509
Gifford, Walter S.....	563
Girard College.....	13
Gitlow, Benjamin.....	692
Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor.....	777
Golden, Clinton S.....	285
Goodwin, Angier L.....	ii
Gorgas, William C.....	91, 92, 102, 299
Gorgas Memorial Institute.....	86
Government, and educational institutions.....	154, 181-182, 189-190, 468
Government, and public administration.....	42, 133, 146, 670-671

	Page
Government operations and foundation operations.....	35,
49-53, 87, 154, 181-182, 282, 352, 371-372, 376, 421,	
447-448, 465-466, 493-496, 499, 669, 760, 778.	
Government research.....	43, 117, 181, 352, 376, 392, 468
Grad, Andrew W.....	548
Graham, Shirley.....	722
Granger, Lester.....	587
Grant Foundation.....	134
Grantees:	
Control of.....	116, 119-120, 152, 157, 176, 179
Criticism of foundations by.....	189, 347
Followup.....	40, 116, 119, 178-179,
225-226, 237, 260, 350, 433-434, 450-451, 463, 590	
Freedom of.....	40, 135, 498-499, 511-512, 770, 772, 775
Screening of.....	239, 357-358, 367, 374, 444
Grantmaking versus operating foundations.....	39, 385, 478, 580
Grants ( <i>see also</i> Fellowships):	
Conditioned.....	15, 16, 47-48, 101, 116
Grantmaking procedure.....	118-119,
157, 176, 330-334, 438, 478, 484	
How initiated.....	264-265, 390
Officers versus board of trustees.....	329, 478-479, 481-483, 647
Prestige value.....	16, 398
Problems created by expiration of.....	111, 115, 175-176
Projects versus endowments.....	99, 176-177
Relations with grant seekers.....	559
Small foundations.....	641
Subcontracting.....	239, 253, 581
Grassi, Giovanni Battista.....	88
Graves, Mortimer.....	542-546
Great Island Conference.....	307
Gregg, Alan.....	303
Griswold, A. Whitney.....	607
Griswold, Erwin N.....	777-778
Gromyko, Andrei A.....	681
Gropper, William.....	698-699
Guggenheim, Simon.....	601, 603-604
Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, John Simon.....	299,
303, 306, 697-698, 712, 721, 771; r 8	
Testimony of Henry Allen Moe.....	601-621
Guilford College.....	301

## H

Hacker, Louis M.....	168
Hackett, Lewis W.....	90
Hahn, Maxwell.....	436-452, 783
Haldane, J. B. S.....	533-534, 598, 648
Hale telescope.....	151, 477
Hall, Robert B.....	343
Hampton-Sydney Institute.....	301
Han-seng, Chen.....	364
Hardman, J. B. S.....	538, 703
Harkness, Edward S.....	403

	Page
Harkness, Mrs. Edward S.....	403
Harkness, Mrs. Stephen V.....	403
Harper, William Rainey.....	177
Harrison, George L.....	607
Harrison, Shelby M.....	19, 386
Harvard University.....	115, 186, 225, 268, 542, 617
Law School.....	777-778
Russian Research Center.....	303, 344, 394, 508
School of Business Administration.....	133
Hatcher, Harlan.....	772
Havens Relief Fund.....	13
Haverford College.....	344
Hayden Foundation, Charles.....	304
Hays, Arthur Garfield.....	695
Hays, Brooks.....	ii, 52
Heaton, Herbert.....	771
Heckscher, Foundation.....	694, 699
Hendrix College.....	301
Hicks, Granville.....	538, 599
Highlander Folk School.....	416, 432
Hill Family Foundation, Louis W. and Maud.....	770
Hill-Burton Bill.....	406
Hiss, Alger.....	183, 569-571, 584-585, 657-662, 780, 785-786; r 7
Hoerschelmann, Edouard E.....	679-680, 715
Hoffman, Paul G.....	219-220, 226-227, 227-262, 358, 368, 473, 648
Holland, William L.....	426, 526, 527, 548
Hollis, Ernest V.....	3-18, 83, 149, 155
Hollingshead, Byron.....	175
Holmes, Horace.....	261
Holmes, Oliver Wendell.....	294, 435
Home economics.....	463
Hoover, J. Edgar.....	528, 737
Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government.....	133, 146
Hoover Relief Administration.....	692
Hopkins, Mark.....	274
Hormel Foundation.....	770
Hornbeck, Stanley.....	785
Horton, Mildred McAfee (Mrs. Douglas Horton).....	246
House Resolution 561, text.....	1
Hsu, Y. Y.....	657
Hughes, Langston.....	605, 698, 721
Human relations in industry.....	133, 146, 768, 771
Humanities.....	487, 547, 565
Hutchins, Robert M.....	231, 244, 262-308, 314, 351, 619

## I

Icor.....	693
Illinois.....	289, 308, 787-788, 791
India.....	231-232, 355, 508
Indochina.....	509
Indonesia.....	231, 233, 509
Industrial Relations, Commission on.....	13, 463-464, 500-501

	Page
Information returns.....	22, 381, 395, 561
Existing forms inadequate.....	85, 370-380
Processing of.....	60-62
Sample form.....	990A, 73-76
Sample form.....	990r, 77-78
Institute for Inter-American Affairs.....	101, 103
Institute for Philosophical Research.....	295
Institute of Human Relations, Yale University.....	282
Institute of International Education.....	254, 573
Institute of Pacific Relations.....	287, 425, 433; r 7
And Carnegie Corporation.....	360, 363, 365-366, 374
And Carnegie Endowment.....	581-582
And Rockefeller Foundation.....	507, 519-529, 540-542, 548
Testimony of Manning Johnson.....	713
Alfred Kohlberg.....	652-657, 660, 665-666
Maurice Malkin.....	700
Insulin.....	349
Intercollegiate athletics.....	113, 275
Intercultural Publications Corp.....	249
Intercultural relations.....	437
Intermediaries between foundations and grantees. <i>See also</i> names of specific organizations, e. g., American Council of Learned Societies; Social Science Research Council.....	15, 122, 362
Charge of intellectual inbreeding.....	138
Middleman in the search for grants.....	321
Internal Security Act of 1950.....	59
International Assembly of Women.....	588
International Conciliation.....	574, 578, 587-588
International Education Board.....	476-556
International Harvester Foundation.....	28
International Juridical Association.....	446, 613, 694, 697, 737, 744-745
International Labor Defense.....	693, 698
International Mind Alcoves.....	594
International relations.....	42, 306-307, 578-585
International Relations, Walter Hines Page School of.....	362
International Relations Club.....	587-589
International Workers Order.....	693
Internationalism.....	r 11
Investment policies, foundation.....	58-59, 353
Investments by charitable organizations in profitmaking enter- prises.....	18, 28, 58, 77-78, 667
Isaacs, Harold R.....	664

## J

Jaffe, Philip J.....	657, 713
Japan.....	343, 364, 508-509
Jefferson, Thomas.....	279, 343
Jefferson School of Social Science.....	613, 731
Jerome, Victor J.....	702, 721, 744
Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.....	90, 763
Johns Hopkins University.....	541
Walter Hines Page School of International Relations.....	362
Johnson, Alvin.....	530-533

	Page
Johnson, Manning	704-713
Johnstone, William C.	589
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee	518, 613
Joliot-Curie, Frederic	535-536
Jones, Lewis Webster	310
Jones, Mark M.	765-768
Jones, T. Duckett	200
Josephs, Devereux C.	342, 380-382
Judd, Walter	661
Judgment of men	374
Juilliard Musical Foundation	300, 306
Juvenile delinquency	777

## K

Kandel, I. L.	186
Karpovich, M. M.	345
Katz, Milton	214, 245
Katzner, J. Benjamin	645-646
Kazakevich, Vladimir	513
Keele, Harold M.	ii
Passim	r 14
Kellogg Foundation, W. K.	299, 771
Kennan, George F.	249, 252
Kennelly, Edward C.	r 14
Kentucky, University of	463
Kenyon College	257
Keppel, Frederick P.	20, 44, 170, 301, 351, 371
Keynes, John Maynard (Lord Keynes)	144, 335
Kiger, Joseph C.	r 14
Kimball, Lindsley F.	562
King, Carol Weiss	695, 726
King, W. L. Mackenzie	567
Kinsey, Alfred C.	303
Kirk, Grayson L.	665
Kluckhohn, Clyde	345
Knight, Edith M.	r 14
Koch, Robert	88, 91
Kohlberg, Alfred	366, 524, 651-672, 781, 785-786
Kollontai, Alexandra	693
Kozelka, Richard L.	771
Kresge Foundation	299
Kress Foundation, Samuel H.	299
Kreymborg, Alfred	361
Kronenberg, Henry H.	311
Kunitz, Joshua	513
Kuntz, Edward	695

## L

Labor Herald	693
Labor research	693
LaGuardia, Fiorello	737
Lamont, Corliss	513, 594, 700, 713, 724
Lane, Clayton	527, 665

	Page
Lange, Oscar	539, 724
Langer, William L.	179
Languages, teaching of	179-180, 545
Larsen, Roy E.	114, 121, 246
Lasser, J. K.	649
Latin America	508
Lattimore, Owen	183, 256, 287, 362, 374, 525, 540, 657, 666, 672
Laughlin, James	249
Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial	476, 523, 544
Lauritsen, Charles C.	200
Lawrence, Ernest O.	151
Lawson, John Howard	698, 721
Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain	446
Leadership training	460-461, 538
League for Mutual Aid	425
League of Nations	523
League of Women Voters	579
Leffingwell, Russell C.	369-380, 389, 510
Leonard Wood Memorial for the Control of Leprosy	86
Lerner, Max	413, 423, 588
Lesser, Dave	698
Leverage	342, 349, 454-455, 470, 494, 554
Levine, Isaac Don	785-786, 658-659
Lewis, Mrs. Alexander	663
Lewis, Shura	663
Lewis, Wilmarth S.	607
Liberian Foundation	299
Libraries	168-169, 335-336
Library of Congress	507
Lindeman, Eduard C.	215, 285, 302, 413, 589
Lippmann, Walter	246
Liquidating funds	38, 303
Lister, Joseph (Lord Lister)	88
Litvinov, Maxim	675, 679
Little Royal F.	83
Lockwood, William	428
Longley, Clifford B.	214
Lonsdale Company	84
Louisville, University of	309
Lovestone, J.	700
Lowell, Abbott Lawrence	267
Loyalty Review Board	544
Lull, George F.	95
Lynchburg College	301
Lysenko, Trofim	158, 534

## M

Macalester College	774-775
Magdalen Society	12
Magidoff, Robert	428
Malkin, Maurice	689-704, 782-783
Mann, Thomas	538
Manuscript collections, historical	109



	<b>Page</b>
Marcantonio, Vito.....	737
Markle Foundation, John and Mary R.....	25, 299, 771
Marquis, Donald G.....	200
Marshall, C. B.....	527
Marshall Foundation, Robert.....	81, 378, 693, 712
Marshall Plan.....	571, 585
Martens, Ludwig.....	692
Maryland.....	637
Marx, Karl.....	144, 185, 293, 333
Mason, Edward S.....	345
Massachusetts, Commonwealth of.....	788
Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities.....	427
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.....	90, 181, 337, 460, 466
Mayo Elton.....	146
Mayo Foundation.....	771
McCarran Act.....	435
McCarran Subcommittee. (See U. S. Senate, Subcommittee of Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee.)	
McCloy, John J.....	231
McCormick Memorial Fund.....	299
McFarland, Russell.....	r 14
McGillen, Clarence A., Jr.....	r 14
McKay, Claude.....	722
McPeak, William.....	201
McWilliams, Carey.....	364, 721
Measurement of success or failure. (See Evaluation.)	
Medical education.....	87, 95, 111-112, 115, 150, 338-339, 486, 495, 763
Medical Education in the United States and Canada (A. Flexner).....	111, 113, 150, 299, 338-339
Medicine, full-time clinical professorship.....	17
Mellon, Paul.....	246, 295
Memorial Hospital, New York.....	455
Mendell, Clarence W.....	607
Mental health.....	133-134, 146-147, 439
Mexico.....	492
Michelsen Foundation, Christian.....	497
Michigan, State of.....	791
Michigan, University of.....	343, 772
Middlebush, Frederick.....	105-123
Midwest Deposit Library.....	351
Milbank Memorial Fund.....	134, 299, 385
Millsapp College.....	301
Minnesota, University of.....	539, 768-772
Mistakes, acknowledgment of.....	40, 87, 143, 157, 170, 220, 256, 288, 350, 366, 368-369, 371, 407, 440-442, 554, 605, 760, 763, 779.
Mitchell, Wesley C.....	148
Modern Language Association.....	15
Moe, Henry Allen.....	303, 601-621
Molotov, V. M.....	675
Moore, Harriet L.....	657
Morgan, Ruth.....	413
Morning Freiheit.....	699

	Page
Morrill, J. L.....	768-772
Morrow, Dwight W.....	407
Mosely, Philip E.....	249, 252, 513
Mudd, Roger H.....	r 14
Mueller, C. F., Co.....	28
Muller, Herman J.....	603
Municipal Finance Officers Association.....	133, 146
Murphy, J. Morden.....	426, 527
Murphy, William J.....	771
Murray, Philip.....	433
Museum of Modern Art.....	531
Myers, Elkan R.....	640-645
Myers, William I.....	123-149
Myrdal, Gunnar.....	303, 359

## N

Nason, John W.....	779
Nathan, Lord.....	791
Nathan, Otto.....	588
Nathan Report.....	791
National Bureau of Economic Research.....	127, 129, 130, 136, 143, 144, 148, 551-552
National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools.....	114, 121, 347
National Commission on Accreditation Procedures.....	316
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.....	698
National Conference on Academic Freedom.....	733
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.....	446, 544, 594, 724
National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.....	615, 733
National Education Association.....	187, 310
National Emergency Council for Democratic Rights.....	739-741
National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.....	86, 101, 771
National foundations.....	30-31
National Information Bureau.....	451
National Lawyers Guild.....	446, 608, 613, 695-696, 736, 744-745
National Planning Association.....	354, 415
National Research Council.....	14, 93, 302
National Science Foundation.....	30, 117, 118, 565
National Youth Administration.....	173
Near East.....	243, 508
Nehru, Jawaharlal.....	232, 234
New Hampshire.....	649, 788, 790
New Masses.....	365, 524, 617, 652, 692, 698
New Mexico.....	186
New School for Social Research.....	424, 529-533
New York, State of.....	786, 787-788
New York Community Trust.....	30
New York Foundation.....	304
New York Teachers' Union.....	614
New York University Law School.....	28
New Zealand.....	355
Nichols, Henry J.....	91
Nobel prizes.....	489, 535, 603, r 8
Noguchi, Hideyo.....	91

	Page
Nolde, O. Frederick .....	577
Norman, E. Herbert .....	548
North, Robert C. ....	664
North Carolina, University of .....	301, 344
North Carolina State College .....	301
North Carolina State Health Department .....	89
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools .....	163, 315
Norway .....	497-498
Novy Mir .....	693
Nuffield Foundation .....	474, 497
Nutrition Foundation .....	770

## O

Odegard, Peter H. ....	201, 540
Odets, Clifford .....	702
Office of Naval Research .....	546
Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD), Committee on Medical Research .....	87, 93
Office Workers Industrial League .....	699
Old Dominion Foundation .....	246, 295
Olds, Irving S. ....	319, 607
Ontario Charitable Gifts Act of 1949 .....	650
Open Road, The, Inc. ....	442, 738-739
Operations, foreign .....	355, 407-409, 488-493; r 11
Africa .....	257
Australia .....	334, 355
Burma .....	233
Canada .....	355
Ceylon .....	355
India .....	231, 355
Indonesia .....	233
Mexico .....	492
Near East .....	243
New Zealand .....	355
Pakistan .....	231, 233, 240, 250, 355
South Africa .....	355
Turkey .....	241
Opinion research .....	131-132
O'Toole, Donald L. ....	ii, 269-270, 319-320, 595-596
Oumansky, Constantin .....	677-678, 681

## P

Paepcke, Walter P. ....	246, 319
Pakistan .....	231, 233, 240, 250, 355
Palliative versus preventive work .....	31, 42-43, 442, 485, 566
Pares, Bernard .....	594
Pasteur, Louis .....	87, 88, 91, 761
Pauling, Linus .....	539, 723
Peabody Education Fund .....	13, 37
Peabody Institute .....	186
Pecora, Ferdinand .....	695
Pennsylvania, State of .....	786
Pennsylvania, University of .....	364, 542

	Page
Pensions.....	106, 164-165, 190-192, 336-337
People's Institute of Applied Religion.....	442
Peoples of the Soviet Union, The (Lamont).....	594
Perkins, James A.....	332
Perlman, Philip B.....	590-591
Perpetuities.....	14, 36, 566, 568, 667
discretionary.....	37, 470, 764
Perry, Ralph Barton.....	592-593
Personnel, foundation.....	38-39, 121, 243-245, 460
Bureaucracy.....	303
Care in selection.....	572, 585-586
Infiltration by leftists.....	666, 668, 762
Loyalty.....	289-298
Number of employed.....	389, 412, 459, 478, 591
Overseas.....	237-238
Qualifications of executives.....	326-327, 562
Phelps-Stokes Fund.....	445, 692
Philanthropic Giving (Andrews).....	19
Philanthropoid.....	253, 337
Philanthropy, motivations of. ( <i>See also</i> Taxation; Business enterprises, control of).....	638
Physical sciences.....	125, 142-143, 152, 304
Pilgrim Trust.....	497
Plain Talk.....	658
Poillon, Howard.....	151
Polier, Chad.....	694
Polier, Justine Wise.....	446, 694
Pound, Roscoe.....	762
Prentis, H. W., Jr.....	319
President's Commission on Higher Education.....	177
Preventive versus palliative work.....	31, 42-43, 442, 485, 566
Primus, Pearl.....	722
Princeton University.....	538
Pritchett, Henry S.....	165, 301, 337, 765
Pritt, D. N.....	695
Programs, foundation.....	42, 195-218, 256, 342-346, 776
Progressive Party.....	615
Propaganda by foundations.....	296, 422, r 12
Influencing legislation.....	591, 773
Prospectus.....	249
Psychology.....	124, 130-131, 145
Public accountability. ( <i>See</i> Accountability.).....	
Public administration.....	133, 146, 771
Public Administration Clearing House.....	133, 146
Public Affairs Committee.....	364, 586
Public health.....	86, 95, 111-112, 115, 305, 404, 763
As weapon against communism.....	94
Public interest.....	340, 379, 422
Public relations.....	394, 464, 503, 512, 554
Puerto Rico.....	84

## Q

Questionnaires. (*See also* Congressional investigation)..... 747-758

## R

	Page
Radicalism in educational institutions . . .	187-189, 238-239, 320-321
Rainey, Homer P . . . . .	173
Rayon Foundation . . . . .	84
Recreation . . . . .	42
Reece, B. Carroll . . . . .	ii; r 14
Reed, Philip D . . . . .	246
Reed, Walter . . . . .	88, 91, 102
Reed Club, John . . . . .	698
Reeves, Floyd W . . . . .	173
Refugees, aid to . . . . .	530, 539, 686-687
Refutations and rebuttals . . . . .	781-786
Regan, Thomas J . . . . .	413
Regional educational project . . . . .	113
Registry trust . . . . .	49, 252, 391, 561, 575, 764, 768, 791
Regulation ( <i>See also</i> State regulation; names of States) . . . . .	18, 45, 48-49, 156, 251-252, 340, 393, 397-399
Digest of state, of charitable corporations . . . . .	786-792
Fear of excessive paper work . . . . .	155
Need for . . . . .	565
Review board . . . . .	49, 252, 421
Select Committee's recommendations . . . . .	r 14-15
Reid, Ira D. A . . . . .	726, 729-734, 785
Reiss, Bernard . . . . .	721
Religion . . . . .	42, 152, 337
Rentschler, Gordon S . . . . .	220
Reports, annual . . . . .	49, 85, 155, 352-353, 346, 379-380, 405, 419-420, 501, 557-558
Content of . . . . .	389-391, 395, 399-400, 405-406, 454, 459, 501-504, 557-558
Distribution of . . . . .	205, 353, 391, 395, 464, 502-503, 574, 620, r 13
Quarterly . . . . .	346, 352
Research, basic . . . . .	134, 136, 151-153, 159, 474, 497
And applied research . . . . .	457, 496-497, 769
Corporations reluctant to engage in . . . . .	469, 777
Gambling odds involved . . . . .	45
Government reluctance . . . . .	376, 563
Increased opportunities from discoveries . . . . .	456, 495-496
Innovations from foundations . . . . .	160
Research agency, independent . . . . .	363, 366, 526
Research Branch, Information and Education Division, U. S.	
Army . . . . .	132, 145
Research Corporation . . . . .	151
Review by public authority . . . . .	49, 252, 421
Rhode Island, State of . . . . .	84, 649, 787, 789-790
Rhode Island Charities Trust . . . . .	84
Rice, W. G., Jr . . . . .	589
Rich Associates, Raymond . . . . .	86, 420
Rich Foundation . . . . .	27
Risk money. ( <i>See</i> Venture capital.)	
Rivers, W. F . . . . .	426
Roberts, Owen J . . . . .	246
Robeson, Paul . . . . .	588

	Page
Robinson, Earl.....	721
Rockefeller, John D.....	87, 567
Rockefeller, John D., Jr.....	556, 567
Rockefeller, John D., III.....	565-568
Rockefeller, Nelson A.....	307, 415
Rockefeller benefactions.....	37, 83, 89, 90, 203, 257, 299
Rockefeller Foundation.....	101, 103, 109, 113, 114, 134, 148, 173, 179, 287, 339, 475-555, 652, 655, 656, 725; r 12
Testimony of Chester I. Barnard.....	555-565
Dean Rusk.....	475-555
Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.....	89, 299, 339, 475
Rockefeller International Health Board.....	89, 92
Rockefeller, Laura Spelman, Memorial.....	476, 523, 544
Rockefeller Sanitary Commission.....	87, 89, 299, 476, 486
Rockefeller Yellow Fever Commission.....	91, 102
Rogers, Lindsay.....	168
Roosevelt, Eleanor.....	533, 695
Roosevelt College.....	305, 308
Root, Elihu.....	369, 569, 573, 765
Ropes, E. C.....	428
Rorty, Malcolm.....	148
Rose, Milton Curtiss.....	411-435
Rose, Wickliffe.....	90, 299, 763
Rosenau, Milton J.....	90
Rosenberg Foundation.....	708, 725
Rosenfeld, Moses W.....	623-640
Rosenwald, Julius.....	38, 46, 262, 303, 474
Rosenwald Fund.....	38, 302, 306, 712, 721
Rosinger, Lawrence K.....	362, 541, 725
Ross, Helen.....	447
Ross, Ronald.....	88
Rowe, David N.....	548
Royal Institute of International Affairs.....	426
Royal Society.....	534
Ruml, Beardsley.....	307, 763-765
Runyon, Damon Memorial Fund.....	771
Rusk, Dean.....	475-555, 597, 647-648, 665
Russell, Frederick F.....	91, 92
Russell, Paul F.....	90
Russell Sage Foundation.....	19, 48, 49, 53, 83, 134, 155, 299, 383, 724, 786
testimony of F. Emerson Andrews.....	19, 53, 83-85
Donald Young.....	383-403
Russia.....	158, 180-181, 247-249, 252-253, 255, 258-259, 282-283, 303, 344-346, 373-374, 394, 427-429, 507-508, 510- 514, r 9.
Grants to institutions in U. S. S. R.....	548
Relations with.....	664-665
Testimony of Igor Bogolepov.....	673-688
Russian Research Center, Harvard University.....	303, 344, 394, 508
Ryerson, Edward L.....	577

## S

	Page
Sage Foundation. ( <i>See</i> Russell Sage Foundation.)	
Sailors' Snug Harbor.....	667
St. Laurent, Louis.....	583
Salem College.....	301
Salinsky, Jacob.....	538
Salzburg Seminar in American Studies.....	404, 409
Sarah Lawrence College.....	305, 722
Sawyer, Ralph.....	619
Sawyer, Wilbur.....	93
Scandinavia.....	771
"Scatteration"..... 284, 349, 418, 441, 451-452, 485, 491, 566, 580	
Schneider, Isador.....	721-722
School for Democracy.....	613
Schulkind, Adelaide.....	692
Schuman, Frederick.....	587
Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace.....	588, 617
Scientific research abroad.....	158-161
Scope, size, and number of foundations.....	4, 21, 25, r 2
Seabury, Samuel.....	737
Searight, Mary E.....	r 14
Sears, Roebuck Foundation.....	773
Secrecy..... 304, 392, 399, 776, r 13	
Reasons for.....	26, 156, 560, 646
Small foundations.....	558, 633-634, 639
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	286, 304, 422
Security, Loyalty, and Science (Gellhorn).....	735
Security, national.....	556-557
United States, a target for ideological penetration.....	514-515
Sedgwick, William T.....	90
Select Committee, members of listed. ( <i>See also</i> Congressional investigation) ii; report of.....	r 1-15
Selekman, Ben M.....	402
Senn, Milton.....	439
Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Kinsey).....	303
Sforza, Carlo.....	574
Sherman Antitrust Act.....	472
Shore, Isaac.....	695
Shotwell, James T.....	573, 593
Sigerist, Henry E.....	428
Sifer, Joseph F.....	91
Simmons, Ernest J.....	428
Simmons, James Stevens.....	85-104
Simpson, Richard M.....	ii, 50-51, 204, 230, 250, 252, 286, 392-395, 450, 468-470, 494-495, 564-565, 669
Slater Fund.....	13, 299
Sloan, Alfred P., Jr.....	319, 453-475
Sloan Foundation, Alfred P., Jr.....	179, 299, 453-475
Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research.....	455, 470
Slonimsky, Nicholas.....	513

	Page
Small foundations.....	115-116, 260, 414-418, 623-646
Accumulation of funds.....	641
Central staff suggested.....	501
Costs.....	625
Inefficiencies of.....	29, 451-452, 472, 565
Reasons for secrecy.....	558, 633-634, 639
Role of trustees.....	625, 634
Small Town (Hicks).....	538
Smith, Adam.....	185, 333
Smith, Walter Bedell.....	550
Smith College.....	537
Smithsonian Institution.....	13
Smyth, Henry D.....	489
Snape, William H., Jr.....	r 14
Snow, Edgar.....	657
Social Science Research Council.....	14,
	122, 136, 138, 148, 362, 508, 666, 771
Social sciences.....	43-44, 134, 375, 487, 551, 648, 768, 777
As source of strength for American way of life.....	137, 139; r 9
Defined.....	124
Excluded from National Science Foundation.....	30, 565
Extensively discussed.....	123-149
Foundations engaged in research in the.....	134
National register of social scientists.....	546
Need for foundation support.....	229-230,
	255, 306, 343, 375-376, 437-438, 487, 759
Social welfare.....	42, 305
Sociology.....	124, 131, 132, 145
Soper, Fred L.....	92
South Africa.....	355, 364
South Carolina.....	788
Southern Conference Educational Fund.....	424, 433
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.....	424, 433, 443, 587, 614, 731
Southern Negro Youth Congress.....	734
Southern Regional Council.....	731
Soviet Union Today, The (American-Russian Institute).....	594
Spanish Refugee Appeal.....	588
Sparks, Frank H.....	773-774
Spaulding, Francis T.....	201
Spelman Fund of New York.....	476
Stachel, Jack.....	695, 703, 721, 744
Stander, Lionel.....	702
Stanford University.....	114, 115, 306, 678
Stassen, Harold E.....	295, 593
State, County and Municipal Workers of America.....	614
State regulation ( <i>see also</i> names of States).....	400, 649, 786-792
Statistics.....	124
Stefansson, Vilhjalmur.....	589
Stern, Bernard J.....	359
Sternberg, George M.....	91
Stettinius, Edward R., Jr.....	307



	<b>Page</b>
Stevens, David H.....	537
Stevens Institute of Technology.....	530
Stevenson, William E.....	409
Stewart, Marguerite.....	586
Stewart, Maxwell S.....	364, 586, 657, 722
Stiles, Charles Waddell.....	92
Stokes, Rose Pastor.....	692
Stone, Harlan F.....	739
Straight, Dorothy Whitney (Mrs. Leonard K. Elmhirst).....	412
Straight, Michael Whitney.....	411-435, 700, 782-783
Strode, George K.....	90
Strong, Anna Louise.....	657, 702
Strong, Richard Pearson.....	92
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	59
Subversion.....	122, 762
Effect of foundation activities on maintenance of capital- istic system.....	137, 139, 140, 151, 182-184, 287, 354, 378, 381, 400, 462, 550- 552, 559, 595, 762, 772, 773; r 7
Leftist tendency of foundations.....	235-236, 257, 286-288, 320
Problems of definition and control.....	123, 518-522
Reasons for criticism.....	357, 381-382
Screening, manpower required for.....	80, 82
Sugarman, Norman A.....	55-82
Sumner, James B.....	603
Survey Graphic.....	364
Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.....	145
Swan, Thomas W.....	607
Swarthmore College.....	344, 779
Swope, Gerard.....	427, 527, 665

## T

Taft, William Howard.....	573
Taggard, Genevieve.....	722
Tarr, Edgar.....	583
Taub, Ellen.....	695
"Tax avoidance".....	629
"Tax evasion".....	629
Tax exemption. ( <i>See also</i> Abuses; Taxation.)	
For corporate contributions.....	27, 58, 83, 644
For foundations.....	17, 58-59, 60-68, 79-83, 237
For individuals resulting from gifts through foundations..	632
Forms used in filing returns.....	60, 61, 65-78
Manpower required for examination of returns.....	79
Sample application for.....	65-68
Prohibited transactions.....	58-59
Procedure for judicial interpretation.....	62-63
Question of, for operations in foreign fields.....	237
Suggestion of increased, to encourage charitable contribu- tion.....	100, 250-252, 286, 448-450, 470-471, 494-495, 564, 644, 669, r 13

	Page
Taxation. ( <i>See also</i> Abuses; Tax exemption.)	
" Avoidance " and " evasion " .....	629, 779, r 13
Evasion by foundations .....	18, 304
Evasion by individuals .....	560, 629
Effect of, on future of foundations .....	456, 465, 468-469
Remission of, as source of philanthropic funds .....	34,
	230, 392, 394, 470-471
Taylor, Eleanor K. ....	786-792
Taylor, George E. ....	344
Taylor, Mary L. ....	r 14
Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association .....	164-165,
	191, 324, 777
Teacher-training .....	41, 108, 185, 186, 305
Carnegie Foundation .....	108
Emphasis on method versus content .....	184-187, 314-315
Ford Foundation .....	186, 238, 267, 271-275, 309-318
Harvard University .....	268
Teaching with Books (Branscomb) .....	169
Technical assistance .....	103, 231-243, 499-500, 564, 579
Technical Cooperation Administration (point 4) .....	241
Television, educational .....	267, 274, 280-281, 296
Terman, L. M. ....	145
Texas, University of .....	344
Textile Workers Union of America .....	649-650
Textron, Inc. ....	83, 304, 650, 789
Thomas, Norman .....	692
Thorndike, E. L. ....	145
Thorner, Daniel .....	364
Thurstone, L. L. ....	190
" Timid Billions " (Embree) .....	299-308
Timidity, on part of foundations .....	16,
	299-309, 341, 347, 375-376, 765
Tobey, Charles W. ....	83
Tobias, Channing .....	444, 694, 697
Toynbee, Arnold J. ....	308
Trachtenbert, Alexander .....	703, 717, 725, 731, 744
Trotsky, Leon .....	693
Trustees .....	33, 36, 156, 387, 609
Characteristics .....	17, 302, 775
Compensation of .....	38, 84, 224,
	254-255, 327-329, 388-389, 407, 438, 471, 481
Divesting donor of control .....	197-199,
	203-204, 221-224, 438, 454, 776
Duties of, versus duties of business directors .....	370-373, 562-563
Frequency of meetings .....	327-328
Geographical concentration of .....	329,
	387, 406-407, 438, 480-481, 576-577, r 10-11
Interlocking directorates .....	16, 215-216, 254, r 10
Pressure by tax authorities on appointments of .....	669
Qualifications .....	39,
	202, 215, 221, 327, 387, 392-393, 454, 479-480, 778
Reliance on .....	285, 459, 552
Remoteness from operations .....	660, 664, 665
Role of, in small foundations .....	625, 634
Selection of .....	223-224, 327
Size of the board .....	214, 326, 438, 454, 479

	Page
Trusts and Foundations.....	497
Tulane University.....	344
Tulsa, University of.....	301
Turch, Charles J.....	774-775
Turkey.....	241
Twentieth Century Fund.....	14, 19, 134, 303, 385

## U

United China Relief.....	655
United Federal Workers of America.....	614
United Public Workers of America.....	614
United Nations.....	525, 571, 573, 578, 585-586, 590, r 12
U. S. Army:	
Medical School.....	90
Research Branch, Information and Education Division.....	132, 145
U. S. Department of Defense.....	296
U. S. Department of State.....	233, 250, 409, 513, 528, 541, 549, 618
U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Un-American Activities.....	161, 294, 298, 401, 408, 505, 516, 529, 544, 583, 588, 599, 608, 734, 737, 741
Committee on Ways and Means.....	286
U. S. Public Health Service.....	87, 92, 93, 101
U. S. Senate, Subcommittee of Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee.....	361, 364, 371, 401, 408, 519, 521, 583, 684
United States in World Affairs, The.....	670, 681
United World Federalists.....	596
University administration.....	268-269, 277, 512
University College.....	534, 648
Hospital Medical School.....	489
Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency (Glueck and Glueck).....	777

## V

Vanderbilt University.....	114, 344, 775-776
van Kleeck, Mary.....	401, 703, 706-707, 724
Vassar College.....	537
Vatican Library.....	573
Vedder, Edward F.....	91
Venture capital.....	15, 16, 17, 43, 49, 84, 220, 229, 255, 342, 356, 454-455, 583, 758, 770, 779
Effect of publicity on.....	405
Evaluation of pioneering studies.....	135, 170
Grubstaking.....	604
Use in medicine and public health.....	86, 87, 99
Vermont, University of.....	463
Voice of America.....	249

## W

Wabash College.....	773-774
Wadsworth, Eliot.....	569-570
Wallenborg Foundation.....	497
Walsh, Frank P.....	13, 500
Walter Hines Page School of International Relations.....	362
Ware, Harold.....	693, 694

	Page
Warren, Andrew J.....	93
Washington, University of.....	344
Watson, Cecil.....	771
Watson, Thomas J.....	595
Waymack, W. W.....	577
Wealth and Culture (Lindeman).....	589
Wealth of Nations, The (Smith).....	333
Weaver, Warren.....	557, 563
Webber, James B., Jr.....	196, 220
Weiner, William.....	695
Weiss, Louis S.....	726
Welch, William H.....	299
Wellesley Summer Institute.....	414
Wells, Herbert George.....	759
Wenner-Gren Foundation.....	134, 497
Whipple, G. H.....	90
White Williams Foundation.....	12
Whitmore, Eugene R.....	91
Whitney, Helen Hay, Foundation.....	200
Whitney, John Hay, Foundation.....	283
Whitney, William C., Foundation.....	411-435, 697
Who Should Go to College (Hollingshead).....	175
Wilbur, Ray Lyman.....	523, 526
Wilkerson, Doxey A.....	359, 726
Williams, Aubrey.....	173
Williams, Claude.....	443
Williams, John Sharp.....	573
Williams College.....	587, 588
Willits, Joseph H.....	563, 652-657
Wills. (See Funds, foundation.)	
Wilson, Charles Edward.....	220
Wilson, Robert R.....	775
Wisconsin.....	788
Wittfogel, Olga Lang.....	360
Woltman, Frederick.....	512
Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.....	664
Wood, Leonard, Memorial for the Control of Leprosy.....	86
Woodruff Foundation.....	101
Workers Laboratory Theatre.....	694
Workers' School.....	613, 693
World Health Organization.....	101
World Peace Foundation.....	581
Wright, Richard.....	722
Wriston, Henry M.....	163-193, 317, 332, 495, 585, 781-782
Wyzanski, Charles E.....	220

## Y

Yale University.....	264, 678
Institute of Human Relations.....	282
Law School.....	278, 281, 607

	Page
Yergan, Max.....	364
Young, Donald.....	383-403
Young, Owen D.....	173
Young Men's Christian Association.....	364
Yugoslavia.....	360, 643

## Z

Zlotowski, Ignace.....	539
------------------------	-----





# FORD FOUNDATION

