

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1952

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT
FOUNDATIONS AND COMPARABLE ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The select committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:35 a. m., in room 1301, New House Office Building, Hon. Donald L. O'Toole presiding.

Present: Representatives O'Toole (presiding), Simpson and Goodwin.

Also present: Harold M. Keele, counsel to the committee.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The committee for the investigation of foundations will come to order. Counsel, will you proceed to call your first witness?

Mr. KEELE. Mr. Moe, please.

Mr. O'TOOLE. For the purpose of the record, the witness will give his name and address and whom he represents.

STATEMENT OF HENRY ALLEN MOE, SECRETARY OF THE JOHN SIMON GUGGENHEIM MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. MOE. My name, sir, is Henry Allen Moe. I reside at 4655 Fieldston Road, New York City. I am the secretary of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and have been its secretary since its organization in 1925.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Thank you, sir, and thank you for your attendance. You may proceed.

Mr. KEELE. What is the nature of the work done by the Guggenheim Foundation?

Mr. MOE. The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation is purely a fellowship-granting organization. We make grants only to individuals to assist them to carry on their work of research and artistic creation, which work in all instances is proposed by the applicant and never suggested by the foundation. All of our grants from our beginning have been of this nature, and there have been no other kinds of grants made by us.

Mr. KEELE. Isn't it a fact that the efforts of your foundation are concentrated on finding young and promising people in the arts and sciences, and developing those people through grants-in-aid to them?

Mr. MOE. That is precisely the purpose of the foundation, and was the purpose that Senator and Mrs. Guggenheim had in mind when they established the foundation and endowed it.

By means of these fellowships, our purpose is to add to the pool, the reservoir, of trained ability in the United States—and we had the same purpose as we have moved out of the United States into the other American republics and Canada and the British Caribbean—and to increase that pool of highly trained and able people for the benefit of our country.

Mr. KEELE. Do I understand from that, Mr. Moe, that your expenditures are entirely in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. MOE. Entirely in the Western Hemisphere, sir, with this exception.

When the Philippines were a possession of the United States, we granted fellowships to Filipinos as citizens of the United States, and when the Philippines became independent, of course we continued our fellowship grants to Filipinos.

Mr. KEELE. Now what are the particular lines that you endeavor to develop?

Mr. MOE. We have no lines that we desire to develop. We have only one line which is concerned with people. We aim to train people to do better what they are fitted to do and want to do. That is our program.

We do not have any more interest in, let us say, atomic physics than we have in biochemistry or any other field that you might name.

Mr. KEELE. In other words, it is not limited then to the arts or to the humanities?

Mr. MOE. We have, as Francis Bacon advised, taken all knowledge and all art for our province, in the sense that whatever able and sound people can do we want to help them to do.

Mr. KEELE. Would you tell us a bit by way of illustration perhaps just how you find these people and how this work is done, how you, in other words, implement your program?

Mr. MOE. Yes, indeed. In the first place anybody, literally anybody, may present an application to us, and whether we have seen him before or ever heard of him before, we give him a fair hearing on the merits of his work.

When he makes application, he is asked to answer a long series of questions which go to five points. First, a record of his personal history. Second, a record of his education. Thirdly, a record of what he has done. Fourthly, a statement of what he proposes to do with our money. And in the fifth place, he is asked to name a series of reliable persons who know him, are competent to judge his field, to whom we may refer.

All this information having come in to us, we thereupon proceed to make inquiries of all the persons to whom he has referred us.

But if the application looks like anything that we are likely to grant on the merits, we thereupon institute another series of inquiries of people that he does not name, and then all this information is gathered together and presented to the committees of selection, and the committees of selection make their recommendations to the board of trustees.

This is done with great care. Painters submit paintings. We have a jury of painters to advise us on the quality of these paintings. Physicists submit their papers, their published papers and their manuscripts, and they are judged by the top physicists of the country.

. And so it goes on through all fields of knowledge and all the arts. And at this time of the year, Mr. Keele, with about 1,200 applications in the office, I never quite know how I am going to get through with this complex process, but somehow we manage every year to do it.

Mr. KEELE. How many scholarships or fellowships or grants do you make on an average a year, Mr. Moe?

Mr. MOE. Well, sir, the answer to that is this. We started in the first place with 15, and we have gradually been built up by accretions of capital, additional gifts of capital from Senator and Mrs. Guggenheim, until now we make somewhat over 200. And the number per annum is still on the increase.

We have been in the very fortunate position of getting additions to capital, so that we could step up our program in numbers constantly. Next year I don't know; certainly 200 or so.

Mr. KEELE. What is the amount on the average of your income?

Mr. MOE. Our income averages just over \$1,000,000 a year, \$1,082,000 as I remember it, sir.

Mr. KEELE. And the value of your assets is what?

Mr. MOE. Just over \$30 million.

Mr. KEELE. Now it is my understanding from our investigation that you have developed a number of outstanding people.

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEELE. What would be your evaluation of it, Mr. Moe, looking back over the years?

Mr. MOE. Well, sir, we submitted to this committee a list of 2,190 grantees of the foundation made since our beginnings in the year 1925, and we submitted this list with the pride of achievement of an institution which exists in the public interest, and we think that we are entitled to say on the basis of this list, the total list minus our mistakes, that the United States has gained incalculably from the fact that Senator and Mrs. Guggenheim established this fellowship program.

Mr. KEELE. Who are some of the outstanding persons that have been assisted by the foundation?

Mr. MOE. Well, I perhaps should start by naming three Nobel prize winners: Dr. Arthur H. Compton, now chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis, who as a young man in 1926 was granted a fellowship. He of course was one of the top scientists in the development of the atomic bomb and the study of atomic energy, which was precisely his fellowship project. Then I should list Dr. Herman J. Muller, now of the University of Indiana, who won the Nobel prize in medicine for his studies of mutations in genes produced by X-rays and other rays. There again it is a case of a young man who had gotten a fellowship, who panned out as we hope they all will pan out.

And finally, Dr. Sumner, James B. Sumner, of Cornell University, who likewise won the Nobel prize in medicine.

Now if you will permit me, Mr. Counsel, I will take you through the matter of Dr. Sumner. His application arrived at the office I think the year was—I had better look that up because I am not good on dates—1936, in the autumn of 1936. We put it through the mill. It looked pretty good.

Then I started to give it the kind of intensive consideration that I spoke about a few minutes ago, of asking people to whom Dr. Sumner had not referred me.

And in the course of that investigation, I got some very adverse judgments of his scholarship, namely, that his ideas about immunological phenomena were pretty archaic, but you deal in hunches in this business a good deal, Mr. Counsel; and we had a hunch that this was still pretty good.

So I made a routine request for his papers and got them in, and then we really learned what Dr. Sumner had done. And so we granted him his fellowship, and he went to Sweden and studied with the great masters of protein chemistry there, and some 20 years later he got the Nobel prize. And I shudder as I think back on it to remember the small plus margin on him that there was in my office at the time we began considering his application.

Senator Guggenheim, as you know, was a miner, a mining man, and he understood what a grubstake was, and when the Senator and I talked—and we used to talk a great deal—we used to talk in terms of grubstaking. He used to say, “When you are grubstaking, you take chances. You act on the best evidence you’ve got, but still you have got to take chances because nothing is certain in the end.”

And that is the way we always have tried to operate.

Mr. KEELE. What about the age of the applicants generally and those who receive grants? Are they younger men or women generally, or are they the older groups?

Mr. MOE. I can’t give you an exact statement of the average age of applicants, but I can tell you that we have granted fellowships all the way in age from 22 to 77.

Here again we think as a foundation existing in the public interest: We get an application from a man who may be old in terms of years, and we look him over carefully and we decide that he has got a great contribution to make to the United States for which he needs a comparatively little bit of money to put over. We will put a bet on such a man.

And, of course, that is also a bet, because while with reference to the man who is 22 years of age you have a certain type of gamble, with reference to the man who is 77, you have another type of gamble, namely, that maybe he won’t be able to finish.

But to answer your question directly, the average age of our grantees through the years, including the older and the younger, has hovered around 35 years.

Mr. KEELE. What is the average amount of the grants that are made?

Mr. MOE. Again I am poor on figures but, of course, that has had to go up with the value of the dollar, or rather, with the decrease in value of the dollar. Last year the average grant was about \$3,750 for a year.

Of course, when we make grants for shorter periods, the grants are correspondingly smaller usually. You see, it is all tailored, Mr. Keele, to the needs of the individual.

When you are doing the kind of thing that we are doing, you have to recognize that it costs us varying amounts of money to provide the opportunity that you judge that the man needs. He may have a wife and children, he may need to do a good amount of expensive traveling, and so we tailor our grants to the needs of the particular individual.

Mr. KEELE. Now you mentioned the mistakes you have made. Will you elaborate on that?

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir. We have made mistakes, for purposes of this committee, and we have made other types of mistakes.

As to the other types of mistakes, I can say that some of the people that we have made grants to, though we think that the total record is exceedingly good, have not been as good intellectually as we thought they were in the beginning. And so, to that extent, there are mistakes on that side.

As to mistakes, for the purposes of your committee's investigation, there have been mistakes too. Of course, the most grievous mistake of all was a grant to Alvah C. Bessie, who later on, more than a dozen years later on, was cited by the House of Representatives for contempt of the Congress, was tried, was found guilty, was sentenced and served time for contempt. We have no pride in that record. There are others.

Mr. KEELE. Well, there are certain others. Will you mention those which are, as you view it now, unhappy choices?

Mr. MOE. Well, I suppose in this connotation I would have to say—and I have no desire to try to conceal it, of course—a grant to Langston Hughes, a poet, was a mistake.

At the time we made our fellowship award to Mr. Hughes all the signs were good, but if we look back on it now as a matter of hindsight, we would have to say we wish we hadn't made that one.

Mr. KEELE. How old was Langston Hughes at the time he was given this grant?

Mr. MOE. Sir, I would have to look that up.

Mr. KEELE. Do you recall just approximately?

Mr. MOE. He was in his early thirties or late twenties, and he was then a poet of very fine promise.

Mr. KEELE. It has been said here by several who have testified, they have touched on this—I don't remember at the moment who made the specific statement, but they have said—either in their reports or from the witness stand that they were convinced that if a person was committed to the Communist ideology, they were unable to be objective either in the arts or the sciences. Will you subscribe to that view?

Mr. MOE. We would have no doubt about that at all, Mr. Keele, and I said in our answers to the committee's questionnaire that we had been more alert and diligent along those lines than most. And I proved that statement out of our records, as I think you will agree.

I also said that since 1945 we haven't stopped learning about things, and the convictions which we held in the thirties along these lines have, of course, been fortified to the point where there is just no question that we would have no truck with them at all.

But having said this, sir, you see, we who operate really on the frontiers of knowledge and understanding have to recognize that we are not the Almighty. And not being the Almighty, we can't find out everything, no matter how hard we try.

And not having found out everything, our judgment can't be as accurate as if we had been able to find out everything, and if, having found out everything, we could foresee the future, which we cannot do.

Mr. KEELE. Isn't it a fact, Mr. Moe, that among the groups whom you seek to promote in their interests, that is, those with artistic abilities particularly, there is apt to be a greater risk of their embracing a foreign ideology?

Mr. MOE. Well, I don't know about that, Mr. Keele. The artist, contrary to popular impression, is likely to be a pretty sensible fellow. But what I think you can say on the basis of history is that the great artists and writers and composers of all time have never been exactly cozy members of society.

And if you look at your history from that point of view, you can start back, certainly, as far as Dante, and you can come up through John Milton in England, and Goya in Spain, and Cervantes in Spain, and Beaudelaire in France, and our own Edgar Allan Poe. These people live in a world that isn't the world of reality to you and to me.

And as I said in the beginning, if you are dealing with these—your writers, your artists, and your composers—you take a calculated risk that they are not going to be conformists in any sense, and in my view, it is a good thing they are not, too. They are the people that, when they are really good, carry the ball for the progress of civilization.

But the temporary aberrations, let me say—or let me illustrate with one. The reason there is no portrait of Wellington by Goya is very simple. The Duke of Wellington had liberated the Spanish Peninsula, and so he was sitting to the greatest portrait painter of Spain, and in the course of sitting to Goya, he said something that Goya didn't like, and Goya picked up a piece of statuary and heaved it at the duke's head.

Well, it is the same thing as if General Eisenhower, having liberated France, was sitting for a French portrait painter and the painter had thrown a rock at his head.

These people are not conformists, and when you set out to make grants to them, you are taking a certain number of risks, which risks we by our charter have to take, because it is in our charter that not only scholars but creative workers are entitled to the Guggenheim Foundation's money.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does the witness mean that because these artists live in a world of fantasy that you have to be fantastical in dealing with them?

Mr. MOE. No, sir, we are not fantastic in dealing with them; not at all, sir. I don't think they live in a world of fantasy, Mr. O'Toole. I think they live rather in a world of their own in which what are realities to you and to me are not realities to them.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I hope they are closed corporations.

Mr. MOE. Closed operations?

Mr. O'TOOLE. Closed corporations.

Mr. KEELE. Well, there have been some instances, Mr. Moe; let's speak, for instance, with reference to Thomas Irwin Emerson.

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEELE. Would you just tell us something about the grant in that case?

Mr. MOE. Yes, indeed. That grant was made in the year 1952, that is last April. As I said in response to your questionnaire, we were unaware of either of the two mentions of him by the House committee. I think they are both by the House committee.

The purpose of the fellowship award is stated in the trustee's minutes as follows:

Studies mainly from a legal point of view of the fundamental rights and obligations of the individual citizen in a modern democratic society.

The usual inquiries were made about Professor Emerson. We, of course, noted that he was a member of the faculty of the Yale University Law School. We also learned, of course, in the course of our investigation, that he was what I suppose might be called a controversial figure. So we bored in on this one, and I myself went to New Haven to look into it.

There I had a talk with Mr. Emerson, and I asked him a series of pretty searching questions. Among those questions was: "Where do you stand on this in the political spectrum, let's say?"

And he said to me: "I'll tell you. I stand precisely, I think, where the American Civil Liberties Union stands, except I think that the union probably has gotten a little weary of well-doing, and I may be a little more militant."

I also said: "Take it from the left, Mr. Emerson, and tell me where you stand with reference to something from the left."

He said: "I stand a very long distance to the right of the Civil Rights Congress."

I thereupon said to him: "What do you want this fellowship for, anyway? You've got a good job at New Haven. Presumably you have some time. What's the real basic purpose?"

He said: "When you are tackling a job such as I am tackling—which I do not regard as a job that I will get through in a year, but as a very long kind of purpose for me—when you are tackling that kind of a job you need time to reflect and consider and to get a mature point of view, which point of view you cannot get if you are mixed up in it from day to day."

Having talked with Mr. Emerson for perhaps an hour, then, as the old news reporter I am, I went out into the corridors of the Yale Law School and I tackled 10 students, which was the number I set for myself, and I asked them all if they had had courses with Professor Emerson.

I struck four who had had courses with Professor Emerson, and so, through a series of questions of those four, I got the very firm conviction about Professor Emerson that he is a very able lawyer, that he is deeply concerned with the matter of civil rights, that he is a teacher who doesn't slant his material in any particular, and that he had a real intellectual job here that he proposed to do as a long-term proposition to the best of his very great ability.

And having done this in the Yale Law School, having talked with Professor Emerson and having talked with his students, I thereupon went out into the university and there I became aware of this report dated the 9th of February 1952. It is by a committee of Yale alumni under the chairmanship of the Reverend Henry Sloane Coffin, and having as members Arthur L. Corbin, who is a retired professor of the Yale Law School, Judge Thomas W. Swan, of the United States Circuit Court; Clarence W. Mendell, who is the retired professor of Latin and former dean of Yale College; Irving S. Olds, who was then chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp.; George L. Harrison, who is chairman of the board of the New York Life Insurance Co.; Wilmarth S. Lewis, who is a capitalist and a scholar and a member of the Yale Corp.; and Edwin F. Blair, who is a lawyer and a corporation executive and chairman of the Yale Alumni Board and a member of the Yale Alumni Council. They reported that they had been appointed by the president, Whitney Griswold, who was a

Guggenheim fellow when he was young, to survey "the intellectual and spiritual welfare of the university, its students, and its faculty."

And they reported in this fashion: They said:

A few Yale graduates have stopped their contributions to the alumni fund because they fear that Yale is harboring in its faculty persons who are working for the destruction of our democratic society.

Yale does not knowingly appoint members of the Communist Party to its faculty. We approve this policy. The administration of the university, which in our opinion, is the group best qualified to pass judgment in the matter, knows of no Communist on the faculty at the present time. Furthermore, it knows of no member of the faculty who has tried to undermine or destroy our society, or our democratic form of government, or to indoctrinate students at Yale with subversive theories. Our inquiries confirm the accuracy of the judgment of the administration and of the university council.

And a few days later the chairman of that committee, the Reverend Henry Sloane Coffin, pinpointed that statement with reference to Professor Emerson. In the judgment of that committee, said Dr. Coffin:

From Professor Emerson's students we have abundant evidence that he did not bring into the classrooms any propaganda or views of a partisan character.

Which just supported all that I had been able to learn at New Haven during the day that I gave to a study of Professor Emerson.

Mr. KEELE. Is that the type, or is that typical of the type of investigation which you make, Mr. Moe?

Mr. MOE. Sir, there are many applications which are easy to pass upon. They are so first-class, and there is so obviously no possibility of anything being wrong with them, that you don't have to take a whole day to go into the matter.

But even so, we get our records up, we make the consultations that I spoke about before, and we have a complete dossier. But with reference to a controversial person, such as Professor Emerson, yes, this is the type of investigation we give them.

Mr. KEELE. Now, were you aware at that time—you say you knew he was controversial, or you say he was controversial—of the extent of his activities and the nature of them, which made him controversial, Mr. Moe?

Mr. MOE. No, sir. We have answered here that we were unaware of these mentions. I knew that he had connection with the National Lawyers Guild.

I also knew that the National Lawyers Guild had not been listed by the Attorney General, but at the time when this grant was made, as I have said in one of our answers to your questionnaire, we had not read publication 137, and we did not know at that time that the National Lawyers Guild had been listed by, I think, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. That I did not know.

Mr. KEELE. Un-American Activities.

Mr. MOE. Un-American Activities is what I think I said; yes, sir.

Mr. KEELE. Actually, Professor Emerson had been active in committees or activities which have been characterized as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee for some time, at the time that grant was made, Mr. Moe, but you say you did not know of that.

Mr. MOE. That we did not know, sir. But still, after all our studies of the reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activ-

ities, it is not clear to me what conclusions the House committee itself would expect us to draw from their citations.

Certainly, if this information had been available, we would have taken account of it. But certainly also, we could not have given the application of Mr. Emerson any more careful investigation than we did give it.

Mr. KEELE. What is the case with reference to John King Fairbank?

Mr. MOE. John K. Fairbank, sir, was granted a fellowship by John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation in the year 1951.

It was to go to Japan, and there carry on a series of studies of Japanese historiography on China; that is to say, to endeavor to get a historical understanding of the way Japanese historians and writers have regarded the history of China through the centuries. It was judged by historians to be a very important intellectual study.

Of course, we noted that Professor Fairbank is a full professor of history at Harvard University. It was abundantly evident from our inquiries, our very careful inquiries concerning him, that he enjoyed the respect of his colleagues in the university and in other universities. And according to our investigations of him, he came out as a reliable scholar in a very controversial field.

It seemed clear to us at the time we made our investigation that while, of course, there would be some variations or some differences and disagreements with respect to his views, that those views came clearly within what I might perhaps be allowed to call the allowable tolerances in free America, with no credible doubt whatever about his loyalty to the United States.

Mr. O'TOOLE. May the Chair interrupt at this point?

Were these doubts about his views relative to his political views?

Mr. MOE. No, sir. They were, as far as they came to me, sir, in respect to some of his historical views.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I merely wanted to clarify that.

Mr. MOE. Yes; that was the way they came to us, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to refer briefly to Professor Emerson's situation.

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. And ask this question: Had you at the time you awarded the fellowship then had the information before you which you now have with respect to Professor Emerson, would you have recommended the grant and fellowship?

Mr. MOE. I will answer the last part of your question first, sir. I have never served on any committee of selection of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation.

I am the fellow who does the work. I pile the straws of evidence and the straws of judgment, and I hope to make such a high and clear pile that the committee, looking at them, considering those straws of evidence and judgment, will find their decision clear.

Now, as a lawyer, sir, you know the old maxim "Delegatus non potest delegare," that is to say that no trustee can delegate his function.

The board of trustees of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation could not, I think, within law or equity, delegate—I will not say delegate but abdicate—its judgment of a particular situation to any list whatever.

And so I say that if I, now speaking as a trustee of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, not as the secretary who does the work, had known of these mentions, as I know them now—I do not see, sir, that the decision on Professor Emerson would have been different.

Mr. SIMPSON. The question I asked was, Had you the complete information on Professor Emerson which you now have, you as a trustee would have voted to grant the fellowship?

Mr. MOE. I think so, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, is it what you would term a borderline case?

Mr. MOE. Borderline in what sense?

Mr. SIMPSON. You are working, you have testified as I understand it, in an area where there is a calculable risk. You are dealing with people in some areas, I believe you said, that live in a world of fantasy or in an area which isn't common, and yet in an area from which great advances in science, in the arts have come in the past.

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, dealing with that area, I ask you first, Is Professor Emerson in that area?

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir; I would say he is, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now is there a limit within that area beyond which you won't go?

Mr. MOE. Very definitely, sir; and we cut it off every year.

Mr. SIMPSON. You mean by that with respect to the political situation, that where a man is an avowed Communist or known to be to your satisfaction a Communist sympathizer, you would not consider him for a fellowship?

Mr. MOE. We wouldn't have any truck with him at all.

Mr. SIMPSON. And in your opinion Professor Emerson, in the face of all the information now before you, is not in that category?

Mr. MOE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. And for that reason you would if you had the power of recommending, or as a trustee, you would vote to give him the fellowship, had you to do it over?

Mr. MOE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have wondered for a long time about Government, why it is that they employ so many people whose Americanism subsequently is questioned, rightly or wrongly.

I mean, for every job there are a dozen applicants that wanted the job, and I wouldn't take the borderline case. I would take the man I thought was sound. I have often wondered why Government gets into this area of fantasy thinkers, and seemingly picks up a doubtful case in many instances.

Now, I am just wondering—this may be beside the point—whether perhaps Government has that same belief that foundations might have, that they should go into an area to allow the experiments. That is what you do in a foundation.

Mr. MOE. Well, I would say, sir, with respect to employing anybody for the foundation, I would have no different point of view than you have expressed. We take no chances whatever.

As to Government employing, I don't have any information.

As to foundation granting, I have a great deal of information, and the situation is, you see, that you are playing for high stakes.

If you pick the gilt edge it pays 2 percent. Well, in the peculiar business that I am in, that isn't good enough. And it wasn't good enough for Senator Guggenheim. So you take chances for these high stakes that you are playing for.

But you do not put any long-term bets on them. You put a little bet and you watch it, and if it doesn't come out right, you don't give them another nickel. So it is this constant attention to your grantees which gives you the basis for judging what you do next.

But in the case of Professor Emerson, as I said before, here is a very able man and teacher, who is concerned with one of the central problems of America today, and you will note that he said in his statement of project that he was not only concerned with the rights of the citizen, but with their obligations.

And that point of obligations I found very prominent in his thinking when I had a talk with him. A man like that, with his ability and with his strategic position in teaching in Yale University, who wants to get out and mature a point of view, it seems to me, sir—and I submit to you—that that is a good venture opportunity for the foundation.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am interested in another line of questioning that will take only a few minutes. You are the general secretary, are you?

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. And do you interview all applicants, or pass upon each applicant?

Mr. MOE. No, sir; I do not. It is a very complicated mechanism that I have set up through the years, whereby everybody gets the consideration, let me say, of better men than myself, people that we have relied on through the years, whose batting average of picking the comers is good, because we know what their batting average is. Those people see the candidates and report to us.

It is only in a case such as one in this controversial area that I presume to go out and talk with the man himself. And I did it with the more confidence in Professor Emerson's case because I am a lawyer myself.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do those people report to the trustees or to you?

Mr. MOE. They report to me, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. And you are a trustee, and you meet with the trustees?

Mr. MOE. I meet with the trustees. This is a fairly recent phenomenon or circumstance in the foundation, Mr. Simpson.

I was the secretary of the foundation from 1925 until 1945, without being a member of the board of trustees. At that time the board of trustees decided, so they told me, on the basis of their long experience with me, that they wanted me of them and a member of the board.

Mr. SIMPSON. I read most of your report and I am interested in what you term the jury. Are they the individuals to whom you now refer as passing upon the merits of the applicant?

Mr. MOE. This goes in three stages, sir. The first is the opinion of the experts in the field, for example, physics. Dr. Arthur H. Compton has passed on them for years, as a member of the foundation's advisory board.

Having passed the experts, the applications then go to the committee of selection, which committee of selection devotes, well, at least 2 months of their lives every year to the work of the foundation, because when I get through with my documentation on the candidates, the documentation runs between twelve and fifteen thousand pages. It is that complete. And then the committee of selection meets.

In recent years they have met for 5 days in two stages, 2 days in February ordinarily and 3 days in March.

Mr. SIMPSON. Are you on that committee?

Mr. MOE. No, sir. I am the secretary of that committee. And then they come up with a series of recommendations within the budget that the finance committee of the board of trustees has allowed us.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the selection committee a committee of the trustees?

Mr. MOE. No, sir; no member of it has ever been a member of the board of trustees.

Mr. SIMPSON. And then you have their selections and then you go to the trustees; is that right?

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir; and we type a summary of all the recommendations of the committee, which summary gives a man's name, age, position, a statement of the proposal for which the committee recommends he gets money, a statement of the period for which he gets it, and a statement of the amount which is recommended.

This is mailed to the board of trustees in advance of their meeting, and at the meeting I take them through this list of recommendations, name by name, and when I come to a recommendation such as Professor Emerson, I pause and I say to them just what I have said to your committee about this man. And this has been done every time from our beginning.

Mr. SIMPSON. With respect to Professor Emerson, you would pause, and then give the trustees this extraneous information which didn't apply to the other men? Is that what you mean?

Mr. MOE. I mean, the statement I made here concerning my particular investigations of Professor Emerson.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then that is what I am interested in knowing. That is to say, you informed the trustees when you recommended the granting of that—

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. You informed them of your findings as the result of a special survey?

Mr. MOE. That's right; yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. MOE. I think substantially I used the same words to the board that I used to this committee.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is all; thank you.

Mr. O'TOOLE. At this point the committee will be in recess for 5 minutes.

(Short recess.)

Mr. SIMPSON. The committee will come to order.

Mr. KEELE. We are pursuing the question here of borderline cases or investigations after a man had become a controversial figure.

Let me direct your attention to what we have been able to find from the House Un-American Activities Committee with reference to Emer-

son, Mr. Moe. Let's just examine it a moment, and then in the light of that see what we have to say. That is what is revealed:

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson was a signer of a brief in behalf of the attorneys who defended the Communist leaders in the New York trial—

I assume they are talking about the lawyers who were sentenced by Medina for contempt—

as shown in the Daily Worker for November 2, 1949 (p. 2). According to the Daily Worker of February 1, 1950 (p. 3), Prof. Thomas Emerson was one of a group which issued a statement which contained a defense of the lawyers for the Communist leaders. According to the Daily Worker of February 23, 1950 (p. 2), Prof. Thomas Emerson opposed the prosecution of Communists. The Daily Worker of September 12, 1952 (p. 5) reported that Prof. Thomas I. Emerson of Yale University was to speak at a dinner honoring four attorneys for the 15 Smith Act Communists on September 18 in New York, N. Y.

Thomas I. Emerson was listed as a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association in the pamphlet, "What is the I. J. A.?" being listed among committee members from the District of Columbia. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense." The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, House Report No. 3123, September 21, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line."

Thomas I. Emerson was one of the signers of a letter defending the Jefferson School of Social Science, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 26, 1948 (p. 11). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 4, 1947. "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" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 150.)

A mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated May 18, 1951, listed Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, New Haven, Conn., as a signer of a petition to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain." Attorney General Clark cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as "subversive" and "Communist" in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The special committee * * * in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist * * * as a "Communist front organization."

Thomas I. Emerson, Washington, D. C., was listed as a member of the committee on constitution and judicial review of the National Lawyers Guild in the News Letter of the organization, dated July 1937, page 2. As shown in the election campaign letter, dated May 18, 1940, Thomas I. Emerson was a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Washington, D. C., chapter, administration slate. Thomas I. Emerson, Connecticut, was listed as vice president of the National Lawyers Guild on a letterhead, dated May 7, 1948. Thomas I. Emerson, Washington, D. C., was a member of the convention resolutions committee of the National Lawyers Guild, as shown in Convention News, May 1941, page 2. The Washington Post of January 23, 1950, reported that Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School, was a member of the committee of the National Lawyers Guild which prepared a report to President Truman criticizing the FBI (p. 4). The Daily People's World of April 2, 1951 (p. 12), listed Thomas I. Emerson as president of the National Lawyers Guild and reported that he joined the campaign to free Willie McGee.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a "Communist front" organization. The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, House Report No. 3123, September 21, 1950 (originally released September 17, 1950), cited the organization as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Thomas I. Emerson was a sponsor of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. (See Report, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Committee on Un-American Activities, June 16, 1947, p. 14.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a "Communist front" organization. The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare 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."

As shown by the Daily Worker, issues of March 23, 1951 (p. 4), and April 9, 1951 (pp. 2 and 9), Prof. Thomas I. Emerson was presented with an award at the fifteenth annual conference of the teachers union.

According to the New York Times of September 24, 1943 (p. 25), the New York Teachers Union received its charter from the Congress of Industrial Organizations as local 555 of the New York district of the State, County and Municipal Workers of America. It was previously affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers as local 5 but was expelled on charges of being Communist-dominated at the August 1941 convention of the American Federation of Teachers.

The State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, which the Teachers Union joined, later merged with the United Federal Workers of America at a convention held in Atlantic City during the week of April 23-27, 1946, and became the United Public Workers of America. In Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 18, 19) it was stated: "The Special Committee on Un-American Activities finds that Communist leadership is strongly entrenched in the following unions which are at present affiliated with the CIO. * * * State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; * * * United Federal Workers of America."

Thomas I. Emerson, professor, Yale Law School, was a speaker before the United Public Workers, local 20, New York City, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 22, 1949 (p. 4).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report issued in 1948 entitled "100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Government" (p. 11), referred to the United Public Workers of America in question 61 as follows:

"61. Getting down to details of what you have found, how about communism in Federal employee unions?"

"The United Public Workers of America (CIO) is deep into Federal service and it is Communist-controlled.

"The UPWA has 15,000 members in the highly strategic Panama Canal Zone and the United States district attorney there has openly declared this situation a public danger."

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated June 16, 1947 (p. 11), cited the United Public Workers of America as a Communist-controlled organization. The committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, October 23, 1949, reported that it had found "Communist leadership strongly entrenched" in the United Public Workers of America, and that "its local No. 555, of the Teachers Union * * * was originally expelled from the American Federation of Labor because of Communist leanings * * *" (p. 106).

Professor Thomas Emerson, Yale Law School, was a sponsor of a meeting of the Civil Rights Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of January 19, 1949 (p. 10). In the Daily Worker of June 21, 1949 (p. 2), Thomas I. Emerson, Yale law faculty, was named as chairman of a panel at a rally held by the Civil Rights Congress in behalf of the Communist leaders. The Daily Worker of June 28, 1949 (p. 9), named Prof. Thomas Emerson, Yale Law School, as a speaker before the Civil Rights Congress. Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School, was one of the initiating sponsors of the Bill of Rights Conference, of the Civil Rights Congress, according to the "Call to a Bill of Rights Conference," New York City, July 16-17, 1949 (p. 2). Reference to Prof. Thomas I. Emerson as a sponsor of the Bill of Rights Conference appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1949 (p. 5).

Attorney General Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as "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."

As shown in the Conference Call and conference program (p. 12), Prof. Thomas I. Emerson was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, held in New York City, March 25-27, 1949, under auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Thomas I. Emerson was listed as a member-at-large of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on an undated letterhead of the organization (received January 1949); he signed a statement issued by the organization, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 29, 1948, page 2. Thomas I. Emerson was one of the signers of a statement issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which appeared in the Congressional Record, July 14, 1949, page 9620. He signed a resolution of the organization calling for a hearing of Tunisia's demands in the United Nations as reported by the June 2, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3).

The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City, March 25, 26, 27, 1949 (H. Rept. No. 1954, April 26, 1950 (originally released April 19, 1949) p. 2), cited the National Council * * * as a Communist-front organization, and the Scientific and Cultural Conference * * * as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

Professor Emerson was one of the signers of a letter to President Truman and a member of a delegation requesting to see him protesting the setting up of concentration camps as detention centers for subversives as reported in the Daily Worker of January 28, 1952 (p. 3) and the Daily People's World of March 6, 1952 (p. 3).

Thoms I. Emerson, representing the Progressive Party, testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 4, 1950, on H. R. 7595 and H. R. 3908, bills to control subversive activities.

It is noted that Thomas I. Emerson, National Lawyers Guild, New Haven, Conn., testified on H. R. 5852, a bill to control subversive activities, in hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, May 27-28, 1948, page 146.

A statement condemning the President's loyalty program which was published in the Congressional Record, December 16, 1947, page A5159, was signed by Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School.

Professor Emerson was a signer of a letter to President Truman to recognize seating of People's Republic of China in UN (Daily Worker, March 5, 1951, p. 4). He was a signer of a statement against contempt proceedings (Daily Worker, February 19, 1951, p. 2).

References to Thomas I. Emerson appear in the following publications of this committee:

Hearings Regarding Communist Espionage in the United States Government (includes Interim Report on Hearings Regarding Communist Espionage in the United States Government), July 31; August 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30; September 8, 1948; report August 28, 1948, page 630.

Hearings on legislation to outlaw certain un-American and subversive activities, March 21, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30; April 2, 3, 4, 1950, pages 2252, 2356.

Hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part II, August 28, 31; September 1, 15, 1950, pages 2984, 2990.

Report on Hawaii Civil Liberties Committee—A Communist Front, June 23, 1950, pages 9, 19, 28, 33, 34; 37, 58.

Report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, pages 16, 18, 19.

Report on the Communist "Peace" Offensive, April 1, 1951, pages 57, 104, 108, 148.

Hearings regarding Communist Activities among professional groups in the Los Angeles area—part 1, January 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, and April 9, 1952, page 2681.

Now, I think we are agreed that mere reference to a man by the House Un-American Activities Committee does not ipso facto make him a Communist, nor does that committee so judge.

However, it has been pointed out, I think, repeatedly, both by those who have in the past been active members of the Communist Party

and who have since recanted, and it has been pointed out by various investigating bodies, that identification with or participation in the activities of Communist-front parties as designated by the House Un-American Activities or the Attorney General's list, is in itself a very suspicious factor, and I think it has been repeatedly said to our investigators by acknowledged former Communists, that when any person is identified with any large number, 30 or 40, that they have never known that person not to be either a concealed or active member of the Communist Party of their own knowledge.

Reviewing this situation in the light of the record that I have read, which was supplied us as a photostat from the House Un-American Activities Committee, what would be your thinking with reference to Emerson had those citations been before you at the time that the grant was made?

Mr. MOE. Well, sir, we have answered in our answer to the questionnaire that we were not aware of this, despite what I think to be the very careful study that we made of Professor Emerson.

We have nothing pending with respect to Emerson, Professor Emerson, at this time. If in the future anything should come, pending with reference to Professor Emerson, I would put all that, or all that I could get, in the record and let the committee of selection and the board of trustees look at it.

And having, as I have, a very high respect for the Congress, which I have said in print when it wasn't fashionable to say so, I would say, sir, that all these circumstances or facts would have to have the most careful scrutiny of the Guggenheim Foundation.

As I said in answer to Congressman Simpson's questions, I have never served on the committee of selection of the Foundation, and only fairly recently have become a member of the board of trustees. We would think awfully hard about a record of this kind, but I cannot sit here and commit the Foundation to a future course of action. I can't say what we would do with referenie to that.

Mr. KEELE. And we are not asking you that. We are only asking for your opinion.

Citations such as that, or a record such as that, if it may be called a record, would, I gather from what you have said, be entitled to very careful consideration by your selection committee and by your trustees?

Mr. MOE. It would lead to more than consideration. It would lead to the most careful scrutiny that we could give it, with full weight to the value of the evidence presented.

Mr. KEELE. I think you said that you were not aware—and I want to go back to that—of these citations at the time that Emerson was granted this fellowship.

Mr. MOE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. KEELE. Mr. Moe, did you at that time consult the guide to subversive organizations, let's say, or the Attorney General's list or any of the other publications which purport to list Communist-front organizations?

Mr. MOE. The Attorney General's list, sir, I know from memory. I don't have to consult it. I have looked at it a great many times.

I answered, in answer to the questionnaire, that I was unaware of Publication 137 until you sent me a copy, and the reason I was unaware, of course, is that the Publication No. 137 is a list of organ-

izations and publications, and we make no grants to organizations or publications.

It's a cinch, you know, if you are making grants to organizations. You turn up the list, and if the organization is on the list, you say "Nothing doing." It's easy, there is no problem.

But when you are making grants only to individuals, as we are, as you have said, Mr. Counsel, the fact that a chap belongs to one of these organizations is not a determiner. And under the doctrine of the United States Supreme Court in *Garner v. Los Angeles Board*, of course, it can't be a determinant.

Mr. KEELE. It only becomes, as I view it, a circumstance to which one can attribute, I think fairly, some suspicion, and if they appear in a number of such organizations, the degree of suspicion, of course, is increased.

Mr. MOE. Let me put it this way, Mr. Keele: The more they are on, the tougher look we are going to give it.

Mr. KEELE. Are there any other specific cases of grants which you feel perhaps in view of hindsight that mistakes have been made, that you would like to comment on, Mr. Moe?

Mr. MOE. None leaps to mind, Mr. Keele.

Mr. KEELE. Well, I was thinking of Carleton Beals perhaps, or Peggy Bacon or Aaron Copland.

Mr. MOE. Well, if there is anything wrong with any of the three people you have mentioned, I don't know of it.

Mr. Copland was, of course, a participant as a sponsor in that so-called Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York in 1949. He has since served as Charles Eliot Norton professor in Harvard University, which is, so far as the arts are concerned, probably the highest distinction that can be attained by an artist or writer in America.

He is recognized to be one of the foremost of American composers, and I well remember when we granted our first fellowship to Mr. Copland in 1925. He was among the first 15 fellowships, fellows of the foundation.

He had been born and brought up in Brooklyn in rather poor circumstances, and by his undoubted musical abilities had pulled himself up and was engaged in musical composition. We gave him \$2,500 a year for 2 years to study with what was then probably the greatest teacher of composition in the world, Mademoiselle Boulanger in Paris, and he has gone on from success to success in his profession. And as a man, sir, I don't know that there is anything wrong with him, and I have known him for over a quarter of a century.

Mr. KEELE. Well, neither do I have any knowledge as to whether there is anything wrong with him. I do note that he has been identified pretty closely with *New Masses*, the *Daily Worker*, and that he has allied himself apparently in a number of instances with Communist-front organizations or in activities of Communist-front organizations.

Mr. MOE. Mr. Keele, I don't know the dates of these things that you are stating, but I think you have to relate this kind of thing probably to the climate of opinion that existed at the time when Mr. Copland, as you say, wrote for the *New Masses*. I don't know whether he did or not.

I remember those days very well, sir. I remember the enormous pressures that we were under in those days to grant fellowships. I also think that we were more alert to see the direction of the wind than most.

But we are not God and we can't foresee the future. But with respect to Mr. Copland, sir, I would not think that there could possibly be anything wrong with him from the point of view of this committee.

Mr. KEELE. Well, I think that the committee has tried, I know the staff has, to prevent distortion in this general picture.

We recognize, and it has been repeatedly stated here, that the political and security atmosphere and climate was considerably different in 1943 than it is in 1952, and that it was also different in the thirties from what it is today. We recognize that, and I assume you were making reference to that.

Mr. MOE. That is precisely what I was making reference to; yes, sir.

Mr. KEELE. The point has been made by, I believe, the Rockefeller representatives, that particularly since 1945 they have been giving much greater scrutiny to the political adherence or political views of applicants or organizations with which certain people were identified than they did prior to that time, and I assume that same thing would probably apply in your case.

Mr. MOE. Any good citizen, Mr. Keele, would be bound to do that. Your sensitivity is sharpened on these things obviously, and it has to be sharpened in view of world conditions as they are today.

Mr. KEELE. All right, now you spoke of pressures. I wonder if we could pursue that. By pressures you mean to make grants?

Mr. MOE. Pressures to make grants to certain people. You have a feeling that this fellow isn't all right. In this game you have to play your hunches, and only the future can tell whether or not a fellow like me is any good at it, but this fingertip feel, this thing that you feel in your bones makes you decide, and you pile up the straws of evidence to make the committee decide in the negative. As good Americans, you look at it from the point of view of the good of the country.

Mr. KEELE. Where do these pressures come from, if we may go into that a bit?

Mr. MOE. Well, you have adverted to it yourself, Mr. Keele, the kind of climate of opinion, the writing that went on at the time, a fair amount of correspondence I may say which came right out of Washington in those days, which we looked at very carefully; and, as I have reviewed the record, I am very pleased that we made no grants to certain people in view of what happened subsequently.

Mr. KEELE. The point has been made here, I think Mr. Barnard made it and others have made it, that there was a time when the Administration itself was encouraging at least friendly overtures toward the Soviets, toward the Soviet Government, is that not true?

Mr. MOE. There was a publication of the Department of State to that effect on cultural relations with the Soviet Union.

Mr. KEELE. Did the pressures to which you have referred emanate in part from that general atmosphere?

Mr. MOE. From that general atmosphere, and that is what I am saying, yes, sir.

Mr. KEELE. And I take it from what you have said, that you and your trustees did resist those pressures to some extent?

Mr. MOE. The resistance, sir, was enormous on every case in which we had credible evidence from our point of view which made the thing dubious.

Mr. KEELE. Mr. Moe, I think in fairness it must be said that by the judgment of your peers, that is fellow philanthropoids, it seems unanimously to be their opinion that you have done, your organization has done, a very outstanding job on the creditable side of the ledger. Do you subscribe to that as you look back over the years?

Mr. MOE. If you leave me out of it, yes, sir.

I think the foundation has done a magnificent work for the good of the country. I think this war, the past war, could not have been fought as effectively as it was fought unless some of our fellowship grants had been made which permitted the fellows to do things for the Armed Forces which, without the training the fellowships afforded, they would not have been able to do. I will give you some illustrations if you want.

Mr. KEELE. I think they might be helpful.

Mr. MOE. Well, you can take Dr. Ralph Sawyer, who is now dean of the Graduate School of the University of Michigan who, as a young man, was granted a fellowship to assist him to carry on studies of the spectrographic analysis of metals.

Dr. Sawyer's great contribution to the spectrographic analysis of metals was to reduce the time of analysis. Whereas before Dr. Sawyer it took about 30 minutes to make such an analysis, on the basis of Dr. Sawyer's work, it now takes only about 3 minutes, and the result of that is that steel or any metal can be analyzed while it is in a molten condition, and being thus analyzed, can be tailored to meet the requirements of its particular use.

Now based upon this contribution by Dr. Sawyer, he was in the Navy during the war in charge of the testing of gun steel and armor plate, and I am sure that Dr. Sawyer would testify if he were here, that the fellowship which he had from the foundation when young, contributed considerably to the assistance that we was able to give to our country in the time of our danger.

Mr. KEELE. Mr. Moe, Robert Hutchins gave us a little aphorism in his testimony which went something like this: There was no correlation between political sagacity and academic eminence. I wonder if you would comment on that.

Mr. MOE. I would be glad to comment on that, Mr. Keele, and I would say that I agree with Dr. Hutchins, and I would almost say, and I have said in my more pessimistic moments, that there is a correlation between academic eminence and political naivete—that is, there is a correlation.

I disapprove of these chaps, Mr. Counsel, who use their scientific and other eminence for the purpose of giving expression to views which, if they did not possess their scientific eminence, would not be listened to at all.

Some of them are inclined to express judgments on political matters which they have not studied one-tenth as critically as they study their science. I don't want to single out scientists only in this category.

I object to all professionals, including professors and movie stars and every other category of professionals, who step out of their pro-

fessional roles while using their professional eminence to get a hearing for something that they couldn't get a hearing for if it were not for their professional reputations.

My objections include conscious as well as unconscious, unconscious as well as conscious manifestations of this type. I disapprove of it, but I can't do anything about it, and I wouldn't do anything about it if I could.

After all, it's a free country, and from my point of view everybody has the right to make a damn fool out of himself in his own way if he wants to.

Mr. KEELE. And a number do.

Mr. MOE. And a number do.

Mr. KEELE. Let's see if this is a fair summation of your thought and testimony, namely, that your foundation operates only in the field of assisting individuals?

Mr. MOE. That's right.

Mr. KEELE. Secondly, that you are preponderantly operating on the frontiers of knowledge or assisting those who are operating on the frontiers of knowledge?

Mr. MOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEELE. Thirdly, that you are willing to accept the calculated risk of operating in that field and with the type of individual in that field, knowing that some choices are going to be bad, in view of the expected gain that will result from the good choices that you make and from backing those who later produce in a large and significant way.

That is the roster of your more than 2,000 grants, you have many distinguished grantees who have made significant and important contributions, and that you also have a number of alumni of whom you are not proud and where your choices were bad, if you had had hindsight, not only because of the lack of intellectuality perhaps, but also because of political naivete or possibly even something more sinister.

But that in view of proportions you feel the record is a good one and probably you cannot expect, on balance, to improve the percentage very much, even though you continue to use the same judgment you have in the past. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. MOE. It is a very fair statement, Mr. Keele, and I subscribe to it in full.

I would only add one thing, and that is that our list would not be as good as it is unless we were willing to take the risk in the beginning.

If you go back to my statement concerning Dr. James B. Sumner, unless we had been willing at that time to take the risk which we were advised was inherent in that situation—from a scientific point of view I mean only—well, Dr. Sumner would never have gotten any money from us.

Mr. KEELE. What do you think about the requirement of reporting from foundations?

Mr. MOE. Well, sir, as you know, we have made reports from the beginning and we continue to make reports. We not only publish a biennial report, but whenever we have made a series of fellowship grants, we send a list with some explanation of each grant to every daily newspaper in the country, and some weeklies, and then we get up a printed list of these grantees which we send to all the persons who were applicants for fellowships, in addition to those who got the

fellowships, and this printed list is distributed in quantities of about 12,000 every year.

So we are constantly several times in the course of the year, whenever we make a series of grants, informing the public of them, and then we summarize it all with biographies and so on and so forth biennially in our thick reports.

I think that every institution, large or small, that enjoys tax exemption is under the strongest duty to make that kind of a report to the public.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Moe, the committee is really appreciative of your presentation this morning. We thank you for your appearance and are happy to have had you here and to have made the valuable contribution you have.

The committee will now adjourn and meet again at the call of the chair.

Mr. MOE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p. m. the committee recessed to reconvene at the call of the chair.)

