TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 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 a. m., in room 1801, New House Office Building, the Honorable Richard M. Simpson presiding.

Present: Representatives Simpson (presiding), O'Toole, and Goodwin.
Also present: Harold M. Keefe, counsel to the committee.
Mr. Simpson. The committee will come to order, please.
Mr. Keefe, will you call your witness?
Mr. Keefe. Mr. Davis, please.
Mr. Davis, I wonder if you would be good enough to state your name and your residence for the record.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. DAVIS, HONORARY TRUSTEE OF THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Mr. Davis. John W. Davis, New York City; lawyer, by occupation.
Mr. Keefe. And will you tell us what connections you have had and have at the present time with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mr. Davis. I became a member of the board of the Carnegie Endowment in 1921. I continued as a member of the board until—I have got the dates written down; let me look at them. I continued as a member of the board until December 1950.
At that time I retired from the board and was elected an honorary trustee without either powers or duties.

Mr. Keefe. Mr. Davis, you were a member of the nominating committee which selected Alger Hiss as president of the Carnegie Endowment; were you not?
Mr. Davis. I was.
Mr. Keefe. And the other members of that committee were Arthur Ballantine and Elliot Wadsworth; is that correct?
Mr. Davis. Correct.
Mr. Keefe. Will you tell us in your own words and way the story of the selection of Mr. Hiss?
Mr. Davis. Well, on the retirement of Dr. Butler in 1945, who had been president of the endowment ever since the death of Elihu Root, we determined on rather an extensive reorganization. We approached Mr. Dulles with the idea that he would become president or, if not president, chairman.
He agreed to become chairman provided we install an all-time working
president on whom the administrative and presidential duties
should be imposed. He was not willing to assume them.

We had clearly in mind the sort of man we were in search of. We
wanted a man of not more than advanced middle life with plenty of
years of service still in him, and we wanted, if possible, a man who
had some personal contact with foreign affairs and governmental
matters. We went about it right seriously.

We had a number of men under consideration, some of whom we
approached who were not willing to assume the office, and finally
the name of Mr. Hiss appeared.

We examined his past from the time he was admitted to the bar.
I won’t pretend that I did all the examining, but I did quite a little
of it, and so did Mr. Ballantine, and so did Mr. Wadsworth. All the
reports we had from every quarter about Mr. Hiss were entirely
favorable.

We had an interview with him and outlined what we had in mind
as to the future conduct of the endowment and the duties of the office
that we were trying to fill. He expressed himself most intelligently
on the subject, made a favorable impression on us, and we recom-

mended him to the board, and, thereupon, the board elected him as
president.

Now, in a nutshell, that is the story as far as I know it.

Mr. Keele. Do you recall who first proposed Mr. Hiss’ name, Mr.
Davis?

Mr. Davis. Well, I can’t tell who first proposed him. The first
person who mentioned him to me was Mr. Dulles.

Mr. Dulles was the prospective chairman, and naturally the com-
mittee wanted his advice and any assistance he could give. He men-
tioned Mr. Hiss and spoke of having encountered him in this, that,
or the other international affair, and recommended we look him over,
which we did.

Mr. Keele. What was the nature of the investigation you made,
Mr. Davis, other than talking with Mr. Hiss?

Mr. Davis. Other than talking with Mr. Hiss?

Mr. Keele. Yes.

Mr. Davis. Oh, we talked with the members of the law firms with
which he had been connected, Choate, Hall & Stuart of Boston, the
Cotton & Franklin firm of New York, which is now Cahill, Reindel &
Zachary, or Cahill, Zachary & Reindel, I believe—I haven’t got it
right—and we talked to the State Department. I said “we,” I did
not, but Mr. Wadsworth did, and Mr. Ballantine did, and everybody
that we thought had had contact with Mr. Hiss that we could en-
counter, we made a serious effort to get their opinion about him.

We did not, as I recall, have any documentary search, but we made
such investigation as you would naturally make in seeking to employ
a man for a new and important job.

Mr. Keele. Did any of the other members of the then board of
trustees speak in behalf of Hiss?

Mr. Davis. Yes. There were some members of the board who knew
him personally and who praised him very highly. At the moment, I
don’t think I can recall those names for you.

Mr. Keele. Now, after he was indicted, he was kept, but did not
actively discharge the duties as president; isn’t that correct?
Mr. Davis. That is correct.

Mr. Keele. I think Dr. Wriston, when he was here, told us something of that. Would you tell us what entered into the decision of the board to retain Hiss after his indictment?

Mr. Davis. To retain him?

Mr. Keele. That is, as president.

Mr. Davis. At the meeting of the board in December, which was held before his indictment, although we were cognizant of the fact that the grand jury had his name before it, Mr. Hiss presented his resignation.

There was a feeling in the board—of which I personally thoroughly shared—that to accept his resignation and deprive him of the presidency instantaneously would be a prejudgment of his case, and we had no right to do that until the facts appeared.

We accordingly gave him leave of absence; and, because of his having no financial resources of his own, we gave him a leave of absence with pay for 3 months. That was afterward extended by the executive committee of the endowment until, I believe, May of that year.

Mr. Keele. That is correct, I believe.

Did he enter into policy-making decisions during his tenure of office as president?

Mr. Davis. Oh, yes.

Mr. Keele. And, from your observation, did he give any indication of bias, shall we say, in favor of the Soviet Government or of the satellites of the Soviet Government?

Mr. Davis. Not the slightest.

Mr. Keele. No indication?

Mr. Davis. None whatever.

Mr. Keele. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that he worked diligently for the Marshall plan during that time.

Mr. Davis. Yes; he did, and I may say that the endowment, looking for some place where it might be useful, conceived that for the moment the best service it could render was to support the United Nations and do what we could to popularize that movement.

Mr. Keele. Weren't there any letters addressed to the committee or to members of the board, to which your attention was drawn, which cast some question on his integrity or ability?

Mr. Davis. None.

Mr. Keele. I was under the impression that Mr. Davidow, of Detroit, had written Mr. John Foster Dulles prior to the time that Hiss assumed office, possibly after his selection, in which he raised some question about Hiss.

Mr. Davis. I have read Mr. Dulles' testimony before the committee. He mentions that letter. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. Dulles may have shown it to me, but I do not recall it.

Mr. Keele. In other words, there was no objection from anyone to Hiss' nomination or proposed nomination and election as president, prior to his taking office?

Mr. Davis. None whatever to my knowledge.

Mr. Simpson. I would like to ask Mr. Davis this: Keeping in mind the obligation upon trustees to secure desirable personnel to administer a foundation, keeping in mind also your experiences with respect
to Mr. Hiss, have you any suggestion by which such an error might not occur in the future?

Mr. Davis. Well, there is no magic formula for it that I know of. I think it is the duty of any board, whether a foundation or a private corporation, or, if you choose, a Government institution, to use the utmost care in trying to find out about the people that they select, and of course every man who is selected for a new position, no matter what his past record is, by way of an experiment. He may succeed, and he may not succeed, but the only formula I would give would be entire care and diligence, which I may say was exercised in this case, to find the proper man.

Mr. Simpson. That is all I have, Mr. Keele.

Mr. Keele. I have no further questions, Mr. Davis.

Mr. Davis. Thank you, gentlemen. I have a little matter across the street to attend to; and, if you will excuse me, I will depart.

Mr. Keele. We appreciate your coming here to give us your time.

Mr. Simpson. I want to express the pleasure of the committee for your appearing here this morning. Thank you.

Mr. Davis. It is a pleasure and an honor for me, gentlemen.

Mr. Keele. Mr. Johnson, please.

Dr. Johnson, will you state your name, your place of residence, and your connection with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace?

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

Mr. Johnson. I should be glad to, sir. I have a statement here. With your permission, I should like to read it.

Mr. Keele. I think that would be quite acceptable to the committee.

Mr. Johnson. It is very brief, sir.

My name is Joseph E. Johnson. I am president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, with offices at 405 West One Hundred and Seventeenth Street, in New York City.

I welcome the opportunity to appear, on behalf of the endowment, before your select committee. The founder of the endowment, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, believed that men of great wealth had an obligation to use their money in the interest of the community as a whole. Similarly, it is my very strong conviction that foundations have a special obligation to the public at large. This is not solely because they enjoy tax-exempt status. It results also from the fact that they function in a sense in the public domain. Certainly that is true of a foundation whose legally established purpose is the search for peace, for that search is the concern of every citizen.

A foundation is a public trust. Its affairs should therefore be an open book. What I know about your committee leads me to believe that the present inquiry should provide the American people with information of lasting usefulness, making possible a better and wider understanding of the role of foundations in American society.

I should be less than frank if I did not acknowledge that at the outset the formidable task of preparing for the inquiry staggered me. We do not have a large staff at the endowment, and the labor involved in preparing our reply to the committee's questionnaire has not been light. I could not at first help regretting the time
and effort which had to be taken away from our regular work. Now, however, I find that the necessity of reviewing the endowment's record has given me a fresh perspective for the years ahead. The story of its achievements for more than 40 years—and of the part played by the distinguished men who have made that story possible—has strengthened the confidence and determination of our entire organization.

When in 1950 I was asked if I would be interested in becoming president of the endowment, I could not help but respond favorably. I am, sir, a historian, having taken my doctor's degree in American history at Harvard, where I had also done my undergraduate work. I taught for a year at Bowdoin College in Maine, and went to Williams College in 1938. In 1942, I was granted leave of absence to take a position in the State Department, where I remained for nearly 5 years. During this time I came to have a special interest in United Nations affairs. I returned to Williams in 1947, and had planned to remain there. Yet there was a special challenge in the offer from the endowment.

I knew something of the endowment's history. I knew that it had been established by Andrew Carnegie in 1910 to work unceasingly, in his words, to "hasten the abolition of international war, the foulest blot upon our civilization." I realized that it was a foundation that dealt with intangibles and could not therefore easily reckon its achievements in concrete results. I knew it was not large in terms of capital and income. I knew also that it was directing its attention largely to problems of the United Nations, in which my own special experience and interest lay.

Since assuming the presidency of the endowment, I have learned that the establishment of the foundation by a gift of $10,000,000 on December 14, 1910, was the culmination of Andrew Carnegie's long career of intensely practical interest in the peaceful settlement of international disputes. I have read that his decision to move at that time was stimulated by President William Howard Taft. I have learned that the 28 original trustees included not only Elihu Root and Nicholas Murray Butler, who were Mr. Carnegie's principal collaborators in this effort, but such distinguished Americans as former Secretary of State John W. Foster, Senator John Sharp Williams, and Mr. Joseph H. Choate. I believe you will agree with me that the list of present trustees shows that the high caliber of the board has been maintained to this day.

I shall not take the committee's time to describe in detail the manifold activities of the endowment during the 42 years of its existence. These are set forth in detail in the published annual reports. There are, however, a few items I should like to mention.

There is the monumental 150-volume economic and social history of World War I, edited by my distinguished predecessor, Dr. James T. Shotwell, now the endowment's president emeritus.

There were the grants over two decades that made possible the cataloging of the Vatican's priceless library.

The endowment pioneered in promoting the international exchange of students, teachers, technicians, editors, and agriculturists—work carried on today under the Fulbright Act, by the Institute of International Education, and by a number of other governmental and pri-
vate programs. It was this endowment activity that brought over here men like the late Italian Foreign Minister, Count Carlo Sforza, and that gave assistance at the right moment to promising young men, many of whom have since made names for themselves in international affairs.

The endowment's publication of the results of inter-American conferences down to 1942 has been a boon to statesmen and students of the American Republics.

The magazine International Conciliation, started in 1907 and published since 1924 by the endowment, in the past was perhaps the single most useful tool for those who wanted and needed to read important documents and state papers. I believe that it is today performing an equally useful service in presenting objectively information about the activities of the United Nations and other international organizations.

The Carnegie Endowment contributed significantly in the inception and work of international relations clubs on college and university campuses not only in the United States and Canada but elsewhere in the world. Many individuals who were later active in the field of international relations had their interest first stimulated by these clubs.

The active leadership and support of the Carnegie Endowment was, I believe, the chief force behind the research, publication, and development that took place in the field of international law in the final half of this century.

In closing these remarks, I should like to add one further comment. The larger foundations, such as the Carnegie Corp. and the Rockefeller Foundation, are, as you know, grant-making foundations. The Carnegie Endowment is not. While in the past a fair proportion of its funds were spent in the form of grants, it has always carried on operations of its own, and today functions almost exclusively by carrying out through its own staff or through contracts specific programs authorized by the trustees. This approach to our work is in a real sense symbolized by the new International Center Building on the United Nations Plaza in New York City, the cornerstone of which was laid only last Sunday.

It seemed to me when I joined the Carnegie Endowment in 1950 that its work for the cause of peace was well worth the best of any man's effort. I feel doubly sure of this today and I shall be glad to answer any questions the committee may wish to ask concerning my administration of the endowment and the plans and hopes that its board and staff have in mind for the future.

Mr. KEELE. Dr. Johnson, you have mentioned in your statement the fact that you favor making known the activities. You have touched upon it.

What is your view as to the desirability of foundations making public reports of their activities, of their grants, of their income, their assets, and other such pertinent material?

Mr. JOHNSON. Sir, my view is very clear on this. As I said earlier, foundations have a special relationship to the public, not only because they are tax-exempt.

It seems to me that any organization which has this special relationship has a real obligation to make public in the fullest possible manner what it is doing, how it is spending its money, where it receives its
money, why it is doing what it is doing. I would certainly believe
that a foundation should feel itself under an obligation to make full
report of its activities. We always felt so.

Mr. Keele. I believe reports show that you publish about 1,500
copies of your annual report.

Mr. Johnson. That was the distribution of the last annual report,
sir. We are hoping and planning to distribute more copies in the
future. We would like to see that copies were available for as many
people as are interested.

Mr. Keele. How do you get distribution of those, Dr. Johnson?
What do you do with them? How do you get them disseminated?

Mr. Johnson. Well, in the first place, sir, we send copies to all
college and other libraries. The endowment in the past, carrying on
Mr. Carnegie's very real interest in libraries, had a program of relation-
ship with libraries throughout the world in the field of interna-
tional relations.

We have a long list of libraries, college, university, public libraries,
and others. We send copies to all those libraries.

We send copies to administrators in education; that is, to college
presidents and others. We send copies to the press. We send copies
to professors and others whom we know to be interested in our subject
matter.

We do the best we can to send out copies to large numbers of people.
I believe, sir—I am not sure of this, but I believe—the last issue went
to the Members of Congress.

Mr. Keele. You say you send them to the Members of the Congress?

Mr. Johnson. I am not sure, but I believe so. I think it would be
a good idea to do so; the newspapers, radio, and press.

Mr. Keele. Do you believe that it would be desirable for some
sort of legislation which required public reporting of that kind and
the filing of reports in places where they would be available to those
who were interested in them? That it would be a benefit to foundations?

Mr. Johnson. I would certainly, sir, think that would be of benefit
to foundations and to others. We would see no objection.

I should have added, we always send copies of course to the Library
of Congress. I believe all our reports are on record and all our publi-
cations are sent automatically to the Library of Congress.

Mr. Keele. I have noted here in your statement that you feel the
work required in preparing for this investigation has been of some
value aside from many tangible results that may come from the
investigation.

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Keele. I think that has been touched on a time or two, and
a number of the foundation representatives have spoken to me about
that phase, but I don't believe it has been spread on the record. It
may have been.

Do you feel that aside from any results we get here, the work and
expense entailed was from the point of view of the foundation justifi-
able?

Mr. Johnson. I do so now, very definitely so. For one thing, all
of the present members of the staff in policy positions have come there
since 1948, and most of us, all but one, have come since 1948 or 1949.
It has therefore been very useful to all of us indeed who participated in the preparation to learn something of the past of the endowment.

We have also discovered—and I have made a series of notes in the course of preparation—certain weaknesses in our administration which I hope will be straightened out.

We also had a chance—this is perhaps the most important of all—to take a good look at our own present program in the light of past programs, and in a real sense have had reaffirmed in our minds, the minds of the staff, the decisions which we had taken with respect to program in recent years.

Mr. Keele. Have you talked with the heads or representatives of other foundations of comparable size, or larger than yours, as to whether or not they found this reexamination beneficial?

Mr. Johnson. No, sir; I have not. The only thing I recall, I read Mr. Dollard’s testimony before this committee, and Mr. Dollard stated that he had found it was beneficial. I have not talked with him or any others on that particular subject.

Mr. Keele. Well, Mr. Rusk has said to me, I believe, not before the committee, that he has found it particularly valuable in view of the fact that he was heading a foundation with a long history, and that he had only been there for a very short time, and that under compulsion as it were, he had had to review the entire history of the foundation.

In other words, your point is that the reexamination of your program, of your activities and so forth which this compelled, was in itself valuable?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir; and I hope we can plan, ourselves, not perhaps for preparation for a committee but for our own sake, to do some reexamination periodically in the future.

Mr. Keele. How many trustees do you have?

Mr. Johnson. We have charter provision for 27 trustees, sir. Actually at the moment there are only 25. One General Barrows, of San Francisco, former president of the University of California, resigned earlier this year, and the next one, Mr. John Foster Dules, the chairman of the board, resigned this month, and his resignation was accepted at the trustees’ meeting on Monday.

Mr. Keele. I have observed that the trustees come to a large extent from far places in the country, that you have a wide geographical distribution of your trustees. I should think that at least half of them, or almost one-half of them, come from areas other than the New York-New England district; is that correct?

Mr. Johnson. That is correct, sir. I haven’t actually looked at the figures, but it is approximately so, and this is the result of a deliberate policy, a deliberate policy I suspect, although I don’t know, instituted by Mr. Carnegie himself.

He made an interesting provision which you may have noticed, sir, in his deed of gift. He said that all trustees should not only have their own expenses paid at the meeting of the board, but should be allowed to bring either a wife or a daughter with them to the meeting of the board. This suggests that he was anxious to have broad representation.

I know Dr. Butler felt that way, and I know that I feel it is important to have members of the board of trustees who are scattered around the country in various communities. I also feel, however, sir,
that it is important to have a nucleus within reach of New York, be-
cause inevitably one must draw on those people for the active members
of the executive committee.

Mr. Keeler. Is there anything in the nature of the work that you
attempt to perform in the Carnegie Endowment which is persuasive
in pulling directors from the Pacific coast, let's say, as you have a
number of them, which might not motivate other foundations along
the same line?

In other words, do you have a special need as you view it for a wide
geographical distribution that may not be necessary in the case of
other foundations?

Mr. Johnson. Well, I am not sure, sir, whether there is a special
need in our case as distinct from other foundations, but I can say
this to you.

It is my own personal and very firm belief that the issues of peace
and war are, to a large extent, because of the position of the United
States in the world today, dependent upon understanding on the part
of all of the people of the United States.

It would be a great mistake in my opinion for our foundation to
concentrate its trustees and its interests in and around the eastern
seaboard.

Mr. Keeler. What has been the experience of the foundation with
reference to attendance on the part of those who come from distant
parts of the country?

Mr. Johnson. It has been very good, sir. We have one trustee
from Iowa who, I think, has been to every one of the trustee meet-
ings since I have been there; a trustee from Colorado who has come
to every one, or almost every one since I have been there; a trustee
from Chicago who has done the same thing.

There have been in this period three trustees from California, Mr.
Barrows having resigned. They have had better than a 50 percent
batting average.

Mr. Keeler. In other words, the geographical distance does not
seem to be a deterrent to their attendance?

Mr. Johnson. No, sir; it does not.

Mr. Keeler. Do you, however, draw for your, shall we call them,
work horses, the ones who do the greatest amount of work—probably
your executive committee, your financial committee? Do you draw
for these on the group that is more locally situated?

Mr. Johnson. The executive committee in the past, sir, when I first
came on the board, or just before, included this member from Iowa,
Mr. William Waymack. He went off the committee. It now includes
the member from Chicago, Mr. Ryerson.

It includes one man from Boston, Mr. Bundy, who has been recently
elected chairman of the board to succeed Mr. Dulles, but most of
them are in and around the New York area.

One, Mr. Nolde, is from Philadelphia, but spends a good deal of
time in New York. So, we have tended always to have what might be
called a safe majority.

The executive committee consists of seven members, including the
chairman of the board and the president. We have felt it was neces-
sary to be pretty sure of having four or five always on hand.
Mr. Keele. How have you attempted to implement or carry out your program over the last few years, Dr. Johnson? I mean, in what manner have you worked to accomplish your objectives?

Mr. Johnson. Well, sir, in the first place there has been since 1946, and particularly early 1947, a program of work in relation to the United Nations.

This has been carried out in part through publication in our magazine, International Conciliation, of matters relating primarily to the United Nations; not exclusively, but primarily.

For example, each fall we get out what we call issues before the United Nations General Assembly, which is an attempt to set forth in as brief compass as possible the principal issues which are arising before the General Assembly, for the information of representatives of nongovernmental organizations, of the public at large, of college professors, and also of delegations.

I have noticed that a number of these copies are bought by the smaller delegations.

Besides that we have had a series of volumes, relatively small volumes, which we call United Nations Action, written by specialists dealing with the past. For instance, there was one on Palestine; there was one on the Iranian case. Palestine does not exactly appear to be the past at the moment, but this was the past at the time it was written.

There was an issue—we are thinking now of an issue—on Kashmir to help students, to help people who are interested in the United Nations.

Then we have a series which we still have, although there have been only one or two volumes published recently, of what might be called organizational and administrative problems of the United Nations and also policy problems, studies of the United Nations Secretariat, studies of other administrative problems, a study of the role of the General Assembly, a study of the International Court of Justice, a study of the way in which the Security Council operates.

Besides that, we have, as the result of some consideration that started in the staff when I first joined the endowment, embarked upon a program, which was approved by the trustees in May 1951, to initiate some basic study of problems of international organization.

We assume that international organization is here to stay in some form or other. We assume that it is an important factor in international life.

We feel that there are many questions still unsolved and still unanswered on a philosophical, on a historical, on a political-science basis as distinct from the rather pragmatic answers that one has to give in day-to-day operations. That is a major program area, and will be for some time.

As a project under that area, we are at present embarking upon a series of studies of what we call national policies and attitudes toward international organizations, with particular reference to the United Nations.

These studies are being undertaken in approximately 18 countries around the world, representative countries, in order to find out, if we can, why these people went into the United Nations, what they expected to get out of it, what they have in fact gotten out of it, and what they think might be the future.
This is tied into the fact that there is supposed to be, or there may be, a conference with a review of the United Nations Charter about 3 or 4 years hence.

Another major program area is in the field of education in world affairs. We started from the premise that, with the United States playing the role it does in world affairs at the present time, and with the American people having such a vital interest and a vital role with respect to these issues of peace and war, an understanding on the part of the American people of international problems was important, and the way in which we are now implementing that decision is in assisting universities and colleges and teachers' colleges to look over their own work in the light of the present situation.

We first held a series of conferences, of which the last is to take place in Dallas this coming week end—the first took place in Denver a year ago this summer—bringing together not only the teachers of international relations but the college administrators, teachers in other fields from several institutions in the particular region. We will now have blanketed the United States, suggesting to them that in the present circumstances they might take a look at themselves.

We are not trying to ask them to do anything for us at all. We are trying to help them to look not only at their teaching of specialists in the field of international relations but the ways in which they attempt to teach the ordinary student, who may be a specialist in some other field but who may have a need, as for example, an engineer who may be sent out on a technical-assistance mission or who may go out for ARAMCO to a foreign country.

Next, to take a look at their research program in the light of the public needs.

Thirdly, to see how they deal with the problems of their foreign students who come in increasing numbers.

As you probably know, there are something like 30,000 foreign students who last year were in American colleges and universities. And the problem of making these students understand the United States, going back home as friends of the United States, is a very real problem.

And, lastly, the problem of their relationship to the community at large.

These essentially are our programs with one addition, which I certainly should mention. That is the fact that we are now building this international center in New York, which is a fairly sizable building, as you will see from the picture on the cover there of which we occupy only one floor for our own offices.

We rent it to other nonprofit organizations, as many of them as possible in the international field, trying to bring them together in one building, and we have plans for an international center, we call it, on the second floor, which will be a meeting place for private citizens interested in world affairs.

We are right across the street from the United Nations, which is a place of great attraction for visitors. It is a place where representatives of nongovernmental organizations, like the chamber of commerce, labor unions, the League of Women Voters, and others, come. We hope to make our international center a real place to bring them together and to stimulate discussion and interest.
Mr. Keele. Your work, I assume, or the work of the foundation, is such that it is largely international in character; at least, in its approach to its work it must be international in character?

Mr. Johnson. It must be international in character.

Mr. Keele. Now, you maintain a foreign office; do you not?

Mr. Johnson. We have an office in Paris, sir. In the mid-1920's, the endowment purchased a building in Paris which has become the endowment's European center. That is still going on. The director of that European center in the past was an American.

We had a feeling that it might be helpful if we could have a European who knew the United States and knew American thinking well but was still a European, and we appointed, shortly after I became president of the endowment, a young Belgian with a distinguished record, both as a soldier until the surrender of Belgium and as a participant in the underground afterward, and also a distinguished record as a student and scholar in the field, as the director of the European center, but he works in programs and with respect to programs that are decided by the trustees in New York.

Mr. Keele. The assets of your foundation are approximately $13,-000,000; are they not?

Mr. Johnson. The actual market value at the present time. The book value is a little over $11,000,000, sir.

Mr. Keele. You have had grants in addition to the original grant from the Carnegie Corp.?

Mr. Johnson. We have had periodic grants from the Carnegie Corp. Mr. Keele. And your average income runs about $600,000 or something like that?

Mr. Johnson. It has in the past as a result of those grants. It is a little bit smaller now. The Carnegie Corp. has given us only one grant in recent times, a grant of $25,000 this year, since I have been there.

Mr. Keele. About what percentage of your expenditures is made abroad?

Mr. Johnson. If you will excuse me, sir, I think it is around 7 percent; but I want to check this, if I may.

Mr. Keele. It averages out over the past few years about 7 percent; doesn't it?

Mr. Johnson. It averages out about 7 percent. It may be a little bit more as a result of this program which is now getting under way, the studies of national attitudes.

Mr. Keele. Tell us this: Are you a grant-making or an operating foundation, or do you do both?

Mr. Johnson. At the present time, sir, we do almost nothing but operations. In the past there were a number of grants. The trustees began to feel several years ago that a foundation as small as ours would suffer more from what I believe you yourself called scatteration, what our trustees have called birdshot operations, than a larger foundation might do.

Obviously, with our income, we could not grant large sums. The building of the new international center has tended to concentrate our efforts in New York. We still make occasional small grants, very small, as a rule. I can't think of any since I have been there which has run to a total of more than $3,000 for an institution.
We do as part of our operations, as I have suggested in my initial remarks, contract for jobs which we wish done. That is, respecting this study of national policies and attitudes, we have made contracts with organizations in other countries under which they contribute something and we contribute something.

Mr. Keele. What, in your opinion, is the relevant need for your foundation’s work as of today, compared to the time it was established by Mr. Carnegie?

Mr. Johnson. I would say, sir, despite the fact that governments and other agencies have put infinite millions and even billions of dollars into the same kind of work, striving for peace, that were not put into that work in 1911, the need for our work is greater than it has ever been before.

The attitude of 1910 and 1911 to 1914 was an attitude of hopeful- ness that peace was just around the corner. Mr. Carnegie was very much interested in the then pending arbitration treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States, and he hoped that when that was adopted, as he thought it would be adopted, we could begin to work in other areas of the world. There was a period of optimism.

Now we are in a period where in my opinion nobody can be very optimistic. Everyone has to think in terms of tension over a long period of time.

Mr. Keele. Is there any other major foundation which has for its sole objective work for peace?

Mr. Johnson. No, sir; I know of none which has it for its sole objective. The World Peace Foundation, which is a relatively small foundation in Boston, established at the same time in the same year as the Carnegie Endowment, has this objective. The Ford Foundation, as you know, has as one-fifth of its total program interest in the conditions of peace.

Mr. Keele. Among the larger foundations, the Carnegie Endowment is almost unique, is it not, in its dedication and work toward a single purpose?

Mr. Johnson. I think that is so, sir.

Mr. Keele. What grants did the Carnegie Endowment make to IPR, and over what period of time?

Mr. Johnson. The Carnegie Endowment began making grants to the IPR in March 1926, at the time it was being established, and continued making grants until July 3, 1939, which was the last one.

The total grants in that period ran to $152,000 for general purposes, and about $182,000, sir, a little bit over $182,000.

Mr. Keele. And what was the period?

Mr. Johnson. The period was from 1926 to July 3, 1939.

Mr. Keele. There have been no grants made to IPR, either the American council, the Pacific council, or any of the other councils, since 1939?

Mr. Johnson. None, sir.

Mr. Keele. Why did it stop? Why did the Carnegie Endowment stop its grants to IPR in 1939?

Mr. Johnson. I can’t give you the full story, sir. I have looked in our records, and cannot tell the full story. I can tell you when it happened and suggest to you why I think it stopped.

The decision not to renew the grants was made in May 1940. This was just after the fall of Norway and Denmark. It was a time when
the so-called phony war was ended. It was a time when we apparently were getting more and more involved.

At that meeting in May 1940, a number of grants to organizations operating outside of the United States were either reduced or eliminated from the budget, and I assume from what I know that that was the reason for the elimination of the grants to the IPR.

Mr. Keele. In other words, it was the international situation rather than any lack of sympathy on the part of the foundation for the work of the IPR?

Mr. Johnson. All I can say, sir, is that is my assumption from looking at the record.

Mr. Keele. I have read, of course, in preparation for this investigation, the charge which has been leveled at your foundation that, instead of being an instrumentality of peace, it was really an instrumentality for warmongering.

I suppose you have read those charges at one time or another?

Mr. Johnson. I have, sir.

Mr. Keele. Will you tell us the basis of those charges, or the alleged basis of them?

Mr. Johnson. I am frank to say that I don’t know the basis for the charges, unless it can be this:
The Carnegie Endowment has always made a point of stating that it was not a pacifist as distinct from a peace-loving organization. All of the officers of the endowment have taken the position, as far as I know, that peace with justice and equity is the kind of peace we want.

We are not interested in peace for the sake of peace. That has angered certain people at certain times. As far as I know, the record is clear that the endowment has been concerned with peace.

When war has come, the officers and trustees of the endowment, as loyal American citizens, because of their convictions, joined very actively in the war effort. But in each case, both in 1917 and in 1939, the endowment began planning with its own facilities as best it could for the period when peace might come again.

Mr. Keele. Well, it is my recollection that Nicholas Murray Butler was one of those who was very active in getting American participation in the First World War; isn’t that correct?

Mr. Johnson. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Keele. And he was at that time the president of the Carnegie Endowment?

Mr. Johnson. He was

Mr. Keele. And was peculiarly identified in the public mind with the Carnegie Endowment, I think; is that right?

Mr. Johnson. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Keele. I think that charge, as I read it, was illustrated by the fact that the president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was one of those most active and most persuasive in inducing American participation in World War I. I believe that was the substance of the charge.

Mr. Johnson. I believe, sir, that our letterhead after 1917 carried the line “Peace through victory.”

Mr. Keele. In other words, the point I am trying to make, and I believe that you are trying to make, is that the Carnegie Endowment is not a pacifist organization.
Mr. Johnson. That is precisely the case, sir; and I assume, without having ever met Mr. Butler or talked to him, that Mr. Butler's view was that of many people between 1914 and 1917: that the peace and security of the United States were directly involved in the war in Europe, and that the way in which one could begin to work toward true peace with justice was in this direction.

Mr. Keele. I gather from the answers that have been made in the questionnaire that was sent you, that you subscribe to the statement that has been made here so many times, that the function of foundations today is that of supplying risk capital or venture capital for projects on the frontiers of knowledge, if we may use the cliché now. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. Johnson. That is a correct statement, sir. As a matter of fact, when I began to read what others had said, I realized that I was going to seem like a plagiarist when I appeared here, but I assure you that the idea was in our minds before we knew what others would testify.

Mr. Keele. Well, I believe your reply was one of the first we received, so though they have all been along the same tenor, I don't think that can be charged. I think that represents, does it not, a unanimity of opinion with reference to the functions of foundations?

Mr. Johnson. It certainly seems to, sir.

Mr. Keele. Have you anything more you would like to say on that?

Mr. Johnson. I would like to tell a story to indicate the way this may operate even without prior knowledge. This is a story which was told me. I have never checked it, but I have every reason to believe it is true.

In 1940, after the fall of France, a very prominent Canadian, Edgar Tarr—I think he was a publisher or editor of the Winnipeg Press, thought it was important to bring together representatives of the North Atlantic community to consider what their problems would be in the future, and he persuaded the officers of the Rockefeller Foundation that this was a worthy project, and he held a conference in Maine, in the spring or early summer of 1940. Among the people whom he invited there was a French-Canadian lawyer completely uninterested in politics, completely uninterested for the moment in international affairs. This man came to the conference.

When they left, Mr. Tarr said, "Well, thank you for coming, but I wish you had talked," and the man said, "Well, I didn't know anything, but you have interested me tremendously, and I assure you that this is a subject that I shall not forget."

That man's name was Louis St. Laurent, who is now the Prime Minister of Canada, and who was one of the chief authors of the North Atlantic Pact. That is the way just a drop can have results.

Mr. Keele. Dr. Johnson, in answer to our questions as to grants made by the Carnegie Endowment to organizations or individuals who have been cited or criticized, by the House Un-American Activities Committee, or by the McCarran committee, or which appeared upon the Attorney General's list, you made a number of answers and listed a number of organizations and individuals.

Mr. Johnson. We listed only one organization, I think, sir; the IPR.
Mr. Keele. I believe that is correct. That appears on what page?
Mr. Johnson. That appears on page 78. It begins a little bit earlier for the IPR. It begins on page 74 for the IPR, and goes to page 78 for the individuals.
Mr. Keele. That is right. You have listed the varying amounts which were given to the Institute of Pacific Relations and those you have already summed up or totaled?
Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir.
Mr. Keele. And now with reference to individuals, of course, you put at the head of the list Mr. Alger Hiss. We have heard about his selection from Mr. Davis. You were not connected with the Carnegie Endowment at that time?
Mr. Johnson. No, sir; I had no connection with the Carnegie Endowment until July 1, 1950.
Mr. Keele. What was the total amount of money received by Mr. Hiss from the Carnegie Endowment?
Mr. Johnson. He received a total in salary of $37,388.90 for the period from February 1, 1947, to December 13, 1948, and he received for expenses in connection with his job a total of $4,151.91.
Mr. Keele. And then while on leave of absence?
Mr. Johnson. While on leave of absence from December, he received a salary of $7,388.90.
Mr. Keele. Now you have had occasion, you say, to review the activities and the work of the foundation, or endowment I should say. Will you tell us the activities to which Mr. Hiss gave his attention, so far as the records and your investigations have been able to reveal?
Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir, gladly. They fell into two broad categories, one administrative, the other policy.
As a result of the decision to concentrate on the United Nations, there came the decision also to concentrate the offices of the organization.
We at that time, as you know, had an office here on Jackson Place, as well as an office in New York. It was felt that it was desirable to have one central organization.
Mr. Hiss devoted a considerable part of his time to planning the consolidation of the offices in New York. This job was a long and difficult one. It was not completed until after he had left the endowment, not fully completed until after I had joined the endowment when we sold the quarters on Jackson Place to the United States Government.
Mr. Keele. That was not a matter of determination or policy. That was simply a matter of implementation of a policy already established.
Mr. Johnson. That is one thing. The other thing, sir, was in the field of policy. The endowment trustees had taken the position that they desired to help to support and strengthen the United Nations, to make it better able to do the job which it was trying to do, which it was supposed to do.
Mr. Hiss prepared a memorandum which was approved by the trustees in May 1947 with respect to ways in which that could be done, and most of his administration was concerned with problems of working this out as far as the endowment's own activities were concerned.
He initiated these studies of United Nations administration which I mentioned. He initiated the transformation of International Con-
iliation into a magazine largely concerned with problems of the United Nations.

The whole concentration of effort as far as the records reveal on the part of the endowment was toward education about, research about, assistance in one way or another to the United Nations. There were obviously the ending of older programs, but this was the general emphasis.

Mr. Hiss played. I know, a very active role in 1947 with respect to the development of public understanding about the Marshall plan. He wrote an article in the New York Times magazine in November 1947 setting forth the arguments in favor of the Marshall plan. Those were, as far as I have been able to discover, sir, his chief activities.

Mr. Keele. He was in office only, or, rather, he was actively discharging only the duties of president for what period, about 18 months?

Mr. Johnson. A little over 18 months, from February 1, 1947, to August 1948.

Mr. Keele. Now, from your observation and examination of the work done at that time, and from any discussion you may have had with trustees and employees of the endowment, did you detect any bias in the work or activities of Alger Hiss during that 18-month period that he was acting president, or president and discharging his duties as president, which indicated a bias in favor of communism or of the Soviet Government?

Mr. Johnson. Not a bit, sir. I see no sign of it at all. I think one thing which was mentioned by Mr. Wriston was that among the new trustees who were elected after he came into office were people who were very prominent members of American business, people who were very conspicuous capitalists in one way or another.

The whole record seems to be a record of interest in making the United Nations work, and making the United Nations work in democratic ways, and I emphasize "democratic" as we understand that term, and not as it is misused by the gentlemen on the other side of the iron curtain.

Mr. Keele. As a result of the experience of Mr. Hiss, does the endowment, which I shall refer to as the foundation, although its title is endowment, take any additional precautions in the screening of possible employees or those whom it considers for employees? Or perhaps it has not added any employees since that time, outside of yourself?

Mr. Johnson. I can't speak directly to the precautions taken as to myself. From the inquiries that were made of me, I can gather that they were fairly extensive, and I have heard from others that they were fairly extensive.

There were certainly checks with the State Department; that I know. There were even inquiries as to whether my wife was a member of any organization, and I could answer not quite honestly, as I discovered later, that she was a member of none. I discovered later she was a member of a small group who met annually to lay wreaths on the dead, Confederate dead, in Lynchburg, Va.

As for what I have done as president of the endowment, I have taken very great care with respect to any possible candidate for the endowment, to inquire of people who have known him, people whose judgment I respect as to what they know about it.
One thing I should say, sir, which I think is relevant. One cannot get—and I think Mr. Rusk brought this out in connection with the IPR yesterday—out of the United States Government the information which they give to other United States Government agencies, and so one has to do the best one can in consulting individuals with respect to past records of prospective employees.

Mr. Keele. Now, among others, you have listed, in answer to the question to which I referred, Mrs. Marguerite Stewart. That appears on page 79 of your answer.

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Keele. Will you tell us something of Marguerite Stewart?

Mr. Johnson. I can tell you very easily, sir. We had a problem. We were trying an experiment for us in the distribution of a publication more widely than we generally distribute. We wanted to get as many as 50,000 copies of this publication out.

We were informed that Mrs. Stewart had had experience in this respect. She came in on a temporary basis solely for the purpose of getting this document, this volume called United Nations, Its Record and Its Prospects distributed.

She was not in a policy position. The manuscript had been finished. The book, I think, was actually in print before she joined the endowment. It was after she had severed her connections that I learned that she had been cited, been mentioned, before the House Un-American Activities Committee, in other ways.

Mr. Keele. What was the total amount that she received?

Mr. Johnson. A total of $326.67, sir.

Mr. Keele. For 14 days of work?

Mr. Johnson. For 14 days of work.

Mr. Keele. And now with reference to her husband, Maxwell S. Stewart, who is listed here, what about him?

Mr. Johnson. This was before my time, sir, but I can tell you to the best of my knowledge what happened.

Mr. Stewart, as you know, is connected with the public-affairs committee, which distributes rather widely popular pamphlets on matters of public interest.

He approached the endowment in late 1947 and suggested that the endowment and the public-affairs committee cooperate in the distribution of a pamphlet on the United Nations, which he would prepare. The endowment turned over to the public-affairs committee—this was agreed to—a sum of money, which included $1,400 for Mr. Stewart to prepare the manuscript.

As it turned out, the manuscript was never satisfactory because Mr. Stewart didn’t know anything about the United Nations, with all due respect, and as a result, although the money was paid to him, the manuscript was never used.

I myself have never seen it. It had been buried in the files by the time I joined the endowment, and that ended the unhappy experiment.

Mr. Keele. What was the total amount received?

Mr. Johnson. The total amount received by Mr. Stewart was $1,400.

Mr. O’Toole. At this point, Mr. Johnson, I would like to ask a question of you. You have mentioned various pamphlets that have been put out by the endowment, and been distributed by them.
What is the purpose of these pamphlets? Is the purpose to inform the public of certain things, or is it an endeavor to bend public opinion in certain ways?

Mr. Johnson. The purpose, sir, is an informational and educational purpose. I think we assume that an informed public makes informed decisions. We feel it our obligation to try to inform the public about problems of international relations.

We try our very best in the publications, in International Conciliation, for example, to present objectively the situation which exists.

Mr. O'Toole. In almost all cases isn't it true that the pamphlets have a positive outlook, that there is not a presentation of both sides of the question? There is strictly a presentation of the views of the foundation?

Mr. Johnson. No, sir. Excuse me, there is a real effort to present a positive outlook, always within the framework that the endowment's function is international peace, to promote international peace, and we therefore have a positive outlook in the direction of international peace and international cooperation.

But we try to present both sides of issues.

Occasionally there will be articles published by individuals which represent a conclusion on one side. We stand always ready to publish an article on the other side of the same issue if there is any serious question involved. That has been a very strong feeling on my part, sir.

Mr. O'Toole. Is there always peace in the endowment?

Mr. Johnson. Pretty much so, as much as in any organization, I suspect.

Mr. O'Toole. That is all, Mr. Keele.

Mr. Keele. In addition to that $1,400, Mr. Stewart did receive $50?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, he did.

Mr. Keele. For preparing a study outline, Thunder Out of China?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Keele. And an additional $75 in 1947 for a lecture delivered under the auspices of the International Relations Club?

Mr. Johnson. That's right, sir; making a total of $1,525.

Mr. Keele. And now with reference to Frederick Schuman—and who is Frederick Schuman?

Mr. Johnson. He is a professor of political science at Williams College, a well-known writer in the field of international relations. He received $50 as an honorarium in 1939. He was first mentioned, I believe, in 1944 in the Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Keele. And Lester Granger?

Mr. Johnson. Lester Granger, sir, received $50 in 1943.

Mr. Keele. For what, please?

Mr. Johnson. For a lecture delivered, also under the auspices of the International Relations Club.

Mr. Keele. And who is Mr. Lester Granger, and what are his citations?

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Lester Granger, sir, I believe is a Negro who was cited first in the report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and he is listed as a sponsor for the conference, which was cited as Communist-front and Communist-controlled.

I think it should be added, sir, that in the annual report of the Un-American Activities Committee in 1949, Mr. Granger testified that the
Communist Party was not influencing minority Negro groups as greatly as Paul Robeson had said. I don’t know what the significance of those remarks is.

Mr. Keele. Now Max Lerner. Who is he, and how much did he receive, and for what?

Mr. Johnson. Max Lerner received $50 in 1940 as an honorarium for a lecture delivered under the auspices of the International Relations Club.

Mr. Lerner is a political scientist who now writes a column for the New York Post. He has been a teacher at Harvard, also at Williams. I believe he is also teaching now at Brandeis University, outside Boston. He had been cited, or been mentioned in the 1938 hearings of the Dies committee. I don’t think that was a citation. It was a mention in the hearings. He was mentioned in the hearings in 1946 and 1947, some time after this honorarium was received.

Mr. Simpson. The committee will recess for 5 minutes.

(Short recess.)

Mr. Simpson. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Keele. Mr. Johnson, what about Mordecai Ezekiel?

Mr. Johnson. Mordecai Ezekiel, sir, received an honorarium of $50 in 1941 for an article in our magazine, International Conciliation.

Mr. Keele. What are the citations on Ezekiel?

Mr. Johnson. Ezekiel was cited in the review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace by the Un-American Activities Committee in 1949. He was among the members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was cited by the Attorney General as subversive.

He was cited also as subversive by the committee, as a member of the Spanish Refugee Appeal, and as a member of the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. All of these citations, sir, came sometime after the honorarium. You may be interested that the article, the subject of the article, was “Economic relations between the Americas.”

Mr. Keele. With reference to Vera Dean?

Mr. Johnson. Vera Dean was cited in the report on the Congress of American Women, October 1949. She was not cited as a member of the congress. She participated in the International Assembly of Women, a meeting which the Congress came to dominate. The citation in my evidence here, sir, does not indicate whether she was still a member after the Communists came to dominate, or not.

Mr. Keele. And what is the total she received?

Mr. Johnson. She received a total of $150 in 1940, 1941, and 1942, as honoraria for lectures delivered under the auspices of the International Relations Club.

Mr. Keele. And Otto Nathan?

Mr. Johnson. Otto Nathan was listed as the sponsor of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace in 1949. Mr. Nathan received honorarium totaling $250, between 1935 and 1938, for lectures delivered under the auspices of the International Relations Club.

Mr. Keele. And Friedrich Foerster?

Mr. Johnson. Friedrich Foerster received $1,000 in 1940, $500 in 1941, and $600 in 1942, under the programs for international visits of representative men and refugee scholars from abroad. He was a refugee from Nazi Germany. He was mentioned in the review of the
Scientific and Cultural Conference in 1949, some 7 years after the last grant to him.

Mr. Keele: And William C. Johnstone?

Mr. Johnson. William C. Johnstone received a total of $350 as honorarium for lectures from 1941 to 1944. Mr. Johnstone was mentioned in the McCarran committee report on the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1952.

Mr. Keele. What about Stefansson?

Mr. Johnson. Stefansson, sir, received a grant of $1,800 in the fiscal year 1947, the endowment’s fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1946, to do research on the topic “Northern Routes of Trade and Intercourse.”

Mr. Stefansson was, of course, well known as an Arctic explorer. He was cited by the McCarran report of 1952. He had been mentioned also in reports before the Un-American Activities Committee in 1947.

My information, sir, does not indicate whether those reports were published before or after the payments which were made in May and June of 1947.

Mr. Keele. And Edouard Lindeman?

Mr. Johnson. Edouard Lindeman received from the endowment $700 in March 1941 and $850 in March 1942, a total of $1,050, in connection with lectures stemming out of the conference held in England under the auspices of Dr. Butler, arranged by Dr. Butler, concerning international trade.

Mr. Keele. Who is Lindeman, or who was he?

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Lindeman, sir, he is listed in a number of organizations. I cannot tell you.

Mr. Keele. He was a professor at Columbia, wasn’t he, and the author of the book Wealth and Culture, which is one of the early studies of foundations, as a matter of fact?

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Keele. What about W. G. Rice?

Mr. Johnson. W. G. Rice, Jr., listed in the report of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill in 1950, received $50 in 1937, 13 years before, as an honorarium for a lecture delivered under the auspices of the International Relations Club.

Mr. Keele. Have you made any computations as to the total amounts received by this organization and these persons to whom we have just given our attention?

Mr. Johnson. I have, sir.

Mr. Keele. What is the total?

Mr. Johnson. The total amounts received are $246,194.71 out of a total expenditure of the endowment from the beginning of $249,034.83, 62, close to 25 million. This is approximately 1 percent of the total of all our expenditures.

I might add, sir, that if one subtracts the money given to the Institute of Pacific Relations prior to July 1, 1935, which is the period I covered, this comes to about nine-tenths of 1 percent of all our grants since that period, and perhaps it is not irrelevant to note that the total paid to individuals after they had been cited, except to Mr. Hiss, comes to $3,701.67, which is less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of all the money expended by the endowment.

Sir, if I could, I would like also to mention something else. The endowment has had a program of international law fellowships, Hague
Academy international law fellowships, visiting professorships, both for Americans going abroad and for others coming over here.

Under that program roughly 340 people were sent from one country to another, and as far as we have been able to determine, not one of those 340 people has been mentioned by either the Un-American Committee or the McCarran committee.

Mr. Keele. By far the largest amount of that part which you say has gone to organizations or individuals who have been cited, went to the IPR?

Mr. Johnson. That's right, sir, $182,000 approximately out of a total of $246,000.

Mr. Keele. Now we have had statements made here—I believe you likewise made the statement in your answers—once a grant is made, there is no effort to control the results of that work; is that right?

Mr. Johnson. That is generally true, sir.

Mr. Keele. Now in connection with that, there has been brought up the subject of the exchange of correspondence between you and Cody Fowler, president of the American Bar Association, which took place primarily in 1950 and 1951, I believe, mostly in 1950. Will you tell us what that situation was that gave rise to that exchange of correspondence?

Mr. Johnson. I should be glad to, sir. In 1948, the Carnegie Endowment made a grant of $15,000 to the American Bar Association on a condition which was met, that the bar association match this with its own funds to the tune of $7,500.

This total of $22,500 was put into a pool, and the purpose of the grant was to continue a cooperative program which had been started late in 1946 to promote the progressive development of international law in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The purpose of the grant of 1948 specifically, according to the records of the endowment, was the study of codification and development of international law. In 1950 the Solicitor General of the United States informed me that he understood Carnegie Endowment funds were being employed to oppose approval by the Senate of a convention then pending before it.

Since this was a very serious charge, I looked into the matter at once. I found there was not sufficient information to be sure that the charge was correct, and I composed a letter addressed to Mr. Fowler, who had recently become president of the bar association.

Since, sir, I am not a lawyer, since this was a matter involving lawyers, I thought it best to consult with two lawyers on my board.

I consulted with Mr. John Foster Dulles, the chairman of the board, and with Mr. John W. Davis, who had been a president of the American Bar Association and who had participated in the discussions leading up to the grant, and after consultation with them, I drafted a letter which they both approved, which I sent to Mr. Fowler.

In this letter I stated that from the information available to me, it did not appear that the funds were being used for the purpose of the original grant. I asked for information on this point. I received a courteous reply from Mr. Fowler saying he would look into it.

Then in December he submitted to me a long report from the chairman of the committee, under which these funds had been expended, the Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations. This long letter took strong issue with my interpretation of the facts.
Mr. Simpson. Dr. Johnson, what was the point of the Solicitor General's interest, that the money was not being spent to carry out the purpose of the grant, or that it was being spent to influence legislation?

Mr. Johnson. I think his interest, sir, was that it was being spent to influence legislation.

Mr. Simpson. But were you doing that with all your money in the United Nations?

Mr. Johnson. No, sir, excuse me, we have never attempted, except on this occasion, to influence issues before the United Nations or issues before the United States Government as a result of United Nations action. After decisions have been taken, we feel it proper to inform people about the decisions.

Mr. Simpson. Do you see a distinction?

Mr. Johnson. I see a distinction; yes, sir.

Mr. Simpson. O.K., I don't.

Mr. Johnson. Very sharply.

Mr. Keele. What was the particular treaty or convention before the Senate at that time?

Mr. Johnson. It was the Genocide Convention, sir, which has been adopted by the United Nations and signed by the United States, and which had been submitted to the Senate.

I might in this connection say that I took, myself, and still take, no position with respect to the Genocide Convention. I would have felt the same way if the influence were being used to support the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

Mr. Keele. What was your understanding, or what were you informed by Mr. Perlman, that the American Bar Association was doing with reference to this?

Mr. Johnson. He informed me, sir, that the three people who had testified against the ratification of this convention were all members of this Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations, and it was my understanding that this committee got its funds from this $22,500.

Mr. Keele. You mean that Perlman was saying that because the same members of the committee of the American Bar Association who had charge of the expenditure of this money appeared and testified, that that was the use of the money?

Mr. Johnson. I think he was suggesting, sir, that the money had been spent for purposes of influencing legislation, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. Keele. Well, was it shown that the money had been spent for the expenses of those men to come here and testify, or was it merely fortuitous that the same men who were on that committee were witnesses who came before the Senate?

Mr. Johnson. It was not shown that the money had been spent, sir. May I say, when I wrote my letter, one of the reasons for writing it was to get more financial information. I cannot testify to that. I am not entirely sure it was merely fortuitous.

These men had presented a report on the Genocide Convention before the American Bar Association. They were very much interested in this subject.

Mr. Simpson. Don't speakers that you send out, if you send speakers out to the international clubs, chambers of commerce, and so on, aren't
they selling something? Aren't they telling you why Congress should adopt certain types of legislation?

I always thought that was one of the real purposes why they appeared before clubs, to sell the idea of the United Nations, to have Congress approve it. I am for it. I am not objecting to it, but——

Mr. Johnson. I make a distinction, sir, between telling people about United Nations, giving information about the United Nations, and appearing before a congressional committee with respect to legislation then pending before that committee.

Mr. Simpson. It looks to me as though it is a question of whose goose is plucked.

Mr. Keele. What did your investigation show in the last analysis, or what did this report show in the American Bar Association?

Mr. Johnson. The report of the American Bar Association, and what I was able to find in the endowment files showed that these funds were being used for two purposes.

The first was to hold a series of meetings around the country with respect to certain problems, such as the Genocide Convention, and there is no question about that being a legitimate use of the funds, in my mind, and I stated in my letter.

It also showed that the funds had been used to draft reports which were submitted to the American Bar Association and with proposed resolutions which were approved by the house of delegates of the association.

Mr. Keele. Was that all right in your opinion?

Mr. Johnson. Well, sir, again I am not a lawyer, but I must say that, in my opinion, which the committee strongly differed with, these reports were not the kind of reports which would come from an objective study trying to get all points of view on the issues involved.

Mr. O'Toole. In other words, the endowment only molds public opinion where it can do it.

Mr. Johnson. No, sir. I don't think—that is certainly not my interpretation of it. My interpretation is that the endowment's interest is in educating the public about international relations, and not in molding public opinion for any particular legislative issue.

I would not think, for example, that the endowment should take a position as an organization on issues pending, particularly a position with respect to testifying on issues pending before the Congress.

Mr. O'Toole. The foundation or the endowment expressing its opinions, its findings, is doing no more to mold public opinion than does the Chevrolet Co. in advertising its car.

Mr. Johnson. I hadn't thought of exactly that analogy, sir. Perhaps so.

Mr. Keele. What action was taken, if any, by the board of trustees on the basis of the report made by the American Bar Association?

Mr. Johnson. The board of trustees took no action, sir, one reason being that most of these funds had been expended and they decided, since the funds had been expended, the matter should be allowed to drop, and it was dropped.

Mr. Keele. Wasn't there remaining about $6,000 at the time?

Mr. Johnson. No, sir, $600.

Mr. Keele. What connection, if any, has Ralph Barton Perry had or what connection does he have with the Carnegie Endowment?

Mr. Johnson. He has none at all, sir, at the present time.
I believe—and our own review did not reveal this—that Mr. Perry has been a member of committees which have been set up with endowment funds. One, a committee which was set up under the Commission to study the organization for peace, on problems of atomic energy.

Mr. Keele. He has never been a trustee, has he?

Mr. Johnson. He has never been a trustee.

Mr. Keele. Or an employee of the foundation?

Mr. Johnson. Or an employee. He may, sir—and I will be glad to check into this—have received a check for expenses to attend meetings of these committees.

Mr. Keele. Our information is that he was a member of several advisory committees. I don't quite understand how those advisory committees are set up or what their connection is with the foundation. Do you know about that?

Mr. Johnson. Well, one of them, sir, was this committee on the study of atomic-energy problems.

In 1945, after Hiroshima, Dr. Shotwell, who was then director of the division of economics and history of the endowment, requested and received a grant to set up a committee to study problems of the international control of atomic energy.

He set up such a committee which functioned from 1945, about December, until I think 1948. He had on it, I can't tell you who was there all the way through, but I attended an early meeting myself. I was then still in the State Department, and I attended as an observer. I remember Mr. John W. Davis was there. I remember that Mr. Davis, who recently died, who was president of Stevens Institute, was there. I remember Mr. Harold Stassen was there.

It was a group of citizens of scientific and public interest who were concerned with this problem, and they did a good deal of research into problems at the time that the issues of international control were going forward.

The other committee, I believe, sir, was an advisory committee on economics. The Carnegie Endowment and the International Chamber of Commerce cooperated for a while in a program relating to international trade, and the advisory committee on economics was helping to prepare scholarly, scientific studies of problems of international economics.

Mr. Keele. Who is Ralph Barton Perry?

Mr. Johnson. Ralph Barton Perry is, I think, now emeritus professor of philosophy at Harvard College.

I have met him myself, I think, once or twice. I certainly don't know him well. My knowledge of Mr. Perry is chiefly—that is, his activities of a nonacademic kind—chiefly stems from my recollection of the very active work that he did in 1940 and 1941 in connection with the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies. He was one of the most active leaders in and around Boston of that organization.

I believe he also helped—and here I may be pulling something incorrectly out of my recollection, but I believe he also helped—the Army in setting up in the early days the information and education program in that district.

Mr. Keele. He has been identified with a number of organizations which have been listed as Communist fronts or Communist sympathizing organizations; has he not?
Mr. JOHNSON. I believe, sir, from what you tell me that he has.
Mr. KEELE. I see that he was a signer of a petition to the Speaker
of the House in 1940 for the American Committee for Democracy and
Intellectual Freedom; that he was a member of the national com-
mittee of that organization as shown by their letterheads.
That the Daily Worker in 1939 carried a statement that he pro-
tested the ban of the American Student Union; that he was a sponsor
for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., signed
the call to the congress of that organization, was a member of the
sponsoring committee of the committee on education of that organi-
zation.
He spoke at the Get Together With Russia Rally sponsored by the
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship at Madison Square
Garden, December 2, 1946; that he was a signer of the statement call-
ing for a conference with the Soviet Union in 1948.
He sent greetings on the thirty-first anniversary of the Russian
Revolution, as reported in the Daily Worker; and he was a sponsor
of the Soviet Russian Day dinner celebrating the twenty-fifth anniver-
sary of the Red army.
There are numerous other citations here, two and a half pages of
them. Is that the extent of his connection with the Carnegie En-
dowment, to the best of your knowledge?
Mr. JOHNSON. As far as I know, sir. I should like to say this:
That from what I have read very limitedly of Mr. Perry’s writings,
he is a strong believer again in democracy as we understand it and
the western way of life.
I suspect that many of these things took place at the time when it was
official policy to cooperate with the Soviet Union. I don’t know
whether there is any citation after December 1946, but there has been
a significant change since that time in the attitudes of many people.
Mr. KEELE. We were interested particularly in the statement in
the 1946 Year Book of the endowment with reference to the Inter-
national Mind Alcoves. Was the policy of the endowment to send
out books to those Alcoves?
Mr. JOHNSON. It was, sir.
Mr. KEELE. Perhaps it is still. I don’t know.
Mr. JOHNSON. No, sir; it is not.
Mr. KEELE. Looking at those books, there seems to be a rather heavy
preponderance on the one world idea. Sir Bernard Pares’ article
on Russia, Corliss Lamont’s The Peoples of the Soviet Union, the
American-Russian Institute’s Soviet Union Today—no, I am sorry,
The Soviet Union Today put out by the American-Russian Institute—
Ruth Benedict’s The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.
Mr. JOHNSON. Which is about Japan.
Mr. KEELE. Some books by Owen Lattimore, James P. Warburg,
Mr. Dulles, Mr. Willkie. What about the intention of sending those
books out?
I think my question really goes back to the question or to the point
made by Mr. O’Toole. Are they all books in support of one world,
international relations, et cetera, or just what was the general bent
of those books?
Mr. JOHNSON. Sir, I should like to start out by saying that the
whole program of distributing books was stopped before I joined the
endowment.
I think the history is substantially this, and I referred earlier to Mr. Carnegie's well-known interest in libraries. I think there was a feeling in the endowment that the endowment could usefully help people study international relations by making gifts of books to colleges and universities and other libraries which helped to explain and help people understand international relations.

I cannot tell you how these books were selected. The person who selected them is no longer on the staff. It was an attempt, I suspect, to give representative volumes dealing with international relations.

I think there were a number, as you suggest, by people like Mr. Dulles and others. Certainly there was no specific emphasis so far as I know on the one-world idea in the endowment as a whole. There was an emphasis on international understanding.

I would think, for example, that Ruth Benedict's Chrysantheme and the Sword, which is an anthropologic study of what made the Japanese tick, a study which I believe was originally written for the United States Government as part of the psychological work, this is an attempt to help people understand. I think there is no evidence of a bias, except a broad bias of an interest in international relations and international understanding.

Mr. Keele. Would it be fair to say that the activities of the endowment had been directed along the lines of advocacy of international cooperation?

Mr. Johnson. That is quite correct, sir.

Mr. Keele. And that in pursuance of its belief that that will be a contributing factor to international peace; is that correct?

Mr. Johnson. That's right, sir.

Mr. Keele. Now, then, let's move on from that point to this. In your opinion, based upon your work with the endowment, a study of its archives, consultation with its staff and the board of trustees, has any of the work of the foundation tended to weaken the capitalistic system or the Government of America in its traditional role?

Mr. Johnson. I think the answer to that is a categorical "No," sir. I think the effort has been very much the contrary.

I cannot believe that men like Thomas J. Watson, who was a very active trustee of the endowment until he retired as an honorary trustee recently, would have had anything to do with the endowment if it had not been interested in the capitalistic system.

I cannot believe that these trustees of the endowment, some of whom I have named, some of whom, all of whom, are named not in our current annual report, trustees over a period of time, would have been interested in anything which was not in their opinions favorable to the best interests of the United States and its traditional historical role.

I certainly, myself, can assure you as an American historian, who has been interested in American diplomatic history, and as a person who served for 5 years in the State Department, I have no interest in anything but the promotion of the best interests of the United States.

Mr. O'Toole. Mr. Keele, might I interrupt at that point? I noticed that there is a tendency all through this investigation on the part of witnesses for the foundations and for the endowments to engage in a lot of name dropping, big names.

We talk about Professor So-and-So and Mr. Watson and Carnegie and Rockefeller, and everybody is taking those names as though they
have a face value that is 100 percent pure or almost as pure as Ivory
soap.
We are all sufficiently well-versed with the history of our country to
know that the names of Carnegie and Rockefeller were applied to
many pages of cruelty and inhumanity in dealing with their fellow
human beings, and I think it would be far better to stick to ideas
and stick to thoughts and stick to sound facts than to try to prove
arguments by the use of names of certain individuals.
I don't think the naming of a name such as John Foster Dulles or
Watson or Moses or the Ten Commandments does anything to fortify
the argument. That is a personal opinion on my part.
Mr. Keele. I was about to ask you whether or not there was not at
one end of the spectrum a body of people indulging in a body of
thought of internationalism and one world, and if there was not at
the other end of the spectrum a group who were stanch isolationists
who disapproved of international cooperation.
Mr. Johnson. I think that is true, sir.
Mr. Keele. They are poles apart in their views. Now we have
heard a great deal about the sponsorship of projects which support
the view of those who believe in international cooperation. Is there
any foundation, to your knowledge, that supports or sponsors any
projects which represent the thought of the group at the other end
of the spectrum?
Mr. Johnson. I do not know of any, sir, but before answering that
I would like to make this statement.
We do not sponsor projects at the extreme end, the one-world end,
of the spectrum. This perhaps reflects a personal predilection on my
part, but I am on record on a number of occasions of not being a sup-
porter of the United World Federalists. I do not believe that one
achieves one's goals that way.
I can't think of any foundation which supports the concept that
the best way for peace and security and development for the United
States is on the isolationist end.
Mr. Keele. Well, now, the views of those who advocate that are
entitled at least to consideration; aren't they?
Mr. Johnson. They are, sir.
Mr. Keele. Well, why is it that we are unable to find in our in-
vestigation, at least, any funds of a foundation being devoted to even
the expression of those views or any projects which tend to express
those views?
Mr. Johnson. I can't answer that, sir, with respect to any founda-
tions. I assume that the mandate of the Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace by virtue of Mr. Carnegie's charter was a mandate
which favored the development of peace and security through inter-
national cooperation.
Mr. Keele. Yes, and I say again my questions are not intended to
carry criticism. That is not my function as I view it.
I am trying to get information, and I am not thinking so much of
the Carnegie Endowment, because that was channeled or angled in
the direction of international cooperation, obviously, and Carnegie
so said.
I am thinking of the fact that we can find no evidence of any foun-
dation anywhere taking up the cudgels on behalf of that group, of
which there seems to be a rather articulate minority who believe in
isolationism, if I may use that term—the reverse, shall we say, of internationalism—and I am wondering why at least that view isn’t presented somewhere.

Whether the foundation agrees with it, the sponsors, or not, is not the point, or whether I agree with it, and I may not, but we just don’t find that shade of opinion represented anywhere, and I wondered if you could throw some light on it, not so much in view of your position with the endowment, but rather as a generalization.

Mr. Johnson. No, sir; I am afraid I can’t. I would wonder whether some of the books which have been published which present the other point of view haven’t been helped in one way or another, directly or indirectly, through foundation funds.

For instance, the works of Charles Beard. I have no idea whether that has taken place or not. It might be an interesting avenue of exploration. I have no answer to that question.

Mr. Keele. It was suggested yesterday, and I think you may have heard this, by Dean Rusk, that perhaps criticism of foundations stemmed in large part from that group who thought the foundations favored international cooperation, or at least indulged in international operations to some extent from the group who were critical of that.

It seems to me that there might be some justice, the idea occurs to me at least of their being critical if there can be found no support for their view, or at least if no support, support for the propagation of their view or the explanation of their view. I am just trying to explore that with you.

Mr. Johnson. Sir, I have never gone into that question. It may be that Mr. Rusk is correct, that that is where the criticism of foundations stems from.

The criticism of the Carnegie Endowment, as you suggested earlier, stems from the attitude of the endowment toward war, the First World War and the Second World War. That may come from the same group.

I would think that my own personal reaction would be—and obviously this is a personal reaction—that the kind of careful study of these problems which we try to undertake leads to a conclusion that neither the isolationists’ point of view nor the one-world point of view is at present tenable.

The isolationist point of view was tenable and understandable 50 years ago. The one-world point of view may be tenable and understandable I won’t suggest how far in the future that may have to be.

Mr. Keele. Doesn’t that in itself indicate that the foundations do, whether consciously or unconsciously, tend to mold thinking, or at least to give their support only to one line of thinking?

Mr. Johnson. I am not sure, sir, that that necessarily follows. It is conceivable and probably is the case that foundations have given support to people who were scholars, who might have had another line of thinking. I simply don’t know.

But the tendency has been in the direction of support of scholarly activities, of an attempt to understand the problems. Again I say this is my conviction.

A scholarly study of all the implications of these problems seems to suggest that neither extreme is a viable extreme for the United States and the world today.
Mr. Keele. I can understand why a foundation would support
J. W. B. Haldane or any group of scientists who were, shall we say,
Darwinians, and that they would today refuse to lend their support or
give their funds to anyone trying to disprove the Darwinian theory.

But when it comes to a question of philosophy rather than scientific
proof, the matter of ideology, I am a little disturbed by the fact that
we do not find any sponsorship of the views of those who differ with
the people who are advocating international cooperation. I am not
attempting by this phrase or statement to indicate my views at all.

Mr. Johnson. I understand. I have no answer to that, sir. I did
not know that these facts were as you stated, that there is no sponsor-
ship for those groups.

Mr. Keele. And I can't say categorically that there is not, Mr.
Johnson. I only say that we have been unable to find it.

We have sort of looked for that with some care and curiosity, and
I think Mr. O'Toole's statement was some indication along that line,
I think along the same lines, was it not, Mr. O'Toole? Was not your
question directed to much the same point?

Mr. O'Toole. Yes.

Mr. Keele. Any other questions?

Mr. Simpson. Doctor, I am interested in knowing the point at which
the money from the foundation is within your discretion and where
the trustees pass upon your activities.

Mr. Johnson. I can answer that one, sir, very readily.

In the first place, the trustees adopt at each annual meeting in May
a budget for the fiscal year beginning the first of the following July.
This budget is initially prepared in the endowment staff.

It is discussed with members of the board of trustees, particularly
in recent years with those who have responsibility, as the building
committee does, for the expenditure of funds for our building. It is
then considered by the executive committee, gone over by them, modi-
fied in cases by them, and then approved by the trustees.

Mr. Simpson. That is, a lump sum is approved?

Mr. Johnson. It is more than a lump sum, sir. It is broken down
into considerable detail. I think you get an indication of the amount
of detail in the financial statement in this annual report.

Mr. Simpson. That is what I was looking for.

Mr. Johnson. It begins on page 28. You get the general income.
Then on page 30 is the work program which is broken down into a
number of items.

Mr. Simpson. Well, let's take any one of them; take "Survey of
current activities in the field of international affairs." Was that a
lump-sum appropriation there?

Mr. Johnson. That is a lump-sum appropriation there.

Mr. Simpson. Now, as to the actual spending of that $1,400, who
determines who gets that?

Mr. Johnson. That is within my decision, sir. That is all deter-
mined by the president of the endowment, who reports then later to
the trustees what action is taken.

The only sum which I can spend in my absolute discretion is a sum
which is marked as the president's contingency fund in our budget. It
does not appear here. That comes to a total of $10,000, and there
I report to the trustees.
MR. SIMPSON. Where then, as president, do you delegate authority to determine whom you send out to make a speech somewhere?

MR. JOHNSON. We don't send people out to make speeches any more, sir. That was all in the past.

I have to approve every commitment sheet for the expenditure of funds that comes within the purview of the endowment; and, therefore, I have a pretty good look at everything that is done.

MR. SIMPSON. Well, you have a big responsibility then to make sure that these individuals are the right kind; haven't you?

MR. JOHNSON. I do, sir. I am very conscious of it.

MR. SIMPSON. Would you tell us, as the other foundations have given us an answer to this question: To what extent do you consider the citations by the Un-American Activities Committee, the Attorney General's office, and so on, as a conclusive factor in connection with the selection of these personnel?

MR. JOHNSON. Yes. With respect to the Attorney General's list, I would very definitely state that any organization which is on that list would not be an organization to which the endowment would consider giving funds.

With respect to mention of individuals in the reports of the Un-American Activities Committee, this would be a very significant factor in our determination. It would not necessarily, in my opinion, and should not necessarily, be a concluding factor.

One might have to know, for example, whether a person was mentioned as a member of an organization having been a member in 1937, for example, and having broken with that organization.

If I may use an example, you, Mr. Keefe, raised yesterday with Mr. Rusk the question of the grant to Granville Hicks. He had been a member of the Communist Party. At the time that grant was made, he had broken with the Communist Party. His name still might have appeared on the list of the Un-American Activities Committee. One would have to take those facts into account.

MR. SIMPSON. One other question of you. I hold in my hand the annual report.

MR. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

MR. SIMPSON. And we referred to page 30 in that report. Is it your idea that, if Congress should by legislation require a report, this report is sufficiently in detail?—and I refer to that item you just mentioned, "Survey of current activities in the field of international affairs," and I add that the casual reader or the interested reader wouldn't have any idea where that $1,000 went.

MR. JOHNSON. Well, sir, I think that could be answered by looking at the section on publications of the endowment on page 11. It might be necessary to make clear what the relationship is; but, at page 11, the paragraph at the top of the page says, "The latest volume of Current Research in International Affairs."

Actually, that is the survey: current research. It is the publication of a volume describing what is being done in a number of institutions, chiefly in the United States and British Commonwealth, in this field.

MR. SIMPSON. You recognize a limit as to the practicability?

MR. JOHNSON. I do, sir.

MR. SIMPSON. Beyond which you can't go into detail?

MR. JOHNSON. I do, sir.

MR. SIMPSON. Not because the public shouldn't know it, but because it would be too big a bookkeeping job, or what?
Mr. Johnson. It would be a substantial bookkeeping job. It would require a very long report.

We go into very considerable detail, as you know, in our reports to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. My own feeling would be that if anybody, a member of the public or anybody else, wished to know what the breakdown was in that case, he had a right to know. If he wished to find out further how the sums—perhaps even a better example is these sums with respect to program area A on page 30, "International organization."

Some indication of that is given in the report itself, but I should think you might like to know where this money has been spent. I don't see, sir, that anything more is needed than the verbal report; that is, the written report of activities in conjunction with this statement of expenditures.

Mr. Simpson. Thank you, sir.

Mr. O'Toole. I do not know, truthfully I do not know, whether the witness was invited or subpoenaed here. Were you invited?

Mr. Johnson. I was invited, sir.

Mr. O'Toole. Well, when you were invited here to testify, did the Carnegie Endowment hold a meeting of its board or its group of trustees prior to your coming here?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir; but it just was a happenstance, if I may say so.

In the first place, when we received the questionnaire from your committee, I obtained the authorization of the executive committee to establish a special committee to help me in preparing the answer to the questionnaire. We prepared the drafts in the staff.

They were submitted to the special committee which consisted of the chairman of the board, Mr. Dulles, the then vice chairman and now chairman, Mr. Bundy, and to five other members of the board. They went over it with us, made comments and suggestions. It was then submitted.

It had been planned that I was to testify last week. Mr. Davis also. Mr. Davis could not appear until this week, and Mr. Keele and your committee, sir, very courteously allowed us to testify today instead of a week ago.

In the interim by pure accident we had a meeting of the board of trustees last Monday, and we discussed this with the trustees. They had all copies of the questionnaire before it was submitted, or at the time it was submitted. We had a considerable discussion.

Mr. O'Toole. What caused this pure accident that brought about the meeting?

Mr. Johnson. The trustees' meeting, which is set by the bylaws, takes place on, I guess it is, the second Monday in December just by regular occasion.

Mr. O'Toole. It wasn't by accident then.

Mr. Johnson. It was actually a juxtaposition.

Mr. O'Toole. That is all.

Mr. Simpson. We thank you, Doctor, for your appearance.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, sir, very much.

Mr. Simpson. The committee will adjourn until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the committee recessed to reconvene Thursday, December 11, 1952, at 10:30 a.m.)