The special subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 1301 of the House Office Building, Hon. Carroll Reece (chairman of the special committee) presiding.


Also present: Rene A. Wormser, general counsel; Arnold T. Koch, associate counsel; Norman Dodd, research director; Kathryn Casey, legal analyst; and John Marshall, Jr., chief clerk of the special committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Wormser, as I understand, Mr. Dodd will resume this morning.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Dodd goes on with his statement of which we have a copy today, there are 2 or 3 questions about his statement yesterday which have occurred to me since I have had a chance to look at the record. I wonder if it might be well to get those in the record now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I think so.

Mr. HAYS. I think it is mainly to clarify some of the things that were said. Mr. Dodd, one of the things you said yesterday was that only a few foundations were investigated by the Cox committee. Could you give us a figure on that?

Mr. Dodd. Offhand in any accurate terms, I do not think so, Mr. Hays, but compared to the number of foundations that are involved, the committee had very little time and relatively very few were studied. I should say probably 10.

Mr. HAYS. You think about 10?

Mr. Dodd. I think about 10. Yes, sir. They had questionnaires on almost 900 of them, Mr. Hays.
Mr. Hays. This might be a pertinent question. In view of the fact this committee has had more time, perhaps 3 or 4 times more, how many do you think we will investigate?

Mr. Dodd. We have gone about it a little differently. As I tried to outline in the statement yesterday, we took up the general concepts that fit all foundations, rather than attempt either by sampling or tabulation to arrive at conclusions from a specific number of foundations. We knew we could never cover the field and there is no pattern that runs through foundations in general. For example, we investigated, rather, we communicated with probably 60 or 70 of the largest ones, just to see whether or not any pattern was discernible and discovered that they vary so much, one from the other, that we could not go at it from that standpoint. There was no basis for sampling which would, in my judgment, end in any fair treatment of them.

Mr. Hays. To get back to my question, how many will we be able to cover, I do not expect you to be definite.

Mr. Dodd. In the ordinary sense that a deep investigation of a single foundation is concerned, I would say not more than 1 or 2.

Mr. Hays. Another thing you said yesterday in response to a question of mine was that you had received replies from 700 colleges. That is replies to a questionnaire that you had sent out. Can you tell me offhand how many of those colleges replying received any grants?

Mr. Dodd. No, sir, I cannot yet, because the tabulations have not been completed.

Mr. Hays. But they will be available later?

Mr. Dodd. They will be available in very complete form.

Mr. Hays. I have one more question. We discussed a little bit yesterday this matter of your statement that the foundations have not been asked why they did not support projects of a pro-American type.

Mr. Dodd. That was one of the criticisms.

Mr. Hays. Yes. I objected to that because I do not like that kind of question, but it might well be, since it is in the record, and since it is a statement that you attribute to the chairman of the committee, if we could have along with your other definitions the definitions of what you mean by pro-American.

The Chairman. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Hays. Yes.

The Chairman. Since that question came up, I have taken occasion to review the speech of mine to which it referred, and this is the language preceding the quotation of the 12 criticisms that were listed, and I am quoting:

The committee (referring to the previous so-called Cox committee) in its report to the House, House Report 2554, listed 12 complaints and criticisms of foundations in the form of the following questions.

And I simply quoted from what was contained in the report of the House committee. So that they were not original criticisms of mine.

By what I say now, however, I am not disavowing the fact that I might accept the criticisms. I just want to get the record straight with reference to what was the basis for the so-called 12 criticisms, which were raised yesterday. They were taken from the report to the House by the previous committee.
Mr. Hays. In looking this over rather hurriedly I do not see anything in there in exactly that same specific language. Why do we not include this paragraph or two in the hearing record?

The Chairman. That is entirely satisfactory to me, if it is satisfactory to Mr. Dodd.

Mr. Dodd. Yes, indeed.

Mr. Hays. Let us go back far enough to pick up the thought of it. In fact, I would say the beginning of the paragraph there, so we understand what it is.

The Chairman. Yes. It is so-called part 1, stating that the time and facilities were inadequate and goes down to part 2, I presume.

Mr. Hays. Yes.

The Chairman. So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to have the whole speech put in the record.

Mr. Hays. I have no objection.

The Chairman. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. Hays. Just make sure it is labeled your speech.

(The speech referred to is as follows:)

Mr. Reeder of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not say this lightly but in my opinion, the subject embraced in House Resolution 217, now before us, is one of the very important matters pending in Washington.

No one seems to know the number of tax-exempt foundations. There are probably 300,000 foundations and organizations which have great tax exemptions. These exemptions cover inheritances, income, and capital-gains taxes. The majority of these organizations are honestly and efficiently conducted. In the past, they have made a magnificent contribution to our national life. In the past, the majority have justified these tax exemptions, even though the probable cost to the taxpayers runs into the billions.

Certainly, the Congress has a right and a duty to inquire into the purposes and conduct of institutions to which the taxpayers have made such great sacrifices. In any event, the Congress should concern itself with certain weaknesses and dangers which have arisen in a minority of these. Some of these activities and some of these institutions support efforts to overthrow our Government and to undermine our American way of life. These activities urgently require investigation. Here lies the story of how communism and socialism are financed in the United States, where they get their money. It is the story of who pays the bill.

There is evidence to show there is a diabolical conspiracy back of all this. Its aim is the furtherance of socialism in the United States.

Communism is only a brand name for socialism, and the Communist state represents itself to be only the true form of socialism.

The facts will show that, as usual, it is the ordinary taxpaying citizen who foots most of the bill, not the Communists and Socialists, who know only how to spend money, not how to earn it.

The method by which this is done seems fantastic to reasonable men, for these Communists and Socialists seize control of fortunes left behind by capitalists when they die, and turn these fortunes around to finance the destruction of capitalism.

The Members of this House were amazed when they read just recently that the Ford Foundation, largest and newest of the tax-free trust funds, had just appropriated $15 million to be used to “investigate” the investigating powers of Congress, from the critical point of view.

The Members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which Judge Velde is chairman, have a great deal of personal knowledge, gained by hours spent in listening to sworn testimony from Communists and ex-Communists, and those who seek refuge in the fifth amendment, as to the extent of the treasonous conspiracy in our Nation.

No Congressman, who has gone through such experiences, could fail to be alarmed at the fact that $15 million from the fortune of the late Henry Ford, who probably hated communism more than any other American of his day, was to be expended to attack the Congress for inquiring into the nature and extent of the Communist conspiracy, on grounds that Congress was “abridging civil
liberties" of individuals by requiring them to answer whether or not they were Communists.

After all, no committee of Congress ever had a fund of $15 million to finance its inquiries, hire a staff, conduct its research, and print and circulate its findings. The House Committee on Internal Affairs has a budget of only $20,000 for this biennium—one-fiftieth of the sum the Ford Foundation proposed to expend for a refutation of its findings and those of other committees of the Congress engaged in similar pursuits.

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

During the last few weeks of the 82d Congress, a select committee of seven Members of the House conducted—pursuant to House Resolution 561—a somewhat hasty, limited, and abbreviated inquiry into the administration of certain tax-exempt foundations, including the huge Ford Foundation.

The House passed the resolution to create this select committee on April 4, 1952, and on July 2, 1952, by a vote of 247 to 99, voted $75,000 for the investigation. But actually, the counsel and the staff only started its work early in September; and thus, had only 4 months to carry out the task entrusted to it by Congress. Hearings were started late in November and only 17 days were devoted to hearing witnesses.

The select committee's work was further handicapped by the fact that its chairman, Hon. Eugene E. Cox, who was primarily responsible for the creation of the select committee, fell ill during the hearings and died before the committee submitted its final report to Congress. I was prevented from attending these hearings, as a minority member of the select committee, by serious illness in my family.

The select committee of the 82d Congress filed its report on January 1, 1953. In signing the report, I inserted a notation at its end with the distinct intention of introducing a resolution to continue the investigation of foundations and their subversive activities in this Congress. Pursuant to this notation, I introduced on April 23, 1953, a House Resolution 217, to create a committee by this Congress to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of tax-exempt foundations.

In introducing this resolution, I made some remarks on the work of the select committee of the 82d Congress. So that my colleagues may be acquainted with what was revealed by this select committee without reading nearly 800 pages of testimony and documents of the hearings, which has no index, I presented the following summary of what was disclosed:

First. The evidence presented at the hearings in this case by sworn testimony, indicated that at least in one case, even some of the trustees of a supposedly legitimate foundation, with over $10 million in assets, were Communists.

Second. The hearings disclosed that some officers of large and supposedly legitimate foundations were Communists.

Third. Numerous Communists have received grants from foundations chartered by the Congress of the United States, and in some instances, these Communists received grants from more than one foundation.

Fourth. Foundation grants have been given to many organizations designated by the Attorney General of the United States as Communists, or exposed by the investigations of committees of the Senate and House as subversive organizations subject to Communist Party discipline and control. A primary example of this is the Institute of Pacific Relations, exposed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as subject to Communist discipline, which has received more than $214 million from various foundations.

When introducing House Resolution 217, I listed some of the omissions and faults of the work of the select committee of the 82d Congress which must be remedied by this Congress. I feel that these omissions and faults should again be brought to the attention of the House, and that I should not only elaborate these faults and omissions, but should point out what the proposed new select committee of this Congress intends to do to remedy them.
I. TIME AND FACILITIES WERE INADEQUATE

The Committee To Investigate Foundations in the 82d Congress had completely inadequate time and facilities to do the job Congress entrusted to it. The committee, in its report to the House—House Report 2554—listed 12 complaints and criticisms of foundations in the form of the following questions:

1. Have foundation funds been diverted from the purposes established by the founders?
2. To what extent have foundations been infiltrated by Communists and Communist sympathizers?
3. Have foundation funds been channeled into the hands of subversive individuals and organizations; and if so, to what extent?
4. Have foundations supported or assisted persons, organizations, and projects which, if not subversive in the extreme sense of that word, tend to weaken or discredit the capitalistic system as it exists in the United States and to favor Marxist socialism?
5. Are trustees of foundations absentee landlords who have delegated their duties and responsibilities to paid employees of the foundations?
6. Do foundations tend to be controlled by interlocking directorates composed primarily of individuals residing in the North and Middle Atlantic States?
7. Through their power to grant and withhold funds, have foundations tended to shift the center of gravity of colleges and other institutions to a point outside the institutions themselves?
8. Have foundations favored internationalism?
9. To what extent are foundations spending American money in foreign countries?
10. Do foundations recognize that they are in the nature of public trusts and are, therefore, accountable to the public, or do they clothe their activities in secrecy and resist efforts to learn about them and their activities?
11. Are foundations being used as a device by which the control of great corporations are kept within the family of the foundation's founder or creator?
12. To what extent are foundations being used as a device for tax avoidance and tax evasion?

Before attempting to answer any of these questions, the report of the committee of the 82d Congress immediately points out: In dealing with these questions, the committee recognizes all too clearly that which must be apparent to any intelligent observer, namely, that it was "allotted insufficient" time for the magnitude of its task. [Quoted matter added.]

Obviously, the select committee had insufficient time to investigate fully these matters and make seasoned and timely recommendations to the House for legislative corrections of those evils which may exist and require serious consideration.

A special committee of this Congress, in accordance with House Resolution 217, would have sufficient time to undertake extensive research and investigation, for holding public hearings, and to report its findings and recommendations to Congress. It should be noted that despite its serious limitations, the select committee of the 82d Congress disclosed, as indicated by my previous four-point summary, substantial evidence regarding support given to Communists by foundations. If considerable evidence can be revealed by an incomplete investigation, which had so little time, it can be reasonably expected that a new committee, which has the time to explore the various ramifications of support given to Communists by foundations, will produce startling evidence.

II. EXCUSES CONCERNING GRANTS TO COMMUNISTS TOO READILY ACCEPTED

The select committee in the 82d Congress permitted the officers and trustees of foundations, exercising control over the disbursement of hundreds of millions of dollars in tax-exempt funds, to give the excuse, without being challenged for their veracity or the reasonableness of their statements, that foundation grants were made to Communist organizations and individuals unwittingly and through ignorance. A new special committee of the 83d Congress should ask these officers and trustees who testified to give evidence under oath that grants to Communists were, in fact, given unwittingly and if precautions are being taken so that the practice of making grants to subversives would be stopped.
III. TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS WERE NOT UNDER OATH

The committee to investigate foundations failed to require the officers and trustees of foundations who appeared before it as witnesses to give their testimony under oath. It did not require the representatives of the foundations to swear to the truth of the information they furnished the committee in answer to its questionnaires. The usual jurat was omitted. As a result of this, neither the Congress nor the people know whether these officers and trustees were telling the truth. For the sake of the foundations, this error should be rectified. In fact, under this practice some officers and trustees of foundations used the hearings as a soundingboard for their opinions and views rather than giving sworn testimony regarding questionable activities of their foundations. The only witnesses I can find who were actually sworn and placed under oath were 2 anti-Communists, 2 Department of Justice employees, and Ira Reid and Walter Gellhorn. Only 6 witnesses out of 40 were sworn. In view of these circumstances, much of the testimony has no more validity than common gossip, and no proper investigation has taken place. House Resolution 217, to create a special committee of the 83d Congress, explicitly charges the proposed committee to administer the oath so that the serious omission of the former committee in this respect would be remedied.

IV. ONLY A FEW FOUNDATIONS WERE INVESTIGATED

The committee of the 82d Congress had only time to consider evidence about a few foundations, and much of the information it received in answer to its questionnaires it did not have time to digest. It did not publish the voluminous but revealing answers to its questionnaires, which would have been valuable source material for anyone interested in what the foundations are doing. The select committee of this Congress would have time to digest, utilize, and publish the answers that the foundations have given to the questionnaires. In fact, House Resolution 217 specifically charges the Sergeant at Arms of the House to obtain the records of the former select committee and to make them available to the new committee.

V. PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF FOUNDATIONS WERE NOT INVESTIGATED

The select committee of the 82d Congress did not ask the representatives of the foundations to explain why they were indulging in propaganda, in view of large grants to organizations, projects, and persons which are promoting special interests or ideologies. These representatives were also not requested to explain activities of foundations which are, in fact, influencing legislation, inasmuch as their grants frequently have an outright political objective rather than an educational one.

Foundations, in their statement of policy, say that because of the legal exemption from income tax they cannot undertake to support enterprises carrying on propaganda or attempting to influence legislation. Such large foundations as Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, Sloan, and Field explicitly make this assertion in their published reports. Although foundations contend that they are promoting education, documentary evidence in my possession raises the question whether some large foundations are not actually engaged in propaganda.

Large foundations have a tremendous influence on the intellectual and educational life of our country. These foundations, possessing huge sums of untaxed wealth, seem to be dedicated to promoting specific views on such matters as the welfare state, the United Nations, American foreign policy, the nature of the American economy, and so on, rather than presenting objective and unbiased examination of these issues. Extensive evidence that I have examined shows that organizations primarily committed to a given ideology have received large grants from some big foundations over many years, and in numerous instances they have received such grants simultaneously from different foundations.

The assets of the large foundations are tax exempt and, therefore, ought to be spent on projects and organizations representing the views of all of the people and not only of a segment dedicated to a specific ideology. Since the activities of some of the large foundations appear to be biased in favor of a particular ideology, in reality they are indulging in propaganda calculated to influence legislation on both domestic and international matters. Under such circumstances, these foundations are violating their charters given to them by the
United States Congress and are betraying a public trust. I do not mean to imply that all foundations and all of their activities are not serving the public welfare. Some foundations by some of their grants have made great contributions to medical and technological research and have improved the health and general welfare of the people. But in the realm of the social sciences many foundations have not observed the highest standards of scholarship and ethics, which require the presentation of only factual and unslanted material. In fact, the want of ethics and the misrepresentations of some foundations are so low that a business corporation doing the same thing would be condemned by the Federal Trade Commission and held guilty of false advertising.

The foundations must be investigated in terms of the above-mentioned statements of fact, and should be given an opportunity to try to disprove them. The all-important question of the foundation's propaganda activities and attempts to influence legislation was completely ignored by the previous committee. However, House Resolution 217 explicitly authorizes the new committee to determine which foundations are using their resources for political purposes, propaganda, and attempts to influence legislation.

VI. FOUNDATIONS WERE NOT ASKED WHY THEY DON'T SUPPORT PRO-AMERICAN PROJECTS

A very important question, which is vital to the future of the American Republic, was never raised at all during the inquiry of the 82d Congress. This question is: Why do the pro-American projects find it so difficult to get grants from some of the foundations? Some large foundations must answer questions such as the following:

A. Have they financed studies regarding the excellence of the American Constitution, the importance of the Declaration of Independence, and the profundity of the philosophy of the Founding Fathers? And, if not, what is their excuse for neglecting the study of the basis of the American Republic?

B. Have they given support to the educational programs of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Catholic and Jewish veterans' organizations? And, if not, what is their explanation of the fact that they have been supporting agencies which are left of center and are internationalists, and not similarly favoring nationalist organizations?

C. Have they supported studies which are critical of the welfare state and socialism, and demonstrate the merits of the competitive private-property system? And, if not, what justification do they have for such negligence, while they have given numerous grants to persons and organizations which favor the welfare state and socialism?

D. Have they given grants to active anti-Communists and repentant Communists who have served the United States bravely and at great self-sacrifice by exposing the Communist conspiracy within our borders? And, if not, what are their reasons for not giving grants to such persons, while they have admittedly supported Communists and pro-Communists?

These large foundations must be given every opportunity to answer fully such questions to the committee of the 83d Congress and to submit evidence to the extent they are able, to prove that they have given support to pro-American projects and organizations. Should they not be able to do this, or should their contribution to such projects and organizations be very scanty, they must furnish a detailed justification for policies which overlook the preservation of the American Republic.

VII. EXTENSIVE EVIDENCE WAS NOT USED

The select committee of the 82d Congress did not use a great deal of the documentary evidence that was actually in its possession. Much of this extensive evidence showed subversive and un-American propaganda activities on the part of foundations, as well as outright political activities which attempted to influence legislation. It is obviously impossible for me to even summarize this voluminous evidence, but I feel that my colleagues should have at least a few examples of foundation-financed projects which are not only unscholarly, but of such nature as to aid and abet the Communist and Socialist movement. Since time does not permit the full documentation of these examples on the floor of this Chamber, the documentation will be presented as an appendix in a revision and extension of my remarks in the Record.
Important and extensive evidence concerning subversive and un-American propaganda activities of the Ford Foundation, which was available to the committee of the 82d Congress, was not utilized. Thus, the Ford Foundation—which is the wealthiest and the most influential of all foundations—was not actually investigated. In fact, the hearings on the Ford Foundation constituted merely a forum for the trustees and officers of this foundation to make speeches instead of answering specific questions regarding the many dubious grants made by them. Documentary evidence in my possession raises some serious questions regarding some of the officers and activities of the Ford Foundation. Again, time does not permit the presentation of this evidence regarding the Ford Foundation on the floor of this Chamber, therefore, the evidence will be given in the extension of my remarks in the Record.

I have submitted for the consideration of this Chamber an eight-point analysis of the omissions and faults of the work of the select committee of the 82d Congress and justification of the vital need to remedy these faults and omissions by a special committee of this Congress, to be created by House Resolution 217.

The matters to which I drew your attention are not only vital for the future of our Nation, but have also very practical consequences for the pocketbooks of every American taxpayer. Foundations actually operate by Federal subsidy through enjoying tax exemptions by authority of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code. Considerable revenue is lost to the Government by the tax exemption given to foundations. This revenue must be made up by augmented payments on the part of the average American taxpayer. Thus, tax-exempt large foundations may be abusing their status at the expense of the American taxpayer. This abuse of tax exemption is particularly relevant at this time, when we end up the fiscal year over $9 billion in the red and the Secretary of the Treasury has to go out and borrow this amount in cash to keep the Government operating.

Should the investigation disclose that some foundations, because of their activities, are not entitled to tax exemption, the Federal Government would actually obtain additional revenue in taxes, which, in turn, would lessen the tax burden of average citizens. I mention this fact because in view of the need for Government economy, and because Congress is already spending money for investigations, it is important to justify the creation of a new investigating committee in terms of what it may do to assist the Government to close loopholes in the tax laws.

The assets of tax-exempt foundations already run into billions. Tax-exempt foundations are bound to become more and more important due to the trend of putting more and more businesses in such trusts. The present laws governing the inheritance and transfer of property are creating a great many tax-exempt foundations whose assets are based on corporation securities. In view of this trend, the foundations may soon become the dominant owners of tax-free American business. Under such circumstances, a very large segment of American business will be under the control of a few trustees who will be also spending the large tax-exempt funds entrusted to them. Such a tremendous concentration of control and power would be in itself an unhealthy development and could easily be abused. This is still another reason why a careful investigation of the tax-exempt foundation situation is imperative.

The questionable activities of foundations are of such vital concern to the American people that in recent weeks two committees of the United States Senate—the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Committee on Government Operations—have announced their intention to look into the activities of foundations. Thus, it appears that my recommendation made in signing the report of the select committee of the 82d Congress was well taken. However, the Internal Security Subcommittee is specifically concerned with the subversion, and with matters directly affecting the internal security of the United States. Since the scope of the committee is limited, it would be impossible for it to investigate adequately the propaganda activities of foundations and their attempt to influence legislation. These activities are in a sense much more important than foundation grants to Communists. Similarly, the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is limited to subversion.

Moreover, these three committees, as well as the Ways and Means Committee or any other standing committee, are too preoccupied with other matters to be able to undertake a thorough and complete investigation of the complex and extensive
activities of numerous foundations. This, of course, is not intended as a reflection on the excellent work done by these committees, but is merely a statement that only a special committee of the House could do the job properly. Only a special committee would have the time, specialized staff, and facilities to undertake a thorough inquiry into the complex problems raised by the foundations’ activities, which require exclusive concentration on the part of an investigating body.

The House must undertake this task not only because its previous committee was not able to complete the job entrusted to it, but also because some foundations chose to interpret the report of that committee as a mandate for continued support of subversive and un-American propaganda activities and for undermining the investigative processes of Congress. For instance, the previously mentioned Ford Foundation grant makes available $15 million for investigating congressional methods of inquiries into communism and subversion. On the other hand, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has an appropriation of only $300,000; the Senate Committee on Government Operations, $200,000; the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, $200,000. It would seem that because of the large sum provided for this task, the Ford Foundation considers the investigation of Congress highly important. This intention of the Ford Foundation constitutes an insult not only to the Congress of the United States but the American people as well, since this body is the representatives of the American people. It is up to the House to meet such a challenge by establishing a new special committee for a thorough and complete investigation of the Ford and other foundations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that House Resolution 217 deserves the immediate and serious consideration of all those interested in the safety and welfare of our Nation and the dignity and accomplishments of our Congress.

PRO-COMMUNIST AND PRO-SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA FINANCED BY TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

A few examples of foundation-financed unscholarly projects which are, in fact, pro-Communist and pro-Socialist propaganda are the following:

A. The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences is slanted toward the left

The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, financed by tax-exempt funds, is considered a sort of supreme court of the social sciences. It is the final authority to which appeal is made regarding any question in the field of social sciences. The encyclopedia has influenced the thinking of millions of students and other persons who have consulted it since the appearance of its consecutive volumes during 1930-35. Alvin Johnson, who has been the moving spirit behind the encyclopedia and was its associate editor and is now president emeritus of the New School for Social Research, estimated that “there are at least half a million consultations of the encyclopedia every year, in spite of the fact that it is out of date.” The Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Russell Sage Foundations initially subsidized the encyclopedia to the amount of $600,000. The eventual cost of the encyclopedia was $1,100,000.

Although the preface of the encyclopedia says that it endeavored to include all important topics in the social sciences, it does not contain an article on the American Revolution, while it has articles on the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution.

Johnson, in his book Pioneer’s Progress, on pages 310-312, said that two of his assistant editors were Socialists and that another editor was a Communist. Johnson, in his great naivete, expected that these editors would not try to slant the encyclopedia in favor of communism and socialism. Yet articles dealing with subjects on the left were primarily assigned to leftists, while articles dealing with subjects on the right were also assigned primarily to leftists.

The article on bolshevism and Gosplan were written by Maurice Dobb, an economist sympathetic to the Soviet point of view. The articles on bureaucracy and Lenin were written by the Socialist Harold Laski. The articles on Fabianism and guild socialism were written by the Socialist G. D. H. Cole. The article on communism was written by Max Beer, of the University of Frankfort, who was a devoted, wholehearted disciple and enthusiastic biographer of Marx. The article on socialism was written by Socialist Oscar Jaszi. Otto Hoetzsch, of the University of Berlin, in his article on Government, Soviet Russia, says, among other things:
“National autonomy is thus guaranteed in theory and largely in practice as well; there is no legal discrimination between the rates of the Soviet Union * * *. The Soviet principle thus results in a parliamentary democracy functioning on the basis of indirect representation, but exclusively for the proletariat. Although the elections are subject to the pressure of Communist dictatorship, this worker’s democracy is not entirely a fiction.”

The following articles on the subjects dealing with the right were also written by leftists: The article on Middleman was written by Maurice Dobb. The articles on The Rise of Liberalism and Liberty were written by the Socialist Harold Laski. The article on Individualism and Capitalism was written by Charles Beard, who at the time he wrote this article was a leftist. Capitalism was written by Werner Sombart, a former Marxist who became eventually affiliated with the Nazis. Laissez Faire was written by the Socialist G. D. H. Cole, who refers to laissez faire as “unworkable’ and as “theoretically bankrupt.” He concludes:

“As a prejudice, laissez faire survives and still wields great power; as a doctrine deserving of theoretical respect, it is dead.”

The fair and scholarly procedure would have been to assign articles on subjects of the left to leftists and the articles on subjects of the right to believers in limited government and classical economies. Since this was not done, the encyclopedia is to a large extent propaganda for communism and socialism. It is indeed regrettable that this encyclopedia, financed by tax-exempt funds, should have sponsors which were listed in the preface of the first volume of the encyclopedia as follows:

American Anthropological Association
American Association of Social Workers
American Economic Association
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Sociological Society
American Statistical Association
Association of American Law Schools
National Education Association

The student or anyone else consulting the encyclopedia is thus misled, because, upon noting the sponsorship, he assumes that the encyclopedia is bound to be unbiased and is representative of the highest available scholarship.

B. The University of Chicago Roundtable is propaganda, not education

The University of Chicago Roundtable has received during the last 12 years over $600,000 as of 1950, from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The listening audience of these Sunday noon roundtable radio broadcasts has been estimated by its staff to be between 5 to 8 million persons. The roundtable claims to be an educational program, but this is doubtful. To be a genuinely educational program, everyone of the roundtable broadcasts dealing with controversial subjects should have participants who are truly representative of each side of the problem discussed. However, on the basis of my examination of transcripts of a great many of these roundtable discussions, it appears that in most cases the background and ideology of the participants were so similar that no genuine discussion of controversial subjects could take place and no fair presentation of all sides of these issues could be expected. And in many cases the ideology of the participants was leftist.

For example, the August 18, 1946, broadcast dealt with What Is Communism? The participants were Milton Mayer, a Socialist journalist, and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. of Harvard University and of Americans for Democratic Action, and Lynn A. Williams, vice president of the Stewart-Warner Corp. and subsequently vice president of the University of Chicago. Part of the discussion said:

"Mr. SCHLESINGER. It certainly would appall the editors of Pravda to know that you, an American capitalist, are teaching the Communist manifesto to your workers.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly did not sell it to them, because, try as I would to teach them all the merits of what Marx had to say, they would have none of it.

"Mr. MAYER. * * * socialism, as we see it operating under the labor government in Great Britain, has collective or social ownership of the means of production just as communism does. But socialism is still parliamentary, non-violent, gradualist, democratic, progressive."
In view of the opinion of participants of the broadcast, where is the capitalist, anti-Communist and anti-Socialist viewpoint? The March 14, 1948, broadcast, entitled “The Communist Manifesto, 1848 to 1948,” had the following participants: Herman Finer, a British Socialist, Abram Harris of the University of Chicago, and Malcolm Sharp, professor of law at the University of Chicago, who was associate attorney for the Rosenbergs, executed Communist spies, has numerous Communist-front affiliations, and was quoted by the Chicago Maroon as saying that Communist professors should not only be hired, but should be sought after.

The December 17, 1950, broadcast, entitled “Freedom in an Age of Danger,” had the following participants: Robert Horn, William R. Ming, Jr., and Louis Wirth, all of the University of Chicago. All three participants criticized the Attorney General’s list of Communist organizations and the McCarran Internal Security Act. Since no one who recognized the patriotic purpose of this list or of the act participated in the program, it was definitely unbalanced and slanted to the left.

The June 29, 1952, broadcast, a discussion of how to deal with Communist subversion, had as participants Daniel Bell of Columbia University, Dwight MacDonald, a journalist, and Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago. MacDonald attacked the Attorney General’s list of subversive organizations, Senators McCarthy and McCarran, and the Smith Act. Bell also attacked the Smith Act. Wright attacked Senator McCarthy and the McCarran committee. No one participated in the program who had anything to say in favor of Senators McCarthy and McCarran, the Smith Act, or the Attorney General’s list of subversive organizations.

I also found that on such controversial issues as the human-rights program of the United Nations, American foreign policy, and political and economic questions, little chance was given to conservative and nationalist views. Had the ideological balance of the program’s participants alternated from week to week, we would not be forced to the suspicion that this was a propaganda sounding board.

C. The citizenship education project is slanted toward the left

Between 1949 and 1951, the Carnegie Corp. has granted to the Teacher’s College of Columbia University for its citizenship-education project the sum of $1,417,550. Examination of this project indicates that, like the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences and the University of Chicago roundtable broadcasts, it is slanted toward the left. One of the main accomplishments of the citizenship education project was a card file of 1,046 index cards which are sold to high schools for use of civics teachers. Each of the cards contains a summary and annotation of a book or pamphlet on political and social issues for the teacher’s guidance in presenting a social problem to a class.

Examination of the 1950 card file shows that the great majority of books and other items selected for summary and annotation are leftist, liberal, and internationalist in their viewpoint and only a few are conservative and nationalist in their outlook. Actually there are only about 2 dozen cards which refer to material that is conservative in outlook—this is a very small percentage out of over 1,000 cards. Thus, the teacher who uses this card file has very few items to contrast against the liberal, leftwing, and internationalist items in the file.

In addition, leftist materials in the card file are most often annotated as “factual,” and the few rightist materials are most often annotated as “opinionated.” For example, card No. 249 refers to We Are the Government, by Elting and Gossett, and describes it as “factual, entertaining, descriptive, illustrative,” while the book in reality is pro-Communist. Card No. 249 refers to A Mask for Privilege, by Carey McWilliams, and is described as “historical, descriptive.” McWilliams is a notorious Communist. Card No. 901 refers to Building for Peace at Home and Abroad, by Maxwell Stewart, and is described as “factual, dramatic.” Stewart has been named as a Communist. Card No. 902 refers to The American, by Howard Fast, another notorious Communist who actually went to jail for contempt of this House, and is described as “historical, biographical.”

The following are examples of how conservative works are torn down by the annotations: Card No. 800 refers to The Road to Serfdom, by Frederick A. Hayek, and is described as “factual, strongly opinionated, logical.” Card No. 730 refers to Be Glad You’re a Real Liberal, by Earl Bunting, director of the National Association of Manufacturers, and is described as “opinionated, biased, descrip-
While the works of Communists and fellow travelers are often referred to as factual, this pamphlet by Bunting is called opinionated. In addition, on the card, where the summary is given, the synopsis starts out by saying:

"Meaning of the word 'liberal' (as defined by the National Association of Manufacturers)."

While Communists and fellow travelers are not identified as such, this item is clearly labeled as to its political orientation. I shudder to think about the fate of those thousands of schoolchildren who are given this kind of misleading instruction, financed by a tax-exempt foundation.

D. The public affairs pamphlets edited by a Communist

The public affairs pamphlets have received support in the amounts of several hundreds of thousands of dollars from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. These pamphlets are prominently displayed and sold in many public libraries and are frequently used in high schools. Many hundreds of thousands of copies of these pamphlets are distributed annually. For numerous years Maxwell S. Stewart has been the editor of the public affairs pamphlets, which are published by the Peacemakers committee. He has been an associate editor of the Moscow News, and has taught in Moscow. Dr. Louis F. Budenz has identified Stewart as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony given before the McCarran committee.

The House Military Subcommittee charged in 1949 that the publications of the Public Affairs Committee, Inc., "are recommended by the Affiliated Schools for Workers"—communist—and sold by Communist bookstores." George Seldes, in his pro-Communist publication called In Fact, offered a free public affairs pamphlet as a bonus for renewal subscription for In Fact. Seldes said, in part:

"These pamphlets prepared by the Public Affairs Committee are, though popularly written, authoritative. You will find them an excellent source for dependable information."

One of the public affairs pamphlets, entitled "The Races of Mankind," by Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish, published in 1943, was banned by the USO and the Army. Ruth Benedict had Communist-front organization affiliations, and recently Weltfish refused to answer the question whether she has been a Communist, before a Senate committee. Maxwell Stewart has written numerous pamphlets, such as Industrial Price Policy, which is slanted toward the left; the American Way, which casts grave doubt on the value of the free-enterprise system; Income and Economic Progress, which follows a similar line of argument; and the Negro in America, in which he lands such undoubted Communists as Paul Robeson, Langston Hughes, and W. E. B. DuBois, and does not consider anti-Communist Negroes as outstanding Negroes. Charles Edward Amory Winslow's pamphlet, Health Care for Americans, was recommended as supplementary reading in the Jefferson School of Social Science. Carey McWilliams, who has been named a Communist, also write such pamphlets as Small Farm and Big Farm, What About Our Japanese-Americans. Louis Adamic, an admitted Communist, wrote a pamphlet called America and the Refugees.

E. The NEA and PEA propagandize for socialism

The National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association have received major contributions from the General Education Board, one of the foundations dispersing Rockefeller tax-exempt money. The National Education Association and Progressive Education Association are very important because through them the foundations are reaching right into the public schools and are affecting millions of schoolchildren. By 1947, some $8 million was spent by the General Education Board on new educational goals and procedures, and among others the National Education Association and Progressive Education Association were generously supported in educational reorganization and experimentation. During the 1930's these 2 educational organizations received particularly large sums of money, and by 1940 the National Education Association received a total of $456,100 and the Progressive Education Association a total of $1,685,941. Just what kind of educational reorganization and experimentation was supported by the tax-exempt funds of the General Education Board?

The Progressive Education Association—PEA—in its official magazine called Progressive Education, on page 257 of the November 1947 issue, had a lead article by John J. DeBoer, president, American Education Fellowship—the American Education Fellowship is the present name of the PEA. DeBoer has extensive Communist-front affiliations. In his lead article, DeBoer said that the 1947 con-
vention of the American Education Fellowship—AEF—had such speakers as Langston Hughes and W. E. B. DuBois, whose affiliation with communism has already been indicated, and Curtis McDougall, who was a senatorial candidate on the Communist-dominated Wallace-Taylor-Kremlin ticket.

In the same magazine, on page 268, there is an article by Theodore Brameld, entitled "A New Policy for AEF." This article is a resolution for the American Education Fellowship, which was adopted at the 1947 convention to which DeBoer referred. The platform proposed by Brameld says on page 260 of the magazine:

"The two great constructive purposes which should now govern the American Education Fellowship follow directly from this brief analysis. They are:

"I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system, a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional free enterprise: * * * a system in which the interests, wants, and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are owned and controlled by the people; a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned 'public' utilities. * * *

"II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; * * * an order in which international economic planning of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards, is practiced, parallel with the best standards of individual nations * * * an order in which world citizenship thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

Is this an educational program or is it propaganda in favor of socialism and world government?

The ideology of the National Education Association was stated in 1934 by William Givens, who at that time was superintendent of schools at Oakland, Calif., and subsequently became executive secretary of the NEA, a post which he held for 18 years. Under the title "Education for the New America," in the Proceedings of the 72d Annual Meeting of the NEA, Givens said in 1934:

"This report comes directly from the thinking together of more than 1,000 members of the department of superintendents (school superintendents). * * *

"A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the owners, must be subjected to a large amount of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society, the credit agencies, the basic industries, and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership.

"Hence they will join in creating a swift nationwide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interests of all of the people."

Is this an educational program or is it propaganda in favor of socialism? And why should the General Education Board, whose funds came from Rockefeller, who made his money under the free-enterprise system, support such propaganda?

In 1940 the General Education Board gave $17,500 to the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies, both divisions of the National Education Association, to prepare several teaching units which would provide teachers with resource material on social problems. One of these units was prepared by Oscar Lange and Abba P. Lerner and was called the American Way of Business. Both Lange and Lerner have been socialists for a long time, and Lange eventually renounced his American citizenship in order to become the Kremlin's Ambassador for Communist Poland to the United Nations. The American Way of Business, which was published by the National Education Association, is not an analysis of American business, but a propaganda tract for communism. Why should tax-exempt funds be used to enable two Socialists to write a propaganda piece on American business enterprise?

I also want to raise the significant question whether it is a coincidence that during the time when the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association received particularly large grants and the American Way of Business was financed, the director for General Education, the division of the
General Education Board under which these grants were made, was Robert J. Havighurst, who has extensive affiliations with Communist fronts.

The five examples I have given of the use of tax-exempt funds are just indications of the kind of problems which a committee of the 83d Congress should thoroughly explore. These few examples are in my mind sufficient to justify a thorough inquiry. These examples do not involve just a grant of a few thousand dollars to a person who happens to be a Communist, but involve giving millions of dollars for many years to pro-Socialist and pro-Communist propaganda projects that are vitally affecting our children in our schools and have a tremendous influence over the public mind.

**SUBVERSIVE AND PRO-COMMUNIST AND PRO-SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF THE FORD FOUNDATION**

To illustrate the dubious staff and the many subversive and propaganda activities of the Ford Foundation, I offer the following examples from the extensive documentary evidence which I have in my possession:

1. **Doubtful staff of Ford Foundation**

   A. The record of Messrs. Berelson and Moseley: Bernard Berelson is the director of the Ford Foundation's Behavioral Sciences Division, which has just been allotted $3,500,000 for the creation of a center for advanced study in behavioral sciences, which will consider social relations in human behavior. Berelson, while on the faculty of the University of Chicago, served on a committee to welcome the Red dean of Canterbury, the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, world renowned apologist for communism who sports a Soviet decoration for his work in behalf of his Kremlin masters. The welcoming committee for the Red dean of Canterbury was organized under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, an agency which has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States. The East European fund was established by the Ford Foundation, is financed by it and deals with issues relating to the Soviet Union and its European satellites, and particularly with the settlement and adjustment of Soviet refugees who have come to the United States. The president of this fund is Philip E. Moseley, who is also director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University. Some years ago Professor Moseley made the following evaluation of the Soviet Union in a pamphlet he wrote for the Foreign Policy Association, also supported by foundations:

   "Over the long run, great numbers of people will judge both the Soviet and American systems, not by how much individual freedom they preserve but by how much they contribute, in freedom or without it, to develop a better livelihood and a greater feeling of social fulfillment."

   Garet Garett, editor of American Affairs, said that this is straight Communist Party ideology:

   "It means only that pure Communist ideology may be thus imparted by Columbia University's Russian Institute through the Foreign Policy Association."

   Philip C. Jessup and Ernest J. Simmons are members of the administrative board of the Russian Institute at Columbia University, which is headed by Mr. Moseley. Professor Simmons is the editor of a book entitled "U. S. R.," which grew out of studies at Cornell University that were financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. At least 15 of the 20 contributors of this symposium edited by Simmons are pro-Soviet and none of the other 5 has ever been known as critics of the Soviet Union. Moreover, Professor Simmons has affiliations with Communist fronts.

   B. The record of Mr. Gladieux: Another officer of the Ford Foundation is Bernard Louis Gladieux, former secretary to and protege of Henry Wallace. Gladieux entered Federal service in 1938 in Chicago with the Federal Works Agency, transferred to the Labor Department, Wage and Hour Administration, from there to the Bureau of the Budget, then to War Production Board, leaving the WPB on November 22, 1944, to go with UNRRA. On March 2, 1945, Henry Wallace was sworn in as Secretary of Commerce, and on April 30, 1945, he named Bernard L. Gladieux as his executive assistant. Gladieux remained in the Department of Commerce until October 1, 1951, when he was appointed as an officer of the Ford Foundation in charge of the New York office and as assistant to the president of the Ford Foundation.

   I have been advised by a reliable and responsible source that Bernard L. Gladieux, while in Government service in Washington, had in addition to official...
association in the ordinary course of business, social contacts with the following persons: William W. Remington, Michael J. Lee, Harry Samuel Magdoff, Philip M. Hauser. Magdoff was identified before a committee of the House in 1948 as a member of a Soviet spy ring. He recently appeared before the Senate Internal Security Committee and dived behind the fifth amendment when asked the $64 question. William W. Remington is in jail serving a term for denying that he was a Communist Party member while in the secret cell of Communists in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Michael J. Lee was fired from the Department of Commerce for disloyalty. Dr. Philip M. Hauser, a former professor at the University of Chicago, who wrote pro-Russian speeches for Henry Wallace, has not as yet been called as a witness by the committees who have investigated him and his activities.

Advice was also furnished to me that no investigation of Bernard L. Gladieux' loyalty had even been requested or made while he was in Federal service. But a review of hearings held pursuant to Senate Resolution 290, Sixty-First Congress, 2d session, by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, certainly indicated that Gladieux' loyalty should have been investigated. A Member of the Senate took the witness stand before the committee and, after first being duly sworn as a witness, testified as follows:

"I understand that one Bernard L. Gladieux, of the Secretary's office, who is a protege of Henry Wallace, has exercised the power of nullifying decisions of the so-called loyalty board. In other words, if it found he was cleared of actual disloyalty but recommended as a poor security risk, not a good security risk, then someone overruled that finding."

Now, I am informed that it could be, probably is, Mr. Gladieux. Mr. Gladieux never appeared before the Senate committee to answer the charges against him which were made on March 28, 30, and April 4, 1950. However, Mr. Gladieux was a witness on February 27, 1950, before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, of which the gentleman from New York, Mr. Rooney, was chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Flood, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Preston, the late Hon. Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Cliff Clevenger, were members.

At page 2341 the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rooney) stated:

"The story this year is that the Department of Commerce has taken the place of the State Department; that the Department of Commerce is the outfit in Government which is honeycombed with people belonging to the Communist Party."

Mr. Flood, on page 2346, made the following statement:

"You are executive assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, and after 2 hours of examination and cross-examination here I have not the faintest idea of your personal attitude toward this kind of case, which is a borderline case, or frankly on a case where anything else is concerned. I am very unhappy about your own point of view. Do you appreciate that?"

On page 2362, Mr. Gladieux, as the hearings were about to close, made a lengthy statement, to which the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rooney), on page 2363, replied as follows:

"That is all so much nice language. To me it does not mean a thing. You have come up here this afternoon to acquaint us with the situation in the Department of Commerce. The results have been nil. We have not had the cooperation from you that we have had from the Department of State.

"You refused to take us into your confidence with regard to these things, and I have tried to handle it in an amicable way so that if questions were raised on the floor we might have the answers to them. You have reacted in the other direction, away from us. So now we are far apart, and we will have to stay that way. There is nothing that I can see that we can do about it."

"In 1950 the junior Senator from Nevada (Mr. Malone) rose on this floor to suggest that certain persons in the Department of Commerce were dangerous security risks."

Senator Mundt went on to say that a committee was created to investigate the charges made by Senator Malone, but that "after 3 or 4 days' hearing, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer rushed up to the Hill and agreed to fire the two men whom I had drawn into the net—Lee and Remington—if the hearing could be stopped." Continuing, Senator Mundt stated:

"I did not hear that agreement, but I know it was made, because I could never get the committee together again.

"I was really after Mr. Gladieux, secretary to the Secretary of Commerce, and"
Mr. Blaisdell, who was and had been during the troublesome period in China in charge of that matter under my attack. They, Mr. Gladieux and Mr. Blaisdell, subsequently quit for reasons best known to themselves—they knew we were on their trail.

"I believe that is why they quit."

Is it possible that the trustees of this huge foundation never made any investigation of Mr. Gladieux or checked with the FBI to determine his loyalty to his country?

B. The record of Robert Maynard Hutchins: The keyman in the Ford Foundation is Robert M. Hutchins, formerly chancellor of the University of Chicago. His formal position with the Ford Foundation is that of associate director, but, in effect, he has been running the foundation. While Hoffman was the president, Hutchins' prominent position was made possible by the fact that Hoffman considers Hutchins as the greatest living educator and literally worships him. With the resignation of Hoffman as president of the foundation, H. Rowan Gaither, a San Francisco attorney, became president of the foundation. But Gaither is a mere figurehead and Hutchins is still running the foundation. Gaither has accepted the presidency only for a year, and thus Hutchins may yet become the formal head of the organization. But even without such a formal presidency, in view of the facts stated above, Hutchins in effect runs the Ford Foundation.

In his capacity as the policymaker of the Ford Foundation, Hutchins possesses a completely unprecedented financial power over education, the humanities, and the social sciences. By giving or withholding grants, Hutchins is in position to influence his views into any aspect of American intellectual life. Therefore, it is essential to inquire about Hutchins' views and his record concerning the Communist menace.

Testifying in 1949 under oath before the Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission inquiry into subversive activities at the University of Chicago, Hutchins admitted that he was a sponsor of the October 1948 meeting of the bureau on academic freedom of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Regarding the Methodist Federation of Social Action, Hutchins has said:

"You are advancing the cause of true Americanism."

The first page of the publication of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, where this quotation appears, asserts that the federation rejects the profit motive and favors a classless society. Does Hutchins think that such an ideology constitutes true Americanism?

The University of Chicago, under Hutchins' administration, has distinguished itself as the only institution of higher learning in America which has been investigated five times for immoral or subversive activities. These investigations are: First, Illinois State Senate inquiry, 1935; second, University of Chicago alumni committee, 1947-48; third, University of Chicago board of trustees, 1948; fourth, Illinois Seditious Activities Investigation Commission, March-June 1949; fifth, Investigation and subsequent report to the Illinois Legislature by State Representative G. William Horsley, Springfield, 1949. The first investigation was a whitewash; the second requested the resignation of Hutchins; the third held its deliberations in secret; and the fourth and fifth did not clear the university. Both the majority report of the Illinois Seditious Activities Commission and the independent report of Representative Horsley condemned the university's administration severely and asked the legislature to deny tax exemption.

At the hearings of the seditious activities commission of the Illinois Legislature at the 1949 investigation of the University of Chicago, Hutchins, after being sworn in, testified as follows:

"The subpena which I have received summons me to testify concerning subversive activities at the University of Chicago. This is a leading question, and the answer is assumed in the question. I cannot testify concerning subversive activities at the University of Chicago because there are none."

At the same hearings, Hutchins was asked the following question and made the following response:

"Question. The records which I shall present through other witnesses show, in summary, that some sixty-odd persons listed in the latest available directory of the University of Chicago as professors or professors emeritus have been affiliated with 135 Communist-front organizations in 465 separate affiliations. Is that not something for which the university might well be alarmed?"

"Answer. I don't see why."
In the course of the same investigation it was disclosed that there were Communist and pro-Communist student organizations on Hutchins' campus. The student Communist club was freely admitted by Chancellor Hutchins, who said "the club has not sought to subvert the government of this State."

In his testimony before the same investigation, Hutchins stated that "it is not established that it is subversive to be a Communist."

It must be noted that this testimony was given more than a year after the start of the Berlin airlift.

At the same investigation Hutchins was asked the following question to which he made the following response:

"Question. Do you consider that the Communist Party in the United States comes within the scope of a clear and present danger?

"Answer. I don't think so."

Hutchins was also asked: "Are you aware that the Communist-front organization is a part of the Communist movement, just as much as the party itself?

"No."

Then he was asked: "You haven't attempted to make a study of the Communist Party?

"No, I haven't." Hutchins replied.

He was also asked: "Is there any doubt that the Communist Party is a conspiratorial fifth column operated in the interest of a foreign state?

"I am not instructed on this subject," Hutchins answered. Such was the attitude of Hutchins toward communism after the start of the Berlin airlift, and at a time when the United States was spending billions of dollars abroad to fight communism.

On June 25, 1951, the Daily Worker, on page 2 under the headline "Ford Foundation Head Joins Blast at High Cost O.K. for Smith Act," the following item appeared under a Chicago dateline of June 24:

"Prof. Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago and now associate director of the Ford Foundation, joined with Osmond K. Fraenkel, noted New York attorney, opposing the Supreme Court decision upholding the conviction of the 11 convicted Communist Party leaders. Dr. Hutchins said that the majority decision indicates that we are at last up against a great crisis in this country. He spoke of the ruling as a complete reversal of earlier precedents set by the high Court * * *. Speaking here at an American Civil Liberties Union meeting in his honor, Dr. Hutchins declared that 'it may now become more difficult for us to take some of the positions we have in the past.' He referred to his stated willingness to hire Communists as university professors. Hutchins told the Illinois Legislature that he would even take back into the university faculty Oscar P. Lange, who, as I pointed out before, renounced his American citizenship to become Moscow's Ambassador for Communist Poland to the United Nations. 'We may even have to decide whether we must violate the law in order to remain in conformity with our convictions,' he said."

Hutchins wrote the introduction to a book entitled "Character Assassination," published in 1950, which was written by Jerome Davis, who has been in more than 40 Communist-front organizations. Hutchins also wrote the foreword to a book entitled "Political and Civil Rights in the United States," published in 1953 by Thomas I. Emerson and David Haber. Louis Budenz, testifying under oath, named Emerson as a member of the Communist Party, a charge which Emerson denied. But Emerson has been in a large number of Communist fronts and was head of the Communist-controlled National Lawyers Guild, the legal arm of the Communist Party in the United States. There is no doubt that the National Lawyers Guild is a subversive organization, and it has been cited officially as much.

Hutchins, whose attitudes I have illustrated, is the key man in the Ford Foundation, which owns outright some 374,000 shares of stock of the 400,000 shares of stock in the Ford Motor Co., one of the biggest industrial giants in the whole world. The stockholdings, according to Henry Ford II, amount to 50 percent of the outstanding stock of the Ford Motor Co. Recently the New York Times magazine pointed out that the Ford Foundation is the "virtual owner of the gigantic Ford Motor Co." According to Paul Hoffman, then president of the Ford Foundation, the Ford Foundation had made grants of $72 million in 2 years, 1951-52.

So it may readily be seen that a grant of $15 million, to protect the civil liberties of Communists and to investigate the Congress of the United States, from the tax-exempt millions of the income from the stock of the late Henry
Ford, a man of sterling character and unblemished reputation whose industrial genius helped build America, and whose faith in our institutions and our American way of life was never shaken, is really peanuts to the Ford Foundation which deals out grants with a lavish hand, both to the left and the right, mostly left. Here is the last of the great American industrial fortunes, amassed in a competitive, free market place in the last 50 years, being used to undermine and subvert our institutions, $15 million being set aside to investigate the Congress of the United States. What a sad tribute to the man we all respected and loved, Henry Ford. He was a symbol of outstanding commonsense and public virtue. Never would he have approved such tactics by the Ford Foundation, to which he left his fortune estimated at over a half-billion dollars in stock in the Ford Motor Co., the earnings of which go directly into the tax-exempt Ford Foundation.

In view of the attitude of Hutchins toward communism, it is not at all surprising that the Ford Foundation has made some highly dubious grants. I offer the following examples for your consideration:

**2. Ford Foundation's support of communism and Socialist propaganda**

A. Grant to aid Communists and to discredit their investigation: I have already referred to the $15 million grant to investigate the Congress of the United States and its committees. In a recent broadcast Eric Sevareid, a CBS commentator who has long opposed congressional investigations of communism, and openly defended John Stewart Service, 1 of the 6 persons arrested by the FBI in the Amerasia case, enthusiastically praised this $15 million fund and called Hutchins “the driving spirit behind this new crusade.” There can be no question that Hutchins is behind this new Ford Foundation project, for he has consistently expressed his concern for the civil liberties of Communists. Since we know Hutchins' attitude toward communism and we know that his conception of civil liberties is similar to that of the Communists, we can be sure that the new Ford Foundation project will aid the Communist conspiracy and will try to discredit all those who fight it. This will undoubtedly happen, for the chairman and the president of the new Ford Foundation project are mere figureheads and fronts and Hutchins is dominating the project.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Jackson, said on this floor that “Needless to state, the investigations proposed by the Ford Foundation will be greeted with enthusiastic approval from Shanghai to East Berlin. The approval will not be given voice by the silent millions of captive peoples, but by the commissars and their agents.”

He aptly characterized this 15 million project by saying that it “will serve only to lend additional aid and comfort to the Communist Party.” The American Legion's newsletter, the Firing Line, stated that this project is regarded by many anti-Communists as “a huge slush fund for a full-scale war on all organizations and individuals who have ever exposed and fought Communists.”

In passing, it should be pointed out that the Ford Foundation's effort to discredit legislative inquiries into Communists activities is not unique inasmuch as the Rockefeller Foundation has undertaken, on a smaller scale, a project with the same intention. In 1947 the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of $110,000 to Cornell University to conduct a study on civil liberties and the control of subversive activities. This project resulted in the publication of a series of books attacking legislative investigations of Communists activities, volumes full of typical pro-Communist distortion. One of the authors of these volumes was Prof. Walter Gellhorn, of Columbia University, who has Communist-front affiliations and who has explicitly demanded the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Recently Gellhorn was identified, in testimony given under oath, as a member of the Communist Party, a charge which he denied.

It should also be pointed out that at least one foundation has used its funds not only to discredit the investigation of Communists, but to support directly Communists fronts and to aid Communists on trial.

On September 24, 1942, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dims], in a speech in the House, showed that the Robert Marshall Foundation of New York was supporting Communist fronts and Communist causes, and he listed the actual disbursements made from the estate of the late Robert Marshall, a Red New Dealer from the Department of Agriculture, who left an estate of over a million and a half dollars to the foundation and named trustees, most of whom were radicals and Reds. This is the same foundation which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Velde], in a speech in the House on October 17, 1951, exposed
as being the provided of the sum of $20,000 in attorney fees to Joe Rauh, chairman of the executive committee of Americans for Democratic Action and attorney for the convicted perjurer and Soviet spy, William Walter Remington, who is now in jail serving time for betraying his country in wartime and falsely denying Communist Party membership while in a secret cell of the Communist Party in the Tennessee Valley Authority. One of the trustees of the Robert Marshall Foundation was and is Edwin S. Smith. This is the same Smith that President Roosevelt put on the National Labor Relations Board. On May 21, 1953, this same Edwin S. Smith was summoned before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and when asked if he was a Communist, he immediately dived behind the fifth amendment and claimed privilege.

B. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of Americans for Democratic Action employed by Ford Foundation; According to page 34 of the 1951 Annual Report of the Fund for Adult Education, a subsidiary of the Ford Foundation, the TV-Radio Workshop, administered by the fund for adult education, hired Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., as commentator for a series of 12 weekly broadcasts. Schlesinger, of course, is a big shot in the ADA. The following public statements by Schlesinger are worthy of note:

In 1946 Schlesinger wrote that the present system in the United States makes "even freedom-loving Americans look wistfully at Russia."

On December 11, 1949, on page 3 of the New York Times, Schlesinger said: "I happen to believe that the Communist Party should be granted freedom of political action and that Communists should be allowed to teach in universities, so long as they do not disqualify themselves by intellectual distortions in the classrooms."

On August 18, 1948, on a University of Chicago Round Table broadcast entitled "What Is Communism?" Schlesinger said: "Surely the class struggle is going on in America. I would agree completely with the Communists on that."

Schlesinger was then asked: "Do you mean that capitalism is dead everywhere except in the United States?"
He replied: "It is dead."

In answer to the question, "What did it die of?", he said: "It died of itself. There is much to what the Marxists used to say about capitalism containing the seeds of its own destruction."

Schlesinger, in a public-affairs pamphlet of 1950, entitled "What About Communism?" criticized the Committee on Un-American Activities and said that it was more interested in slandering and smearing liberals than in exposing real Communists. He said: "The methods of the witchhunt, especially when employed from the ambush of congressional immunity, are sometimes almost as dangerous to democracy as the methods of the Communists themselves."

He also said: "With the formation of Americans for Democratic Action, liberals who believed in the non-Communist left acquired an organization of their own."

As the gentleman from California [Mr. Jackson] pointed out concerning the grant of $15 million to investigate the House and Senate, the money might have been better spent by the Ford Foundation to help ferret out and expose the subversion in our schools and our universities, or the Ford Foundation might have done something about the Ford plants in the Detroit area which the gentleman from California described as a seething mass of Communist conspiracy and intrigue, where thousands of unsuspecting and loyal American workers were being duped and held in a tight grip by the Communist leadership of Local 600 of the United Automobile Workers of America. Local 600 is the largest labor union in the world and has, or did have, some 60,000 members, and still it is classified as just one local union of the United Automobile Workers of America. In February, March, and April, 1952, the House Committee on Un-American Activities held open public hearings in Detroit, and witness after witness took the stand and testified under oath as to the Communist domination and control of local 600 by the Kremlin. So the committee issued subpoenas for the officers of local 600 at the Ford plants and brought them before the committee and asked them if they were Communists. Not a single officer of local 600 answered the question. They took refuge in the fifth amendment, refusing to answer on the grounds to do so would incriminate them. Yet they still work for Ford.

Now you would think that when a congressional committee, a committee of this House, goes to Detroit to hold hearings regarding Communists in the Ford plants that the Ford Motor Co. would assist. Exactly the opposite was true. Not
only did they offer the committee no assistance, but when requested to cooperate with the committee in ferreting out and exposing these agents of the Kremlin in the Ford plants, they refused.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities got absolutely no help from the Ford Motor Co., but, even worse, the national leadership of the United Automobile Workers headed by Walter Reuther, now president of the CIO, was no better off. They finally had to pass an amendment to the union constitution at the national convention, held in Atlantic City recently, to authorize the national officers to remove these Communists from the domination and control of local 600.

So, instead of the Ford Foundation voting $15 million to investigate Congress, they might well clean up their own backyard first, their plants and the Ford Foundation, too.

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

C. Grant to an organization supposedly controlled by a Communist: I have been advised by a reliable source that an organization which has received substantial grants not only from the Ford Foundation, but also from the Carnegie Corp., is supposed to be dominated by a Communist who dictates the policy of the organization. It would be unfair for me to provide specific information on this matter until witnesses are put on the stand to give their testimony under oath.

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

It would be interesting to find out just what kind of philosophical conclusions Professor Adler will arrive at with reference to the virtues of patriotism and government based on unalienable rights of men.

E. Grant to promote socialism: According to the Ford Foundation Annual Report for 1951, the foundation has granted $50,000 to the Advertising Council, Inc., for a restatement of the principles of American society. The council's public policy committee includes, in addition to Paul Hoffman, former president of the Ford Foundation, and Chester C. Davis, its associate director, several persons who have Communist-front affiliations.

The Miracle of America, a publication of the Advertising Council, Inc., states that the public-policy committee of the Advertising Council approves and endorses the economic-education program of the council. This program is described in the Miracle of America under the title "Platform for All Americans." This platform starts out like a firecracker Fourth of July patriotic speech and then turns out to be a rewrite of the British Labor—Socialist—Party program. Adoption of this platform would guarantee the success of any Socialist legislation in America. The Miracle of America, containing this platform, has been circulated by hundreds of thousands by the Advertising Council as a part of its campaign of public information. Is this an educational program or is it propaganda in favor of socialism?

F. Grant to pro-Communist India: The Ford Foundation has singled out India for some of its largest grants and is spending millions of dollars in that nation. Is there some special significance to singling out India for large Ford Foundation grants, in view of the fact that the head of the Indian Government is more sympathetic to the Soviet Union than toward the United States, and that he wants the United States to recognize Red China and admit that Communist nation, which is slaughtering Americans in Korea, to the United Nations? I am greatly concerned with what is being done with the Ford Foundation millions in India. That nation is a potential ally of the Soviet Union, and if the Ford Foundation projects in any way are fostering a pro-Soviet attitude in India, the consequences may be disastrous for the future of America.

The stakes are very high, for if India should definitely become a Soviet ally, the power of the Kremlin's bloc would be immeasurably increased. My fear of what the Ford Foundation might be doing in India is increased by the fact that in the case of China the activities of the Rockefeller Foundation in that
nation helped, instead of hindered, the advance of communism. The late gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Cox, on August 1, 1951, made the following statement in this Chamber, with reference to the guilt of the Rockefeller Foundation for the triumph of the Communists in China:

"The Rockefeller Foundation, whose funds have been used to finance individuals and organizations whose business it has been to get communism into the private and public schools of the country, to talk down America and to play up Russia, must take its share of the blame for the swing of the professors and students in China to communism during the years preceding the successful Red revolution in China. For two generations, the Rockefeller Foundation played a guiding role in higher education in China. Over a period of 32 years $45 million of Rockefeller money was expended in China, most of it going to Chinese institutions of higher learning. If the Rockefeller fund spenders had had even an elementary conception of what was going on among the Chinese teachers and students, they would have taken steps to halt the stampede of the Chinese colleges to communism. When the crisis of the Chinese revolution came, it was the student and teacher element, educated largely with Rockefeller money, who were the backbone of the Red success. Our boys are now suffering and dying in Korea, in part, because Rockefeller money encouraged trends in the Chinese colleges and schools which swung China's intelligentsia to communism."

What has happened once can happen again, and I am sure that my colleagues in this Chamber share my anxiety as to the future of India and what the Ford Foundation is doing there—whether its activities are of such nature as to hamper India's orientation toward the Kremlin or to assist and augment it? In addition to the Rockefeller Foundation's activities in China, the Institute of Pacific Relations, supported mainly by foundations, played a major part in the success of the Chinese Red revolution. The McCarran committee's extensive investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations showed how this organization, financed primarily by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp., played the Kremlin's game with reference to China, and how it made possible the transformation of Nationalist China, our ally, into Red China, our enemy, with whom we are engaged in a bloody war. This investigation was a post mortem—it took place after China had been sold out to the Kremlin. But how much more useful it would be for a congressional committee to try to prevent by exposure any sort of activity, financed by the Ford Foundation, which may have a similar effect in India as the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations' activities had in China.

The few examples I have given in regard to some of the officers of the Ford Foundation and its subsidiaries, and in regard to some of their activities, certainly warrant a thorough inquiry into their officers and all of their extensive activities, which reach not only into every area of American intellectual life, but also into the far corners of the earth.

Mr. HAYS. I want to finish on this—and I do not see anything similar to the paragraph that Mr. Reece has shown me. If you are going to leave the statement, that foundations have not been asked why they did not support projects of a pro-American type, it leads me to believe that the staff is of the opinion that they did not or have not. If you are of that opinion—

Mr. DODD. It was not meant to convey that, Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS. I would still like to have a definition of pro-American.

Mr. DODD. May I answer?

Mr. WORMSER. May I interrupt Mr. Dodd?

Mr. HAYS. If you mean by pro-American, if they have not contributed research that led them to the thinking of McKinley, Ulysses S. Grant, and Cohn and Schine, I am not for that in any case. But if pro-American means what I think it means, that is a very serious indictment. If pro-American means the pre-1900 isolationist policy of one of the political parties, I want to disagree with that definition of pro-American, because that does not mean pro-American to me.

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Hays, may I make a suggestion? We can, I think, give you a reference to the Cox hearings in which that question
was asked and the term pro-American activities was used. That is
where it was gotten.

Mr. Hays. Yes; but Mr. Dodd makes the statement here, the implied
statement that foundations have not contributed to the pro-American
activities.

Mr. Wormser. I would like him to answer that, but I do not think
he meant to imply that.

Mr. Hays. I think that is the crux of the whole statement he made
so far. If the thing is going to turn on that, then we ought to have a
definition of this term.

The Chairman. If the gentleman will yield, I never understood
Mr. Dodd to say that the foundations had not contributed anything
of so-called pro-American activities, but he said the charge had been
made or the criticism had been made that their donations, grants, or
assistance had been weighted against the so-called pro-American activ-
ities. But Mr. Dodd can best answer that himself.

Mr. Hays. Let me read again what Mr. Dodd said yesterday. It
is on page 39 of the report. He says, "From our point of view there
seem to be eight criticisms which had been made of the work of the
Cox committee." I will not read all of them, but he goes down to
this one, which looks like the sixth, that foundations had not been
asked why they did not support projects of a pro-American type.
If that does not imply that they did not support it, I do not know
what does. I want that clarified right now.

Mr. Dodd. May I answer it, Mr. Hays?

Mr. Hays. Surely, I would like you to.

Mr. Dodd. That was nothing more than listing what had been set
forth as the type of criticisms, and we found they had been leveled
against the work of the Cox committee. The effort of the staff was
to include that portion of research which would enable eventually
to have those criticisms answered. That is all that statement is
there for.

Mr. Hays. Then has the staff found any evidence that the founda-
tions have granted aid to pro-American projects?

Mr. Dodd. Yes, sir. If you will refer to the statement which I made
in the foreword, in which I believe—

Mr. Hays. That is clear enough for me. I just wanted to clarify the
point that there had been, and we are not starting out with an in-
dictment that they had never done anything pro-American.

Mr. Dodd. Oh, no.

The Chairman. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I
undertook to make that clear in my opening statement yesterday.

Mr. Hays. I appreciate that. I did not want that statement to go
unchallenged. I still say I think we ought to have from the point of
view of the staff a definition of what you mean by "pro-American." I
do not insist on it at this minute, but I think along with your defini-
tions, I think we ought to get it in the record.

The Chairman. You can do that, can you not?

Mr. Hays. Later.

Mr. Dodd. Not only that, sir, but it would seem to me to be the op-
posite of the working definition which the staff used as to what was
un-American, which was the definition that we obtained from
Brookings.
The **Chairman**: You and Mr. Wormser work out that in connection with your other definition.

Mr. **Dodd**. Mr. Chairman, may I refer Mr. Hays to this statement in the foreword that bears on this question which he has asked.

Mr. **Hays**. Do you have the page number?

Mr. **Dodd**. I have not.

Mr. **Hays**. All right; read it.

Mr. **Dodd**. I am reading from the foreword, which was the statement made by me as I started yesterday's testimony.

And in the vast majority of instances, they—

That is the benefit created by foundations—

must be regarded as beyond question either from the standpoint of their conformity to the intentions of their donors or from the standpoint of the truly American quality of their consequences.

Mr. **Hays**. That is fine. I am glad to have that read again, because yesterday the public address system was not working too well, and we did not have a copy of what you were saying. It is very probable that we missed several important things that you said.

Mr. **Dodd**. May I ask if you can hear me all right now?

Mr. **Hays**. I can hear you; yes.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The **Chairman**: You may proceed, then.

Mr. **Wormser**. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the committee the benefit of a few excerpts which illustrate some of the things Mr. Dodd said yesterday, and is to say today. I think it would be better if I introduced those or offered them after he has finished his complete recitation.

The **Chairman**: Without objection, and any of the insertions, I think, should come at the end of Mr. Dodd's statement, rather than during.

Mr. **Dodd**. May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

The **Chairman**: Yes.

Mr. **Dodd**. I am going on from where we left off yesterday where I mentioned that there were several entities other than strictly educational institutions which we felt we would have to include in our studies. I mentioned them by name. To characterize some of these briefly:

The American Council of Learned Societies was founded in 1919 to encourage humanistic studies, including some which today are regarded as social sciences. It is comprised of 24 constituent member associations. In its entirety, it appears to dominate scholarship in this country.

The National Research Council was established in 1916, originally, as a preparedness measure in connection with World War I. Its charter was renewed in 1919, since which time, on behalf of its eight member associations, it has been devoted to the promotion of research within the most essential areas ordinarily referred to as the exact and applied sciences.

The Social Science Research Council was established in 1923 to advance research in the social sciences. It acts as spokesman for seven constituent member associations representing all of the major subdivisions of this new field of knowledge, i.e., history, economics, sociology, psychology, political science, statistics, and anthropology.
The American Council on Education was founded in 1918—
to coordinate the services which educational institutions and organizations
could contribute to the Government in the national crisis brought about by
World War I.

Starting with 14 constituent or founding organizations, this for-
midable and influential agency has steadily expanded until today its
membership is reported to consist of 79 constituent members (na-
tional and regional educational associations); 64 associate members
(national organizations in fields related to education); 954 institu-
tional members (universities, colleges, selected private school sys-
tems, educational departments of industrial concerns, voluntary as-
sociations of colleges and universities within the States, large public
libraries, etc.).

The National Education Association was established in 1857 to
elevate character, advance the interests of the teaching profession,
and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States.
Broadly speaking, this powerful entity concentrates on primary and
secondary schools. Its membership is reported to consist of 520,000
individuals who include, in addition to teachers, superintendents,
school administrators, and school secretaries. It boasts that it is—the
only organization that represents or has the possibility of representing the
great body of teachers in the United States—thus inferring a monopolistic aim.

The League for Industrial Democracy came into being in 1950,
when it was known as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, for the
purpose of awakening the intellectuals of this country to the ideas
and benefits of socialism. This organization might be compared to
the Fabian Society in England, which was established in 1884 to
spread socialism by peaceful means.

The Progressive Education Association was established around
1890. Since then it has been active in introducing radical ideas to
education which are now being questioned by many. They include
the idea that the individual must be adjusted to the group as a result
of his or her educational experience, and that democracy is little
more than a system for cooperative living.

The American Historical Association was established in 1889 to
promote historical studies. It is interesting to note that after giving
careful consideration, in 1926, to the social sciences, a report was
published under its auspices in 1934 which concluded that the day
of the individual in the United States had come to an end and that
the future would be characterized, inevitably, by some form of col-
lectivism and an increase in the authority of the state.

The John Dewey Society was formed in 1936, apparently for the
twofold purpose of conducting research in the field of education and
promoting the educational philosophy of John Dewey, in honor of
whom the society was named. It could be supposed that those who
were members of this organization would be devoted to the premises
upon which Mr. Dewey had based his experiments in education since
1896. Basically, these were pragmatic and a stimulus to empirical
thinking. He held that ideas were instruments and their truth or
falsity depended upon whether or not they worked successfully.

The broad study which called our attention to the activities of these
organizations has revealed not only their support by foundations,
but has disclosed a degree of cooperation between them which they have referred to as "an interlock," thus indicating a concentration of influence and power. By this phrase they indicate they are bound by a common interest rather than a dependency upon a single source for capital funds. It is difficult to study their relationship without confirming this. Likewise, it is difficult to avoid the feeling that their common interest has led them to cooperate closely with one another and that this common interest lies in the planning and control of certain aspects of American life through a combination of the Federal Government and education.

This may explain why the foundations have played such an active role in the promotion of the social sciences, why they have favored so strongly the employment of social scientists by the Federal Government, and why they seem to have used their influence to transform education into an instrument for social change.

We wish to stress the importance of questioning change only when it might involve developments detrimental to the interests of the American people, or when it is promoted by a relatively small and tightly knit group backed by disproportionately large amounts of money which could threaten the American ideal of competition.

In summary, our study of these entities and their relationship to each other seems to warrant the inference that they constitute a highly efficient, functioning whole. Its product is apparently an educational curriculum designed to indoctrinate the American student from matriculation to the consummation of his education. It contrasts sharply with the freedom of the individual as the cornerstone of our social structure. For this freedom, it seems to substitute the group, the will of the majority, and a centralized power to enforce this will—presumably in the interest of all. Its development and production seems to have been largely the work of these organizations engaged in research, such as the Social Science Research Council and the National Research Council.

The demand for their product seems to come from such strong and sizable aggregations of interests as the National Educational Association and the American Council on Education, whose authorities seem to see in it the means by which education can render a national service. They make frequent reference to this service as "synonymous with the cause of education" and tend to criticize strongly anyone who dares to doubt the validity of their conclusions.

Its promotion appears to have been managed by such organizations as the Progressive Education Association, the American Historical Association, the League for Industrial Democracy, the John Dewey Society, and the Antidefamation League. Supplementing their efforts were others, such as the Parent-Teachers Association, the National Council of Churches, and the Committee for Economic Development, each of which has played some part in adjusting the minds of American citizens to the idea of planning and to the marked changes which have taken place in "the public interest."

Others, too, are engaged in the dissemination of this idea as being essential to the security of this country. Neither time nor funds have permitted me to direct the attention of the staff to the operations and influence of any but a few of these, beyond taking notice of their existence and the purposes which they serve.
From our studies, it appears that the overall administration of this functioning whole and the careful selection of its personnel seem to have been the peculiar interest of the American Council of Learned Societies. It is interesting to note that, by legislative action recently, another entity has been brought into being known as the National Science Foundation, whose purpose is to develop a national policy with respect to science. Its additional purpose is to serve our Government in an advisory capacity in connection with the huge appropriations now being made for research in the interests of effective controls. Evidence exists of close cooperation between privately endowed foundations, the agencies through which they have operated and the educational institutions through which they have been accustomed to make grants for research. This process may contribute to an undesirable degree of concentrated power.

It is also interesting to note that by comparison with funds for research provided by foundations, those now flowing from our Government are so large that they dwarf foundation contributions. This promises to be true for some time to come and indicates that foundations may extend their influence over a wider area than in the past.

The result of the development and operation of the network in which foundations have played such a significant role seems to have provided this country with what is tantamount to a national system of education under the tight control of organizations and persons little known to the American public. Its operations and ideas are so complex as to be beyond public understanding or control. It also seems to have resulted in an educational product which can be traced to research of a predominantly empirical character in the inexact or social sciences.

In these fields the specialists, more often than not, seem to have been concerned with the production of empirical data and with its application. Principles and their truth or falsity seem to have concerned them very little.

In what appears from our studies to have been zeal for a radically new social order in the United States, many of these social science specialists apparently gave little thought to either the opinions or the warnings of those who were convinced that a wholesale acceptance of knowledge acquired almost entirely by empirical methods would result in a deterioration of moral standards and a disrespect for principles. Even past experience which indicated that such an approach to the problems of society could lead to tyranny, appears to have been disregarded.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interrupt Mr. Dodd, but I have several questions. Right here it seems to me there is one that it might be well to ask him to clarify. He is tossing this word "empirical" around with a good deal of abandon, and I wonder if you would mind defining what you mean by empirical?

Mr. Hays, and the tabulation of those. What we would ordinarily know as a statistical approach.

Mr. Hays. Thank you.

Mr. Dodd. May I continue, sir?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Dodd. For these reasons, it has been difficult for us to dismiss the suspicion that, latent in the minds of many of the social scientists
has lain the belief that, given sufficient authority and enough funds, human behavior can be controlled, and that this control can be exercised without risk to either ethical principles or spiritual values and that, therefore, the solution to all social problems should be entrusted to them.

In the light of this suspicion and the evidence which supports it, it has been difficult to avoid the conclusion that social scientists of the persuasion I have been discussing have been accepted by foundations, government, and education as though their claims were true—this is in the face of the fact that their validity has been disputed by men well trained in these same disciplines.

In spite of this dispute within his own ranks, the social scientist is gradually becoming dignified by the title “Social Engineer.” This title implies that the objective viewpoint of the pure scientist is about to become obsolete in favor of techniques of control. It also suggests that our traditional concept of freedom as the function of natural and constitutional law has already been abandoned by the “social engineer” and brings to mind our native fear of controls—however well intended.

In the face of this, it seems strange that foundations made no reference in their reports to the consequences to be expected from a new science of society founded on empiricism and undisciplined by either a set of principles or proved experiments. Apparently they were content to operate on the theory that they would produce usable data for others to employ and rely upon them to account for the effects. It may not have occurred to their trustees that the power to produce data in volume might stimulate others to use it in an undisciplined fashion without first checking it against principles discovered through the deductive process.

Their position that they need not closely follow the effects of their support of such grants also seems strange. Their reports often show that they were supporting such a new “science.” The descriptions, however, made it very difficult to judge the ultimate purposes for which this support was being given.

To summarize, both the general and the specific studies pursued by the staff during the past 6 months lead me to the tentative conclusion that, within the social-science division of education, the foundations have neglected “the public interest” to a severe degree.

In my judgment, this neglect may be found by the committee to have stemmed from:

The willingness of foundations to support experiments in fields which defied control; to support these uncontrollable experiments without first having proved them to be “in the public interest”; and to extend this support without reporting its purpose in language which could be readily understood.

I suggest that the committee give consideration to the tendency of foundation trustees to abdicate responsibility. To illustrate: The following statement has been taken from An American Dilemma, the Negro Problem and Modern Democracy, a book by Gunnar Myrdal, with the assistance of Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose, volume II:

This study was made possible by funds granted by Carnegie Corp. of New York. That corporation is not, however, the author, owner, publisher, or proprietor of this publication, and is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements made or views expressed therein.
While this refers to but one project out of many, it becomes significant when it is realized that the project to which these books relate involve some $250,000, and led to the publication of statements which were most critical of our Constitution.

The similar tendency to delegate responsibility will be seen in the support given by foundations to agencies such as the Social Science Research Council, which disregards the legal concept: "He who acts through an agent, acts himself."

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

In a sense, Ford appears to be capitalizing on developments which took place long before it was founded, and which have enabled it to take advantage of the wholesale dedication of education to a social purpose, the need to defend this dedication against criticism, the need to indoctrinate adults along these lines, the acceptance by the executive branch of the Federal Government of responsibility for planning on a national and international scale, the diminishing importance of the Congress and the States and the growing power of the executive branch of the Federal Government, the seeming indispensability of control over human behavior.

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

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

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

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

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

1. Are men equal and do we demonstrate this equality?
2. What constitutes “the consent of the governed” and what does this phrase imply in practice?
By inference, the first question is subtly answered in the negative. By direct statement, the second is explained as submitting to majority rule—but the restriction of the majority by the Constitution is not mentioned. Only an abridged version of the Declaration is printed. It is interesting that this should omit the list of grievances which originally made the general concepts of this document reasonable.

It seems incredible that the trustees of typically American fortune created foundations should have permitted them to be used to finance ideas and practices incompatible with the fundamental concepts of our Constitution. Yet there seems evidence that this may have occurred.

I assume it is the purpose of this inquiry to gather and weigh the facts.

Respectfully submitted by myself.

Mr. Chairman, that is the end of the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the following page refer to, which makes reference to charts?

Mr. DODD. You will recall that I mentioned in my statement yesterday that the staff had made a study of the changes which had taken place in the elements comprising the public interest from the turn of the century to the present day. That study was entitled "The Economics of the Public Interest." In that study, Mr. Chairman, are these 12 charts.

The CHAIRMAN. Are those charts to be submitted?

Mr. DODD. At counsel's convenience, I believe he plans to do so. But I also believe he plans to do so when he submits that particular study itself. Of that I am not sure.

Mr. WORMSER. I think we will introduce it later. You may have it now if you wish, but it would come in more logically later, Mr. Chairman.

May I now offer certain material which Mr. Dodd might read into the record to illustrate some of the things he had discussed in his testimony. For example, on page 45 of the record, he made a statement discussing the extent to which foundations like Carnegie and Rockefeller had made contributions or expended funds for the purpose of directing education in the United States toward an international frame of reference.

Mr. HAYS. That is a good place for a question right there, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you submitting something, Mr. Wormser?

Mr. WORMSER. I was about to; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hays has a question.

Mr. HAYS. I would like you to explain a little more fully, you say that these foundations have furthered this purpose by directing education in the United States toward an international frame of reference and discrediting the traditions to which it had been dedicated.

What are these traditions to which it has been dedicated? That seems to me to be a rather critical thing, and I would like to know more about it. I may get educated all over. I am reading from the report on page 45, where you stopped. I read a little more.

Mr. WORMSER. It is page 14 of your manuscript copy, Mr. Dodd.

Mr. DODD. May I answer, Mr. Hays?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.
Mr. Dodd. That which appeared most frequently, Mr. Hays, would relate to an adage or viewpoint which was to avoid entangling alliances and which had come down through the years. That would be a pertinent aspect of it with respect to international affairs.

Mr. Hays. You mean you are taking that from George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. Dodd. I am just taking that because they make reference to it.

Mr. Hays. I do not think we can keep something that George Washington said 150 years ago as being a basis for guidance today and say anything contrary to it is 100 percent wrong. I think George Washington was a pretty smart man, and I respect him and revere him, but certainly the Monroe Doctrine was an entangling alliance, and it also is one of those revered cliches that we use a good deal now. I would rather that this investigation got off without using any more cliches than we can help.

Mr. Dodd. This is not designed to say whether it is good or bad or be critical or otherwise. This is the way it appeared, and this is the way it unfolded.

Mr. Hays. I got the pretty firm impression that it was going to appear this way the first time I ever talked to you about it. Do you remember last fall, more than 6 months ago, I tried to find out just where this investigation was going, and I got pretty much the impression that I could have almost written this myself from that first conversation. That is all right. I do not want to find fault with that. But let us bring in the facts to prove it. Let us not stand on a bunch of assertions.

Mr. Dodd. As I understand it, that is what counsel intends to do, Mr. Hays.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Hays and Mr. Chairman, we expect in the course of hearings to introduce in addition to the testimony of witnesses, various extracts from printed material produced or supported by the foundations themselves. There will be a considerable body of that kind of evidence.

In this particular connection, Mr. Hays, we suggest that a proper subject of inquiry for the committee is whether or not propaganda is desirable for a foundation which operates as the fiduciary manager of public funds. In the case of the Carnegie endowment we will be glad to introduce evidence later to show that they were consciously produced, a propaganda machine. We are anxious to get the facts. If there is an adequate explanation of that which takes it out of the class of propaganda which public funds privately managed should not be used for, we will be glad to hear it. But it seems to me that this committee has the duty to inquire whether or not propaganda by foundations with public money is desirable.

Mr. Hays. You say that the Carnegie Foundation consciously produced a propaganda machine?

Mr. Wormser. Yes.

Mr. Hays. And that is bad per se.

Mr. Wormser. I am presenting that to the committee to decide. I am not trying to decide.

Mr. Hays. If a foundation has produced consciously a propaganda machine, it is the Facts Forum. I have not much evidence that the staff has done much digging there. They not only have a propaganda machine, but that outfit puts money in to defeat people like me for
Congress. That is pretty essential to me. That is bad propaganda from my viewpoint.

The Chairman. Another foundation, or at least an organization that comes within the definition of a foundation, has been called to the attention of the committee, and that is the so-called Christian Laymen's Movement, which it certainly would appear from some documents which I have seen circularized, engages in propaganda.

Mr. Hays. The chairman knows that he and I have discussed that, and we are in complete agreement, that in the first instance it is not a foundation, and in the second instance, we ought to bring them in and find out why they have used the name.

The Chairman. If any foundations have contributed money for political purposes, I think that ought to be developed.

Mr. Hays. Directly or by purporting to present facts, and doing so in a biased manner.

The Chairman. If any of the foundations have contributed money for political purposes to defeat or elect any candidate, I think that ought to be developed.

Mr. Wormser. May I say regarding the Facts Forum, may I say that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is making a study of its own of that institution.

Mr. Hays. May I say I talked to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and they have finished their study. If you cannot get it, they will make the facts available to you.

Mr. Wormser. The second thing I want to say in explanation is that we have had considerable difficulty in getting access to forms 990-A, as you know. The return of this particular foundation was finally made available to us last Friday at 4:30.

Mr. Hays. I talked to the Assistant Director about 3:30. He really acted fast. He told me you would get it. I appreciate the speed with which he made it available.

The Chairman. However, the chairman might say that with reference to making available the tax return form 990-A which is the document in which the committee is particularly interested, it has been authorized to be made available by an Executive order. The delay and the difficulty has come through the slowness of the administrative action in the Department, as I understand it, but that matter is now pretty well cleared up; is it not, Mr. Wormser; so that these forms are now available. In fairness to the staff, there has been really—

Mr. Hays. I realize that, Mr. Chairman, and I just got into the picture because the staff informed me that they were having trouble getting hold of this particular one, because it seemed to be lost or something. When I called, it was not lost; they found it right away.

The Chairman. It is my understanding that you had difficulty getting some of the others also.

Mr. Wormser. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. So, it was not this particular one that was an isolated case.

Mr. Wormser. We gave them a list of those foundations whose returns we wanted particularly to examine. When they finally gave us access to them, we found that many of those we wanted were still not there, and the problem was that they had not been gotten into the Washington office from some of the field offices. So, we still have
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not got a complete story to tell. Moreover, we have the mechanical
difficulty with our small staff that they will not let us photostat any
of these returns and permit us only to examine them on their premises
which makes it very difficult for us to work with them.

Mr. Hays. I assume that on this complete story, Mr. Dodd says he
thinks the Ford Foundation ought to be gone into pretty thoroughly.
I suppose we will develop that story by having them in. If the staff
is too busy, it would suit me to bring in Mr. Hunt and the rest of the
Facts Forum people and develop their story right here, too. He
seems to have trouble getting publicity. Maybe we will get him a
little.

The Chairman. As a result of my consultation with the staff, it is
expected that the foundation generally will have opportunity to ap-
pear, in fact will be invited to appear. The presentation by Mr. Dodd
is more or less forming the basis for the appearance of the representa-
tives of the various foundations.

Mr. Hays. This is the indictment or the bill of particulars.

Mr. Wormser. The bill of particulars is a good term, Mr. Hays.

Mr. Hays. That is what I was going on. I just want to be sure
that we get this one I am talking about in the bill of particulars. I
want to amend it right here and get them in.

The Chairman. As I understand it, the staff have had certain rea-
sons for proceeding this way. One was that they thought it was
desirable for the foundations themselves to understand the approach
which the staff had made in this study. From some of the conversa-
tions that Mr. Wormser, as well as myself, have had with foundations,
I think they are rather satisfied with this method of procedure; not
that it is either favorable or unfavorable to them, but they think it
is a sound and logical method in which to proceed.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I may be seeming to ask
some critical questions, but I do not want to imply that there has been
any trouble between myself and the staff. It may be that I do not
see eye to eye on a good many things, but the staff has been very
responsive any time I have asked them a question to come up and
explain it, or to make the files available, or anything like that. There
has been no difficulty whatsoever on that score.

The Chairman. Certainly I never so understood you to infer, that
is, not only the staff, but the members of the committee themselves.

Mr. Hays. Let us not be too optimistic.

The Chairman. I am only speaking up to the present time. I am
not projecting that into the future. If there are no further questions,
Mr. Wormser, you may proceed.

Mr. Wormser. This statement was not intended to cover every-
thing we are going to cover in the hearings. This was intended to
cover what we might call the most important or main lines of inquiry
we suggest. The reason for doing it now is, as the chairman said, to
give the foundations an opportunity to know what most important
matters we want to go into in relation to them.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Wormser. I think Mr. Dodd might wish to read an extract
from the report of the Carnegie Endowment which is taken from their
1937 yearbook, being part of the report of the division of intercourse
and education.
Mr. Dodd (reading):

One of the regular branches of work of the division of intercourse and education is the distribution of the International Mind Alcove Collection. The public libraries of small communities welcome these carefully selected books on foreign countries and international relations as a distinct help in developing and broadening the point of view of their communities often isolated from reading material of this type. During the past 14 years 739 towns have benefited by this service with 490 on the Alcove list at the end of 1936.

The Chairman. What is that number?

Mr. Dodd. 490.

Mr. Hays. What is this Alcove list, before you go any further? Would you enlighten the committee?

Mr. Dodd. The list, Mr. Hays, is a composite of titles of books which go as a single collection into libraries in communities. I think the name "Alcove" is to designate that it stands by itself in whatever library it happens to be put. I think that is how they happened to hit on "Alcove" as a word. Their full title is "International Mind Alcove Collection." I think that is to set the tenor of the books themselves. In other words, the general subject of international matters.

Mr. Hays. I take it that the staff does not approve of this collection; is that right?

Mr. Dodd. No, Mr. Hays. I think counsel is introducing this as an example of the fact that the Carnegie Corp. or the Carnegie Endowment for Peace was interested in awakening the people of this country to an international viewpoint. This is not to mean that it is good or bad, sir.

Mr. Hays. All right. That is what I want to get clear. That suits me.

Mr. Dodd. I sincerely hope, as that statement was read, that there are no instances of an attempt at what we call quality judgments.

May I proceed, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Dodd (reading):

After a collection has reached 100 titles, no further books are sent. In this way funds are released to establish new Alcoves elsewhere.

The librarian agrees when accepting the initial installment to interest readers in every way possible in the books and in their purpose and often this personal enthusiasm and cooperation add greatly to the success of the work. The local press is generous in giving space for the announcement and description of new Alcove titles, 4 of which are sent every 3 months, thus permitting the very latest publications to be chosen.

Then on page 59 of this same yearbook:

International Relations Clubs

The international relations clubs organized under the auspices of the division throughout the world show an increase in 1936 to 66, making a total of 805. These clubs are most numerous in the 48 States of the United States, in all of which they are active. Clubs are also organized in 52 other countries reaching halfway round the globe to distant Siam and including such parts of the United States as Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and also the Philippines. For 20 years the work of the international relations clubs has been described in these reports. It is an integral part of the work of the division carried along the lines so often laid down in these pages.

On page 62:

There are now (that is as of December 31, 1936) 157 groups organized in foreign countries.
On page 63:
The international relations clubs in high schools have been a natural outgrowth of the work of the clubs in colleges and universities. Members of these latter clubs have spoken at the high schools in their communities and have invited high-school students to come to their meetings. Also club members graduating from college frequently go into the teaching profession which puts them in direct touch with high-school students who are eager to learn more about international relations. On December 31, 1936, there were 206 high school international relations clubs, and applications are constantly being received. To these clubs a package of pamphlet material is sent twice a year to aid them in their studies.

And finally this comes from President Butler’s report to the annual meeting of the board of trustees on page 179:

As you see from the annual report, we have now in the United States between 800 and 900 international relations clubs, chiefly in the smaller institutions of learning, college and high school. They meet on the average of once a week. They read and discuss endowment publications, the news of the day, everything bearing upon economic cooperation and peace.

We have in addition about 800 International Mind Alcoves in public libraries. These bear our name. They consist of books, 30, 40, 50, sometimes 100 in number, which can be read either by young people or old, as the case may be, and which give an account of the characteristics, the geography, the history, the literature, the products, the life of other peoples. Sometimes there is included a novel dealing with the psychology and the habits of other people than our own. These are producing a very profound effect upon the mind of the young people in the United States and have shown themselves to be very practical, indeed.

Mr. Wormser. Again in the same area, I would like with your permission, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Dodd to read from the 1947 yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment, which contains a report called Recommendations of the President. The president, incidentally, in passing, at the moment was Alger Hiss. I would like Mr. Dodd to read starting at page 16.

Mr. Hays. Would you describe that again, and tell us what it is? I am sorry I did not hear everything you said. I did hear the name Alger Hiss.

Mr. Wormser. Yes. It is from the 1947 yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Entered at page 15 is a reprint of a document called Recommendations of the President to the Trustees. It is signed by Alger Hiss, president.

Mr. Hays. It was an unfortunate thing when the Secretary of State recommended him to the Carnegie Foundation, was it not?

Mr. Wormser. I think we would all agree on that.

Mr. Dodd (reading):

Among the special circumstances favorable to an expansion of the endowments own direct activities, the most significant is the establishment of the United Nations with its headquarters in New York, and with the United States as its leading and most influential member.

The United States was the chief architect of the United Nations and is its chief support. The opportunity for an endowed American institution having the objectives, traditions, and prestige of the endowment, to support and serve the United Nations is very great. No other agency appears to be so favorably situated as is the endowment for the undertaking of such a program.

So far as we have been able to ascertain, no other agency is contemplating the undertaking of such a program. Consequently, I recommend most earnestly that the endowment construct its program for the period that lies ahead primarily for the support and the assistance of the United Nations. I would suggest that this program be conceived of as having two objectives. First, it should be widely educational in order to encourage public understanding and support of the United Nations at home and abroad. Second, it should aid in the adoption of wise policies, both by our own Government in its capacity as a member of the United Nations, and by the United Nations Organization as a whole.
The number and importance of decisions in the field of foreign relations with which the United States will be faced during the next few years are of such magnitude that the widest possible stimulation of public education in this field is of major and pressing importance. In furthering its educational objective, the endowment should utilize its existing resources, such as the international-relations clubs in the colleges and international conciliation, and should strengthen its relationships with existing agencies interested in the field of foreign affairs. These relationships should include close collaboration with other organizations principally engaged in the study of foreign affairs, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the developing university centers of international relations, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, and local community groups interested in foreign affairs, of which the Cleveland Council on World Affairs and the projected World Affairs Council in San Francisco are examples.

Of particular importance is the unusual opportunity of reaching large segments of the population by establishing relations of a rather novel sort with the large national organizations which today are desirous of supplying their members with objective information on public affairs, including international issues. These organizations, designed to serve, respectively, the broad interests of business, church, women, farm, labor, veterans, educational, and other large groups of our citizens, are not equipped to set up foreign policy research staffs on their own. The endowment should supply these organizations with basic information about the United Nations, and should assist them both in selecting topics of interest to their members and in presenting those topics so as to be more readily understood by their members.

We should urge the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations to supply similar service on other topics of international significance. Explanation should also be made by the endowment as to the possibilities of increasing the effectiveness of the radio and motion pictures in public education on world affairs.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Wormser, may I ask a question?

Mr. WORMSER. Please, Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS. What was the purpose of putting that in the record?

Mr. WORMSER. I am trying to give a few illustrations of some of the more important statements which Mr. Dodd made in his report to give some justification for lines of inquiry. As I said before, we asked the committee to consider whether propaganda by a public foundation privately managed but consisting of public money in essence is desirable or proper. We believe we have evidence to show that the Carnegie Foundation or Endowment for International Peace has created, as I said, a propaganda machine. Its propagandas might be good.

Mr. HAYS. Let us explore while we are at it and see if it is in any way responsible for the present floundering foreign policy we have. There seems to be some connection between Mr. Dulles and this Carnegie Foundation. Maybe we will get to the bottom of that. There might be something useful out of this after all.

The CHAIRMAN. I suggest we can make our observations on that after the hearing has been further developed.

Mr. WORMSER. These are merely illustrations and not the complete story in any way.

Mr. HAYS. I do not expect the staff to follow that suggestion, but it is the line of inquiry I would like to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have further suggestions there?

Mr. WORMSER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure the staff will give full support to the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I will even try to get them some more money for that.

Mr. WORMSER. I believe at page 26 of the record Mr. Dodd referred to the operations or activities of the foundations in changing our edu-
cational and to some extent, I believe, our cultural life somewhat radically. I would like him to read with your permission from a book of Ernest Victor Hollis, Philanthropic Organizations and Higher Education, published in 1938. Mr. Dodd will read from page 81.

Mr. HAYS. This refers to what paragraph on page 26 of the record?

Mr. WORMSER. I have not the record in front of me, Mr. Hays.

Mr. Koch. The last full paragraph of Mr. Dodd's statement.

Mr. Dodd (reading):

Foundations have been so skillful in overcoming these obstacles that they now exercise a maximum of initiative. Today they have a vital part in practically every type of progressive educational experiment underway in America. Possibly there has been no more radical and forward-looking study of the American scene than is presented in the 16-volume report of the Social Studies Commission of the American Historical Association, which was begun in 1927 and very recently completed.

The report demands a radical change in many of the major premises underlying our economic, social, and cultural life. This ultraprogressive study was sponsored and supported to the extent of $340,000 by the Carnegie Corp. In addition, the corporation has contributed an aggregate of $1,404,840 to experimentation in adult education, $309,500 to the study of radio in education, and an aggregate of $5,700,000 to the endowment and support of progressive experimental college programs in general, and specifically at Chicago, Bard, Colgate, Stevens, Southwestern, and over $5 million to the promotion of educational efforts in the fine arts, especially the pictorial and graphic arts and music.

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Chairman, this appears, I believe, on page 31 of the mimeographed statement.

Mr. HAYS. We will have an opportunity to come back and question some of these statements later.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Dodd mentioned in connection with the book, American Dilemma, by Gunnar Myrdal, that there were some statements in that book critical of our Constitution. With your permission I would like him to read several of these statements to illustrate what he means.

Mr. Dodd. This is the first of approximately four such statements, Mr. Chairman.

Indeed, the new republic began its career with a reaction. Charles Beard in An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, and a group of modern historians, throwing aside the much cherished national mythology which had blurred the difference in spirit between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, have shown that the latter was conceived in considerable suspicion against democracy and fear of "the people." It was dominated by property consciousness and designed as a defense against the democratic spirit let loose during the Revolution.

This conservatism, in fundamental principles, has, to a great extent, been perverted into a nearly fetishistic cult of the Constitution. This is unfortunate since the 150-year-old Constitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions and since, furthermore, the drafters of the document made it technically difficult to change even if there were no popular feeling against the change.

Modern historical studies of how the Constitution came to be as it is reveal that the Constitutional Convention was nearly a plot against the common people. Until recently the Constitution has been used to block the popular—

The CHAIRMAN. Will you repeat that last sentence?

Mr. Dodd. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Modern historical studies of how the Constitution came to be as it is reveal that the Constitutional Convention was nearly a plot against the common people. Until recently the Constitution has been used to block the popular will: the 14th amendment inserted after the Civil War to protect the civil rights of the
poor freedmen has, for instance, been used more to protect business corporations against public control.

Another cultural trait of Americans is a relatively low degree of respect of law and order.

Mr. Wormser. I would like to call your attention again, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this two-volume book was financed by the Carnegie Corp. to the extent of a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Hays. On that that you just read, did I understand you to say that is four different excerpts?

Mr. Dodd. I said it was about four different excerpts.

Mr. Hays. All lifted out of context, no doubt.

Mr. Dodd. I personally read the book, Mr. Hays, but I would not say it had been lifted out of context.

Mr. Hays. The way you read it, I thought it was all one statement. It is four different places in the book. Is that correct?

Mr. Dodd. Yes. The first one appears on page 7, the second one on page 12, the third one on page 13, and the fourth which I read was sentence No. 1 in a paragraph appearing on page 14. Broadly speaking it is a sequential statement.

Mr. Hays. There are statements in there that I certainly disagree strongly with, and I think are damaging and untrue, but I want to get the page so I can read the whole thing, and find out what they are related to.

The Chairman. I think to have the pages listed is a very good thing.

Mr. Hays. I want to make it perfectly clear that I think some of those statements are certainly statements that the committee has every valid reason to find fault with.

Mr. Dodd. It goes on, Mr. Chairman:

This trait, as well as the other one just mentioned is of paramount importance for the Negro problem as we shall show in some detail in later chapters. There is a—

Mr. Hays. Read that sentence again about the Constitution being difficult to amend. It sounds almost like Mr. Bricker might have said it.

Mr. Dodd (reading):

This is unfortunate since the 150-year-old Constitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions and since, furthermore—

Mr. Hays. That is not the one.

Mr. Dodd (reading):

The drafters of the document made it technically difficult to change even if there were no popular feeling against change.

Mr. Hays. Part of that statement is certainly true, we will have to admit. I do not admit your premise.

Mr. Wolcott. Is that bad?

Mr. Hays. No; I am for it being difficult to change. I rather enjoyed the attempt that was made here not long ago.

Mr. Dodd. Then it goes on, Mr. Hays:

Each legislative statute is judged by the common citizen in terms of his conception of the higher natural law. He decides whether it is just or unjust and has the dangerous attitude that if it is unjust he may feel free to disobey it.
That relates to our evidence of disrespect for law and order.

This anarchistic tendency in Americans' legal culture becomes even more dangerous because of the presence of a quite different tendency, a desire to regulate human behavior tyrannically by means of formal laws. This last tendency is a heritage from early American puritanism, which was sometimes fanatical and dogmatic and also had a strong inclination to mind other people's business.

So we find that this American who is so proud to announce that he will not obey laws other than those which are good and just, as soon as the discussion turns to something which in his opinion is bad and unjust, will emphatically pronounce that there ought to be a law against it. To demand and legislate all sorts of laws against this or that is just as much part of American freedom as to disobey the laws when they are enacted. America has become a country where exceedingly much is permitted in practice, but at the same time exceedingly much is forbidden by law.

And the final statement is as follows:

The popular explanation of the disparity in America between ideals and actual behavior is that Americans do not have the slightest intention of living up to the ideals which they talk about and put into their Constitution and laws. Many Americans are accustomed to talk loosely and disparagingly about adherence to the American creed as lip service and even hypocrisy. Foreigners are even more prone to make such a characterization.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, I have here a quotation which, if you will turn to the bottom of page 31, Mr. Dodd referred to the tendency by trustees to delegate their responsibility. There are apparently several types of delegation. This very short quote which I shall read myself with your permission illustrates one type. It is from a book by Shelby M. Harrison and F. Emerson Andrews, published by the Russell Sage Foundation in 1946, at page 44:

The primary function of a board of trustees is the broad determination of policies in harmony with the foundations' charter. However, while complete authority has been vested in the board, it has neither the time nor usually the special knowledge required for detailed administration of the work of the larger foundations.

I would like to have Mr. Dodd read most of two letters addressed by Prof. J. Fred Rippy, of the University of Chicago to the Honorable E. E. Cox, who was chairman of the previous committee which we referred to as the Cox committee. The first is dated August 4, 1951; the second is dated November 8, 1952.

With your permission, I have deleted two small sections of the first letter for the sole reason that they name individuals, and in conformance with our desire to keep individuals out of these hearings as much as possible, I would prefer not to have them read into the record. If the committee wants I can show them the original letters.

Mr. Hays. I think it would be a good idea for the committee to see the letters before you read them. Who is this Professor Rippy, and what is his ax to grind?

Mr. Wormser. I have here an extract from Who's Who.

Mr. Hays. Of course, he writes that himself. That is their honest estimate of themselves.

Mr. Wormser. It will give you his university connections. He got his A. B. at Southwestern, his A. M. at Vanderbilt and his Ph. D. at the University of California. He has had three fellowships, one from the Guggenheim Foundation, one from Carnegie. He has been an assistant professor of history at the University of California. He was before that I believe an instructor in history at Chicago, then assistant professor or associate professor. He was a full professor
of history at Duke, and a full professor at Chicago. He has also taught at Johns Hopkins, at the National University of Mexico, at the University of Louisiana, and the University of Washington. He belongs to many of the societies. He has had two Government posts, a member of the United States National Commission on History and Geography. In 1935 he was a delegate to the Panamanian Conference on History and Geography.

Mr. Hays. Is he now associated with the University of Chicago?

Mr. Wormser. These 1951 and 1952 letters say the department of history. Yes, he is still there.

Mr. Hays. I assume the letters are critical of the university.

Mr. Wormser. They are not critical of the university; no.

Mr. Hays. I do not see any reason to delete. He mentions his opinion about these people. If they are not so, let them come in and say so. If you are going to put his letter in, let us not get in the habit of dropping out things.

Mr. Dodd. I better read from their original.

Mr. Hays. They will go in in their entirety?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Hays. It is only his opinion.

Mr. Wormser. I did it for their protection.

Mr. Hays. Never mind. If you are going to put it in, let them come in and protect themselves. Maybe they will have something to say about him.

Mr. Wolcott. I think Mr. Wormser's idea was that we should not turn these hearings into an investigation of individuals' morals or attainments or qualifications and so forth. I respect the fact that if his opinions of individuals are not germane to this subject, they probably should be deleted. But I recognize also a member's right to object to deleting any part of them. I suppose that as Members of the Congress and congressional committees are immune from publishing libelous statements, so I think we are safe in reading it. I do not know that we want to contribute to it.

Mr. Hays. I do not want to contribute to any libelous statement, but I think it might turn out this man—and I am saying it might, because I don't know and I have not had a chance to read the letters—but it might turn out he is a little bit disgruntled, and frequently you get letters from people like that. He said he had some sad experiences. Maybe from his viewpoint they were sad. I do not know. He mentions his names of people who gave him sad experiences and says they are arrogant, and let them come in and say what they think about him.

Mr. Wolcott. If you want to think of the sadness of others, you will make others sad.

Mr. Hays. Let us leave the letters out. I do not like to put in parts of letters, because when you start deleting you make the public suspicious that everything is not right. Let us either leave them out or put them in. If you are solicitous about the people he mentions, I am just willing to forget them.

Mr. Wolcott. I surely am not. I have not seen the letters. I might agree with you.

Mr. Hays. It may be a good thing if the committee read the letters so we would all know what we are talking about, and put them in tomorrow. That might illuminate the subject.
Mr. Wormser. That is perfectly acceptable to me.

Mr. Hays. If there is disagreement as to whether they go in or not.

Mr. Wolcott. I thought if they are not germane to the subject matter, I think the staff is right in requesting that part be deleted. But I have no objection to not having it deleted, and that it be read.

Mr. Wormser. May I make the suggestion that Mr. Dodd read the second letter, which has no deletions in it.

The Chairman. Very well.

Mr. Wormser. Will you read the second one, Mr. Dodd?

Mr. Dodd. I am reading from a letter dated November 8, 1952, from a Prof. J. Fred Rippy, University of Chicago, department of history. It is addressed to the Honorable E. E. Cox:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COX: Since I wrote you on August 4, 1951, Dr. Abraham Flexner, a man who has had much experience with the foundations, has published a book entitled "Funds and Foundations," in which he expresses views similar to those contained in my letter. I call your attention to the following pages of Flexner's volume: 84, 92, 94, 124, and 125. Here Dr. Flexner denies that the foundation staffs had the capacity to pass wisely on the numerous projects and individuals for which and to which grants were made, and contends that the grants should have been made to universities as contributions to their endowments for research and other purposes.

The problem is clearly one of the concentration of power in hands that could not possibly be competent to perform the enormous task which the small staffs had the presumption to undertake. This, says Flexner, was both "pretentious" and "absurd." In my opinion, it was worse than that. The staffs were guilty of favoritism. The small committees who passed on the grants for projects and to individuals were dominated by small coteries connected with certain eastern universities. A committee on Latin American studies, set up in the 1940's, for instance, was filled with Harvard graduates. A single professor of history on the Harvard faculty had the decisive word regarding every request for aid presented by historians.

By granting these subsidies to favorite individuals and favored ideas, the foundations contribute to inequalities in opportunity and interfere with "free trade and ideas." They increase the power of favored groups to dominate our colleges and universities. Men whose power exceeds their wisdom, or men who are not guided by the principle of equality of opportunity, could become a menace. If possible, under the terms of our Federal Constitution, these foundations should either be taxed out of existence or compelled to make their grants to colleges and universities, to be distributed by faculty committees of these institutions. Evenhanded justice may not prevail even then because such justice is rarely achieved in human relations. But a greater approximation to evenhanded justice will be made because these local committees will have more intimate knowledge of recipients. This, as you know, is the fundamental justification for decentralization of power, for the local autonomy which was so prominent in the thinking of our Founding Fathers.

Very sincerely,

J. FRED RIPPY.

The Chairman. Mr. Wormser, do you have anything further?

Mr. Wormser. Just one thing, Mr. Chairman. I have here a long memorandum—

Mr. Hays. Wait a minute. Are we leaving Professor Rippy now? I wanted to ask a question or two before we leave him completely.

Mr. Wormser. I thought you were going to read the letter which has not been introduced.

Mr. Hays. We are going to read it, but maybe we will never introduce it. If we are going to introduce letters from isolated—and I would not like to use the word "obscure" because I never heard of him—professors, maybe we ought to know a little more about him. Maybe we ought to have him in here to ask a few questions. Does the staff have any knowledge whether he ever applied to Harvard and
I got turned down for a job? He seems to have a craw for Harvard. I am no defender of Harvard. I never went there. It would be interesting to know these things.

I might interpolate to say that in my experience in Congress when people are moved enough to sit down to write you a letter, they usually have some personal reason for it. I have never gotten a flood of letters about the foundations inquiry. In fact, I have not gotten a letter, and I am not soliciting any either. But being the suspicious-minded person I am, I would just like to know more about what motivated him to write this, who he is, why that is his opinion. So what? There are 165 million other people who might have a different opinion. So where do we go from there?

Mr. Wormser. It is introduced only as his opinion.

Mr. Hays. He says the board of trustees of a university would be better, in a bald statement, to decide what to do with this money. I would not want to get into personalities, but I can think of some boards of trustees that I would not trust with a $5 bill. I know some of them personally, and who appointed them. Maybe I would not trust the foundations either, but I would not say it is better without something to back it up. If you put this stuff in the record, it has a sort of sanctity. It has the force and effect as though it were true.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Hays, the only way you can judge, I suppose, is by putting things in the record and weighing them when they are in there.

Mr. Hays. That is all right. Go ahead. I got my observations in about them. If I have cast any doubt about it, I am glad.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, I have a memorandum here which Miss Casey prepared for Mr. Dodd on the National Education Association. We would like to introduce it into the record. It is probably too lengthy to read. It is 27 pages. Mr. Dodd might identify it, and go over its general import, and then I would like you to give us permission, if you will, to have it physically incorporated in the record.

Mr. Hays. It is a memorandum Miss Casey prepared on what?

Mr. Wormser. A staff memorandum on the National Education Association.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the National Education Association is an extremely important factor, obviously, in the work of the foundations in the educational field insofar as it is the organization which represents the teachers who ultimately use the work, we suggest, produced by the foundations in the educational area.

Mr. Hays. It is not a suspect organization?

Mr. Wormser. How do you mean "suspect"?

Mr. Hays. Having any devious motives or subversive influence?

Mr. Wormser. No, no subversive influence.

Mr. Hays. I used to belong to it. I want to be sure I do not get in trouble here.

Mr. Wormser. We do think they are subject to your examination for various reasons.

Mr. Hays. I do not mind. They used to take money out of my paycheck for membership without asking me. I just wanted to get that in, if it was a subversive organization.
The Chairman. Is that sufficiently identified now? If so, it would not be necessary for Mr. Dodd to identify it further. It is your desire that it be submitted for the record.

Mr. Wormser. I think it ought to be written right into the record so you can read it.

The Chairman. Without objection it will be so ordered.

Mr. Dodd. May I identify its source, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Dodd. It arises from a study of a volume issued by the association in 1948 entitled, "Education for International Understanding in American Schools," with a subtitle "Suggestions and Recommendations." The gist of it, Mr. Chairman, is to clarify the important role the teacher has to foster two things in this country: a development of an understanding of international affairs, and, at the same time, the teacher must lead the way to a breakdown, so to speak, of our allegiance to a local or nationalistic viewpoint.

(The memorandum is as follows:)

Memorandum to: Mr. Dodd.  
From: Kathryn Casey.  
Subject: National Education Association.

One example of foundation support of organizations which display an unusual philosophy in their publications is the National Education Association.

This association has received from the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations approximately one and a half million dollars (a complete tabulation is available by year of grant and nature of project).

In 1948 the association issued a volume entitled "Education for International Understanding in American Schools—Suggestions and Recommendations," prepared by the Committee on International Relations, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the National Council for the Social Studies—all departments of NEA. The representatives of each of these departments on the committee as stated in the front of the book is:

Representing the Committee on International Relations of the National Education Association:

Ben M. Cherrington, director, Social Science Foundation, University Denver, chairman.

Rachel Evans Anderson, chairman, Physical Science Department, Andrew Jackson High School, New York, N. Y. (since September 1947).

Rufus E. Clement, president, Atlanta University (since September 1947).

Vanett Lawler, associate executive secretary, Music Educators National Conference, and music education consultant, Pan American Union (since September 1947).

William F. Russell, dean, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Howard E. Wilson, associate director, Division of Intercourse and Education, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (since March 1947).


Representing the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a department of the National Education Association:

C. O. Arndt, professor of education, New York University.

Gertrude A. Hankamp, executive secretary, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gordon N. Mackenzie, professor of education, and chief, Division of Curriculum and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Helen Frances Storen, assistant professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Representing the National Council for the Social Studies, a department of the National Education Association:

Howard R. Anderson, chief, instructional problems, Division of Secondary Education, United States Office of Education.

Merrill F. Harshorn, executive secretary, National Council for the Social Studies.
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Erling M. Hunt, professor of history, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Wallace W. Taylor, professor, and head of social studies, Milne High School,
New York State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y.

The preface signed by "The Committee" states that the book represents the consensus of "the committee on the basis of information and opinion from many sources during 2 years of investigation and discussion—from April 1946 to April 1948" (p. v). According to the preface (p. vi), the first question demanding an answer was: Why should American schools be concerned with education for international understanding? The committee's answer to that question will be found in chapter 1 of this report. The second question was: What schools and what teachers have the responsibility for educating children and youth for international understanding? The committee's answer: All elementary and secondary schools have that responsibility; and every administrator and supervisor as well as every teacher of every subject on every grade level shares a part of it.

Another fundamental question to which the committee and staff devoted extended consideration in the early stages of the project was: What should be the specific objectives of school programs for international understanding? For assistance on this point the committee sent letters of inquiry to 300 distinguished Americans of wide experience in world affairs, two-thirds of whom replied with considered and useful statements. These statements were evaluated by 16 scholars, journalists, and public officials who met with the committee at Pocono Manor, Pa., in January 1947 for a 3-day discussion of the same basic question. Ideas obtained from these sources, as revised after review by others and by committee discussion, are presented in chapter 2 and elaborated in chapter 3.

The next question was: How can educational effort be most effectively focused on, and most efficiently expended in, the achievement of these agreed-upon objectives? At this point the help of curriculum experts and classroom teachers was solicited. Arrangements were made to have this question given systematic consideration by experienced teachers enrolled in the 1947 summer sessions of 23 colleges and universities and 2 city school systems in the United States, and in the UNESCO Seminar for Teachers at Sevres, France. Faculty members representing 12 of these 26 cooperating summer schools met with the project staff and 3 members of the committee for a 3-day conference in Washington in May to make advance plans for the summer program. During June and July staff members visited 14 of the summer-school groups to assist them in their work on the project and to receive their oral suggestions and written materials. Reports from the other 12 summer groups were received by mail. During the spring and summer of 1947 additional help was obtained by mail from teachers, supervisors, and administrators in all parts of the country. The results of these several undertakings are embodied in chapters 4 and 5.

The preface (page vii) also states: "Original financial support for the project was a grant of $13,500 from the National Education Association's war and peace fund, a fund established by contributions from many thousands of teacher members during 1943-45 in order to enable their association to play a more significant role in "winning the war and securing the peace." A subsequent grant of $13,000 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, in October 1946, which permitted a substantial expansion of the scope of the project, is hereby acknowledged with deep appreciation. Although funds from the Carnegie Corporation of New York materially aided the preparation of this report, it should be stated that that corporation is not the author, owner, publisher, or proprietor of this publication, and is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements made or views expressed therein."

In addition to stressing the Building America series and UNESCO material throughout, the volume contains the following statements:

In the foreword by Warren Robinson Austin, then United States representative at the U. N. he states: "The Assembly of 1947 unanimously passed a resolution calling upon the member states of the United Nations to provide for effective teaching about the United Nations in the schools. Education for International Understanding in American Schools is one appropriate response on the part of the American people to the United Nations call. It suggests practical ways and means of extending the fine work American teachers have already undertaken for international understanding.

"The United Nations is properly presented as a facility to be used by peoples and government, and to be changed by them from time to time to fit their needs, not as an isolated institution to deal with problems for which the member nations might like to escape responsibility."
"Through educational processes we must develop a habit of individual thinking about international affairs which will cultivate a sense of public responsibility for the success of the United Nations.

"In my judgment, this involves a more fundamental acquisition of knowledge than we have yet gained. To be responsible participants in a United Nations world, a citizen must have a clear and accurate picture of their world as it really exists. They must understand, in the fullest sense, the facts which make interdependence of nations and peoples basic. They must achieve a vivid sense of functional geography, and thus come to recognize that they, as individuals, their community, and their country depend upon resources and products from every part of the globe. They must understand why it is impossible for any group of people to survive long in modern society isolated from others.

"This, in my judgment, is the foundation stone of international understanding. "One of the reasons that education is a precondition of peace in the modern world stems from the fact that conflicts are basically caused by contradictions between popular conceptions on the one side, and the realities of the 20th century on the other side. In the last hundred years, science and technology have radically changed the conditions of life and the relationships of peoples. We have introduced mass production and specialization and rendered obsolete the old handicraft economy. Nation-states must adapt themselves to the changes which have taken place through some such machinery as the United Nations.

"This involves rationalization of production and distribution on a worldwide basis. It means, for example, that peoples and nations must learn to act cooperatively on such essential matters as employment, expansion of agriculture, health, and trade. Solution of economic problems on a purely national basis without regard to the effect of their conduct on other peoples and nations breeds economic war.

"Development of international collaboration is going on at a remarkable pace. Witness the cooperative planning of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, the European recovery program and the steps toward European union, and the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Trade Organization on a worldwide basis.

"All of these and many other activities are limited and inhibited to the extent that citizens of the member states cling to obsolete ideas and attitudes contrary to the facts of the 20th century. Therefore, the United Nations relies upon education to develop the understandings essential to its successful operation. The modern rate of change is so rapid that we cannot content ourselves with passing on the old skills and beliefs generation to generation.

"In carrying forward this task of enlightenment for adaptation to the requirements of a changing world, teachers have a vast new reservoir of vital information in the documentation of the United Nations. Here is a challenge to the interpreters—the writers of books, producers of educational films, and educational radio—to translate the findings of United Nations organizations in terms that can be understood by the average citizen. Without his understanding cooperation, rational plans of political leaders cannot be carried out.

"The rapid adaptation of modern people to the potentialities of our times can result in knitting them together in such relationships of interdependence that peace becomes the only practical condition of existence. The facts are on the side of international collaboration. It is the high mission of education to teach these facts. If this is done, the youth of today, and succeeding generations, will become increasingly competent to unite the strength of nations to maintain peace."
The United States, in spite of its present position and power, is therefore forced to consider the problem of attaining and maintaining peace not from the point of view of domestic security and well-being alone but also from the point of view of the security and well-being of the world in general.

As a first step in this process (establishment of a world order), the United Nations has been created. Through its Security Council, every dispute that affects the peace of the world can be brought before an international body endowed with authority to take all necessary steps for the restraint of aggression. Its General Assembly is an international forum for the discussion of all matters of international concern. Collaboration among the nations for economic, social, and cultural welfare is being organized and given administrative instruments through the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies: the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Trade Organization, the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and others. The fundamental problem of formulating standards acceptable to all peoples to guide the relationships of groups with one another receives the continuous attention of a Commission on Human Rights.

The United States has assumed full obligations under the charter and has repeatedly declared officially that it regards full participation in United Nations activities as a fundamental tenet of its foreign policy. The creation and operation of the United Nations, however, is not the whole answer to the problem.

The beginning has been made, but it is only a beginning. Much remains to be done and it is this 'much' that is the crux of the challenge that faces American teachers today.

Today's problems must be solved by the adults of today. The immediate obligation of teachers, therefore, is to act as adults among adults, and to place whatever knowledge and ability they have in the service of the community in an effort to achieve responsible public decisions that will arrest the trends that may result in another conflict. Teachers must do more than this. They must improve their own grasp of the world's problems and the new relationship of the United States to these problems in order to exert a positive and constructive influence for peace.

The other situation facing the teaching profession today is the long-term one—the education of our children. The obligations here are manifold and they encompass the needs of the next few years as well as the years beyond. The needs of the next few years are of immense importance, for our youth are growing up in the midst of crisis. It is therefore imperative that they (our youth) be equipped to understand the nature and complexity of problems that surround them and that they be trained in the art of judgment that will be ultimately reflected in the public decisions that constitute the foundation of official governmental policies. Since it seems evident that the firm establishment of a world organization and the achievement of a world order will be a slow and gradual process, the children in our schools will be called upon to sustain, and strengthen, this movement and to lend their efforts to its advancement.

Teachers, thus, carry a larger responsibility than most of their fellow citizens for contributing to the maintenance of enduring peace. More than average influence in adult community life can properly be expected of them because of their special qualifications of training and professional status. And, in addition, they are invested with a unique obligation to influence citizen action for peace for years to come by reason of their position of leadership with respect to the younger generation. As citizens, teachers must try to give children and youth a chance of survival; as teachers, they must equip children and youth to make use of that chance.

It is more important than ever that teachers recognize the importance of educating for international understanding in our elementary and secondary schools. This is not to say that the responsibility ends here, for it does not. However, it can be said that acceptance of the responsibility to educate our children in international understanding is to give them a basic preparation that can be utilized in facing the problems that now and will continue to emerge.
"* * * If this educational challenge is to be accepted, it must be accepted boldly; that is to say, educators must be prepared to take the matter seriously and to embark upon a soberly conceived program with a determination to reach the objective. This will certainly involve curriculum revision and the recasting of many time-honored educational policies and practices. It is a case in which half-measures and lip-service will not be adequate, for if these are the substance of the effort, the challenge will go unanswered.

"This report summons the teaching profession of the United States to unite in planning and executing an educational program for a peaceful world."

CHAPTER 2. THE GOAL

Page 11:
"The long-range goal of education for international understanding is world peace and human welfare, achieved and maintained through a peaceful world order operating through international organizations. The immediate purpose of such education in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States is the development of American citizens who are conscious of their new obligations to mankind.

"The measure of success for a school program in international understanding is the extent to which the young people who are graduated from high school after 11, 12, or 13 years of opportunities to grow in international understanding can demonstrate both individually and in their communities throughout the Nation, an ability to think and act as Americans who see beyond the confines of their own Nation and its own problems. Such a citizen might be called a world-minded American."

Page 12:
"* * * These 16 experts met with the committees sponsoring the present project for a 3-day conference at Pocono Manor, Pa., January 18–20, 1947. At this conference exhaustive discussion was devoted to the question of what the world-minded American should know, feel, and do. The names of members at the Pocono Conference are given in the acknowledgments.

"Out of the 200 letters and the 500-page transcript of the proceedings of the Pocono conference, the staff and sponsoring committees formulated a series of statements designed to identify some of the characteristics of world-mindedness toward which school programs in 'education for international understanding' might be directed. After criticisms and suggestions from many persons, leading to a succession of revisions, a list of 10 marks of the world-minded American was agreed upon by the committees. The list is as follows:

"Marks of the World-Minded American

"I. The world-minded American realizes that civilization may be imperiled by another world war.

"II. The world-minded American wants a world at peace in which liberty and justice are assured for all.

"III. The world-minded American knows that nothing in human nature makes war inevitable.

"IV. The world-minded American believes that education can become a powerful force for achieving international understanding and world peace.

"V. The world-minded American knows and understands how people in other lands live and recognizes the common humanity which underlies all differences of culture.

"VI. The world-minded American knows that unlimited national sovereignty is a threat to world peace and that nations must cooperate to achieve peace and human progress.

"VII. The world-minded American knows that modern technology holds promise of solving the problem of economic security and that international cooperation can contribute to the increase of well-being for all men.

"VIII. The world-minded American has a deep concern for the well-being of humanity.

"IX. The world-minded American has a continuing interest in world affairs and he devotes himself seriously to the analysis of international problems with all the skill and judgment he can command.

"X. The world-minded American acts to help bring about a world at peace in which liberty and justice are assured for all."
The 10 marks of the world-minded American as stated above in this chapter are the goal of education for international understanding toward which all teachers of all subjects in American elementary and secondary schools should direct their instruction. The fuller meaning of each of these marks is elaborated in chapter 3. Instructional problems involved in educating children and youth to the attainment of each of the 10 marks, together with suggested learning experiences appropriate to each, are considered in chapter 5.

CHAPTER 3. THE MARKS OF THE WORLD-MINDED AMERICAN

More recently, the idea has become established that the preservation of international peace and order may require that force be used to compel a nation to conduct its affairs within the framework of an established world system. The most modern expression of this doctrine of collective security is in the United Nations Charter.

The social causes of war are overwhelmingly more important than the attitudes and behavior of individuals. If this be true, the primary approach to the prevention of war must involve action in the area of social and political organization and control. The role of the individual, however, is not unimportant. It must be recognized that individuals do have tendencies toward pugnacity and aggression, that they react to frustration, that they respond to emotional appeals of aggressive leaders, and that they can develop callousness toward violence and human suffering. All these human traits make war more possible, but by no means inevitable. The educational problem both in and out of school is to assist individuals to recognize their own behavior tendencies and to assist them in directing their behavior toward peaceful and other socially approved ends.

While we need not demonstrate the proposition that a world-minded American has a deep faith in the power of education generally, something remains to be said of the power of education as a force for achieving international understanding and world peace. Here the matter is much broader than formal education in American schools. Education for international understanding involves the use of education as a force for conditioning the will of a people, and it comprises the home, the church, the school, and the community. It utilizes old techniques and mass media such as the printed word, the cinema, the radio, and now television. It involves, too, the efficacy of education for peace as a force among all peoples of the world and not merely the United States.

"In an absolute sense, there is no empirical evidence to prove that education can become a powerful force for world peace. It is not, however, necessary to have this proof for the world-minded American to place a faith in education as an instrument for world peace. We do know that education has contributed substantially to the attainment of lesser goals and with this knowledge there is reason to believe that education can make a substantial contribution to the achievement of this high purpose.

"It is not enough, however, for the world-minded American to believe that simply because education has accomplished certain ends, it can assist in attaining world peace. Such a belief, if carried no further, rests on a tenuous base of assumption that mere exposure to a bombardment of ideas and the completion of certain mechanical processes will produce a desired result."

The world-minded American believes that the force of education as a factor for peace lies in the capacity of the educative process to develop standards and values and to supply knowledge and perception, and from these two to produce citizens who understand the necessity and desirability of peace and the role they can play in achieving it.

"Education for Peace Through Mass Media

"World-minded Americans are aware of the tremendous educational potency of the media of mass communication—the press, film, and radio. Teachers from 28 different countries, assembled at Endicott, N. Y., in August 1948 for the World Conference of the Teaching Profession, declared:

"The influence of the press is limited only by the extent of literacy; the radio leaps across national boundaries to inform and inspire all who have ears
to hear; the cinema teaches its lessons, wholesome or detrimental, with a power and persuasiveness beyond those of the most skillful teachers and the most highly organized educational systems. These, and other modern media of mass communication, have in the past and may in the future work either with teachers or against them in their efforts to develop international understanding.

"It is important that the world-minded American develop an ability to discriminate and analyze what he reads, sees, and hears through these mass media. The same time, he should use these media in promoting the ideal of peace and in convincing others of the validity of the objective."

Page 37:

"* UNESCO is devoted to formulating and carrying out on a world-wide scale a positive program for promotion of international understanding through education."

Page 37:

"* UNESCO offers a direct means through which the power of education may be channeled for the gradual achievement of its overall objective. There has seldom been an opportunity of this kind offered to the people of the world. It behooves the world-minded American to know what UNESCO is and what it is attempting to do. Having discovered this, he should lend his efforts to its support. Every person has a part to play in promoting the purposes of UNESCO, but because of the nature of the job to be done an extraordinarily large responsibility rests upon members of the teaching profession."

Page 44:

"The World-Minded American Believes that Unlimited National Sovereignty Is a Threat to World Peace and that Nations Must Cooperate to Achieve Peace and Human Progress

* The nation-state system has been in existence for about three centuries. Although serious attempts have been made by many of the nations during this period to establish permanent peace on a worldwide basis, all such attempts have failed. The nation-state system has not been able to the present time to abolish wars. Many persons believe that enduring peace cannot be achieved so long as the nation-state system continues as at present constituted. It is a system of international anarchy—a species of jungle warfare. Enduring peace cannot be attained until the nations surrender to a world organization the exercise of jurisdiction over those problems with which they have found themselves unable to deal singly in the past. If like conditions continue in the future as in the past, like situations will arise. Change the conditions, and the situations will change."

Page 45:

"* Unfortunately man did not attain peace through the nation-state system on a worldwide basis."

"So long as these narrow nationalistic ideas continue to be held by many people in all nations today, there is a threat to peace."

Page 46:

"The Society of Nations Today

"We are likely to take the present nation-state system for granted; but in so doing, we are likely to overestimate its permanence and underestimate its significance. A study of the development of nation-states in world history raises the possibility that since the society of nations is only three centuries old, the system is not necessarily permanent but may be only a stage in the evolution of political groups. On the other hand, since we are faced today with the actuality of some 60 independent, sovereign political entities, recognition must be given to the difficulty of reconciling the objectives of their foreign policies. Attempts to bring about world cooperation in trade, social welfare, control of armaments, and education are blocked by nations who are either too selfish or too unenlightened to be willing to cooperate. Since collective action by states frequently calls for unanimity to achieve a desired goal, the failure of one of the powers to cooperate will block the attempt. World organizations derive their strength from the voluntary participation and support given by the member nations."

Page 53:

"* Role of public opinion: Some knowledge of governmental structure is of particular importance in understanding the role of public opinion in foreign policy, for in democratic countries, the public is ultimately the judge of all governmental actions. In these countries, therefore, the public will be the ultimate arbiter of the issue of peace or war."
"In our own country, there is and there will always be a gap between the formulation and execution of policy by the Government and its scrutiny by the public except on major issues. This is true because issues arise from day to day that require action within the framework of established policy. Sometimes these day-to-day operations create new policy. The point is that except on matters involving treaties, appropriations, and appointments, there is no constitutional requirement that the public or Congress be consulted, and in many cases it is doubtful if this could be done even if it were required.

"Our system is one in which the public can, does, and should express its opinions through established means, thereby affecting the course of foreign policy. In many matters, the Congress has a significant voice and the public has a full opportunity to bring its judgment to bear. In others, the public has the role of approval or disapproval after a course of action has been embarked upon.

"There is one characteristic of our system that does not obtain in many other democracies—the pressure group. These are individuals or groups devoted to special pleading of all types and trained in the art of influencing legislation. They are often very influential in determining the course of governmental action.

"In parliamentary systems, much the same situation obtains. It may be said, however, that in some parliamentary systems, notably the British system, official conduct of policy is even more responsive to public opinion than in the United States since the group in control of the Government may be more easily deposed from office.

"In totalitarian countries, there is the facade of popular control of government; but with opposition carefully controlled and representative bodies carefully chosen, there is seldom if ever any decision except approval of what the leaders desire. This may not always be the case, however, and it behooves the world-minded American to give some attention to the role of public opinion in totalitarian states."

Page 54: "International Organization

"The world-minded American is deeply concerned with the problem of how world organizations can be made to work most effectively—how they can be used to gain big ends as well as little ones—above all, how the United Nations can be made to contribute maximally to world peace and human progress. And his concern for these matters is not confined to feeling and wishing; he also studies them and does what he can to contribute to the success of the United Nations and other international organizations."

Page 57: "* * * The demonstration of the feasibility of international organization in nonpolitical fields and the failure of the League of Nations makes even more clear the fact that it is in the area of 'political' organization where failure seems to be consistent. This suggests that the difficulty may be traceable to the dogma of unlimited sovereignty—that nothing must be allowed to restrict the complete independence of the state. It suggests also that the dogma of sovereignty has a high emotional content that is self-generated and self-sustained and that so long as the dogma of illimitability obtains, international cooperation of a political nature will at best be tenuous."

Page 60: "* * * The development of international cooperation as a contributing force to economic well-being is possible only insofar as it is applied to give direction to common positive aims and to condition the effects of national economic policies that would otherwise be serious disruptions of the interdependent world economy."

Page 62: "International Cooperation for Economic Well-Being

"* * * And we cannot hope to achieve the objective of an increase of well-being for all men without planned economic cooperation on a worldwide scale. This proposition has already been accepted by most of the nations of the world and is evidenced in the establishment of new means to effect cooperation. The most notable of these are the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and certain specialized agencies: The International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Organization, and the International Trade Organization which is now in the process of being formed. The world-minded Amer-
ican realizes this cardinal proposition, but he realizes, too, that in order to translate it into action, he must understand the meaning of 'planned cooperation,' the purposes for which the new organizations have been established, and the extent to which they can contribute to the attainment of the objectives.

"Planned cooperation" in the economic field needs some definition. It is not simply a matter of many nations doing something together for the whole economic system. The world economic system is so complex that there are many areas in which better results may be obtained by not planning. It is, in large measure, a question of determining 'what' and 'when.' Planned cooperation is therefore a deliberate cooperative effort in the economic areas in which a careful study of the problems and circumstances will give better results than no planning."

Page 66:

"Educators as well as our youth, if they are to be world-minded have a considerable obligation in achieving this particular mark of world-mindedness. They will support the present efforts being made toward cooperative solution of world economic problems. But to do this intelligently they must first make a concerted effort to understand economic forces and economic complexities. They can then assess the role of American economic foreign policy; they can then judge its validity in terms of the contribution it will make to the attainment of the eventual goal. They can also then lend a more intelligent support to the international efforts now being undertaken."

Page 78:

"Awareness of Techniques and Channels of Action"

"The American citizen can bring his personal influence directly to bear on international affairs in ways and he can become an active member of one or more nongovernmental international organizations."

Page 80:

"An individual can increase his effectiveness in influencing foreign policy by associating himself with organizations and by helping to formulate their attitudes on international questions. The groups most suitable for this purpose are the political party and those generally called pressure groups."

Page 81:

"The world-minded American, as a part of his program of action, should concern himself with how these groups operate. He will find that he himself can probably have a greater influence through this technique. He will also find that since a great deal of official action is determined by pressure group action, the use of this device will enable him to be heard and will also enable him to urge his interest for peace against those he considers to be urging a contrary interest. He will find that the variety and interest of the groups with which he can affiliate are endless; and he must, therefore, examine carefully the aims of the group or groups to which he will devote his energies."

Page 82:

"Teachers must act. As citizens, their obligation to act on behalf of peace and international cooperation is a responsibility shared with all other citizens. But teachers cannot be content merely to do just as much as others; they must do more. Teachers in almost any American community have greater competence in leadership skills and in knowledge than most of their fellow citizens. With greater capacity goes greater responsibility for bringing personal influence to bear on civic action on the local, State, and National levels."

CHAPTER 4. PLANNING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH THE SCHOOL PROGRAM

Page 83:

"Responsibility of the school: What is the responsibility of American schools for comprehensive program planning focused on the goal of international understanding? The urgency and the magnitude of the world crisis that now confronts the world's people make it mandatory that every person and institution devote maximum efforts toward building the foundations of peace. This means that schools must assume responsibility for helping all children, youth, and adults to have experiences which will advance understanding of international affairs and which will aid them in recognizing the significance of decisions in which they share, either directly or indirectly. This comprehensive approach is necessary in order that the entire population, young and old, may have experiences which will aid them to become increasingly effective world-minded citizens."
"To involve all citizens, a program in the field of international understanding must move beyond the conventional school-community relationships and organizations. In many communities economic and social groups are already at work on programs designed to increase understanding of international problems. The school, as a public agent, should seek to coordinate such efforts in order that the total impact of community thinking may be brought to bear on major issues. Such a role brings the school into working contact with those agencies in the community which are keyed to action, thus helping youth to function directly with adults and community agencies. By such procedure, too, the danger is lessened that the schools may remain ideological islands in a culture in which decisions are based on values remote from those taught in the school."

Page 91:

"How can schools organize to assume their responsibility?

"Some of the elements and major tasks of developing a program of education for international understanding have been delineated in the preceding pages. The problem of organizing schools, school systems, and school-community relations must yet be considered. The principles and procedures suggested in the paragraphs which follow are not peculiar to the field of international understanding; they apply to any curriculum area."

Pages 92-98:

"Faculty planning.

"Community participation.

"Teaching aids and procedures.

"Student participation.

"Individual teacher initiative.

"Administration and supervision."

Page 98:

"The administrative officials, together with the interschool planning committee, should develop such guiding principles as the following:

"The school system is committed to the task of educating for international understanding, which is recognized as an integral part of the total curriculum program. The task takes its place with other imperatives in the school program.

"Each established part of the school system is involved.

"An interdepartmental planning committee in each school is desirable for the purpose of releasing and coordinating individual school developments.

"Each school is encouraged to develop individual programs as effectively and rapidly as possible.

"An interschool planning committee exists for the purpose of interchange of information and stimulation. Individual school-planning committees may pool ideas through it and thus move toward more effective general school-system procedures."

Page 1005:

"The School in Community Organization for World Understanding

"The last chapter, VI, is entitled 'Aids and Sources,' and has four sections:

"Readings on the 10 marks of the world-minded American.

"Reading materials especially for pupils.

"Films and filmstrips.

"Continuing sources."

On page 217, under the first of these sections, it is stated:

"Readings on the 10 Marks of the World-Minded American

"This section is devoted largely to books and pamphlets, but a few magazine articles are also listed. Items in this bibliography have been selected with two criteria in mind: Authoritativeness and representativeness. Authors of works cited are in nearly all cases recognized authorities in their respective special fields. Readings listed have been chosen to represent different points of view and different facets of each of the 10 marks. No title is cited more than once in this 10-part bibliography; for, even though many of the references might contribute to understanding of 2 or more marks, each is classified under the mark to which it can make its most distinctive contribution. All readings in this section are written on the adult level and may, therefore, be expected to be of most usefulness to teachers, but many of them may also be used profitably by secondary-school students."
"The books and pamphlets have not all been checked, because of the limitation of time, but a casual glance reveals such names as Manley O. Hudson, Philip C. Jessup, W. E. B. DuBois, Max Lerner, Alvin H. Hansen, Stuart Chase, Commission to Study the Organization of the Peace (Eichelberger), Maxwell S. Stewart, Mortimer Adler, Lowell Mellett, Joseph Kise as well as pamphlets from U. N. and the Foreign Policy Association, Institute of International Education, the Public Affairs Committee, and World Peace Foundation.

"In a section headed 'Acknowledgments' at the end of the book, these names appear:

"Chandoe Reid of the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, E. U. Condon, Vera Michele's Dean, Frank Fleming, Donald Stone, Quincy Wright, Harry Bard, David Adler.

"In addition, Willard E. Givens, under the title 'Education for the New America' in the proceedings of the 72 annual meeting of the National Educational Association, is quoted as follows:

"This report comes directly from the thinking together of more than 1,000 members of the department of superintendence * * *.

"A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the 'owners,' must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries, and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership.

"Hence they will join in creating a swift nationwide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interests of all of the people. * * *.

"Mr. Givens became executive secretary of NEA in 1935 and remained in that post until 1952 according to Who's Who. Briefly he has a 'diploma' from Union Theological Seminary, A. M. from Columbia, was a fellow of Educational Institute and the Ford Foundation, member of the American Council on Education, Institute of International Education, Peace Commission of American Academy of Political and Social Science, member of United States education mission to Japan, 1946, Board of Visitors, Air University, 1946-50; member, combined Armed Forces educational program, 1945-53; chairman, National Conference for Mobilization of Education, 1939; chairman, second United States educational mission to Japan, 1950.

"This organization began back in 1865 as the National Association of School Superintendents, and 1870 became one of the four original departments of the NEA. Under the act of incorporation (1906) it was called the department of superintendence, and in 1921 was reorganized with a full-time executive secretary at NEA headquarters. In 1937 the department adopted a revised constitution and bylaws, and its name was changed to the American Association of School Administrators. According to the NEA Handbook, 1953-54, it has a membership of 8,700" (p. 290).

Mr. WORMSER. That is all we have to offer you today, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Dodd has been on the stand almost 2 hours.

The CHAIRMAN. There may be some questions.

Mr. HAYS. I have a whole series of questions. I hope they will not take as long as Senator McCarthy is taking with Mr. Stevens. I think I can do it in an hour or less. I think in view of the fact that it is almost time for the House to go into session we might defer them until the morning. I can start.

The CHAIRMAN. We do have 15 minutes, but that is entirely with the convenience of the committee.

Then if agreeable we will resume Tuesday morning, concluding with Mr. Dodd, and then having the other witnesses. So we will tentatively schedule the hearing for the Public Works Committee room on Tuesday, at 10 o'clock. The committee will be adjourned.

(Thereupon at 11:55 a.m., a recess was taken, the committee to reconvene in the Public Works Committee room, on Tuesday, May 18, 1954, at 10 a.m.)