TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1954

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The special subcommittee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 1334, New House Office Building, Hon. B. Carroll Reece (chairman of the special subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Reece, Hays, and Pfost.

Also present: Rene A. Wormser, general counsel; Arnold T. Koch, associate counsel; Norman Dodd, research director; Kathryn Casey, legal analyst.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Who is your first witness, Mr. Wormser?

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Aaron Sargent, of San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you be sworn? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give in this proceeding shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

TESTIMONY OF AARON M. SARGENT, ATTORNEY,
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. Sargent. Yes; I do. I have the original subpena Mr. Reece served me. May I lodge it with the clerk at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. Wormser. Will you state your name, address, and occupation for the record, please?

Mr. Sargent. Yes. My name is Aaron M. Sargent. My occupation is attorney at law. I also have had experience in connection with special investigations and research, particularly in the educational and antisubversive field. My office is in the Hobart Building in San Francisco, Calif. I maintain a research office at Palo Alto, Calif., which is down in the San Francisco Peninsula. My residence is 606 Santa Rita Avenue, Palo Alto, Calif.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Sargent, you are here, I understand, to give testimony on radicalism in education and the responsibility of the foundations for it?

Mr. Hays. Before we go any further, I have a few questions I would like to ask.

Mr. Wormser. I was just going to ask him to qualify himself.

Mr. Hays. I am going to qualify him. Were you ever offered the counselship of the Cox committee?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, sir.
Mr. HAYS. Do you have any documentary evidence to that effect?
Mr. SARGENT. Not in my possession. You mean the specific offering of the position or discussion of my possible employment?
Mr. HAYS. I asked you a specific question. Were you offered the counselship of the Cox committee?
Mr. SARGENT. In substance, yes. It was indicated verbally that my appointment would be looked upon favorably. The actual tender I do not think was made. I discussed the matter with Judge Cox in Washington at the time.
Mr. HAYS. In other words, it was an informal discussion about the possibility of it, but actually you were never specifically offered it?
Mr. SARGENT. No. I was never specifically offered it in a formal way. It was under discussion. I found myself unable to do it for a number of reasons.
The CHAIRMAN. Would you permit an interjection, Mr. Hays?
Mr. HAYS. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. As a member of the Cox committee, I might say Judge Cox brought up the question of counsel. He brought up the name of Mr. Sargent and gave his background and his evaluation of him, which was favorable, indicating that he thought favorably of his selection. The committee at this informal session authorized him to get in touch with Mr. Sargent and negotiate with him. I do not remember the exact details but as I recall it, the inference was to conclude a contract with him if he desired to do so.
At a later meeting he advised the committee that he had contacted Mr. Sargent, who at that time was in Texas attending a bar association meeting of some kind.
Mr. SARGENT. It was a meeting of the Sons of the American Revolution, National Society, at Houston.
The CHAIRMAN. He advised he would be unable to accept the counselship. That is the basis for my reference the other day. In view of the fact that I made that reference, I thought I should further explain the statement.
Mr. HAYS. Did you ever offer to work for the Cox committee later on, Mr. Sargent, after the counsel was chosen?
Mr. SARGENT. No; I never did. Mr. Harold Keele, the counsel for the committee, contacted me when I was in Washington—I do not recall the exact date—September or October of that year. What year was that? That committee was acting in 1952.
Mr. HAYS. Yes.
Mr. SARGENT. It would be about October, as I recall, of 1952. I was staying at the Statler. Mr. Keele's office contacted me and requested me to confer with him, which I did, and he asked me what I knew about this thing. We went over it in some detail. He asked in what way I could be of any help. I said if you feel that my services would be of any assistance to you, I will see what I can do. But I was never requested to act, and I did not solicit the arrangement in any way. The entire request originated from Mr. Keele. He had me meet with the staff at lunch and we did various things.
Mr. HAYS. You are testifying now that Mr. Keele asked you.
Mr. SARGENT. Correct. He asked me in what way I could help. I indicated I thought that there were only two ways—as a witness, or possibly under some special employment. It was in response to his question how I could aid him. I did not want the association at
the time. I had a great deal of responsibility. I did not even contact his office. I was in town on other business.

Mr. HAYS. Did you have a conference with Mr. Keele at that time?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, I did; a long conference.

Mr. HAYS. It lasted until 8:30 or so in the evening?

Mr. SARGENT. I do not recall the hour. It lasted a long time. He reviewed a great many things about his policies in the handling of the investigation and so forth.

Mr. HAYS. Do you recall saying that you would be available for special consultation or investigative work to this Cox committee at a fee of about $100 to $125 a day?

Mr. SARGENT. I may have stated that amount. That is about what it is worth for an attorney to leave his business and go out of town and attend things of this kind. It is a very expensive and heavy responsibility. I may have said that.

Mr. HAYS. And you recall that was considerably more than the counsel was getting and that the committee probably would not pay that, is that correct?

Mr. SARGENT. I think it was indicated that it was higher than the scale; yes. However, that is what the sacrifice was worth to me.

Mr. HAYS. Did you tell Mr. Keele the reason that you had declined the job of counsel of the Cox committee? Did you tell him that?

Mr. SARGENT. I think he knew it all right. I don't specifically recall.

Mr. HAYS. Remember you are under oath. You just testified that you were not specifically tendered the job. I am asking you, Did you tell Mr. Keele that you declined the job?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't know whether I did or not. You are being technical, Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS. No; I am not being technical at all. I am just asking you a question. You either did or didn't.

Mr. SARGENT. I may have used that expression, but in a technical and exact sense, I was not tendered the job. I felt here in justice to this committee I should not make that statement. There was no formal notice or a letter stating that "we offer you the counselship of the committee."

Mr. HAYS. We brought that out.

Mr. SARGENT. I may have used that reference in talking to Mr. Keele in a loose general sense, in the sense I knew I probably could be appointed and indicating to them I could not be available. I think I would have been justified in making that statement. I said generally something of that nature.

Mr. HAYS. All right. I am not going to try to pin you down more than that.

Mr. SARGENT. In a technical sense, I was not offered the job, no.

Mr. HAYS. Did you give Mr. Keele any reason why you would not have taken the job?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't remember. I may have indicated something. I don't recall specifically at this time.

Mr. HAYS. You don't remember whether you told him that you had an estate that you were executor for in California and you could not afford to turn down the fee involved?

Mr. SARGENT. I could have told him that. That is the fact. It is an estate pending at the present time, as a matter of fact. I am still working on it.
Mr. Hays. Did Mr. Keele question you anything about the size of that estate?

Mr. Sargent. I don’t know whether he did or not. I don’t know whether he did or not. I don’t mind telling you it is a quarter-million-dollar estate in probate. It is important business. The party died while I was in the East.

Mr. Hays. Have you at any time in the past criticized the Cox committee on the ground that the questionnaires were not sworn to?

Mr. Sargent. Yes.

Mr. Hays. Did you discuss with Mr. Keele at any time during your conference the problem of having those questionnaires sworn to?

Mr. Sargent. Yes; I asked why there was no oath on that questionnaire form. He said he was going to bring these people in later and cross-examine them and use these statements to get preliminary information.

Mr. Hays. Did you happen to discuss it with him to the extent of agreeing that had they tried in the limited time to get the questionnaires sworn to that they probably would not have gotten any back?

Mr. Sargent. I think he said something like that. I don’t recall I ever said it.

Mr. Hays. You do not know whether you agreed with that conclusion?

Mr. Sargent. I don’t think so. I was a little disturbed at the procedure. It looked a little irregular to me. That committee had the subpoena power, including power to compel answer. I thought the procedure was a little different, to say the least.

Mr. Hays. Did you discuss the mechanics of this thing? This committee only had a life of 6 months. Wasn’t the question discussed that, if they required sworn questionnaires, that they probably wouldn’t have had time to check every answer of the foundations, and the committee probably would not have gotten back anything, so under the circumstances it was better to go ahead this way than to risk getting nothing?

Mr. Sargent. You misunderstand the purpose and scope of that conversation, Mr. Hays. I didn’t go there to discuss any of these things with Mr. Keele. He called me in because he wanted to talk to me and he outlined various things and I commented upon some of them.

Mr. Hays. He called you in?

Mr. Sargent. I was definitely there at his request, and I remained for a very long time, longer than I had any idea of staying. I got there about 4 o’clock in the afternoon and I didn’t get out until probably around 8 o’clock, nearly 3 or 4 hours.

Mr. Hays. I do not know who called you.

Mr. Sargent. He did. I didn’t discuss these things with him at all, except I might comment on what he said. He was apparently trying to tell me what he was going to do. I was not guiding him.

Mr. Hays. It has been stated here by Mr. Dodd that there are certain things missing from the files of the Cox committee. At least one set of the answers to these questionnaires. Do you happen to have that set?

Mr. Sargent. No, sir.

Mr. Hays. Did you ever have it?
Mr. Sargent. No, sir; I never did. The answers to questionnaires?
In the first place—

Mr. Hays. Do you have any material that came out of the files of
the Cox committee?

Mr. Sargent. Not a single piece of paper of any kind. I think the
suggestion is a little bit unfair, Mr. Hays.

Mr. Hays. Well, now—

Mr. Sargent. May I answer further, please?

Mr. Hays. Yes; you may answer, but we are not going to make
speeches. I have been lenient with you on making speeches so far. Do
you know a fellow by the name of "Bugeye" Barker?

Mr. Sargent. I want to answer the other question first.

Mr. Hays. You said you didn't have any papers.

Mr. Sargent. Yes; but I want to explain the circumstances to show
I couldn't have any in the first place. May I answer?

Mr. Hays. No; you cannot make a speech.

Mr. Sargent. I am not going to make a speech. May I answer that
question first, please?

Mr. Hays. You can answer whether or not you have anything out
of the files of the Cox committee.

Mr. Sargent. I want to explain.

Mr. Hays. I will give you a chance to explain why you couldn't
have later.

Mr. Sargent. I did not at any time have access to those question-
naires or the answers except under the jurisdiction of the Clerk of
the House of Representatives in his office in one of these buildings
under his custody and in his office. The questionnaires had never been
answered when I saw Mr. Keele, which was in October. They had
been sent out. I saw no answers at that time.

Mr. Hays. Do you know one George, commonly known around
here as Bugeye Barker?

Mr. Sargent. I met him when I was in town.

Mr. Hays. Did he ever deliver anything to you from the files of
the Cox committee?

Mr. Sargent. Not a single piece of paper of any kind.

Mr. Hays. Did you try to get from Mr. Keele any material about
the Cox committee?

Mr. Sargent. Not a single thing except a transcript I wanted to
borrow later. He handed me some kind of printed forms of question-
naires he was supposed to use. I think I took a few of those away
with me, just blank forms, nothing aside from that.

Mr. Hays. You didn't ask for anything and later complained that
he turned you down?

Mr. Sargent. No, of course not. I had no right to ask anything
of him. I never did except with respect to the transcript of the Hiss
case.

Mr. Hays. Do you know a George DeHuszar?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, he is in Chicago.

Mr. Hays. Have you ever worked with him?

Mr. Sargent. No, I never worked with him. I discussed problems
with him from time to time. But I never worked with him on any
situation. I have corresponded with him as I do with other people
interested in this kind of work. He did a small job for me years
 ago, long before the Cox committee, and gave me some reports on
some matters.

Mr. Hays. Did I understand you to just say that you never asked
Mr. Keele for anything?

Mr. Sargent. Any documentary material?

Mr. Hays. Yes.

Mr. Sargent. I am pretty clear I never did.

Mr. Hays. Did you ever ask him for any information?

Mr. Sargent. I asked him at one time if he could get me access
to the printed transcript of the proceedings on the trial of Alger Hiss.
I asked him if he could give me that. I was doing research and I
wanted to go over the transcript. He told me by letter he didn’t
have it. I later obtained it from another source. I did ask him for
that. I never asked him for any committee material. I think that
is the only thing I ever did ask him for.

Mr. Hays. Did you write him at least two letters demanding cer-
tain information relative to the work of the committee?

Mr. Sargent. Not demanding anything, no. I had a few letters
with him, yes. I will be glad to identify any letters of mine if you
have them there, and if I look at my file at home, I will send you
copies of what my correspondence with him was.

Mr. Hays. Did you write him any letters wanting to know why
witnesses had not been sworn?

Mr. Sargent. After the thing was over, I did. I wanted to pin
him down and tried to find why. That was after the committee had
disbanded. Yes, I did ask for his explanation and I got no satis-
factory answer.

Mr. Hays. You didn’t sort of try to run this Cox investigation
from the sidelines by any chance, did you?

Mr. Sargent. No, not under any conditions. I had nothing to do
with it. I waited until it was all over. I received the report and the
published transactions. I looked them over. I then discovered that
the witnesses had not been sworn. I was amazed about it. Mr. Keele’s
explanation to me was the fact that some sworn testimony would be
taken. I was astounded at what I found. I then opened correspond-
ence with Mr. Keele to find out why he had not done so. That is when
the correspondence originated on the swearing of witnesses.

Mr. Hays. Did you at any time want to set up another committee in
this session of the Congress?

Mr. Sargent. Another committee?

Mr. Hays. A similar committee to the Cox committee—this com-
mittee?

Mr. Sargent. You mean aside from this committee here?

Mr. Hays. No. Did you at any time either verbally or in writing
ask anyone to introduce a resolution setting up such a committee as we
have meeting here today?

Mr. Sargent. No. The resolution was introduced. I was back here
after the resolution was introduced, and I was in favor of the resolution
carrying. I did not suggest a resolution to be offered in the
first place. I had nothing to do with that.

Mr. Hays. Did any member of this committee tender you the job
of counsel or approach you?

Mr. Sargent. No, not under those circumstances, not even by sug-
gestion or indirection.
Mr. Hays. Did you approach anyone asking to be considered?

Mr. Sargent. No.

Mr. Hays. How was the contact made that brings you here today, Mr. Sargent?

Mr. Sargent. I received a letter from Mr. Norman Dodd. I don’t have the exact date.

Mr. Hays. That is immaterial.

Mr. Sargent. I received a letter quite recently inquiring whether I could be in any way helpful to this committee. I wired Mr. Dodd back and told him that if they desired to take care of the usual expenses that I would be willing to come back and lay the entire matter before you. I received in response to that wire a telegram from Mr. Dodd stating that my willingness to do that was greatly appreciated; that the expenses would be provided, and that I would be notified shortly. I talked with him on the phone subsequently, and I told him that I felt that if I came, I should have the protection of subpoena so as to make it clearly a well-defined legal arrangement. The subpoena was forthcoming, and I came. This originated in the first place at the instance of your staff, and throughout was at their request, and not my request. If that had not happened, I would never have been here at all.

Mr. Hays. Understand I am not trying to lead you into anything on that question. I am merely trying to find out how the contact was made.

Mr. Sargent. The contract was made at the instance of your staff. I am here at their request.

Mr. Hays. As I understand it from this three-page mimeographed form that you have here, in which you say in the last paragraph that a considerable amount of time is required for your presentation. I assume that you have a prepared presentation there, well documented and so on.

Mr. Sargent. I have an outline to enable me to testify. It is not prepared in the sense that it can be mimeographed and distributed and have any use. I have an outline and it is organized to minimize your time and to be orderly in its handling.

Mr. Hays. In other words, you are sitting there with a prepared script that you cannot furnish to the committee, is that it?

Mr. Sargent. The question is not being able to furnish the committee. I understand you want to know what I know about this subject. I have arranged notes to enable me to do this with a minimum of time and lost motion. I have such an outline for my guidance, yes. The first part of my testimony, Mr. Hays, will be devoted to this first statement here. For your convenience, as I get to other sections of this, I will try and give you some sort of agenda as best I can. I have been in town only 5 days and working constantly to put this material together after I got here.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Hays. I will ask you one more question, Mr. Sargent. In view of the fact that you do not have a prepared statement, and according to the short statement you have here, you say that it is going to be very long, you would not have any objection if the committee interrupted you at any place to try to ask you a question to clarify something?
Mr. Sargent. No; subject to one request, Mr. Hays. It may de-
velop that you will ask me some question which cannot be fully
answered without reference to other testimony I propose to give.
In a case of that kind, I would like to indicate to you the nature of
the other testimony, and ask leave to respond to it later. Running
questions as we go, of course, I am happy to answer.

Mr. Hays. The committee will not try to put a limitation on your
answer.

Mr. Sargent. No; there are several blocks of testimony and one
of these questions may anticipate something which I am going to cover
very fully.

The Chairman. Also, Mr. Sargent, I have indicated to Mr. Hays
and Mrs. Pfost that in addition to the questions they may ask as they
go along, that after reading the full transcript of your testimony, if
further questioning is desired, that you will become available to
answer.

Mr. Sargent. Certainly, except I do hope that it is possible to mini-
mize my stay in Washington and do it promptly. I have to go to
New York from here. If I can get through this continuously to a
point where you are approximately through, I will contact the com-
mittee staff, and if you want to hold one more hearing to question
me further on my testimony in coming back from New York I can do
that, and perhaps that will accomplish your purpose.

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Sargent, you have no carbon copies at all. You
have only one original of your lengthy testimony?

Mr. Sargent. I have not written out my testimony. I am giving
it as I go. I have notes from which I can testify to these various
facts. I haven't it written out in full, no. I am testifying and not
just reading a piece of paper here.

Mr. Hays. Let me ask you this, and I am trying again to get some
clarification on this. Do you propose being specific? If you make
any generalizations, are you going to try to document those, and
name names?

Mr. Sargent. I propose to be absolutely specific and to make my
statements based upon documents which I personally have examined.
In some cases I have the document right here and I will read from the
document itself.

Mr. Hays. In other words, you will read excerpts?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, and I will cite the original source. I am refer-
ing to books. I am referring to manuscript material.

Mr. Hays. All right.

The Chairman. You may proceed, then, Mr. Sargent.

Mr. Wormser. May I first ask, Mr. Sargent, to state what educa-
tional and other experience you may have had which might qualify
you to give expert testimony in this proceeding?

Mr. Sargent. From the standpoint of educational background, I
am a graduate of Stanford University, class of 1923, receiving a de-
gree of bachelor of science in mechanical engineering, I was gradu-
ated from Hastings College of Law, which is the University of Cali-
ifornia, in 1926, being granted the degree, bachelor of laws. I was
admitted to the bar of the State of California in 1926. I became
a member of the bar of the United States Supreme Court in 1930.
I am a member of the American Bar Association, the American Judi-
cature Society, State Bar of California. Twenty-seven years experi-
ence in the active practice of law, and 17 of those years concerned to
some extent with antisuverse work and investigations affecting
American education, and particularly the public school system.

From the standpoint of specific proceedings, I participated in hear-
ings in 1941-42, before the San Francisco City Board of Education
in regard to Rugg social science textbooks. Between 1942 and 1945,
I studied the progressive system of education. This was done at
the request of the California Society, Sons of the American Revolu-
tion. We inquired into the textbook condition of our State schools
and our State department of education at Sacramento.

In 1946, I began the inquiry which led up to the proceedings which
were later brought to Congress on the so-called Building America
textbooks.

I handled proceedings for the SAR before the State Board of
Education of California, and later made a presentation before legis-

ciative committees on that. I drafted certain legislative bills on educa-
tion for that session at the request of various parties involved. I
have since studied the national aspects of this subversive teaching
problem.

I am the author of the Bill of Grievances which was filed with the
Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, and the Un-American
Activities Committee of the House of Representatives by the
National Society, Sons of the American Revolution. I conducted the
research on which that document was based.

In 1952 for a brief period in May I was employed as a consultant
for staff work in research by the Senate Internal Security Commit-
tee. In 1952-53 I directed some research work conducted at the Hoover
Institute Library at Stanford University on war, peace, and revolution.
That is the collection of material assembled by Mr. Herbert Hoover
and his associates.

I have studied curriculum and teaching methods in social studies,
the philosophy and practice involved in the progressive system of
education, communism in education, also propaganda, tactics and ac-
tivities of revolutionary organizations, and the history of subversive
movement. Likewise the legal and constitutional questions involved.

On the question here by Mr. Hays it was brought out the cir-

cumstances under which I came. I served for a number of years as
chairman of the Americanization committee of the National Society,
Sons of the American Revolution. I do not occupy that office at the
present time. I am merely a member in good standing of the Society.
I am here not as the representative of any group, but an individual
citizen under subpoena by you.

In the interest of full disclosure, I wish to acquaint you with this
fact at the present time. I am the president and research director of
a tax-exempt foundation for educational work that was recently
organized but which has no funds at its disposal at the present time,
and which has had no business relationships of any kind with any
foundation to which I will refer in my testimony. The corporation
is entitled, "Fund for American Leadership, Inc." It was organized
under California law on August 17, 1953, for the purpose of training
leaders in antisubversive work and studying revolutionary meth-
ods, their history, development and activities, which threaten the
national security, their propaganda, impact on American institutions,
to study educational problems arising out of that condition and to
determine sound and practical solutions.

I have here a certified copy of those articles which I would like
to have made a part of the committee files.

Mr. Hays. Just a minute. Let me ask you about that. Has that
foundation ever had any money?

Mr. Sargent. No. It still has no money. We are in the process
determining what contact can be made to get funds.

Mr. Hays. I just suggest in view of some of the statements that
have been made about the gullibility of some of these people you
ought not to have much trouble in getting money.

Mr. Sargent. The difficulty is that our side can’t get the money,
but the other side can always get it. This corporation was created
to find American money to study the antisy—

Mr. Hays. All you ought to do is say that in Texas and if you
are any kind of salesman at all, you ought to get the money.

Mr. Sargent. So I appear strictly in an individual capacity. That
corporation is not affected in this matter. I am speaking entirely on
that basis.

Now, I have a prepared statement for the committee which at this
time I would like to read.

The investigation required of this committee is one of the most
important matters which has ever come before the Congress of the
United States. It concerns the national security, the defense of the
principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States. You
will find that the situation confronting you is the result of a disre-
gard of trust responsibility—a condition amounting to abdication of
duty by the trustees of the tax-exempt foundations which have exerted
such a great influence in the history of our country since the turn of
the century.

In discharging its responsibility and weighing the evidence, this
committee must have some standard or yardstick to apply. I believe
the following are the legal and moral standards which apply to this
trust relationship.

This is an elaboration of the poster we have on the board here.
Standards of foundation conduct: It is the duty of tax-exempt
foundations and their trustees to observe and be guided by the follow-
ing standards of conduct:

First: Patriotism. To bear true faith and allegiance to the philos-
ophy and principles of government set forth in the Declaration of
Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Second: Loyalty. To be active and positive in supporting the
United States Government against revolutionary and other subversive
attacks;

To put patriotic money at the disposal of patriotic men in this field
of education to enable them to support and defend our Constitution
and form of government.

Third: Obedience to law. To faithfully obey the laws of the United
States and the provisions of State law under which foundation
charters are granted;

Fourth: Respect for exemption. To use the tax-exemption privi-
lege in good faith, recognizing the purpose for which that privilege
is granted;
To refrain from supporting communism, socialism, and other movements which (1) increase the cost of government, (2) endanger the national security, or (3) threaten the integrity of the Federal Government.

Mr. Hays. Right there, I am going to stop you and ask you a question. That is a very fine statement, but if you refrain from supporting everything that the Republican campaign orators called socialism, then you would be against everything that has been passed by the Congress in the past 20 years. Is that your definition?

Mr. Sargent. No, sir. When I talk about socialism in my testimony, Mr. Hays, I mean socialism of the kind advocated by the Fabians of Great Britain, which has ruined the economic system of that country, not individual projects which may seem wise for some purpose or other on their own merits.

Mr. Hays. I won't debate with you what has ruined the economic system of Great Britain or even say that Time magazine, a week or two ago, talked about the remarkable recovery and the great dollar balance. We will leave that out. Would you consider bank-deposit insurance to be socialism?

Mr. Sargent. No; not within the scope of what I mean here.

Mr. Hays. We want to get this term straightened out, because it has been too widely applied.

Mr. Sargent. I am very happy to do that.

Mr. Hays. How about old-age insurance?

Mr. Sargent. No.

Mr. Hays. Social security and unemployment insurance?

Mr. Sargent. No.

Mr. Hays. You would not consider any of those to be socialism?

Mr. Sargent. I am talking about nationalization of business and industry, a government-operated system which is national socialism or Fabian socialism.

Mr. Hays. We will try to get one maybe you can get in on. How about TVA?

Mr. Sargent. I think that is doubtful.

Mr. Hays. That is in the sort of gray area?

Mr. Sargent. You are not asking my policy on legislative matters now?

Mr. Hays. No; but you are throwing these terms around, and you are going to continue, I am pretty sure, and I want to get a delineation of what is and what is not socialism when you use the word. You say it is Fabian socialism. You may understand that and I may have some smattering of what it means, but, if they put that in the newspapers, to 99 percent of the people it is going to mean nothing. So I am trying to get this down—

The Chairman. Since TVA has been interjected, may I also make a comment on that. I think I can do so objectively. The TVA was started initially purely as a defense project for the purpose of manufacturing nitrogen which was then not available in adequate and insured quantities. That is back in World War I. Then in connection with the expansion of the development it was based upon flood control, which is a very important phase of the TVA development. Then since the expenditures were being made for flood control and defense, there was an incidental development, which was power. I think all
engineers recognize that if the Government was going in to develop the river for adequate flood-control purposes, as well as defense, that then adequate provision must be made for the development of the river for power purposes.

The only question remaining to be decided was the manner in which the power development should be carried out. I think there was never any question after the Government moved in but that the Government should construct the dams. The question arose as to the manner in which the power should be distributed. That is the key question.

If you will pardon me, since the question has come up and it comes up frequently, a sharp difference of opinion existed—I was chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the original Tennessee Valley development and was chairman of the House conference committee.

One of the very sharp differences between the Senate committee and the House committee was with reference to the distributing of the power. As an individual, and I was supported by the majority of the House conference, I opposed the Federal Government establishing a sprawling power-distributing system, and advocated instead that the local authorities be permitted to organize companies for the distribution of the power. When the TVA Act in its final form was adopted, that policy was embodied in the act. So that the Federal Government does not distribute the power. I think this is an important thing to keep in mind. The government outside of its defense and flood-control aspects generates the power and sells it wholesale to the various distributing agencies, which in the main are owned by municipalities. If desired, those distributing facilities could be owned privately, as I recall, but it happens that none of them is.

I think when we get to questioning the socialism aspect of TVA, it is well to keep in mind just what the TVA is; and that is the reason I am taking a little while here to make this explanation with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority in view of my intimate relations with it from its very inception.

Mr. HAYS. Just let me say a word or two to clarify a couple of things. In the first place, the incidental bydevelopment, which is power, is the thing that put refrigerators in the kitchens and better food on the table, and, in many cases, shoes on the feet of a lot of people down in east Tennessee and other areas around there. I am using that in a rather facetious way, but I am saying that it has created jobs where there were no jobs, and it has been good for the whole economy. The only way we did it differently in my district—we had the power there, but we had no way to distribute it.

The record will show that I have been objecting strenuously as a member of an REA co-op to building our own power facilities when there was plenty of power to buy. So we built the distribution plant and we did it in reverse. I am aware of the sharp differences of opinion. I was interested in getting power to the farmers. We do have it. The power companies generate it and sell it to the co-ops who sell it to their members. It is an interesting example of private business and cooperatives working hand in hand to the mutual profit of both.

The only reason I have brought up TVA is because it has been called and has become associated in the minds of a great many people with the term "socialism." I wanted to know when we are using the term here what it does and does not cover.
Mr. Sargent. When I use the term "socialism," I refer to the political movement which is known as the Socialist movement. The movement which is working for a general program of planned economy based on nationalization of industry, business, national resources, and credit. The political operation of a nation's economy, not fragmentary things. Politics is something which these foundations are not supposed to go into, and I think they have no right to undermine the basis of their exemption by doing things of that type.

Mr. Hays. We will get to that in your specific accusations.

Mr. Sargent. The fifth standard here is academic responsibility. This is a part of my concept of standards of foundation conduct.

Academic responsibility requires these foundations to limit their activities to projects which are, in fact, educational, and are conducted in an academically responsible manner in accordance with proper academic standards;

To refrain from using education as a device for lobbying or a means to disseminate propaganda.

That is the end of the statement of standards.

The money administered by these foundation trustees is public money. The beneficiaries of these trusts are the American people; the parents of children in our public schools. Education is a sacred trust. A high degree of integrity is expected of those connected with it. We must consider the ethical duty of foundation trustees from that standpoint.

Serious charges have been made against the foundations: It is your duty to answer these questions; to find solutions and perhaps recommend legislative action. I intend to be objective and give you the facts; to present the truth without fear or favor. This presentation will cover the history of the subversive movement; it will outline the boundaries of the problem; discuss the most important ramifications, and endeavor to give the data required for your consideration.

The subject is important, and also complex. Under the most favorable conditions, a considerable amount of time is required for my presentation.

The Chairman. Now, reverting back to the TVA, because reference was made to wearing shoes.

Mr. Hays. I am glad to discuss that with you all afternoon.

The Chairman. I might say that some of them wore shoes down there before TVA.

Mr. Sargent. Inasmuch as this matter touches directly on education and involves a degree of criticism, I think it fair and proper for me to state very briefly my position on the question of public education and the public schools. It is as follows:

I support the public-school system and recognize its necessity to make our system of government workable in practice. I believe it is necessary and essential to maintain the integrity of that system and protect it from subversives, political action and other pressure groups. I believe in the fundamental integrity of the average teacher. I am convinced that the best interests of the teaching profession will be served by the investigation to be made by this committee, and that such an inquiry will restore integrity in the educational profession and enable the schools to regain the position of confidence and esteem they should have in the hearts of the American people.
Mr. HAYS. You are saying by inference that they do not have that position at the moment?

Mr. SARGENT. I think they have lost it to a degree, Mr. Hays, because of the tactics to which I refer.

Mr. HAYS. You talk about California. But I want to put in the record right here that the schools in Ohio have not lost the confidence of the people, and they have not lost any integrity, and they are just as good as they ever were; in fact, they are a little better.

Mr. SARGENT. Have you seen the magazine articles about the people being concerned about the conditions of their schools nationally?

Mr. HAYS. Do you believe in astrology?

Mr. SARGENT. No, sir; not I.

Mr. HAYS. Could you give me any reason why there are so many peculiar people drawn to southern California?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't live in southern California, and I wouldn't know.

Mr. HAYS. You know, it is a funny thing, but every time we get an extremist letter in my office—and it is either on the left or the right—you don't have to look at the postmark. It either comes from southern California or Houston, Tex. I just wonder if there is some reason for it.

Mr. SARGENT. I think, Mr. Hays, you will certainly want to reserve your judgment about this question of the schools' integrity being involved until you have heard the evidence in this case, and I would like to present it from that point of view.

Mr. HAYS. I just want to put in about the schools in Ohio. If you have any evidence to the contrary, we will get down to specific cases.

Mr. SARGENT. I know nothing about the Ohio situation specifically, either pro or con.

Mr. HAYS. I thought not. I know a good deal about it. I happened to be a teacher there. I have a lot of friends who have positions as superintendents and executives in the school system from the large to the small cities. There is no question about it. Not even some crackpots in our legislature who have wanted to investigate everything else have investigated the schools, because there is no demand or reason.

Mr. SARGENT. I am giving you facts and not opinion. First of all, in approaching this problem of the foundation influence, the subversive-teaching problem is a foundation problem, and the foundation problem in turn is a political problem with many ramifications.

From the American standpoint it had its beginning shortly before the turn of the century in the 1890's. This movement is closely related to Fabian socialism, which became established in Great Britain about 1885, and developed into the movement which has undermined and almost destroyed the economic system of Great Britain.

When the beachhead was established in our country, we had three bulwarks of defense: First, there was a sound tradition founded on Americanism; secondly, a written Constitution, and finally, Federal judicial power in the courts capable of enforcing constitutional rights.

The radical intellectuals attacking that system relied upon propaganda and brainwashing. They organized an attack upon patriotism, challenging basic American philosophy founded on the doctrine of natural law. They sought to create a blackout of history by slanting
and distorting historical facts. They introduced a new and revolutionary philosophy—one based on the teachings of John Dewey.

As early as 1892 they sought to establish the Federal income tax to pave the way for national Federal socialism. This had the effect of putting the people on an allowance, giving the National Government unlimited power to spend for socialistic purposes, and reducing the people to its will. It was proposed to carry out other parts of the socialistic program by false and slanted propaganda.

Eventually the judicial power itself was to be undermined by court packing and by attacks calculated to make the courts subject to the Executive.

Education is one of the vital areas involved in this attack on the American system. The field includes not only elementary and secondary schools, but also our colleges and universities. The tax-exempt foundations are directly involved, because they have supported this movement in the past, and are still promoting it in ways which restrict educational activities and control public opinion.

The history of this movement is a record of the greatest betrayal which has ever occurred in American history. Those are conclusions based on the evidence I will present to you, and I am here for the purpose of proving them.

To understand these conditions, it is necessary to trace briefly the history and development of the American subversive movement.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to object to going further, and I want to make a motion that the committee adjourn until we settle this matter. This fellow can come in and read a political speech which he has had plenty of time to prepare. He has a mimeographed news release to the newspapers to get his views across, but he can't do it for the committee. I don't know who mimeographed this for him, but it looks like it came from the staff. Until we get a vote of the committee in executive session, I move right now that the committee adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to the mimeographing, the chairman suggested to the staff that he thought it would be a convenience to the press to have a release for the press in advance.

Mr. HAYS. The press is here, and they can decide for themselves about these kinds of people. They do not have to have any spoon-fed stuff. I don't give them any of mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The extent of the mimeograph of the release I had no responsibility for.

Mr. HAYS. This kind of stuff goes in the paper. Suppose it is true? I do not know whether it is or not. But we will give it the benefit of the doubt. It is in there. If it is not true, it is still in there, if the press uses it, which I doubt.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is convenient to the press to have a release in advance with the dateline on it.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, sir, it is a convenience for them to have a dateline at the same time the committee meets so the press has it, and the public has it before the committee hearing.

Mr. SARGENT. This statement was prepared because it was my understanding that it was your desire to have some statement. That statement is a summary of the historical material.

Mr. HAYS. I am not finding too much fault with you. I would like to have the record show that the committee was not notified you were
subpoenaed. We understood you were going to be a witness. We are either going to have some orderly procedure here, or we are going to adjourn and let the majority decide. If they are going to run it, then let them get on the record.

The Chairman. It is the chairman's thought that all of the witnesses should be subpoenaed, and should be put under oath. That is the procedure which we are following. I think in fairness to the witnesses they should be subpoenaed and they are all put under oath, and everybody is on the same basis, and in the same category. That is the orderly procedure. We adopted that procedure at the suggestion of Mr. Cox, which I think would serve for that matter as a standard. Everybody that has a story is going to have an opportunity to tell his story. None of us has any spare time that we want consumed, unless we are accomplishing something by it.

You, as I have, sat on many committees. The witnesses do not always have prepared, complete statements in advance. Frequently they do have comprehensive notes prepared, which serve as a basis—

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, if I may interrupt you, there is a principle involved here, and that is that everything that Mr. Sargent has read up to now since he started reading was furnished to the press with a 10 a.m. deadline in a mimeographed form, and it was not furnished to this committee. If we are going to do this business by indirectness by the back door, and by getting the drop on certain members of the committee, I want to know it right now.

Mr. Wormser. Don't you have a copy of the release?

Mr. Hays. Yes, I got one from the press just now.

Mr. Wormser. It was not on your desk?

Mr. Hays. No, it was not. If you want to debate this now, I make a motion now that we adjourn and go into executive session.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Hays, Miss Casey told me she herself put a copy on your desk.

Miss Casey. I put all three things on each member's desk.

Mr. Hays. All right. There are three things; one, a cover sheet; two, a special release, and this; I do not have it. That is what Mrs. Pfost has. I am not saying that it was intentional, but I am saying that it happened that way. There is a principle involved here. There is an indictment of the whole American educational system here, which was fed out to the press in a mimeographed copy and read to the committee at 11 o'clock. The press has had it God knows how long: "Hold for release 10 a.m. Monday morning."

Mr. Sargent. May I proceed with my evidence?

Mr. Hays. No, you may not proceed until we either adjourn or I am voted down, one of the two.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, may I state that the press has asked us specifically whenever we can to give them some sort of digest of what the witness is going to testify.

Mr. Hays. The press has not been alone about that. I have been pleading with you for the same thing for the members of the committee.

Mr. Wormser. May I go on. I understood it was proper procedure for us to do that. We have done it with considerable effort. It is not easy to get these things out. We are trying to suit the convenience of the committee, and to the extent that the press is involved, their convenience also.
The Chairman. I might say that so far as the staff is concerned, they have resisted doing it. It was at my insistence that they did it, because of the great inconvenience that it occasioned them, and the facilities of the staff. I insisted that it should be done. I am sure that they worked overtime. It was not for the purpose of advancing any view or the interests of any phase of this subject under investigation, but purely based upon my long years of experience here in Washington, the convenience of the press having something in advance. That is all there was to it. I am at a loss to understand—

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt to suggest that the gentlemen of the press here would certainly be willing to state, I am sure, that they pleaded with us to give them this digest.

Mr. HAYS. We can put them on the stand and let them state that. That doesn't change my mind a bit. If they are entitled to have it, the committee is entitled to have it.

Mr. WORMSER. The committee has had it.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, just now, because I raised a rumpus about it. We got it only by accident because one of the boys from the press table brought it over.

Mr. WORMSER. I beg your pardon. Miss Casey distributed them.

Mr. HAYS. Miss Casey admits through some oversight we did not get it. I don't want you to blame Miss Casey.

The Chairman. Mrs. Pfost, you had one?

Mrs. PFOST. No, this gentleman of the press handed it over to me, and then gave me a second one.

Mr. WORMSER. Miss Casey has made the definite and flat statement that she put a full set in front of all five committee members.

Miss CASEY. I put a full set before each member.

Mrs. PFOST. Here are the three articles, but not the press release.

Mr. HAYS. I didn't eat it, and it is not here. I have not moved out of this chair since I have been here.

The Chairman. Why don't we proceed? I will call a meeting of the committee during the afternoon to discuss any questions of procedure.

Mr. Sargent. May I continue, then, Mr. Reece?

Mr. HAYS. You can continue and I will withdraw my objection, but now I will start asking a few questions about this press release I just got.

You say "when the beachhead was established in our country." You are talking about what beachhead?

Mr. Sargent. The beachhead of the organized Socialist movement which had its inception in Great Britain under the Fabian tactic, and which came in here to infiltrate our educational system.

Mr. HAYS. You apparently know there was a beachhead. When and where was it established? When was the first landing made?

Mr. Sargent. A definite landing was made as far as becoming an effective agency in about 1905 with the organization of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. That is one of the points I am going to cover in my testimony when I get to it.

Mr. HAYS. We will get to it a little in advance. What was the name of the organization?

Mr. Sargent. Intercollegiate Socialist Society, organized by Jack London and a number of others, in Peck's Restaurant in New York City.
Mr. Hays. In 1905?
Mr. Sargent. About 1905.
Mr. Hays. By Jack London?
Mr. Sargent. Yes.
Mr. Hays. Is that the Jack London that used to write some books?
Mr. Sargent. That is right, that is the man. I have a pamphlet explaining that which I will read to the committee when I get to that point.
Mr. Hays. Did he import this thing from some other place?
Mr. Sargent. He was a member of a radical intellectual elite that came in here definitely to try to twist our institutions around in favor of the organized socialist movement.
Mr. Hays. Back in 1905.
Mr. Sargent. Yes. Some of the background extends further back than that, but that is a definite identifiable date.
Mr. Hays. They did a lot of twisting, I assume?
Mr. Sargent. They sure did.
Mr. Hays. We have resisted pretty well for 50 years, haven't we?
Mr. Sargent. Have we?
Mr. Hays. I am asking you. What do you think?
Mr. Sargent. I think we departed very materially. Among other things, it is plainly asserted and charged today that the doctrine of inalienable rights and natural laws as set forth in the Declaration of Independence is obsolete. They have accomplished that false belief in the American mind.
Mr. Hays. Now, Mr. Sargent, you would not want to take a poll down on the street and ask the first 100 people you meet if they believe that?
Mr. Sargent. No. I am talking about the slanting of the courts and the governmental procedure.
Mr. Hays. All the courts have been undermined, too?
Mr. Sargent. Somewhat, yes.
Mr. Hays. Congress, too, I suppose?
Mr. Sargent. I am not going into all that. I am here to give you the chronology and facts, Mr. Hays, by documents, and not my personal opinions.
Mr. Hays. Let me tell you just because you say it is so doesn't make it a chronology or a fact.
Mr. Sargent. I am giving the evidence. I state my conclusions as set forth here. I am going to cite the books and materials which make that position maintainable.
Mr. Hays. There may have been a fellow by the name of London and some others who believed in socialism, but what are you going to do about it? Did they have a right in 1905—I am not asking as of today—to believe in whatever they wanted to believe?
Mr. Sargent. I am not questioning the right. I am telling what they did. I am here to prove the allegation by means of the evidence and I would like to go on with it.
Mr. Hays. You were satisfied to distribute that statement of yours to the press, and I am not going to be satisfied until I find out a bit more about it until I find out how you picked these sentences—
Mr. Sargent. I am here for the purpose of proving it.
The Chairman. Most of the sentence to which you refer was repeated in the statement which he has made. Mr. Sargent has a
presentation to make. The chairman's feeling is that it would be helpful and it would be in the interest of conservation of time and orderly procedure, I do not mean without interruption, if he would be permitted to proceed in a reasonably orderly manner to complete his testimony. There are numerous questions which I am sure that I for one will want to ask him as we go along or later. But if we move along, I think it would be in the interest of good procedure.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the thing that concerns me is: If such a thing has happened, that is one thing. I would like to be specific about it, and I am going to continue objecting to this kind of presentation. Let me read why: “They organized an attack on patriotism. They sought to create a blackout in history. They introduced a new and revolutionary philosophy. As early as 1892 they sought to establish”—this has all been handed out to the press with an awful lot of pronouns in there. What I want to know is who are these people. Let us start from the beginning and name names and do it right.

The Chairman. That is what I would like to know. I would like for him to proceed with his statement and see if we can find out.

Mr. Sargent. I will give you exactly that information chronologically on the basis of books by going through this thing. I can't answer your questions in one sentence.

Mr. Hays. No, but your statement to the press, Mr. Sargent—and you won't sit there and deny it—was deliberately designed to create an impression that education all has got an odor about it.

The Chairman. Mr. Hays—

Mr. Hays. You can hammer all you please, but you are not going to shut the minority up. You have mimeographed statements but you are not going to silence me.

The Chairman. I am not trying to silence anyone.

Mr. Hays. You are not going to, either.

The Chairman. I want to take the responsibility myself for a statement being prepared for the press. I am the one who insisted on it. Mr. Sargent knew nothing about it. The members of the staff did not prefer to do it, and I suggested that I thought it ought to be done even at great inconvenience to the staff.

Mr. Hays. Who wrote it?

The Chairman. As to that, I do not know. It was mimeographed, I am sure, at the instance of the staff.

Mr. Sargent. The statement was prepared by me by request. I did not originate the idea of having one. I did it because I was present at your hearing the other day—

The Chairman. The responsibility for the statement being given out to the press is the chairman's.

Mr. Hays. All right. It is the chairman's.

The Chairman. He did not know there was any or could be any controversy on that phase of it, I might add.

Mr. Hays. You do not realize how easily you can get into a controversy with me.

Mr. Sargent. I was here the other day, Mr. Hays, and I heard your request that statements be furnished, and I assumed I was furthering your wishes in the matter.

Mr. Hays. You sure would, if I had the statement at 10 o'clock or 5 minutes until 10.
Mr. Sargent. I prepared it, as I understood you wanted statements furnished.

Mr. Hays. I have said repeatedly that I am not blaming you. The point I am making, and I want to make it perfectly clear, is this: I have tried to insist from the very first meeting we had that this thing be conducted objectively and in the interest, to use your own terms, Mr. Chairman, of orderly procedure. There have been a lot of people and a lot of organizations and a lot of institutions that have had a lot of things said about them, both by written statements and in the hearings. I haven't heard any of them. I have not been able to get a commitment that any specific one of these people is going to be allowed to come in and tell his story. You know what happened in the McCarthy hearings. They kept Stevens on the stand for 14 days until they wore him out and wore the public out, and they got one impression across to the people's minds, and the other side is not going to get into the papers unless it is a lot more sensational than I think it is going to be. This is the same technique. We will put out the sensational accusations and get it in the paper on page 1, and if they are not true, if these people come in, that will get on page 16, and who is going to read it anyway.

The Chairman. The chairman has stated that he has not made any plans about publicity. He has not been interested in that phase of it. What he is interested in is developing the facts with the view of the facts ultimately forming the basis of a report. It is the long-range results that the chairman is interested in and he has made no efforts—and I am sure the members of the press will bear me out in this—to try to get over to the press any idea, preconceived or otherwise. I am sure that some of the press have looked at the chairman somewhat critically because of his failure to give information about the committee. I wanted to wait until the facts were developed and let the press develop its own view. The chairman has certainly not tried to publicize himself. He does not care whether his name is ever in the paper. As far as publicity is concerned, I have reached the period in my life where I am not looking for publicity, I am not looking for any clients, and not looking for anything further in the way of personal advancement. The chairman is interested in only one thing, and that is helping this committee do a good job, which I think the country is interested in. I am not going to lose my patience. I do not have any time to spare, but I am going to take whatever time is necessary in order to do what I can toward helping accomplish the job.

I want to provide every opportunity for the views which occur to you as we go along to be advanced, Mr. Hays.

Myself, I am very much interested in getting the story which Mr. Sargent, who has now for some 15 years been intimately associated with this whole subject, and the proof which he might or might not have to support what he has to say. I am not accepting what he has to say as being factual until he has completed his statement, and I see what he has to support it.

Mrs. Prost. Mr. Chairman, since we have this report here before us, this release, I wonder if I might ask Mr. Sargent a couple of questions that are embodied in the release?

The Chairman. Yes.
Mrs. Pfoest. I notice on the bottom of page 1 and carries on to page 2:

As early as 1892 they sought to establish the Federal income tax in order to pave the way for national Federal socialism.

This statement would indicate that you feel that the Federal income tax has brought about socialism, and that it is a socialistic procedure.

Mr. Sargent. I think it has had a tremendously powerful effect in doing exactly that in two ways. One way is placing very, very large amounts of money at the disposal of the Federal Government to spend, and the other way is the resultant control which it has had upon the people. At the national level, a general socialistic program would be impossible without that tax.

Mrs. Pfoest. Do you think we should not have a Federal income tax?

Mr. Sargent. I think the power of the Federal Government to tax income should be very strictly reduced in order to prevent the invasion of the sovereignty of the States, and let the States do it. I think it is. The average workingman works 1 day a week to pay this tax. It is a soak-the-people tax as it is operating now.

Mrs. Pfoest. Do you think we should not have a Federal income tax?

Mr. Sargent. I think the power of the Federal Government to tax income should be very strictly reduced in order to prevent the invasion of the sovereignty of the States, and let the States do it. I think it is.

Mrs. Pfoest. Do you think we should not have a Federal income tax?

Mr. Sargent. I think the power of the Federal Government to tax income should be very strictly reduced in order to prevent the invasion of the sovereignty of the States, and let the States do it. I think it is. The average workingman works 1 day a week to pay this tax. It is a soak-the-people tax as it is operating now.

Mrs. Pfoest. It is what?

Mr. Sargent. Soak, soaking the people and subjecting them to the power of the Federal Government.

Mrs. Pfoest. Then you would eliminate completely the Federal income tax and allow the States to take care of their taxes?

Mr. Sargent. I would not eliminate it completely. I would put a ceiling on it, and not have the Federal Government absorb most of the available revenues. Let the States spend their own money where the people can control the projects at a local level and not be subjected to Washington.

Mrs. Pfoest. What would you do when these emergencies arise, such as we have had—war emergencies?

Mr. Sargent. I am thinking of the tax-limitation proposal advanced by others, which includes an emergency clause allowing higher taxes to cover defense or other emergency.

Mrs. Pfoest. Then you would still have to revert back to a Federal income tax to take care of national emergencies.

Mr. Sargent. When the emergency was over, the tax would go back to the limited rate. However, that is not germane to what I am presenting here.

Mrs. Pfoest. It will be one of those things which is going out to the press today. To me it is an insinuation that the Federal income tax paves the way for national Federal socialism, and certainly we have Federal income tax today, and I wanted to clarify whether or not you believe the Federal income tax is a socialistic measure.

Mr. Sargent. I can add another point. If you will look at the Federal budget in 1892, when this tax was first proposed, you will find the Federal Government did not need any such revenue at all. It did not need a tax of this kind for its fiscal purposes at all. The Federal budget was very low. The Federal Government always had the power to tax inheritances. The courts sustained that. Here we have a case where a tax capable of this great abuse was actively proposed and put over when there was no money need for the tax.

There was some other reason. In the light of developments, there are many, including myself, that ascribe an entirely different purpose...
The purpose being to pave the way for Federal control on a very, very broad scale. It occurred at a time when this Socialist movement was moving in. My conclusion is that it was done for that purpose, and I think that is a correct assumption.

Mrs. Proctor. In other words, you are practically saying that you feel that the Federal income tax is used for furthering socialistic measures.

Mr. Sargent. It is establishing that; yes. Without the Federal income tax, national socialism in the United States would be practically impossible to accomplish. The Government could not do it. The abuse of the tax power is one of the most serious things we have had here in altering our entire balance in government. It has made the States paupers and compelled them to come to Washington to get their money and submit to the conditions imposed on them to get their own money back.

Mr. Hays. That is a pretty broad statement without much foundation.

Mr. Sargent. You ask—

Mr. Hays. I am not going to ask anybody. My State didn't have a nickel of bonded debt until last year. It is against the State constitution, so it was not a pauper. But there is a way they can go into debt if they want to, and that is by vote of the people. So all through the years instead of building roads by selling bonds, as North Carolina did, the people of Ohio have chosen not to do that, but come down to get the money from the Federal Government when they could. They didn't come as paupers. So last year they decided in their wisdom by an overwhelming vote—and I didn't think it was such a good idea then and it may turn out it is not yet—but the people voted, they bonded the State for half a billion dollars to build the roads, but they did it by vote of the people.

Mr. Sargent. You had in Taft a great American who has represented some of the philosophy I speak of.

Mr. Hays. Taft was a great American, and you and I can agree on that. He was one of the great Americans of all time and knowing him as I did, if he were sitting here today, he would be just as bored with this procedure as I am.

To get back to your statement, you are making the flat assertion here that the income tax started out as a Socialist plot to destroy the Government. That is what your statement says.

Mr. Sargent. It had that purpose on the part of the Socialists who advocated it, yes; that is my opinion.

Mr. Hays. But your statement implies, if it does not flatly say, that the people who passed the income tax were involved in this.

Mr. Sargent. The people did not think that. They thought they were buying something else. They found out later they were buying a larger package than they had any idea.

Mr. Hays. The people can stop the tax and repeal it.

Mr. Sargent. They can do it by constitutional amendment.

Mr. Hays. They can do it by changing the Members of Congress in a democracy.

Mr. Sargent. That is right.

Mr. Hays. If this were a great Socialist plot and they thought they were being robbed, they could change the Congress.
Mr. Sargent. I am not here to discuss the political science problem involved in the tax.

Mr. Hays. You are here saying this.

Mr. Sargent. I am pointing out that the circumstance can be weighed properly in the light of the history of the time which I am proposing to give you, dates and circumstances, so you can integrate the relationship of this pattern.

Mr. Hays. But it is your opinion that the income tax was first introduced as a result of a socialist plot.

Mr. Sargent. I think the radicals of that period had precisely that in mind, yes.

Mr. Hays. Do you have any other legislation that you think came about as a result of a socialist plot?

Mr. Sargent. I don't know of anything in particular at this time that occurs to me. I am talking about the broad pattern and not the whole series of legislative enactments. I don't think that is pertinent to your inquiry here.

Mr. Hays. It is pertinent in view of this statement to ask you if you think that people should be taxed according to their ability to pay.

Mr. Sargent. I said the Federal Government's power to do it. The States have that power. I am talking about the Federal Government's power to do the taxing and to control the States through this type of thing.

Mr. Hays. You have implied here that you have a great deal of reverence for the Constitution. The Constitution gave the Federal Government certain powers to tax.

Mr. Sargent. I am talking about the 16th amendment power to tax the people without limit.

Mr. Hays. But that is part of the Constitution, is it not?

Mr. Sargent. Yes.

Mr. Hays. Put in there in a constitutional manner.

Mr. Sargent. Yes, and I am saying that constitutional proposal as far as the radicals were concerned was deliberate to make Federal national taxation a possibility.

Mr. Hays. They started out on the 16th amendment to make Federal national socialism.

Mr. Sargent. I think that was part of the scheme. I am talking about the Federal tax.

Mrs. Pfoest. The reason I am asking you this, Mr. Sargent, is because the news release has been given, and I thought it should be explored and clarified before we adjourn today. The last paragraph——

Mr. Sargent. On page 2 or page 1?

Mrs. Pfoest. On page 2. I might go back to “Eventually,” the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 2:

Eventually, the judicial power itself was to be undermined by “court packing” and by attacks calculated to make the courts subject to control by the Executive.

Education is one of the vital areas involved in this attack on the American system of government. The field includes not only elementary and secondary schools, but also our colleges and universities. The tax-exempt foundations are directly involved because they have supported this movement in the past, and are still promoting it. * * *
You feel that the foundations are directly involved in supporting this type of thing. You are making that allegation with regard to the educational system in America.

Mr. Sargent. That is right.

Mrs. Post. And you say that the history of this movement is a record of the greatest betrayal that ever occurred in American history.

Mr. Sargent. I think that is a correct statement.

Mrs. Post. Do you feel that these tax-exempt foundations are knowingly placing their money in the hands of and stimulating this type of socialistic method?

Mr. Sargent. I think they are doing it on purpose, yes, deliberately. There is such a record of continuous notice, failure to do anything——

The Chairman. I am very anxious to get his testimony.

Mr. Sargent. I can answer this much more fully.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, if some of the spectators can't keep still I suggest you get the sergeant at arms to clear them out. I am tired of the whispered advice.

Mr. Sargent. May I say it is difficult to answer fully and clearly questions like this because it includes evidence I am going to put in. After the evidence is in, I can answer you much better.

Mrs. Post. I realize that, but I was thinking that with this type of statement going out, perhaps we were enlarging on that one phase of it and could get some direct answers.

Mr. Sargent. I will elaborate further. It is my opinion that the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations are guilty of violation of the antitrust laws and should be prosecuted. I have evidence I am going to present here on that subject and court decisions. I think they are violating the prohibition against restraint of trade, and that this is being done on purpose.

Mr. Hays. Why don't you turn that evidence over to the Attorney General?

Mr. Sargent. You can decide what to do with it after you have the material.

Mr. Hays. This committee is not going to decide what to do with it. If you want my opinion, the committee ought to dispense right now without more of this.

Mr. Sargent. I am here on subpoena to give you the facts. I would like to do it.

Mr. Hays. I am going to explore this statement of yours to try to get some facts about it, if I can.

Mr. Sargent. My answer is that I think this was done on purpose and knowingly.

Mr. Hays. You say, "Eventually the judicial power itself was to be undermined by court-packing"; just how were the courts packed?

Mr. Sargent. By the Roosevelt proposal of 1937 in February, and the attacks on the judiciary which preceded it.

Mr. Hays. It didn't pass.

Mr. Sargent. No, but there was a continuous policy of loading judicial appointments for years with men of a specific philosophy and discriminating against others who held counterphilosophy.

Mr. Hays. In other words, the courts were loaded all the 20 years the Democrats were in with Democrats; that is a very unusual situation.
Mr. Sargent. I am not talking about Democrats. I am talking about men having a philosophy similar to that which actuated the so-called left-wing group.

Mr. Hays. The courts have been loaded a little bit along the way by the present Chief Executive. He appointed the Chief Justice. Perhaps the most significant social decision the courts ever handed down has been the one they handed down last week, and with all of this packing of these peculiar people they came up with a unanimous decision.

Mr. Sargent. I am not talking about that decision.

The Chairman. You do not mean to say that the President is trying to pack the courts?

Mr. Hays. I am not accusing him of anything.

Mr. Sargent. In 1936 in October, before the Presidential election, a group of educators sponsored and printed and put in the hands of American schoolchildren a schoolbook advocating a plan to pack the Supreme Court of the United States. I say that is a deliberate attack on the judiciary, in the educational system, and I have the evidence.

Mr. Hays. You say that was a deliberate attack on the judiciary. Do you realize that the Supreme Court has not always been composed of nine members? There was one time when it had more. Was that an attack on somebody?

Mr. Sargent. I think my answer, Mr. Hays, is this—

Mr. Hays. In other words, anybody who disagrees with you and your very peculiar beliefs, as I have seen them outlined here, is attacking the system; is that right?

Mr. Sargent. I want to answer your question; yes. I think the Senate Judiciary Committee finding that this court-packing bill was dangerous and unparalleled is sufficient justification for my statement. The unanimous report of the Senate Judiciary Committee. You asked me for my authority. I have in my possession a schoolbook advocating the court-packing plan and putting it in the elementary, and I think it was the secondary classrooms in those days before the presidential election, and before the Congress of the United States got the court-packing bill.

Mr. Hays. All right, that happened.

Mr. Sargent. Yes.

Mr. Hays. I was not here when you say it happened.

Mr. Sargent. It proves educators did it, does it not?

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but I will have to ask some person be put out if they cannot refrain from heckling. I admit there are a lot of people who do not agree with me and that is all right.

Mr. Sargent. May I again request leave to follow my testimony?

The Chairman. I was going to ask that the spectators be careful not to make interjections.

Mr. Hays. To go back to one other thing, do you agree to any change? It has been advocated for a long time in textbooks and otherwise that the voting age should be lowered to 18. Do you find anything significantly wrong with that?
Mr. Sargent. I have never thought much about it. It is not within the scope of what I am presenting here. I don’t really know.

Mr. Hays. Of course, it is within the scope, because you are inferring that because somebody suggested that maybe 11 would be a better number than 9 that is un-American.

Mr. Sargent. No, I am talking about the use of foundations and the educational system for partisan political purposes which has been done and which I am prepared to prove. That is what I am here for.

Mr. Hays. Do you think that lowering the age limit to 18 is a partisan political purpose?

Mr. Sargent. I think for an educational system to advocate it is lobbying and prohibited by statute; yes.

Mr. Hays. You don’t think a teacher in a classroom would not have a right to bring it up in a class of American Government and get some discussion and opinion?

Mr. Sargent. I am not talking about that. I am talking about a foundation promoting that concept with its money. Congress said it should not be done under section 101, and I understand you are here to get evidence of that kind, that they have actively promoted issues.

Mr. Hays. Do you think if a foundation gave somebody money to advocate it in a book that that would be bad?

Mr. Sargent. If the book was objective; no. Slanted presentations of issues is prohibited here. Suppression of the right of critical analyses of scholarly findings is definitely an infringement of your statute.

Mr. Hays. Do you believe that through any book that I happen to hand you or I could go through any book on the subject you hand me and delete paragraphs here and there, that would make it slanted any way we wanted to slant it?

Mr. Sargent. I am not talking about deleting paragraphs. I am talking about a consistent policy of always supporting one side of the controversy and never doing anything in support of the other. That is propaganda.

Mrs. Pfoert. You feel that the foundations have used their money to that extent?

Mr. Sargent. I think definitely they have. I think that is the crux of this matter.

Mrs. Pfoert. You think they have not used their money on constructive books, but they will give out great donations on the subversive type of literature and further that type of printing entirely?

Mr. Sargent. Yes. I am convinced of it. In fact, I have been told that by people in the profession. Prof. John C. Almack, formerly of the Stanford School of Education, told me one time that it is a waste of time trying to get any money from the foundations for the conservative side of these issues. That it could not be done. He was an experienced educator.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Sargent. Thank you.

Here, then, briefly, is a chronology of the subversive movement as, first of all, general background material. I will commence by talking about the Fabian Socialist movement in Great Britain. I have notes here. The data on this first sheet is taken from a source book which I think is a recognized and able authority. It is the book entitled
"Fabianism in the Life of Great Britain"; the author is Sister Margaret Patricia McCarran, the daughter of Senator McCarran. It is a doctoral thesis resulting in the granting of her degree of doctor of philosophy. It is a very extensive book based on original source material.

Mr. Hays. You say she is a sister?

Mr. Sargent. She is a member of a Catholic order.

Mr. Hays. I didn't know they used her last name.

Mr. Sargent. That is her full name. Her full name appears on the book and that is who she is. I have read the book myself.

I am taking significant dates here to orient the British movement with the American side of the picture. The inception of the movement was the year 1883; an original Fabian group formed, composed of Thomas Davidson, Edward R. Pease, and Hubert Bland. They met in London and adopted an agreement to reconstitute society and they adopted the name "Fabian."

The Fabian system briefly consisted of four elements. Research, to further their specific ideas; education of a propaganda type to carry it out; penetration of governmental agencies generally, legislative and executive both; and, finally, penetration carried to the point of permeation resulting in complete control of the governmental system.

The following year, 1884, George Bernard Shaw joined the movement and became, and was active, for many, many years subsequently. In 1885 Sydney Webb, Sydney Olivier, and Anna Besant became members. They established a publication known as the Fabian News in 1891.

In 1892 they began active lecturing and campaigning. They elected a member of Parliament that year. They moved into the university field in 1895 and established a unit at Oxford. They founded the London School of Economics—

Mr. Hays. Mr. Sargent, that is all a matter of history. We know about those characters. They have been pretty well discredited down through the years. Nobody is paying much attention to them. Do you think it is fair to waste our time?

Mr. Sargent. I think it is fair. They have not been discredited and they have not stopped. There is substantial evidence that the successors of that group are very intimately connected with American affairs right now.

Mr. Hays. I have heard that charge bandied about for a good many years, but it only results in somebody saying so. Nobody has ever pinned it down. It finally boils down to, "well, he disagrees with me, so therefore he is no good."

Mr. Sargent. Won't you wait until I get through before you conclude that? Maybe you will change your mind.

Mr. Hays. I will tell you, the way you are going, some of the stuff you are bringing in, I don't know whether you are ever going to get through.

Mr. Sargent. If you will help me I will get there as fast as I can.

By 1900 the movement had entered four of the universities in Great Britain. I have referred to the Federal income tax movement here. That began in 1892 with a demand for Federal income tax legislation made at a time when the fiscal needs of the Federal Government required no such taxation. Some political objective must have been
behind the move at the time because the revenue need was not there. In 1893 the Income Tax Act was passed and then repassed over a Presidential veto. In 1894, the United States Supreme Court held the statute unconstitutional of the basis of the Constitution as it then stood.

The agitation continued. In 1909 Congress proposed the income tax amendment to the States and in 1913 it was adopted as the 16th amendment to the Federal Constitution. Unlimited tax power was conferred. The effect was as I mentioned.

Mr. HAYS. You say that was proposed in 1909?

Mr. SARGENT. The amendment was proposed in 1909.

Mr. HAYS. That took a vote of the Congress?

Mr. SARGENT. That is right, it was voted.

Mr. HAYS. Do you have any breakdown of how many on each political party voted on that?

Mr. SARGENT. I don’t know. I presume it was substantial.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, both parties had already been indoctrinated with this socialism as early as 1909?

Mr. SARGENT. I didn’t say that.

Mr. HAYS. You say right here in your statement you handed out to the press that this was a plot to establish the Federal income tax in order to pave the way for national Federal socialism.

Mr. SARGENT. I say the radical group had that in mind. The people had a more immediate situation at hand. There were great abuses in that period that we are all familiar with and reform of some type was undoubtedly due and needed.

The conclusion I adopt is that a normal American movement for reform was perverted by the introduction of various things which were accepted and which became dangerous in practice and made our present situation what it is. There was a political purpose behind this amendment obviously. The money was not needed. The idea was to give the Federal Government the power to take money. The power to take money became a very important part in what followed.

That is all fact. That is well known.

Mr. HAYS. Some of it is fact.

Mr. SARGENT. It is a fact the Government didn’t need the money. Look at the budget. It is a fact that unlimited power was conferred. It is a fact that subsequently there has been a very extensive use of that power. It is also a fact that without this power socializing of the United States would have been well nigh impossible.

Mr. HAYS. Was the Government in debt in 1909?

Mr. SARGENT. I don’t think it had very much. The Civil War was pretty much off the books and the budget was very low. The Spanish-American War was more or less a picnic. It only lasted a short time and the cost was not great.

Mr. HAYS. We ought to mimeograph that and send it out to the Spanish-American veterans.

Mr. SARGENT. In the financial sense it was not costly. It lasted a short time. Financially I am speaking of. It was not an expensive war, and we had a period of very great prosperity and plenty of resources.

From the educational standpoint, the story begins about 1896 with the establishment of the Dewey Laboratory School at the University
of Chicago. That school continued until 1903. The Dewey in question here is the professor of philosophy, John Dewey, who expounded a principle which has become destructive of traditions and has created the difficulties and the confusion, much of it, that we find today. Professor Dewey denied that there was any such thing as absolute truth, that everything was relative, everything was doubtful, permanently doubtful, that there were no basic values and nothing which was specifically true.

The concept was revolutionary in practice. I don't know what the good professor thought of his reasons, but the effect of it was to undermine existing props and to make possible the specific thing I refer to here, because as soon as you say there are no basic principles at all, that everything is debatable and uncertain, changeable from day to day, you automatically wipe the slate clean, you throw historical experience and background to the wind and you begin all over again, which is just exactly what the Marxians want someone to do.

Therefore, John Dewey was a gift from the gods to the radicals. He was just tailor-made for this sort of situation. I haven't the faintest idea of what Dewey himself thought he was doing. I am merely saying it happens and had this effect.

Mr. HAYS. You would not think there is anything unusual in a professor of philosophy coming up with some crackpot theory like that.

Mr. SARGENT. I would think it is somewhat significant and unusual when a long parade of other people back up the man and make it the guiding philosophy of an educational system.

Mr. HAYS. You would not say that there ought not to be any new ideas or research in any educational system?

Mr. SARGENT. No; I didn't say that.

Mr. HAYS. You say that any time we break with tradition we are automatically getting into something bad.

Mr. SARGENT. I am saying it is generally agreed by philosophers that this philosophy of John Dewey was extremely destructive in practice and made it possible to accomplish the things that were later done. It brought about the policy of attacking the American tradition. They attacked patriotism.

Mr. HAYS. Let me try to tie that down with an example here. You say attack American tradition. There was a tradition around the time of Civil War that it was perfectly all right for you to buy your way out of the Army. I think the fee was $300.

Mr. SARGENT. That is an American tradition?

Mr. HAYS. It was then. It was very reputable and nobody questioned it and everybody did it.

Mr. SARGENT. That is not what I mean by the word "tradition."

Mr. HAYS. It is hard to keep words in context and define them.

Mr. SARGENT. Tradition as in the Declaration of Independence. That is a statute passed by the Congress and is a basic document. The principle of the Declaration of Independence was directly undermined and attacked by the philosophy of John Dewey.

Mr. HAYS. Another document that you keep citing, and a very valuable document, is the Constitution. Did the Constitution have any reference to slavery at all in the beginning?

Mr. SARGENT. Of course it did. You know that. Until 1808.

Mr. HAYS. That was part of the tradition?
Mr. Sargent. No. I don't use tradition in that sense. Every section of the Constitution is not a tradition by any manner of means. I mean the essentials.

Mr. Hays. What are you going to do, pick the traditions and the rest is not according to your definition?

Mr. Sargent. No, I am going to talk about the essential rights of human beings. Most people agree on what that stuff is.

One of the most fundamental concepts of all is the doctrine of inalienable rights, the fact that your rights belong to you and my rights belong to me and are not given to me by any majority in society; that we acquire those rights at birth and we get them by natural law or the laws of God.

Mr. Hays. I will go along with you. That is the first time today that you and I have been able to specifically get something down in a definition that both of us could agree on.

Mr. Sargent. All right. Dewey throws that out. He said not even that one. That is overboard, too.

The philosophy of John Dewey is a natural for radicalism because it makes everything uncertain and the subject of confusion. They deny there are such things as natural rights. They say that rights are whatever the majority say, here today and gone tomorrow. Sort of an off-again, on-again Flannigan affair.

Mr. Hays. You believe in laissez-faire?

Mr. Sargent. What do you mean by that term?

Mr. Hays. It is generally used in the same term. You know the definition of it. Let-alone theory, that the Government should not interfere.

Mr. Sargent. No; I don't think there should be a complete want of governmental restraint. Anarchy would be the result of it.

Mr. Hays. There has been testimony before these hearings that there has been a plot to do away with the laissez-faire theory.

Mr. Sargent. That word has been booted around to a great extent. Like "democracy," it has been picked up by all the Communist fronts and they throw it all over the place until the word is almost useless for any practical purposes.

Mr. Hays. In other words, laissez-faire, democracy, or any other word has certain limitations?

Mr. Sargent. Some of those words have. Natural law means a very specific thing. I say that John Dewey's philosophy struck a mortal blow at natural law and that is the cement which holds this country of ours together from the standpoint of religion, philosophy, and governmental policy.

Mr. Hays. You and I both apparently agree that John Dewey's philosophy is not the kind of philosophy with which we would associate ourselves.

Mr. Sargent. That is right. Definitely. I think it is a very destructive thing and very unfortunate.

Mr. Hays. But you would not say that John Dewey did not have a right to believe that and to advocate it?

Mr. Sargent. No. All these people had a right to advocate these things. But the foundations didn't have a right to step in and actively promote one theory and throw the rest overboard.

Mr. Hays. Up to now you say the foundations did that and threw the other one overboard?
Mr. Sargent. I will get to that. That comes into the picture. I am giving you the historical background first. I will be talking about foundations very shortly.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Sargent. On the basis of these principles John Dewey established this laboratory school at the University of Chicago in 1896 and conducted experimental education. He continued until 1903.

Teachers College, which has become subsequently identified with much of the conditions to which we will refer, became affiliated with Columbia in 1898.

In 1902, John D. Rockefeller established his first foundation known as General Education Board. From the standpoint of contemporary affairs, that was just 1 year before the first Russian revolution, attempted under Lenin, when they adopted the principles of Karl Marx. There was violence, and in Russia at that particular time there were threats which broke out in 1905 after Russia lost the war with Japan.

The writers of this period were discussing many conditions which were obviously bad and should be condemned. In 1904, for example, Robert Hunter wrote his book entitled “Poverty,” Steffens wrote about The Shame of the Cities, Tarbell wrote the book The History of the Standard Oil Company at about the same time. In 1905, Charles Evans Hughes made his investigation of life insurance scandals in New York.

The point is that the country at the time was in a very active condition of flux due to these many influences which I think we are familiar with.

Jack London writes in 1905 in War of the Classes explaining how he became a Socialist. In the same year John Dewey became professor of philosophy at Columbia University and brought his concept into that university.

Now we come to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. My authority here is a publication of that organization itself, which relates the facts regarding its formation. This is published by the League for Industrial Democracy, which is the successor of the old Intercollegiate Socialist Society. The pamphlet is entitled “Thirty-five Years of Educational Pioneering. L. I. D. Celebrates Past Achievements and Asks Where Do We Go From Here?”

Mr. Hays. When was that published?

Mr. Sargent. It relates to the original history of the movement; copyright notice is 1941. It was a meeting they held to discuss their own history and background and recites what happened.

The meeting which is reported on by this pamphlet, as the pamphlet states, was held on Thursday evening, November 28, 1941, at their 35th anniversary dinner at the Hotel Edison in New York City. There were three or four hundred members and guests present.

One of the main speakers was John Dewey, president of the League for Industrial Democracy, who is referred to here as one of the foremost educators and philosophers. Harry W. Laidler, the executive director of the league was among those present. Harry W. Laidler’s speech gives an exact copy of the original call issued for the formation of this prior group in 1905 and reads as follows. The heading is Call
for an Intercollegiate Socialist Society and the main body reads as follows:

In the opinion of the undersigned, the recent remarkable increase in the Socialist vote in America should serve as an indication to the educated men and women in the country that socialism is a thing concerning which it is no longer wise to be indifferent.

Mr. Hays. When was this written?

Mr. Sargent. This was the original notice of 1905 being reported. At the subsequent anniversary dinner they put in their copy of the original notice of formation which I am reading.

The undersigned, regarding its aims and fundamental principles with sympathy, and believing in them will ultimately be found the remedy for many far-reaching economic evils, proposed organizing an association to be known as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society for College Men and Women, Graduate and Undergraduate, through the formation of study clubs in the colleges and universities, and the encouraging of all legitimate endeavors to awaken an interest in socialism among the educated men and women of the country.


The article goes on to state that the meeting was organized as a result of this call and held on the top floor of Peck's Restaurant, 140 Fulton Street, New York City, on the afternoon, September 12, 1905.

Further on in the article it relates that in the year 1906 in pursuance of this plan, Jack London took a spectacular trip among colleges. That was in early 1906. It says that in scores of colleges the speakers of this organization presented to students the challenge of a new social order. It refers to present day leaders of thought in the movement, including Paul Douglas, Isador Lubin, and a number of others here.

Mr. Hays. Let us have them all.


Mr. Hays. What were they doing?

Mr. Sargent. It says here that many of these people were among the active members of Intercollegiate Socialist Society college chapters during those days. In other words, these names relate to the early activities of the group.

Mr. Hays. That was 1906?

Mr. Sargent. You can't say exactly, Mr. Hays, because they are referring to the early days. He does not peg this particular thing as a date. It was during the early period as this pamphlet would indicate, in any event.

Mr. Hays. It seems to me you might have missed the most significant thing in that whole thing. You have not emphasized it. You said when you started out somewhere along in there that the significant size of the Socialist vote must convince of one thing or another. That
was back around 1905. I don’t know what the Socialist vote was in 1905, but I will wager in proportion to the population it was lower than now.

Mr. Sargent. I have no idea. That statement appeared in the call of the notice.

Mr. Hays. Don’t you think you are right?

Mr. Sargent. I would not want to hazard a guess.

Mr. Hays. In other words, you are getting pretty excited about something here that has proved over the years 1905 to 1954 that it didn’t have enough drive of its own to survive.

The Chairman. May I interject? You are making reference of that in connection with the 1941 meeting of the LID as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. Sargent. Yes. The Intercollegiate Socialist Society, the predecessor for the Industrial League for Democracy.

Mr. Hays. What I am referring to is the original call for the meeting.

Mr. Sargent. That is right.

The Chairman. May I ask, is the League for Industrial Democracy a tax exempt institution?

Mr. Sargent. It is my understanding that it is. This was clearly a propaganda organization, Mr. Hays. It was formed, as its notice shows in the first place, to actively promote a political movement, namely, socialism.

Mr. Hays. I am not arguing with you, sir, that it was not a propaganda organization or anything of the kind. It probably was. The thing that I am trying to find out is how much significance did it have and whether it ever had any effect or not.

Mr. Sargent. I think it had a great deal of significance. Not in the Socialist Party vote, but in making its policies effective in other ways as the Fabians in Great Britain did. They infiltrated other parties and worked their will in this fashion. They didn’t go out and run for election. They used the attack system by masquerading under other groups. That is exactly what we find in this educational picture.

This pamphlet I have before me shows that Robert Morse Lovett became the first president of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and you will find from its proceedings that he was identified with it for many years. Mr. Lovett has one of the most outstanding records of Communist-front affiliation of anyone I have ever seen. He belonged to a total of 56 Communist-front organization, this man, the president of this particular group here.

I have the list before me. He belonged at some date or dates between this time and the year 1949, to one or more of these various organizations, not necessarily, of course, simultaneously.

Mr. Hays. He is a bad actor, I take it, this fellow Lovett. Are you going to read all 56 of those?

Mr. Sargent. He is an egghead. He is an educated fool who joins anything and is a knockout for propaganda and used this organization obviously for the purpose to which I refer. I think the record can properly state something about the character of the people that got in here because we are studying propaganda.

Mr. Hays. If you are going to use the word “egghead,” and I have no objection to it—it has become a generally accepted term—maybe
we ought to have a definition of it. You use it in a connotation that is ridiculous or something of that kind?

Mr. Sargent. You want a definition of egghead; all right, I have it. It is in an article in a recent magazine. I think I would go for this. It is the American Mercury issue of June 1954.

Mr. Hays. I think you probably would go for anything that the Mercury writes.

Mr. Sargent. The article is by Howard Lord Varney, who has a lot of experience, and is called The Egghead Clutch on the Foundations. You might want to bring that man down here. He seems to have a great deal on the ball.

Mr. Hays. I will tell you if we bring any more down here like some we have now I am in favor of the committee hiring a staff psychiatrist.

Mr. Sargent. I think somebody ought to put a psychiatrist on Robert Morss Lovett.

Mr. Hays. I don't care whether he belonged to all of them. The only thing I was interested in was if he belonged to 56, why don't you put them in the record?

Mr. Sargent. I am glad to do that provided it is understood that it will be part of my testimony.

Mr. Hays. Yes. We are trying to save time. If you read 56 Communist front organizations —

The Chairman. They may go in as part of the record.

Mr. Sargent. I thought as part of the rule I had to read it or the equivalent to get them in.

Mr. Hays. By agreement we will put them in.

Mr. Sargent. I have a list in my binder, and give it to the reporter to insert.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

References to Robert Morss Lovett, compiled from material furnished by congressional committees, publications, public records, and other sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Appendix IX page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National committee, All America Anti-Imperialist League</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signatory, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for the Freedom of Mooney and Billings</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born</td>
<td>349, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, American Council on Soviet Relations</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National advisory Board, American Friends of the Chinese People</td>
<td>371, 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of American Friends of Spanish Democracy</td>
<td>380-383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, American Fund for Public Service</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National vice chairman, American League for Peace and Democracy</td>
<td>390-394, 397, 401, 404, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice chairman, American League Against War and Fascism</td>
<td>416, 424, 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signatory, Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union</td>
<td>467, 771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory board, Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian War Relief, Inc</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor and advisory board, American Student Union</td>
<td>520, 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National advisory board, American Youth Congress</td>
<td>535, 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory council, Book Union</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago All-American Anti-Imperialist League</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signatory, Committee For a Boycott Against Japanese Aggression</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee to Save Spain and China</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of Constitutional Liberties</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory board, Film Audiences For Democracy</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorser, Friends of the Soviet Union</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friday.
References to Robert Morse Lovett, compiled from material furnished by congressional committees, publications, public records, and other sources—Con.

Organizations

Official, Garland Fund ........................................... 764
National committee, International Labor Defense . 830
Speaker, International Workers Order ......................... 892
League of American Writers ...................................... 968, 973
Advisory committee, League for Mutual Aid ................... 982
Endorser, American Committee for International Student Congress Against War and Fascism ................................. 1083
Chairman, August Peace Parade and Jane Addams Memorial 1103
National Mooney Council of Action .............................. 1142
Sponsor of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor Banquet ................... 1164
USA supporter, National Committee to Aid the Victims of German Fascism ........................................ 1170
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners 1177
National Committee for People's Rights ........................................ 1179
Signatory, National Emergency Conference ..................... 1205, 1207
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights .... 1209, 1214
Sponsor of National Federation For Constitutional Liberties 1229, 1233
National People's Committee Against Hearst .................... 1300
Sponsor of National Right-to-Work Congress .................... 1308
Signatory, National Writers Congress ............................ 1340
Signatory, New Masses Letter to the President .................. 1356
Committee member, Non-Partisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio ....................... 1375
Signer, Open Letter to American Liberals ....................... 1379
Signer, Open Letter For Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union ................................................................... 1384
Signer, Open Letter Protesting the Ban on Communists in the American Civil Liberties Union .............................. 1386, 1388
Advisory editor, Champion of Youth .............................. 1447
Contributing editor, Science and Society ....................... 1456
Arrangements committee, People's Front For Peace .............. 1462
Contributor, Soviet Russia Today .................................. 1603
Chairman, Chicago Committee For the Struggle Against War 1618
National committee, Student Congress Against War ............ 1620
Signatory, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade ........... 1651
Sponsor of the American Pushkin Committee ...................... 1772
Speaker, Greater Boston Peace Strike Committee ................ 1780

Robert Morse Lovett is given as a sponsor of various activities of the American Peace Crusade, which was described (statement on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, H. Rept. No. 378, on the Communist “Peace” Offensive, released April 1, 1951) as an organization which “the Communists established” as “a new instrument for their ‘peace’ offensive in the United States”; heralded by the Daily Worker “the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.”

The Daily People's World of March 3, 1952, gave him as one of the sponsors of the delegation of the National Delegates Assembly for Peace (identified by the Daily People's World as a meeting of the American Crusade) who marched on Washington, D. C., April 1, 1952.

According to the Daily Worker of August 20, 1947, Mr. Lovett was cochairman of the Call for the Conference of the Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. He signed the organization's letter in behalf of Communist deportation cases (Daily Worker, March 4, 1948); its statement in behalf of Gerhart Eisler (Daily Worker, December 21, 1948); and its statement against denaturalization (Daily Worker, August 10, 1950).

The American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General, June 1 and September 21, 1948, and the special committee cited it as “one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States (reports March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942).

Professor Lovett was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions).
The Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheels-horses and supports of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations." The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization; and the World Peace Congress was cited as a Communist front among the "peace" conferences.

He signed a statement in behalf of the so-called Hollywood Ten (who were shown to have affiliation with Communist organizations and to have had Communist Party registration cards) who refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker (December 31, 1951, August 11, 1952, December 10, 1952) named him as a speaker at a rally in New York City to "smash the Smith Act"; as signer of a telegram prepared and dispatched by the National Committee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims; and as signatory to an appeal to the President requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party who were convicted under the Smith Act.

According to the Daily Worker of March 2, 1953, after addressing the ninth annual dinner at the Jefferson School of Social Science, Professor Lovett asked all present to "stand in tribute to two famous Marxist leaders of the United States working class—Elizabeth Gurly Flynn and the late Mother Bloor."

The Jefferson School was cited by the Attorney General as "an adjunct of the Communist Party (press release of December 4, 1947); special committee report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, states "at the beginning of the present year (1944) the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science."

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn was convicted under the Smith Act on charges of conspiring to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence (Daily Worker, January 22, 1933).

Mr. Sargent. Is this your hour of recess?

The Chairman. No; you may proceed.

Mr. Sargent. Following this movement here, Socialist groups sprang up at Columbia, Wesleyan, Harvard, and many other colleges. There was a Princeton chapter set up in the year 1907. We find that the changes that began to prevail in the educational policies of some of our leading groups became quite prominent around the year 1930.

Mr. Hays. When you read the list of colleges you got down to one in Ohio. What do you mean to imply by reading those names, anything more than that they had a chapter of Socialists on the campus?

Mr. Sargent. I am just citing the fact that it organized an active chapter on the campus. It is an illustration of the spread of the movement very promptly among what are presumably leading universities. I imply nothing beyond that statement.

Mr. Hays. That college happens to be considered in my State as being one of the best colleges and not only in Ohio, but in the United States. It is very expensive. The only reason more people don't go to it is because probably they can't afford it. But I never heard anything subversive and abnormal about it. I just want to be sure that the record does not imply that.

The Chairman. From what was said, I drew no adverse interest.

Mr. Sargent. I make no statement one way or another. It is not my intention to do so. I was discussing the rather early spread of the movement.

In 1913—this is interesting because it indicates the way this destructive Dewey philosophy began to take hold—in 1913 the National Education Association issued a document known as bulletin 41, which contained recommendations of the National Education Association regarding the teaching of history. I think this is pertinent because one of the things involved here has been distortion of history and its use for propaganda purposes.

Mr. Hays. What year was this?
Mr. Sargent. 1913. This statement of point of view in that bulletin as printed in our United States Bureau of Education says:

High school teachers of social studies have the best opportunity ever offered to any social group to improve the citizenship of the land. This sweeping claim is based upon the fact that the 1½ million high school pupils is probably the largest group of persons in the world who can be directed to a serious and systematic effort, both through study and practice to acquire the social spirit.

It is not so important that the pupil know how the President is elected or that he shall understand the duties of the health officer in his community. The time formerly spent in the effort to understand the process of passing a law under the President's veto is now to be more preferably used in the observation of vocational resources of the community.

The committee recommends that social studies in the high school shall include community health, housing, homes, human rights versus property rights, impulsive action of mobs, the selfish conservatism of traditions and public utilities.

Here you have the inception of the move which became definite later, to use the schools for a political objective to modify the social order, and therefore to become instruments of propaganda.

It began as early as 1913.

Mr. Hays. Let us discuss that a little bit. What is wrong with that paragraph you read?

Mr. Sargent. It is promoting a particular thing which would obviously result in legislative action.

Mr. Hays. Name it. You see, you have the advantage there. You have in front of you everything that you read. I don't. I thought I heard some things in there that I didn't think too much wrong if they taught a little bit about in schools. For instance, the subject of housing might well be something that could be profitably discussed.

Mr. Sargent. Isn't it propaganda to shift the emphasis from the Constitution of the United States to a housing project as a substitute?

Mr. Hays. We are not talking about housing projects. We are talking generally about housing.

For instance, whether or not bad housing and slum housing has a deleterious effect on community life. Do you think that should not be mentioned in school at all?

Mr. Sargent. At the proper grade level I see no objection if the discussion is balanced. I am talking about the shift from the Constitution to the social things in substitution.

Mr. Hays. Did you ever teach school, Mr. Sargent?

Mr. Sargent. No, sir, but I have good friends who did and do.

Mr. Hays. Do you think it would be possible to get an intelligent group of high school people together and teach the Constitution without getting into something besides the context of the subject matter in front of them? You are talking about a balanced presentation. I have had a good deal of experience with high school students and it is pretty difficult not to get both sides of the thing presented in the average high school class.

Mr. Sargent. It is very hard to get both sides presented as things operate now. I am a parent and I have children in the public schools and I have had very serious discussions with many people on this.

Mr. Hays. I disagree with that.

Mr. Sargent. You were a teacher yourself at one time.

Mr. Hays. I have a call that we are wanted on the floor, the minority, so could we adjourn now?

The Chairman. We will recess now and resume at 2:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2:30 p.m. the same day.)
Afternoon Session

(The committee reconvened at 2:30 p.m., upon the expiration of the recess.)

Testimony of Aaron M. Sargent—Resumed

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Sargent. At the time of adjournment, we were at the year 1913. That is the approximate date of the organization of the Rockefeller Foundation which is the second of the great foundations created by John D. Rockefeller, Sr.

The first one, as you will recall, was General Education Board, the organization date of which was 1902.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. I hesitate to use that word, but I feel I have to.

I would like to read from the rules of procedure adopted on page 7 of the first day’s hearings:

(b) Executive hearings: That is the majority of the committee believes that the interrogation of the witness in a public hearing might unjustly injure his reputation or the reputation of other individuals, the committee shall interrogate such witness in closed or executive session.

Now, I do not know what the other two members of the committee think, but the minority is of the unanimous opinion that this witness is going to injure the reputation of other individuals and we feel that he should be interrogated first in executive session before all of this is spread upon the record and has in the eyes of the public a certain validity which it might not be entitled to.

In support of this point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should like to cite to you the principle about which I argued this morning, namely, that by preparing a sort of blanket indictment and releasing it to the press, that that got on the ticker and in the papers to the exclusion of anything else about the hearings this morning.

I feel as ranking minority, and if Mrs. Pfost disagrees with me, she can indicate it, that a witness who is making as many general and specific accusations as this witness seems to indicate he is going to make, should be heard in executive session so that the members of the committee will have some knowledge of what is coming out and some chance to intelligently prepare a set of questions to ask him.

Now, I will give you one example. I do not want to unduly drag this out.

But going back to the socialistic plot about the income tax, I had not realized until I did a little checking during the lunch hour that the income tax was first introduced by the Honorable Cordell Hull, of the State of Tennessee.

I do not think that you would want the inference here to remain that he was a socialistic individual and involved in any plot to foist socialism on the United States.

I do not think you would unless we went into it a little more fully.

Mr. Sargent. Nobody has mentioned Mr. Hull, Mr. Hays.

Mr. Hays. I have mentioned Mr. Hull. I point out to you that this is in direct relation to your statement that this is part of the plot.

Mr. Sargent. I charged Mr. Hull with nothing. I said underlying this thing is a radical intellectual elite having a purpose of their own
and no other people in any way connected with it came along and made its enactment possible.

Mr. Hays. In other words, he was a tool.

Mr. Sargent. He was led by the influence of the time, as many people were, to do a thing which turned out to be a rather effective device for the radical clique.

Mr. Hays. Now, just a minute, until we dispose of this motion and then you can make all the statements you want to make.

Mr. Sargent. I would like to speak on this Executive order, because this suggestion is unfair to me and the manner in which this thing is being protested.

Mr. Hays. You are not a member of this committee and if a member of this committee makes a point of order you in no wise enter into it one way or the other.

Mr. Sargent. I am an American citizen, and I have a right to express my views, if I wish to do so.

Mr. Hays. You are an American citizen, but if you would act a little bit more on the principle of fair play and Americanism, we would get along a little better.

The Chairman. So far as the Chair has been able to observe, the witness has not up to now said anything derogatory about anyone, or indicated that he had in mind doing so.

If that should be the case, then I think the suggestion that you have made would be well taken.

My interest as chairman of the committee is to permit the witnesses who know that the foundations have not been conducted as they should have been in all instances, to present their views. If they have something, the committee staff, and the committee itself, feels justified in taking the time of the committee.

Then I am equally interested in the foundations, or those who wish to speak in behalf of the foundations, having the same opportunity.

As I said originally, my only purpose, so far as I am concerned, is to get an objective study made of this subject.

Mr. Hays. If this is an objective study, to drop the name of Senator Douglas in as a Socialist, and then let Senator Douglas come in and deny later on that he is one, then I do not understand the meaning of the word "objectivity."

But this has happened and it happened this morning, I do not like it and I notice all the significant dates that this gentleman has presented have always been dates when the Democrats seem to have been in power.

It might have started back under the Republicans, but we did not get to it until 1913, then something else, and we get to that in 1933, something like that.

I am not going to sit here and let it happen. There is more than one way to get this. I do not want to be put in a position of walking out of this committee, but I can.

The Chairman. He named a group that had met as a committee. So far as I am personally concerned, not having been as observant as other people, I did not identify Senator Douglas as being on the list.

Anyway, the list itself was not read in a relationship that cast any reflection upon the members of the committee. At least I did not so understand.
I do not see any reason why Mr. Sargent should not be permitted to go ahead and make his statement. Then if there are any questions that need to be raised at the time, or if he brings in anybody in a derogatory way, then I think that is something that the committee should consider at the time because we do not expect that kind of thing in the committee.

Mr. Hays. I am willing to be just as cooperative and tolerant as the chairman can possibly be, but I think the committee certainly has carefully tried to live within the rules that were adopted.

Mr. Sargent. Mr. Reece, all I am proposing to do here is to read material from books, pamphlets, and documents and to make normal comment on the material I read.

It is just a question of written material. My basic evidence is entirely written.

The Chairman. You have reached that point?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, sir; I am going to do that exclusively.

Furthermore, the suggestion that this has a political twist is not correct. This is nonpartisan. I am reading a considerable amount of material during the 1920's. In fact, I am covering in regular fashion the significant events which occurred, when they took place based on their apparent relevance to the matter before you here.

I will stick to that in entire good faith.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it will be impossible for me to match your patience, but I am going to try.

Again I am going to try to explain to you what I think is the basic difference in opinion. That is this: that I have felt it was deliberate. If I am wrong, I am very sorry, but up to now I have seen no reason to change my opinion.

We have people coming in here with these prepared statements, typewritten out, this scattergun technique, in which certain names are dropped in, certain statements are made.

The members of the committee have no advance opportunity to inform themselves, to find anything out about it, to find out even the basic research to see whether it is true, and then the inference is left.

I do not think it is any inference in the case of the income tax, and I keep referring to that, but it is such a glaring example that this is part of an un-American subversive socialistic collectiveness, to use a lot of terms that have been flung around with great abandon, plot; and the newspapers or anyone listening can get that impression.

In addition, it is spread on the record of a committee of Congress, and the inference is that it is true and then later when the people who may have been maligned or who may have been testified about in a way that put them in a bad light, come in and deny it, then it is not news anymore.

I think we ought to have some insight in what these people are going to say before we let them come in here with a shotgun and shoot off in all directions.

Mrs. Pfost. May I ask a question?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mrs. Pfost. Is the staff of the committee so busy that they cannot type up for us the excerpts of the material that he is going to give us this afternoon, or the forthcoming witnesses?

Now, the majority of the witnesses who appear before the committee I am on, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, supply each
member of the committee with a mimeographed copy. And in the instances when I have testified before another committee, I have always furnished them with typewritten copies, or, if the committee is large, mimeographed copies.

The Chairman. So far as typing statements, that could be done, and copies made available, if the statement itself is available. But in some instances, as I understood to be the case with Mr. Sargent, so much of his material is going to be what you might call documentary, that the statement itself that might be typed up was very sketchy and in order to make a complete statement, the documentation had to accompany the statement.

So that outside of his introductory references which were typed, the rest of it was simply what might be called notations to guide him in the presentation of his documentary evidence, which he has now reached and is ready to give.

Mrs. Prost. I observed, however, after he had started in with his particular binder from which he is working now, that he was reading whole paragraphs out of it.

Mr. Sargent. In some cases I have read paragraphs merely for the reason it would place a great burden on the Library of Congress to physically haul each one of those books over here. I have simply given in some cases reference to the fact that such a book was written at that particular time to build what you might call climate.

I think this is a matter of great importance to the American people and I do not like the inference. There have been some very derogatory remarks made about me, and to suggest an executive hearing is a very unfair thing to me.

Also I should think they should be put in the open.

As long as I stick to books I think I am entitled to stick to these facts.

I am willing to submit myself to cross-examination. I think this is a public matter to be transacted publicly. I will adhere to your rule in good faith.

I am not throwing slugs at individuals. I am reading books, pamphlets, documents, and I am commenting on books, documents, and pamphlets; that is all.

Mrs. Prost. Of course, this morning you did refer to people by name.

Mr. Sargent. I read them out of a pamphlet.

Suppose I write some of these things out, suppose I had the time to do all that and I presented that to someone here, does that mean that there is to be a suppression of certain parts of the evidence which I have here which appeared to be pertinent to this inquiry?

Mrs. Prost. No; but certainly we would have an opportunity to go over the material and see what type of thing you were going to testify on if we had it in advance and it would give us an opportunity, too, to determine whether or not it would require an executive session, instead of just a scattering of shot, as Mr. Hays has said.

Mr. Sargent. I will not go into executive session except under protest and under process. I am not prepared to testify in any executive session in this matter, unless compelled to by the processes of this committee.

I think it is improper and unfair to me, and I want to protest against any such suggestion.
Mr. Hays. In what way would it be unfair to you? It is done in every other committee in the House where accusations are made against individuals.

Mr. Sargent. I interpret the remarks you have made as intending to cast reflection on me, and if such a hearing were held and the record not put out later, it would be used against me as having brought improper matters before this committee.

Mr. Hays. I am not trying to be unfair to you because I do not want to be doing what you are doing to other people. All I suggest is that if you are so afraid of an executive session, and I believe you have spent 5 hectic days getting this material ready, let the staff spend another hectic day or two getting it typed up so that we can at least look at it before you come in here and start reading it.

Do you think that is an unfair request?

Mr. Sargent. I think it is proper to let me proceed with this case as it is.

Mr. Hays. What you think is not going to have very much influence on the vote of the committee, I suppose.

Mr. Sargent. I am unable to do that effectively. Furthermore, I would prefer to give testimony on this matter just as a witness does in court. A witness does not have a cold statement with him in court. He testifies in a normal fashion. He subjects himself to being questioned as he goes.

I am prepared to do that.

Mr. Hays. As you have probably observed already, these congressional committees do not run very much like a court of law. You can come in, by somebody. In many cases it is a lengthy, long-drawn-out process by deposition and what-have-you.

The Chairman. I think we should all refrain from characterizations when we are referring to other people. With my experience it is that we all have a hard enough time.

You take the statement that was made earlier, that if we are going to have the type of witnesses we have had, we ought to have a psychiatrist examine them. That casts a reflection on these two witnesses.

Mr. Hays. I did not mean to cast any reflection on the other 2 witnesses as much as I did on the 1 here, to be frank about it.

I do not know whether I am awake or dreaming, to tell you the truth. Sometimes, to use the expression of one of the reporters this morning, this could not be happening; we must have all been asleep.

I have had a lot of nightmares, but never one like this.

The Chairman. As I recall the way the statement was made, referring to the ones that had been called, it was two very eminent scholars who were widely recognized in the field of education.

Mr. Hays. The first witness turned out to be a witness for the other side on cross-examination, about the NEA. He certainly damaged that argument terrifically.

The second one, I think, is a kind of nice mixed-up fellow that needs straightening out somewhat. At the moment I think he is a little confused.

I do not mean to imply anything is badly wrong with him.

Mr. Sargent. This reading this morning was at your request.
Mr. Hays. You dropped in the name of Senator Douglas and one other name I do not remember. I merely said if you are going to start dropping names of political people, let us put them all in the record. The record will show that.

Mr. Sargent. You asked for all the names, however, and I gave them.

Mr. Hays. That is right, because you put in the name of Senator Douglas and I personally believe you did it deliberately with malice aforethought.

Another thing you did, you brought in the name of Sister Mary Margaret, and then you pause for emphasis and put in the name of McCarran.

I submit to you that ordinarily people in the orders do not use the last name and I wonder if it is in the flyleaf of the book.

Mr. Sargent. It is. I gave you the information about the author and the book.

Previously you had been questioning authority for the statements I was making. I want to make it clear that I was relying on a high-type of research book in the statement I made.

Mr. Hays. Maybe we ought to subpoena the officials of the Catholic University and find out how high-type this is.

I happen to know something about the background of the author of that book, how long it took her to get a degree, and so forth, and even that there was a little pressure used or she would not have it yet.\(^1\)

Mr. Sargent. May I go on?

The Chairman. I question seriously whether references of that type ought to be thrown out in the committee.

Mr. Hays. If we are going to throw them out we ought to throw them all out.

I made a point of order. The rules are here. Are we going to abide by them?

The Chairman. I am interested in the decorum of the committee as a whole. I do not know this Sister.

Mr. Hays. I do not know her, either, but I have done a little checking. You see, that is where you are at a disadvantage. You have to use your lunch hour to try to find out what kind of documents these are.

Mr. Sargent. I will bring the book for you tomorrow morning.

Mr. Hays. The book itself does not mean anything. It is but one person's opinion. You are buttressing your opinion with somebody else's opinion.

Mr. Sargent. It is based on original documentary material. I checked some material at the Hoover Institute on War, Peace, and Revolution at Stanford University.

It is considered to be the best document of its kind in existence. I think any well-grounded scholar will tell you the same thing. The book is eminently reliable.

Mr. Hays. I want to vote right now whether we abide by rule 1, or whether we do not. I am going to insist we have a vote. We have a right to have one.

\(^1\) Statement of rector of the Catholic University of America, regarding this comment appears at p. 1179, pt. 2.
It says here:

If a majority of the committee believes—

and I do not know how we are going to find out how the rest of them will believe unless we put the question.

The Chairman. There have been no names brought in here in a derogatory way so far as the chairman can see. It happens that 1 of the other 2 majority members has been engaged in drafting the Social Security Act at this time—the amendments to it.

The other is a chairman of another important committee.

Mr. Hays. That is interesting. They gave their proxies to you to do their thinking for them. It says:

If the majority of the committee believes,

I do not see how we are going to get the basis for that unless you are going to do their thinking for them or have them here to say what they think; 1 of the 2.

I would not even object to this unusual procedure, Mr. Chairman, but we have had it before, and when we want to cross-examine these people we cannot cross-examine them because tomorrow we have subpoenaed so and so and the next day we have so and so.

I know what is going to happen. When the great crusade bogs down completely, we will all go home and that will be the end of the hearings and the other side will not be heard.

The Chairman. Mr. Sargent says that he will make himself subject to cross-examination after his whole testimony is completed.

Mr. Sargent. I can come back here next Monday or Tuesday for that purpose and the transcript can be written and it can be studied fully.

Mr. Hays. How long have you been here now under subpoena?

Mr. Sargent. I arrived in town Wednesday morning, last Wednesday.

Mr. Hays. The committee has been responsible for your expenses, I suppose, ever since then?

Mr. Sargent. I don’t know what the rule is on that. I felt a need for an adequate preparation.

Mr. Hays. In other words, the taxpayers of the United States are paying for you to come from California to Washington and getting these documents together.

Did you have any help from our staff?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, I did.

Mr. Hays. Now, the truth begins to come out. The staff helped you out, too?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, that is right.

Mr. Hays. You know, that is a kind of funny thing. I cannot even get one staff member to help me because there is not any minority staff, but they help the witnesses that they go out and dig up and bring in who present the same peculiar type of thinking apparently that they do.

Mr. Sargent. May I testify, please?

Mr. Hays. I do not know. We have not decided yet.

Mr. Sargent. I am here to testify. I would like to do it, Mr. Hays, and to give you the truth based upon documents, books, and pam-
phlets, and to read from them accurately and comment normally on the material I read. That is why I am here.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, there is a principle involved. I would like to go along with you. I like you and all that.

The Chairman. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. Hays. All right. I move that under the rules the witness be dispensed with until such time as the committee can decide whether or not they want to subpoena him in executive session.

Mrs. Probst. I second the motion.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, may I bring out one material fact?

Mr. Sargent, to what extent has the staff of the committee assisted you? Personally I have had about 10 minutes conversation with you. I have seen none of your material.

Mr. Sargent. Simply in getting various things for me which I desired, and just in the way of general help, not a great deal of specific help. I brought quite a quantity of stuff with me and I had various requirements. I, of course, had to familiarize myself with your prior proceedings to see what was desired.

Mr. Wormser. I supplied you with no material except what you requested specifically for us to get?

Mr. Sargent. That is right. I went to the Library of Congress and I ran down material on things which I lacked. I did my own research here. It has been entirely for your benefit.

I have come here at personal financial sacrifice, as far as that goes.

Mr. Wormser. The implication that the staff has in any way prepared your testimony is not correct?

Mr. Sargent. On the contrary, I prepared it myself and it is my own views.

Mr. Hays. I was trying to find out the answer to that question, whether they did, or not.

The Chairman. The answer is that they did not.

Mr. Hays. All right, that is what I wanted to know, but they did give him clerical help. Up to now I have asked for a transcript of the facts from them and I have not been able to get them.

The Chairman. I vote "no," and I also vote the proxy's "no."

Mr. Hays. I have one more question to ask.

Are you going to abide by the rules?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Hays. If the minority is not here, you cannot have a hearing?

The Chairman. That is right, without any majority of the committee.

Mr. Hays. We will be back when we get a majority of the committee, but I want to hear the other two vote, themselves.

The Chairman. Under the circumstances the committee stands adjourned until the morning at 10 o'clock.

The committee tomorrow will meet in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building.

(Thereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m. Tuesday, May 25, 1954, in the caucus room, Old House Office Building.)