The special committee met at 10:28 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 1301, New House Office Building, Hon. Carroll Reece (chairman of the special committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Reece, Wolcott, Hays, Goodwin, 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.

The Chairman would like to make a statement. In view of the fact that one of the members of the committee referred to the other side, and in other expressions inferred that the majority of the committee or its counsel or staff had taken a side, I was trying to prove a case, neither the majority members of the committee nor its counsel or staff have a side in this inquiry, as the chairman has heretofore said. As a convenience to the foundations, an initial report was submitted outlining the main lines of major criticisms of foundations which a preliminary study by the staff had shown were sufficiently supported by evidence to warrant considering carefully.

We are now in the first stage of assessing these criticisms by hearing some of the supporting evidence. We shall later hear evidence supplied by the foundations themselves, defending against these criticisms. We shall not prejudge. We shall not try to prove a case. We are here to learn what the truth may be.

Needless to say, criticism cannot be expected to come from the foundations themselves. It must come, if at all, chiefly from persons not directly connected with foundation matters. We shall give foundation representatives respectful attention. We do not see why persons who have criticism to offer are not entitled to the same courteous treatment. Failure to give them such courtesy and inclination to condemn them for daring to criticize frankly and even severely would seem to me to deny such witnesses the privileges of citizens and to fail to give them the consideration to which we believe they are entitled from members of the committee.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, in reply to your prepared statement, I will say off the cuff that I did not infer that there was another side. I stated frankly that there was another side. Anybody who wants to read your statement in the Congressional Record or in volume 1
of this transcript will very definitely get the impression that you were on that side. Then if they will read Mr. Dodd’s statement, they will see that after 6 months of research, that he got on your side, too. If anybody has the stomach to read that statement of yours clear through, and then get up here and say there is not a side, and there has not been a very definite and damaging attack made on foundations, they better reread it.

The Chairman. Mr. Sargent had not completed his statement when we adjourned——

Mr. Hays. I have a point of order before he starts.

The Chairman. At the time of our recess yesterday. The question, I think, arises whether he should be permitted, as he has expressed a desire, to complete his statement and then make himself available for criticism or for questioning when he has concluded—he agreeing to make himself available for that purpose.

The chairman’s interest is in orderly procedure and in moving forward. We spent the better part of the day yesterday and the witness was able to make very slight progress on his statement, and I am wondering what the wishes of the committee with reference to procedure might be.

Mr. Hays. I have a point of order right now.

The Chairman. May I hear it?

Mr. Hays. You sure may. I am quoting clause 25, rule 11, paragraph (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, very briefly:

Each committee shall so far as practicable require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

I make a point of order that the witness has not complied with this rule, that it has been practicable for him to do so inasmuch as the staff typed up his statement for him, or at least assisted him in it, and there is no reason why this rule should not be complied with.

The Chairman. A preliminary statement was prepared yesterday for the members of the committee, and likewise for the press. It was not comprehensive. The Chair had understood that the witness expected to confine, after his opening analysis of his testimony, largely to documentation, and in view of that fact, the Chair indicated to the witness that method of procedure would be satisfactory, if he made himself available for questioning after the transcript was available to the members of the committee.

Mr. Wolcott. Mr. Chairman, the situation seems to turn on whether it is practicable or not. Those of us who have any responsibility in presenting this testimony realize that it might not be practicable under the circumstances for the witness to prepare a statement, nor for the staff to digest it. The question turns on whether it is practical or not. I think we would get more information that we are seeking without a prepared statement than we would in a prepared statement.

I am very much interested in the subject this witness is discussing. I might say I have my own views on Fabian socialism, or whatever you might call it. I think the real danger to the American system of government is not communism. The real danger to the American system of government is Fabian socialism. If any of these foundations are engaging in practices paralleling the growth of Fabian socialism
in the British Empire, which resulted in the socialization of the British Empire to the prejudice of their type of democracy, then I think it is the duty of Congress, surely the members of this committee, to find out what is happening.

I understand that this witness has qualified himself as more or less expert on this matter. That is the thing that we are seeking, information which he has.

As far as anything else is concerned, I would let the chips fall where they may. We have to make a record here and find out what is going on. The Fabian Socialists work quietly through infiltration. The Communists are out waving their red flags and yelling and whooping and hollering and picketing. We can see that. We cannot see Fabian socialism. We have to dig for it. We are in the process now, as I understand it, of digging for it.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, sir; we were digging back in 1892.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That does not make any difference. The Fabian Socialist movement in Great Britain went back to the turn of the century. Great names were mentioned. George Bernard Shaw was one of the greatest of Fabians in Great Britain. He has the respect of millions of people. I am sure that the founders of these foundations would turn over several times in their graves if they felt that their money was being used for the destruction of the American system of government. Whether it is destroyed by socialism or communism is not the point. I think we owe them an obligation, as well as ourselves and the people whom we represent, to find out whether there is any danger to the American system, and where it lies. That is the reason I am on this committee. I would not be on the committee if I was not interested in that subject.

I have several other committees that take up most of my time. I cannot stand here—I have not the time—to bicker about the way in which we develop the matter. We have got to do a job and it has got to be done. It has got to be done pretty quickly. Otherwise, we are running the same course, a parallel course, to Fabian socialism which destroyed Great Britain. I do not like it, frankly. I do not like what I see on the horizon. The sun is not coming up. It is a very cloudy day in America because of Fabian socialism.

Let us bring it out here and find out what is going on.

Mr. HAYS. There are a lot of differences of opinion.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know it. I have been charged repeatedly before the Banking and Currency Committee of years gone by of seeing ghosts under the table. Sometimes those ghosts come out and kick you in the shins. We want to avoid that if we can.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I am temporarily on leave from another committee, and a most important executive session. I am not interested at the moment in colloquy between members of the committee. I understand you have a witness ready to go forward. I understand you have a point of order before you. Is there any reason why that cannot be concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is over. The Chair sees no practical justification for upholding the point of order, and he overrules the point of order.

Mr. HAYS. The Chair would not uphold any point of order that he did not agree with, no matter what the rule said. That has become pretty obvious in these hearings.
The Chairman. Now——

Mr. Hays. Don't start interrupting me, or you better bring in the sergeant at arms, because I am going to be heard just the same as you are. You may be afraid of Fabian socialism, but I am afraid of Republican dictatorship. Let us get it out in the open. You brought in the shock troops here, so let us fight it out.

Mr. Goodwin. I understood we were going to hear the witness.

Mr. Hays. We are going to have more points of order.

The second point of order is that the committee is in violation of the rules of the House and the Reorganization Act, inasmuch as the minority of the committee has been deprived of one single staff member.

The Chairman. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. Hays. I will say the Chair did not keep his word. When I helped the Chair get his $65,000, so you would not look stupid when they were going to shut you off, you promised me a staff member. Did you or did you not?

The Chairman. No one has individually a member of the staff.

Mr. Hays. You have the whole staff.

The Chairman. There is a member of the staff that was employed on the recommendation of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Hays. As a stenographer.

The Chairman. No; not as a stenographer.

Mr. Hays. That is what she does.

The Chairman. As an analyst or researcher, I am not sure what her title is. That is what our understanding is.

Mr. Hays. I have a motion to make. I move that we hear this witness in executive session in order to prevent further name dropping and any further hurting of people who have no place in this hearing.

Mrs. Pfoest. I second it.

Mr. Wolcott. As a substitute for that, Mr. Chairman, I move that the witness be allowed to proceed with his statement without interruption.

Mr. Hays. You can pass all those motions you want, but I will interrupt whenever I feel like it. How do you like that? So you might as well save your breath, Jesse.

Mr. Wolcott. I should like to.

Mr. Hays. You run the Banking and Currency Committee without proxies, but in this committee you run it with proxies. You make the rules as you go along for the majority, and I will make the rules for myself as I go along, and if this fellow does not want to bring in a statement, I will interrupt him whenever I feel like it. He better get a bigger mouth than that.

Mr. Wolcott. As I understand it, this committee made the rules, and we are proceeding under the rules adopted by this committee.

Mr. Hays. You know there is no such rule on this committee. When did we make this rule?

Mr. Wolcott. I understand we can vote by proxy. If we do not, I shall make a motion that we do vote by proxy. I understood that I had given the chairman a proxy and there had been no objection to it.

Mr. Hays. I just want the record to show that you rule one way in the committee of which you are chairman and another way here.

Mr. Wolcott. You can make that record if you want to. The Banking and Currency Committee of 29 members have asserted themselves on a good many occasions, and we get along very nicely in that com-
mittee and with the rules of the House. Until the Banking and Currency Committee changes the rules, we will abide by the rules which have been adopted, if any have been adopted. I do not remember that any have been adopted. We operate under the rules of the House.

Does anybody want to support a substitute motion? I move a substitute motion to the motion made by the gentleman from Ohio that the witness be allowed to proceed with his statement without interruption, and at the conclusion of his statement that he subject himself to questioning.

Mr. Goodwin. Second.

Mr. Hays. I have something to say on that motion. It might take quite a little while. In the first place, what this motion entails is that this fellow can come in here and do what he did yesterday.

Mr. Goodwin. Who is "the fellow," may I inquire?

Mr. Hays. Right down here.

Mr. Goodwin. You mean the witness?

Mr. Hays. I will call him anything I like. We understand each other.

Mr. Goodwin. Mr. Chairman, I have something else to do besides—

Mr. Hays. Go ahead. Whenever you go, the minority will go, and that will be the end of the hearing. If you can just stay here and be patient, I have a right to be heard on the substitute and I am going to be heard on the substitute.

The Chairman. Reasonably.

Mr. Hays. I will decide what is reasonable. In other words, you know the trouble around here—and this is pertinent, too—that there have been too many committees in which the minority has allowed itself to be gagged into submission and silence. I am going to be the kind of minority that does not go so easy for that gaggle stuff.

Mr. Wolcott. You have been in the minority for 20 years.

Mr. Hays. You know the funny part of it is that most of you fellows are still in the minority, because you don't seem to have the responsibility to run this Congress. That is why the great crusade is in reverse.

Mr. Wolcott. If the minority will allow us to assume our responsibility, we will get along.

Mr. Hays. The minority on this committee is not going to sit here silent and have peoples' characters assassinated at will by dropping their names in as Senator Douglas' name was dropped in yesterday, deliberately, because it was 1 of only 2 names the witness mentioned out of a whole series of names. He had his name underscored in the pamphlet that he was reading from. He had the name "Paul Douglas" underscored.

The Chairman. But the others were being put in the record.

Mr. Hays. At my insistence, let the record show.

The Chairman. No, they were being put in the record.

Mr. Hays. No, they were not being put in the record. The only thing that was going into the record was what this gentleman was going to say. I said if you are going to read—the record is here, and if you want to start reading from the record, I will read from the record.

Mr. Wolcott. I ask for the question.

Mr. Hays. I am still talking.
Mr. Wolcott. I ask for the question.

Mr. Hays. Go ahead and ask. I say the gentleman is coming in with a shotgun and shooting in all directions, and the committee does not want to give protection to the people whose characters he is going to assassinate. That is what the substitute motion does. I think it is bad and in violation of the rules of the House. It is in violation of the rules of orderly committee procedure which you seem to be so concerned with. I just want the record to show that if the majority wants to let people like this come in and do that, that is up to them.

The Chairman. All in favor say "Aye."

Mr. Wolcott. Aye.

Mr. Goodwin. Aye.

The Chairman. Opposed, "No."

Mr. Hays. No.

Mrs. Pfoest. No.

The Chairman. Aye. Three have voted in the affirmative and two in the negative. The substitute motion is carried.

Mrs. Pfoest. Mr. Chairman, I have a motion. I move that the committee subpoena Dean Rusk, president of the Carnegie Foundation, and hear him just as soon as possible.

Mr. Hays. Would you like to make that more specific and say "as soon as we finish with this witness"?

Mrs. Pfoest. Yes. I will add that, "as soon as we finish with this witness."

Mr. Hays. I will second that motion.

The Chairman. The committee has had in mind hearing Dean Rusk. I think the chairman's own view is that there ought to be an orderliness about the procedure. No doubt Dean Rusk——

Mr. Hays. What is disorderly about subpoenaing him next?

The Chairman. So far as the chairman is concerned, he certainly has no personal objection to his appearing at any time.

Mr. Hays. I am anxious to ask him 1 question, just 1, I promise you, and if he answers it as I think he will, I may ask a second to just complete an identity.

The Chairman. Who is that?

Mr. Hays. Mr. Rusk. I will give you a promise that is all I want to ask him. But if he answers the question as I believe he will, it may change the whole course of these hearings, and we may find that we have to back up and make a fresh start.

Mr. Wolcott. May I ask the chairman if it is the intention of the staff to have Dean Rusk before the committee?

The Chairman. That is the intention; yes.

Mrs. Pfoest. How much later on, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Koch. As soon as all of the so-called criticisms are before the committee so that Dean Rusk and anybody else can answer all of them.

Mr. Hays. Is there any reason why he can't come in and answer one question that will take perhaps 5 minutes?

Mr. Koch. I would suggest that maybe we could stipulate that you send him the question and let it be read into the record.

Mr. Hays. No; I want him to appear under oath. He has to be under oath or else the answer is no good.

Mr. Koch. Couldn't he put it in an affidavit?

Mr. Hays. No.
Mr. Koch. The point is that if he has to come back later to answer a lot of other questions as a matter of convenience for him—maybe I should not be arguing his convenience—but later on he may want to be on for a whole day.

Mr. Hays. It only takes an hour for him to come down—where is he, in New York?

The Chairman. The plan of the procedure, may I say for the members of the committee who have not all had an opportunity to be here all the time, was to present what was generally termed a line of criticism against the foundations. Then the foundations and those who might be interested in speaking on their behalf would have full knowledge of everything that was said and be able to make a complete coverage, or as complete as they desire to do so. That was the procedure as I indicated in my statement a little earlier, that we intended to follow. The Chair has no deep feeling about it one way or another. I shall consult the attitude of the other members of the committee.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, let me say that you have expressed a great deal of concern both here in public and in private about the expediting of these hearings. I told you that if the minority could have a feeling that any slight wish that it might have might be respected that you might find it easier to get along with the minority.

Now, we are only asking in the form of a motion that Mr. Rusk be brought in here for 5 minutes. We will even give you a time limit on him.

The Chairman. I would hardly be inclined to feel that we bring him in under limited time.

Mr. Wolcott. I have a good many questions to ask all of these foundations when they come in.

Mr. Hays. I have no objection to bringing him back later, Mr. Wolcott, but there is a very pertinent thing that ought to be brought out at this point, and I want him here to ask him. It has a great deal of bearing, as you will see. I can't say what it is at the moment.

Mr. Wolcott. How can we vote intelligently—

The Chairman. If the witness is to be called, it would not be the chairman's thinking that he ought to be called subject to limitations.

Mr. Hays. I don't care whether you do or not. I merely offered that to your convenience to show you that we were not trying to dilly-dally or delay by having him here.

Mr. Wolcott. Question.

The Chairman. The Chair will either put the question or he will say that Dean Rusk will be summoned to appear after we have concluded with Mr. Sargent's testimony.

Mr. Hays. That is satisfactory.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully suggest that while counsel has not the slightest objection to calling Dean Rusk for this purpose, we hope it will not be a precedent so that the procedure we planned will be disturbed.

The Chairman. It is not so intended. It is an exception.

Mr. Hays. Let me say to you this, Mr. Wormser, that we are using the name Dean Rusk. I am not acquainted with the gentleman at all. I never met him that I know of. But I believe he is the president of the Carnegie Foundation.

Mr. Wormser. Rockefeller.
Mr. Hays. That is the man I want.
Mr. Wormser. We intended to call him. I have had conversations with Dean Rusk.
The Chairman. That was so understood, and the chairman will issue a subpoena to that effect.
Mr. Wormser. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, one more thing. There was some difficulty in arranging for two professors to appear next Tuesday, Professor Rau of Yale, and Professor Colgrove, formerly of Northwestern. It is rather difficult to get these men who are on active duty. Could I put them on Tuesday?
The Chairman. Dean Rusk will not consume all day Tuesday, and I would suggest that they be available when Dean Rusk completes his testimony.
Mr. Wormser. All right.
(Discussion off the record.)
The Chairman. This is a friendly discussion here.
You may proceed, Mr. Sargent.

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

Mr. Sargent. During the course of our discussions yesterday, there was reference to an original source book upon which I relied in giving certain testimony regarding the early history of the British Fabian movement.

Mr. Hays. I have a question right there, and that is this: On these source books and these various things you are going to read into the record, will there be many more names read into the record?
Mr. Sargent. I will read the title of the book, I will read the author of the book, I will read literally and exactly the order in which material appears, any panel of names starting with the first name and going to the last name, and making no selection of my own in between the first and the last. I do not intend to create the inference you suggested yesterday, I assure you, sir. That will not happen again.
Mr. Hays. All right.
Mr. Sargent. I am referring to this book now because there was some comment—
Mr. Hays. I have another question right there.
Mr. Sargent. I understood I was not going to be interrupted.
Mr. Hays. You misunderstood then. You did not hear what I said. You said you didn’t intend to create the inference that was created yesterday. As I read the press this morning, I read in one of the papers, a New York paper, that some reporter asked you if Paul Douglas which you mentioned, and you mentioned only one other name at that point in the testimony—
Mr. Sargent. Isadore Lubin was the other name.
Mr. Hays. If that were the Senator from Illinois, and the paper quoted you as saying that you presumed that it was; is that correct?
Mr. Sargent. I thought it was, yes, because of Paul Douglas’ subsequent appearances at various meetings of the League for Industrial Democracy, as shown by its publications.
Mr. Hays. Then you did intend deliberately to put Paul Douglas’ name in the record.
Mr. Sargent. I had no particular intend to ascribe anything to him aside from showing the fact that he was there. I underscored those two names because—

Mr. Hays. That is exactly what—

Mr. Sargent. May I finish my answer, please? I underscored those two names because those names were known to me.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Sargent, apparently the minority is going to be overruled quite a bit, but the minority is going to insist that we try to conduct this as nearly as possible in conformity with other congressional hearings. When any member of this committee—majority or minority—asks you a question, that doesn't give you an automatic license to make a speech. You could have either answered that question “yes” or “no.” That is all I want. If you are so anxious to conserve time, perhaps if you would just be a little more succinct in your answers to the questions I ask you, we could conserve some time that way.

I ask you, did you deliberately intend to put the name of Paul Douglas in the record?

Mr. Sargent. No, not in the sense in which you ask the question.

Mr. Hays. You are interpreting the sense I ask the question?

Mr. Sargent. No. I would like to explain my answer. May I do so?

Mr. Hays. Did you have his name underscored in the pamphlet?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, along with other names.

Mr. Hays. All right, that is enough.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Sargent. I did not read the remaining names because they were not particularly known to me especially, and I was trying to conserve the time of the committee. There was reference to this book on Fabianism. I have it before me. It was part of my luggage I brought from California with me. The exact title of the book—I am reading on the cover itself now—is, Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain, 1919–31. The author’s name given below is McCarran. At the bottom the publisher’s name, Heritage Foundation.

The next item on the flyleaf reads as follows:

Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain—

Mr. Hays. Just to get the record straight, would you be able to mention the names of any other books published by this Heritage Foundation?

Mr. Sargent. Clarence Manion’s book, The Key to Peace, has been published by them and distributed widely through the American Legion.

Mr. Hays. He is the fellow that Eisenhower fired?

Mr. Sargent. He did not fire him. Are you attacking Manion along with the rest of them?

Mr. Hays. No, I wanted to know if it is the same company that published his book.

Mr. Sargent. They do, and I think the American Legion and many Members of Congress endorse that as a very valuable contribution to the subject.

The flyleaf is entitled, “Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain, 1919–31.”
On the next page I find the following:

This dissertation was conducted under the direction of Prof. John T. Farrell, as major professor, and was approved by Prof. Friedrich Engle-Janosi, and Rev. Wilfred Parsons, S. J., as readers.

The title page itself, and I am reading in full, is the following:

Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain, 1919-31.
A Dissertation.
Submitted to the—

Mr. Hays. Mr. Sargent, may I interrupt you again?

Mr. Sargent. Yes.

Mr. Hays. I would like to be a little patient with you and let you read as much as you like. This committee also has some problems and one of them is the lack of time to do everything that we would like to get done. If you are going to spend your time reading flyleaves and title pages, is there any objection—and I will assure you there will be none—if we include the title page and flyleaf in the record? You have been 5 minutes reading that and what does it mean after you have read it?

Mr. Sargent. I am very anxious to save time. There was reference to the thing. I want to say this, that this shows on its face it is a dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of doctor of philosophy, and the author's name appearing in the book is Sister M. Margaret Patricia McCarran, Ph. D., of the Sisters of the Holy Names, second edition.

As some evidence of the thoroughness of the work, I would refer to the bibliography in the back. It cites 85 authors and material, and in addition it refers to Fabian treatises and pamphlets, tracts, articles, a wealth of source material.

It is my opinion and of many others who study these subjects that it is the outstanding book of its kind. I have the book and would like to leave it with the clerk for the convenience of any member of the committee to examine.

The Chairman. Filed with the committee, but not for printing.

Mr. Sargent. Not for printing, hardly, no.

Mr. Hays. Because we don't have a copy of what you are going to say, it is very difficult to keep all these straight. Would you repeat the title of that once more, please?

Mr. Sargent. You mean the title page? Fabianism in the Political Life of Britain, 1919-31. The first chapter is the introduction—

Mr. Hays. Would you want to give us a little digest of what this is all about?

Mr. Sargent. What, the book?

Mr. Hays. Can you give us a thumbnail sketch of what its conclusions are, or anything?

Mr. Sargent. The book itself——

Mr. Hays. Or is it just a running history of the movement?

Mr. Sargent. First of all the introduction, the valuable part for present purposes, the introduction itself, which gives the early history of the development of the movement there in Great Britain commencing in the 1880's and running down to the 1900's. It is necessary for the author to give that as background before the commencement of her study. She picks up the period from 1919 to 1931, explaining the
way in which the Fabian Party made its infiltration of Great Britain effective, and dominated Government policy and put over its system. That is what the book is about.

Mrs. Prost. In Great Britain?

Mr. Sargent. Great Britain; yes. It is significant because it is my judgment a parallel of certain efforts that are being made in this country. I will read you the various titles if you want the scope of it.

Mr. Hays. No; I was trying to get a general idea of what is in it.

Mr. Sargent. The period under critical study is 1919 to 1931, but the background material is the one to which I referred, namely, the inception of the Fabian Party and the persons identified with it.

Mr. Hays. I understood you to say that in your opinion there is a parallel between that movement in England and some similar movement here.

Mr. Sargent. Yes, there is a tie—there is apparently a tie-in.

Mr. Hays. Do you think there is any movement in the United States, even a small one, which might be roughly compared to the Nazi-Socialist movement in Germany?

Mr. Sargent. I wouldn't compare them as such. No, I think there is a radical intellectual elite that is attempting to subvert and guide the policies in our country and the foundations are aiding them financially.

Mr. Hays. We sort of got off the trail there, didn't we? I am asking if there is any group which would be diametrically opposite to that, who would like to put the country in some sort of dictatorship of wealth, we will say, and sort of orient all thinking into their way of thinking, such as the fact that big wealth should be allowed to be predatory, it should not have any income tax, and that the oil depletion allowance ought to go up from 27½ percent, I have heard the figure to 75 percent, and things like that. Do you think there is any concerted group that is pushing that kind of philosophy?

Mr. Sargent. It is not that kind of picture. It is a different picture, but it is subversive. I will answer that fully when I complete my evidence here. The evidence I have here bears on that question.

Mr. Hays. When you get through your testimony, I will be glad to ask you again.

Mr. Sargent. I will be glad to have you make a note of it and remind me.

My position in this matter, first of all, I think I should state clearly as an aid to free consideration of my evidence. The position I take is that we have here involved a right of freedom of inquiry. That includes the right to make an academically free inquiry into the success and failures of the past 50 years, to determine our future course of action with due regard to the results of such an analysis competently made. We have the right to consider and to give proper weight to such views as expressed along that line by a scholar such as Clarence Manion in his book, and others. In short, that particular point of view is entitled to equal consideration and equal publicity with the views of those who may happen to disagree with this particular wing, if you want to call it that.

Mr. Hays. Let me ask you a question right there. I am inclined to agree with that as I understood you reading it. You say that you believe that everyone should have a right to freedom of academic inquiry—is that the way you stated it—and that the views of both
sides should have an equality of presentation, or is that generally what you said?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, I am standing here particularly for the right of what I call critical study and analysis and the publication of the results of that critical study and analysis, and the right to have foundation support in making it.

Mr. Hays. That leads me right up to what I want to ask you. You say, or you are implying—I think you are saying, and I don't want to put words in your mouth—that the foundations have not been supporting your point of view.

Mr. Sargent. Definitely.

Mr. Hays. You think the Congress ought to make a law and say, "Look, you foundations have to support Mr. Sargent's point of view," is that right?

Mr. Sargent. No, I don't say anything like that. I say if they don't do that, they become propagandists for one side and cease to be educational, and should forfeit their exemption privilege.

Mr. Hays. You don't think all foundations are on this side?

Mr. Sargent. I think you will find an amazing picture if you inquire into it.

Mr. Hays. I have done a little inquiring into it. I am not a self-appointed expert on the subject. But there are some foundations which do give the other side. What about the Heritage Foundation?

Mr. Sargent. Do you know the Heritage Foundation applied to the Ford Foundation for a grant to distribute Manion's The Key to Peace, and could not get the money? Do you know that?

Mr. Hays. I don't know that, but I would say that a lot of people would say that is using intelligent judgment on the part of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Sargent. That is a fact.

The Chairman. For the record the chairman might state that the Heritage Foundation is not a foundation in the tax-exempt sense of the word.

Mr. Sargent. That is correct.

Mr. Hays. I am glad to have that in the record. I didn't know that.

Mr. Sargent. No; it is a business corporation.

Mr. Hays. As I say, I am not an expert.

Mr. Sargent. But the Ford Foundation was unwilling to appropriate money to aid the distribution of a work of academic merit, Clarence Manion's book, here.

Mr. Hays. You know it is a funny thing, but I have a copy of that book on my desk and I have read it. And there are certain things in it which I think are an interesting point of view. I don't agree with it 100 percent. I certainly would not criticize any foundation because they didn't see fit to distribute it, by and large. As a matter of fact, I think they would have wasted a lot of money if they had, because I don't think too many people would have read it if you made a present of it. It is pretty heavy going. You send 1,000 copies to the first 1,000 names you pick at random out of the telephone book in Washington and you won't find many people reading it.

Mr. Sargent. I have some tangible evidence to submit on that point regarding the impact of this thing on the publishing business which I will give you in due course.
Mr. Hays. Let me get back to one more question we have not cleared up. You said you were some official in the foundation; is that right?

Mr. Sargent. I am an officer in a foundation which has been incorporated by myself. I left the articles here, yes. It was organized last August 1953. I am the president of it. It is merely a corporation with no funds and no activities yet.

Mr. Hays. What is the foundation supposed to do? What is its purpose?

Mr. Sargent. Its purpose is to study revolutionary movements, propaganda, and techniques, and to endeavor to prepare educational materials for the more effective combating of the advance of socialism and communism.

Mr. Hays. What has prevented you from going ahead and doing that?

Mr. Sargent. One thing that has prevented it is that I have been surveying the ground to find sources of money which are acceptable. We do not want to accept money under conditions involving financial censorship or control of our operations. We want to be in a position to proceed objectively without being required to stop following something significant because somebody's toes are being stepped on. Under those conditions we cannot use large foundation money, because we believe the result of this study will be critical to their operations. Therefore, we must find other patriotic money.

Mr. Hays. In other words, you know what you are going to find out before you start?

Mr. Sargent. No, we don't. We have some idea from what we found. The evidence I am going to give you, if permitted, will show precisely why I think that is the exercise of good judgment.

Mr. Hays. You are going to be permitted. I can stay here all summer if necessary.

Mr. Sargent. May I go on, please?

Mr. Hays. No; I have another question I want to ask. I have to insist that you answer the questions, and you can go on when I am through asking the questions.

Mr. Wolcott. I thought the motion was that he be allowed to conclude his statement. I am very much interested in his statement. I am not so interested in your questions frankly.

Mr. Hays. I know you wouldn't be. That is one reason I am asking them. We can either go ahead or under the rules the minority can leave and stop the hearing. Which way do you want to do it?

The Chairman. The other member stepped out momentarily.

Mr. Hays. He is not here.

The Chairman. He is available and will come back.

Mr. Hays. We may have to leave, and I am going to insist. You said yesterday you would obey that rule.

Mr. Wolcott. It is a prerogative of any Member of Congress to leave any committee any time he sees fit. It is also the prerogative of the committee to meet and adopt such rules as are necessary for orderly procedure.

Mr. Hays. Let me say, Mr. Wolcott, that you are not going to gag the minority here.
Mr. Wolcott. I am not trying to gag anybody. I exercise my prerogative as a Member of Congress to make any motion that is germane to any subject before any committee of which I am a member.

Mr. Hays. And also you have to call on the right of the chairman to overrule any point of order even if it is a rule of the House. In other words, we will make the rules as we go along. I will play that way, too. I have one more question.

In other words, you are not operating, because you do not have any money.

Mr. Sargent. Because we have not found acceptable money as yet.

Mr. Hays. Don’t you think if the motives of your foundation—and I am not questioning you on that—are what you say they are, you could find some money if you look for it?

Mr. Sargent. I have presented some applications. We are also studying the practical problems involved in how to carry on such an operation efficiently. The organization of an operation of this type as a new venture to fill a need which did not exist before involves taking steps carefully and with full consideration. I want to do a responsible job. There has been only a little over 6 months in the organization period, and we tried to do our study work first, preliminary study work, and go into the out-and-out financing element later.

Mr. Hays. The main question, and this can be answered very briefly, is this: If you can get the money from the sources that you consider satisfactory, there won’t be anybody trying to keep you from doing a job; will there?

Mr. Sargent. I don’t know.

Mr. Hays. Nobody could, could they, if you have the funds?

Mr. Sargent. I think the grip of some of these large foundations on the American people at the present time is something that will astound you. I think that we have a great lack of true freedom. There are men today who are afraid for various reasons to support things which they would otherwise approve of. I think you have a very serious condition and my evidence will reveal it.

Mr. Hays. I don’t think there is any doubt that people are afraid to support things they might otherwise approve of. In fact, there is a great noticeable lack of courage here about exploring into the hidden crevasses of these people who are trying to promote a Nazi philosophy in this country. As a matter of fact, if you ask any critical questions when you have certain types of people in the audience, you are liable to get called names, as I did yesterday. I think that certainly is a significant commentary on the jittery state of mind of America at this point.

I am not going to call you Hitler, because I disagree with you, and I don’t mean to imply that you resemble him. But as mad as I would get with you, I would never call you that, because I would not stoop to that kind of dirty, nasty business.

Mr. Sargent. My purpose, Mr. Chairman——

The Chairman. Mr. Hays had completed his questioning awhile ago, he indicated. If so, why not proceed with your testimony, Mr. Sargent?

Mr. Sargent. Very well. Our position here also is that there should be and has been certainly up to now a want of access to foundation grants for the type of research to which I am referring, that the acid
test here will be to determine the willingness or unwillingness of these large foundations, let us say, now and in the future to do this. If they are carrying on propaganda or trying to build or create some order or form of social organization of their own, they will consistently continue this policy. On the other hand, if they are prepared now to assume their academic responsibility, these applications will receive consideration.

There are a few preliminary observations—

Mr. Hays. Mr. Sargent, right there is a question. There has been a lot of noise around Washington and Congress that this inquiry was set up for one reason, to blackjack foundations into giving money for what they did not want to. Do you feel there is an attempt to do that?

Mr. Sargent. No feeling on my part.

Mr. Hays. None of your testimony would be inclined that way?

Mr. Sargent. No. I am going to give you the facts here as they turn up. I want to turn out to you some things that I believe are significant in the law. Let us consider now this tax-exemption question. The immediate one, of course, is that an exempt foundation pays no tax on its own income, which is, of course, a substantial thing. But that is only a fraction of the impact of these conditions. An even greater factor of importance is the deduction rights of the people who give the money to the foundations. The exemption privilege that we are referring to generally here is title 26, United States Code, section 101, subsection (6), the familiar one about educational and scientific organizations not conducted for profit and not carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. Section 23 (O) (2) permits individual taxpayers to deduct their contributions to groups of this type. Section 812 (d) recognizes the deductibility on estate-tax returns. In that case the deduction right is without limit. Therefore, if you have a foundation which is engaging in propaganda or political activity, you have in effect a front through which people as donors can pour money, and through that thing power, into this political action framework and themselves take on their estate-tax returns a total deduction for the whole thing, depriving the United States Government of all of the taxation rights on that money so given. Henry Ford has done it. In the case of the income tax to the extent of the deduction allowed, the same things prevails.

Mr. Hays. Are you saying they put money in political campaigns?

Mr. Sargent. No; I say if a foundation acts in such a slanted or discriminatory fashion as to always ignore one side and advocate the other side, it is a propaganda group by the mere facts in the case. If you are advocating only one thing, or side, you are promoting that side. You are not educational at all. If you are objective, you give critical analysis facilities to the other side. The test—

Mr. Hays. You used the term “political” in some concept.

Mr. Sargent. I say the purpose of some of the foundation programs, as you will see from the evidence, is of a political nature and not in the sense of supporting a particular candidate, but promoting a philosophy and theory of government.

Mr. Hays. Promoting any political party?

Mr. Sargent. Using the school to build a new social order is political propaganda.

Mr. Hays. Do you mean to imply they are favoring one political party or the other?
Mr. Sargent. I think they are favoring the New Deal party.

Mr. Hays. I would have gladly accepted a contribution from any one of the Fords. They seemed like nice people. They could contribute $5,000 in Ohio in my campaign, but they didn't. They gave it to the Republican Party, $25,000, as I recall.

Mr. Sargent. I am just talking here about this foundation.

Mr. Hays. They are a foundation.

Mr. Sargent. Another factor here also is the leverage factor foundations exercise on the agencies they support. In the case of a university, they are always nip and tuck on a budget. A grant by a foundation of a few hundred thousand dollars can influence and guide the entire curriculum in the institution. The leverage factor could be as much as 10 to 1 on the basis of money contributed.

Mr. Hays. I would like to ask you, Mr. Wolcott, in all friendliness, how is the budget of the University of Michigan derived?

Mr. Wolcott. I don't know.

Mr. Hays. Is it State supported?

Mr. Wolcott. Yes.

Mr. Hays. They get some outside money.

Mr. Wolcott. It is an endowed university, as I understand, and they get some money from outside.

Mr. Hays. Let us not blanket them all. I know the universities in Ohio which are State supported come into the State legislature, Ohio State, Miami, Kent State, Bowling Green, and they submit their request in front of the proper committees, and if they can justify it, they get it. As a matter of fact, the criticism out there has been—I don't say it is justified, but you hear it a lot of times—that the universities can get any amount of money they want from the legislature.

Mr. Sargent. There is a leverage factor capable of being exercised, and it may appear in some cases that it has been. That is my statement.

We are going into the history of this movement. I referred to 1913 as the date of the creation of the Rockefeller Foundation which was the second of the large funds established by the late John D. Rockefeller. That had power to benefit—to promote the welfare of mankind throughout the world, as I recall. His preceding foundation of 1903, I think it was—1902, General Education Board—had to do with the promotion of education in the United States. In 1916, the Rockefeller fund, known as General Education Board, published a pamphlet by Abraham Flexner. The pamphlet was entitled, "Occasional Papers, No. 3, A Modern School." It recommended changes needed in American secondary education.

Mr. Hays. Right there, you said you were not going to use names, and I am not criticizing you for it.

Mr. Sargent. As the author.

Mr. Hays. Would you mind telling us something about this Flexner fellow?

Mr. Sargent. He wrote a book. He was identified with various Rockefeller benefactions, as I understand. I have not checked him in detail. It was not my intention to discuss Mr. Flexner, but merely the fact that this pamphlet was written at the time and sponsored by this board. That is the limit of my interest.

Mr. Hays. What is the title?
Mr. Sargent. Occasional Papers, No. 3, A Modern School. It was published by the General Education Board. A copy is in the Library of Congress, which I have personally examined. The recommendations and substance made in that pamphlet are that tradition is too largely controlling education, that there is too much formal work and subjects are too remote from experience. That what is needed is a modern concept, what is termed a modern curriculum, where there should be less reliance on textbooks and an activity program ought to be substituted.

Mr. Flexner advocated the experiment. The pamphlet in question contains the following statement of the foundation and I am quoting that here as I take it from my notes:

The general education board does not endorse or promulgate any educational theory, but is interested in facilitating the trial of promising educational experiments under proper conditions.

The board authorizes the publication of these papers with a request for criticisms and suggestions and an expression of opinion as to the desirability and feasibility of an experiment of this type.

That is the end of the quotation.

In the same year, namely 1916—

Mr. HAYS. Right up to there, are you expressing a criticism of what you read?

Mr. SARGENT. No; I simply am stating it happened. I am giving you things that happened when they happened factually as I find them to be. I am placing no interpretations except what the material itself gives. If I have any other interpretations to make, I will state it positively. If I do not state any interpretation, none in particular is intended except what normally flows from what I am reading.

Mr. HAYS. As I heard you read the thing, it sounded fairly logical to me.

Mr. SARGENT. I am giving the history of how the thing started. This was the inception of the movement.

Mr. HAYS. Would you mind refraining for a minute until I can see if we have some agreement on a matter of procedure. If we can maybe we can hurry this up.

(Discussion off the record.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might say we have just had another friendly conference, and we have reached an understanding which was previously announced but which the Chairman wishes to state will be the procedure. That is for the witness to complete his testimony without interruption, and then will be available for full questioning at the conclusion of his testimony at whatever length the committee members might feel justified in questioning.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, at that point that was my suggestion and I make it for a number of reasons, the main one of which is, Mr. Sargent, that I hope you won't feel that I have belabored this point too much, but it is very difficult to sit up here and get the full implication of everything that you may read without having anything to follow to check back and forth on. Maybe we are spoiled, but we have become accustomed to that at committee hearings. The only reason I have been interrupting you is to try to clear up in my own mind and perhaps in the record some of the things that seemed to be inferences that maybe you did not mean to be inferences as you now say in the last one you didn’t mean to infer. You are putting
it in, and you can read it and judge it. I will try not to interrupt you unless I think there is something I have lost the context and any interruption I make, please understand it, although I may disagree with you, I am not antagonistic to you. You have a right to your point of view. We will try to let you finish and then when we get the record that will be the same as if you prepared one in advance and submitted to us, which might have expedited. Then we will come back and examine you on the record.

Mr. Sargent. I think that is perfectly all right. I think that is the perfect way to do it.

Mr. Hays. The chairman and the ranking minority member agreed that the minority may have as much time as the conscience dictates, and I may make clear that the minority has no conscience, and there will be no limitation on time.

The Chairman. There is no disagreement on that procedure. The chairman recalls that was the procedure which he announced yesterday when the witness first appeared, and there has been no other disposition. But I am very glad to have a clarification of it, and we will proceed accordingly.

You may proceed.

Mr. Sargent. In regard to the subject of names, I will say this again, and I will adhere to this strictly. Naturally, I will give the name of the author of the publication, because that is one of the facts surrounding it. It is not my intention in mentioning any names to infer anything else than the context itself may indicate. I am giving the content of certain things, and that will be read by excerpts in certain places, and I will summarize the general result in others, but they represent my attempt to fairly indicate what is in the book, if I don’t read it in full.

Mr. Hays. I have a question right there. Yesterday you indicated very definitely that you thought somebody or another, I forget who it was now, was subversive because he said he belonged to 56 Communist-front organizations or designated organizations. Would it be asking too much to say that we can assume that unless you otherwise designate that anybody you mention is not subversive just because you mention it, and if you think they are you will say so?

Mr. Sargent. I think that is quite a burden. I haven’t taken the trouble, Mr. Hays, to go through the names and affiliations of all the people I mentioned. The committee staff may find a tie-in or connection—

Mr. Hays. What I am trying to say is that just because you mention them, nobody should assume that they are left wingers or subversives.

Mr. Sargent. You should not assume that they are all right because I mention them, or you should not assume that they are all wrong. I make no statement one way or another. If I find something pertinent, I will mention it.

Mr. Hays. If you find someone that belonged to a lot of front organizations, you will be sure to get that in.

Mr. Sargent. I have not had the time to do that detail on all these people. I will give you a few from time to time that I think are pertinent. I have read the pamphlet here published by general education board by Flexner. The same year, 1916, the department of educational research was established at Teachers College, at Columbia
University. In 1917 the Lincoln Experimental School was established in New York City. The details on that experimental school which was under the guidance or auspices of, as I understand, the Teachers College, Columbia, is set forth in a pamphlet which is entitled "Introducing Teachers College." That is also a Library of Congress publication.

I have taken some quotations in that pamphlet, pages 32 and 33, which I am reading, as follows:

A few years later (meaning after the opening of the Teachers College) Teachers College by opening the Lincoln School kindled the fire which helped to spread progressive education. The school opened in September 1917, at 646 Park Avenue, with Dr. Otis W. Caldwell as director. It was established as one phase of the large-scale Teachers College program to intensify scientific educational research. A department of educational research had been organized at the college during the preceding year. About the same time Dr. Abraham Flexner of the general education board published a profound paper on the need for a modern school to test the possibility of a secondary school better adapted to American needs in which mathematics, modern languages, natural and social sciences, rather than the discipline of ancient languages and formal studies, would form the basis of a cultural education. It was introduced by Dr. Flexner's thinking and supported by the general education board. The college developed plans for this experimental school. In 1922 the 123rd Street Building was opened. Dr. Caldwell relinquished the directorship in 1917 to head the newly established Lincoln Institution School of Experimentation and was succeeded by Dr. Jesse Newlon, former superintendent of the Denver, Colo., Public Schools.

To this rapidly expanding center of learning students began to come from abroad as well as from all parts of this country. It was Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who made it possible for Teachers College to attack this problem squarely. Again he showed his interest in the work of the college by making available through the International Education Board a subsidy of $100,000 a year for 10 years to be used to establish and maintain the International Institute of Teachers College.

In February 1923, Dr. Paul Monroe, who had been with the college since 1897, was appointed director of the institute. Dr. George S. Counts was made associate director a few years later.

That is the end of that item.

The year 1917, as you will recall, was the year in which the Bolshevik Revolution succeeded and took over the Government of Soviet Russia, and the Kerensky government was established.

Mr. Hays. What is the significance of that?

Mr. Sargent. The significance of that is that in 1920 the New York Legislature prepared the Lusk committee report concerning revolutionary activity, pointing out the danger of such conditions in our country, and that the condition they found was part of the atmosphere surrounding the period in which this development occurred, and may have had some influence upon it, as I think it did, from the subsequent actions in that school.

Mr. Hays. Did I understand you to say that this committee report said that there was revolution in the air here in 1917?

Mr. Sargent. I can't hear you.

Mr. Hays. Do I understand you to say that this Lusk committee report indicated that there was revolution in the air here in 1917?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, sir. That the conditions around New York City in particular was considered to be quite serious, and there were a great many intellectuals of that period who had very strong sympathies toward the revolutionary movement in Russia at that time. It is a long detailed report, Mr. Hays, and a very important document. It was published in 1920 by a committee of the New York Legislature.
Mr. Hays. That is funny. I was around in 1917, and I have been around since, and I don't remember anybody thought there was much danger of a revolution then.

Mr. Sargent. Among the intellectual elite there was very definitely such a condition during this period which is part of the history of it.

Mr. Hays. You keep using the term “among the intellectuals” and “among the intellectual elite” and maybe I am reading something into it that is not there, but I seem to get a sort of nasty connotation. You are not an intellectual?

Mr. Sargent. I am talking about the type of intellectual that promotes this thing. They are not true intellectuals at all. They are bigots. They stand for a certain thing and do not tolerate or listen to the views of anybody else. They are the people historically who have promoted revolutions. The literature is voluminous on that. Prof. Ludwig von Mises of New York University points out specifically that socialism is not a revolt of the people. It is a program instigated by a special type of intellectuals that form themselves into a clique and bore from within and operate that way. That is the way these things happen. It is not a people's movement at all. It is a capitalizing on the people's emotions and sympathies and skilfully directing those sympathies toward a point these people wish to reach.

Mr. Hays. Do all intellectuals gravitate toward that?

Mr. Sargent. Of course not.

Mr. Hays. There are some good ones?

Mr. Sargent. I think Clarence Manion is an excellent one.

Mr. Hays. Is he an intellectual?

Mr. Sargent. I think he is a true intellectual.

Mr. Hays. There is also that connotation. There are all shades of opinion.

Mr. Sargent. I put it in quotes.

Mr. Hays. That is when you begin to get people reading meanings into it, because they think you mean them to read a meaning into it, because it is in quotes, or it would not be in quotes. I want you to define “egg head” before we finish this. You defined that yesterday.

Mr. Sargent. I think we will get down to that. If you want a quick picture of this revolt of the so-called intellectual group during this period, you will find that in Frederick Lewis Allen's book, Only Yesterday, discussion at page 228. He describes the atmosphere of the period in very clear terms.

In 1920, Prof. Harold Rugg began introducing pamphlets of his in this Lincoln Experimental School operated under the auspices of Columbia University.

Mr. Hays. By Rockefeller money, is that right?

Mr. Sargent. I don't know whether he physically printed these pamphlets with Rockefeller money or not.

Mr. Hays. You say they gave him $100,000 a year to run the school.

Mr. Sargent. Yes; but I didn't say that Rockefeller paid for the specific printing of the pamphlets. I think what I did say was that Rockefeller money supported the school and a substantial amount of money went into it.

Mr. Hays. Did I understand you to say Rockefeller himself gave that money?
Mr. Sargent. No; General Education Board, it says here. My authority on that is Columbia's own pamphlet entitled, "Introducing Teachers College."

It says here, as I was reading, it was Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who made it possible for Teachers College to attack the problem. The money, it says here, was a subsidy of $100,000 a year for 10 years through International—wait a minute—through International Education Board. That is one of the Rockefeller funds.

Mr. Hays. Apparently from the way you read it, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had something personal to do with it.

Mr. Sargent. That is what Teachers College says. I didn't say it. I am reading what Teachers College said about their own operation. That is their own statement which I am reading to you literally. The second sentence would seem to indicate that their International Education Board did. In any event, it had the support through some Rockefeller operation of some type. These pamphlets which Prof. Harold Rugg developed at the Lincoln Experimental School subsequently became—were developed into the so-called Rugg social science textbook series.

One of the original pamphlets was called, Building a Science of Society for the Schools.

At this point it is a little bit out of the chronology but in the interest of tying things together all at one point, perhaps I better give you something about what these Rugg social science textbooks turned out to be.

The period during the 1920's until about 1930 was the development period, and then they finally came out in a series of books for the high-school level as I recall. Those books became very controversial nationally, and Professor Rugg, in one of his own statements in a magazine article, claimed as I recall that about 5 million of them had been distributed and put in the American public schools. There was a controversy in the San Francisco City Board of Education regarding these texts arising out of some citizens protest against the material, and the superintendent's recommendation that the books be taken out.

Mr. Hays. Were you one of the citizens who protested?

Mr. Sargent. No, sir, I was not.

Mr. Hays. Weren't you mixed up in that fight?

Mr. Sargent. I was requested to come in and give evidence which I had, but I did not initiate the proceeding. I did come in and I spoke in opposition to the books, having read them, and I protested the treatment given the Constitution of the United States in particular, and constitutional history.

This is a copy of an official report of the San Francisco Board of Education. The controversy began, as I remember, about May or June of 1952, when there were public hearings. The board decided to appoint a panel of experts, nearly all men of education, to read the books themselves and render a report.

The members of that committee to study the books and report back were Monroe Deutsch, who was then at the University of California, provost, I think, at the university; Glenn E. Hoover, of Mills College, a college for women in the San Francisco area; John L. Horn, I don't recall his academic contact at the time; Lloyd Luckmann, I think he
was at the University of San Francisco; Edgar E. Robinson was professor of history at Stanford University; and Harold R. McKinnon was a member of the San Francisco bar.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, did you prepare a bill of grievances relative to these textbooks you are talking about?

Mr. SARGENT. Not with relation to the Rugg books, no. I prepared that very much later. I did prepare it, yes, and it was filed with Congress. I have a copy here. It was filed with Congress about 1949, as I remember. Yes, April 1949 is the notary date on the document.

Mr. HAYS. It was filed with the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee.

Mr. SARGENT. It was originally delivered to the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee. I think Senator McCarran offered a resolution to take up the investigation and the parliamentarian referred it to the House Committee on Labor and Welfare. It is the Thomas committee. The Thomas committee did nothing about it.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say this to keep the record straight. If Senator McCarran offered a resolution, it could not possibly be referred to a House committee.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't mean to say the House committee. I meant the Senate committee.

Mr. HAYS. You said the House committee.

Mr. SARGENT. It was inadvertence on my part. The parliamentarian of the Senate ruled that it concerned education, more strictly, than constitutional government and so on, and therefore it belonged in the Thomas committee. Senator Thomas of Utah was in the Senate at the time.

Mr. HAYS. It has laid there rather dusty ever since.

Mr. SARGENT. He sat on it and did nothing about it.

Mr. HAYS. It could not get dusty if he sat on it.

Mr. SARGENT. All right. In any event that document was prepared years later than this matter to which I refer. I was reading from the San Francisco report. I gave the names of the signers.

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask you another question while we are talking about this before we get too far away from it. Did you try to get the House Un-American Activities to go into this?

Mr. SARGENT. I discussed it with them.

Mr. HAYS. They did not want to do it?

Mr. SARGENT. They wanted to stick with the Communist side of the case, yes. They said they wanted to place emphasis on that first.

Mr. HAYS. You say you suggested that they take it up but they didn't do anything about it. I couldn't hear your answer.

Mr. SARGENT. As a matter of fact, they did do something. They started with it. Mr. Wood of Georgia was chairman of the committee at the time and he did—I think they did send out some questionnaires to a few colleges, but they went no further than that.

Mr. HAYS. Did you offer to testify before them?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't recall I was ever asked. It never came to that point, because there was no resolution offered. The House Un-American Activities Committee needs no resolution, I believe.

Mr. HAYS. What I am driving at, and I will be very frank about it, is this: It seems to me you have sort of been itching to get this stuff in print for a long time, and you were not able to get anybody
to let you go ahead with it until you came here. Is that right or wrong? You gave it to this and that committee. You say one sat on it, and the other never took it up, and we are going to let you say it here.

Mr. Sargent. I have not been running around in any such fashion. It is a matter of public importance and I think I am entitled to present it.

Mr. Hays. I don’t mean to imply that you were running around, but the record shows by your testimony that you tried to get two different committees to take it up, and they didn’t.

Mr. Sargent. The committees considered the matter and there was some preliminary discussion. For policy reasons they decided not to go forward with it at that time.

Mr. Hays. Okay.

Mr. Sargent. At that time, period.

Mr. Hays. Or any subsequent time since.

Mr. Sargent. I am not in a position to state what various committees may or may not want to do. I am here for the purpose of presenting this matter now. This report, and I will read it in full, is dated March 30, 1943. It is the unanimous report bearing the signatures of all the gentlemen I have named. The chairman of the committee was Dr. Monroe E. Deutsch of the University of California. It is addressed to Mr. Harry I. Christie, president of the San Francisco Board of Education at the city hall, San Francisco.

Dear Mr. Christie: The committee set up by action of the San Francisco Board of Education to submit a report as to whether or not the Rugg books should be continued as basic textbooks in the junior high schools of the San Francisco Unified School District, begs leave to submit the following report. It would preface its statement of findings with certain preliminary remarks.

The report herewith presented is unanimously approved by all members of the committee; certain members, however, are submitting statements giving supplementary reasons for joining in the recommendations.

Moreover, before submitting its statements the committee wishes to make this declaration; it is most unfortunate that the controversy over these books has become so bitter that an evaluation of the content and contribution of the books has been frequently confused with an evaluation of the character and motives of the persons involved. We have confined our attention to the books. The committee desires to make clear its own conception of the function it has been asked to perform. Obviously we are not acting as an administrative board; nor are we acting as a group of teachers choosing a textbook or constructing a curriculum. We have been asked to function as a committee in the field of education, and although we have been nominated by six institutions of higher learning, we sign as individuals, as we have conferred as a group of individuals and were asked to give our considered opinion after careful study.

One question has concerned us—and upon this we give our answer. Do the books under our examination provide, in accord with a sound and satisfactory conception of education, a fair and balanced presentation of the facts of our past and our present in such a way as to be desirable as required textbooks for students of the junior high school age in the San Francisco schools? The committee finds that in form and style the books are attractive and interesting, and we believe that this is ample explanation of their popularity with students and teachers and many others who have read them. The contemporary world is seen as having no boundaries of interest and the unity of the world is emphasized. We agree with these objectives so effectively stated.

But we question the concept of education on which these textbooks are founded. Of course we agree as to the vital importance of our democracy—in the present and in the future, but it does not follow that belief in democracy means acceptance of a method of education which directs the main attention of young students, usually between 12 and 15 years of age, to a discussion of questions and seeing all sides rather than the study of geography and history and
literature. We do not believe in the study of problems as a satisfactory method of education for children of that age.

The unsound basis in teaching is revealed in the overemphasis upon the future and upon change rather than the fact of growth and development as a continuous process in all times. The weight of instruction is placed not upon achievements and accomplishments but upon aspirations and hopes. This concept of teaching is revealed in repeated assertions of the need of rebuilding and recreating. Such an approach is not in accord with the guiding purpose of general education which is to furnish information as a reservoir of fact and to provide basis for growth and development. The pedagogical principles upon which these books are built disregard the fundamental fact that foundations of basic knowledge and skills must be laid before pupils are given the impression they are ready to deal with contemporary problems.

Believing as we do that one of the great objectives of education of young people is the development of a desire to participate in a democracy, we find that these books are unsatisfactory in not providing a conviction of the need of long study and careful thought before arriving at decisions and presuming to take action. These books are built upon the assumption that it is one of the functions of the school, indeed it appears at times to be the chief function, to plan in the classroom, yes, even in the junior high schools, the future of society. From this view we emphatically dissent. Moreover, the books contain a constant emphasis on our national defects. Certainly we should think it a great mistake to picture our Nation as perfect or flawless either in its past or its present, but it is our conviction that these books give a decidedly distorted impression through overstressing weaknesses and injustices. They therefore tend to weaken the student's love for his country, respect for its past, and confidence in its future. Accordingly, to answer the question submitted to us by the board of education, we unanimously recommend that the Rugg books should not be continued as basic textbooks in the San Francisco junior high schools. We likewise recommend that the books to be substituted for them be chosen by the established procedure according to which a committee of teachers submits recommendations as to textbooks. We approve of this procedure in the San Francisco schools and favor its continuance. We feel, however, that the teachers in the schools should call upon scholarly experts in the particular field of study in which textbooks are to be selected for an appraisal of the books from the standpoint of accuracy and perspective.

It is our earnest hope that the choice of textbooks may always be made hereafter through the proper educational procedure. Their selection is certainly a matter to be determined by those who are devoting their lives to education.

There was a supplemental statement here by Glenn E. Hoover as follows:

The controversy over the Rugg books arose primarily because they were denounced as subversive. This charge was made, not by the scholars and teachers who use them, but by individuals and organizations whose normal activities are quite outside of the field of public education; that charge is a serious one for it reflects not only on Professor Rugg, but also on the great university with which he is connected, and the teachers and administrators in the public schools where these books have been used for so many years.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sargent, if you have reached the point, some of the members wish to be on the floor for the convening of the House in connection with the preliminary proceedings of the House, so it would be necessary for us to recess at this time.

Mr. SARGENT. May I read one paragraph and finish this statement and then stop? It will take a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SARGENT (reading):

I feel it my duty to report the charge that the Rugg books are subversive, in the accepted sense of the word, is, in my opinion, completely without foundation. Although I found what seems to me to be serious defects in them, I am glad to bear witness to the high patriotism of their author and the teachers who without complaint have used them for so long. The patrons of the schools which have adopted these books have the right to be assured on that point.

Respectfully,

GLENN E. HOOVER.
There is another statement I will refer to this afternoon.

Mr. Hays. I would like the record to show right at this point that despite the fact that you say you could not prepare a statement for the committee, that you have been reading for about 25 minutes from a prepared statement.

Mr. Sargent. From a document, sir.

The Chairman. The committee will reconvene at 2 o’clock, if that is agreeable, and then we will run as the business on the floor permits us to run.

(Thereupon, at 11:55 a.m., a recess was taken until 2 p.m. the same day.)

Afternoon Session

The Chairman. The committee will come to order, and you may proceed, Mr. Sargent.

Mr. Sargent. I understand the mikes are not on. I will try to talk a little louder, so that you can hear me.

The Chairman. You may go ahead.

Mr. Sargent. At the hour of adjournment, I was discussing the San Francisco report on the Rugg social science text books. I read the majority report. I also read a separate statement by Mr. Glenn E. Hoover. There is a concurring statement by Harold R. McKinnon, of San Francisco. I will not read it at length. It is long. I will read certain excerpts which I think indicate the nature of his thinking and his additional reasons for disapproving the books, because I think those reasons are pertinent to matters contained in your staff report.

These are some of the things which Mr. McKinnon said in concurring in this finding:

What Professor Rugg is trying to do is to achieve a social reconstruction through education. The end in view is a new social order in which all the aspects of human relationships, including the political and economic, are to be refashioned and rebuilt. The means by which this end is to be accomplished is education.

In presenting these problems, the author is far from neutral.

He discusses natural law and says:

The lack of an underlying assumption of moral law which is inherent in human nature and which is the norm of good conduct, of happiness, and of socially desirable traits, is evident throughout the texts. Professor Rugg, of course, rejects such an idea of law.

Another comment:

Nothing is more insistent in the books than the idea of change. From the habit of denying facts and fixed realities, Professor Rugg proceeds to the notion of trial and error in all human affairs. One is never sure one is right. Since everything changes, there is nothing upon which one can build with permanence. Experiment is the rule in social affairs as well as in physical science—experiment in government, in education, in economics, and in family life.

Mr. McKinnon refers to the antireligious bias in the books and says:

Throughout the books runs an antireligious bias. In some instances, this takes the form of caricaturing religion; for example, by saying “medieval Europeans found life so hard and so unhappy that most of them eagerly turned their thoughts to a dream of heaven.”
In his concluding statement, Mr. McKinnon says:

In the light of the foregoing, should the textbooks of Professor Rugg be continued in the junior high schools of San Francisco? I think clearly they should not. I say this with the realization that such a conclusion must not be asserted except for reasons that are grave and fundamental. No mere incidental error and no characteristic which does not sink deeply into the fundamentals of human nature would suffice for such an adverse recommendation.

He goes on to say:

America, in spite of all its faults, has achieved something in the history of social and political life which has borne rich fruit and which may bear richer provided we do not lose the thread. But this is the condition: provided we do not lose the thread.

What is that thread? It is the concept upon which our country was founded, that man is a rational being who possesses rights and duties.

Mr. McKinnon quotes the Declaration of Independence, particularly the clause about the fact that men are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights and it is the Government's duty to sustain them.

He then says:

The conflicts between Professor Rugg's philosophy and these principles of the Declaration are irreconcilable. Men are created equal only if they are spiritual beings. It is in their spiritual, moral nature that their equality alone can be found.

Finally, he says:

It is true that social conditions and circumstances change. The point is that the principles themselves do not change, for they are inherent in the nature of man, a nature which does not change. Because Professor Rugg's teachings are contrary to this notion * * * I am compelled to join in the recommendation that his books be discontinued. In placing my recommendation on this ground, I do not imply that I am at variance with my colleagues on the other grounds which they assert. On the contrary, I am in general agreement with them as to those grounds. But I wish to stress the points I have made, because I consider them ultimate and fundamental.

Now, various charges were made before the San Francisco City Board of Education before the rendition of that report. The board adopted the findings of its committee of experts, and the books were eliminated.

I have here a pamphlet used in the presentation before the board, which summarizes the nature of the objections lodged before the board by those protesting. I do not intend to read this at length, but I will merely give you some of the major contentions made by those whose position was sustained in this proceeding.

Complaint was made of the undermining process involved here by implanting a continual expectancy of change in the minds of students of immature age in schools; of the fact that the American way of life has been portrayed as a failure; of the disparaging of the United States Constitution and the motives of the men who framed it.

Mr. Hays. What are you reading from now?

Mr. Sargent. From a pamphlet here entitled "Undermining Our Republic," prepared by the Guardians of American Education, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York City.

These pamphlets were delivered to the members of the board of education and considered by them in connection with their decision to appoint a committee and later to rule upon the books.

Mr. Hays. Well, now, if you are going to cite this organization as an authority, I think it would be only fair that we know a little bit
about who they are. I never heard of them before. It is a self-appointed organization, I take it, from the title.

Mr. Sargent. Yes. I am merely using it, Mr. Hays, for the purpose of enumerating the specific grounds made at that hearing to the board, the kind of protests that were made. I am not offering the pamphlet in detail.

Mr. Hays. Of course, not being an attorney, I am at somewhat of a disadvantage here, but I have always understood that when you offered anything in evidence, in order for it to have much weight it had to have some standing.

I do not know anything about that pamphlet, but it seems to me up to now it would not have very much weight, unless you can give it some weight.

Mr. Sargent. I can tell you what the organization is. It is founded by Colonel Rudd of New York City, who, as a citizen, discovered the propaganda in these social science textbooks. One is "Rugg" and the other is "Rudd." The man who protested the books is Mr. Rudd, and the other is like rug on the floor.

This pamphlet contains a detailed study of the material. I am merely using it for my convenience in enumerating the kinds of objections that were made here to the books.

Mr. Hays. When we get around to some of these things, this may not seem to have very much weight, but on the other hand it is an example of what I mean. Maybe you did not attend, but there was a meeting, and you perhaps know about it, of the Sons of the American Revolution, in Cincinnati in 1953. Right?

Mr. Sargent. You mean the national congress? I was not there.

Mr. Hays. Did they have a congress in 1953?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, they have one every year. That year, I think it was in Cincinnati. I was not present.

Mr. Hays. Is your foundation Patriotic Education, Inc.?

Mr. Sargent. No, sir, no connection with it.

Mr. Hays. Do you know anything about that organization?

Mr. Sargent. I know some members of the organization created such a corporation. I am not a member of it and have nothing to do with its work.

Mr. Hays. Does it have any standing at all?

Mr. Sargent. What do you mean?

Mr. Hays. I mean is it a reliable organization?

Mr. Sargent. As far as I know. I know very little about it, except that such an organization was established.

Mr. Hays. What we are trying to get at: Would it be the kind of an organization you bring in here and cite as saying so and so and expect the committee to give it weight?

Mr. Sargent. They have no publications which the committee could receive here, so far as I know. It is in no way involved in this present matter.

Mr. Hays. They had a publication in Cincinnati in which they had a picture of Bishop Oxnam and a hammer and sickle, denouncing him and calling him Communist. I just wonder if that is the kind of organization cited. I am a little concerned.

Mr. Sargent. We are just talking about the organization known as Guardians of American Education, Inc., here, and it has done nothing
like that. I don't know very much about the work of the other organization.

Mr. Hays. What qualifications does Mr. Rudd have?

Mr. Sargent. He has made a very intensive study of the propaganda and history of this movement. He was requested by the Senate Internal Security Committee to testify before them as an expert on some educational matters.

Mr. Hays. That is interesting. How do you get to be an expert on these things?

Mr. Sargent. I wouldn't know. The gentlemen here presumed I had something to tell them, and I presume I am an expert.

Mr. Hays. I was thinking of Mr. Rudd. What about him?

Mr. Sargent. He has studied this subject for years and knows the literature and was of great assistance to me in becoming acquainted with it. I think if you read this book you will discover that he has a great deal of basic knowledge. This pamphlet shows that he studied the history of the subversive movement as it applies particularly to these books. But I am using this only in an enumeration of the grounds made there, and this pamphlet was delivered to the San Francisco Board of Education in connection with its deliberations. I gave them these pamphlets. I happened to have them at the time.

I know of no derogatory fact about the Guardians of American Education, Inc., at any time since I have been acquainted with their work, commencing about 1942, and running down to the present time. In my opinion they are entirely reliable.

Mr. Hays. I was not meaning to imply that there was anything derogatory. I am trying to get the idea across that I don't know anything about them, and I just wonder how they get in here.

Mr. Sargent. They have been an active organization. Their main project is opposing the use of these books in the schools which the San Francisco Board of Education found unfit and condemned. That has been their major activity, so far as I know.

Mr. Hays. Did any other school board anywhere condemn these books?

Mr. Sargent. I think they have been condemned in many places; yes.

Mr. Hays. Do you know of any specifically?

Mr. Sargent. I am not acquainted with all the record. I can find out. I know they have been protested all over the country. I don't have a documentation on where and how many. They were eliminated throughout the State of California, as a result of this finding of the San Francisco board. There is a long record of protest on those books.

Another exception taken to these books was the technique of employing a school system as an agency to build a new social order in a classroom. They cited Professor Rugg's intent to use the schools for his particular type of propaganda.

There are many other comments here, but that was the substance of it, and the decision I have given you.

Now, one of the next significant documents in tracing this matter is a pamphlet known as Dare the School Build a New Social Order? I have here a typewritten copy of that document. It is a book which is out of print. The Library of Congress has an original. My type-
written copy is a prepared copy, however, and I am working from
that. The author of the pamphlet is George S. Counts, who was at
this time and may still be a professor of education at Teachers College
in Columbia University, New York City.

The pamphlet was published—the copyright notice is 1932—by

The foreword to the pamphlet, signed by George S. Counts, bears
the date April 15, 1932, and says that the pamphlet is based upon
three papers read at national educational meetings in February of
that year, namely, the year 1932; that one was read before the Pro-
gressive Education Association in Baltimore, a second before a
Division of the Department of Superintendents in Washington, and
a third before the National Council of Education, also in Washington.

It says the titles of these pamphlets were as follows: "Dare Pro-
gressive Education be Progressive?"; "Education Through Indoctri-
nation"; and "Freedom, Culture, Social Planning, and Leadership."

It states that because of the many requests received for these papers,
they have now been combined, and issued in pamphlet form. And
this pamphlet I have here is the composite of those particular papers,
apparently.

Mr. HAYS. They have a great deal of interest, you said?

Mr. SARGENT. Profound interest; yes.

Mr. HAYS. So much of an influence that it is now in print?

Mr. SARGENT. No, it had an influence at the time it was picked up.
And you look through the writings of the various educational associa-
tions and you find this philosophy planted at that time has taken hold.

Mr. HAYS. Is there anything else wrong with Dr. Counts' philos-
ophy? He wrote a lot of books. Is that the only one you find fault
with?

Mr. SARGENT. I think there are a good many that you can question,
and I am going to refer to some of those in his activities as I go
along. I am giving you considerable detail on Professor Counts. He
is the man responsible probably more than any other for subverting
the public school system, his philosophy, his political activities. That
is directly sustained by his writings, which I will give to you.

Now, this pamphlet here includes the following statements:

We are convinced that education is the one unfailing remedy for every ill
to which man is subject, whether it be vice, crime, war, poverty, riches, injustice,
racketeering, political corruption, race hatred, class conflict, or just plain ordi-
nary sin. We even speak glibly and often about the general reconstruction of
society through the school. We cling to this faith in spite of the fact that the
very period in which our troubles have multiplied so rapidly has witnessed
an unprecedented expansion in organized education.

He says:

If an educational movement or any other movement calls itself progressive,
it must have orientation. It must possess direction. The word itself implies
moving forward, and moving forward can have little meaning in the absence
of clearly defined purposes.

He says:

The weakness of progressive education thus lies in the fact that it has
elaborated no theory of social welfare unless it be that of anarchy or extreme
individualism.
He says:

If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence of this class—naming the conservative class—facing squarely every social issue, coming to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish an organic relation with the community...fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become less frightened than it is today of the bogies of imposition and indoctrination. This brings us to the most crucial question in education, the question of the nature and extent of the influence which the school should exercise over the development of the child.

He says among other things:
It is a fallacy that the school shall be impartial in its emphasis and that no bias should be given to instruction.

He says:
My thesis is that complete impartiality is utterly impossible.

Mr. HAYS. Do you disagree with that?
Mr. SARGENT. With that?
Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. SARGENT. No, I think at the proper grade level it is not impossible at all. I think at the lower grade level it is your duty to teach positive emphasis in support of established principles in our Constitution.

Mr. HAYS. The only difference between this fellow and you is that you want to teach your principle and he wants to teach his.

Mr. SARGENT. No, I want to teach the law of the United States.

The law of the United States is the Declaration of Independence, the statute of July 4, 1776, and the Constitution, and the fundamentals upon which our country is based.

Mr. HAYS. Now, I can make a better demagogic speech about the Declaration of Independence than you can, and I will bet you on it.

Mr. SARGENT. That is not a demagogic speech. That is in the Declaration.

Mr. HAYS. And we all revere the Declaration of Independence, and let's just admit that and admit that we do. But you know something? When you teach the Declaration of Independence, it is a limited document, and you can't spend a 12-year curriculum on it. You have to teach a little arithmetic and some reading. I gather that you want to dismiss social science from the curriculum, and maybe we could agree to do that. But you cannot subvert historical facts.

I am not expert, and I want that in the record, but I will bet you that I know more about teaching than you do. And you sit here and tell us what has happened and what hasn't happened and what you want to happen, and you disagree with this fellow and that fellow. Well, you have got that privilege, but that does not make them bad people just because you disagree with them.

Mr. SARGENT. I would like to talk about George Counts, and I would like to go on with it.

Mr. HAYS. Harold Rugg has distorted his historical facts.

Mr. SARGENT. We are talking about George Counts.

Mr. HAYS. I don't know. I don't know. I think he is. He may still be at Columbia. I don't know.
Mr. HAYS. If he is living, we ought to bring him in.

Mr. SARGENT. I think it would be an excellent idea. I want to be present when you do.

He goes on to state in his pamphlet that—

Professor Dewey, in the book referred to, Democracy and Education, says, "The school should provide a purified environment for the child," with this view I would certainly agree. Probably no person reared in our society would favor the study of pornography in the schools.

Then he says:

I am sure, however, this means stacking the cards in favor of the particular system of value which we may happen to possess.

Then he goes on here further. He says:

Progressive education wishes to build a new world but refuses to be held accountable for the kind of world it builds.

He says:

In my judgment the school should know what it is doing insofar as it is humanly possible and accept responsibility for its acts.

There was further agitation by Professor Counts at about this period, resulting in the issuance of a pamphlet known as A Call to the Teachers of the Nation that was issued in 1933 by a committee of the Progressive Education Association, of which George S. Counts was the chairman. It was published by John Day Co. of New York. The committee consisted of George S. Counts, chairman, Merle E. Curt, John S. Gambs, Sidney Hook, Jesse H. Newlan, Willard W. Beatty, Charles L. S. Easton, Goodwin Watson, and Frederick Redefer.

I have here a quotation from that pamphlet—it is in the Library of Congress—which contains the net conclusion in this particular report.

It says—and I quote:

The progressive-minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization militantly devoted to the building of a better social order ** *.

In the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged, such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the talent, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence to wage successful war in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the Nation. To serve the teaching profession in this way should be one of the major purposes of the Progressive Education Association.

Gentlemen, if that is not lobbying, I do not understand the meaning of that term.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Sargent, are these books and accounts that you are giving us material that has been paid for by the foundations through donations?

Mr. SARGENT. I have no idea. They represent the philosophy of these people, and I am connecting this up by showing that the people who did it had contact with institutions enjoying foundation support.

Mr. HAYS. You are not connecting anything up. Let me say to you that this investigation has to do with foundations.

Mr. HAYS. Now, you can disagree with Mr. Counts' philosophy or you can not disagree with it. I do not care whether you do or do not. I do not know enough about it to take a position. So it is lobbying. If I accept your assertion there at face value, is there anything wrong with this fellow lobbying? What are you doing? What have you been doing?

You have been doing a lot of lobbying over the years.
Mr. Sargent. I am not lobbying. I am here at your request under subpoena.

Mr. Hays. You are not here at my request.

Mr. Sargent. I am sorry if I am unwelcome.

Mr. Hays. You are not unwelcome. Right here would be a good place for this, Mr. Chairman. I had a phone call last night, just to show you what this hearing is attracting, from somebody, some woman. She said, "I am doing a sequel to the Kinsey report, and I was wondering if I couldn't come before your committee."

I said, "You are doing a sequel to the Kinsey report?"

She said, "Well, it wouldn't be named as that, but that is what it would really be. And had I been able to have gotten out mine in the beginning, the Kinsey report would have been practically useless."

Now, I could go ahead and read this, but that gives you an indication of the kind of people, I guess she wants to come in and testify. She went on to say, "I read in your hearing that Carnegie gave Kinsey some money. Do you think I could get some?" She said Mr. Dodd said that, and I said, "Mr. Dodd is closer to Carnegie than I am. Why don't you call him. I will be glad to give you his phone number."

That is how I had to get rid of her. I just offer that as an indication of what we can get into here and maybe what are are already into.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, I think for Mrs. Pfost's benefit I might note that the Progressive Education Association is a tax-free organization, and it in turn has received very substantial grants from other foundations. That will come out later.

Mr. Hays. But, Mr. Wormser, as I get the connection here, all I see in connection with that here is that Dr. Counts said something favorable about it. But the witness himself says that he has no evidence that the foundations gave any money to publish this pamphlet. And certainly Dr. Counts or Dr. Anybody else can publish anything they want to, I guess, up to now.

Mr. Sargent. But they did give money to support the ideas set forth in that pamphlet. That is a fact, and it will be connected up.

Mr. Hays. You might be getting some concrete evidence. But you have been one who has been very solicitous here about wasting time. You have got all this stuff written out.

Apparently by vote of the committee we can not do anything about it and they are going to let you sit there until kingdom come or doomsdays and read it. So why don't we just put the whole shebang in the record, print it up, and then call you in when we have time to look it over and ask you a few questions about it.

Mr. Sargent. I would like to go on, sir.

Mr. Hays. I know you would like to go on. You have been trying to get before a congressional committee for years, and apparently you are enjoying it.

But I think it is a waste of time.

Mr. Sargent. I think this is quite pertinent. I have here an important document. This is a photostat of the announcement of the summer sessions at Moscow University to be held in the year 1935. The American Advisory Organization on that consisted of George S. Counts and Heber Harper. The total number of names mentioned here is 25. I will read them in the order in which they appear in the pamphlet.

The first two are the ones I have named.
Mr. HAYS. Just a minute. What is that to prove?

Mr. Sargent. It shows the indoctrination course scheduled for American educators at Moscow University in the summer of 1935 and bears an intimate relation to the propagandizing of the American school system and will tie in with the foundation grants your committee is inquiring into.

Mr. HAYS. That isn’t the university at Moscow, Idaho, is it?

Mr. Sargent. This is printed in English, probably in New York City. The National Education Association issued an advertisement sponsoring this project in March 1935 in their journal.

The CHAIRMAN. Since Mrs. Pfost comes from Idaho, she is particularly interested in this.

Mr. Sargent. Moscow, not United States of America, let us say.

The National Advisory Council on this summer session of 1935 consisted of:

W. W. Charters, director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University; Harry Woodburn Chase—

Mr. HAYS. Would you mind going back? I was called out.

Mr. Sargent. I thought you had left us for the time being.

Mr. HAYS. Oh, no. I would never leave this interesting speech.

Would you start over, there, until we make some sequence about Ohio State University?

Mr. Sargent. Well, I read the first two names in the first place, Counts and Harper. Then, the National Advisory Council, on the opening page of this thing, consists of the following people:

W. W. Charters, director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University—

Mr. HAYS. Now, then, right there. This is an advertisement you are reading?

Mr. Sargent. No; there is a formal official announcement of the course of study listing the actual courses to be given over there, the hours, the credit, and the entire arrangement.

Mr. HAYS. Now, was that ever held?

Mr. Sargent. Yes; definitely.

Mr. HAYS. That is the same outfit that Joe McCarthy accused Murrow of sponsoring, isn’t it?

Mr. Sargent. I don’t know whether he did or not.

Mr. HAYS. You know good and well it is.

Mr. Sargent. Murrow is on the list, and I have always understood that it was held all right. I have been told that it was held. I think everybody admits it was held.

Mr. HAYS. Ed Murrow says it wasn’t. Can you name anybody that says it was? I mean, I am just interested in finding out. If it was held, that is one thing. But if it is a phony you are dragging in here, that is another thing.

Mr. Sargent. This is no phony. This has been referred to many times, and I have never heard anybody deny the fact that such a session was held. This is an official announcement for the holding of a meeting.

It has a study tour, and the whole thing.

Mr. HAYS. I assume that that is what it is. But the question I am asking is that you say it had a terrific effect in indoctrinating these people. The mere fact that the ad appeared didn’t indoctrinate anybody.
Mr. Sargent. That is an announcement of the meeting.
Mr. Hays. If they went there and studied, I will go along with you; they probably got indoctrinated. But I am trying to find out from you if it was ever held.
Mr. Sargent. It is my understanding that definitely it was held in accordance with this announcement here.
Mr. Hays. That is your understanding. Can you offer any evidence?
Mr. Sargent. I have discussed the matter with various people in this field, and that is the information given to me, that it was held. Until this moment, I have never heard anybody say it wasn't.
The Chairman. You might check a little further on that and advise us more definitely.
Mr. Hays. Now just a minute. If we are going to have more checking, let's leave the whole business until we get it checked. What I would like to know right now: Can we have an agreement to bring in Dr. Counts and let him tell us his story about it? Is he still living, Mr. Wormser?
Mr. Wormser. I wouldn't know.
Mr. Hays. He must be getting pretty old now.
Mr. Dodd. No; he is in his middle sixties.
Mr. Hays. I thought he was older than that. I heard his name when I was in the university many years ago.
Mr. Sargent. This is an official announcement.
Mr. Hays: Just a minute.
Let us let the committee decide what we are going to do. Don't be too eager.
Can we get an agreement at this time that at an appropriate time, to be decided when the appropriate time is—I will be glad to leave that to the Chair—this can be done.
The Chairman. I see no objection. Then it will be agreed.
Mr. Hays. I have more than one motive. I had to read one of his books when I was in college, and I always did want to ask him something.
Mr. Sargent. The second name was Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University; and then
George S. Counts, National Advisory Council, also professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University;
John Dewey, professor emeritus of philosophy, Columbia University;
Stephen Duggan, director, Institute of International Education;
Hallie F. Flanagan, professor of English, Vassar College;
Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina;
Robert M. Hutchins, president, University of Chicago;
Charles H. Judd, dean, School of Education, University of Chicago;
I. L. Kandel, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University;
Robert L. Kelly, secretary, Association of American Colleges;
John A. Kingsbury, secretary, Milbank Memorial Fund;
Susan M. Kingsbury, professor of social economy and social research, Bryn Mawr College;
Paul Klapper, dean, School of Education, College of the City of New York;
Charles R. Mann, director, American Council on Education; Edward R. Murrow, assistant director, Institute of International Education; William Allan Neilson—

Mr. HAYS. May I interrupt you right there?
That is the one we are talking about. And Mr. Murrow says it wasn't held.

Mr. SARGENT. It may or may not be what he is talking about. I don't know. This particular thing is an official announcement and a detailed course listing. There may be something else about Murrow. I don't know.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I must object to this kind of stuff. I mean, even Joe McCarthy had that thing repudiated, and I don't see why we should let someone come in here and rehash that kind of stuff.

I mean, this is exactly the kind of thing that Joe accused Murrow of, and it has very definitely been established that the thing was never held. Now, if it were held, that is material, and if those men went there and became indoctrinated, I would like you to know that I would be one of the first to want to bring them in and cross-examine them, but to let an obscure person who has no standing in the educational field come in here and malign people like this—I have to object to this.

Mr. SARGENT. It was not established that this was not held, and I think it will be completely established that it was. And I do not know whether this is the document about Murrow—

Mr. HAYS. You are under oath, but you keep saying you think it was held, and it hasn't been clearly established.

Now, do you know whether it was or whether it was not?

Mr. SARGENT. I was told positively by Mr. Hunter, a Hearst correspondent in Washington, D. C., that this meeting was held, and the photostat I have in my hand was given to me by him.

Mr. HAYS. Well, now, then, in other words, he knows more about it than you?

Mr. SARGENT. He is in the newspaper business, and he has contacts, and he gave me this particular thing. I have also discussed this elsewhere. I have never heard it suggested by anybody that this was not held.

Mr. HAYS. You apparently don't read the papers much or look at television, because it is pretty generally understood. It has been more than suggested. It has been definitely said.

Mr. SARGENT. Murrow has done a lot of things. I am not talking about Murrow here. He is one of the names on the list, and my reason for bringing it up has nothing whatever to do with Mr. Murrow. It has to do with the educational picture your committee is considering.

Mr. HAYS. Then why are you reading all these names?

Mr. SARGENT. To show that a very large group connected with American educational affairs at the time participated in the course of study offered by this document here, enumerating what kind of a course of study it was, and the arrangement.

Mr. HAYS. Now, Mr. Chairman, he is again saying they participated. They say they didn't. Can we again get an agreement, to subpoena Mr. Murrow and ask him about it?
The Chairman. Well, we would be glad to subpoena someone. I think we ought to have a judgment on which ones of the names mentioned.

Mr. Hays. I nominate Mr. Murrow, because I think if it is a lie he is probably the fellow that can nail it to the cross about as quickly as anyone that has been mentioned.

The Chairman. But it would seem to me this would have some bearing, regardless of whether the summer school was actually held; that the announcement, the program, the course of study, that was agreed upon in anticipation of the school being held, has an important relationship regardless of whether the actual course of study was held. Whether it was held or was not, I have no information.

Mr. Hays. I am inclined to agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that it would have a great deal of importance, even the fact that such a course was considered and the ad was published. But this witness keeps inferring, and bringing in names, and saying, “I know that it was held,” or “I have every reason to believe it was held.” And the most prominent name perhaps that he has mentioned has been Edward R. Murrow. And I don’t think I am being unreasonable if I ask that the committee agree at this moment to subpoena Mr. Murrow and merely ask him, “Was or was not this held” and then if you have any other questions you want to ask him, that is good enough. That is all I want to do.

Mr. Sargent. There is some other information, Mr. Hays.

This pamphlet states on its face that sessions of this type were held in Moscow in 1933 and 1934, and it describes both of those sessions and indicates that the present meeting I mention here had its origin out of those meetings.

So there is a direct statement here that two other sessions have been held previously.

Mr. Hays. I don’t know what you are reading from.

Mr. Sargent. Well, I will come to that. I am trying to read this chronologically, in order to have no question about my making selections or editing. I am beginning at the start, and I am going through it.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion? I would be glad to have the staff ascertain whether it was held or not. If it was not, of course, we would be perfectly delighted to concede it, Mr. Hays.

Mr. Hays. I would like to have somebody under oath testify whether it was held or not.

Mr. Wormser. Is that necessary?

Mr. Hays. I think it is.

The Chairman. At the same time, I think it would be well for the staff to ascertain the periods at which the schools were held.

The committee will stand in recess.

(Short recess.)

The Chairman. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state right now that I have just been in touch with New York and have hurriedly checked the Ed Murrow statement, and he states positively and definitely—he did on television—that this thing was never held; that the Soviet Government canceled it; that he personally did not go to Europe that summer, or to Russia; that several members of this group didn’t go
to Europe. Some of them did go on a tour of Western Europe, but none of them attended any such course.

Now, as I say, that was a hurried checking, and I would like to be able to call somebody in who can do more than give hearsay. You cannot admit hearsay evidence in a court, and that is all that this is.

The Chairman. It has been agreed upon that some person connected with the organization will be called, that can give definite testimony. But if you will bear with the Chair a moment, what seems to be very important to my mind is the reference to the session having been held in 1933 and 1934, which has the same implication as the one that was proposed for 1935. And I, myself, am prepared to believe that there is a question about whether that was actually held. But I think there is significance so far as this hearing is concerned to the fact that it was announced, that the course of study was made up, and certain educators and other interested persons here participated in the preliminary activities to the holding of the summer school. Whether it was actually held, I agree is pertinent, but I think we can definitely establish that fact, and some appropriate official will be summoned to give that information.

Mr. Hays. The whole point of my objection is that again we have evidence of this business of name dropping which, if left unchallenged, would give the general impression to the public at large that Ed Murrow and all these other names mentioned were a bunch of Communist sympathizers who were trying to actively promote communism in the United States.

Now, maybe some of the names mentioned are. I don't know. But I did want the record to show that this is the same old tripe that we had a big hassle over on television a few weeks ago, and I thought then it was pretty definitely disposed of.

If we have anything here this gentleman can present that has some bearing on the matter, that is one thing, but to continue this character assassination and so on and so forth by inference and by saying, "Well, somebody told me so,"—that is something else again.

I think we will have to give these people, if there is any awareness about this a chance to come in.

The Chairman. Everybody who wants to come in will be given an opportunity at the right time. But, again, it is my own feeling that regardless of whether the summer school of 1935 was held, the program from which Mr. Sargent is reading has an important bearing on the subject. But I agree with you with reference to what you have said.

Mr. Hays. Now, Mr. Sargent, right there, would you mind if I took a look at that list? Not because I doubt what you are reading, but I cannot keep all those names in my mind, and I would like to look at it to see if there are any other names I recognize besides Ed Murrow's.

I do not know any of them personally, not one of them.

Mr. Sargent. Certainly.

Mr. Hays. Here is an example of what we are dealing with. It says:

The summer session originated as a result of an experiment conducted during the summer of 1933 by a group of American educators. The American summer school in Russia was organized to offer due courses dealing with "experimental educational programs of the Soviet Union" and "institutional changes in the Soviet Union."
Now, I can understand why the Russian Government canceled this thing. Of course, they didn’t want anybody to find out what was going on. That would be one viewpoint of it, wouldn’t it? They didn’t want any one from America going back there after finding out what they were doing? And I am not surprised that they did cancel it.

The Chairman. I was going to ask Mr. Sargent if he would leave that with the committee, again not to be printed but as part of the record?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, I will. There is a copy which was intended for your use.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. Sargent. Two things are apparent on the face of this document. One is that the group of persons I named here did apparently allow their names to be used in the publication of a pamphlet containing an offering of the program set forth in the document.

Secondly, the March 1935 issue contains the same panel of names here, a picture of Red Square in Moscow, and some detail bringing the meeting to the attention of people in the educational profession. Those things we know.

The exact fact, whether it was held later or canceled, is not within my personal knowledge, and I, therefore, offer no testimony.

Mr. Hays. Well, Mr. Sargent, would you say anyone who had ever been behind the Iron Curtain was automatically suspect?

Mr. Sargent. I didn’t say that. What has that to do with this? Am I calling these people Reds? I didn’t say that, either.

Mr. Hays. Not in so many words, but you are certainly trying to infer that they are.

Mr. Sargent. I am saying that was the educational thinking at the time, sir, and that is important background material in reviewing what this committee is supposed to determine, that the thinking has gone to a point where it was seriously considered to be a worthwhile project to do the things which I am referring to here, reading out of this pamphlet. That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. Hays. Did you read the part of the pamphlet I read?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, and I also read something at the end that you did not read.

Mr. Hays. You have had, I don’t know how long, to look at this pamphlet. I had perhaps 2 minutes. But it seemed to me I picked up a pretty significant statement there in the 2 minutes.

Mr. Sargent. There are some other very significant statements.

Mr. Hays. I would like to have time to study the whole thing. Maybe I will agree with you.

Mr. Sargent. I was reading the names here. The remaining list of names is William Allan Neilson, president, Smith College.

Howard W. Odum, professor of sociology and director, school of public welfare, University of North Carolina.

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

H. W. Tyler, general secretary, American Association of University Professors.

Ernest H. Wilkins, president, Oberlin College.

John W. Withers, dean, School of Education, New York University.

Thomas Woody, professor of history of education, University of Pennsylvania.
Harry W. Zorbaugh, director, clinic for the social adjustment of
gifted children, New York University.

The next page says:

The tremendous progress of the Soviet Union in the cultural field creates for
Americans an unequal observation ground for education, sociology, and the
social sciences. The Soviet Union presents a unique opportunity for the study
of the processes of cultural change. The first and second 5-year plans, by creating
the foundations of a planned economy, have brought about a complete recon-
struction in the social attitudes and behavior of the Russian people.

It says:

The Soviet Union possesses the most progressive system of public education,
extensively making use of the best achievements of international pedagogy.

The Chairman. This is all in the announcement?

Mr. Sargent. Yes. All in the announcement. I am getting repre-
sentative samples out of the document, and I am giving you the docu-
ment.

Under “Purpose,” on page 4, it says that this summer session is open
to all academically qualified foreigners who are interested in the cul-
tural and educational aspects of life in the Soviet Union; that the
director of the Moscow University summer session is a Soviet educator.

The summer session is officially an organizational part of the Moscow State
University.

In order to insure close cooperation with American educational institutions,
and with students and educators in the United States, an advisory relationship
was established in 1933 with the Institute of International Education.

I might comment again here, as I showed before: As to the Rocke-
feller Foundation, Rockefeller in some form was a contributor to that
international educational institute. The Teachers College pamphlet,
Introducing Teachers College, so states.

Mr. Hays. Is that Rockefeller, junior, or the foundation?

Mr. Sargent. I don’t know. I read you the excerpt before. It
read, the Rockefellers in some form contributed, at least, to that inter-
national educational institute. The writings of George Counts show
that he was a director of the Institute of International Education.
That appears in a number of his writings, including one entitled
“Driving a Ford Across Soviet Russia,” or some similar title, published
about 1929.

Now, going on with this document here:

At the same time, a national advisory council of prominent American edu-
cators was formed by Prof. Stephen Duggan to assist the Institute of Inter-
national Education in its advisory capacity. To facilitate still closer rap-
proachement, each year several American educators are invited to Moscow as
resident advisers to the summer session. Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Heber
Harper, professors of education, Teachers College, Columbia University, will
act as advisers during the summer session of 1935.

The Moscow University summer session is sponsored in the Soviet Union by
the Peoples’ Commissariat of Education of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet
Republic; by VOKS, the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign
Countries; and by Intourist, the state travel company of the U. S. S. R. Intourist,
through its educational department will supply information to persons interested.

The cover I have here shows that this is a document of, it says,
World Tourists, Inc. The Intourist label, I think, appears here later.
No, I guess I am mistaken on that point.
In the statement under "Origin," on page 5, it says:

The summer session originated as the result of an experiment conducted during the summer of 1933 by a group of American educators. The American summer school in Russia was organized in 1933 to offer two courses.

Mr. HAYS. Are you going to read that whole document?
Mr. SARGENT. No, just excerpts.
Mr. HAYS. Why don't we just, by unanimous consent, put the whole thing in the record, Mr. Chairman?
Mr. SARGENT. Well, I would like to excerpt briefly here.
Mr. HAYS. You seem to like to read. But I would rather read it directly, if it is all right. It would save a little time:
Mr. SARGENT. I want to review the course of study here, the different courses studied. There is one in art and literature, 32 hours; 2 semester units.
Mr. HAYS. Now, wait a minute. Just a minute.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to inserting it; instead of filing it as a document, having it printed in the record at the appropriate point in connection with your testimony?
Mr. SARGENT. You mean printing it in full?
The CHAIRMAN. Printing it in full.
Mr. SARGENT. Well, perhaps not.
I would just like to say a few words about the nature of the courses.
Mr. HAYS. You can say whatever you like. The only thing I am interested in: If you are going to read the whole thing, let's just put it in and we can have your comment.
The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be printed as part of the record, Mr. Reporter.
(The document referred to follows:)

[Flyleaf]
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NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. W. Charters, director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University.
Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University.
George S. Counts, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Stephen Duggan, director, Institute of International Education.
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Hallie F. Flanagan, professor of English, Vassar College.
Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina.
Robert M. Hutchins, president, University of Chicago.
Charles H. Judd, dean, School of Education, University of Chicago.
I. L. Kandel, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Robert L. Kelly, secretary, Association of American Colleges.
John A. Kingsbury, secretary, Milbank Memorial Fund.
Susan M. Kingbury, professor of social economy and social research, Bryn Mawr College.
Paul Klapper, dean, School of Education, College of the City of New York.
Charles R. Mann, director, American Council on Education.
Edward R. Murrow, assistant director, Institute of International Education.
William Allan Neilson, president, Smith College.
Howard W. Odum, professor of sociology and director, School of Public Welfare, University of North Carolina.
H. W. Tyler, general secretary, American Association of University Professors.
Ernest H. Wilkins, president, Oberlin College.
John W. Withers, dean, School of Education, New York University.
Thomas Woody, professor of history of education, University of Pennsylvania.
Harvey W. Zorbaugh, director, Clinic for the Social Adjustment of Gifted Children, New York University.

The tremendous progress of the Soviet Union in the cultural field creates for Americans an unequalled observation ground for education, psychology, and the social sciences. The Soviet Union presents a unique opportunity for the study of the processes of cultural change. The First and Second Five Year Plans, by creating the foundations of a planned national economy, have brought about a complete reconstruction in the social attitudes and behavior of the Russian people.

From a backward and illiterate country, the U. S. S. R. has been transformed into a modern industrial nation. Illiteracy has been almost abolished. The Soviet Union possesses the most progressive system of public education, extensively making use of the best achievements of international pedagogy. Soviet policy in social welfare, the care of mothers and children, the re-education and re-direction of lawless elements, and in other fields, presents a provocative challenge to students on all levels.

PURPOSE

Moscow University summer session conducts an Anglo-American section, open to all academically qualified foreigners who are interested in the cultural and educational aspects of life in the Soviet Union. Instruction is in the English language, by an all-Soviet faculty of professors and specialists. The State University of Moscow certifies academic credit to those foreign students meeting the requirements of the university and completing a course of study in its Anglo-American section. The director of the Moscow University summer session is a Soviet educator. The summer session is officially an organizational part of the Moscow State University.

In order to insure close cooperation with American educational institutions, and with students and educators in the United States, an advisory relationship was established in 1933 with the Institute of International Education. At the same time, a National Advisory Council of prominent American educators was formed by Prof. Stephen Duggan to assist the Institute of International Education in its advisory capacity. To facilitate still closer rapprochement, each year several American educators are invited to Moscow as resident advisers to the summer session. Dr. George S. Counts and Dr. Heber Harper, professors of education, Teachers' College, Columbia University, will act as advisers during the summer session of 1935.

The Moscow University summer session is sponsored in the Soviet Union by the Peoples' Commissariat of Education of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic; by VOKS, the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries; and by Intourist, the State Travel Company of the U. S. R. R. Intourist, through its Educational Department, will supply information to persons interested.

Moscow University will offer, in its Anglo-American section, during the summer of 1935, a variety of courses to serve as a means of furthering cultural contacts between American and Russian teachers and students. The summer session
functions with the purpose of providing foreign visitors to the Soviet Union with the academic facilities and programs necessary for serious study and research. However, the purpose of the summer session is primarily that of assisting foreigners in a survey and understanding of the various phases of contemporary life in the Soviet Union.

ORIGIN

The summer session originated as the result of an experiment conducted during the summer of 1933 by a group of American educators. The "American Summer School in Russia" was organized in 1933 to offer two courses dealing with "Experimental Educational Programs of the Soviet Union" and "Institutional Changes in the Soviet Union." These two courses were conducted in Moscow in an experimental fashion with a group of twenty-five teachers and students of education.

At the second summer session in 1934, thirteen courses were offered in five major fields of art and literature, sociology, psychology, education and research. The staff was composed of twenty-two professors and academic assistants. Two hundred and twelve students attended the 1934 session. Among them were undergraduates, teachers, principals, professors, psychologists, social workers, physicians, nurses and artists.

Basing their judgment upon the undeniable success of these ventures, the Soviet educational authorities organized at the University of Moscow, an Anglo-American section offering full and regular summer instruction in English. The students and professors of the 1933 and 1934 sessions approved the academic advantages of the plan, which enabled the student to travel during his vacation period and at the same time to further his own professional experience. It is a plan that has the full support of the foremost educators and scientists of the Soviet Union. The directors of the summer school discovered that while American educators displayed great interest in Soviet education, it was evident that outside of the Soviet Union there existed no profound knowledge of actual conditions in the Soviet school world. These considerations, coupled with the ever present Russian eagerness for close cultural contact with Americans, are the primary reasons for the continuation of the plan.

THE PLAN OF THE SUMMER SESSION

Moscow University summer session offers the student an opportunity to combine summer vacation with study and European travel at very economical rates. Special rates for maintenance in the Soviet Union are available only to students, teachers or social workers who attend the summer session.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM

The Anglo-American section of the Moscow University summer session offers a wide choice of subjects and courses. The courses offered during the 1935 session, which begins on July 19th in Moscow, are listed below under special group headings.

ART AND LITERATURE

Arts in the U. S. S. R.—30 hours, 2 semester units
(Requires minimum of thirty additional hours observation and field work. Open to all students.)

A discussion of contemporary painting, sculpture, architecture, music, theater, and the dance in the Soviet Union. The course will offer the student a concept of the relation of art to the building of the new Soviet society. Topics to be discussed will include the features of socialist realism in art; the social status of artists; the economic organization enabling creative work; and the role of the arts in the program of popular education.

Observation and field work will be scheduled in galleries, studios, theatres for children and adults, research institutes, club houses for artists and other institutions for the development of art activities.

Literature of Russia and the Soviet Union—30 hours, 2 semester units
(Requires a minimum of thirty additional hours of library work. Open to all students.)

The course will present a brief survey of pre-revolutionary Russia literature and the effects of the old writers upon the new. There will be included a description of the historical stages of Soviet literature; the present school of socialist
realism; the work and influence of such writers as Gorski and others; the themes of contemporary Soviet literature; and the social role of the Soviet writer in the program for the building of socialism.

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES AND SOCIAL BACKGROUNDS OF SOVIET SOCIETY

Principles of the Collective and Socialist Society—30 hours, 2 semester units

(The course, or is equivalent, prerequisite for all students. Students may request exemption when registering.)

An elementary course, presenting and describing the basic ideas and institutions of Soviet society. Beginning with a brief historical account, the course will present in simple terms the theory and practice of socialist construction. Among the topics included in the course are: the theories underlying the Soviet State; the organization of the government and the Soviet economy; the program of educational and cultural advance; the relation of the individual to the family and to other social groups; the question of the village and the collectivization of agriculture; and the solution of the problems of national minorities. The course is intended as a general survey of Soviet life.

Justice and the Correctional Policy of the S. U.—30 hours, 2 semester units

(Requires 15 additional hours of observation. Open to all students.)

The course will describe the Soviet system of jurisprudence and the administration of justice. There will be a review of the major theories of criminology as well as the Marxian point of view towards the problem of crime. It will then specifically deal with crime and its eradication in the Soviet Union. Programs for the education of delinquents (children and adolescents) and for the reclamation of criminals will be presented. In connection with this course, there will be visits of observation to the various institutions concerned with this problem.

Organization of Public Health and Socialized Medicine—30 hours, 2 semester units

(Requires a minimum of fifteen additional hours of observation and field work. Open to all students. Recommended to social workers, physicians and health education specialists.)

The course presents a study of the organization of health and medical services in the U. S. S. R. There will be a description of the organization and programs of hospitals, clinics, rest homes, sanataria and dispensaries in their relationships to factories and farms; medical research and the work of experimental institutes; training of medical workers; care of women and children in factories, schools and on farms; social psychiatry and mental hygiene; physical education and programs for disease prevention; and the organization of professional medicine as a state function.

EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

Survey of Education in the U. S. S. R.—80 hours, 4 semester units

(Requires a minimum of thirty additional hours of library, observation and field work. Open to teachers and students of education.)

This course will describe the philosophy, curricula, and methods of the following divisions of Soviet education:

A—The Unified Polytechnical School and Its Pre-school Foundations: The polytechnical school includes elementary and secondary education. The course will begin with an examination of Soviet pre-school institutions.

B—Vocational and Higher Education: The course will present the Soviet program for the training of workers of all grades and in all fields; it will include a description of such institutions as factory and mill schools, workers' schools (rabfacs), technicums, higher technical schools, pedagogical institutes, medical schools, institutes of Soviet law, art universities, Communist universities and universities proper. Subjects of special interest will be the composition of the student body, the system of maintenance stipends for students, the problems of control and administration, and the relation of vocational and professional education to the planned economy.

C—Extra School and Adult Education Agencies: The course will deal with those educational agencies which reach children as well as adults—libraries, reading rooms, evening and correspondence courses, the press, book stores, clubs, museums, galleries, travel and excursions, radio, post and telegraph, cinema and theatre, the activities of popular societies, etc.
Science and Technic in the U. S. S. R.—60 hours, 4 semester units

(Requires 15 additional hours of library work. Open to all students.)

The course will study the relation of social planning to scientific research in the Soviet Union. The course will include a description of the early types of planning under military Communism; the plan formulated by Lenin for the electrification of the country; the development of the State Planning Commission from its founding in 1921; the structure and function of the system of planning organizations, and the actual methods utilized in the preparation and execution of the first and second five-year plans. The student will be given an outline of the Marxian view of the role of science in socialistic society, and an account of the coordinated development of the Soviet network of scientific research institutes. Soviet development in the fields of social and physical sciences will be studied. The course will conclude with a summary of the present status of planning and science in the Soviet Union.

Survey of Psychological Research—30 hours, 2 semester units

(Requires minimum of fifteen additional hours of library, laboratory or observation work. Registration open only to advanced students of psychology.)

This course presents an advanced discussion of the technical and specialized phases of experimental psychology in the Soviet Union. Such topics as the following will be considered: the status of psychology in Russia prior to the Revolution of 1917; the theories of reflexology and conditioning (Pavlov and Bechterov); trends in contemporary psychological research in the U. S. S. R.; Soviet advance in applied psychology and psychotechnics; psychology and industrial rationalization; and the relation of Marxism-Leninism to psychology.

HISTORY, ECONOMICS AND PHILOSOPHY

History of the Soviet Union—60 hours, 4 semester units

(Requires a minimum of thirty additional hours of library work. Open to all students.)

This course opens with a study of prerevolutionary Russian history. The course will continue with a study of the forces underlying the Czarist policy at home and abroad; the social and economic life of the people under the old regime; the early mass uprisings, strikes and revolutions; the development of capitalism and industry; the distribution of land and property; the revolutionary movement prior to 1905; the 1905 revolution; the World War and the collapse of the old order; the February and October revolutions; the period of military Communism, civil war and NEP; the reconstruction era; the first and second five-year plans.

Economic Policy and Geography of the U. S. S. R.—60 hours, 4 semester units

(Requires thirty additional hours of library, observation and field work. Open to all students.)

The course will discuss the general economic development of the U. S. S. R. by presenting an historical account of the building of socialism in relation to the geographic factors. Topics included in the course are: The period of a military Communism in the first years of the revolution; the new economic policy inaugurated in 1921, and the program of planned construction launched by the first five-year plan in 1928. The course will also touch upon the problems of foreign and domestic trade, wages, housing, social benefits, taxation, Soviet monetary system, etc.

Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism—30 hours, 2 semester units

(Requires a minimum of fifteen hours library work. Open only to advanced students having necessary background in history of philosophy.)

This course will present an introduction to the philosophy of dialectical materialism. The works of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin will be utilized for the presentation of the basic positions, postulates and doctrines of dialectical materialism. The course will also point out the important applications of the philosophy of dialectical materialism to scientific research both in social and natural sciences.

LANGUAGE

Advanced Russian for Foreigners—30 hours, 2 semester units

(Open to students with elementary knowledge of Russian.)

The course will build a more thorough reading knowledge and a better colloquial use of Russian. The emphasis will be entirely upon the practice of Russian for conversational and research purposes. Oral and written composition will be
required. At least one work of contemporary Russian literature will be read and discussed in class.

**Calendar**

July 16–18 incl.: Preliminary sessions in Leningrad.
July 19: Official opening session in Moscow.
Aug. 13: Examinations and final session in Moscow.
Aug. 14–25 incl.: Travel field work period.

Note.—Students may arrive in Leningrad between July 16th and 18th. Those students arriving in Leningrad after July 16, but not later than July 18th, will be granted the privilege of remaining in Kiev for an additional number of days, bringing the total to forty days from date of arrival. Students arriving in Leningrad or Moscow earlier than July 16th will be charged the regular Intourist rate of $5 per day in supplement to the basic summer session rate.

The basic rate for travel and maintenance in the Soviet Union during the period of the summer session is $176.00. No refunds will be granted students leaving the Soviet Union before the end of the summer session, unless withdrawal is caused by illness or force majeure.

These regulations are stated in order to permit the necessary adjustment caused by varying dates of arrival in the Soviet Union.

**Daily Class Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of Psychological Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles of the Collective and Socialist Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>Science and Technic in the U. S. S. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of Education in the U. S. S. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of the Soviet Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Policy and Geography of the U. S. S. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–1</td>
<td>Arts in the U. S. S. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization of Public Health and Socialized Medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice and the Correctional Policy of the Soviet Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>Literatures of Russia and the Soviet Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Russian for Foreigners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Regulations**

1. Enrollments are accepted for one or more courses, but the total number of class room hours may not exceed ninety (six semester units).

2. The course “Principles of the Collective and Socialist Society” is prerequisite for admission to all other courses; however, the student may enroll simultaneously in this and other courses. Students may be exempted from this requirement by presenting evidence of having completed:
   a.—An equivalent course during the Moscow University summer sessions of 1933 or 1934.
   b.—An equivalent course in an American school or university.
   c.—The reading of at least three approved references on the subject.

3. Students enrolling in “Survey of Psychological Research” must list at least three previous courses in psychology when filling out the application form.

4. Changes in program may not be made later than one week after the opening of the summer session in Moscow.

5. Moscow University reserves the right to dismiss students for unsatisfactory work or conduct.

6. Students may not attend courses other than those in which they are enrolled; auditors will not be permitted.

7. Students may not enroll in “Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism” without necessary recommendations or prerequisite courses.

8. All registrations are subject to the approval of the director of Moscow University summer session or the American representative of Moscow University.

9. Academic credit will not be granted to students absent during more than three class sessions.

**Travel Plan**

The unique feature of the summer school plan, offered by the Anglo-American section of Moscow University, is the combination of class room and laboratory study with travel in the Soviet Union. The educational directors of the university are of the opinion that an adequate understanding of the policies and
programs of Soviet institutions is to be found not only through academic investigation but also through direct observation of institutions at work. To this end, and in order to permit the visitor to become acquainted with the many aspects of social conditions not only in one locale but throughout the country, each course listed is offered in conjunction with field work tours. These will include the major cities of the Soviet Union, and permit close observation of institutional life.

Academic work at the University of Moscow includes approximately four weeks of resident study and two weeks of supervised travel. The itineraries for the travel period have been set up to meet professional and academic interests. All students enrolled are offered the choice of the following itineraries.

### Itinerary No. 1

- Aug. 14—Leave Moscow—late afternoon
- 15—En route
- 16—Arrive Sevastopol—morning
- 17—To Yalta
- 18—Yalta
- 19—Yalta
- 20—Yalta
- 21—Yalta; leave Yalta—morning
- 22—Arrive Odessa—morning; leave evening
- 23—Arrive Kiev
- 24—Kiev
- 25—Leave Kiev—noon, for Shepetovka

### Itinerary No. 2

- Aug. 14—Leave Moscow—noon
- 15—Arrive Rostov—evening
- 16—Rostov
- 17—Rostov
- 18—Leave Rostov—afternoon
- 19—Arrive Sochi—morning
- 20—Sochi
- 21—Leave Sochi—evening
- 22—23—En route
- 24—Arrive Odessa
- 25—Leave Odessa—evening, for Shepetovka

### Itinerary No. 3

- Aug. 14—Leave Moscow—late afternoon
- 15—Arrive Kharkov—noon
- 16—Kharkov
- 17—Leave Kharkov—noon; arrive Dnieproges—morning
- 18—Dnieproges—Leave evening
- 19—Arrive Sevastopol—morning; to Yalta
- 20—Yalta
- 21—Leave Yalta—morning
- 22—Arrive Odessa—morning; leave evening
- 23—Arrive Kiev
- 24—Kiev
- 25—Leave Kiev—noon, for Shepetovka

### Itinerary No. 4

- Aug. 14—Leave Moscow—evening
- 15—Old Rostov
- 16—Yaroslavl
- 17—Yaroslavl—leave for Moscow
- 18—Moscow
- 19—Leave Moscow—evening
- 20—Arrive Leningrad—morning; leave afternoon
- 21—Pskov
- 22—From Pskov to Staraya Russia and by boat to Old Novgorod
- 23—Old Novgorod—Leave for Leningrad
- 24—Arrive Leningrad—morning
- 25—Leave Leningrad, for Belo Ostrov (or by steamer)

### Itinerary No. 5

- Aug. 14—Leave Moscow—noon
- 15—Arrive Gorki—morning
- 16—Leave Gorki—noon
- 17—On the Volga
- 18—On the Volga
- 19—On the Volga
- 20—Arrive Stalingrad—morning; leave evening
- 21—Arrive Rostov—evening
- 22—Rostov
- 23—Rostov
- 24—Rostov
- 25—Leave Rostov—morning; arrive Kharkov—evening
- 26—Kharkov
- 27—Kharkov—leave evening
- 28—Kiev
- 29—Leave Kiev, for Shepetovka

### Itinerary No. 6

- Aug. 14—Leave Moscow—late afternoon
- 15—Arrive Kharkov—noon
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Itinerary No. 6—Continued

(15 Day Itinerary—Supplementary Cost $20.00)—Continued

Aug. 16—Leave Kharkov—evening

17—En route

18—Arrive Kislovodsk

19—Kislovodsk to Ordzhonikidze

20—Georgian Highway

21—Tiflis—leave for Batum

22—Batum—leave evening for Yalta

Aug. 23—En route

24—En route

25—Arrive Yalta—morning

26—Yalta

27—Leave Yalta—morning

28—Arrive Odessa—morning; leave afternoon

29—Kiev

Itinerary No. 6—Continued

Students are urged to select their itinerary, and indicate their choice upon the attached registration form, before sailing from New York. Although it is permissible to choose the itinerary while in residence in Moscow, in order to avoid congestion in office routine it is advisable that the choice of itinerary be indicated as soon as possible.

ACCOMMODATIONS AND SOCIAL LIFE

Accommodations offered to visitors attending the summer session of the Moscow University are of the dormitory type. These quarters are designed for students who wish to approximate in the living conditions the life of the typical Soviet students.

Persons desiring individual rooms, or rooms for two, may be accommodated in the dormitories; but since the number of such rooms is limited, requests for other than regular dormitory quarters will be considered in order of their receipt. Supplementary rates for individual or double rooms will be supplied upon request.

Accommodations include three full meals daily and lodging. In addition, the summer session provides guide and interpreter service, rail and motor travel, through Intourist, the Soviet State of Travel Company.

The spirit of the summer session is that of the true Soviet school. In its unique student organization and control of all physical and academic problems, the visitor to the Moscow University begins to understand, through a feeling of participation, the functioning of a Soviet university.

Athletic, cultural and social activities after school hours are provided for the visitor through the cooperation of Soviet student groups. Sightseeing, the theatre, the cinema, boating and bathing, the publishing of a “wall newspaper,” are but a few of the extra curricular activities available. Soviet life is rich in cultural opportunities for all. The tourist is usually unable to fully avail himself of these opportunities. But the student of the summer session will have ample opportunity to participate in any activity he chooses.

Students accepting dormitory accommodations must be fully aware that these accommodations are not luxurious. They are plain but clean. They do not provide the privacy or comforts offered by hotels. Dormitory accommodations are available mainly because many students cannot afford the higher cost of hotel residence. There are separate dormitories for men and women, with a limited number of rooms for married couples.

ACADEMIC CREDIT

The Moscow University summer session certifies foreign students for full academic credit at the University of Moscow. The student may offer the certificate of attendance and credit, issued by the University of Moscow, to the faculty of the American college or university at which he is regularly enrolled, for evaluation and recognition in accordance with the policies and procedures of the institution. In order to assist in the evaluation of credit, the director of the Moscow University summer session will provide the dean, faculty advisor or other administrative official with a full academic description of courses and of the progress in work of each student. The minimum university credit possible is two points and the maximum is six points (semester units).

New York City school teachers may offer the certificates issued by the University of Moscow to meet the requirements for annual salary increment (alertness credit).
Credit will be granted only to those students in regular attendance, who have satisfactorily met all the requirements of Moscow University. Final examinations will be given in all courses.

**REGISTRATION AND FEES**

Courses are open to all persons interested in the cultural and social progress of the Soviet Union.

Registrants desiring academic credit must be bona-fide undergraduate or graduate university students; teachers on elementary, secondary or university level; or social workers.

Before registering, students must examine the daily class schedule in order not to enroll in courses conflicting with each other. After the student's application has been received and accepted, the Educational Department of Intourist will issue to each student a class admission card as well as a student identification card. All student applications must be approved by the office of the Institute of International Education.

Tuition fees are payable at time of registration. All checks for tuition and registration fees must be made payable to the order of Intourist, Inc., which is empowered to collect fees for the Moscow University. The total registration fee is $2.50, regardless of the number of courses in which the student may enroll. The tuition fee for each thirty-hour course is $20.00; the tuition fee for each sixty-hour course is $40.00.

Tuition fees will be refunded in case of changed plans, at any time prior to July 3, 1935. Registration fees will not be refunded.

**MAINTENANCE COST**

The cost of maintenance for the entire summer session, from July 16 to August 25th, inclusive is $176.00.

This amount includes the cost of maintenance in Leningrad or Moscow from July 16th to July 18th; maintenance in dormitories from July 19th to August 13th; maintenance and third-class travel costs from August 14th to August 25th, inclusive.

Students may purchase all travel and maintenance service through local travel agents. Intourist, Inc., provides all travel agents with complete information concerning maintenance, travel, and other services in the Soviet Union. After the student has purchased the necessary service through the travel agent, he will be supplied with covering service-documents to be presented upon his arrival in the Soviet Union to Intourist.

At the earliest possible date, each student will receive a dormitory room-assignment card, a student identification card, and the necessary class admission cards.

**REGISTRATION FORM**

**MOSCOW UNIVERSITY (Summer Session)**

(ANGLO-AMERICAN SECTION)

Directions:

1. Please print legibly in ink. Answer all questions.
2. Consult **Daily Class Schedule** before listing courses.
3. If you desire academic credit, consult the dean or advisor of your school.
4. Checks or money orders must be drawn to order of Intourist, Inc.
5. Mail application form, together with tuition and registration fees, to the Educational Department, Intourist, Inc., 545 Fifth Ave., New York City.
6. For travel information and purchase of maintenance services in the Soviet Union, consult your local travel agent.
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

APPLICATION FORM

Name
Address

Birth date
Occupation
Place of work

Degrees
Present academic status
School or college

Do you desire credit? Yes
Dean or Advisor?

Have you consulted His Name?

Give one University reference (Name) (Address)

List courses in which you are enrolling: (1) (2) (3) (Maximum of three)

If enrolling in advanced course, list previous courses or work in field

If applying for exemption from prerequisite course, state reasons

List Soviet Union Itinerary No. Total amount of fees enclosed

(Date) (Signature)

The Chairman. Now you may make your comments.

Mr. Sargent. There are a number of variety courses here, one on art and literature including Socialist realism in art, discussing the role of the Socialist writer in the program of building for socialism. The principles of the collective and Socialist society, a prerequisite for all students; the course of justice and correctional policy, discussing the Russian system; one on organization of public health and socialized medicine, including social psychiatry and mental hygiene; one on survey of education in the U.S.S.R.; another on science and technique in the U.S.S.R.; one on a study of psychological research; theories of reflexology and conditioning.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Sargent, you are not commenting. You are just reading.

Mr. Sargent. It refers to the works of Pavlov here.

Mr. Hays. We have that all in the record. It is in by unanimous consent.

What are your comments? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Sargent. My comments are that this document shows a framework of a complete system of indoctrination of American educators which could only be put together on the theory of their receiving such indoctrination and coming back here and introducing it into our school system. It even includes the reflexology item I just referred to, including material on Pavlov, who was the author of the principles of brain washing.

It includes a travel program for these educators to go to the Soviet Union and travel around various parts of the country. One of these travel schedules included 5 days at Yalta, among other things.

There are five different itineraries. It says a unique feature was that they would live under conditions approximating that of the average Soviet student, and the educators attending could even receive academic credit, and the New York City teachers would get a salary increment in the New York City school system by attending the meeting.
I cannot conceive how the panel of people named here would allow their names to be used in sponsorship of a project of this type unless they were profoundly in sympathy with the doing of that kind of thing at the period that is mentioned here. This is offered in full for the transcript of my testimony.

Mr. Hays. What the committee is concerned about, Mr. Sargent: Could you give us any estimate of how many more pages of your statement there are to read there?

Mr. Sargent. I am not going to read the entire binder, if that is what you mean. It contains blank paper and various things to which I might want to refer.

The Chairman. The statement of Mr. Hays was that we had anticipated that you would have required 2 days.

Now, the way the situation has developed, I told him we had anticipated you would be able to finish tomorrow.

We are to have two sessions. Of course, that is not binding on anybody, but that is our goal insofar as your direct testimony is concerned. That is the frame of time that we had in mind.

As you state, I did not have in mind that you were going to read all that is in the notes there.

Mr. Wormser. Do you think you could finish in two sessions tomorrow?

Mr. Sargent. I will make every effort to. I think probably.

The Chairman. We want all pertinent information included. At the same time, we do want to conserve the time of the committee as much as we can.

Mr. Sargent. Would it be possible, just in case, if I had one session on the following day?

The Chairman. We don't want to commit ourselves definitely at this time.

Mr. Sargent. I will make every effort to do that.

Mr. Hays. As I understand it, now, you are going to take at least two more sessions and probably a third just to get through reading your statement?

Mr. Sargent. Oh, no. I have an outline of various points to cover here. I am getting pretty well through this historical material. I am getting down to specific topics.

Mr. Hays. The thing that I am driving at is that it is going to take you this long to get through your presentation before we start crossing; is that right?

Mr. Sargent. Presumably. Regardless of the reason one way or the other, I have had only a fraction of the time so far, and it has put me off my stride here, and I have to get back on.

Mr. Hays. There we are getting into the realm of something that is not within the realm of hearsay. We can measure the pages and find out what fraction you have had, and I think you will find out it is a big fraction.

Frankly, I might say that your diatribe has a tendency to afflict me with ennui.

The purpose of this is to try to find out when the committee is going to adjourn for the weekend and when we are going to reconvene next week, because Sunday is Memorial Day, and Mr. Reece and I at least have commitments for Memorial Day.
Mr. Sargent. I think, having your point in mind here, I can bring in an outline tomorrow morning for my guidance which will enable me to refer to certain things, leave the document with you relating to it, and state its general scope.

Mr. Hays. We are not going to try to cut you off.

Mr. Sargent. I understand that.

Mr. Hays. But we are just trying to find out how long we can run this week and when we can come back next week.

Mr. Sargent. I think I can do quite well on a full run tomorrow.

The Chairman. The committee, when it recesses at noon Thursday, will recess to convene the following Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock at a place to be announced.

You may proceed, Mr. Sargent. We will go along as far as we can this afternoon.

Mr. Sargent. Now, Professor George S. Counts, one of those sponsoring this session, became a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the year 1927, and an associate director of the Teachers College International Institute at the same time.

In 1929 he edited a translation of a book by a Soviet educator, Albert P. Pinkevitch, who was president of the Second State University of Moscow. The book states that it was translated under the auspices of the International Institute of Columbia.

In 1931 he published a translation of the New Russian Primer, which was the story of the 5-year plan. The same year he wrote a book entitled “The Soviet Challenge to America.” He was still associate director of this International Institute at that particular time.

In February of 1933, the Progressive Education Journal, which is the official publication of the Progressive Education Society, published an article in which Johanneson I. Zilberfarb, a member of the State Scientific Council and Commissariat of Education of the Russian Republic, wrote an article commenting on this pamphlet, Dare the School Build a New Social Order?

The editors and publishers of the magazine published an excerpt from a letter that Zilberfarb had written to Counts showing the close sympathy existing between the two men at the time, and here is an excerpt from the letter in the magazine. It says:

I read with a great deal of interest your recent publication, Dare the School Build a New Social Order? The remarkable progress you have made in challenging capitalism gave me much pleasure and fired me with confidence in a yet greater friendship between us. This feeling, however, in no way moderated my criticisms of the pamphlet, as you will observe from the enclosed view. May I be so bold as to hope that your profound and consistent attack on the social order in your country will eventually lead you to a complete emancipation from American exclusiveness and intellectual messiahship so aptly exposed in your pamphlet, thus enabling you to consider all social progress from a universal proletarian point of view.

Now, going back on another phase of the same subject, we find that generally in the educational profession, commencing around 1926, there was forming a movement which resulted in a report frankly recommending the slanting of history textbooks for a propaganda pattern to further a collective-type of state.

The document to which I refer is known as Conclusions and Recommendations.
It started as a project in 1926 by a committee of nine, appointed by the American Historical Society. There was a $300,000 grant from Carnegie Corp. for that particular work, a 5-year survey. The information I have bearing on that is contained in the report itself. I don't want to take your time in reading all these names. Would you like me to give an excerpt to the reporter containing the list of names without reading them here all now? Counts is one on the committee.

Mr. Hays. What is the volume?

Mr. Sargent. Conclusions and Recommendations, Report of the Committee on Social Studies of the American Historical Association. They recommend changing the curriculum to promote a collective-type of state and playing down of traditional American values in schoolbooks.

The Chairman. What year is that published?

Mr. Sargent. The publication of that was in 1934. The study began back in 1926 or 1927. It is a $300,000 Carnegie grant. I am reading certain excerpts from the report to show the nature of the conclusions. I wanted to save time by not reading all the list of names.

Mr. Hays. You say it is pertinent material and it is part of the record without being printed?

Mr. Sargent. I thought I could have typed off the list of names and give them to the reporter to insert, instead of reading them now.

Mr. Hays. That is all right with me.

The Chairman. That will be done.

(The list of names is as follows:)

Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D. C.
Charles A. Beard, formerly professor of politics, Columbia University; author of many books in the fields of history and politics
Isaiah Bowman, director, American Geographical Society of New York; president of the International Geographical Union
Ada Comstock, president of Radcliffe College
George S. Counts, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University
Avery O. Craven, professor of history, University of Chicago
Edmund E. Day, formerly dean of School of Business Administration, University of Michigan; now director of Social Sciences, Rockefeller Foundation
Guy Stanton Ford, professor of history, dean of Graduate School, University of Chicago
Carlton J. H. Hayes, professor of history, Columbia University
Ernest Horn, professor of education, University of Iowa
Henry Johnson, professor of history, Teachers College, Columbia University
A. C. Krey, professor of history, University of Minnesota
Leon C. Marshall, Institute for the Study of Law, John Hopkins University
Charles D. Merriam, professor of political science, University of Chicago
Jesse H. Newlin, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University; director of Lincoln Experimental School
Jesse F. Steiner, professor of sociology, University of Washington

Mr. Hays. Let me ask you this. I want to look at one of these books myself. What was the name of that book you mentioned this morning that you said did something about creating an air of revolution around 1917? Do you recall offhand what book you were talking about?

Mr. Sargent. I referred to the New York investigation of radicalism movement, the Lusk Report. It is a work of several volumes, I think 4 or 5 or even 6 volumes, perhaps. It is a very intensive study.

Mr. Hays. There is another book you mentioned and I can't recall the title. I suppose I can get it out of the transcript of this morning.

Mr. Sargent. I referred to revolutionary intellectual elites, von Mises' book.

Mr. Hays. No.
Mr. Sargent. I referred to the Occasional Papers, No. 3, of Flexner, advocating a change in the educational system, that was 1916, General Education Board publication. I don't recall anything else offhand.

Mr. Hays. As a matter of fact, what occasioned the inquiry is that someone came to my office who had been in the audience and asked me if I had ever seen this volume and they mentioned the name of it. I had not, and I cannot even recall the name of it. I thought perhaps I was giving enough of a clue. I may be hazy myself. It will show up in the transcript and we will get hold of it then.

Mr. Sargent. That is right. This report discusses, among other things, educational philosophy for the United States. It says that American society during the past 100 years has been moving from an individual and frontier economy to a collective and social economy. That whatever may be the character of life in the society now emerging, it will certainly be different, and whether it will be better or worse will depend on large measure on the standards of appraisal which are applied. It says that continued emphasis in education on traditional ideas and values of academic individualism will intensify conflict and maladjustments during the period of transition. It says that if education continues to emphasize philosophy of individualism in economy, it will increase accompanying social tensions, and so forth. That the educators stand today between two great philosophies. An individualism in economic theory which has become hostile in practice to the development of individuality; the other representing and anticipating the future.

What these gentlemen propose to do is set forth in their chapter at the end talking about next steps. It says that it is first to awaken and consolidate leadership around the philosophy and purpose of education expounded in the report. That the American Historical Association in cooperation with the National Council on the Social Studies has arranged to take over the magazine, the Outlook, as a social science journal for teachers. That writers of textbooks are to be expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference. That makers of programs in social sciences in cities and towns may be expected to evaluate the findings. That it is not too much to expect in the near future a decided shift in emphasis from mechanics and methodology to the content and function of courses in the social studies. That is the gist of it.

This report became the basis for a definite slanting in the curriculum by selecting certain historical facts and by no longer presenting others, and brought us to the condition we find ourselves in at the present time.

I am at a little disadvantage here. I had some Building of America books which contained some very pertinent material. How much more time have you to meet this afternoon?

The Chairman. About 25 minutes.

Mr. Sargent. That is unfortunate. I thought I would be on all afternoon.

The Chairman. However, we can quit any time.

Mr. Sargent. Logically that particular section belongs at this point. I have a few other things I can use. Here another book of Professor Counts showing the Russian influence on educational leaders at the time. It is called Character Education in the Soviet Union. It is edited by William Clark Trow, foreword by George S. Counts,
and is published in 1934. It reviews the Soviet method of dealing with the question of youth and reproduces various posters used for propaganda purposes in the Soviet Union. Here is the first one here, reproduction of an actual Russian poster. The heading, of course, is written in the Russian language. The translation is on the opposite page, and deals with the subject of international education. The poster says:

Without educating internationalists, we will not build socialism. Animosity between nations is the support of counter-revolutions and of capital. It is therefore profitable and so is maintained. War is needed by capitalists for still greater enslavement of oppressed people. International education is the way toward socialism and toward the union of the toilers of the whole world.

Mr. Hays. Is that book sponsored by a foundation?

Mr. Sargent. It doesn't show on its face. It is printed by Ann Arbor Press. The foreword is by Counts, however.

Mr. Hays. I know. You may be making a case that Dr. Counts is a Socialist or Communist or something. I don't know about that. But I want to know where the foundations get this book.

Mr. Sargent. The foundation tie-in for one is the International Institute in which Counts was in a leadership position and the preferment given to Columbia University and Teachers College by the Rockefeller interests. They have been the main financial stay of that institution in spite of all of their policies.

Mr. Hays. The Rockefeller Foundation has been the mainstay of Teachers College?

Mr. Sargent. I understand it is one of the principal supporting groups.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Sargent, you are pretty evasive. I can see that you have had a good deal of legal training. I ask you a specific question and then you say "I understand." That is one of the nice ways to libel people, isn't it?

Mr. Sargent. That is not lying.

Mr. Hays. I didn't say lying; I said libel. You can say I understand so and so is a such and such, and you did not say it; you just heard it around some place. That is not evidence. Is that evidence? You can't use hearsay as evidence in any court. Apparently you can bring darn near anything into a congressional hearing.

Mr. Sargent. If you want to get down to that, I saw the official treasurer's report of Columbia University, and ran my finger down the various grants, and I found in my own examination of those reports that very considerable sums of money have been granted to Columbia University by that foundation.

Mr. Hays. That is one thing.

Mr. Sargent. I saw that.

Mr. Hays. You say it is the mainstay. Then you change it and say very considerable amounts. There is a little difference there, isn't there?

Mr. Sargent. Your committee report says there has been a great deal of preferment by these foundations in favor of certain universities. That is stated in your own staff report.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Reece said that last year when he made his speech on the floor, too, but that doesn't necessarily make it true. He believes that and he has a right to. Understand, I am sure he is sincere on that. Just because somebody says so, that doesn't make it so. As a
matter of fact, there is a lot of stuff in the Congressional Record that might not have too much bearing of fact. The fact that it is in the Record gives it a certain air. There have been cases where someone put a slant in the Record and made reprints and said, “In the Congressional Record it says.”

The Chairman. You keep referring to my speech. Have you gone back and read any speeches that our late good friend, Gene Cox, made on the advocacy of the passage of his resolution?

Mr. Hays. That is before he got religion.

Mr. Sargent. The Rockefeller Foundation is of——

Mr. Hays. Just a moment. I don’t want to interrupt your continuity. Let us go back to this book. I have done a little searching here, and I still don’t know the name. Didn’t you mention a book by Frederick Lewis Allen?

Mr. Sargent. Only Yesterday. It is a book recounting the times some years ago. He begins, I think, around the turn of the century. It is a very readable book. He discusses what was going on.

Mr. Hays. Could I have some member of the staff call the Library of Congress right away and ask if I can get a copy tonight?

Mr. Sargent. I am not citing it as authority, but a general discussion of the time. I think it is pretty accurate. It was general atmosphere, was the only purpose of referring to it.

Mr. Hays. I just want to look at it.

Mr. Sargent. It is a newsy type of book about discussing the very things that were going on and talked of at the time.

Another poster in this book here about character education in the Soviet has a pamphlet with two children, a boy and a girl, a Russian caption, of course, and a translation “Nursery Schools.” It says:

Enter the preschool campaign. Build a new life and organize the children’s parks and playgrounds. Educate the Communist shift.

That is the beginning of chapter 3. There is one on the 5-year plan here. There is one about liquidating the kulak, a man standing with his hand raised:

Let us eject the kulak from the Kolkhoz.

It talks about self-activity and what the children can do. No, this is not the children but the grownups.

We cannot consider the question of the development of children’s self-activity and work with the pioneer activity apart from their connection with the new environment in which we find ourselves and work with the children.

The point of this is that apparently the obsession at this time had gone to such a point that it was considered worthwhile for an educator to bring that material over here, that propaganda, a man connected with a leading school of education, and to write a foreword to it, and thereby endorse it. The foreword by Counts includes the statement that a child can be formed, a youth can be bent, but only the grave can straighten the back of an old man. Also, that the characteristic which distinguishes the Russian Revolution from the revolution of the past is the attention given to children and youth. They realized that if the revolution was to be successful in the long run, if their ideas were really to triumph, if a new society was to displace the old, then the very character of the people inhabiting the Soviet Union would have to be profoundly changed.
Consequently, as soon as they had made the conquest of political power, they turned their attention to the stupendous task of educating the coming generation to the theory and practice of communism. Their achievements to date are without human precedent in human history.

Mr. Hays. In other words, what he said there is that if the revolution is to be a success, we have to indoctrinate these kids, because if we don't indoctrinate them, they might overthrow us some day.

Mr. Sargent. That is right. To have a successful revolution, you must indoctrinate the children against the formerly existing order. That was his philosophy.

Mr. Hays. Do you agree that in order to have a successful revolution you would have to do that? Understand, I am not asking you to endorse a revolution, but I think that—

Mr. Sargent. I think he has hit it on the head. Of course, that is one way you run a revolution.

Mr. Hays. You and I agree about that.

Mr. Sargent. On a revolution you do, yes.

Mr. Hays. But now what I am trying to find out, and I am very serious about it, was he advocating that we have some kind of revolution and do the same thing here, or was he pointing out that this is the way the Communists are going to do it if they are successful. I do not know this man at all. Maybe he is terrible. But it seems to me from just that one statement he might have been holding up a red flag. On the other hand—I am asking you—was he advocating something or was he warning?

The Chairman. Would you mind reading again one of the last sentences there from the foreword about the accomplishment is unparalleled?

Mr. Hays. Read the whole thing.

Mr. Sargent. It was in the foreword?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Hays. The last two paragraphs you read.

Mr. Sargent. The exact sentence is:

They realized fully that if the revolution was to be successful in the long run, if their ideas were really to triumph, if a new society was to displace the old, then the very character of the people inhabiting the Soviet Union would have to be profoundly changed. Consequently, as soon as they had made the conquest of political power, they turned their attention to the stupendous task of educating the coming generation in the theory and practice of communism. Their achievements to date are without precedent in human history.

Mr. Hays. In other words, they did succeed in indoctrinating these children and knew no better than communism.

Mr. Sargent. I think there is no question about it. I think that is the system that was established. That is the system which by this announcement American educators were going to look at in 1935, the next year.

Mr. Hays. I don't think that would be too bad an idea because if we are going to combat this communism, we are going to have to do it with ideas and if we are going to be able to educate our people that it is bad, I always thought in order to have a successful fight against an opponent, you had to know something about him. I never stay away from political meetings of the opposite party unless they bar me, and in that case I try to send somebody else who can report on it. I want to know what they are doing.
Mr. Sargent. Understanding what they are doing is an excellent idea, and I go all for it. But subjecting a teaching staff to a slanted course on one side, and bringing them home, is no counterbalance against something else. It automatically produces a slant in the mind.

Mr. Hays. Let me say this to you, Mr. Sargent. Along with several other Members of Congress of both political parties, I spent some weeks behind the Iron Curtain and the most effective job I have been able to do in my life—and I can cite you some people who can testify to that, I think—in telling them about what a horrible thing it is, about how it degrades the human, about how there is no freedom of thought, no liberty of any kind, no human decency, has been because I was there and saw it. I was in Prague the night they had the big purge, and they arrested 5,000 people between sundown and sunup, and I will never forget it as long as I live. I think by knowing that I can more effectively tell people when I have the opportunity and occasion about what a horrible thing communism really is.

Are you saying that no one should find that out? I was there and they certainly probably as much as they could subjected us to whatever propaganda they were able to, but it didn't twist my brain any.

Mr. Sargent. If you were there, you saw something which these people in charge of our educational system with foundation grants didn't get—the people that joined all these fronts and did all these other things. The people who don't know and will not listen and not pay attention to the results of an investigation. That is one of the cruxes of our problem. Here, for instance—

Mr. Hays. Now, just a minute.

Mr. Sargent. People who have been there have an entirely different slant from people who have not been there who have read certain literature which they think is all right, and that is all. That is one of our serious problems here. I know what you mean. I have talked to people who have been there recently. I talked to Lt. Paul O'Dowd, Jr., who has received a very distinguished decoration by the United States Government for his resistance to indoctrination in one of these indoctrination camps in Korea, and it is his opinion that there are very serious indoctrination policies in education as presently conducted, and the matter deserves very serious study from that standpoint.

Mr. Hays. Of course, Mr. Sargent, we will all admit that you can indoctrinate people to about anything through education. I hate to dwell on this. I have been one who has never made a very big issue since I have been in Congress either at home or on the floor because it so happens that my mother was from the South and my father from the North, but it seems to me the children in the South have been indoctrinated one way about the racial problem whereas in the North, they have been indoctrinated another. You say it and I admit it that you certainly can indoctrinate children by education. There is no question about it.

Mr. Sargent. Therefore, we must maintain the integrity of this system at all hazards, or at least as best we can. The advice of this thing is that there has been such a heavy slanting on the one side, and almost a total—here is an illustration what I mean by the extent to which a certain element in education has gone completely overboard. This is an article in the May 1946 issue of an educational magazine, an article on communications. It is the Progressive Education
magazine, page 266. The author is Norman Woelfel. He says, "It might be necessary paradoxically for us to control our press as the Russian press is controlled and as the Nazi press is controlled."

He said that in a discussion of how we could accomplish more social good through the media of communication.

Now, something is wrong with educational judgment when things like that are seriously said.

Mr. Hays. Of course we are all against that. On the other hand, it seems to me that you have given quite a serious consideration that you want to control textbooks to your way of thinking.

Mr. Sargent. Nothing of the kind. I say these books are propaganda, and Congress prohibited foundation money for propaganda activity.

The Chairman. That quotation which you just read is from a magazine sponsored by an organization supported, or at least in part by foundation funds?

Mr. Sargent. Yes, it is the Progressive Education Association.

The Chairman. Have you read Norman Woelfel’s book?

Mr. Sargent. Molders of the Mind.

The Chairman. Yes; I have. Gentlemen, the literature on this thing is voluminous. I could take all of this week and next week giving you these things. I am simply giving what I think are representative samples.

Mr. Hays. Literature, of course, is voluminous on both sides of this. I think we are agreed on that. You are from California. Did you ever head of a foundation called the American Progress Foundation?

Mr. Sargent. I don't recall that I have; no.

Mr. Hays. It says here it is in California—and they are bragging about it—nonprofit corporation, federally tax-exempt, and they give their address. Then they have sent a letter out.

Mr. Sargent. Can you give the address?

Mr. Hays. Yes. Suite 101-B, Highland Arcade, 1540 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles 28, Calif. They have sent out a letter, and it is all right to me, and apparently to everybody in Congress, and they say that we are pushing, or we are backing the House Joint Resolution No. 123, copy enclosed, by Representative Ralph W. Gwinn. Congressman Gwinn had a perfect right to introduce this resolution. It is proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens. This copy of it says, "Printed for"—this is a copy of the bill.

Mr. Sargent. What is the bill about?

Mr. Hays. I just read the title to it. You know as much about it as I do from that.

I will read it again if you didn't get it. I don't want to cut you off.

Printed for—and at the expense of the American Progress Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif.—

and they go on to say a nonprofit California corporation federally tax exempt. That is propaganda, isn’t it?

Mr. Sargent. I would certainly say it was; yes. It is influencing legislation.
Mr. Hays. That is a pretty specific example of it.

Mr. Sargent. It is influencing legislation, certainly.

Mr. Hays. I must refer that to the staff.

Mr. Sargent. Unless they have some specific interest. I think, Mr. Hays, a foundation which happens to have a specific interest in specific legislation may properly present and defend that interest. For example, you had all the foundations in the business coming in voluntarily before the Cox committee and testifying, and they had a stake in the controversy. If they didn't have a right to come in on that matter, they would be deprived of their exemption rights by now, for having been there.

Mr. Hays. You may have a point. I don't say this foundation shouldn't do that. I don't know. This was just handed to me by another Member on the floor today, and he said "here is one for your committee." I am just asking you. As far as I am concerned, let them push that bill. If it is a good bill, and if they can convince enough people that is the way we do it under the Constitution, it is not easy.

Mr. Sargent. As a legal matter the distinction is that something directly within the corporate purpose of an organization they may do. There is some organization promoting forestry and conservation and they lobby continuously on that. On general matters, of course, that is another thing.

Mr. Koch. Under the statute it says if a substantial part of their income is used, and we have to worry during these hearings just whether we can make a better definition than substantial. If normally they do perfectly innocuous things and then get off the beam once, we have a question as to is this right or is it wrong. That is where the statute has to be interpreted.

Mr. Hays. That is an interesting thing to bring up because we have had a lot of arguments about Rockefeller and this $100,000 a year he has made available, and the inference has been that it has not been good. Maybe it has not. I don't know. On the other hand, he gave a lot of money to a place down here in Virginia called Colonial Williamsburg, and I expect spent more than he did on this project which I have been to numerous times, and I think is very good.

Mr. Koch. They say that is not foundation.

Mr. Hays. No; he did that. I can't get Mr. Sargent to say, perhaps he doesn't know, whether this $100,000 a year he keeps talking about was from Rockefeller himself or the foundation. It is all vague.

Mr. Koch. Miss Casey says it was foundation money.

The Chairman. Have you reached a stopping place?

Mr. Sargent. I think I have, yes.

The Chairman. The hour of 4 o'clock has arrived, and the committee stands in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 4 p.m., a recess was taken until Wednesday, May 26, 1954, at 10 a.m.)