

## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1954

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

The special committee met at 10:15 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 304, House Office Building, Hon. Carroll Reece (chairman of the special committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Reece (presiding), Goodwin, Hays, and Pfost.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

You may proceed, Mr. Sargent.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I was asking Mr. Sargent informally before the hearing started if he can find in his notes—I have not been able to find it, I just got this transcript handed to me as I was coming over here—I am interested in this book, *Only Yesterday*, which he mentioned. I would like to find out exactly what he said about it, if we could at this point.

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

Mr. SARGENT. I can't do that without having the transcript or getting my notes out of the hotel room. I am coming back in any event for cross-examination after this hearing is completed. I will supply you with the exact reference.

I might say at this time my only interest in mentioning the book at all was that it was talking about what people on the street currently were talking about at the time.

Mr. HAYS. Would you hand me the book, sir?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. It is a newsy book about the state of public discussion at the time, and what the people were doing and acting. That is all; local color. It is not an authoritative work in the sense of proving revolution. It said that people were trying out all sort of things. That is said in that book.

Mr. HAYS. I think you cited this book to support your contention that there was imminent danger of revolution around that period.

Mr. SARGENT. No, sir, I did not. I said it was being talked about at the time.

Mr. HAYS. You didn't say that the country was in imminent danger, that there was a serious danger in 1917 and 1918?

Mr. SARGENT. I said there was on the basis of the findings of the report of the Lusk committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you permit an interruption? As I recall the statement, the Lusk committee reported there was a revolution.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, they made very extensive findings. They found there was at that time a serious danger for our form of government. I did not in any sense use the Allen book as an authority. I don't think Mr. Allen is an authority on the subject.

Mr. HAYS. You see, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I am trying to prove. The witness brings in a book and the committee is at a complete disadvantage, because we don't know beforehand what book he is going to cite, and we don't get the transcript until the next day. I think the transcript will show he is saying two entirely different things about it. He brought the book in. He cited the book. I have never heard of the book. I have had a half hour to glance at this book, and I want to read a few paragraphs out of it. I will read from page 76:

The big red scare was slowly, very slowly dying. What killed it? The realization for one thing that there had never been any sufficient cause for such a panic as had convulsed the country.

I don't know whether this is an authoritative work or not, but the witness cited it so I thought I would look at it.

Then on page 52, he talks about the Boston police riots:

The Boston police had a grievance. Their pay was based on a minimum of \$1,100, out of which uniforms had to be bought, and \$1,100 would buy mighty little at 1919 prices.

Then on page 56, in talking about the then Attorney General, he says:

Mr. Palmer decided to give the American public more of the same and thereupon he carried through a new series of raids which set a new record in American history for executive transgression on individual constitutional rights.

Then he goes on and is talking about the fanaticism and fervor, and he says on page 58;

Nor did it quickly subside for the professional superpatriots and assorted special propagandists disguised as superpatriots had only begun to fight. Innumerable patriotic societies had sprung up, each with its executive secretary, and executive secretaries must live, and therefore, must conjure up new and ever-greater menaces.

You know that has a faintly familiar ring, doesn't it?

Innumerable other gentlemen now discovered that they could defeat whatever they wanted to defeat by tarring it conspicuously with the Bolshevist brush. Big Navy men, believers in compulsory military service, dries, anticigarette campaigners, antievolution fundamentalists, defenders of the moral order, book censors, Jew-haters, Negro-haters, landlords, manufacturers, utility executives, upholders of every sort of cause, good, bad and indifferent, all wrapped themselves in Old Glory, and the mantle of the Founding Fathers and allied themselves with Lenin.

Of course, he goes on to point out that they tried to ally their opponents, as is being done today, with something nasty and dirty. He goes on and I am quoting:

For years a pestilence of speakers and writers continued to afflict the country with tales of sinister and subversive agitators.

He speaks further:

Elderly ladies in gilt chairs in ornate drawing rooms heard from executive secretaries that the agents of the Government had unearthed new radical conspiracies too fiendish to be divulged before the proper time. A cloud of suspicion hung in the air and intolerance became an American virtue.

This is the author that you brought in.

Mr. SARGENT. I brought in a specific statement at a specific time.

Mr. HAYS. I am bringing in some specific statements so we will get a well-rounded picture.

The CHAIRMAN. May I be permitted to—

Mr. HAYS. Just a minute. I want to get the whole picture of this man. He made all sorts of statements, and I am not subscribing to any.

Mr. SARGENT. I only said that the discussion at the time publicly was about this condition. My authority cited was the Lusk Report of the New York Legislature. That book was not cited as an authority. I do not consider it to be authoritative on whether this conspiracy in fact existed. Mr. Allen did not know.

Mr. HAYS. The point I am making, and I think you made it for me, Mr. Sargent, is that you can bring in any book, and you can do it with great regularity, and you can pick out a sentence or paragraph out of it and make it prove whatever you want it to prove. After I read a few paragraphs out of the book, you want to disavow any relationship to it.

Mr. SARGENT. No.

Mr. HAYS. It is something that you are not going to vouch for at all now after we have looked it over.

Mr. SARGENT. No; I vouch for the part of that book which states that the intellectuals were doing all sorts of wild things and discussing it publicly, and that was the air surrounding the period. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. HAYS. You are going to vouch for part of the book and leave the rest out?

Mr. SARGENT. No. I don't have to buy the whole book because he tells the truth on one thing. You think it is a pretty good book?

Mr. HAYS. No; I don't. I think you brought out an authority that may have been a little wild in some of the statements he makes. To further prove that, let me read his subtitles for paragraph 6:

Fair and Warmer Washington. The Helpfulness of Warren G. Harding, Washington Conference. Harding's Death. The Truth Begins To Come Out. Teapot Dome and Elk Hill. Who Loaned Fall the Money? Six or Eight Cows. The Silence of Colonel Stewart and Others. The Testimony of Mr. Hays—

and will the record please show that is Will Hays—

The Reticence of Mr. Mellon. The Veterans' Bureau Scandals. Dougherty. Who Cares? The Undedicated Tomorrow.

That is the kind of book it is.

The CHAIRMAN. If Mr. Hays would be condescending enough to permit one interjection, I would like to say that I would not like to associate myself with what has been read, and I would sum it all up as meaning that anybody who is against Fabian socialism, and all it implies, is classified as a superpatriot with white cloth around him.

Mr. HAYS. You know something? You didn't disassociate yourself with this book yesterday when he was reading paragraphs out of it

that seemed to prove what you wanted him to prove. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, Fabian socialism is not mentioned in this book as far as I can find out.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I was disassociating myself with the interpretation of what you put on what you read.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Reece, I put no interpretation whatever. I merely read some paragraphs out of the book because I wanted to acquaint you with the kind of books that your witness is bringing in here and citing. I am just trying to wake you up.

Mr. GOODWIN. You had one paragraph there on the Boston police strike. Can you find that readily? I am not quite sure I caught it exactly.

Mr. HAYS. I just have some pages marked here. I can find it very quickly. Page 52. I might say I only read, as I said at the beginning, the first sentence out of that. He goes on. I might in justice to this fellow say that the Boston police strike fizzled out, and it was bad for the public welfare and so on. The man says a lot of things. I am only trying to prove, Mr. Goodwin, that you can't take a book and read a sentence or two out of it and say it proves much of anything.

Mr. GOODWIN. Of course, the police strike did not fizzle out. It was ended by the Governor of Massachusetts when he sent a telegram to the country to the effect that there was no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time, and made Gov. Calvin Coolidge President of the United States probably.

Mr. HAYS. No doubt about it. I remember only two statements that he made. That one and the one, "I do not choose to run." That was about his total contribution to history.

The CHAIRMAN. We will not try to enter into the evaluation of the services of Calvin Coolidge. I think the services of that great American speak for themselves.

Mr. HAYS. I have just one other question, and then you can proceed, Mr. Sargent.

Do you know Bob Humphrey of the Republican National Committee?

Mr. SARGENT. No. H-u-m-p-h-r-e-y?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. SARGENT. No; I don't recall the name.

Mr. HAYS. He has not helped you at all?

Mr. SARGENT. Not a particle. In fact, no person connected with any political organization or group has done so as far as I recall.

Mr. HAYS. I do have one more thing, Mr. Chairman. I want to state at this time that I talked personally last night to Mr. Edward R. Murrow, and he categorically denies that he has ever in his life been in Russia, regardless of anything you may say to the contrary.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say he was. I said he signed the prospectus.

Mr. HAYS. You told us yesterday that you heard from good authority that the school was held and these people attended.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say all these people attended. I said I believed the school was held.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Murrow is sending down a statement; it should be here today, and when it comes, I expect to read it into the record.

Mr. SARGENT. I think, Mr. Chairman, in justice to me and the American people, unsworn statements and information regarding telephone

calls should be considered as having no evidentiary value whatever before this committee.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, don't ally yourself with the American people. In the first place, you are not running this committee, and what you think has nothing to do with it.

In the second place, I am of the opinion after your testimony is made, most of the American people will not ally themselves with you. I don't want any more inferences or insinuations out of you. You act like you are running this thing here, and you are not.

Mr. SARGENT. No; I am trying to present a case.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question that will be determined when matters or information are presented as to what the form of presentation shall be. I think it would be best not to get into it now.

Mr. HAYS. I think so, too, Mr. Chairman, and I think it would be well to have an understanding that the witnesses are not to give any advice on how to conduct the hearings. Just because it is happening around the Capitol and other places, we don't have to take it as a precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness will proceed in order, and the chairman hopes that the members of the committee will do likewise.

Mr. SARGENT. When there was first discussion about the rule for my making a presentation in full and having questioning afterward, I volunteered and offered to appear before you for the purpose of answering questions fully. I want to renew at this time my expression of my willingness to do so, and say I expect to do that. At such time and place as you may designate after my testimony is completed, I will so appear and I will do it voluntarily.

Inasmuch as this question has been arised about this Frederic Lewis Allen book, I think something of considerable importance has emerged from it, and I think this is what it is.

There is an important difference between what people are currently thinking or talking or writing about at a given period, as to actual conditions, and what exists at the time. I want to give you what I think is a graphic illustration of exactly that.

I doubt if you can search the literature of the period 1933-36 and find very much support for the idea that a revolutionary movement was going on. There was an investigation by a select committee of this House at the time. The facts on that are contained in the inquiry regarding the charges of the late Dr. William Wirt, of Gary, Ind. Mr. Wirt made some very serious charges. I have a copy of them before me. He asserted—

Mr. HAYS. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, the witness just got through objecting about me making a statement or reading anything from Mr. Murrow. Now he is reading an unsworn statement from some character that I never heard of before.

Mr. SARGENT. This is an official record of the House of Representatives, sir, on the case of William A. Wirt.

Mr. HAYS. Just because it is in the official records of the House of Representatives doesn't necessarily make it so, and was it sworn to. That is your point, not mine.

Mr. SARGENT. It was introduced on the testimony of Dr. William A. Wirt, and it is a document upon which the House of Representatives appointed a committee to go into the charges. I have read that record.

Mr. HAYS. What pertinency does it have to this?

Mr. SARGENT. Because it shows a revolutionary condition seriously charged at the time and active attempts being made to suppress the investigation, a minority report filed stating that it had been suppressed, and those charges were not inquired into.

Mr. HAYS. Does it have anything to do with the foundation?

Mr. SARGENT. It has a great deal to do with the conspiracy situation I referred to, and I think it should be in the record this morning.

Mr. HAYS. The New York Times said something to the effect that you made a lot of talk about the 1920's and 1930's, and you had not related it to anything pertinent to this investigation—I believe those were the words—or you had not related it to the foundations. That is what I think.

Mr. SARGENT. I am intending to do that, Mr. Hays. Your staff here has other information. It is not expected of me to prove the entire case. I am proving certain phases of the case which are within my knowledge.

Mr. HAYS. Let us use the words “you are attempting to prove.”

Mr. SARGENT. Very well. This report contained some very serious charges having a vital bearing on the safety of the American people. It included the statement here—this is a conversation in the presence of Dr. William A. Wirt, an eminent educator of his time—he states in this document here that he was advised that he was underestimating the power of propaganda which since the First World War had developed into a science, that they could make the newspapers and magazines beg for mercy by taking away advertising, by laws to compel only the unvarnished truth in advertising; that schools and colleges could be kept in line by the hope of Federal aid until the many New Dealers in the schools and colleges had control of them.

The document in question is a part of the official records of this House in the inquiry into the charges of Dr. William A. Wirt. Of the committee appointed there, the minority was unable to get any subpoena power to bring in the people referred to by Dr. Wirt. They protested and filed a minority report which is also a document of record in this House. Those members said they could not join in the report, and that the committee had not met its responsibility. That the resolution was a coverup, a cowardly effort to smother the issues presented by the Dr. Wirt letter, that the letter does not present a personal matter, but a broad issue of whether or not there are those connected with the administration who are committed to philosophies of government contrary to the Republic under the Constitution.

The minority protested that they were denied the right to call a single witness designed by them. They appealed for subpoena power to Arthur Morgan; H. A. Morgan; David Lilienthal, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Harold Ickes, Public Administrator; and Harry Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator. I have read all of the names referred to in that paragraph. By their votes the three members refused to permit these five public officials to be brought before the committee.

The minority members informed the majority members that if they were permitted to bring the witnesses before the committee, they would show the following, and they list a series of charges here which are long, and which I won't read. One was that the Tennessee Valley Directors had organized a subsidiary corporation with the stock in those corporations to be owned by the United States Government, and

corporations chartered by it to engage in the business of processing, and so on.

Mr. HAYS. What does that have to do with foundations, even assuming that it were true, and as I recall it now, I heard of this fellow, and he was more or less discredited by many witnesses who testified directly opposite.

Mr. SARGENT. One thing is that it would have exposed the Ware Communist cell in the United States Government which was formed in the Agriculture Department in 1933 in May. Alger Hiss was in that cell. Alger Hiss later became the president of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace.

Mr. HAYS. Put in by the present Secretary of State, Foster Dulles.

Mr. SARGENT. And defended in a Federal court in the United States in the city of New York in a trial handled on those charges of espionage—rather perjury.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, Alger Hiss is in jail. We know that. That is where he belongs. The evidence pointed out that and the Democrats put him there. You have made a lot of inferences which you admitted yourself against the so-called New Deal Party. The New Deal Party, as you call it, put Alger Hiss in the penitentiary. You are basking in the limelight reflected from a convict.

Mr. SARGENT. No; I am not basking in any limelight. I will give you later the story of the character witnesses of Alger Hiss.

Mr. HAYS. We don't want the story because there is no pertinency to this.

Mr. SARGENT. I think there is. I am citing this mainly for the purpose of proving that there is a vast difference between what is being currently gossiped and talked about and what actually exists currently. There was a very active revolutionary cell in the United States Government in the 1930's. The Wirt charges were true, and they were suppressed. These educational conditions we mentioned occurred at the very time that Wirt was airing these charges within the Government. There was a conspiracy and it was revolutionary in its nature. There was a conspiracy forming in 1920 as found by the Lusk committee report. Mr. Allen didn't know it.

Mr. HAYS. Even if that is true, you are getting pretty hard up for publicity if you have to rehash that stuff, because all of that has been investigated, the facts have been brought out, and you sitting there saying so and so was true does not make it true. The fact of the matter is that there is a great deal of doubt about the credibility of you at all, because you started this hearing off by saying, when I asked you the question were you offered the counselship of the Cox committee, "Yes, sir." It is right here in the record. When I pinned you down, you weasled considerably.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say "Yes, sir."

Mr. HAYS. Yes, you did say "Yes, sir." Don't call me a liar, because the record says so.

Mr. SARGENT. Assuming it was offered makes no difference in the present connection.

Mr. HAYS. It makes a difference as to whether we are going to believe what you say or not.

Mr. SARGENT. May I go on with my testimony?

Mr. GOODWIN. Why should we not let the witness go ahead with the testimony. We are to be the judges of the evidentiary value. In the

meantime, if he believes it is pertinent to the inquiry, it seems to me he should proceed.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Goodwin, let me say this. I am only trying to keep the witness talking about something that has a remote relationship to the subject at hand.

Mr. GOODWIN. I understand that.

Mr. HAYS. I am sorry that you have not been here. I have a great deal of confidence in your fairmindedness, and I realize that you could not be here because of the importance of the Ways and Means Committee considering the bill. This witness has a tendency to go off on all sorts of tangents that have nothing pertinent to do with the facts. He says right here that he didn't say what the record says he said. If he is going to do that, where are we going to stop?

Mr. SARGENT. You requested me to finish today.

Mr. HAYS. I am more interested in the principle of truth than saving time.

Mr. SARGENT. You will have the truth from me, and you will be getting it.

Mr. HAYS. I didn't get it at the beginning.

Mr. SARGENT. At the close of the session yesterday, I was asked a question regarding the foundation known as the American Progress Foundation, a California nonprofit foundation. Reference was made to House Joint Resolution 123, a proposal for the amending of the Federal Constitution to prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens. I subsequently contacted the office of Mr. Gwinn to determine what the organization was. He has some of their letters from there. I am informed that this is a membership corporation. In other words, it is not the kind of a foundation I am talking about. The kind of foundation we have been discussing here is the section 101 (6) foundation, which has merely a board of directors, administers money, and has no general membership. Corporations of this type fall under subdivision (8) and subdivision (8) is the same basis as the American Civil Liberties Union, for example. The Revenue Bureau holds them exempt as to their own income, but does not permit deductions by donors on their own income-tax returns of money given to them. This is, I think, quite clearly a sub (8) corporation, and would have the same status as ACLU. I think that is the correct status of it.

I have a letter here furnished to me which confirms the fact that the Civil Liberties Union is a subdivision (8) corporation (26 U. S. C. A. 101, sub (8)), and the Treasury regulation on that is sec. 39.101 (8) (1) of regulation 118).

We were referring yesterday to this book about character education in the Soviet Union. One of the committee members, I think it was Mr. Reece, asked me to read over a paragraph in the foreword by Dr. George S. Counts. I think Mr. Hays asked a question as well. The statement was that as soon as the Soviets 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. There is a very important fact in there which seems to appear wherever these revolutionary movements with education take shape. In Russia, for example, it appears to be the case that they did use the progressive system to start with. They used it to destroy



the old tradition. Having destroyed the old tradition, they moved in with positive indoctrination to protect revolutionary gains.

That is the technique. First you destroy what is. You move in with force and put in what you want to do, and then you positively put the mind in a straightjacket and defend that status. It may be of interest to note that in the February-March issue, 1934, of Progressive Education magazine, Nucia P. Lodge, who is one of the translators of some of George Counts' books, and worked on the Russian books with Counts, wrote an article in which she propounds the question, Has Soviet Russia repudiated progressive methods?

Mr. HAYS. When was this written?

Mr. SARGENT. In January and February 1934.

Mr. HAYS. Do you know anything about Dr. Counts at all except what you read from his books?

Mr. SARGENT. I have read his writings somewhat extensively. I know him from books.

Mr. HAYS. Do you know anything about Elizabeth Bentley?

Mr. SARGENT. I have heard of her from the newspapers. She testified on the Alger Hiss hearing.

Mr. HAYS. She was a Communist at one time.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. She is now repentant.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. You have read some things from Dr. Counts' writings to indicate at least that if he was not a Communist, that he was an extreme leftwing thinker.

Mr. SARGENT. He had very extreme views, and he had a profound influence on the educational system.

Mr. HAYS. Along about the same time that Elizabeth Bentley was an active Communist?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. Do you know anything about his present views?

Mr. SARGENT. He has written that he has purportedly changed. The book does not show that he repudiates the right to use the school system as a political instrument to modify the social order. I have seen that book.

Mr. HAYS. If we had him in here and he swears that he changed his mind and could bring something to prove that he is an active anti-Communist, which he now is, then he would become as sacred as Elizabeth Bentley. You cannot accept one repentance without accepting others.

Mr. SARGENT. This is not a personal attack on Counts at all. This is a comment on the damage done on the educational system by conditions of this sort. It is directed squarely to the point that Congress wishes to do something to make this damage unlikely in the future. This is not a personal vendetta at Counts or anybody else.

Mr. HAYS. Thanks to Mrs. Pfost, I found your remarks about the book. You said:

If you want a quick picture of this revolt of the so-called intellectual group during the 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.

Mr. SARGENT. I said atmosphere, yes.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, you were recommending a certain portion of the book. Do you want to repudiate everything but that one page?

Mr. SARGENT. No, I am not required to buy the whole of a book because it has one paragraph which seems to be accurate. Quite often in the trial of a case you use testimony as an admission from the defendant. It fits the case perfectly. You don't have to buy the rest of his testimony because you cite a portion of it.

Mr. HAYS. It has always been among people who knew what they were doing in research that you had to establish the credibility of the sources you cite. You seem to want to establish that by picking a paragraph here and there that suits your purpose, and any other contradictory paragraph, that guy was wrong about that—"He is only right when he agrees with me."

Mr. SARGENT. I said atmosphere, Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS. I know what you said.

Mr. SARGENT. Atmosphere is what was being publicly discussed at the time, and that statement of the atmosphere I think is a correct statement. That is all I had to say on the point.

Mr. HAY. Just a minute. I have this here to read.

Mr. SARGENT. I understood I was to go through with this and to be cross-examined later.

Mr. HAYS. You get a lot of misunderstandings.

Mr. SARGENT. Wasn't that the agreement?

Mr. HAYS. We are getting a lot of agreements here that we bring these people back later, but I have a sneaking suspicion that this committee is going to run out of money and you are going to get to spread your diatribe on the record and go home.

Mr. SARGENT. That is unfair. I offered at the opening of the hearing, and I will be back next Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. The understanding is that at the conclusion of Mr. Sargent's testimony, and at the next session, he will be available for questioning at length.

Mr. HAYS. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an issue made here about whether or not I am telling the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't—

Mr. HAYS. Yes, there has. The man said he didn't say what he said and I said he did. I am going to read the record.

Mr. HAYS. Were you ever offered the counselship of the Cox committee?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, sir.

That is your answer, that is all.

Mr. HAYS. Do you have any documentary evidence to that effect?

Mr. SARGENT. Not in my possession. You mean a specific offering of the position or discussion of my possible employment?

Mr. HAYS. I asked you a specific question. Were you offered the counselship of the Cox committee?

And then you said:

In substance, yes.

That "Yes, sir," got sort of wishywashy there.

It was indicated verbally that my appointment would be looked upon favorably. The actual tender I do not think was made.

I know the actual tender was not made. I am preparing to bring in a witness, if the chairman will sign a subpoena, who will testify flatly

that after investigation they threw up their hands in horror and didn't want anything to do with you.

Mr. SARGENT. Oh, so?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. SARGENT. All right. Anything of that kind I will answer, and I will answer fully—

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman will just state that last statement is at variance with my information as a member of the committee.

Mr. HAYS. I would like the record to show that may be true, and I would not question you at all. But I think the record should also show that you only attended two committee meetings the whole time so you probably didn't have very much information about what went on.

The CHAIRMAN. I hardly think the record will show that.

Mr. HAYS. I believe it will. You know, we had a debate about that on the floor, and in the interchange, I got a little enthusiastic and I said you had only been there once. You asked me to correct that. And I said, "Well, we will say twice", and you accepted. That is in the Congressional Record.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't accept that.

Mr. SARGENT. The foundations were opposed to my employment. That is a fact.

Mr. HAYS. Judge Cox in his statement to the Congress was pretty worked up about the foundations and it hardly seems likely to me that he would have taken their advice about whom to employ.

Mr. SARGENT. I say the foundations were opposed to my employment. However, I would like to go on with this, if I may. I am here to conclude today, if I can arrange to do so.

There was reference in prior testimony to the League for Industrial Democracy, which is a tax-exempt corporation. I have some additional information to submit regarding its activities. Here is a letter bearing the signature of Harry W. Laidler, September 9, 1935. It is a photostat. It is addressed, "Dear Friend," and evidently it is one of his letters sent out circular fashion to a group of people, and not one addressed to an individual. It says:

If you could come into the LID office today you would receive reports of great productive educational activity in the summer, of an unusually full program for the fall, but of an empty treasury which threatens to seriously affect our work.

I am not going to read it, but leave it for the record. There is reference to the launching of their plans in high school, building up lecture circuits and in general carrying on propaganda within the educational system. It shows still as president of the organization Robert Morss Lovett, to whom I have referred.

(The letter is as follows:)

If you could come into the LID office today you would receive reports of great productive educational activity in the summer, of an unusually full program for the fall, but of an empty treasury which threatens seriously to affect our work.

The summer report would tell of an exceptionally good June conference on white collar and professional workers under capitalism. It would bring you the story of a group of 21 picked college students brought together in the L. I. D. summer school for 6 weeks of intensive training in field work with union and unemployed groups, of morning seminars in theory and tactic, of every-day discussions of problems common to students from California to the Carolinas. The schools built a comradeship which is basic for enduring work in the movement on the campus or in the field.

During the summer also the pamphlet *Strikes Under the New Deal* was completed and is now ready to mail. Research on two new pamphlets was vigorously pursued. Participation in the Young Congress helped greatly in formulating a militant program for the nation's youth.

As to plans for the immediate future—we must launch student organization everywhere and at once, early in the college and high school year. We must build up the lecture circuits in new centers. We must arrange various radio programs. We must complete the pamphlets begun in the summer. These are preliminary to establishing a new research service which we believe will double the amount of research produced and reach a much larger audience than we have had in the past. The Chicago office, with a plan for extended work in the metropolitan area, is ready to reopen. The emergency committee for strikers relief will be called upon to renew its efforts on behalf of the sharecroppers who are about to undertake a cotton pickers strike.

In addition to our major program, the L. I. D. continues its work of active cooperation with other groups. By arrangement with the New Beginning group, which carries on underground work in Germany, one of its leaders is to come to America under our auspices. With several defense organizations we are undertaking a campaign to widen the support for Angelo Herndon; we are active on the Sacramento defense committee to fight the criminal syndicalism laws in California. Other joint efforts find the L. I. D. actively participating.

The disastrous effects of an empty treasury are obvious. Won't you make the continuation of L. I. D. work possible by sending in a contribution or pledge now? \$9,000 is necessary if we are to meet the minimum requirements of the program for 1935, which in the face of social needs is at best adequate. Upon your immediate response depends the future of the L. I. D.

Sincerely yours, Norman Thomas, Harry W. Laidler.

Mr. SARGENT. I have some publications of this organization, showing their educational work. One is entitled, "Socialism in the United States, a Brief History, by Dr. Harry W. Laidler." The copyright date is 1952.

I have one entitled "A Housing Program for America." I don't see a copyright date on this.

Mrs. FROST. Mr. Sargent, is the printing paid by the foundation?

Mr. SARGENT. This organization itself is tax-exempt. I don't know whether or not a foundation paid for either the printing or the pamphlet. Your committee will have to find out what has been the source of revenue of this organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give the name of it again?

Mr. SARGENT. The League for Industrial Democracy. This one I don't see a copyright date. I can't peg the date for you.

Mr. HAYS. If they are under section 8 you are talking about whether they are tax-exempt or not, they can engage in propaganda.

Mr. SARGENT. But Congress has a right to consider whether it is wise to continue such a privilege when it has been used in effect to continue a lobby.

Mr. KOCH. This is the one that is under 8. It was Civil Liberties that you used before. This is under 6.

Mr. SARGENT. Here is one, *Toward a Farmer-Labor Party*, again by Harry W. Laidler. The copyright date is 1938.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, are these just submitted for the record, but not to be printed?

Mr. SARGENT. No, I just am referring to the fact that such a publication was made at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. They are submitted for the record but not for printing.

Mr. SARGENT. No. In fact, these are my personal copies. I want to take them away. The Library of Congress has them all. They are copyrighted publications. Here is a pamphlet called, *Russia—De-*

mocracy or Dictatorship, by Norman Thomas and Joel Seidman. The copyright is December 1939.

Mrs. PFOST. How widely circulated were these?

Mr. SARGENT. I think rather extensively. I don't know too much about that. They have an office in New York City out of which they disseminate various things. The address given here is 112 East 19th Street, New York City. I personally went to that office within the last year or two, I don't recall the exact date, and I purchased some publications of the British Fabian Society of Great Britain. I have three right here. One is called, National Coal Board, by G. D. H. Cole, revised edition.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, have you made any investigation into the Ku Klux Klan along about this period? You are back in that period, and I wonder if you think it was good or bad?

Mr. SARGENT. Is that a tax-exempt organization?

Mr. HAYS. Depending which State it was in, it was something.

Mr. SARGENT. I know nothing about it, and I would like to proceed with my testimony.

Mr. HAYS. Do you think it was bad?

Mr. SARGENT. I would like to proceed with my testimony.

Mr. HAYS. What you would like has no bearing.

Mr. SARGENT. I think it is a bad organization. May I proceed with my testimony?

Mr. HAYS. You have been more than arrogant, and you can keep on going that way, but if I have some questions to ask, get it straight I am going to ask them.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hays, we must have some decorum here, and bringing up the Ku Klux Klan is evidently done for—

Mr. HAYS. No, it is not. It is right in the book that the witness submitted. I will read it for you.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't cite any such thing.

Mr. HAYS. It is in your book. You brought the book in.

Mr. SARGENT. Must we talk about the whole book?

Mr. HAYS. It might be more interesting than a lot of stuff you are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Ku Klux Klan has nothing to do with this investigation by any stretch of the imagination. As Members of Congress, let us accept our responsibility and proceed with this study in as orderly fashion as possible. Let us not make inferences on anybody.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Reece, I am not making any inferences, but if you want any arguments about accepting our responsibilities as Members of Congress, I am willing to argue with you. I think we have a responsibility as Members of Congress not to bring in any obscure character assassins and dignify them by letting them use this as a forum to assassinate right and left, such people as Senator Douglas, and Mr. Edward R. Murrow. Even this witness will never remotely get the prominence they have by even trying to assassinate their character, although he may get cheap publicity out of it. There is no inference there. I said it straight.

Mr. SARGENT. I read the entire list of names. Mr. Murrow's name about the middle. I gave it no special reference.

Mr. HAYS. And you mentioned a former Member of the United States Senate from North Carolina. If the chairman was so inter-

ested in observing decorum and rules, he would not let you drop names because it suits your purpose.

Mr. SARGENT. I am glad I have not cited the Encyclopedia Britannica because then we would have to discuss all the articles.

Mr. HAYS. I have no doubt from your attitude you are an authority on all the subjects.

Mr. SARGENT. I purchased these pamphlets in the League of Industrial Democracy in New York City. I gave the title. It is about the national coal board. The copyright date on that is September 1948, and a revised edition January 1949. It was purchased by me subsequent to that at that office.

I have another Fabian tract here, this is No. 288, entitled, "Rearmament—How Far?" It says that it contains speeches at a Fabian conference in the summer of 1951. The address given is Fabian Publications, Ltd., 11 Dartmouth Street, S. W. 1. I presume that means London.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation that he keeps talking about the Fabian Society and you said the Ku Klux Klan had no relevance to this hearing. I will tell you what it is. Both are dead as the dodo bird, so you can compare them on one basis. One was an extreme left-wing outfit and the other extreme right-wing Fascist outfit. If we are going to have a course in ancient history, we ought to have all phases of it.

Mr. SARGENT. Here is a 1950 pamphlet, a very recent document of the League for Industrial Democracy. It reveals the political part of the organization by the panel of speakers. The program listed is Freedom and the Welfare State Today, a Symposium, by Oscar R. Ewing, Herbert H. Lehman, George Meany, Walter P. Reuther and it says "and others" "Harry W. Laidler, editor." Would you like me to read the names of the others?

Mr. HAYS. I think you have enough prominent names in there to at least convince the committee that you heard of a few prominent people.

Mr. SARGENT. I would like to know whether you wish the other names read.

Mr. HAYS. It is immaterial to me.

Mr. SARGENT. If you don't want them read, I am not desiring to, particularly.

I have another one from the League for Industrial Democracy. This is 1949. It is entitled "Education and the Social Order," by John Dewey, showing the organization sponsorship of the John Dewey philosophy.

Here is a pamphlet which is copyrighted 1945, entitled "Forty Years of Education, a Symposium." It says on the cover "By Upton Sinclair and many others." The participants here on the inside of the title page are, and I am reading them in order, column 1, and then column 2, Upton Sinclair, Eleanor Roosevelt, Arthur Creech Jones, Frank Scott, Charles G. Bolte, Wallace J. Campbell, John L. Childs, Julius Hochman, Harry W. Laidler, Algernon Lee, Newbold Morris, Harry A. Overstreet, Mark Starr, Norman Thomas, Theresa Wolfson, and it says, "and many others."

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask you right there, Could you give me any semblance of a reason why you read those names? What is the pertinence?

Mr. SARGENT. To show that this organization is political in character. It brings in political people and supports political issues of a certain type.

Mr. HAYS. Do you mean to infer that it brings in the wrong kind of political people?

Mr. SARGENT. The statute makes no difference between good or bad propaganda. It says organizations under this exemption shall not carry on propaganda.

Mr. HAYS. This foundation you are the head of, if you ever get any money, what kind of propaganda are you going to carry on?

Mr. SARGENT. We are not going to carry on any propaganda at all. We are going to support the Constitution of the United States. We are going to study factually the conspiracy threatening the United States Government, and give full publicity to it by educational materials to get the truth to the people.

Mr. HAYS. You say you are going to get the truth to the people? Do you think anybody might think at all that what you have to say might be propaganda?

Mr. SARGENT. I think you will undoubtedly disagree with me, Mr. Hays. I am expecting that.

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask you this. Do you think because Eleanor Roosevelt and Norman Thomas and Newbold Morris all attended the same meeting, that is some sort of discredit, we will say, to Mrs. Roosevelt?

Mr. SARGENT. I am not talking about discredit. I am saying the activity is political in nature and the prominence of all these political people establishes the fact.

Mr. HAYS. You are not inferring that there is any left wing stuff about it?

Mr. SARGENT. This is an organization having a so-called liberal flavor to it.

Mr. HAYS. So the very association gives a bad connotation.

Mr. SARGENT. I am not talking about anything they do which is not political. I am not attacking any individuals. I am saying they were there. You are not authorized to infer such a statement from me.

Finally, there was a meeting of the John Dewey Society—not the John Dewey Society, the League for Industrial Democracy; this bears the copyright date 1950. It is a meeting held as a tribute to John Dewey. The people present at that meeting, according to the statement here, were John Dewey, David Dubinsky, Irwin Edman, Frank D. Fackenthal, Felix Frankfurter, Alice Hoffman, John Haynes Holmes, Hu Shih, William H. Kilpatrick, Harry W. Laidler, William Pepperell Montague, Joy Elmer Morgan, Jawaharlal Nehru—

Mr. HAYS. You have heard of him?

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't see the last name first. Ralph Barton Perry, Walter Reuther, Rebecca Simonson.

Now, my next item has to do with a project financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. I have a photostat of the announcement here, "Building America. The general education board of the Rockefeller Foundation provided over \$50,000 to assist in the development of 'Building America,' now endorsed by outstanding educators in every State, distributed by the Grolier Society, Inc." That is a publishing concern in New York.

That photostat came into my possession in approximately around 1946 or so. The Grolier Society was handling the books at the time.

I am now proposing to show you what the people of the United States got for this \$50,000 gift from the Rockefeller Foundation. I have here a book out of the Library of Congress, it is Volume II, Building America.

Mr. HAYS. Are you just going to read a paragraph or two out of it?

Mr. SARGENT. I will read as much as you want. I am discussing one article here.

Mr. HAYS. Nobody seems to care about the taxpayers and all the stuff that they let you put in the record that we will have to pay for printing. You might as well read it all to get a true picture.

Mr. SARGENT. I don't have time. I will show you the samples.

Mr. HAYS. You don't work; do you? You have no job; do you? You have lots of time; don't you?

Mr. SARGENT. I am here at \$6 a day at a sacrifice. I think that is immaterial.

Mr. HAYS. That is not quite as much as \$125 a day that you offered your services.

Mr. SARGENT. Mr. Hays, I would like to go on without being insulted.

This is a sample of the material as it was issued. This book here, volume II, contains a series of units discussing various topics. The topics are articles, Our Constitution, Safety, Clothing, Social Security, Steel, We Consumers, Conservation, and Movies.

The original publications in pamphlet form one unit at a time, such as I have here, the one on Russia—China, rather—I have one on Russia. They were published serially and when the stack was completed, they would combine them in order in the shape of a book.

The publication in question originated with the Society for Curriculum Study, an organization established at Ohio State University.

Mr. HAYS. That is really a leftwing institution. Senator Bricker is one of the trustees out there.

Mr. SARGENT. I said Ohio State University originated it.

Mr. HAYS. They don't even allow—

Mr. SARGENT. It has an interesting history which I would like to trace.

Mr. HAYS. Don't talk while I am going. You brought in Ohio State in a nasty way, as you have a cute habit of doing. It happens that is the principal university in my State, and it so happens that it is generally considered to be a very conservative institution with men of the general political thinking of Senator John W. Bricker, of Ohio, on the board of trustees. Some of the members of the board of trustees were appointed by Senator Bricker. I don't want any inference there—and I will use this term very generously—no neophyte who knows nothing about education and has obviously proved it in 3 days, is going to slander Ohio State University. You may slander some people and some institutions, but let us keep the record straight on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state on his own account that he doesn't consider that there is any slur attached to Ohio State University. I share the same high regard for Ohio State University as does the gentleman from Ohio. I think that the record standing of Mr. Sargent, who is before the committee, speaks for itself.



Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, that is a good statement. Just what is the record standing of Mr. Sargent? He is a self-appointed expert. He says that himself.

The CHAIRMAN. It is all in the record at the beginning of his testimony in order to qualify him. If you looked at yesterday's statement you will find it.

Mr. HAYS. I looked it over when I qualified him, and I qualified him at the go that he weaseled out of the truth at the beginning. If that is the qualification we want to have, let us have it understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The courts are available if he has weaseled on the truth.

Mr. HAYS. Don't worry, I will submit it to Mr. Brownell, and if he ever gets done with the McCarthy hearings on perjury, maybe he will have time to look at this one. I think he is going to be a busy man for a long time.

Mr. SARGENT. If you will make a statement off the floor of Congress, I will take care of it.

Mr. HAYS. I will make a speech in my district on Sunday, and I will have a lot to say about you, and it will all be off the floor of Congress, and I will submit you a copy.

Mr. SARGENT. This article to which I refer is entitled "Our Constitution." It contains the elements of the plan to pack the United States Supreme Court. I personally examined the copyright documents in the Federal Copyright Office here in Washington, and discovered that the publication of this document was October 1936. In short, this material got into the hands of teachers, and presumably pupils in public schools, before the November 1936 Presidential election, and several months before the bill was introduced in February 1937 to pack the Federal judiciary.

Here are some of the statements contained in this article. This is for classroom use and discussion. The publication originally was for the secondary school level. It has since been graded down to be used in elementary schools when the children do not have an understanding sufficient to deal with the issues propounded here. It propounds a question whether the Constitution as drawn up serves the needs of the American people and what changes have been made in the Constitution, and the Supreme Court decisions on it. Whether further changes should be made in the Constitution to serve the needs of the American people.

With your permission I have a copy of the same thing which is marked. I would like to read from my copy, because it will save time. I have the same article.

Mr. HAYS. If it is all the same with the committee, I would like you to read from the Library of Congress copy.

Mr. SARGENT. Then I will use my copy to identify the passages and then turn over and read it.

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't make any difference which copy you read from.

Mr. HAYS. It may not to you, but it does to me.

Mr. SARGENT. I am very glad to do that. There is a discussion here about Shea's Rebellion, and the weakness of Congress before the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It says that the States appointed delegates to a convention. That Samuel Adams, a friend of liberty, was absent from the convention. That Patrick Henry

declined "because he said he smelled a rat." I am reading exact quotes here—

That nearly all the men who gave their great talent to the job were capable, well-to-do lawyers, planters, merchants, bankers, or businessmen. Some of them had lent money to carry on the Revolution. Many held continental bonds and paper money which were almost worthless, but which they wanted the new government to make good. None of the delegation was a city mechanic or a small farmer who owned little or no property.

It says on page 7 that the convention held together by the strength of a hair only because the delegates were agreed on one main point—

They wanted a strong government to protect property against the common man who owned little more than the strength and skill of his hands.

There is a cartoon on two pages here, 8 and 9, portraying the function of the Supreme Court as the killing of legislation. The instance given here is the 16th amendment, the income-tax amendment. With the people demanding an income-tax law, the veto. Here in the cartoon is a scroll of paper portrayed as a man standing before the Supreme Court and pleading, and on the other side he lies on the floor dead, and it says here :

Killed in test case before Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision.

Mr. HAYS. Could you identify the cartoon, where it first appeared, and so on?

Mr. SARGENT. It doesn't contain any name here. It is just in the book.

Mr. HAYS. It must have been in some newspaper or somewhere.

Mr. SARGENT. I don't know where it was. It may have been drawn for the purposes of the book. I have no knowledge one way or the other.

On pages 10 and 11 there are more scenes. Here is a picture of the Black Legion with two men dressed in the robes of the Black Legion.

Mr. HAYS. You think kids should not know that?

Mr. SARGENT. They should have an honest presentation of both sides and at an age when they can understand it.

Mr. HAYS. Probably the only way we could get an honest presentation would be for you to write one. Why don't you write one and see if you can get it printed.

Mr. SARGENT. On page 24, there is what is called the New Deal score, listing the various prominent cases at the time, the TVA case, the Gold Clause case, Hot Oil, and various other decisions. Then we have here on page 26, the statements of what the liberals propose, and I will read them all :

1. Have Congress pass an act requiring at least a 6 to 3 vote in the Supreme Court to declare any Federal law unconstitutional.

2. Have Congress propose a sweeping amendment which would make it constitutional to pass any law providing for the general welfare for poor people.

3. Compel all justices to retire on pensions when reaching the age 70. (A bill which allows Supreme Court Justices over 70 years of age to retire on full pay if they so desire has been recently passed by Congress.)

4. Add justices to the Supreme Court, in this way making it more responsive to the will of the people.

In short, the propaganda of these agencies with foundation aid had reached the point where they were advocating court packing and were putting it in the American public-school system.

I am talking now about the National Education Association, which is also a tax-exempt organization, an organization whose charter the Congress has a right to examine if it is considered wise to do so. I will refer to the NEA.

Mr. HAYS. Would you mind if I asked you a question about the membership of the NEA?

Mr. SARGENT. If you wish.

Mr. HAYS. Am I right in saying that the membership of the NEA comprises about every primary and secondary schoolteacher in the United States?

Mr. SARGENT. A very large membership, yes. They have little or no control over the actions of the people at the top.

Mr. HAYS. They probably know more about that than you do.

Mr. SARGENT. I would be reluctant to believe they did in view of some of the activities we find. The National Education Association later took over this publication, Building America, and sponsored it actively and sold it. They sponsored it for use in California in a proceeding in which I participated, and where charges made by the Sons of the American Revolution and represented by me were sustained and held to be completely with foundation. The charges had to do with a special edition of Building America, three books. There was 1 book for the seventh grade, and 2 books for the eighth grade. These books were compiled by taking certain of these Building America pamphlets, and publishing them in a predetermined order. When you see the order in these books, you find what you have here is a stacked deck.

The first book in the seventh grade, before children have anything in the way of teaching, or did have in our school system at the time, in American history, is devoted to China. This article is written in effect according to the Owen Lattimore line, involving the betrayal of American interests in China. A committee of the California Legislature was appointed to investigate that matter, and they found just exactly that.

I will read you what they said about this Building America unit on China, or a portion of it. I will leave the pamphlet with you for further study:

This book is peculiarly useful to the Communists as a medium to further disseminate the current party line concerning conditions in China.

That was the finding of a California legislative committee on this article.

The next article had to do with Soviet Russia, indoctrination on that score. It is an obvious piece of propaganda. It begins on the first page with a question propounded to Stalin:

Are you going to try to communize the United States?

Mrs. PROST. Is that in the large book? You are quoting now from a pamphlet.

Mr. SARGENT. This is in the book, yes. I will read from the book itself. It is the same thing. This is the California edition I have here of the book on Russia. The second unit is Russia.

Mr. HAYS. Is the California edition different?

Mr. SARGENT. No, it is identical. This is merely the California stacked deck of the original. It was arranged in a propaganda manner to make it more effective.

Mr. HAYS. Was the deck stacked by somebody in California or the NEA?

Mr. SARGENT. The NEA I understand sponsored the publication in its present form for California use.

Mr. HAYS. You understand that?

Mr. SARGENT. They did.

Mr. HAYS. All right.

Mr. SARGENT. I was present in the legislative hall in Sacramento, Calif., when a letter was read from the National Education Association in Washington urging the legislative committee to sustain the books which were these books I have before me now, and I am testifying from. This is for seventh graders at a highly impressionable age, and propounds this question supposed to have been answered by Stalin whether he is trying to communize the United States. The answer:

Of course not—

was followed by the question:

Are you going to try to turn the Soviet Union into a democracy?

Mr. HAYS. What was the answer to that question?

Mr. SARGENT. It is not answered. The next sentence said:

The truth of this story is far less important than the point it makes.

The article traces the course of the Russian Revolution. Here on page 78 is a discussion of one-party government. The first paragraph:

The 1936 constitution begins by stating that the U. S. S. R. is a Socialist state of workers and peasants. The land is the common property of the people who also own the means of production, distribution, and transportation. It contains all the famous freedoms, freedom of speech, press, assembly, and conscience.

Mrs. FROST. Mr. Sargent, what years were these textbooks used in the California schools?

Mr. SARGENT. They were actively proposed in 1946.

Mrs. FROST. Are they still being used in California?

Mr. SARGENT. No, they were never used because the legislature refused to appropriate the money. The Superintendent of Public Instruction denounced the legislature for refusing to furnish the money to buy these books and continued to carry on an agitation to attempt to force them in our schools. They had been literally compelled by legislative process to refrain from putting these books in the schools of California.

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask you this. You read what the Soviet constitution purports to say and probably it does say that. I don't know, I never read it, but does it anywhere in that volume say that they have not lived up to what the constitution says?

Mr. SARGENT. It contains a few statements which are claimed to take the curse off the thing, but the net weight is propaganda in that direction.

Mr. HAYS. But you are not reading any of the statements in which they might point out that although the Soviet Government says so and so, it does such and so else?

Mr. SARGENT. It contains some weasel words on the other side, yes. I have not time to read the entire publication. It is here for you to look at.

Mr. HAYS. You ought to be an expert on that.

Mr. SARGENT. I think the legislative committee of California is an expert. I have right here before me the legislative committee report. So you don't have to take my word.

Mr. HAYS. It that the Tenney report?

Mr. SARGENT. No, the Dilworth committee, a committee of high standing operating since 1946, and has rendered to date 12 reports, including the situation at Pasadena, which has been grossly misrepresented by the National Education Association.

The CHAIRMAN. I would be interested in its evaluation.

Mr. SARGENT. The evaluation on this Russian article in the third report of the Senate Investigating Committee on Education of the California Legislature, this is known to us as the Dilworth committee. Senator Nelson Dilworth of Riverside County, Calif., is its chairman. The discussion on the Russian article commences at page 78 and it says:

If any book in the Building America series were examined for Communist propaganda, this would be the most natural target. Assuming that some of the writers who had to do with the drafting of the material for this particular volume wanted to say nice things about the Soviet Union and subtly play up the good points of Marxism and play down the worst features, and assuming further that they were quite aware of the probability that this book would be the first to go through a critical examination: How would they proceed?

In the first place, there is always propaganda through the omission from text material of objectionable topics. An example of this has already been seen in the volume of China, in the omission of mentioning the very solid ties between the Chinese Communist Party and the Kremlin. Then there is the use of the illustration. This is a particularly effective technique in books of this sort, designed for use by grammar-school children who are prone to pay more attention to the many photographic pictures than to the comparatively dry text. Thus all the Russian women are robust, sturdy, well-fed, well-dressed, and appear to have been freshly scrubbed.

Every field is lush with grain or corn; every barn is bursting with hay; the people are smiling and happy. None of these Soviet citizens appear to be afraid of the secret police, the purges, exile to the salt mines or party discipline. The scarcity of necessary materials bothers them but little; stores are shown displaying flowered yardage materials, there are pictures of gay ballerinas in the theaters, traveling shops serving the collective farmers in the fields, church services to dispel the silly notion that there is anything athiestic about these carefree Marxists.

Among other things this analysis of the legislative report lists the front organizations of some of the authors of reference material in these books, among them Anna Louise Strong, Albert Rhys, Allen Roberts. The analysis of this particular unit showed among other things that the reference materials were practically study lists to indoctrinate teachers in communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Earlier you quoted from a California book a statement to the effect that the Russian constitution guaranteed the four freedoms, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and so forth. Was that quoting from the Russian constitution, or was that a statement contained in that book on the author's responsibility, in which case it would be purely propaganda?

Mr. SARGENT. The particular statement there in the text here is not in quotes. The part in quotes in that paragraph is simply this: "Socialist state of workers and peasants." The rest purports to be a statement of what the Russian constitution contains.

Mr. HAYS. May I see it?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of that material has been authoritatively circulated, and urged to be used in the public schools, and it is disturbing to me unless there is some satisfactory explanation of it.

Mr. HAYS. There are some things. The constitution recognized the Communist Party and forbids the formation of any other political organization. It defines the party as "the leading core" and those are quotes, and the direct nucleus of all organizations. It goes on to say that many minor positions in the Government are held by non-party members. However, since the party is the leading core in the organization it is doubted whether a candidate of whom the party disapproves could be elected to the office.

Mr. SARGENT. And you are expecting a seventh grade school child to evaluate material like that without studying history. I said it was propaganda, because of the grade level.

Mr. HAYS. Understand, I am not saying that the Building America books are all right. I don't know anything about them. I know they have been the subject of a great deal of controversy. The point I am making is—and I have never seen one until this minute—there are 2 or 3 statements that might be a little derogatory about the Communists.

Mr. SARGENT. There are some statements as a clever attempt to take the curse off the propoganda load in the books, yes. The California committee also found that the photographs in here came from SCFOTO, which is the Soviet propoganda agency. They also noted in here—

Mr. HAYS. Seriously, let me ask you a question, and I am very serious about this. Presuming, and I assume you think we should teach our children something about Communist Russia—I mean we can't say it does not exist—how would you go about it? I am very serious, and I want to tell you why. I got a letter the other day from a teacher in my district, and he said:

I am writing to you because I have to teach something about Russia and the Communist system—  
and he said—

I have heard you speak about being behind the Iron Curtain and what it does to people. I would like to have some material on that, but—

he said, and this is the significant thing—

I am afraid to write to the Russian Embassy or to any place else to get even their side of it to show what kind of propoganda they put out, because in the little town I live in, if I got a letter from them, I would be immediately suspect.

In other words, the poor guy wanted to get hold of some of this propoganda so he can show the children how they indoctrinate people, and there is no freedom and he is afraid. How would you do it?

Mr. SARGENT. I would obey the statutes of California which provide that it is unlawful for a teacher to advocate communism, that it is allowable to teach truthfully and factually the subject at a grade level where the pupil has a proper foundation and is able to understand it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, that is no answer.

Mr. SARGENT. It is. I would do exactly that. I would not put it in an elementary school.

Mr. HAYS. Forget that. How are you going to teach them about it. The teachers now are afraid to mention the word. You can't fight an evil like communisim by saying it does not exist.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will permit an observation on my part, a teacher that has presumably qualified himself to teach school and doesn't know enough about communism in Soviet Russia to adequately teach the students, I think ought to be given another examination.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Reece, that is a nice statement. I don't mind you engaging in a little pleasant demagoguery. I am sure that will read good down in Tennessee. How is the average American teacher going to know much about Russia or anything else unless he reads some books. He is not going to stand before the class and say, "I am an authority on Soviet Russia; it stinks. We will go on to England."

The CHAIRMAN. The average American teacher today is a college graduate and a large percentage of the teachers today are graduate students in some phase, and they have had a wide opportunity to study every reasonable facet of education and American history, or at least even in the distant era when I was teaching school that was to a very large degree the case. I don't minimize the problem that you raise there, however. The teacher does have an important responsibility.

Mr. SARGENT. We have a great educational need there, Mr. Hays, which should be met. It is the opinion of many that the place to start is to form a good course of study and to start aiding the educators who are of the same turn of mind to understand what this is, to devise the teaching material and do a positive job. I am all in favor of that being done.

Mr. HAYS. Is that supposed to be a geography book you are reading from?

Mr. SARGENT. This is social studies. You have been talking about social studies and foundations' support for them. This is social studies as received by the people of California by the gift of the Rockefeller Foundation and others.

Mr. HAYS. Do you have any textbooks in the social studies that you would recommend as being all right?

Mr. SARGENT. I am not familiar with all the books they are using. Of course, we have. As social studies, I think the social studies concept has proved to be a vehicle for propaganda, and is erroneous. Many believe that history should be taught factually as a subject, and the other subjects should be taught factually, and not mixed in this form.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, you think you ought to teach history by teaching them that in 1492 Columbus discovered America, and in 1776 there was a revolution, and in 1860 Lincoln was elected President of the United States, and in 1861 some nasty southerners started a rebellion against the country. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. That is factual, but do you think that will be valuable?

Mr. SARGENT. Did I say that?

Mr. HAYS. I am trying to find out what you mean.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say that. I said history should be taught as a factual subject.

Mr. HAYS. Is that what you mean by factual?

Mr. SARGENT. No; I do not mean that. I mean the teaching of significant movements which have occurred throughout American history, the movement which resulted in the Declaration of Independence, and so on.

Mr. HAYS. I think all teachers teach that. What about the Know-Nothing Party? How would you handle that? Do you remember that movement?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. It was a very discriminatory and disreputable organization.

Mr. HAYS. What about the Whig Party? What would you say about it?

Mr. SARGENT. I think a discussion of the Whig Party would be a very profitable thing, particularly now. The history of the Whig Party is very significant.

Mr. HAYS. What about the background and what caused the break-up of the Whig Party? Would you let them find out anything about that, or just say it was not there any more?

Mr. SARGENT. At the proper grade level I definitely would.

Mr. HAYS. Somebody somewhere along the line is going to disagree with something that is said. No teacher in a classroom can keep track of everything that every student says, and somebody will disagree, and some organization will say, "My goodness, look what they are letting them say in school."

Mr. SARGENT. I am talking about the blackout in history in California and no history books furnished in the department of education from 1928 until almost 1940. They were following the line advocated by the progressive education group at Columbia University. A legislative investigation started before they began to furnish history books as required by law. There was no history.

Mr. HAYS. I don't know anything about the blackout in California, and I don't know whether this is the proper place to go into that. I don't think there was any blackout in my State.

Mr. SARGENT. Ohio may be perfect. Other places are not quite so good.

Mr. HAYS. No; but Ohio does not have as many radicals on both sides as California does. I think that is a generally accepted fact.

Mr. SARGENT. May I go on, please. I would like to finish my presentation.

Mr. HAYS. It is all right with me.

Mr. SARGENT. As further evidence of the propaganda purpose and that these books are a stacked deck, I call your attention to the fact that the last articles at the end of the eighth grade, after all that material goes in, the last articles are "Our Constitution," "Civil Liberties," and "Civic Responsibility." But all the other material comes first. The Constitution article is the one I referred you to here. The Dilworth committee report points out something else. This Russian article contained many cartoons of Stalin. There were no pictures at all of Lincoln or Jefferson, but there were two very derogatory cartoons put in. These cartoons were put in a revised edition after the legislative investigation had started, showing a deliberate attempt to throw propaganda into the schoolbooks. Here is one showing Lincoln burying the Constitution. The cartoon is reproduced in this report. The text quoted by the Dilworth report says:

"In violation of the Bill of Rights, President Lincoln threw people suspected of disloyalty into prison without trial. Military courts heard civilian cases. Chief Justice Taney was alarmed at these illegal measures, but Lincoln defended his action as a necessity of war. 'It is better to save the Union without a Constitution,' he said, 'than to save the Constitution without a Union.'"



The committee is profoundly shocked at this one-sided and derogatory presentation of President Lincoln. It leaves out all that is noble and inspiring to all peoples in the world in the character and acts of President Lincoln who freed a great race from slavery and is today the outstanding exponent in history of the rights of the common man.

"Before the advent of communistic philosophy into this country after the Russian Revolution, the teachers of the schools all over the United States encouraged the children to bring pennies to school to build the great memorial monument to Lincoln on the banks of the Potomac at our National Capital.

"Nothing so vividly illustrates the change in attitude of some of our national educational leaders in some policy-forming positions of the National Education Association of professional educators and teachers as this about-face toward the memory of Abraham Lincoln who lived and labored 'That government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.'"

Here is one on Thomas Jefferson attempting to tear down the Constitution—this is for the elementary grades.

The Dilworth report says:

There are two great Americans that the devotees of foreign isms and ideologies consistently smear. They are Abraham Lincoln because he suppressed a revolution and Thomas Jefferson because he is the great advocate of rights of the State and individual as opposed to centralized government control.

The Dilworth committee also says:

If cartoons are so vital for a textbook, why were none used for Russia or Stalin?

The conclusion of this report, and it is a unanimous report of the California Legislature, is that they consider it their duty to publish a complete evaluation of the propaganda and they find the books to be unfit for use in our schools. They did make that evaluation. They found among other things that 113 Communist-front organizations had to do with some of the material in these books and that 50 Communist-front authors were connected with it. Among the authors are Sidney and Beatrice Webb, identified with the Fabian Socialist Movement in Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN. I failed to catch those numbers.

Mr. SARGENT. 113 front organizations. This reference is at page 47 of the report, and 50 front authors. The reference is at page 48. I will be glad to leave my report for the convenience of the committee.

Mr. HAYS. Do I understand that these books are not in use anywhere in California?

Mr. SARGENT. No. We succeeded in defending ourselves against them.

Mr. HAYS. Do you think they are in use anywhere?

Mr. SARGENT. They were for some time. Texas rejected them by action of their State board of education, as I am informed. There have been questions about them elsewhere.

There was a program to put these in the schools everywhere and it is my understanding that the California proceeding broke it up.

To illustrate the extent to which building a new social order is a program in these books, let me read the titles serially to show that it is a very unusual curriculum. This is commencing with the 7th grade, and running through the 8th:

China, Russia, East Indies, Our Neighbors in North Africa, America's Outposts, Italian Americans, Seeing America, Foreign Trade, Lend-Lease, Oil, Rubber, Seeing America, Our Federal Government, Congress, Politics, Machinery for Foreign Relations, Social Security, Community Planning, Our Land Resources, Our Water Resources, Conservation, We Americans, the American Indians,

Spanish Speaking People, Family Life, Arts and the American Craftsmen, America Discovers Its Songs, The American Theater, Our Constitution, Civil Liberties, For the Right to Liberty, and Civil Responsibilities.

Someone has passed me a note stating that the Building America books are being used in Arlington right now. I do not know that for a fact. Your committee may want to inquire.

One more illustration on propaganda, and I will turn to another subject. This article on social security, which is not part of the curriculum to begin with, no place in an elementary grade, is not a prescribed course of study, here is a full page picture the size of a Saturday Evening Post cover, with a destitute woman with a child in her arms. That is your propaganda you will find throughout these books, the seamy side of American life, the unfortunate; sympathetic Russia is sweetness and light. The United States is a place of destitution, failure, unsound conditions. The propaganda impact of that kind on a child of tender years is obvious. The California Legislature barred them.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the same series?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, that is the same series. That was barred in California, too. These lead me to another topic.

I was talking about the propaganda activities of the National Education Association.

Another one was carried on by the National Education Association which interjected itself into a controversy involving the superintendent of schools at Pasadena, Calif., Mr. Willard L. Goslin. Mr. Goslin's conduct was unsatisfactory to the Pasadena people. They opposed a bond issue which he wanted passed, they were opposed to his policies of bringing people from Columbia to workshops, for example, William H. Kilpatrick.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what we have to do with Pasadena's problems about the superintendent of schools.

Mr. SARGENT. You will find out in a minute. The National Education Association injected themselves into the case and chastised the people of Pasadena for firing the superintendent of schools. They have no right to invade the local jurisdiction of schools; that is a political activity.

Mr. HAYS. Were you engaged in that fight at all?

Mr. SARGENT. No, sir; I had no part in it. I did go down and find out what happened afterwards. I had no connection with it. That was not my case.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to state here since so many references have been made to the witness, and I have no responsibility for him, that all my checking indicates that he is an eminent lawyer in California with a very high standing.

Mr. SARGENT. This is another report of the Dilworth committee of the California Legislature. It is the eighth report of that committee. It contains at page 93 a reprinting of a document which purports to be made by Harold Benjamin, chairman of the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA. It is entitled, "Report on the Enemy." It was delivered at an NEA meeting, 88th delegate assembly, at St. Louis, Mo., July 3, 1946. In this article he portrays the people as enemies of their schools and says in substance that the educational profession should organize to combat them. He says some of these people are traveling under alias. Some of them

are taxpayers. Some of them are antitax groups, heated patriots and opponents of Columbia Red pragmatism and so on. This document I will likewise leave with you.

Incidentally, on my own investigation—Mr. Benjamin in this article ascribes all of the responsibility—not all but a substantial part of it to one Allen A. Zoll of New York, who wrote a statement about progressive education which is printed in this report, and which is certainly an entirely proper statement for any person to make—Benjamin says that statement by Allen Zoll took over the entire controversy and had a decisive influence. Mr. Benjamin sent an investigator to Pasadena to inquire into this case, a Mr. Skaife, of the National Education Association. Mr. Skaife inquired into this case and found the charge about Allen Zoll was unsubstantiated and nonfounded and rendered such a report to the National Education Association before Mr. Benjamin delivered this false attack on the people. I think that is an important example of propaganda activity by a tax-exempt organization, namely, the National Education Association.

There is more to this story of the smearing of American people by tax-exempt groups. I have one here which is a true copy of a letter sent by this Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of the NEA. It is called Inquiry Into Unjustified Attacks on Public Education, A Questionnaire. I wish to have this put in full in the transcript. In the interest of saving time I will not read it all. This document was sent to approximately 15,000 school teachers and administrators throughout the country to gather evidence against the people who were protesting conditions in the schools. It asks for information about the forms of attack being made, such as failure to teach the three R's, too many frills, and fads, the high cost of schools, improper textbooks, insufficient emphasis on United States history and the Constitution.

Mr. HAYS. Who sent this out?

Mr. SARGENT. The National Education Association officially.

Mr. HAYS. Could I see it?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. That is a true copy of the original. They are gathering evidence on people opposed to school conditions obviously for the purpose of organizing an attack on the people who do not agree with them.

Mr. HAYS. That is what you say.

Public education is under fire today in many quarters. During recent months some of the most damaging attacks have been on the public schools at the local community level.

While educators do not object to constructive criticism designed to improve schools, they are growing concerned over unjustified criticisms and misleading propaganda put out by individuals and groups whose motives are suspect.

As evidence has accumulated from a number of communities across America, we have felt increasing need to get a full national picture of attacks on education. It is not clear yet as to whether these attacks have been concentrated only in a relatively few communities or are part of a widespread pattern.

One aim of this questionnaire is to get a national picture of the breadth and concentration of recent unjustified attacks on public education.

You might conceivably find fault with that because they are saying they are unjustified. I have never seen this before. Here are some questions. You read some. I have not even looked at this. I will read the first one and see what it says:

1. Have organizations, clubs, societies, groups (or individuals representing them) attacked the public schools or public education in general in your com-

munity Answer Yes, No. If so what year or years did the attack or attacks occur?

2. If your answer to the above is Yes, please name the organizations. After each one identified, indicate by N, S, or L, whether you believe it is a National, State, or local organization.

3. If education has been attacked in your community since 1948, has the attack been brought to a head over some issue (e. g., bond or tax rate election) concerning school costs? Answer Yes or No.

In your opinion is the principal motive for the attacks in your community a desire on the part of certain persons to reduce school costs regardless of the damage done to the school program and the welfare of children? Answer Yes or No.

I believe you read the next one?

Mr. SARGENT. Some of them. It is all going into the record.

Mr. HAYS (reading):

5. Check any of the following forms of attack on the public school program which have appeared in your community:

- a. Failure to teach the three R's adequately.
- b. Too many frills and fads.
- c. The high cost of public schools.
- d. Improper textbooks.
- e. Progressive education.
- f. Subversive teaching.
- g. Failure to teach moral and spiritual values.
- h. Communistic teaching.

i. Insufficient emphasis on United States history and the Constitution.

j. Indoctrinating children with the blessings of the welfare state.

k. Teaching Socialism.

l. Other forms (please explain).

6. The following are pamphlets presenting drastic criticism of public education. After each please check appropriate columns.

Have Heard of

Have Read

Has circulated in this area.

- (a) They want your child!
- (b) Must American Youth Be taught that Communism and Socialism are superior to Americanism?
- (c) How Red are the schools?
- (d) Progressive Education Increasing Delinquency.
- (e) Private schools: The answer to America's educational problem.
- (f) How Red is the Little Red Schoolhouse?

7. Have any other pamphlets attacking the public schools been circulated in your community? Answer yes or no.

8. If the answer is yes to the above question, please give titles, sponsoring organizations, and indication of contents (if you have extra copies, we will appreciate your sending one to us).

9. Has information concerning any of the following organizations come to your attention?

- a. National Council for American Education.
- b. Pro America.
- c. Committee for Constitutional Government.
- d. America's Future, Inc.
- e. Friends of the Public Schools.
- f. Constitutional Education League.
- g. American Educational League.

If so, from what source did this information come to you?

The CHAIRMAN. The questionnaire will be printed in the record in full.

(The questionnaire referred to follows:)

INQUIRY INTO UNJUSTIFIED ATTACKS ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

A QUESTIONNAIRE

Public education is under fire today in many quarters. During recent months some of the most damaging attacks have been on the public schools at the local community level.

While educators do not object to constructive criticism designed to improve schools, they are growing concerned over unjustified criticisms and misleading propaganda put out by individuals and groups whose motives are suspect.

As evidence has accumulated from a number of communities across America, we have felt increasing need to get a full national picture of attacks on education. It is not clear yet as to whether these attacks have been concentrated only in a relatively few communities or are part of a widespread pattern.

One aim of this questionnaire is to get a national picture of the breadth and concentration of recent unjustified attacks on public education. The other aim is to determine the characteristics and features of attacks on public schools as they have occurred in various communities.

A superintendent of a large school system recently wrote to NEA as follows: "For a period of 30 years I have been in public-school work, the first 10 as a teacher, the second 10 as a supervisor, and the third 10 as a superintendent, and while I have observed, in some instances, direct forces working against the school program, I have never observed as organized an effort as seems to be prevalent in communities at the present time."

This study has been approved by the executive committee of the National Education Association.

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire will serve our profession and the institution of free public schools in America. National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Please note: You will not be quoted directly except with your express consent.

SECTION 1

Your name.

Your position.

Your community and State.

Your school system (please check).

Is your school system a city?

A county or parish?

Other type?

Approximate number of pupils enrolled in your school system during 1949-50.

SECTION 2

Please answer the following and comment wherever possible:

1. Have organizations, clubs, societies, groups (or individuals representing them) attacked the public schools or public education in general in your community? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

If so what year or years did the attack or attacks occur?

2. If your answer to the above is yes, please name the organizations. After each one identified, indicate by n. S. or l, whether you believe it is a national, State, or local organization.

3. If education has been attacked in your community since 1948, has the attack been brought to a head over some issue (e. g., bond or tax rate election) concerning school costs? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

4. In your opinion is the principal motive for the attacks in your community a desire on the part of certain persons to reduce school costs regardless of the damage done to the school program and the welfare of children? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

5. Check any of the following forms of attack on the public school program which have appeared in your community:

- a. Failure to teach the three R's adequately.
  - b. Too many frills and fads.
  - c. The high cost of public schools.
  - d. Improper textbooks.
  - e. Progressive education.
  - f. Subversive teaching.
  - g. Failure to teach moral and spiritual values.
  - h. Communistic teaching.
  - i. Insufficient emphasis on U. S. history and the Constitution.
  - j. Indoctrinating children with the blessing of the welfare state.
  - k. Teaching socialism.
  - l. Other forms (please explain).
6. The following are pamphlets presenting drastic criticism of public education. After each please check appropriate columns.

(Column 1 headed) : Have heard of—

(Column 2 headed:) Have read—

(Column 3 headed) : Has circulated in this area—

- (a) They Want Your Child!
- (b) Must American Youth Be Taught That Communism and Socialism are Superior to Americanism?
- (c) How Red Are the Schools?
- (d) Progressive Education Increasing Delinquency.
- (e) Private Schools : The answer to America's educational problem.
- (f) How Red Is the Little Red Schoolhouse?

7. Have any other pamphlets attacking the public schools been circulated in your community? Yes -- No ---

8. If the answer is "Yes" to the above question, please give titles, sponsoring organizations, and indication of contents (if you have extra copies, we will appreciate your sending one to us) :

9. Has information concerning any of the following organizations come to your attention?

- (a) National Council for American Education.
- (b) Pro America.
- (c) Committee for Constitutional Government.
- (d) America's Future, Inc.
- (e) Friends of the Public Schools.
- (f) Constitutional Education League.
- (g) American Educational League.

If so, from what source did this information come to you?

10. Please name any of the above organizations which you believe attempted to influence attitudes and action with regard to public education in your community :

11. Have attacks in your community or area—
  - (a) Condemned an enriched, permissive school program and advocated a simpler, less flexible program in which students "survive" to the degree that they learn formal subject matter under conditions emphasizing competition?
  - (b) Involved ideological criticism of the democratic philosophy as American educators commonly understand it?
  - (c) Attempted to undermine the reputation of national educational leaders (Dewey, Kilpatrick, etc.) professional organizations (NEA, AASA, etc.) or teacher training institutions?

- (d) Received any unusual help from the press in developing their campaign?
  - (e) Borne any relationships to parochial and private school interests?
12. To what extent do you think these attacks have been hurtful to the schools? (Check one:) Very hurtful . Hurtful . Not especially hurtful . Beneficial in that they backfired .

13. Have the public schools in your community or area received help from any local community organizations in meeting attacks or major criticisms as they have occurred? Yes -- No ---

14. If your answer to the above question is "yes" please name these organizations and indicate briefly how they have helped :

15. What measures are you taking, or have you taken, in your community to forestall or offset attacks against the program of public education?

16. How successfully do you feel these measures to be?

17. Please add any comments which will be helpful in interpreting what you have indicated above or which supply information that you think is pertinent.

Please return this questionnaire as soon as possible to: National Commission

for the Defense of Democracy through Education, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Mr. HAYS. Go on and read it, but it seems to me it is an attempt to find out what is going on.

Mr. SARGENT. It is an attempt to gather evidence for the purpose of lobbying and interfering with the local jurisdiction of school authorities, and this is a tax-exempt corporation engaging in that lobbying activity. It is not their business whether the people in Pasadena like their superintendent.

Mr. HAYS. I won't debate that question with you.

Mr. SARGENT. It isn't.

Mr. HAYS. But it is certainly the business of national organizations of teachers and principals to know what attacks are made on the institutions which they work in and represent and a mere fact-finding questionnaire to get that information—this committee sent out a lot of questionnaires to universities all over the country asking what grants they got from foundations, whether they had been refused, and so on. Some of them didn't like it.

Mr. SARGENT. That is not the half of it. The NEA officially interfered with the Pasadena school controversy. Mr. Willard Given, the executive secretary of the NEA, offered a resolution before the United States Commission for UNESCO condemning the people of Pasadena for firing Superintendent Goslin. Do you know that?

Mr. HAYS. I don't know. Maybe he was justified.

Mr. SARGENT. He did. The lobbying was carried to UNESCO; a speech on that subject was delivered by Mr. Lawrence C. Lamb, a member of the Pasadena School Board, protesting this interference with the integrity of the school system in the August 1, 1951, issue of *Vital Speeches*. I asked for a Library of Congress copy, and unfortunately the page containing this particular article seems to have been torn out, so I will have to ask leave to put in an excerpt in the record later. I think it is important. I will get it later. That is the fact. He went all the way to UNESCO to interfere with Pasadena's jurisdiction and the school board member I named protested that it had come to a point where the national propaganda hopped on the back of local citizens trying to run their school affairs in their own way.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. HAYS. Was everybody in Pasadena unanimous about this thing, or was there some controversy?

Mr. SARGENT. There was controversy. It was their right to be right or wrong, and not to be interfered with in arriving at the conclusion, right or wrong.

Mr. HAYS. There was controversy?

Mr. SARGENT. Certainly there was extensive controversy.

Mr. HAYS. There were two sides to the question?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. But it was the duty of the NEA to take neither side.

Mr. HAYS. I don't know whether it is up to you to say what the NEA's duty is. It is your opinion.

Mr. SARGENT. It is lobbying, however.

<sup>1</sup>The speech of Mr. Lawrence C. Lamb, referred to by the witness, appears following his testimony at p. 403.

Mrs. FROST. This questionnaire, however, indicates they are trying to tell California what to do.

Mr. SARGENT. They certainly are.

Mrs. FROST. In the questionnaire?

Mr. SARGENT. Not the questionnaire alone, but the information obtained from it was to be used for that purpose and is used for that purpose.

Mrs. FROST. How widely did the circular become circulated?

Mr. SARGENT. Fifteen thousand copies throughout the Nation.

Mrs. FROST. It was not circulated only in California?

Mr. SARGENT. No, throughout the country. All principal districts, about 15,000 of them.

Mrs. FROST. I wanted to ask further, do you think these questions in this area are out of line, that the National Education Association should not concern themselves with this subject?

Mr. SARGENT. I think they are intended to obtain evidence to use in interfering with school jurisdiction. They are trying to get, to use a colloquial expression, the dirt on certain groups they want to get after and oppose. These organizations, Pro America, for example, a highly respected organization, why do they want to know what Pro America is doing about this thing?

Mr. HAYS. I don't know anything about Pro America. That is a good catchy title. But are you familiar with the organization, Friends of the Public Schools?

Mr. SARGENT. I know there is such an organization with an office in Washington.

Mr. HAYS. Do you know anything about it?

Mr. SARGENT. They have issued bulletins.

Mr. HAYS. They are anti-Catholic.

Mr. SARGENT. I don't agree with their stand.

Mr. HAYS. But you don't think it is all right for them to inquire about them?

Mr. SARGENT. I think they have a civil right.

Mr. HAYS. I think they have a civil right, but a duty to find out if such organizations as that are propagandizing teachers. I get their pamphlet. I don't subscribe to it. They sent it free. I file it in file 13. I have read enough to know it is an antireligious, bigoted outfit.

The CHAIRMAN. Since Pro America has been referred to, I am familiar with the organization, Pro America. It is concentrated very heavily in California. It is composed of very fine ladies and is an entirely patriotic and civic organization, and so far as I know, no criticism has ever been leveled against the organization known as Pro America.

Mr. SARGENT. They also want to know whether people protest about indoctrinating children with the blessing of the welfare state and with communistic teaching. I have yet to see any evidence of anything really effective that the NEA has done aside from adopting resolutions about Communists not teaching to effectively combat the indoctrination such as contained in these books sponsored by them.

In any event, they have been actively interfering. They have been doing much more than gathering information.

Mr. HAYS. Are you inferring from that statement that the NEA is pro-Communist?



Mr. SARGENT. That the NEA is governed by a so-called liberal clique following the liberal line. I didn't say Communist.

Mr. HAYS. Is your definition of liberal the same as the letter I got the other day which said beware of these people putting the tag of liberal to you, because a liberal is a "non-dues-paying Communist." Would that be your definition of it?

Mr. SARGENT. Some are and some are not.

Mr. HAYS. But you think anybody that has any liberal ideas is a little suspect?

Mr. SARGENT. No; I don't think that. There is a definite philosophy of education in public affairs. In general the League for Industrial Democracy crowd and the John Dewey-Kilpatrick faction in Teachers College, who have succeeded in getting their particular views made really an educational line through control of the National Education Association, and they are promoting it and defending it.

Mr. HAYS. Do you think the NEA ought to be listed as a subversive organization?

Mr. SARGENT. No; I don't think so at all. I think their propaganda activity should be very extensively inquired into. They lobby for legislation. They have a legislative committee. They are infringing on the jurisdiction of the local authorities of our school system, and impairing the integrity of that organization.

Mr. HAYS. What about your organization, the Sons of the American Revolution? Do they do any lobbying?

Mr. SARGENT. They propose some patriotic measures from time to time which is their right. That is within their charter.

Mr. HAYS. Anything they propose is patriotic?

Mr. SARGENT. It is designed to do with things like national defense exclusively, and the Constitution, as far as I recall.

Mr. HAYS. What about the posters they had at the convention about Bishop Oxnham and the hammer and sickle?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't know anything about the incident.

Mr. HAYS. I understand quite a few of them disavowed the thing, but some of the more extreme people sponsored it and had it there.

Mr. SARGENT. Every large organization has people with varying views. Another pamphlet here showing the extent of this organized attack on the American people who do not like school conditions is a pamphlet entitled, American Education Under Fire. The author stated on the cover is Ernest O. Melby. This pamphlet states that it was prepared with the cooperation of Mary Beauchamp, Prof. Thodore Brameld, Prof. Herbert Bruner, New York University; Prof. David K. Berninghausen, secretary, Committee on Intellectual Freedom, American Library Association; Prof. H. Gordon Hullfish, Ohio State University; Richard Barnes Kennan, executive secretary, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HAYS. Right there, I want to ask you a question. What is wrong with Dr. Hullfish?

Mr. SARGENT. I am not saying anything is wrong with him. I am saying he sponsored the pamphlet.

Mr. HAYS. Is there something wrong with the pamphlet?

Mr. SARGENT. It is a one-sided case of the presentation of the attack of people against the schools. Yes, I do. I don't know anything about Hullfish at the moment.

Mr. HAYS. I have a suggestion, and I suppose I will have to put it in the form of a motion. I have had a slight contact and acquaintance with Dr. Hullfish, and I would like to subpoena him. It is a reasonable request, and I want to have him say something about these things. I don't know what he will say. He won't be primed.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman has no objection to subpoenaing Dr. Hullfish, but I think it is inadvisable to go about this subpoenaing on a hit-or-miss basis.

Mr. HAYS. If we have not gone about the hit-or-miss business now, I will put in with you so we might continue that.

I make a point of order that the House is in session and the committee has no right to sit.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think you may be able to conclude this afternoon?

Mr. HAYS. I don't know whether you will reconvene or not. May I say that you have to have permission of the House to sit? I am going to object. I think the minority has a right to have it in the record that they want a few people to come in here that are available. If you will brush it aside, then I will adopt the policy of hindering the operation as much as possible because it is one-sided. I want to bring in some people and if you want to have a conference and agree to it, I will withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no disposition to shut off anybody that wants to come or no disposition not to subpoena anybody—

Mr. HAYS. I will modify that to invite Dr. Hullfish because I don't think you will have to subpoena him.

The CHAIRMAN. To round out the study.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to make this statement, Mr. Chairman. I was advised that after the first day when I began to question this witness to the displeasure of some people that from here on in I was told—and I have it on good authority—that Ohio State was going to be cracked whenever they got a chance, and whatever professors could be dragged in. That statement was made by somebody out in the audience who was feeding information. I am going to be put in the position right now of saying that as far as Ohio State is concerned, it is run largely by a Republican board of trustees, but you are not going to let anybody come in here and smear it.

The CHAIRMAN. What present disposition would you have that I would be prejudiced against Ohio State University, Ohio State, and citizens?

Mr. HAYS. I don't say you are. I want you to agree to let me bring in some people.

The CHAIRMAN. I was long a friend of Ohio. In the first instance, I served in the 166th Infantry Ohio Regiment of the Rainbow Division. I have many friends in Ohio. My closest political associates have been from Ohio, I am glad to say, on the national level. My entire contact with Ohio University—Ohio State University—has been such as to inspire the greatest confidence. But that I am not referring to every individual that might be connected with Ohio State University. So there is no basis whatever for the suggestion so far as this committee is concerned. I am confident that the mere fact that somebody in the audience may have passed up such a statement—I would very much appreciate those statements not being interjected.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Reece, I did not interject Dr. Hullfish's name into this hearing. I am trying to protect him from any inference that there is something wrong with him.

Mr. SARGENT. I did not interject him. I am reading an entire list. I have referred to Ohio State always with some matter that included it. I mentioned other names with equal impartiality and I will continue to do that.

Mr. HAYS. I have not heard you mention any suspects at Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. If he finds them, I will want him to mention that.

Mr. HAYS. I guess he can find them.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will recess until 2 o'clock in the hopes we can finish.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, a recess was taken until 2 p. m. the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON RECESS

The CHAIRMAN. Will the committee be in session?

You may proceed.

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

Mr. SARGENT. At the session this morning there was—

Mr. HAYS. Before you get started so I won't interrupt any statement, and if you can't remember exactly what you said I have asked them to bring up the transcript, but you mentioned Mr. Allen Zoll, and do you remember what you said about him?

Mr. SARGENT. I said in substance that they had referred to a pamphlet written by him which had been distributed to some extent in connection with the Pasadena school controversy, a pamphlet—

Mr. HAYS. This is all new to me. You say "they" had referred. Whom do you mean?

Mr. SARGENT. Some of the various people, NEA among others. The statement that Harold Benjamin made, this report on it refers to Zoll's pamphlets and denounces this and what happened in Pasadena as being an affair instigated by Allen Zoll, and charged directly it was. The NEA's own commission investigated and found out that Zoll did not instigate it and his writings had very limited effect on it. Zoll has been very extensively smeared, and they have been attempting to smear many other people through Allen Zoll.

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask you this: You wouldn't consider an Attorney General's listing as a smear, would you? You have cited numerous people who have been on the Attorney General's list yourself and I haven't challenged you and said you are smearing them.

Mr. SARGENT. I am not smearing them.

Mr. HAYS. Let me read you what I got from the Attorney General.

Mr. SARGENT. I know all about it.

Mr. HAYS. But perhaps the audience doesn't and so I will read it.

This came from Mr. William Foley, head of the Internal Security Affairs Office, of the Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Mr. Zoll has been disclosed and he himself has disclosed that he is the founder and national president of the American Patriots, Inc.

This organization was designated by the Attorney General and still is a Fascist organization. In 1939, he was arrested for attempt to extort money from the president of a radio station which had refused Father Coughlin the right to speak on that radio station. He, Mr. Zoll, caused a picket line to be thrown around that radio station. This information was in the New York Times of July 2, 1939, July 8, 1939, and September 13, 1939. The picket line was thrown around the radio station for the same reason as above.

Mr. Zoll attended a luncheon at which Mr. Fritz Kuhn, head of the German-American Bund, was guest speaker in 1938. Mr. Zoll has been reported by newspapers as being very active in association with the Christian Front which is an anti-Semitic group.

Mr. Zoll was also cosponsor for meetings with Gerald L. K. Smith. Now you say this is the fellow they tried to smear?

Mr. SARGENT. No, I say that they tried to smear the people at Pasadena through the things you have told us about Allen Zoll. And to represent that Allen Zoll was instigating the whole performance.

Mr. HAYS. But you did put pamphlets out?

Mr. SARGENT. He had some literature, and some people bought the literature, and it is well written, and there is nothing objectionable in the literature, and the California legislative committee found the literature was not objectionable or Fascist or improper in any way.

Mr. HAYS. But you have cited a bunch of people here, all through your testimony, and inferred if they were on Attorney General's subversive list, that was sufficient prima facie evidence that everything they said or did, past, present, or future, was bad.

Mr. SARGENT. I have not referred to that.

Mr. HAYS. If we are going to use that definition, I think we ought to apply it to everybody.

Mr. SARGENT. I don't think I have referred to the Attorney General's list at all from the time I landed here until now.

Mr. HAYS. You say they are on lists. And haven't you testified and read that so and so belonged to 136 Communist-front organizations?

Mr. SARGENT. The list I gave was from the House Un-American Activities Report, appendix IX of 1944. I gave the Zoll incident for a definite reason. Zoll has been very, very extensively smeared, and I personally don't know the merits of it one way or the other; but I do know the people of Pasadena had nothing to do with the affairs of Mr. Zoll and I also know that the National Education Association investigated and talked to Willard Goslin, and reported in writing to Washington that the Zoll story, as applied to the people of Pasadena, was false and had no important influence on the case.

After receiving that information, Harold Benjamin launched an attack on the people of Pasadena in his report to the enemy.

Mr. HAYS. Who is Harold Benjamin?

Mr. SARGENT. He is connected with this defense commission, so-called, of the National Education Association, and he vilified the people of Pasadena knowingly after his own investigating agent was down there and found that the charge was false.

Mr. HAYS. That is a pretty serious charge.

Mr. SARGENT. I saw the report, Mr. Hays.

Mr. HAYS. But you just said that he vilified the people of Pasadena knowingly, is that right?

Mr. SARGENT. He tried to tag the Zoll story—

Mr. HAYS. Didn't you just say that?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, and it is true.

Mr. HAYS. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an agreement that we call in Mr. Benjamin and ask him about this.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, without passing or making an expression about the advisability of whom we should or shouldn't call, I don't think it is in the interest of good procedure to just sit here and miscellaneously say we are going to call first one and then another.

Mr. HAYS. In the interest of fair presentation, these people have been mentioned very unfavorably, and I don't know whether it is true or not; but it seems to me the only way you are going to get an objective picture is call them and let them testify.

The CHAIRMAN. We haven't heard from Mr. Sargent yet. It may be that he will want to testify, and anybody that has been unfavorably mentioned, and desires to testify, my own feeling is should be permitted to testify.

Mr. HAYS. May I ask you this—

The CHAIRMAN. Those who do not express a desire to testify, if the committee feels that their testimony is important, in developing the full story, then they should be required to testify.

Now that is what I feel should be the guide.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, here is the situation: We are allowing Mr. Sargent here to go on at great length, and I have shown no disposition to limit him, and, in fact, I have told you that I will try to accommodate myself to be here as long as he desires to talk.

But when I say that I would like to hear from some of these other people, I sort of get a general sluffing-off and let-us-put-it-off attitude, and you know as well as I do that the committee has limited funds.

And I think that you will agree with me, in public, that there wouldn't be a Chinaman's chance now of getting any more funds from the Congress, after the first 3 weeks of this.

When we run out of money, we are through. I just would like to hear a few of these people who may have been smeared and/or at least they may think they may have been smeared.

The CHAIRMAN. It isn't the intention of the chairman of the committee to request the committee to request additional funds of the Congress. But if it is and funds should be required and the committee should request it, I have confidence that the Congress might favorably consider the request.

But that is not indicated at the present time. Also, I feel that there would be ample funds to complete this full investigation, and go through with the complete and full hearings so that nobody is going to be shut off because of lack of funds.

Mr. WORMSER. May I make a suggestion, Mr. Hays?

I have tried to make clear to the attorneys for the major foundations that we would suit their reasonable convenience in the calling of witnesses. I suggest that they be asked what witness they would like to have. After all, we want to reserve as much time for them as we can.

Mr. HAYS. Do you have any objection if I invite Mr. Benjamin to appear and he accepts?

Now, that ought to be a fair thing. I am not even going to ask you to subpoena him. Let us invite him. You don't have any objection to

inviting him, and you keep saying everybody is invited and let us get specific about it.

The CHAIRMAN. My thought is, as I say, that anyone that has been unfavorably mentioned, if he desires to appear, he will have opportunity to appear. Anyone that the committee feels should appear, in order to develop the full story, will be or should be subpoenaed to appear.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, you sit there with three votes in your pocket, and so it just boils down to who you feel should appear. I am asking you pointblank: Can we have Mr. Benjamin?

Before we get on to that, I believe we had an agreement before lunch that Dr. Helper should be invited.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. And I also would like to have Mr. Benjamin invited. If he declines, I will say no more about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we discuss that, and we will work these things out. We are not going to have any trouble in reaching a decision about who should be called.

Mr. HAYS. We are having a lot of trouble to get you to say Mr. Benjamin can come.

The CHAIRMAN. You bring these requests up in such a way that you are impugning the good intentions of somebody, unintentionally or otherwise, that the chairman is not going to do the fair and objective thing. Therefore, in public session you have to get him nailed down on something.

I don't think that that is a dignified procedure. The chairman certainly has shown no disposition to want to cut anybody off. I think we can say that anybody that you upon reflection feel should be called that arrangements will be made to call them.

Mr. HAYS. I am not impugning anybody's motives. But when you say that I have to nail things down, let me say this: That if past experience has showed me that I better nail them down, that is the way I am going to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you are getting—

Mr. HAYS. I am not being a bit personal. I will say that I didn't mention you, but if you want to put the shoe on, I can't help it.

But in my lifetime, let me say that I have noted that if you get things nailed down there is hardly any arguments about who said what and who didn't say what, and who we promised to bring in and who we didn't.

As far as being fair and impugning anything, let me say to you that you have brought this witness in and I didn't know that he was to be brought in until 2 or 3 days before. I had no knowledge that the staff was going to bring this witness in and I didn't object to it.

We have heard him for a long, long time. I think we could dispense with Dr. Hullfish, Mr. Benjamin, Ed Murrow, and a few more of them, all put together in the amount of time he has had.

I don't think that that would be unfair.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I think the references that you made which might very well be inferred, and you made references to the chairman, is quite uncalled for. But still, that is not going to ruffle me in the least.

Mr. HAYS. I am not trying to ruffle you, I am trying to get an agreement we call Mr. Benjamin in.

The CHAIRMAN. During my many years on the Hill, I have gone on the theory when you are dealing with Members of Congress you are dealing with gentlemen. And I hope my experinece will not cause me to feel otherwise.

Mr. HAYS. Let us not deal in inferences. If you feel that way, why don't you just say so. I am a pretty outspoken fellow and I don't make any inferences.

Any time you said I have made an inference, and it is no inference, and so if you are trying to say now that I am not a gentlemen, just say so. That is the way to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't use the kind of language that has been used here, myself, that is not in my character, except under purposes of great provocation.

Mr. HAYS. I imagine you were greatly provoked when you said some of the things you did about some of the eminent Republicans in your speech on the floor, about the Ford Foundation having prominent Communists in it, and so on.

You see, I am in a very anomalous position here. And I am only trying to have fair play and to protect you might say the moneyed wing of the Republican Party by an attack from another wing of the Republican Party. I don't suppose I will get much gratitude, but I have a tremendous sense of fair play.

If I am going to referee the fight between one group of Republicans and another one, I think I ought to have a little bit of leeway about who would we call in as witnesses. I am trying to be the referee.

If there is going to be any bloodletting, I want it to be done under fair circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. I feel under great obligation to you standing in the position of referee.

Mrs. FROST. Where does this Mr. Benjamin live? What is the residence?

Mr. SARGENT. I presume it is Washington, D. C. He is connected with or the last I heard he was connected with the National Commission for Defense of Democracy of NEA. I think he works out of National Headquarters. I don't know for sure.

Mr. WORMSER. May I just put this before you—

Mr. SARGENT. He is from the University of Maryland.

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Chairman, this may be of some help to us.

In studying what should go in our rules of procedure, I studied the rules of other committees, and also the lectures of professors, and what not. And some of them recommended a rule that where a person was referred to by a witness as a subversive, he should be notified of that fact and given an opportunity to come in and say whether he was or not.

That of course is an easy case. But here if a witness calls a man a McKinley Republican or another witness calls a man an FDR Democrat, I question and I will leave it to you whether those fellows, whether it is worthwhile calling them in and asking him if he is a Southern Democrat instead of an FDR Democrat or McKinley Republican.

In other words, clearly if the witness has something to contribute on the purpose of foundations, then clearly they should be subpoenaed. But if they are just, shall we say, modestly embarrassed by being called, let us say, a McKinley Republican, should we go to the trouble

of always inviting them in to say whether he is or he is not or should we restrict it to the question if he is called a subversive? I definitely say that this committee should invite him and tell him of the fact and invite him to come in any say whether he is or he is not.

Mr. HAYS. Well, of course, the testimony that Mr. Sargent has given, a great deal of it, has implied many things. But when you try to pin him down, he is very careful to back up and say, "Well, I didn't call him so and so."

But by implication, you can call people a lot of things.

Now, the reason I asked for Mr. Benjamin specifically is that I understand he is an official of the NEA, and certainly the NEA has been given a pretty rough time in Mr. Sargent's testimony. And I would like to get Mr. Benjamin, and perhaps maybe somebody else from the NEA, because you know out where I live the NEA, all of the teachers in my district practically belong to the NEA; they are respectable people, and I don't like to have them maligned by inference through an organization that they belong to.

I am not going to sit here quietly and let it be done, if these hearings drag on until Christmas.

The CHAIRMAN. It is expected that someone from the NEA will be called.

Mr. HAYS. You keep saying "it is expected," and I want to tie it down.

The CHAIRMAN. It should be the appropriate one that is representative of the NEA.

Mr. HAYS. I kept hearing that "it was expected" we would start these hearings every week from January on; but we didn't get them started. An so I just feel that I would like to get a few things tied down so we know where we stand, that is all.

Mr. SARGENT. May I proceed with this?

Mr. HAYS. Don't get too excited—you may not get too excited—I am going to make a point of order that the committee is out of order, and the House goes in session and we have no permission to sit.

Mr. SARGENT. I am here to try to finish this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. You kept hearing after January that the committee was going to have hearings and it is having hearings.

Mr. HAYS. It took a long time to get at them.

The record will show if the rules are changed, and as I have said, I have had them changed in the middle of the game before.

The CHAIRMAN. I would not get excited about that.

Mr. HAYS. I didn't even get excited when a person came in my office today and said that I worked for a Republican Congressman. And I think that you ought to know this. It just revolts me that there was a discussion in our office this morning about the Republican National Committee was going to double the amount of money that they spend against you the last time and that you are getting too obnoxious, and how they spent \$33,000 the last time, the Republican National Committee put in \$8,000.

Now I suppose they are going to double that \$8,000, but you know the funny part of it is that the people of my district, Mr. Reece, have never had any inclination to pay any attention from outsiders, and I got a lot of Republican votes in spite of all of this outside money. I got it the last time.



The CHAIRMAN. I have no information on the subject about which you are talking.

Mr. HAYS. I am giving you some.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to have the information.

Thank you very, very much indeed.

You may proceed.

Mr. SARGENT. As far as Mr. Allen Zoll is concerned, he is a man who has been very extensively smeared, either justly or unjustly, and I am not familiar with the facts.

I have not read the various citations involved here, and I don't know one way or the other. The charges may be true or they may be untrue, or they may be partly true or partly false. I have not referred here in any instance to the record of any person except on the basis of my personal examination of the record that I have referred to.

I am only interested in the Zoll incident from one standpoint, that is, that the known smear which had highly developed proportions was applied through the report on the enemy of Harold Benjamin.

Mr. HAYS. You can smear a Fascist, you mean it is possible?

Mr. SARGENT. You can drag a Fascist, someone Fascist or non-Fascist, you go drag that record in on a community and attempt to show that the community is backing the man himself and smear people who are in no way connected with what the original source may be, that is what happened here.

Mr. Benjamin dragged it into Pasadena where it had no place and a California legislative committee found it didn't have any place. It is another example of this.

Mr. HAYS. When you drag somebody's name into this, you are not smearing them, and you are just being a good patriotic American, like you have done with Dr. Hullfish and others.

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't drag Dr. Hullfish in any derogatory capacity, and I referred to him as one of the people who wrote a pamphlet.

Mr. HAYS. You didn't say that you recommended him?

Mr. SARGENT. I think the pamphlet is unjustified and this is a piece of propaganda.

Mr. HAYS. But saying he wrote an unjustified piece of propaganda isn't smearing him at all. That is just being truthful.

Mr. SARGENT. The propaganda is his own work and I have a right to discuss the man's work. The Pasadena case is not the work of Allen Zoll.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to state right here that there has never been in my experience in a study of history a situation in which a congressional committee has let anyone come in and indiscriminately smear as many people as this committee has let this witness do in the past 3 days.

Mr. SARGENT. My authority here is the report of the California legislative committee under Senator Dilworth's chairmanship. It is the eighth report and I read you from the report, and I read it factually.

Now, there has been reference here to the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, of which I am a member. I think, in justice to that organization and in view of the reference that I am entitled to read a statement of their position on this subversive teaching question. It is a resolution adopted at their national congress, held at Minneapolis, Minn., May 18, 1952.

It is as follows: By consent I will not read it word for word. I can have the reporter copy it, but I will give you its substance. It is on page 5, column 1, carrying over to the first column on page 6 of the document known as the bill of grievances.

It states in substance that they decided and believe the following to be a true statement of conditions affecting the public schools: That textbooks, subversive textbooks and teaching practices originate from sources that are interstate and international in scope, effective control is beyond State power; that an intelligent and informed public opinion is the only sound method of correcting the evil, and in accordance with American principles.

The public opinion to be effective should be national and should be equal in strength to the subversive influences involved. And that:

An investigation of the kind required should be conducted in a judicial manner as a nonpartisan impartial inquiry sufficiently broad in scope to inform the people as to the nature and extent of the subversive educational problem affecting the public schools in the several States.

That the society has a proper interest in the matter under its charter and that its officers are authorized and instructed to prepare a document for Congress calling for a national investigation of these practices, and to do and perform any acts necessary to have it favorably considered.

The petition so prepared, in accordance with that resolution—known as the bill of grievances—presented to the United States Senate Judiciary Committee and to the House of Representatives, reads as follows:

*Be it resolved by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in annual congress assembled:*

First: That we do hereby believe and determine the following to be a true statement of the conditions affecting the public schools of many of our States, resulting from the introduction of subversive textbooks and teaching practices:

(a) That such textbooks and teaching practices originate from sources which are interstate and national in scope;

(b) Effective control thereof is beyond the power and outside the reach of any processes available to the legislature of any one State;

(c) Intelligent and informed public opinion affords the only sound method of correcting this evil in accordance with American principles;

(d) Public opinion, to be effective in this field should be made national in scope and equal in strength to the subversive influences now affecting our public school system;

(e) An investigation of the kind required should be conducted in a judicial manner as a nonpartisan and impartial inquiry, sufficiently broad in scope to inform the people as to the nature and extent of subversive education problems affecting the public schools in the several States;

(f) That this society under its charter has a proper and direct interest in this subject, sufficient to justify it in taking action to bring about such an investigation.

Second: That we do hereby authorize and instruct the officers and request the trustees of this society to prepare and submit a petition to the Congress of the United States calling for a national investigation of subversive teaching practices affecting the public schools in the several States to the end that appropriate action may be taken thereon, and to do and perform such acts as they may deem necessary to have such petition favorably considered.

Mr. SARGENT. The organization of which I am a member stands behind the sort of inquiry which this committee is carrying on.

In the interest of clear thinking and also fairness, I think we should state here, my testimony has, as you recall been confined entirely, I think, to the 3 foundations. The Big Three, I think I called them. That is Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford.

Two of those or they all have ramifications of one sort or another, and I have not referred to all of them. Rockefeller has 3, the Rockefeller Foundation, the General Education Board, and the International Education Institute. Carnegie, as you know, has the Carnegie Corp. of New York, which is the one that sponsored that survey, \$300,000 survey on conclusions and recommendations. It also has a Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. And the Ford Foundation has a giant fund with many subcorporations.

When I say the foundations, unless otherwise indicated, I mean someone or more of that group. They are the money power behind the condition, propaganda condition and other conditions you are inquiring into.

I think it should be understood that there are areas not included in the present scope here, areas having nothing to do with control of propaganda, and such with which I think that your committee will not be interested, and certainly I am not.

Mr. HAYS. Could you give us just in brief a summary of a paragraph or so, so that we can get it in a condensed form of just what these 3 foundations have done that you object to?

Mr. SARGENT. The Rockefeller Foundation has actively promoted and supported the injection and the propagation of the so-called John Dewey system of experimental education and has aided the introduction of Communist practices in our school system and is defending and supporting the continuance of those practices in the schools.

Mr. HAYS. That is the Rockefeller Foundation?

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, sir, and also the General Education Board and the International Education Institute.

Mr. HAYS. Carnegie has aided it through various grants; both of them incidentally are carrying on a lobby and a very extensive lobby, involving the schools which I will testify about this afternoon.

The Ford Foundation has become the lobby which has interfered or is interfering with the integrity of local schools and is promoting world federalism and world federal government, among other things, and extending its power into many areas capable of being dangerous.

Do you have any strong belief that the Ford Foundation either is Communist or has promoted communism in any way?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't know the specific instances referred to in the chairman's report and I can't testify on my own knowledge, but I understand it has.

But I don't personally know that and I can't testify to it.

Mr. HAYS. Do you happen to have there among your papers a list of the directors of these foundations?

Mr. SARGENT. No.

Mr. HAYS. Does the staff have a list of them?

Mr. SARGENT. I am not attempting to name names. I am talking about action.

Mr. HAYS. This is on my own; I am going off on an expedition here.

Miss CASEY. We have their names as they appear in the latest annual reports we have. I think in most instances that would be 1952.

I think also their letterhead may have the names. However, I am sure these foundations—Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford—would gladly give us a list of their officers and trustees from the time they were established.

Mr. HAYS. I am asking unanimous consent to put into the record at this point the list of all the officers and directors of each of these foundations.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.  
(The list of names is as follows:)

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, 1911-54

*Trustees*

James R. Angell, 1920-21, ex officio; president of Carnegie Corp.  
 Thomas S. Arbuthnot, 1953-52, ex officio; president of Carnegie Hero Fund Commission  
 Newton D. Baker, 1931-37  
 James Bertram, 1911-34, life member  
 W. Randolph Burgess, 1940  
 Vannevar Bush, 1939, ex officio; president of Carnegie Institution of Washington  
 Nicholas Murray Butler, 1925-45, ex officio; president of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
 Oliver C. Carmichael, 1945-53, ex officio; president of Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching  
 Andrew Carnegie, 1911-19, life member  
 Mrs. Andrew Carnegie, 1919-29  
 John J. Carty, 1923-32  
 Samuel Harden Church, 1914-43, ex officio; president of Carnegie Institute  
 Lotus Delta Coffman, 1936-38  
 Charles Dollard, 1948, ex officio; president of Carnegie Corp.  
 Robert A. Franks, 1911-35, life member  
 William N. Frew, 1911-14, ex officio; president of Carnegie Institute  
 William Frew, 1943-48, ex officio; president of Carnegie Institute  
 John W. Gardner, 1954  
 Morris Hadley, 1947  
 William J. Holland, 1922-32, ex officio; president of Carnegie Hero Fund Commission  
 David F. Houston, 1929-34  
 Henry James, 1928-47  
 Walter A. Jessup, 1934-44, ex officio; president of Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching (1934-44) and of Carnegie Corp. (1941-44)  
 Devereaux C. Josephs, 1944, ex officio 1945-48; president of Carnegie Corp.  
 Nicholas Kelley, 1936  
 Frederick P. Keppel, 1923-41, ex officio; president of Carnegie Corp.  
 Russell Leffingwell, 1923  
 George C. Marshall, 1946-50  
 John C. Merriam, 1921-38, ex officio; president of Carnegie Institution of Washington  
 Margaret Carnegie Miller, 1934  
 Frederick Osborn, 1936  
 Arthur W. Page, 1934  
 John A. Poynton, 1916-34  
 Gwilym A. Price, 1953

*Trustees—Continued*

- Henry S. Pritchett, 1911-30, ex officio; president of Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching  
 Elihu Root, 1911-37, ex officio 1911-25; president of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
 Elihu Root, Jr., 1937  
 Charles M. Spofford, 1953  
 Henry Suzzalo, 1930-33, ex officio; president of Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching  
 Charles L. Taylor, 1911-22, ex officio; president of Carnegie Hero Fund Commission  
 Charles Allen Thomas, 1951  
 Leroy A. Wilson, 1948-51  
 Robert S. Woodward, 1911-20, ex officio; president of Carnegie Institution of Washington

*Officers*

## Chairman of the board:

- Elihu Root, 1920-37  
 Nicholas Murray Butler, 1937-45  
 Russell Leffingwell, 1946

## Vice chairman of the board: R. A. Franks, 1920-35

## President:

- Andrew Carnegie, 1911-19  
 Elihu Root, 1919-20  
 James R. Angell, 1920-21  
 Henry S. Pritchett, 1921-23 (acting)  
 Frederick P. Keppel, 1923-41  
 Walter A. Jessup, 1941-44  
 Devereux C. Josephs, 1945-48  
 Charles Dollard, 1948

## Vice president:

- Elihu Root, 1911-19  
 R. A. Franks, 1913-20  
 Charles Dollard, 1947-48  
 John W. Gardner, 1949  
 James A. Perkins, 1951

## Secretary:

- James Bertram, 1911-34  
 Robert M. Lester, 1934

## Treasurer:

- R. A. Franks, 1911-35  
 Robertson D. Ward, 1935-42  
 C. Herbert Lee, 1942

## Assistant to the president:

- Beardsley Ruml, 1920-22  
 William S. Learned, 1922-24  
 Morse A. Cartwright, 1924-26  
 Robert M. Lester, 1926-34  
 John M. Russell, 1934-40  
 Charles Dollard, 1938-45  
 Stephen H. Stackpole, 1940-45

*Officers—Continued*

## Executive associate:

Charles Dollard, 1945-47  
 Oliver C. Carmichael, 1945-53  
 Pendleton Herring, 1946-48  
 Whitney H. Shepardson, 1946-53  
 John W. Gardner, 1947-49  
 James A. Perkins, 1950-51

## Executive assistant:

Stephen H. Stackpole, 1953  
 William W. Marvel, 1953  
 Eugene I. Burdock, 1953

Associate secretary: Florence Anderson, 1951

Assistant secretary: Florence Anderson, 1947-51

## Assistant treasurer:

Michael Pescatello, 1947  
 James W. Campbell, 1953

## Investment officer:

Barent Lefferts, 1932-46  
 S. S. Hall, Jr., 1935-40  
 Parker Monroe, 1935-39  
 C. Herbert Lee, 1937-47  
 Michael Pescatello, 1946-47

TRUSTEES OF THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE,  
 1910-54

Alexander, Wallace McK. (1935-39)

Anderson, Dillon (1953- )

Bacon, Robert (1913-19)

Ballantine, Arthur A. (1936-50, honorary 1953), member, finance committee (1938-50); member, executive committee (1938-48); chairman, finance committee (1948-50)

Bancroft, Edgar A. (1918-25), member, finance committee (1920-25)

Barrows, David P. (1931-51)

Bell, James F. (1939-42)

Brookings, Robert S. (1910-32)

Bullitt, William Marshall (1933-)

Bundy, Harvey H. (1948-), member, executive committee (1949-); chairman, 1952; vice chairman of the board (1951-52); chairman of the board, 1952-

Burke, Thomas (1910-25)

Butler, Nicholas Murray (1910-47), director, division of intercourse and education (1911-45); president (1925-45); president emeritus (1945-47); member, executive committee (1911-45); chairman, executive committee (1925-45)

Cadwalader, John L. (1910-14)

Catlin, Daniel K. (1930-51, honorary 1951-54)

Chapin, W. W. (1939-54, honorary 1954)

Cherrington, Ben M. (1943-)

Choate, Joseph H. (1910-17), vice president (1911-17)

Clapp, Margaret (1951-)

Cole, David L. (1951-)

- Davis, John W. (1921-50, honorary 1950); vice president (1937-47); acting president (1945-46); chairman, executive committee (1945-46); vice chairman of the board (1947-50)
- Davis, Norman H. (1931-43)
- Delano, Frederic A. (1920-49), assistant treasurer (1923-29); treasurer (1929-36); member, executive committee (1929-36); member, finance committee (1923-38)
- Dodge, Cleveland H. (1910-19)
- DuBridge, Lee A. (1951-)
- Dulles, John Foster (1944-52), chairman of the board (1946-52); chairman, executive committee (1946-52)
- Dunn, Frederick S. (1951-)
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. (1948-52)
- Eliot, Charles W. (1910-19)
- Evans, Lawton B. (1926-34)
- Finch, George A. (1940-), assistant secretary (1911-40), secretary (1940-47); assistant director, division of international law (1917-40); associate director, division of international law (1940-43); director, division of international law (1943-47); member, executive committee (1940-46); counselor (1948-50)
- Foster, Arthur William (1910-25)
- Foster, John W. (1910-17), member, executive committee (1911)
- Fox, Austen G. (1910-37), member, executive committee (1911-37)
- Franks, Robert A. (1910-35), member, finance committee (1911-35); chairman, finance committee (1921-35)
- Fraser, Leon (1938-45), member, finance committee (1938-45); treasurer (1941-42)
- Freeman, Douglas S. (1937-53)
- Gaines, Francis Pendleton (1933-51), member, executive committee (1937-47)
- Gray, George (1915-25), vice president (1918-25)
- Gross, Ernest A. (1953-)
- Hamlin, Charles S. (1923-38), assistant treasurer (1929-38); member, finance committee (1930-31)
- Harrison, Earl Grant (1947-), member, executive committee (1947-50, 1953-)
- Heinz, Howard (1926-41)
- Hill, David Jayne (1918-32)
- Hiss, Alger (1946-50), president (1946-49); member, executive committee (1946-48)
- Holman, Alfred (1920-30)
- Houghton, Alanson B. (1930-41), treasurer (1936-41)
- Howard, William M. (1910-30)
- Jessup, Philip C. (1937-), director, division of international law (1940-43)
- Johnson, Joseph E. (1950-), president (1950-); member, executive committee (1950-); member, finance committee (1950-)
- Kirk, Grayson L. (1953-); member, executive committee (1953-)
- Lansing, Robert (1920-28), vice president (1926-28)
- Lowden, Frank O. (1923-41)
- Manning, Richard I. (1930-31)
- Mather, Samuel (1910-19), member, finance committee (1911-19)
- Molyneaux, Peter (1934-51)

- Montague, Andrew J. (1910-37), member, executive committee (1911-35); assistant treasurer (1917-23); treasurer (1923-29); vice president (1929-37)
- Morris, Roland S. (1930-45), member, executive committee (1935-45); assistant treasurer (1938-42); treasurer (1942-45).
- Morrow, Dwight W. (1925-30), member, finance committee (1925-28)
- Murrow, Edward R. (1951-)
- Nelson, Otto L. Jr. (1949-), member, executive committee (1949-)
- Nolde, O. Frederick (1951-), member, executive committee (1951-)
- Olds, Robert E. (1925-32)
- Page, Robert Newton (1920-25)
- Parker, Edwin B. (1926-29)
- Patterson, Ellmore C. (1951-), chairman, finance committee (1951-)
- Percy, LeRoy (1925-29)
- Perkins, George W. (1910-20), chairman, finance committee (1911-20)
- Peters, William A. (1926-29)
- Pritchett, Henry S. (1910-39), member, executive committee (1911-35)
- Reed, Philip D. (1945-53)
- Rockefeller, David (1947-), member, executive committee (1947-); assistant treasurer (1947-49); treasurer (1949-); vice president 1950-53; vice chairman (1953-)
- Root, Elihu (1910-37) president (1910-25); chairman, executive committee (1911-25); member, executive committee (1925-30)
- Ryerson, Edward L., (1933), member, executive committee (1951-53)
- Schieffelin, W. J., Jr. (1941), member, finance committee (1954)
- Schmidlapp, Jacob G. (1910-19)
- Scott, James Brown (1910-43), secretary (1910-40); secretary emeritus (1940-43); member, executive committee (1911-40); director, division of international law (1911-40); director emeritus, division of international law (1940-43)
- Severance, Cordenio A. (1918-25)
- Sheffield, James R. (1919-38), member, finance committee (1920-23, 1988-30, 1931-38); member, executive committee (1923-27, 1930-38)
- Sherman, Maurice S. (1926-47), member, executive committee (1935-47)
- Shotwell, James Thomson (1925-51, honorary 1951), director, division of economics and history (1924-48); member, executive committee (1927-29, 1948-50); acting president (1948-49); president (1949-50); president emeritus (1950)
- Shuster, George N. (1954)
- Sibley, Harper (1938), member, finance committee (1948)
- Slayden, James L. (1910-24)
- Smiley, Albert K. (1910-12)
- Smith, Jeremiah, Jr. (1930-34)
- Sprague, Charles A. (1954)
- Straus, Oscar S. (1910-26)
- Strawn, Silas H. (1926-46)
- Sutherland, George (1920-25)
- Taft, Robert A. (1935-38)
- Taylor, Carles L. (1910-22)



- Tower, Charlemagne (1910-23), member, executive committee (1911-23; treasurer (1912-23)  
 Wadsworth, Eliot (1937-51), assistant treasurer (1944-45); treasurer (1945-49); member, finance committee (1945-49); member, executive committee (1945-49)  
 Wakefield, Lyman E. (1943-45)  
 Watson, Thomas J. (1934-51, honorary 1951), chairman, finance committee (1935-47); member, executive committee (1936-46, 1948-51)  
 Waymack, W. W. (1941-), member, executive committee (1946-49)  
 White, Andrew D. (1910-18)  
 Williams, John Sharp (1910-22)  
 Woodward, Robert S. (1910-24)  
 Wright, Luke E. (1910-18)  
 Wriston, Henry M. (1943-54)

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

*Trustees*

- Raymond B. Allen, 1948-  
 Frank Aydelotte, 1921-53  
 H. McClelland Bell, 1905-18  
 William L. Bryan, 1910-38  
 M. Le Roy Burton, 1915-25  
 Nicholas Murray Butler, 1905-47  
 Samuel P. Capen, 1935-50  
 Oliver C. Carmichael, 1937-  
 T. Morrison Carnegie, 1905-24  
 Lotus D. Coffman, 1930-38  
 Arthur H. Compton, 1946-54  
 James B. Conant, 1934-53  
 Edwin B. Craighead, 1905-17  
 William H. Crawford, 1905-20  
 Sir Arthur W. Currie, 1927-33  
 Carter Davidson, 1946-  
 Arthur H. Dean, 1950-  
 George H. Denny, 1905-  
 Albert B. Dinwiddie, 1923-35  
 Harold W. Dodds, 1935-  
 Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1950-53  
 Charles W. Eliot, 1905-09  
 Edward C. Elliott, 1934-46  
 Sir Robert Falconer, 1917-32  
 Livingston Farrand, 1929-39  
 Frederick C. Ferry, 1920-39  
 Dixon Ryan Fox, 1939-45  
 Robert A. Franks, 1905-35  
 Edwin B. Fred, 1946-  
 Eugene A. Gilmore, 1938-48  
 Laurence M. Gould, 1953-  
 Frank P. Graham, 1932-53  
 A. Whitney Griswold, 1950-

*Trustees—Continued*

R. G. Gustavson, 1949-53  
Arthur T. Hadley, 1905-21  
William R. Harper, 1905-06  
Rufus C. Harris, 1945-  
Charles C. Harrison, 1905-10  
John G. Hibben, 1920-32  
Albert R. Hiss, 1918-36  
William V. Houston, 1953-  
Edwin H. Hughes, 1905-08  
Alexander C. Humphreys, 1905-27  
Walter A. Jessup, 1932-44  
David S. Jordan, 1905-16  
Devereux C. Josephs, 1947-49  
Henry C. King, 1905-27  
Grayson L. Kirk, 1953-  
James H. Kirkland, 1917-37  
Thomas S. Lamont, 1949-  
Thomas W. Lamont, 1917-48  
Ernest H. Lindley, 1934-40  
Clarence C. Little, 1927-29  
Robert A. Lovett, 1937-  
Abbott Lawrence Lowell, 1910-33  
Howard F. Lowry, 1948-  
Norman A. M. MacKenzie, 1951-  
John H. T. Main, 1924-31  
Thomas McClelland, 1905-17  
Samuel B. McCormick, 1905-23  
Frederick A. Middlebush, 1937-  
John S. Millis, 1949-  
Walter C. Murray, 1918-38  
William A. Neilson, 1920-46  
John L. Newcomb, 1936-47  
George Norlin, 1925-39  
Josiah H. Penniman, 1924-41  
Sir William Peterson, 1905-18  
Samuel Plantz, 1905-24  
Henry S. Pritchett, 1905-30  
Nathan M. Pusey, 1953-  
Ira Remsen, 1909-13  
Rush Rhees, 1922-35  
Jacob Gould Schurman, 1905-20  
L. Clark Seelye, 1905-10  
Charles Seymour, 1939-50  
Kenneth C. M. Sills, 1933-52  
William F. Slocum, 1906-17  
Edgar F. Smith, 1913-20  
Franklyn B. Snyder, 1940-49  
Robert G. Sproul, 1939-  
Henry Suzzallo, 1918-33  
James M. Taylor, 1910-14  
Charles F. Thwing, 1905-22  
Alan Valentine, 1945-50  
Frank A. Vanderlip, 1905-37  
Charles R. Van Hise, 1909-18

*Trustees—Continued*

Robert E. Vinson, 1920-34  
 Robert C. Wallace, 1938-51  
 Herman B. Wells, 1941-  
 Clement C. Williams, 1939-46  
 Woodrow Wilson, 1905-10  
 Benjamin F. Wright, 1952-  
 Henry M. Wriston, 1932-

*Administrative officers*

## Presidents:

Henry S. Pritchett, 1905-30  
 Henry Suzzallo, 1930-33  
 Walter A. Jessup, 1934-44  
 Oliver C. Carmichael, 1945-53  
 Thomas S. Lamont (president ad interim), 1953-

## Secretaries:

Albert LeForest Derby, assistant secretary, 1905-06  
 Walter M. Gilbert, assistant secretary, 1905-47  
 John G. Bowman, 1906-11  
 Clyde Furst, 1911-31  
 William S. Learned, assistant secretary, 1920-31  
 Howard J. Savage, 1931-49  
 Paul Scherer, assistant secretary, 1947-  
 Robert M. Lester (associate secretary 1947-49), 1949-

## Treasurers:

T. Morrison Carnegie, 1906-10  
 Robert A. Franks, 1910-35  
 Frank A. Vanderlip, 1935-37  
 Howard J. Savage, 1937-49  
 C. Herbert Lee, 1949-

## Assistant treasurers:

John G. Bowman, 1910-11  
 Clyde Furst, 1911-21  
 Samuel S. Hall, Jr., 1921-39  
 Devereux C. Josephs, 1939-45  
 Parker Monroe, 1945-48  
 C. Herbert Lee, 1948-49

## Staff members:

A. Monell Sayre, 1905-13  
 Abraham Flexner, 1908-12  
 William S. Learned, 1913-46  
 Alfred Z. Reed, 1913-40  
 I. L. Kandel, 1914-23  
 Howard J. Savage, 1923-1931; 1949-51

## Actuarial consultants:

Charles E. Brooks, 1918-20  
 Raymond L. Mattocks, 1922-53

## Staff associates:

Harold W. Bentley, 1926-29  
 Paul Webb, 1931-32  
 David Spence Hill, 1931-34  
 W. Carson Ryan, 1936-40  
 Charles R. Langmuir, 1936-42  
 Kenneth W. Vaughn, 1942-47

## TRUSTEES (OR DIRECTORS) AND OFFICERS OF FORD FOUNDATIONS

The Ford Foundation has itself created five other agencies to carry on activities in special fields. Each such agency receives its funds from the Ford Foundation, but is entirely independent, with its own charter and bylaws, as well as its own directors and officers. These agencies are, the East European Fund, Inc., the Fund for Adult Education, the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., Intercultural Publications, Inc., and Resources for the Future, Inc. The directors and officers of each of these agencies are given following those of the Ford Foundation.

*Trustees 1936-54*

- Edsel B. Ford (deceased 1943), formerly president, Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich., 1936-43
- B. J. Craig, formerly secretary-treasurer, the Ford Foundation, 1379 Dorstone Place, Birmingham, Mich, 1936-51
- Clifford B. Longley, attorney, Bodman, Longley, Boble, Armstrong & Dahling, Buhl Building, Detroit, Mich., 1936-43
- Henry Ford II, president, Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich, 1943-55
- Frank Campsall (deceased 1946), formerly assistant general manager and director, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich., 1943-46
- Gordon S. Rentschler (deceased 1948), formerly president, Hooven-Owens-Rentschler Co. and chairman, the National City Bank of New York, New York, N. Y., 1945-48
- Karl T. Compton (deceased 1954), formerly president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., 1946-51
- Benson Ford, vice president, Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich., 1947-57
- Donald K. David, dean, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1948-55
- James B. Webber, Jr., president, J. L. Hudson Co., 1206 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich., 1948-53
- Charles E. Wilson, chairman of the executive committee, W. R. Grace & Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., 1949-56
- John Cowles, publisher, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., Portland and Fifth Streets, Minneapolis, Minn., 1950-56
- Paul G. Hoffman (then president, the Ford Foundation), chairman of the board (since 1953), the Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind., 1950-53
- Frank Abrams (retired), formerly chairman of the Board, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York, N. Y., 1952-55
- Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., judge, United States district court, Boston Mass., 1952-57
- H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president, the Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., 1953-57
- James F. Brownlee, partner, J. H. Whitney & Co., New York, N. Y., 1953-55
- Frederick Lewis Allen (deceased 1954), formerly editor, Harper's magazine, vice president, Harper & Bros., New York, N. Y., 1953-54
- John J. McCloy, chairman of the board, the Chase National Bank, New York, N. Y., 1953-56

*Trustees 1936-54—Continued*

Mark F. Ethridge, publisher, the Louisville Times and the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., 1954-56

Laurence M. Gould, president, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., 1954-57

*Principal elected officers from first meeting of the board of trustees to August 20, 1954*

Chairman of the board: Henry Ford II, November 6, 1950, to date

Vice chairman of the board: Karl T. Compton, April 10 to October 1, 1951

## President:

H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., March 1, 1953, to date

Paul G. Hoffman, November 6, 1950, to March 1, 1953

Henry Ford II, June 4, 1943, to November 6, 1950

Edsel B. Ford, February 4, 1936, to May 26, 1943

## Vice president (formerly called associate director):

Dyke Brown, March 1, 1953, to date

Thomas H. Carroll, June 30, 1953, to date

William H. McPeak, September 16, 1953 to date

Don K. Price, Jr., September 16, 1953, to date

Robert M. Hutchins, January 29, 1951, to May 31, 1954

Milton Katz, September 1, 1951, to January 14, 1954

Chester C. Davis, January 29, 1951, to July 1, 1953

H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., January 29, 1951, to March 1, 1953

## Treasurer:

Oliver May, July 2, 1951, to date

B. J. Craig, February 4, 1936, to July 2, 1951

## Secretary:

Joseph M. McDaniel, Jr., March 1, 1953, to date

Oliver May, July 2, 1951, to March 1, 1953

B. J. Craig, April 10, 1946, to July 2, 1951

Frank Campsall, June 4, 1943, to April 10, 1946

Clifford Longley, February 4, 1936, to June 4, 1943

## EAST EUROPEAN FUND, INC.

*Trustees (from inception to date)*

Frank Altschul, president of General American Investors Co., Inc., March 1951 to date

Paul B. Anderson, associate executive secretary, international committee of the Young Men's Christian Association, March 1952 to date

Merle Fainsod, professor of government, Harvard University, March 1952 to date

George F. Kennan, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, March 1951 to November 1951; September 1953 to date

Philip E. Mosely, professor of international relations and director of the Russian Institute of Columbia University, March 1951 to date

R. Gordon Wasson, vice president of J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., March 1951 to date

John E. F. Wood, partner in the law firm of Root, Ballatine, Bushby & Palmer, New York City, March 1951 to date

*Officers (from inception to date)*

## President:

George F. Kennan, March 1951 to November 1951

Philip E. Mosely, January 1952 to date

Vice president and treasurer: R. Gordon Wasson, March 1951 to date

## Secretary:

George Fischer, March 1951 to May 1951

Elizabeth Meredith, May 1951 to October 1952

Donald A. Lowrie, October 1952 to February 1953

David C. Munford, February 1953 to date (secretary pro tempore  
February 1953 to April 1954)

## Director:

George Fischer, March 1951 to November 1951

Melville J. Ruggles, March 1952 to October 1952

Donald A. Lowrie, October 1952 to February 1953

David C. Munford, full time, February 1953 to September 1953;  
part time, September 1953 to dateDirector, Chekhov Publishing House, Nicholas Wreden, executive  
editor, Little, Brown & Co., September 1951 to dateDirector, Research Program on the U. S. S. R., Philip E. Mosely,  
June 1951 to date

## THE FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION

*Directors*

Sarah Gibson Blanding, April 5, 1951, to present

Harry A. Bullis, May 28, 1953, to present

Howard Bruce, April 5, 1951, to March 13, 1953

Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, April 5, 1951, to present

John L. Collyer, April 5, 1951, to present

Milton S. Eisenhower, May 28, 1953, to present

Clarence H. Faust, April 5, 1951, to present

Alexander Fraser, April 5, 1951, to May 6, 1952

C. Scott Fletcher, April 5, 1951, to present

Clarence Francis, April 5, 1951, to present

Clinton S. Golden, April 5, 1951, to present

Paul H. Helms, April 5, 1951, to present

George M. Humphrey, April 5, 1951, to December 1, 1952

Allan B. Kline, April 5, 1951, to present

William A. Patterson, May 28, 1953, to present

Charles H. Percy, April 5, 1951, to present

Anna Lord Strauss, April 5, 1951, to present

James W. Young, April 5, 1951, to May 6, 1952

*Officers*

C. Scott Fletcher, president, April 5, 1951, to present

Alexander Fraser, chairman of the board, April 5, 1951, to May 6, 1952

Paul H. Helms, chairman of the board, May 6, 1952, to May 20, 1953

Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, May 28, 1953, to present

Joseph M. McDaniel, Jr., treasurer, April 5, 1951, to October 16, 1951

Ernest L. Young, acting treasurer, October 16, 1951, to present

Robert O. Hancox, acting secretary, April 5, 1951, to January 17, 1952

Martha C. Howard, secretary, January 17, 1952, to present

Ann C. Spinney, assistant secretary, July 11, 1952, to present

## THE FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION

*Directors (from April 1951 to present, unless otherwise indicated)*

- Frank W. Abrams, formerly chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (chairman of fund until resignation from board in June 1953)
- Barry Bingham, president, the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.
- Ralph J. Bunche, Director, Division of Trusteeship, United Nations, 405 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
- Charles D. Dickey, director and vice president, J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., 23 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
- James H. Douglas, Jr., Under Secretary of the Air Force, Pentagon Building, Arlington, Va.
- Alvin C. Eurich (see list of officers)
- Clarence H. Faust (see list of officers)
- C. Scott Fletcher, president, Fund for Adult Education, 1444 Wentworth Street, Pasadena, Calif.
- Walter Gifford, room 1010, 46 Cedar Street, New York 5, N. Y., formerly Ambassador to Great Britain and chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph (since April 1954)
- Mrs. Douglas Horton, 52 Gramercy Park North, New York 10, N. Y., formerly Director of the WAVES and president of Wellesley College
- Mr. Roy Larsen, president, Time, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
- Mr. Walter Lippmann, 3525 Woodley Road NW., Washington 16, D. C., columnist
- Mr. Ralph McGill, editor, the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga. (since April 1954)
- Mr. Paul Mellon, 716 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (president, Old Dominion Foundation)
- Mr. Walter P. Paepcke, chairman of the board, Container Corporation of America, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
- Mr. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (until June 1953)
- Owen J. Roberts, 1421 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa. (formerly Associate Justice of the Supreme Court) (chairman of fund board since June 1953)
- James Webb Young, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y., advertising consultant (until April 1952)

## THE FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION

*Officers*

- Clarence H. Faust, president, Fund for Advancement of Education, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (April 1951 to present)
- Alvin C. Eurich, vice president, Fund for Advancement of Education, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (September 1951 to present)
- John K. Weiss, treasurer, Fund for Advancement of Education, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (April 1954 to present)
- O. Meredith Wilson (secretary of the fund from December 1952 to March 1954); Current address: President, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.

*Officers—Continued*

- Philip H. Coombs, secretary, Fund for Advancement of Education, 575 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. (secretary-treasurer until April 1954) (secretary since April 1954)  
 Thomas A. Spragens (secretary-treasurer, June 1951–December 1952); Current address: President, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.

## THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC.

*Directors, past and present*

- James F. Brownlee, partner, J. H. Whitney & Co., New York City, December 1952–May 1953  
 Malcolm Bryan, president, Federal Reserve Bank, Atlanta, December 1952–January 1953  
 Huntington Cairns, lawyer, Washington, D. C., December 1952–August 1953  
 Clifford P. Case, president, The Fund for the Republic, Inc., May 1953–March 1954  
 Charles W. Cole, president, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., December 1952–1956<sup>1</sup>  
 Russell L. Dearmont, lawyer, St. Louis, Mo., December 1952–1954<sup>1</sup>  
 Richard Finnegan, consulting editor, Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago, Ill., December 1952–1954<sup>1</sup>  
 David F. Freeman, secretary, The Fund for the Republic, Inc., December 1952–November 1953  
 Erwin N. Griswold, dean, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass., December 1952–1956<sup>1</sup>  
 Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board, the Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind., February 1953–1954<sup>1</sup>  
 Robert M. Hutchins, president, The Fund for the Republic, Inc., April 1954—  
 William H. Joyce, Jr., chairman of the board, Joyce, Inc., Pasadena, Calif., December 1952–1955<sup>1</sup>  
 Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Ill., December 1952–1956<sup>1</sup>  
 M. Albert Linton, president, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia, Pa., December 1952–1954<sup>1</sup>  
 John Lord O'Brian, partner, Covington & Burling, Washington, D. C., February 1953–1956<sup>1</sup>  
 Jubal R. Parten, president, Woodley Petroleum Co., Houston, Tex., December 1952–1954<sup>1</sup>  
 Elmo Roper, marketing consultant, New York City, N. Y., December 1952–1955<sup>1</sup>  
 George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College, New York City, vice chairman, August 1953, December 1952–1955<sup>1</sup>  
 Mrs. Eleanor B. Stevenson, Oberlin, Ohio, December 1952–1956<sup>1</sup>  
 James D. Zellerbach, president, Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, Calif., December 1952–1955<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Annual meeting in November. Terms of office run until November of the year mentioned.



*Officers*

Chairman of the board, Paul G. Hoffman, February 1953 to present  
 Vice chairman of the board, George N. Shuster, August 1953 to present  
 Presidents, David F. Freeman, December 1952 to May 1953; Clifford  
 P. Case, May 1953 to March 1954; Robert M. Hutchins, June 1954  
 to present

Vice president, W. H. Ferry, July 1954 to present

Secretary, David F. Freeman, December 1952 to present

Treasurer, Isaac Stickler, December 1952 to August 1953

Acting treasurer, David F. Freeman, August 1953 to present

Assisant treasurer, Charles C. Dold, September 1953 to March 1954

INTERCULTURAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 477 MADISON AVENUE,  
 NEW YORK 22, N. Y.

*Directors*

James Laughlin, president, Intercultural Publications, Inc., 477 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

William J. Casey, 60 East 42d Street, New York 17, N. Y., lawyer  
 Charles Garside, president, Associated Hospital Service of New York,  
 80 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Joseph W. Hambuechen, First Boston Corp., 100 Broadway, New York,  
 N. Y., banker

H. J. Heinz II, president, H. J. Heinz Co., Post Office Box 57, Pitts-  
 burgh 30, Pa.

Alfred A. Knopf, president, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 501 Madison  
 Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Richard Weil, Jr., 2 East 67th Street, New York 22, N. Y., executive

*Officers*

James Laughlin, president

Charles Garside, secretary

Ernest J. Perry, treasurer

Ronald Freeland, assistant secretary

The board of directors has been serving since April 9, 1952.

Mr. James F. Brownlee, of Fairfield, Conn., also elected April 9,  
 1952, resigned from the board in December 1952.

Mr. Hayden Carruth served as assistant secretary from September  
 1952 to October 1953, at which time has was succeeded by Mr. Ronald  
 Freeland.

## DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE, INC.

Resources for the Future, Inc., was incorporated in New York under  
 the membership corporation law October 7, 1952. By article VI of  
 the certificate of incorporation the following-named persons were  
 designated until the first annual meeting or until any special meeting  
 held for the purpose of electing directors:

Milton Adler, 12 Crown Street, Brooklyn 25, N. Y.

Charles T. Duncan, 229 West 74th Street, New York 23, N. Y.

Joseph H. Schnabel, 402 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn 18, N. Y.

(NOTE.—The above-named directors named in the certificate of incorporation were on information and belief designated by law firm employed to obtain the certificate of incorporation and are not individually known to the present officers of the corporation.)

These directors named in article VI of the certificate of incorporation met on October 10, 1952, at which time each of them submitted his resignation in turn and the following-named persons were named directors:

William S. Paley

Ralph F. Colin (resigned November 5, 1952)

John S. Minary (resigned November 5, 1952)

The following persons were elected at subsequent meetings of the corporation:

Elected November 5, 1952:

Horace M. Albright

Edward J. Condon

E. B. MacNaughton

Leslie A. Miller

Fairfield Osborn (resigned December 8, 1953)

Beardsley Ruml

Stanley Ruttenberg

M. L. Wilson (resigned May 1, 1953)

Charles W. Eliot (resigned February 5, 1953)

Elected November 6, 1952: Reuben G. Gustavson

Elected June 19, 1953: Otto H. Liebers

The following persons have been elected officers of the corporation since its inception:

Elected October 10, 1952:

William S. Paley, president (resigned November 5, 1952)

Ralph F. Colin, vice president and treasurer (resigned November 5, 1952)

John S. Minary, secretary (resigned November 5, 1952)

Elected November 5, 1952:

Horace M. Albright, president (resigned March 31, 1953, to become effective upon the date of taking office by his successor)

Charles W. Eliot, executive director (resigned February 5, 1953)

Elmer Hennig, secretary and treasurer (resigned July 15, 1954)

Elected March 2, 1953: Reuben G. Gustavson, president (to become effective upon his acceptance and taking office on July 1, 1953)

Elected April 19, 1953: Horace M. Albright, chairman of the board

Reuben G. Gustavson, executive director

Elected July 15, 1954:

Joseph L. Fisher, secretary

John E. Herbert, treasurer

## THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1913, April 1954*

- Agar, John G.,<sup>1</sup> lawyer, February 25, 1920, to November 9, 1928
- Aldrich, Winthrop W., formerly chairman of the board, the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, now Ambassador to Great Britain, April 10, 1935, to June 30, 1951
- Angell, James R.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Yale University, November 9, 1928, to April 15, 1936
- Arnett, Trevor, formerly president, the General Education Board, and the International Education Board, Grand Beach, Mich., November 9, 1928, to April 15, 1936
- Barnard, Chester I., formerly president, the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board, 52 Gramercy Park North, New York 10, N. Y., April 3, 1940, to June 30, 1952
- Bowles, Chester,<sup>2</sup> formerly governor of Connecticut and formerly United States Ambassador to India and Nepal; Essex, Conn., April 7, 1954, to April 6, 1955
- Bronk, Detlev W.,<sup>2</sup> president, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, York Avenue and 66th Street, New York 21, N. Y., April 1, 1953, to April 6, 1955
- Buttrick, Wallace,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, General Education Board, and chairman, the International Education Board, January 24, 1917, to May 27, 1926
- Claffin, William H., Jr.,<sup>2</sup> president, Soledad Sugar Co., Room 1006, 75 Federal Street, Boston 10, Mass., April 5, 1950, to April 6, 1955
- Compton, Karl T., chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., April 3, 1940, to June 30, 1953
- Davis, John W., lawyer, with firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York 5, N. Y., February 24, 1922, to April 5, 1939
- Dickey, John S.,<sup>2</sup> president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., April 2, 1947, to April 4, 1956
- Dodds, Harold W.,<sup>2</sup> president, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., April 7, 1937, to June 30, 1954
- Douglas, Lewis W.,<sup>2</sup> chairman of the board, Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, 1740 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y., formerly United States Ambassador to Great Britain, April 10, 1935, to April 2, 1947; December 6, 1950, to April 6, 1955
- Dulles, John Foster, Secretary of State, Washington 25, D. C., formerly member, Sullivan & Cromwell (lawyers), April 10, 1935, to December 2, 1952

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1913, April 1954—Continued*

- Edsall, David L.,<sup>1</sup> formerly dean, Harvard Medical School, and Harvard School of Public Health, May 25, 1927, to April 15, 1936
- Eliot, Charles W.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Harvard University, January 21, 1914, to May 23, 1917
- Flexner, Simon,<sup>1</sup> formerly director, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, May 22, 1913, to April 16, 1930
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson, pastor emeritus, Riverside Church, 490 Riverside Drive, New York 27, N. Y., January 26, 1916, to February 23, 1921
- Fosdick, Raymond B., formerly president, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, 25 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., February 23, 1921, to June 30, 1948
- Freeman, Douglas S.,<sup>1</sup> formerly editor, Richmond News Leader, and biographer, Robert E. Lee and George Washington, April 7, 1937, to December 5, 1951
- Gasser, Herbert S.,<sup>2</sup> member emeritus, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research (formerly director), York Avenue and 66th Street, New York, N. Y., April 7, 1937, to June 30, 1954
- Gates, Frederick T.,<sup>1</sup> formerly associated with John D. Rockefeller, Sr., formerly chairman, general education board, May 22, 1913, to July 2, 1923
- Gifford, Walter S., formerly president and chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., formerly United States Ambassador to Great Britain, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y., April 15, 1936, to April 5, 1950
- Greene, Jerome D., formerly secretary, the Rockefeller Foundation, formerly, member of board of overseers, Harvard University, 50 State Street, Boston, Mass., May 22, 1913, to January 24, 1917; November 9, 1928, to December 6, 1939
- Hadley, Herbert Spencer,<sup>3</sup> formerly Governor of Missouri and chancellor, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 23, 1927, to November 4, 1927
- Harrison, Wallace K.,<sup>2</sup> Harrison & Abramovitz, architects, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., July 1, 1951, to April 4, 1956
- Hepburn, Alonzo B.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, chairman of the board of directors, and chairman, advisory board, Chase National Bank of the City of New York, March 18, 1914, to January 25, 1922
- Heydt, Charles O., formerly associated with John D. Rockefeller, Sr., 34 Melrose Place, Montclair, N. J., May 22, 1913, to January 24, 1917
- Hopkins, Ernest M., formerly president, Dartmouth College, 29 Rope Ferry Road, Hanover, N. H., November 9, 1928, to December 2, 1942
- Howland, Charles P.,<sup>1</sup> formerly lawyer-member of Rushmore, Bisbee & Stern, November 9, 1928, to November 12, 1932
- Hughes, Charles E.,<sup>1</sup> formerly Chief Justice of the United States, January 24, 1917, to February 28, 1921; November 6, 1925, to November 9, 1928

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

<sup>3</sup> Died never having attended a meeting.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1913, April 1954—Continued*

- Judson, Harry Pratt,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, University of Chicago, May 22, 1913, to February 27, 1924
- Kellogg, Vernon L.,<sup>1</sup> formerly permanent secretary, National Research Council, February 24, 1922, to April 11, 1934
- Kimberly, John R.,<sup>2</sup> president, Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis., April 1, 1953, to April 3, 1957
- Loeb, Robert F.,<sup>2</sup> Bard professor of medicine, Columbia University, 620 West 168th Street, New York, N. Y., April 2, 1947, to April 3, 1957
- Lovett, Robert A.,<sup>2</sup> Brown Bros., Harriman & Co., 59 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., formerly Secretary of Defense, May 20, 1949, to April 3, 1957
- Mason, Max, formerly president, the Rockefeller Foundation, 1035 Harvard Street, Claremont, Calif., January 1, 1930, to June 30, 1936
- McCloy, John J., chairman of the board, the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y., formerly High Commissioner for Germany, April 3, 1946, to June 11, 1949; April 1, 1953, to April 6, 1955
- Moe, Henry Allen,<sup>2</sup> secretary general, John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., April 5, 1944, to April 4, 1956
- Murphy, Starr J.,<sup>1</sup> formerly lawyer-personal counsel, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., May 22, 1913, to April 4, 1921
- Myers, William I.,<sup>2</sup> dean, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., April 2, 1941, to April 4, 1956
- Parkinson, Thomas L., formerly president, Equitable Life Assurance Society 7 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y., April 10, 1935, to December 4, 1946
- Parran, Thomas,<sup>2</sup> dean, Graduate School of Public Health, the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 2, 1941, to April 4, 1956
- Richards, Alfred N., emeritus professor of pharmacology, University of Pennsylvania, 737 Rugby Road, Bryn Mawr, Pa., April 7, 1937, to April 2, 1941
- Rockefeller, John D., Sr.,<sup>1</sup> business and philanthropy, May 22, 1913, to December 4, 1923
- Rockefeller, John D., Jr., business and philanthropy, formerly chairman of the board, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., May 22, 1913, to April 3, 1940
- Rockefeller, John D., 3d,<sup>2</sup> business and philanthropy, chairman of the board, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., December 16, 1931, to April 4, 1956
- Rose, Wickliffe,<sup>1</sup> formerly member of International Health Board and president, International Education Board and General Education Board, May 22, 1913, to June 30, 1928
- Rosenwald, Julius, formerly merchant and philanthropist, January 24, 1917, to April 15, 1931

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1913, April 1954—Continued*

- Rusk, Dean,<sup>2</sup> president, the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N. Y., formerly Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, April 5, 1950, to April 3, 1957
- Ryerson, Martin A.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president and honorary president board of trustees, University of Chicago, January 26, 1916, to December 3, 1928
- Smith, Geoffrey S.,<sup>2</sup> president, Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank, Broad and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., April 5, 1950, to April 6, 1955.
- Sproul, Robert G.,<sup>2</sup> president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., April 3, 1940, to April 6, 1955
- Stevens, Robert T., Secretary of the Army, Washington, D. C., formerly chairman of the board, J. P. Stevens Co., April 2, 1952, to January 16, 1953
- Stewart, Walter W., emeritus professor, school of economics and politics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J., April 15, 1931, to December 6, 1950
- Stokes, Anson Phelps, formerly canon, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., Lenox, Mass., November 9, 1928, to April 12, 1932
- Strauss, Frederick,<sup>1</sup> formerly associated with J. and W. Seligman & Co. (brokers), January 26, 1916, to April 15, 1931
- Sulzberger, Arthur Hays,<sup>2</sup> publisher, the New York Times, and president and director, the New York Times Co., 229 West 43d Street, New York, N. Y., April 5, 1939, to April 3, 1957
- Swift, Harold H., chairman of the board, Swift & Co., Union Stockyards, Chicago, Ill., April 15, 1931, to April 5, 1950
- Trowbridge, Augustus,<sup>1</sup> formerly dean of the graduate school, Princeton University, November 9, 1928, to March 14, 1934
- Van Dusen, Henry P.,<sup>2</sup> president, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th Street, New York, N. Y., April 2, 1947, to April 3, 1957
- Vincent, George E.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president of the University of Minnesota, formerly president of the Rockefeller Foundation, January 24, 1917, to December 31, 1929
- Whipple, George H., formerly dean, school of medicine and dentistry, University of Rochester, 320 Westminister Road, Rochester, N. Y., May 25, 1927, to December 1, 1943
- White, William Allen,<sup>1</sup> formerly proprietor and editor, Emporia Gazette, Emporia, Kans., February 21, 1923, to April 10, 1935
- Wilbur, Ray Lyman,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Stanford University, February 21, 1923, to December 4, 1940
- Wood, W. Barry, Jr. (trustee-elect), professor of medicine, school of medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., July 1, 1954, to April 3, 1957
- Woods, Arthur M.,<sup>1</sup> formerly police commissioner, New York City, was assistant to Secretary of War, 1919, November 9, 1928, to April 10, 1935

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1913, April 1954—Continued*

Young, Owen D., honorary chairman of the board, General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., November 9, 1928, to December 6, 1939

*List of principal officers, 1913-54*

Chairmen of the board of trustees:

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., 1917-40  
 Walter W. Stewart, 1940-50  
 John Foster Dulles, 1950-52  
 John D. Rockefeller 3d,<sup>2</sup> 1952-

Presidents:

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., 1913-17  
 George E. Vincent, 1917-29  
 Max Mason, 1930-36  
 Raymond B. Fosdick, 1936-48

Chester I. Barnard, 1948-52

Dean Rusk,<sup>2</sup> 1952-

Vice presidents:

Roger S. Greene, 1927-29  
 Edwin R. Embree, 1927  
 Selskar M. Gunn, 1927-42  
 Thomas B. Appleget, 1929-49  
 Lindsley F. Kimball,<sup>2</sup> 1949-  
 Alan Gregg, M. D.,<sup>2</sup> 1951-

Secretaries:

Jerome D. Greene, 1913-17  
 Edwin R. Embree, 1917-24  
 Norma S. Thompson, 1925-47  
 Flora M. Rhind,<sup>2</sup> 1948-

Treasurers:

Louis G. Myers, 1913-32  
 Lefferts M. Dashiell, 1932-38  
 Thomas I. Parkinson, 1938  
 Edward Robinson,<sup>2</sup> 1938-

Comptrollers:

Robert H. Kirk, 1917-25  
 George J. Beal, 1925-53  
 H. Malcolm Gillette,<sup>2</sup> 1953-

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH DIVISION

(International Health Commission, 1913-16, International Health Board, 1916-27, merged with medical sciences to become division of medicine and public health in 1951)

*Directors*

Wickliffe, Rose, 1913-23  
 Frederick F. Russell, M. D., 1923-35  
 Wilbur A. Sawyer, M. D., 1935-44  
 George K. Strode, M. D., 1944-51

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

## DIVISION OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

(Division of medical education, 1919-29, merged with International Health Division to become division of medicine and public health, 1951)

*Directors*

Richard M. Pearce, M. D., 1919-30

Alan Gregg, M. D., 1931-51

## DIVISION OF MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

*Directors*

George K. Strode, M. D., 1951

Andrew J. Warren, M. D.,<sup>2</sup> 1951-

## DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND AGRICULTURE

(Changed from division of natural sciences in 1951)

*Directors*

Max Mason, 1928-29

Richard M. Pearce, M. D. (acting), 1930

William S. Carter, M. D., (acting), 1930

Herman A. Spoehr, 1930-31

Lauder W. Jones (acting), 1931-32

Warren Weaver,<sup>2</sup> 1932-

## DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

*Directors*

Edmund E. Day, 1928-37

Sydnor H. Walker (acting), 1937-38

Joseph H. Willits,<sup>2</sup> 1939-54

## DIVISION OF HUMANITIES

*Directors*

Edward Capps, 1929-30

David H. Stevens, 1932-49

Charles B. Fahs,<sup>2</sup> 1950-

## GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD

Founded by John D. Rockefeller in 1902

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1903-April 1954*

Alderman, Edwin A.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., November 27, 1906, to December 31, 1928

Aldrich Winthrop W., formerly chairman of the board, the Chase National Bank of the City of New York, now Ambassador to Great Britain, April 15, 1935, to June 30, 1951

Andrews, E. Benjamin,<sup>1</sup> formerly chancellor, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., June 30, 1904, to May 24, 1912

Angell, James R.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., February 23, 1922, to December 31, 1934

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.



*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1903—April 1954—Continued*

- Arnett, Trevor, formerly president, General Education Board and International Education Board, Grand Beach, Mich., February 26, 1920, to December 31, 1936
- Baldwin, W. H., Jr.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Long Island Railroad Co., February 27, 1902, to January 3, 1905
- Barnard, Chester I., formerly president, General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation, 52 Gramercy Park North, New York, N. Y., April 8, 1948, to June 30, 1952
- Branscomb, Bennett Harvie,<sup>2</sup> chancellor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., April 3, 1947, to April 4, 1957
- Bronk, Detlev. W.,<sup>2</sup> president, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, York Avenue and 66th Street, New York, N. Y., April 8, 1954, to April 5, 1956
- Buttrick, Wallace,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, General Education Board and chairman, International Education Board, May 14, 1902, to May 27, 1926
- Carnegie, Andrew,<sup>1</sup> business and philanthropy, March 24, 1908, to September 16, 1918
- Chase, Harry Woodburn, formerly chancellor, New York University, Box 491, Northport, N. Y., January 1, 1930, to December 17, 1936
- Compton, Karl T., chairman of corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., April 4, 1940, to June 30, 1953
- Coolidge, T. Jefferson,<sup>2</sup> chairman of board, United Fruit Co. and Old Colony Trust Co., 80 Federal St., Boston, Mass., April 6, 1950, to April 4, 1957
- Curry, J. L. M.,<sup>1</sup> general agent, Peabody Education Fund; general agent, John F. Slater Fund, February 27, 1902, to February 12, 1903
- Davis, John W., lawyer, Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., April 15, 1935, to December 8, 1938
- DeVane, William C., dean, Yale College, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., April 6, 1950, to April 7, 1955
- Dillard, James H.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Jeanes Foundation, and president, John F. Slater Fund, February 28, 1918, to December 31, 1929
- Dodds, Harold W.,<sup>2</sup> president, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., January 1, 1937, to June 30, 1954
- Douglas, Lewis W.,<sup>2</sup> chairman of board, Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, 1740 Broadway, New York, N. Y., formerly Ambassador to Great Britain, April 8, 1937, to April 3, 1947; December 7, 1950, to April 7, 1955
- Dulles, John Foster, formerly member, Sullivan & Cromwell, lawyers, New York, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1950, to December 4, 1952
- Eliot, Charles W.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., January 28, 1908, to May 5, 1917
- Flexner, Abraham, formerly director of studies and medical education, General Education Board, director emeritus, Institute for

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1903-April 1954—Continued*

- Advanced Study, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., January 22, 1914, to June 30, 1928
- Fosdick, Raymond B., formerly president, General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation, 25 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., February 23, 1922, to June 30, 1948
- Freeman, Douglas S.,<sup>1</sup> formerly editor, Richmond News Leader, January 1, 1937, to December 6, 1951
- Frissell, Hollis B.,<sup>1</sup> formerly principal, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., November 27, 1906, to August 5, 1917
- Gates, Frederick T.,<sup>1</sup> formerly associated with John D. Rockefeller, Sr.; formerly chairman, General Education Board, February 27, 1902, to December 31, 1928
- Gifford, Walter S., formerly president and chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., formerly Ambassador to Great Britain, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y., April 15, 1935, to April 6, 1950
- Gilman, Daniel C.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Johns Hopkins University; formerly president, Carnegie Institution of Washington, February 27, 1902, to October 13, 1908
- Greene, Jerome D., formerly member of board of overseers, Harvard University, 50 State Street, Boston, Mass., January 26, 1912, to December 7, 1939
- Hanna, Hugh H.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Atlas Engine Works, June 30, 1905, to January 26, 1912
- Harper, William R.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, University of Chicago, June 30, 1905, to January 10, 1906
- Hopkins, Ernest M., formerly president, Dartmouth College, 29 Rope Ferry Road, Hanover, N. H., January 1, 1930, to December 3, 1942
- Howland, Charles P.,<sup>1</sup> formerly lawyer-member of Rushmore, Bisbee & Stern, February 27, 1919, to November 12, 1932
- Jesup, Morris K.,<sup>1</sup> formerly banker, February 27, 1902, to January 22, 1908
- Judson, Harry Pratt,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., November 27, 1906, to March 4, 1927
- Lane Franklin K.,<sup>1</sup> formerly vice-president, Pan-American Petroleum & Transport Co. of New York; formerly Secretary of the Interior in Cabinet of President Woodrow Wilson, February 24, 1921, to May 18, 1921
- McCain, James R., president emeritus, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga., April 4, 1940, to December 5, 1946
- Marston, Edgar L.,<sup>1</sup> formerly investment banker, Blair & Co., January 26, 1909, to May 23, 1918
- Mason, Ma, formerly director of natural sciences, General Education Board, formerly president, the Rockefeller Foundation, 1035 Harvard Street, Claremont, Calif., January 1, 1930, to June 30, 1936
- Mims, Edwin, professor emeritus of English, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., January 1, 1931, to December 31, 1936
- Murphy, Starr J.,<sup>1</sup> formerly lawyer, personal counsel, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., January 27, 1904 to December 31, 1905; January 22, 1907 to April 4, 1921.

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1903-April 1954—Continued*

- Myers, William L.,<sup>2</sup> dean, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., April 3, 1941, to April 7, 1955
- Norton, Edward L.,<sup>2</sup> chairman of board, Voice of Alabama (WAPI, WAFM-TV), 701 Protective Life Building, Birmingham, Ala., April 6, 1944 to April 5, 1956
- Ogden, Robert C.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Union Theological Seminary, February 27, 1902 to August 6, 1913
- Page, Walter Hines,<sup>1</sup> formerly editor, Doubleday Page & Co., New York, formerly Ambassador to Great Britain, February 27, 1902 to December 22, 1918
- Parkinson, Thomas I., formerly president, Equitable Life Assurance Society, 7 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y., April 15, 1935 to December 5, 1946
- Parran, Thomas,<sup>2</sup> dean, graduate school of public health, the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 3, 1947 to April 5, 1956
- Peabody, George Foster,<sup>1</sup> formerly banker, treasurer of General Education Board, February 27, 1902 to May 24, 1912
- Rockefeller, John D., Jr., business and philanthropy, formerly chairman of the board of the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., January 29, 1903 to April 6, 1939
- Rockefeller, John D., 3d,<sup>2</sup> business and philanthropy, chairman of the board of the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., January 1, 1932 to April 5, 1956
- Rose, Wickliffe,<sup>1</sup> formerly member of International Health Board, formerly president of General Education Board and International Education Board, February 1, 1910, to June 30, 1928
- Rusk, Dean,<sup>2</sup> president, the Rockefeller Foundation and General Education Board, formerly Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N. Y., December 6, 1951, to April 7, 1955
- Shaw, Albert,<sup>1</sup> formerly editor, American Review of Reviews, February 27, 1902, to December 31, 1929
- Spaulding, Francis T.,<sup>1</sup> formerly professor of education, Harvard University, formerly commissioner of education and president of University of State of New York, April 4, 1940, to April 2, 1942
- Spaulding, Frank E., formerly superintendent of schools, Cleveland, Ohio, chairman emeritus, department of education, graduate school, Yale University, Casa de Mañana, La Jolla, Calif., February 28, to April 4, 1921
- Sproul, Robert G.,<sup>2</sup> president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., April 4, 1940, to April 4, 1957
- Stewart, Walter W., professor emeritus, school of economics and politics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J., December 15, 1932, to December 7, 1950
- Stokes, Anson Phelps, formerly canon, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., Lenox, Mass., May 24, 1912, to April 14, 1932
- Swift, Harold H., chairman of board, Swift & Co., Union Stockyards, Chicago, Ill., January 1, 1931, to April 6, 1950

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

*List of all persons who have served as trustees since incorporation in 1903—April 1954—Continued*

- Trowbridge, Augustus,<sup>1</sup> formerly dean of the graduate school, Princeton University, January 1, 1930 to March 14, 1934
- Van Dusen, Henry P.,<sup>2</sup> president, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th Street, New York, N. Y., April 8, 1948 to April 4, 1957
- Vincent, George E.,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, University of Minnesota, formerly president, the Rockefeller Foundation, May 28, 1914 to December 31, 1929
- Whipple, George H., formerly dean, school of medicine and dentistry, University of Rochester, 320 Westminister Road, Rochester, N. Y. December 17, 1936 to December 2, 1943
- Wilbur, Ray Lyman,<sup>1</sup> formerly president, Stanford University, January 1, 1931 to December 5, 1940.
- Woods, Arthur,<sup>1</sup> formerly Police Commissioner, New York City; formerly Assistant to Secretary of War, January 1, 1930 to December 31, 1934
- Young, Owen D., honorary chairman of board, General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., February 26, 1925 to December 7, 1939

*List of principal officers—1902-54*

Chairman of the board of trustees:

- William H. Baldwin, Jr., 1902-04
- Robert C. Ogden, 1905-06
- Frederick T. Gates, 1907-17
- Vacancy, 1918-22
- Wallace Buttrick, 1923-26
- Vacancy, 1927-30
- Raymond B. Fosdick, 1931-36
- John D. Rockefeller, Jr., 1936-39
- Ernest M. Hopkins, 1939-42
- Walter W. Stewart, 1942-50
- John Foster Dulles, 1950-52
- John D. Rockefeller, 3d,<sup>2</sup> 1952

Presidents:<sup>4</sup>

- Wallace Buttrick, 1917-23
- Wickliffe Rose, 1923-28
- Trevor Arnett, 1928-36
- Raymond B. Fosdick, 1936-48
- Chester I. Barnard, 1948-52
- Dean Rusk<sup>2</sup> 1952-

Vice presidents:

- David H. Stevens, 1931-38
- A. R. Mann, 1937-46
- Jackson Davis, 1946-47
- Robert D. Calkins, 1947-52
- Lindsley F. Kimball,<sup>2</sup> 1950-

<sup>1</sup> Deceased.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

<sup>4</sup> Principal executive officer prior to 1917 was called secretary and executive officer; see listing under Secretaries.

*List of principal officers—1902-54—Continued*

## Secretaries:

Wallace Buttrick (and executive officer), 1902-17  
 Starr J. Murphy (and executive officer), 1905-06  
 Abraham Flexner, 1917-25  
 Trevor Arnett, 1920-24  
 William W. Brierly, 1925-49  
 Robert W. July, April 7-December 31, 1949  
 Edouard D. Eller, 1950-52  
 Flora M. Rhind,<sup>2</sup> 1952-

## Treasurers:

George Foster Peabody, 1902-09  
 Louis G. Myers, 1910-32  
 Lefferts M. Dashiell, 1932-38  
 Edward Robinson,<sup>2</sup> 1938-

## Comptrollers (auditor prior to 1936):

Ernest A. Buttrick, 1922-31  
 George J. Beal, 1931-53  
 H. Malcolm Gillette,<sup>2</sup> 1953-

## Directors:

Abraham Flexner (studies and medical education), 1925-28  
 Frank P. Bachman (school surveys, public education), 1922-28  
 H. J. Thorkelson (college and university education, accounting),  
 1922-28  
 Charles R. Richards (industrial art), 1926-30  
 Whitney H. Shepardson (agricultural education), 1927-28  
 David H. Stevens (education), 1929-37  
 Max Mason (natural sciences), 1928-29  
 Herman A. Spoehr (natural sciences), 1930-31  
 Warren Weaver (natural sciences), 1932-37  
 Edward Capps (humanities), 1929-30  
 Alan Gregg (medical sciences), 1931-37  
 Edmund E. Day (social sciences, general education), 1930-37  
 R. J. Havighurst (general education), 1937-40  
 A. R. Mann (southern education), 1937-46  
 Jackson Davis (southern education), 1946-47  
 Robert D. Calkins (southern education), 1947-52

Mr. HAYS. Now, the reason I did that in view of the witness' statement is that I don't know who they are. I know some of them and I am sure that some members of the Ford family are members or directors of the Ford Foundation. There are many very prominent people associated with the Eisenhower administration. I want it right in the record that these are the people that the witness—I won't attempt to say because I am afraid he will qualify it, but we will let the record say what he said about them. I want to go on record right here as saying that I don't believe that such people, as the Fords, as Paul Hoffman, and others that I happen to know are officials of them, are in any way remotely or otherwise involved in any plot to subvert this Government.

I say to you in saying that I am defending the present administration, of which I am not a member.

<sup>2</sup> Present trustees.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to have your support of the statement which I have many times made: that the boards of directors of these large foundations are composed in the main of most estimable men of wide experience and, in most cases, extensive business connections; and the complaint that I developed was that they were so engaged with their other and more personal business and professional associations that they did not devote the time required to know what the foundations, the administrative phases of the foundations, were doing.

One of the chief and one of the principal purposes that I thought might be served by this study was to develop the work of the foundations and in that way the members of the boards of directors would come to understand more fully just what the foundations are doing and might thereby be encouraged to give more personal attention to the direction of the activities of the foundations.

Mr. HAYS. Boiled down, in other words, you are saying they are too stupid to know what they are doing now and so we are going to tell them.

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't boil down to that; if it did boil down, it wouldn't boil down to that.

They are men of very great ability and so far as I know men of high purpose.

Mr. HAYS. Do you subscribe to the legal concept that a board of directors of a corporation is responsible for the acts of that corporation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. SARGENT. One of the questions before this committee, and a very important and a very serious one, is going to be to decide whether the condition we have here is negligence, abdication of duty, or deliberate intent.

Obviously, there may be varying degrees and there may be conditions in certain departments and certain methods regarding the handling of their affairs, to explain the condition we have here. I am purposely not naming names on these boards except where I have something indicating that a specific person did a specific thing.

I did state in the opening of these hearings that I thought there was an antitrust question involved here, and I am entirely convinced that there is such a question. The discussion seems to have brought it up at this point and so now I want to mention it briefly.

There is a rule announced recently by the United States Supreme Court, in an opinion rendered by Chief Justice Warren, which has a very close bearing on this matter before us. It is the case of Hernandez against Texas, case No. 406, October term, 1953, decided May 3 this year.

The immediate question involved there was discrimination against one of the Mexican race convicted of a crime in the State of Texas, who protested the grand jury system and also the trial jury system in the State on the ground that members of his race were systematically excluded.

He proved no specific exclusion, but simply said the pattern showed on its face that it was discriminatory, and that a pattern of that character in itself was sufficiently legal proof to maintain his charge.

The Supreme Court unanimously sustained that contention and gave the following statement of law which I think is pertinent, and so I quote :

Circumstances or chance may well dictate that no persons in a certain class will serve on a particular jury or during some particular period, but it taxes our credulity to say that mere chance resulted in there being no members of this class among the over 6,000 jurors called in the past 25 years. The result bespeaks discrimination, whether or not it was a conscious decision on the part of any individual jury commissioner.

The petitioner did not seek proportional representation, nor did he claim a right to have persons of Mexican descent sit on the particular juries which he faced. His only claim is the right to be indicted and tried by juries from which all members of his class are not systematically excluded. Juries selected from among all qualified persons regardless of national origin or descent, to this much he is entitled by the Constitution.

A similar rule has been applied in antitrust cases, particularly in the so-called theater cases, involving the right to use first-run moving pictures, where certain groups in the industry get together and it just automatically comes out that certain people always get the first-runs and other people never get them.

Decisions on that are *Interstate Circuit, Inc., v. United States* (306 U. S. 208), *Ball v. Paramount Pictures* (169 Federal Second 317), from the Court of Appeals in the Third Circuit.

Now, we wish to request this committee to apply a similar rule to the matter before us and to decide by means of a sworn questionnaire properly drawn whether there has been in fact systematic discrimination on the part of these large foundations against pro-American projects and anti-Communists, and others, seeking to support and defend the United States Government.

I am talking now about the chairman's speech relied upon by the House in the adoption of this resolution before you. We would like to request—

Mr. HAYS. May I interject right there, to keep the record straight, now you can impugn the motives of a lot of people, but let me finish here. When you say that the House relied on the chairman's speech, and I am not even going to quarrel with that, I just want to have the record show that in the speech that appears in the record, the chairman only made about 2 or 3 minutes of it and the rest was inserted later, long after the House had voted.

It was done by unanimous consent which is a perfectly legal procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio wants to be reasonably accurate. As I recall, being in charge at the time, I yielded myself 20 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. And the interchange of where people interrupted you, it will show where.

The CHAIRMAN. A substantial part of it was made on the floor.

Mr. HAYS. I won't argue with the gentleman on that.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to my speech since it has been characterized so frequently, I want to say this, for the information of those who have been referring to it so frequently, that I was an advocate when I made that speech. I had introduced a resolution which I was asking the House to favorably consider. It was incumbent upon me as the author of the resolution to set out the reasons why I thought

the resolution should be adopted. It was not incumbent upon me to discuss or set out both sides of the question, in the sense of the word that it becomes my responsibility now to see that both sides of the question are fully developed.

We were discussing as to whether the resolution should be favorably considered by the House, and I was pointing out why it should be favorably considered, which just as I referred yesterday, and just as Judge Cox did when he was setting out why his resolution should be adopted, he mustered all of the reasons, I assume, or at least many reasons, and some of them are stated in pretty strong language as to why the resolution should be adopted. I think it is even stronger than what can be found in my speech.

But I am just saying that to give the viewpoint from which my speech was made. After I made the correction with reference to the time.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman will understand that I feel he had every reason to give his viewpoint, and I am not questioning anything he said; but Judge Cox's statement was pretty strong, I will agree with you. But Judge Cox later had quite a change of heart.

The CHAIRMAN. I may have.

Mr. HAYS. You anticipated my question.

The CHAIRMAN. I tried to anticipate it.

Mr. HAYS. I was going to ask you if we could hope for that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one legal concept, and this is in all seriousness—there is one legal concept about foundations that has disturbed me. One of the fundamental concepts of American jurisprudence is the rule against perpetuities. That is, we are inhibited under this great American concept from passing property beyond the second generation.

I fear that by a device of foundations—and this is not characterizing the foundations, whether it is good or bad, but it is just as prevalent in good foundations as in bad foundations, if the two classes exist. A family, whether it owns a large or small fortune, or a man in the same case, can set up a foundation and put the voting stock of that enterprise in the foundation, and name the board of directors of the foundation, and then provide that that board shall be self-perpetuating, and possibly, as has been found in some of the foundations—and I will not name them now—that the board cannot sell any of that stock that controls the enterprise except by unanimous consent of the board of directors.

That angle is a legal concept involved here that has disturbed me, and which I think the committee ought to give consideration to in connection with its deliberations.

Mr. HAYS. I think that you have a very good point there, and I am glad we find something occasionally we can agree on, but what you have said brings in a foundation which I think is perhaps the most outstanding example of what you are talking about, that has not even been mentioned and so perhaps we ought to look them over; I do not know. That is the Duke Foundation. There is the one that I know about, that that foundation cannot sell one share of Duke stock unless, I believe, it is the unanimous decision of the board.

Now let me just finish, and I am not going to say anything that will offend you. The Duke Foundation has done a lot of worthy things, and from what little I know about them they have established a great



fund that the Duke University Hospital operates under. I happened to have the privilege—and I won't even mention what time it was, so that there will be no political connotations—to go to Duke University, because at one time school teachers could go there without paying tuition because of the Duke Foundation. I won't say what year it was, but I was teaching, and I wasn't getting much money, and so I was looking for a place to get what I wanted in the way of education as cheaply as possible. But that might be a thing that we ought to look into, and I am not going to take any more time, except to say that I concur with you, and that happens to be the one that I know the most about, that does that very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. But the same thing applies, in one degree or another, with all of the foundations, or almost all of them. It is a question of degree. The mere fact that that one foundation might not require unanimous consent of the board to dispose of the voting stock of a corporation would not be controlling.

I am sorry. I only interjected that as a legal concept in connection with foundations, and it disturbed me from the very beginning.

Mr. HAYS. If we just go into that a little bit in this committee, it might be more conducive of good than some of the stuff we have been hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. The staff has been going into it, I assume, because one of the earlier suggestions I made to them was along that line.

Mr. SARGENT. The request I wish to make to the committee is that a suitable questionnaire be signed under oath by responsible officers of these various foundations, at least those engaged in the educational field—that is what we are talking about in this particular social study area—and in matters having to do with behavioral studies, psychology, and anything capable of dominating or affecting the mind or the thought of a man. It should be requested from these foundations whose capital is sufficiently large to give some degree of economic power and influence—the amount, of course, is subject to your judgment, perhaps \$25 million is a starting point for capitalization—in order to elicit information which seems clearly to be within the scope of the House resolution.

For example, willful discrimination without cause against certain types of activities here is unfair, in a very real sense, it is un-American, and it is not in accordance with the purposes of a foundation charter which is a public enterprise.

I would like to suggest such a questionnaire be prepared, to elicit the following information:

First of all, whether the foundation interrogated has made grants to pro-American projects from some designated period of time. To get a good picture here, suppose we start with 1930, and run up to date. Ask for a list of what, if anything, they have done along that line, and require them to describe briefly the nature of the project.

Whether they have supported studies which are critical of the welfare state and socialism, or demonstrate the merits of the competitive private property system.

Whether they have made any grants to active anti-Communist and repentant Communists who have served the United States at self-sacrifice by exposing communism within our borders.

Mr. HAYS. Let me hear that last one again.

Mr. SARGENT. I am reading from the chairman's speech here:

Whether they have given grants to active anti-Communists and repentant Communists who have served the United States at great self-sacrifice, by exposing the Communist conspiracy within our borders.

Mr. HAYS. Do you mean you are advocating that we give grants to repentant Communists?

Mr. SARGENT. People who have a demonstrated record of defense of American principles under present conditions.

Mr. HAYS. You might get a lot of repenters on a thing like that.

Mr. SARGENT. People with an established record, you know what I mean—people like Whittaker Chambers, for example. Those who have served and demonstrated their patriotism and who have gone through hell, mentally and otherwise, to stand up and defend this country of ours. Those men are entitled to consideration, and to public respect.

Whether they have made any such grants in educational projects relating to national defense and security, or the support or defense of the Government of the United States.

Whether they are now, regardless of any prior policies, ready or willing to make such grants.

Whether they are willing to make such grants for purposes of critical study and analysis of the findings and conclusions of other men in education heretofore aided by foundation grants for the purpose of placing the other point of view before the people and having those findings published and made publicly available.

Whether they are willing to have those studies made on the recommendation of some group not dominated by the foundations themselves, or by any organization which has presently had the direction and control of the sources into which this foundation money has been placed.

In other words, it should be a completely objective, outside arrangement formed in some proper way.

That will get you the facts. We won't have to debate about it.

Mr. HAYS. I just have a question there, and I would not want to debate it. I am casting no aspersions on your suggestion whatsoever, and I just want to try to get an opinion here. Do you think such a questionnaire would have any effect of looking like intimidation to the foundations?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't call it intimidation to ask these people whether they are prepared to perform what I think is fully their duty at this time.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, you are pitching for some funds for the Sons of the American Revolution.

Mr. SARGENT. No, sir, I am pitching for some funds for the American people, who are the beneficiaries of these trusts and who are entitled to have the money made available to defend their country.

Mr. HAYS. You are pitching to have them give the people that you approve of?

Mr. SARGENT. I am pitching for everybody.

Mr. HAYS. That is a magnanimous statement.

Mr. SARGENT. It is true. I think that we should find out through an appropriate questionnaire whether these foundations are now willing to conform to the standards of foundation conduct referred to here: Patriotism, loyalty, obedience to their charters, academic re-

sponsibility, and also a respect for their exemption privilege. Such projects could now be started and organized under proper auspices and there are dozens of competent men in the anti-Communist field who could form a group just as responsible and just as effective as this Council of American Learned Societies, which seems to direct all of this money of the giant foundations into such very strange places.

It may be all of this in the past is a mistake, and if it is, all right, let them say so. But this will get you the facts. If Congress should find—and I certainly hope it will not find—but if Congress should find that these people have not done it in the past, and they have no intention of doing it in the future, I think that that is something that the House of Representatives wants to know about.

Mr. HAYS. I think anybody, Mr. Sargent, in any foundation could answer your questionnaire without any fear whatsoever of being prosecuted for perjury or anything of the kind, and answer it favorably, and still go right ahead and determine which people they are going to give money to. Because your saying so does not make it so. They may not agree with you.

Mr. SARGENT. There is a discrimination pattern here which has definitely affected the book trade, and under which apparently almost entirely one class of literature gets into the channels of interstate commerce. In any event—

Mr. HAYS. Your book that you cited this morning, only yesterday got into interstate commerce; and after I pointed out what kind of a book it was, you repudiated it. I do not know how many more of these you will repudiate when I have a chance to examine them, but it will be interesting.

Mr. SARGENT. Have you any objection to such a questionnaire being submitted?

Mr. HAYS. The Chair and I, I think, are prepared to agree that we will take the request under advisement.

The CHAIRMAN. Such a questionnaire would appear to be material to this investigation and can be included as the suggestion of the witness.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. SARGENT. In order to make the request specific, between now and the time I come back for questioning, I will prepare the outline of what I think should be sent.

The CHAIRMAN. Had you repudiated the book to which you made reference?

Mr. SARGENT. No. Of course not.

Mr. HAYS. All but one paragraph.

Mr. SARGENT. No, I didn't. I said the rest of the statements are not necessarily authoritative as a research work.

Mr. HAYS. But you just stated one paragraph was authoritative.

Mr. SARGENT. I said I wouldn't take it one way or the other because I had nothing to do with the matter at hand.

Mr. HAYS. I think that the audience here knows that you pretty generally repudiated the book, except for one paragraph.

Mr. SARGENT. This is a proposal to get specific information, and I think it is a very inexpensive way and a very effective way, and the results will be entirely factual, and I would like leave to prepare a suggested form of questions that the staff might want to consider and the

<sup>1</sup> The questionnaire suggested by Mr. Sargent appears following his testimony on p. 398.

committee might want to, as a means of performing part of your responsibility on this matter here. I think that it would be highly important to do. I will prepare such a statement.

Mr. HAYS. You will submit it, and not as part of the record.

Mr. SARGENT. I will submit it when I come back for testimony, and whether it is in the record or not is a decision of the committee. I would like to make a specific presentation.

Mr. HAYS. I want the record to show that I am not hiring you to prepare anything.

Mr. SARGENT. I am doing it as a part of my presentation here.

Now, if it please the committee, I have other material which is interesting, and I think since we are trying to conclude this matter today, I will first cover some major points of general importance to you and then go back and, to the extent I have time, take up these other matters.

First of all, I would like to discuss the public policy aspects of this situation. There seem to be a number of them. One is the monopoly, the question of monopoly, and economic power.

The tendency of large blocks of capital to gravitate into foundation control; the danger inherent in the mere size of a giant foundation such as the Ford Foundation, just because of its magnitude, half a billion dollars, under control in one place; the extent to which interlocking directorates increase that danger; and the parallel you have here, these foundations are acting as intellectual holding companies with power to dominate and direct public opinion. They are intellectual holding companies to build new social orders acceptable to themselves and not necessarily orders which the people themselves, without the pressure of organized money, would necessarily adopt or promote.

There is a question in line with that. Here is an example of the use of economic power. It concerns the Ford Foundation. I have here before me a photostatic copy of a very recent publication called the Corporate Director, a publication of the American Institute of Management. I understand that it has an economic service. This is the issue of April 1954, volume IV, No. 1. It contains a study on the Ford Motor Co., the first section, and the photostat I have here is a complete copy of that portion of that release.

Mr. HAYS. Who put it out?

Mr. SARGENT. The American Institute of Management.

The article is factual, and it commends itself to me as containing some important facts here. I would like to ask that this particular statement be put in as a part of the transcript, and I will summarize for you the nature of what it is.

It refers to the effect of the Ford Foundation owning 90 percent of the capital stock of the Ford Motor Co. The fact that the members of the Ford family are the officers of the Ford Motor Co., in a position to draw salaries as may be determined, and in a position to allow the motor company to run at a cost basis with no dividends, and, by means of that, to bring to bear destructive economic power on competitors of the Ford Motor Co. which have to pay dividends to stockholders and have to maintain a credit position, which a corporation doesn't have to do when a large foundation owns almost all of the stock.

Mr. HAYS. They have not been very successful with GM, have they?

Mr. SARGENT. The article points out the fact that in 1928, Ford did that with very destructive economic consequences.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargeant, you are not advocating that we should break up the Ford Motor Co. like some people say we should break up the New York Yankees, are you?

Mr. SARGENT. No, sir. I am talking about the question whether a foundation ought to be permitted to own the large blocks of stock in an economic concern such as this.

Mr. HAYS. That brings me down to a very important question. You seem to know a lot about this matter, and can you tell me any other way the Fords could have hung onto their motor empire except this; if they had to put it in where they paid the taxes on it, somebody else would have been in there.

Mr. SARGENT. They can do this in perpetuity as we stand now, and that is one of the dangerous weaknesses on this.

Mr. HAYS. But I asked you a question: Do you know of any other way the Ford family could have hung onto the Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. SARGENT. Probably not, but I am not sure that the Federal Government should help them hold onto that stock.

Mr. HAYS. I am not sure, either, but I just wonder if there was another way.

Mr. SARGENT. I presume there wasn't. This article discusses this economic question—

Mr. HAYS. But you almost begin to talk like one of these Socialists that you are complaining about. Here is preserving this great American fortune in a way which you admit is the only way in the world they could have done it; but you think that is bad. We have just been around nearly a full circle now.

I am not expressing an opinion.

Mr. SARGENT. You will like this part of my testimony, but not the other part.

Mr. HAYS. No, I don't. Ever since the famous statement about what is good for General Motors is good for the country, I do not even run a General Motors car any more. I am a Ford man. That is, just buy the cars, and I only own one of them.

Mr. SARGENT. This article discusses that question, and it says the purpose of the Ford Motor Co. is simply to receive and administer funds for scientific and educational purposes. It says no other automobile manufacturer is in a position to ignore stability of earnings or continuity of dividend payments. That if General Motors or Chrysler earned no money, the management heads would roll and equity credit would be impaired. Ford could declare no earnings and the public not even know of it. All the public would know is that the Ford car was top car on the production sheets and in the dealer's hands.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, right there, if they do not make any money, the foundation does not have any money to operate on; is that right?

Mr. SARGENT. Not at all. It has half a billion dollars, and it can operate for years and years on capital.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, it has a half a billion dollars besides its stock in the Ford Motor Co.?

Mr. SARGENT. It has a total of half a billion, and I don't know what all of the portfolio is.

Mr. HAYS. That is an important question. Is their money in Ford Motor Co. stock, or have they got a billion in loose change?

Mr. SARGENT. They could sit on this situation and live on capital for a while if they desired to.

Mr. HAYS. Let us not in any event say that. I want to know where their money is. Is it in Ford Motor Co. stock, or is it in cash? That is important, I think.

Mr. SARGENT. It may be one and it may be the other, I don't know.

Mr. HAYS. You made a statement inferring that it is neither fish nor fowl, or whatever you wanted it to be.

Mr. SARGENT. I said they have half a billion total assets, and that is what their report shows, and they had 90 percent of the Ford Motor Co.

Mr. HAYS. Is there any way in the world, in order to make that statement have some relation to the picture at all, that we can get the staff to find out just what their assets are and whether it is in cash, stock, or what?

The CHAIRMAN. The staff can do it or, when we have a witness from the Ford Foundation, I anticipate that that will be done.

Mr. SARGENT. This organization says it is their belief that Federal legislation is needed that will prohibit any charitable foundation, pension, or fund from owning or controlling more than 10 percent of any business enterprise and, if nothing else, the Federal authorities should not allow tax exemption on income for more than 10 percent ownership in any business corporation. Otherwise, the public has no voice in the company, and the profit motive cannot survive due to the great advantage enjoyed by companies that can offer unfair competition.

Mr. HAYS. You are inferring there, from reading that statement, that the public should have some voice in the company.

Mr. SARGENT. They mean by "public," have a voice in the general distribution of shares.

Mr. HAYS. I am a rugged individualist, and I have a dairy farm and I have a few head of cattle, and I do not want the public to have any part of running my enterprise. I am going to run it myself.

I suppose, or I thought that was part of this rugged Americanism that we are all for. Now you say that the public does not have anything to do with running the Ford Motor Co., and they didn't have anything to do with it when Old Henry was in it. There was a fellow by the name of Couzens, of Michigan, and he put \$5,000 into it, and Henry was genius enough—and I am talking about the original Henry—that he made enough money that he was able to pay Senator Couzens \$30 million just to get him out of the company so he could run it.

That is not bad, is it?

Mr. SARGENT. This legal device known as the foundation is now used to keep perpetual control.

Mr. HAYS. Do you think that is bad?

Mr. SARGENT. I think once a corporation gets the tax-exemption privilege, it enters into an area where it is subject to a degree of public legislation that it is not subject to as the individual owner would be, certainly. This is public trust money.

Mr. HAYS. Right there—and I hope that you can be helpful to us—do you have any suggestion about any law that we might pass whereby Congress or some other body could get in the picture of running this fortune?

Mr. SARGENT. Gradually you can do two things: One is, you can prohibit the perpetual ownership of large blocks of stock like that in

these corporations, and compel orderly liquidation under penalty of forfeiture of the exemption privilege. It is just like Samuel Insull's empire was broken up by holding-company legislation. You can attack this evil.

Mr. HAYS. I know a little bit about Samuel Insull's empire, and it wasn't broken up so much by holding-company legislation as it just went bust.

Mr. SARGENT. It led to this other legislation, which has been considered important.

Mr. HAYS. Someone got to looking through the paper one day and found it wasn't worth wallpaper.

Mr. SARGENT. I think this merits committee consideration, and I ask this be made a part of the record.

Mr. HAYS. May the committee look at it before it is made a part of the record?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't want to read it all.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that you have read it.

Mr. HAYS. If you don't mind, I would like to see the heading of it.

Mr. SARGENT. The other situation is not photostated, because it relates to another matter.

Mr. HAYS. It is published by the American Institute of Management. What is that?

Mr. SARGENT. I am simply presenting it as being a factual statement of a problem here of importance.

Mr. HAYS. I see no objection to it. I do not know who made the study, but it can be put in the record and stand on its own merits.

Mr. SARGENT. That is all I am asking.

The CHAIRMAN. Without exception it is so ordered.

(The study of the Ford Motor Co. as published in The Corporate Director, follows:)

[From the Corporate Director, April 1954]

#### BACKGROUND STUDIES IN MANAGEMENT ACTION

##### 1—Ford Motor Co.

##### 2—Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Those old enough can perhaps recall the introduction of the Ford Model A to the automobile market in 1928. This new car hit the dealers when consumer demand was on the toboggan, and represented the elder Henry's attempt to recapture a major share of auto sales. It proved to be too much production too late. In later years, more than one economist has retrospectively referred to this increased model A output, with its concomitant ill effect on many Ford dealers, as the straw that broke the camel's back, and helped precipitate the deep depression of the thirties. No such general business decline would have occurred had not conditions been ripe, but, nonetheless, Ford dealers were beset with difficulties on a particularly large scale.

By the same yardstick, we must now measure the Ford Co.'s determined effort to become top again by expanding output in the face of dwindling demand. There can be no doubt of the fact that Ford is expanding and producing so as to outdistance Chevrolet. This is a matter of public record (see table 1 and table 2). Just as the great majority of automobile dealers know this to be true, they also have reason to believe that demand is already exceeded by current output of all automobiles. (The excess output of the past few years is generally estimated at a figure between 400,000 and 500,000 cars.) In some cities the situation is so unfavorable that best quality used cars can be had for as little as \$10 downpayment. Most new cars may be purchased at dealer's cost. Bankruptcies of car dealers grow.

A large and influential bank recently published an economic opinion to the effect that depressions cannot be prevented—only retarded.

We disagree with this economic contention. Production and price correction are needed in order to eliminate the careless and the incompetent, and to re-establish markets on firm foundations. However, they need not be disastrous, nor need they occur in all industries at the same time.

#### GOVERNMENT ACTION

We concur in the Federal Government's obvious belief that action can and should be taken by Government to encourage a rolling correction—industry by industry—and, thus, protect the economy as a whole from paralysis. Hasn't this very circumstance been occurring in the last few years to a greater degree than ever before? Look at the recent records of the textiles or the pharmaceuticals, or the radio and television producers, as evidence that overproduction can occur and be corrected within several industries without national calamity. Why cannot this continue to be so if the proper Government action is available?

No competent financial man doubts the good that has come from SEC regulations of the securities markets, and by the same token the businessman must know that the same principles can, under certain circumstances, apply to conduct in his sphere of activity. It is said only the strong may survive, but when it becomes obvious in any given industry, such as the automobile business, that strength lies principally in size, then we must amend this saying to "only the big survive." This we cannot accept.

Yet the battle of the giants is now upon us. If we are to have an old-style depression, it will undoubtedly come as a result of the unwillingness of large producers to cut production for fear they will lose their dominance of the national market. In no other industry will this be so true as among the automobile manufacturers.

TABLE 1.—*Growing competition in the automotive industry*

Year	General Motors	Chrysler	Ford	Total Big Three	Independents
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
1941.....	48.37	23.37	18.28	90.02	9.98
1948.....	40.04	21.21	19.13	80.38	19.62
1952.....	41.53	21.96	23.17	86.66	13.34
1953.....	45.65	20.33	25.21	91.19	8.81

Source: Automotive Industries.

TABLE 2.—*Current automobile production*

[Low-priced cars—as of Mar. 8, 1954]

	Last week	Like 1953 week	Previous week <sup>1</sup>
Ford.....	30,292	20,291	28,591
Chevrolet.....	25,700	26,585	29,119
Plymouth.....	6,774	13,213	6,040
Studebaker.....	2,216	3,915	1,896
Hudson.....	850	2,171	0
Nash.....	771	4,969	1,581
Willys.....	400	670	350
Kaiser.....	295	1,208	224

<sup>1</sup> Revised.

Source: Ward's Automotive Reports.



In the year just past, General Motors increased its percentage of the total output from 41.5 percent to 45.6 percent, while Ford output rose from 23.1 percent to 25.2 percent. In the meantime, all the others, including Chrysler, lost ground. We now see a mad scramble among the independents to merge and fight for survival. It is fast becoming fact that survival can be possible only through mergers in a great many industries. The really profitable and, therefore, safe business enterprises of today are those that can abandon a market once it becomes over-competitive, and concentrate on new items out of research. This is the fact behind the outstanding success of such companies as Du Pont, Union Carbide, and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing.

It is a serious matter to our entire economy that an industry as important as the production of automobiles is now almost surely at the mercy of 2 warring giants, 1 with the benefit of Government favor and the other with the incalculable advantage of a tax umbrella. General Motors has taken the place of Kaiser-Frazer at court, perhaps on the premise that to the victor belongs the spoils. We all know that military tank production is now on a 1-contract basis with General Motors, yet any large manufacturer will tell you that every large business should have the safety of 2 or more supplies of any 1 article.

But the main theme of our story is the Ford Co. and its tax position. In the first week of the current year, total car production was at the annual rate of 6.2 million cars (much in excess of last year's sales), yet Chrysler, Hudson, and Studebaker were cutting production. The battle was essentially between Chevrolet and Ford. It is admittedly, and publicly, a policy of the Ford Co. to once again outproduce and outsell the Chevrolet by the simple method of forcing dealers to take shipments as they are scheduled at the factory. The philosophy of this may be explored as follows—"build more and better production facilities, produce more and more, regardless of the effect on the national economy, so long as we do not produce more than the total market." The quotation is ours.

At the recent 5-day meeting of the National Automobile Dealers' Association in Miami, Mr. L. D. Crusoe, general manager of the Ford division of the Ford Co. stated, "If we let the dealers tell us how much to produce our output would fall and prices go up. Unless we talk this business to death, we won't have enough cars by April."

Enough cars for what? The embarrassed dealers? The overcrowded roads? The partial payment plans? But all this is still fairly extraneous. The main purpose of our study is to point out that the attitude at Ford is different from that of other auto manufacturers. Why is it different and what should be done about it?

## TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATION

TABLE 3.—*Highlights in the growth of the Ford Foundation*

Year:	Total assets (thousands of dollars)
1936.....	<sup>1</sup> 25
1943.....	<sup>2</sup> 30, 500
1950.....	<sup>3</sup> 510, 972
1952.....	<sup>3</sup> 518, 422

<sup>1</sup> Incorporated in Michigan, Jan. 15, 1936, on a grant from Edsel Ford.

<sup>2</sup> Outright grants from the Ford family and the Ford Motor Co. since 1936. Edsel Ford died in 1943. Part of his estate was eventually bequeathed to the foundation.

<sup>3</sup> The greater part of these assets consisted of 3,089,908 shares of class A nonvoting common stock of Ford Motor Co. carried at \$135 per share; valuation fixed for estate tax purposes in settlement of the late Henry Ford's estate.

Sources: Business Week, Oct. 7, 1950. The Ford Foundation Annual Reports, 1950 and 1952.

The Ford Motor Car Co. was owned by Henry Ford, the First, at the time of his death on April 7, 1947. The taxable value of the company at the time was so great public sale would have resulted had not a tax-exempt foundation been formed to receive the stock of the company tax free.

The Fords made the foundation the residuary legatee for their estates. Their heirs were named to receive specific bequests. Deducted from the amounts

willed to the Ford Foundation were the estate taxes owed to the Government by the Ford heirs as a result of their legacies. Therefore, though the foundation's bequest was not taxable, the money it actually received was reduced by the taxes on the other part of the estate.

The purpose of the Ford Foundation is simply stated in its charter: "to receive and administer funds for scientific, educational, and charitable purposes, all for the public welfare." So now, most of whatever dividends are paid by Ford go to the Ford Foundation and, regardless of the doubts that many informed individuals have as to the wisdom of this foundation's disbursements, the fact is that control of the Ford Co. remains in the hands of the Ford family. Total outstanding stock of the Ford Motor Co. is 3,452,900 shares. Of this, the Ford Foundation holds 3,089,908 shares of class A nonvoting stock. The remaining 10.5 percent, or 362,992 shares, is owned by the Ford family. Their holdings include all 172,645 shares of voting stock.

TABLE 4.—*Directors of Ford Motor Co.*

Name	Outside	Inside
Henry Ford II.....		President—Ford Motor Co.
Benson Ford.....		Vice president, Lincoln-Mercury Division.
William C. Ford.....		Vice president.
J. R. Davis.....		Do.
Ernest R. Breech.....		Executive vice president, Ford Motor Co.
William T. Gossett.....		Vice president and general counsel.
John S. Bugas.....		Vice president, industrial relations.
L. D. Crusee.....		Vice president, manufacturing (Ford Division).
D. S. Harder.....		Vice president, manufacturing.
T. O. Yntema.....		Vice president, finance.
Irving A. Duffy.....		Vice president, purchasing.
Harold T. Youngren.....	Director of Ford Motor Co.	
Donald K. David.....	Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.	
James B. Webber, Jr.....	Vice president, general manager and director of the J. L. Hudson Co. Department Store.	

TABLE 5.—*Trustees of the Ford Foundation*

Name	Outside	Inside
Henry Ford II <sup>1</sup> .....		President, Ford Motor Co.
H. Rowan Gaither, Jr. <sup>2</sup> .....	Chairman, Pacific National Bank of San Francisco.	
John Cowles.....	President, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.	
Frank W. Abrams.....	Chairman, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.	
James E. Webber, Jr.....		Also, member of board of directors, Ford Motor Co.
Donald K. David.....		Do.
Charles E. Wilson.....	Chairman of executive committee, W. R. Grace & Co.	
Benson Ford.....		Vice president, Ford Motor Co.
Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr.....	Judge, United States District Court, Boston, Mass.	

<sup>1</sup> Chairman of the trustees.

<sup>2</sup> President and director, the Ford Foundation.

How else could one explain Henry II being president and his two brothers being vice presidents? Whether or not the Ford Motor Co. makes a profit or pays any dividends in any one year is of scant consequence, either to the company itself or the Ford family. Neither their salaries nor their positions are affected.

No other automobile manufacturer is in a position to ignore stability of earnings or continuity of dividend payments. If General Motors or Chrysler earned no money and paid no dividends this year, management heads would roll.

and equity credit would be seriously impaired. Ford could report no earnings and declare no dividends, and the public would not even know of it. All the public would know is that Ford car was top car on the production sheets and in the dealers' hands, regardless of the economic disaster of overproduction that could result.

The AIM has given much study to this problem, and has decided to pass on to its members, and all those concerned with business theory, the benefit of its findings. It is our belief that in this case, and in many others, Federal legislation is needed that will prohibit any charitable foundation, pension fund, or union, from owning more than 10 percent of any business enterprise. If nothing else, the Federal authorities should not allow tax exemption on income from more than 10-percent ownership of any business corporation. Otherwise, the public has no voice in the company, and the profit motive cannot survive due to the great advantage enjoyed by companies that can offer unfair competition through lack of need for equity credit. This necessary legislation can also prevent families from entrenching themselves without due regard to their ability.

Both these problems are serious, whether the business be large or small, if we are to remain a nation of competent businessmen.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with the question you raised a moment ago, if there was any way by which control of that particular company could have been retained by the family without creating a foundation, as I see it, that raises a question as to whether our tax structures would be such as to make it difficult for a family to go along and hold their fortune, whether it is big or little.

Mr. WORMSER. On that point, a labor union had a very interesting committee several years ago studying foundations, and they came up with an interesting suggestion. That was that no foundation should have in its portfolio more than 5 percent of the stock of a private corporation, because if they had more than that, such as the Duke thing, there might be a tendency of the foundation people to worry too much about the welfare of the private corporation, to the detriment of the foundation. That is just one suggestion that one committee came forth with.

The CHAIRMAN. Another suggestion that has been made, with reference to the legal structure of foundations, is that there might be a requirement or there might be a limit placed on the life of the foundation, and that they be required to be liquidated in a certain period of years, that is, use the assets as well as the income.

Mr. SARGENT. I was about to speak to that perpetuity question, Mr. Reece. One of the very serious difficulties confronting anyone drafting a trust is this matter of perpetual existence. The donor of a trust may select men of judgment known to him who can be relied on because of their integrity and their experience, and so forth, to carry out a desired purpose and to see it through. If men of experience are selected, the average trustee will be probably around 40 years old or closer to that period. If you run along beyond 25 years after that point, you will have men of age 65, retirement age, and you will have the filling of vacancies by the action of a majority of an existing board, and you develop more and more in certain directions. And experience seems to indicate that some of these evils we are talking about are the result of perpetual trusts which are unsound in practice.

Mr. HAYS. You say you have people over age 65. Do you mean that is not so good?

Mr. SARGENT. The tendency is to reach normal retirement age, and that is the way the timetable works on many people, in practice.

Mr. HAYS. Then they become foundation trustees? I do not understand.

Mr. SARGENT. I say a trustee, an original trustee age 40 when appointed, when the trust has had a life of 25 years, will be a 65-year-old man, and that you will have through natural causes a considerable replacement in your directorate on that foundation because of the lapse of time.

Mr. HAYS. I did not want to misunderstand. You did not advocate they should have to retire at age 65?

Mr. SARGENT. No. But the normal operation of the mortality table brings that about.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess for about 15 minutes.

(Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Sargent.

Mr. SARGENT. We were discussing public policy questions involved in this foundation matter.

One question of great and far-reaching importance is the extent to which these giant foundations are guardians, acting in fact as guardians of the people, for all practical purposes. Andrew Carnegie a number of years ago announced what has been referred to as his gospel of wealth. The dust jacket on the book known as *Fruit of an Impulse—45 Years of Carnegie Foundation—1905—1950*, by Howard J. Savage, contains a statement by Mr. Carnegie on the matter, I presume one made many years ago. It refers to the obligation of a man of means to do charitable and worthwhile things for others, which is an entirely commendable impulse and very understandable. His obligation to administer his personal money in a way which, in his judgment, will be beneficial, and so forth.

The concept here to which I refer now is the indefinite handing down of that sort of a guardianship power to others to be executed or administered perpetually, and to impress their so-called superior wisdom on the community.

The part of the statement that I think is pertinent, I want to read now as follows:

Called upon to administer and strictly bound in duty to administer in a manner which in his best judgment is calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community, the man of wealth thus becoming the mere trustee and agent for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

That, of course, was Carnegie's concept of himself, but in practice these trustees have adopted the same concept of their trust money and of what they may do.

I have here a certified copy of the articles of the Ford Foundation, and this is a photostatic copy but it is a true copy, I am sure, furnished to me by the secretary of state of the State of Michigan. I have read this, and this article II here—the only part pertinent to our present purpose—is that these trustees have power to receive and administer funds for scientific, educational, and otherwise charitable purposes, all for the public welfare.

I find not a single restrictive clause in here limiting in any way what these gentlemen may do. If they say it is public welfare, so be

it, it is public welfare. It is absolute power to shape the destiny of a nation. The corporation has perpetual existence. That is under article VII. It has a series of subcorporations. One of them is known as the Fund for the Advancement of Education, which operates, I understand, in the formal education field, colleges, and possibly elsewhere.

This corporation has also general power to receive and administer funds exclusively for scientific, educational, and charitable purposes. Again for purposes defined by a self-perpetuating board of trustees.

From what I have been able to determine, this is really in a financial sense a captive corporation of the Ford Foundation, because its operations would stop any time that the appropriations stopped. The Ford Foundation passes it over to this one, and this one then administers. So this is a hand, and the Ford Foundation is the body. That is the arrangement.

We have another one here which operates in the adult education field, called the Fund for Adult Education. It has similar corporate power, unlimited power to administer and receive funds for scientific, educational, and charitable purposes—which are whatever a self-perpetuating board says is charitable or welfare. There is no control whatsoever.

The people are the beneficiaries of these trusts, they are public trusts, and it is supposed to be public money. The people do not decide these policies, and when they protest them they find that the financial power of the foundation opposes their wishes, and imposes something else the people do not want.

The Ford Foundation used its financial power to attempt to resist the will of the people of Los Angeles in connection with a pamphlet known as the E in UNESCO. This pamphlet was put out by the Los Angeles City School Department, and it promotes various UNESCO activities, and it includes the international declaration of human rights.

Mr. Paul Hoffman, the president of the Ford Foundation, personally appeared before the Los Angeles Board of Education and sought to prevent the removal of these pamphlets out of the Los Angeles city schools by the action of a duly constituted board of the city of Los Angeles, and in so doing he engaged in lobbying, an activity prohibited to the Ford Foundation.

I have a news clipping, bearing date of August 26, 1952, Tuesday, in the Los Angeles Times, and it contains a picture of Mr. Hoffman, several other gentlemen with him, and the statement below reads as follows:

Urge that it stay—These proponents of teaching UNESCO were on hand as speakers. From left: Dr. Hugh M. Tiner, Pepperdine College president; Paul G. Hoffman, of Ford Foundation; Elmer Franzwa, district governor of Rotary, and William Joyce.

Mr. HAYS. What is wrong with that?

Mr. SARGENT. He has no right to engage in lobbying, and he was opposing a local matter and should not have in any way interfered with it. He was president of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. HAYS. You would not want anybody to say you have no right to come here and expound your views, would you?

Mr. SARGENT. He did it as president of the Ford Foundation, and used the power of the Ford Foundation as a leverage in the case.

Mr. HAYS. But you are president of a foundation, and I do not know the name of the foundation, but should you divorce yourself of that before you come down here and express your opinion? You cannot choke off opinion in this country.

Mr. SARGENT. I am here on your subpoena, and responding as an individual.

Mr. HAYS. You offered to come, did you not?

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't offer to come. I was requested to come, and I did nothing whatever to initiate my coming here, sir.

Mr. HAYS. You mean to say this is the only committee in the Congress that brought you in, and the others you just tried to get before?

Mr. SARGENT. That is not so.

The CHAIRMAN. Since that question has been raised, I think possibly I should make a statement regarding it. Knowing of Mr. Sargent's standing and wide knowledge, or at least that was my information, in this field as it relates more particularly to the educational and propaganda aspect, I suggested to Mr. Wormser or Mr. Dodd, possibly both, that they have a talk with Mr. Sargent with a view of seeing, first, if he would be able to make a contribution to the study and, secondly, to see if he would be willing to come if the committee should invite him.

I do not know just how to word it, but that is the story with relation to his appearing here. I am confident the members of the staff carried it out.

Mr. HAYS. I do not care how he got here. I understood that the subpoena is so he can get his plane fare, and I have no objection to that. But the fundamental point, I do not think we are trying to gloss it over intentionally, is, Does Mr. Sargent have a right to his views and Mr. Paul Hoffman does not, or do they both have a right?

Mr. SARGENT. Mr. Paul Hoffman has no right to lobby before the Los Angeles City Board of Education and actively urge that.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Paul Hoffman, as president of anything at all, has a right to be a Republican and have Mr. Eisenhower elected.

Mr. SARGENT. He didn't go there as a Republican.

Mr. HAYS. I am asking you. If you would confine your answers to my questions, we would save a lot of time. I say he has a right to be a Republican.

Mr. SARGENT. Certainly.

Mr. HAYS. And he can still be president of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. SARGENT. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. And he can make speeches for the Republican Party.

Mr. SARGENT. As long as he doesn't drag the name of the Ford Foundation into it.

Mr. HAYS. But if he appears there, and he is president of it, they are automatically going to say he is president of the Ford Foundation. I am a Member of Congress and I could go to a milk producers' meeting and talk about milk but if the papers said I am a Member of Congress, I could not do much about it.

Mr. SARGENT. He was brought out there actively by the American Association for the United Nations for the express purpose of making a presentation at that meeting.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Sargent, I happen to know a little bit about Paul Hoffman, and I don't think that he was brought any place for any purpose. Paul Hoffman is a reputable, outstanding American, who

does not lend himself to any un-American activities, and when you imply that he does or that you use the word "propaganda" in a bad form, you are leaving the impression he did something he ought not to have done. I want to take this opportunity to disagree with you, and say to you that I don't think Mr. Paul Hoffman ever at any time did anything which would adversely affect the United States in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. SARGENT. He was overstepping his exemption privilege, and he was brought in there for a lobbying purpose.

Mr. HAYS. You say he was doing that, but that does not make it so. I keep repeating that.

Mr. SARGENT. I heard the officer of the local unit, in the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles, of the American Association for the United Nations discuss the arrangement for the bringing of Mr. Hoffman to that meeting and I was in their office at the time buying literature, and I overheard the conversation. Mr. Meherin was the name and that is when it was going on.

Mr. HAYS. You are inferring that because he was president of the Ford Foundation and he went out there to advocate this, he automatically brought the Ford Foundation into it.

Mr. SARGENT. They were discussing how they were going to handle it and they were afraid the UNESCO pamphlet was going to be thrown out and they were discussing other ways in which they could back up Mr. Hoffman and bring more strength to bear on that Los Angeles City Board of Education. I overheard that conversation, and I was in the office at the time. Mr. Hoffman was lobbying intentionally.

Mr. HAYS. When he advocated General Eisenhower's election he did that, but he had a right to do that.

Mr. SARGENT. He was doing this as an activity of the Ford Foundation in my opinion.

Mr. HAYS. I am glad that you put that in your opinion. Did the Ford Foundation pay his way out there?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't know who paid his way out there.

Mr. HAYS. But you would like to make a lot of nasty inferences about it.

Mr. SARGENT. I don't make any inference about anything about which I don't know. Mr. Hoffman was there and the clipping says he was there, and the name of the Ford Foundation was affiliated with it. The American Association for the United Nations, another organization, was distributing the literature or the pamphlet I have here, and it came from their Los Angeles chapter, Ambassador Hotel, which I obtained at about that time.

Now, briefly, I want to tell you something about this propaganda, which is also very favorably looked upon from the foundation's standpoint, and very vigorously opposed by an active body of American public opinion, because of its directive effect on our constitutional system.

Mr. HAYS. This propaganda that you talk about, this is Mr. Hoffman's propaganda?

Mr. SARGENT. The universal declaration of human rights.

Mr. HAYS. You were talking about Mr. Hoffman and propaganda.

Mr. SARGENT. I am talking about the pamphlet.

Mr. HAYS. Can you get back to Mr. Hoffman? Did you say he was distributing propaganda?

Mr. SARGENT. I said he was backing up this thing here, this UNESCO pamphlet before the Los Angeles City Board of Education.

Mr. HAYS. You are calling it propaganda.

Mr. SARGENT. This pamphlet is propaganda for the United Nations and its activities.

Mr. HAYS. Now, can you answer this question "Yes" or "No": Was Mr. Hoffman then actively engaged in this propaganda?

Mr. SARGENT. I understand that he was.

Mr. HAYS. All right; that is the question.

Now, that is bad, you say.

Mr. SARGENT. I say it is not in accordance with the tax exemption.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Zoll, who has been cited by the Attorney General as a Fascist, you say what he puts out is not propaganda?

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say anything about that.

Mr. HAYS. You defended him, and you are in a rather peculiar position, and you are defending a man on the Attorney General's list, and attack the reputation of a man like Paul Hoffman.

Mr. SARGENT. I did not defend Mr. Zoll, I said I knew nothing one way or the other. I said Mr. Zoll had been extensively smeared, and that the National Education Association sought to transfer the smear against Mr. Zoll to the people of Pasadena, and it did so.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Zoll, a fascist, has been smeared, but you are not trying to smear Mr. Paul Hoffman, are you?

Mr. SARGENT. I am not trying to do anything except say he was there for political purposes, and he was.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if you sit here and let this man do this kind of thing to people like Paul Hoffman, I just want to state that the doors of the Democratic Party are open to him any time he wants to come in.

Mr. SARGENT. The clipping showing the presence of Mr. Hoffman in that meeting I will leave with the committee, this Los Angeles Times article, August 26, 1952.

Now, this UNESCO project for universal declaration of human rights is a very important thing, and I believe that you should have some of the story. The American Bar Association for several years prior to this had been urging that much more time be granted for study of this proposal because of its far-reaching effects. Their resolutions begin as early as the year 1949, and run through, as I recall, to about 1951, and they ask for a delay on the ground that the legal profession and the public had not studied this proposal, and it was of great importance. This pamphlet evidently was put into the schools at a time before the legal profession itself, or about the time the legal profession was beginning to get a sound idea and it was made school material in the meantime.

Let us have a look at this: Here is article 1, which overthrows an essential principle of the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence says that men have unalienable rights granted to them by God and the laws of nature. This says that men are born free and equal, and should act in a spirit of brotherhood.

Mr. HAYS. Now, then, right there—

Mr. SARGENT. There is no God in it, just brotherhood.



Mr. HAYS. Do you say that saying, now the very implication of brotherhood carries a connotation of religion, does it not?

Mr. SARGENT. A majority group sort of religion, but not the concept in the Declaration of Independence, sir.

Mr. HAYS. It is no inference, it so happens I believe in the Christian religion. I also understood that Christ preached brotherhood. Now are you saying there is something bad about that?

Mr. SARGENT. No, I am talking about the effect of this as a legal document.

Mr. HAYS. But brotherhood isn't good unless it comes from your side, is it?

Mr. SARGENT. I say this is bad to substitute this provision for the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. HAYS. To act in a spirit of brotherhood, I have sort of advocated that, and if I am being Leftist I would like to get away from it.

Mr. SARGENT. This is a substitution for the Declaration of Independence concept, and the present controversy over the Bricker amendment—

Mr. HAYS. Was it different, now, Mr. Sargent? You have a very voluminous flow of verbiage there but let us pick a little structure out of it. What did you say the Declaration said again?

Mr. SARGENT. The Declaration of Independence says all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them. That is the gist of it.

Mr. HAYS. We subscribe to that.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes; those rights belong to you and to me, at birth, and they are ours.

Mr. HAYS. Will you please read the other one?

Mr. SARGENT. The other one says all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and they are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Mr. HAYS. You say that there is something subversive about that?

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say subversive; I said it makes an important change in our basic law in connection with the other provisions of this declaration I am about to discuss.

Mr. HAYS. It seems to me that the teachings of God have certain elements of brotherhood in them that you cannot get away from, and when you start picking or finding fault with the word "brotherhood," that you are quibbling on pretty technical ground with language.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not seem to me it is on very technical ground when he makes reference to God having been left out of the provision that was substituted for the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. HAYS. This wasn't substituted for the Declaration of Independence at all, and you cannot leave God out whether you want to or not. He will be around, and I expect that He will even have an opinion on this if you want to get right down to it. I am not going to tell you what I think it will be, because that is not my province; I am not omnipotent, and I wish the witnesses wouldn't try to be omnipotent, either.

Mr. SARGENT. I will tie this in for you. I am discussing this from the standpoint that this is a proposal for a possible treaty which will become the supreme law of the land, and may be judicially interpreted as a modification of our existing legal system. Article 1, to be under-

standable, should be read in connection with article No. 29, that is subdivision 2, which says:

In the exercise of his rights, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others, and meeting its just requirements of morality, public order, and the general order of a democratic state.

Now, that term "general welfare of a democratic state" seems to create a power by majority vote to limit the rights granted in the rest of this article. The next subdivision of 29 says that these rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

In other words, if someone does not believe in the United Nations and wants to do something contrary to what you want to do, he hasn't any civil rights at all. Subparagraph 3 says so, in article 29. Article 25 provides for social housing and medical care, which are made constitutional rights.

Article 26 says that the purpose of education is the furtherance of the activities of the U. N. Article 21 guarantees free access to public service, and that could interfere with the right to discharge Government personnel who are bad security risks.

Article 19 guarantees freedom of opinion and expression through any media.

Mr. HAYS. Are you reading from your own notes?

Mr. SARGENT. I will read the original for you, and it is a true quote. Article 19 says:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart foreign ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Now that could be interpreted to protect the right to advocate forcible overthrow of this Government.

Mr. HAYS. It could be interpreted, and I don't know who is going to interpret it, and I suppose possibly it could be interpreted the way you have been interpreting things, depending on what you mean.

Mr. SARGENT. If a court laying this alongside of our present constitutional law saw this they could reason that there must have been an intent to substitute something different, and otherwise why make the change. This tends to throw our constitutional law out on the table to be argued out all over again.

Mr. HAYS. I have a sneaking suspicion that Congress is going to protect that. They haven't passed that thing yet, have they?

Mr. SARGENT. Not yet, but these are the grounds upon which many people very seriously opposed this pamphlet which was being actively used in Los Angeles city schools. Article 14 says that everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries the asylum from persecution. Doesn't that mean that the immigration laws can be broken down and we can be compelled to receive hordes from any nation in the world regardless of the impact on American conditions? This article would seem to say so.

There have been many, many things written on this. And very, very serious objections made. The proponents of the Bricker amendment agree I think in substance, and have additional reasons from my own for opposing that particular proposition. That is an example of more propaganda, and more propaganda power, and the Ford Foundation through Mr. Hoffman apparently backs that one.

Mr. HAYS. You are a pretty cagey lawyer, and you keep saying seemingly. Apparently you just tread on the border of libel, but you don't quite get over it.

Mr. SARGENT. I am talking about the UNESCO propaganda bill here.

Mr. HAYS. You mentioned Mr. Paul Hoffman.

Mr. SARGENT. He was there using the weight and prestige of the Ford Foundation to try and influence a city board of education in support of this proposal, which is legislation to make that a part of the law of the United States.

Some of you gentlemen may be interested in what kind of a propaganda outfit this UNESCO really is. You will find the detail on that in a pamphlet entitled "Every Man's United Nations, a Ready Reference to the Structure and Functions of the Work of the United Nations and its Related Agencies."

It is a publication of the United Nations Department of Public Education, in New York, and the publication date is 1952, and this is a third edition. It is quite recent. UNESCO is discussed commencing at page 312, and it talks about their worldwide activities, that they are preparing a scientific and cultural history of mankind, and that they set up an international clearing house to promote exchange of publications between libraries and institutions, and that they have study programs.

Mr. HAYS. Does the Government of the United States belong to that organization at all? Do they contribute to it?

Mr. SARGENT. I think there was some question before the Senate Appropriations Committee about further contributions toward it, if I recall correctly. We still belong to it, and we—

Mr. HAYS. Who is our representative there? Do you know?

Mr. SARGENT. This is UNESCO, this is a separate thing.

Mr. HAYS. This is a subdivision of the U. N.

Mr. SARGENT. This is the body incidentally to which Mr. Willard Givens, of the NEA, offered a resolution protesting the removal of Superintendent Goslin from Pasadena.

Among other things, UNESCO has put out a pamphlet called Television and Education in the United States. This is printed, UNESCO, Paris, 1952.

Mr. HAYS. Now just a minute before you start putting that document in the record. Is that put out by some foundation?

Mr. SARGENT. No, UNESCO.

I am talking about the propaganda power of this setup we have here, which the foundations seem to have, and it bears on the propaganda power of foundations.

Mr. HAYS. It has about as much relation to this investigation as Chic Sale's book, if I can figure it out.

Mr. SARGENT. This discusses the propaganda network, that UNESCO is looking at. I think, Mr. Hays, you will find that the foundations are supporting educational television, and taking a flip at that one also.

Mr. HAYS. These foundations are supporting education television, and UNESCO has a book about it, but what is the relationship?

Mr. SARGENT. I am talking about the organized power of foundations.

Mr. HAYS. I have a television program, too, and I am not connected with any of those. You just use the word "television," and everybody hooks up that has anything to do with television.

Mr. SARGENT. There is an organized movement underway with some foundations—

Mr. HAYS. You said yesterday you didn't believe in astrology, did you not, and you don't use a crystal ball, either.

Mr. SARGENT. Must we go back to that? I am talking about this pamphlet here, and I am talking about the pamphlet on educational television, sponsored by UNESCO, in which they have examined the educational policies of the American Broadcasting Co., Columbia, Du Mont, National Broadcasting Co., and they have inquired into the use of television so far in the schools of Philadelphia, Chicago, Minneapolis, and they have conducted some research on television and children and even considered its use as a teaching tool.

Mr. HAYS. Now you say that is a book put out by an organization which you refuse to state has any foundation funds, and you said it is published in Paris, and you say it is a bad book and perhaps it is. I wouldn't know. But will you kindly try to relate it to the hearing and tell us what we should do about it? Should we pass a law prohibiting them from importing it, or what? I am at a loss.

Mr. SARGENT. You should consider seriously adopting a law which will keep foundations out of entering into things—

Mr. HAYS. But this book, Mr. Sargent, where do they get into the picture with this particular book?

Mr. SARGENT. This is one of the UNESCO activities.

Mr. HAYS. And you said UNESCO is not financed by the foundations.

Mr. SARGENT. I say they are supporting the UNESCO program, and the UNESCO program includes this, which is propaganda power.

Mr. HAYS. They are supporting it 100 percent?

Mr. SARGENT. I didn't say 100 percent.

Mr. HAYS. Well, you see there is the point.

Mr. SARGENT. Did I say 100 percent?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Reece is a Republican, I am a Democrat, and we subscribe generally to the principles of our party, but we do not subscribe to every single thing that every Democrat or every Republican has done, and sometimes we even vote against them.

Mr. SARGENT. We are in an area where propaganda power is acquiring enormous importance to the people, and becoming a growing danger, unless kept within some kind of bounds, and foundation money is being used for operations of which that situation is a part. There was foundation support offered incidentally in my own community for the Bay Area Educational Television Association in San Francisco. That was to promote publicly owned and operated television stations for educational purposes. There was one foundation there at least, and they went to the State government indicating that they would back the project. They are going even into that field.

Now, here is another area. I don't want to take your time on this now, but I would like to deal with it very briefly. I suggested a questionnaire to get the discrimination facts on this case. That is to ask the foundations if they have done any of these patriotic or other things favored by those who do not agree with them. In 1950, in October, when I was Chairman of the Americanization Committee

of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, I sent a letter to a list of 115 textbook publishers, throughout the country, to determine what materials were available for instructing students and adult groups desiring to study the propaganda and activities of Socialist and Communist organizations, or for the study of the economic, financial and political and constitutional effects of Fabian socialism and the social welfare state. I have an affidavit here, confirming the fact that such a letter was sent, and the affidavit contains a copy of my file copy of the letter, and a list of these book publishers' names.

I have here a stack of letters containing their replies. The substance of the replies is that practically no material of this kind was available by any of these publishers. Some of the publishers were not engaged in that line of work and their names of course should not be considered. A substantial number of others were in areas where it was possible.

The list itself was obtained from the official list of book publishers on file in the State of California Department of Education, at Sacramento. I would like to offer the affidavit now, and I would like to at my convenience in the next few days prepare a digest containing the substance of what those letters show, prepare an affidavit based on that digest and then offer that affidavit when I return for cross-examination. It will show the extent to which there is a serious lack of this kind of educational material. I think the committee would be interested in the facts.

May I do that?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done, without objection.

Mr. HAYS. I am not going to let him put in a lot of documents that I do not know anything about, and so I object.

Mr. GOODWIN. What is the harm of letting them in? I assume that although the gentleman from Ohio apparently wants to clear up things pretty well as we go along, it is my thought that there will be ample opportunity later on in executive session for us to evaluate all of this testimony that comes in, and there decide.

Mr. HAYS. I don't think any committee would let anyone prepare a statement and without even knowing the thing that is in it, let it become a part of the record. There is a matter of expense, printing, and it may have no pertinency, and so on and so forth. I think the committee should look at it. This is the first time I have objected. The gentleman has put in many things.

Mr. SARGENT. I will furnish an affidavit certifying it and I will let a member of your staff examine the letters here and check it for himself. It just seemed to be a convenient way to give you the information without reading a lot of letters.

Mr. HAYS. Are you going to put all of the letters in there?

Mr. SARGENT. I am going to give you the substance of it.

The CHAIRMAN. See if I understand your suggestion correctly, that you are going to make a digest of your actions and a summary of the substance of the replies, which go in the record, and then the letters would be submitted for the record without printing.

Mr. SARGENT. I would rather keep possession of the letters, and I don't think you want the letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you restate your suggestion?

Mr. SARGENT. What I am going to do is prepare a summary of the replies received from these publishers. Classifying the material on

the basis of those that said they had nothing, giving a few typical comments from letters that are informative and generally disclosing the result of the survey. I will show the entire stack of letters to the committee staff for their own checking in case they think anything else should be included. This is just a convenient way of summarizing the net results of these replies.

It is just a convenient way of summarizing the net replies.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is well to have the digest in, if a member of the staff took the responsibility for checking the accuracy of the summaries.

Mr. SARGENT. Some of them took a paragraph or two explaining the situation, and others said nothing at all. There are perhaps a dozen or more letters having an informative value, and where there is something in the letter we will quote the paragraph and give the name and address of the publisher. It is to show what kind of a result we got out of the survey.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sargent, why don't you go and prepare it.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes, and I will bring it back with me.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that would be the best procedure.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. SARGENT. Now, I was referring this morning to this pamphlet—

The CHAIRMAN. In the meantime, a member of our staff might take a look at it.

Mr. SARGENT. I was referring to this pamphlet this morning, and I partly read the names, and the pamphlet American Education Under Fire by Ernest O. Melby. I read most of the names, I think. Richard Barnes Kennan, executive secretary of the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, Washington, D. C., and he is one of those preparing the pamphlet. Morton Puner of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is one. Professor Thut is one, of the University of Connecticut, and Prof. William Van Till, University of Illinois.

Mr. HAYS. Is that the complete list?

Mr. SARGENT. That is the complete list, and I read the others this morning. That completes the list.

Mr. HAYS. What pamphlet is that?

Mr. SARGENT. This completes the list.

Mr. HAYS. What is the name of the pamphlet?

Mr. SARGENT. It is American Education Under Fire.

Mr. HAYS. That is the one Dr. Hullfish has included in the list of names.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. The pamphlet states that it is sponsored by the following. Two of these are agencies of the National Education Association. The first agency of that group is National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education. That is the one which Mr. Benjamin acts for.

The second department of NEA is the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Also named is the American Education Fellowship, and the John Dewey Society. The copyright on the pamphlet is held by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Sargent's analysis of the textbook publishers' replies appears following his statement, at p. 393.

This contains a discussion of the controversies involving the schools, and the pamphlet being a joint one shows that all of these groups are sponsors for it.

Mr. HAYS. Is there something implied that there is something wrong with B'nai B'rith now?

Mr. SARGENT. Nothing implied one way or the other, except that they sponsored this.

Mr. HAYS. And that is a bad pamphlet?

Mr. SARGENT. It is an attack on people who do not like conditions in the schools, as I interpret it. I think that it is interesting to find so many groups joining in such a statement. It is another example of the infringement of local jurisdiction, in my opinion. I am citing it for that reason.

This pamphlet commences with page 7, and talks about school controversies from Inglewood, N. J., to Eugene, Oreg., and from New York to Pasadena, stating that the Nation is pitted with battlefields of the war against modern education, and this pamphlet attempts to tell of the tremendous forces and consequences involved in the fight.

The first section analyzes the powers and motivations behind the tax on the public schools and it draws upon the experience of Willard L. Goslin, described in this pamphlet as one of the Nation's ablest educators.

If you read this pamphlet through as a whole, you will find it is a sponsorship of the fortunes of Mr. Goslin again.

Mr. HAYS. Going back to another book you mentioned, you cited this Senate investigating committee, the so-called Dilworth committee, and we seem to be around, full circle in the attacks on religion and the Catholics and the Jews and this thing attacks the American Friends Service Committee. Do you subscribe to that part of it?

Mr. SARGENT. What part is that?

Mr. HAYS. Where it mentions in a very unfavorable way the American Friends Service Committee.

Mr. SARGENT. Let me see what you mean, show me the passage that you are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Dilworth committee report.

Mr. HAYS. I will show you the passage. I have listened to a lot of stuff from you, and I turned it down, but apparently I have lost the place.

Mr. SARGENT. The Dilworth committee is a very reliable committee of our legislature, and it has worked for many years.

Mr. HAYS. You go ahead and I will find this in just a moment.

Mr. SARGENT. You are asking about the Anti-Defamation League, and I would like to state positively for the record I am not anti-Semitic in any way, and I have never adhered to that point of view, and I have very high respect for people of that faith who have done work on behalf of our country.

Alfred Kolberg, of New York, is a very patriotic and useful citizen, and Rabbi Benjamin Schultz is another, and I am fully sympathetic with the problems among that group which arise in connection with this subversive activities question, and if your committee desires information on some of the unfortunate conditions existing among that group, I suggest that you read the book *What Price Israel* by Alfred M. Lilienthal. It is a 1953 publication of Henry Regnery & Co.

of Chicago. I want to make that clear, because there is a tendency, unfortunately, to refer to anyone who even mentions the name of this organization as having anti-Semitic points of view which I positively don't have, and I have never adhered to.

Mr. HAYS. I have found there are a number of references to the American Friends Service Committee, and I just got this book about a moment ago.

Mr. SARGENT. It is probably a citation of some individual.

Mr. HAYS. This is in your report, and it says as follows:

The participation of the American Civil Liberties Union and League of Women Voters and the American Friends Service Committee and the Federation for the Repeal of the Levering Act—

which I am not familiar with—

was of great assistance to and lent respectability to the Communists in the spread of their seditious propaganda.

That is a bad inference, isn't it?

Mr. SARGENT. It probably is, and the report speaks for itself.

Now, as an indication of the extent to which a certain branch of people in education are actively working for the world government movement, I would cite you the eleventh yearbook of the John Dewey Society. The John Dewey Society is one of the organizations sponsoring that pamphlet. The book is called Education for a World Society, and its copyright date is 1951, and it is published by Harper Bros., New York.

The editors named on the title page here are Christian O. Arndt, chairman, professor of international educational relations, School of Education, New York University.

Samuel Everet, assistant professor of education, College of the City of New York.

The consultants are Harold Benjamin, dean of the College of Education, University of Maryland, and George S. Counts, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia, and Professor Van Til, professor of education, College of Education, University of Illinois.

The book in question is one which advocates world government in substance, and the use of education as a means of bringing it about. That is educational propaganda.

Mrs. FROST. Is the publication of that book paid for by the foundations?

Mr. SARGENT. I don't know, and I don't know what support of the John Dewey Society is, but this is cited as an example of the extent to which we have an organized clique for world government within the educational profession, and I think that you can compare that with the foundation policy of supporting similar ideas, in effect the strengthening of the hands of those people.

Mr. HAYS. But it has actually no tie whatsoever that you know of to the foundations, except what you have given?

Mr. SARGENT. I think it will be connected up when your staff gets into the other phases of this problem. I am giving you a part of the evidence within my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sargent, it is now 4:20.

Mr. SARGENT. Give me 5 minutes and I can finish. I just have a summary statement and I am through. My statement is simply this: I have discussed the public policy questions, and there are legal ap-



proaches to this matter which I think the committee may want to consider. One is a declaratory statute confirming the fact that expenditures for education in antisubversive works are within the scope of present revenue laws and the tax exemption privilege will not be impaired by the approval of any project of that kind.

In other words, that there is under existing law a right to defend the Government of the United States, and there can be no legal question involved. That could have the effect of releasing substantial money for patriotic people wanting to defend our country and remedy these conditions.

Secondly, providing for unlimited deductibility of educational contributions for the defense of constitutional government.

Third, a statute requiring a foundation to reject any applications tending to promote the spread of communism, socialism, or the welfare state.

Fourth, a mandatory provision, providing that if any foundation elects to go into these controversial subjects having to do with socialism, and so forth that they must afford equal facilities to both sides as a condition of engaging in such work. Otherwise the statutes should declare they are engaging in propaganda.

Finally, we think it would be useful.

Mr. HAYS. Just a moment. You say "we think." Who is "we"?

Mr. SARGENT. The people I have talked to about this.

Mr. HAYS. You wouldn't mind changing that and making it "I think?"

Mr. SARGENT. I think so and I think many people will agree with me, that the denial of the right of critical analysis and critical study is one of the most glaring weaknesses in our present situation.

Academic freedom perhaps requires that these controversial and debatable subjects be supported. But if a foundation wants to do that, it should be willing to support both sides and let each one thresh it out with the other. If the foundation won't take in both sides, it should take in neither.

Finally, we think there should be some statutory declaration confirming the rights and duties of foundation trustees, their responsibilities as trustees, to be patriotic, loyal, to defend the Government of the United States, and to refrain from engaging in any activity involving possible overthrow of the Government by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at the opening of this session there was an understanding that questions would be postponed until the end of my testimony, and a transcript would be written up and I would appear. I am prepared to do that, and I will be here without further notice at whatever time you see fit to adjourn to.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think it would be convenient in view of the Memorial Day weekend recess, for the committee to meet before Tuesday, and we have an understanding that it is not convenient for the members to meet on Tuesday, so the next meeting of the committee will be next Wednesday, and the time to be announced.

Mr. SARGENT. May I ask that my matter be brought up?

The CHAIRMAN. And then Dean Rusk will follow you.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know whether I will have any time to analyze all of this.

Mr. SARGENT. I am a long distance from home, and I think I should be released. If you want to send me home, and bring me back for examination later, I am perfectly willing to do that, if you want to pay the freight on two trips.

Mr. HAYS. When we go over this, if we find that there hasn't been enough exploration made in it, and other members want to question you, I certainly would be in favor of it.

Mr. SARGENT. It is entirely agreeable with me.

Mr. HAYS. I have very heavy commitments made long before these hearings were set down, and up to now I don't even have all of your testimony.

Mr. SARGENT. I have no objection to being brought back on reasonable notice, if you would prefer that.

Mr. HAYS. We would give you reasonable notice.

Mr. SARGENT. I just want to make it clear that I offered in the first place, and I offer again to come back at any convenient time suggested by you on reasonable notice, that is for any examination you wish to conduct.

The CHAIRMAN. You may be excused for the time being, and you can go back home. If we need you we will give you ample notice so that you can come at the convenience of yourself and of the committee.

Mr. HAYS. Although I may disagree on some things, the committee has been kind enough to respect my commitments over the weekend, and I would be the last person in the world to want to hold you here, so that you would be present when it was convenient to me, and I certainly think that the committee should agree to that.

Mr. SARGENT. I assumed over the weekend you would be ready to go, in which case I would be here.

Mr. HAYS. I want you to know that I concur and suggest that you be allowed to go, and that you will be given ample notice when you return.

Mr. SARGENT. Then I am excused and I come back when requested.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to express appreciation for your testimony, and the time you have taken, and I hope it hasn't been unpleasant.

Mr. SARGENT. I am glad to be of as much service as I can be, and I want to thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will stand in recess until Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock. The room in which we will meet will be announced.

(Whereupon, at 4:25 p. m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 2, 1954.)