The special committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 1301, New House Office Building, Hon. B. 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; John Marshall, chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

You may proceed, Mr. Earl.

Mr. GOODWIN. I wonder, before Mr. Earl starts, Mr. Chairman, if we could not get some sort of a stipulation from the committee that we will be as easy as possible on the questioning. I notice that we are running behind schedule all the time. We learned yesterday that there was a possibility that the House may go into a 3-day recess period beginning with the first of next month. I know that those of us who like to get home occasionally would dislike very much to be held in Washington for the continuation of the public hearings. If the members of the committee could perhaps forego the temptation of cross-examining, it might be possible to expedite.

The CHAIRMAN. If Mr. Earl could be permitted to conclude his prepared statement, I think that would be well.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to have him put his statement in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I haven't had the opportunity to study his statement, myself. As one Member of Congress, I would like to hear it. There might be some questions at the end that I would like to ask him.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say that I will try to refrain. I am just as anxious to get home as anybody else. But since I have sat patiently through a lot of testimony, some relevant and some not so relevant, about foundations, I am not going to show any inclination to shut this questioning off. I think the thing is very fundamental, and ample time should be given to this.

Mr. GOODWIN. My thought is that we could get down to the fundamentals the gentleman from Ohio refers to much more quickly if we use a little more discretion.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate the gentleman's position, and I will try to cooperate, but I think the discretion will have to be left up to each
member of the committee. I don't believe anybody can decide but me what I think it is best to ask about and what is not.

Mr. Goodwin. The last thing I would attempt to do is to tell you how you should conduct your questioning.

The Chairman. We will do the best we can to expedite the presentation, I am sure.

You may proceed, then, Mr. Earl.

TESTIMONY OF KEN EARL, ATTORNEY, LEWIS, STRONG & EARL, MOSES LAKE, WASH.—Resumed

Mr. Earl. Might I ask first whether or not the sound system is working? Is my voice heard up there now?

Mr. Hays. If you will pull the microphone as close to you as you can, Mr. Earl, that will help. These are not as sensitive as some microphones.

Mr. Earl. We had gotten to the middle of page 12 of my prepared statement. We were speaking about a conference which the LID held in 1950. They reported that conference in a pamphlet entitled, "Freedom and the Welfare State." And beginning with the middle of page 12:

Mr. Israel Feinberg, vice president of the ILGWU and a member of the Board of the LID, had this to say:

Labor, in effect, must become the vanguard of the welfare state. But welfare measures alone don't go to the heart of the problem. Labor must lead an attack on the private monopoly power of the giant corporations. It must seek a redistribution of income so that the working people have sufficient purchasing power to halt the drift to depression. All this would require further Government interventions into our economic life. To see to it that the necessary programs are carried out democratically, labor should insist on a voice in formulating and administering them. Labor should be represented on management councils, whether the ownership be private or public—that would be real industrial democracy.

Another LID board member, Mr. Norman Thomas, Socialist leader and chairman of the Post War World Council, attacked anticommunism in these words. This is also taken from the same publication. This is obviously a summary written by one of the editorial writers of the LID:

"Within the trade unions, in the growth of which he rejoiced, there was grave danger that, under cover of a fight against communism—which, properly conducted, is legitimate and necessary in our unions—certain leaders may attempt to fasten a kind of Fascist dictatorship of their own on the unions."

At Washington and in some of the State capitals, we suffer from a rash of stupid and reactionary proposals—such as the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill, which would, if enacted—jeopardize all of our liberty while doing nothing important to stop communism.

The setbacks in civil liberties Mr. Thomas blamed on "the whole Communist technique of conspiratorial deceit," on the reactionaries who exploit the situation caused by Communists, "partly to cover their own bad records by a boisterous patriotism," and on the Republican Party, which is trying to find itself an issue in "socialism versus liberty" (p. 31).

I injected both of those excerpts, because I think that they are strictly in the political arena.

On April 11, 1953, just a year ago, the LID held its 48th annual luncheon in the Hotel Commodore. The subject was "The Crisis in American and World Resources." Speakers included Mrs. Eleanor
Roosevelt; Oscar L. Chapman, former Secretary of the Interior; Thomas C. Douglas, Premier of Saskatchewan, Canada; Adolph Held, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee; Paul R. Porter, former United States Deputy for Economic Affairs in Europe. Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Senator Paul H. Douglas, Congressman Jacob K. Javits and Dr. Harry A. Overstreet sent messages of congratulation and admiration to the league.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Earl, could you tell me just why you put these names in right there, and what significance it has?

Mr. EARL. I put the names in partly because a little later I refer to some of their messages, and also to indicate the political character of the persons who attended the conference. And also, although this came up yesterday, I would like to refer to it: You mentioned yesterday that you figured I had come a long way to testify concerning a very unimportant organization. I rather suspect that persons of Mrs. Roosevelt's stature and Mr. Chapman's stature, and various other people who have been honored by the league and who pay it homage, would be rather at odds with you about that, because they obviously consider it an important organization.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I suppose, Mr. Earl, that they would be able to testify about that better than you would. I don't think you need to put any words in their mouths, and if they want to take issue with you, they can. But if you put their names in here for the purpose of trying to indicate that they are mixed up with any leftwing organization, I happen to know a couple of these people, namely, Congressman Javits and Senator Douglas, and I want to say to you that there are no more outstanding Americans in Washington today than those two men, and both of them have a long record of anticommunism.

Mr. EARL. Mr. Hays, I did not say that these people were left-wingers, that they were Communists, or anything of the sort. I would like to point out that these people are proud of their association with the LID, and what the LID has done. They have said so. And they are going to be the last persons in the world to disavow anything that they have said concerning it.

Now, I put their names in here to indicate the type of people who are associated with the LID and who nurture the things that the LID stands for. That is the reason I put their names in there.

They have been associated at their affairs, and some of these people have been honored by the LID and have gone there to receive their plaudits and banquets, et cetera. And I don't think any of them are going to disavow what the LID has said.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Earl, do you think that is bad, for them to be mixed up, as you say, with the LID?

Mr. EARL. No, Mrs. Pfost, I don't think that it is "bad." I say that it demonstrates the political nature of the LID, and the fact that it is constantly in the political arena. I am not here to judge the merits or the demerits of the program that the LID has espoused, except to say that the LID has espoused socialism, and that they are for certain things, and that, being for a certain political program, for certain legislation, I think they should be plumping for it with dollars that remain after their income has been taxed.

Mrs. PFOST. By your dropping these names in or referring to these people as being associated with or mixed up with the L. I. D,
does that mean that you feel that these people are trying to further socialism? Is that the implication, by bringing the names in?

Mr. Earl. I think that the implication stands for itself. The LID stands for certain principles. It has made no bones about what those principles are. I think the record of the various conferences indicates what those are. You and I know that a great many of those principles have been espoused by both the Republican and the Democratic parties. So I will just drop it there.

Mr. Hays. Well, let's not drop it there, for just a minute. You use a technique that is not one that you have developed yourself. It has been around here before; in which you start off with the premise that these people are not Communists, and thereby plant the seed; just as though I would say to you, "Now, Mr. Earl, don't for a minute think that I think you are stupid," and if I hadn't brought that up, nobody would have thought about it, would they? I am just using that as an illustration, not that I mean you are. But that is the kind of technique you are using on these names.

Mr. Earl. I disagree with you, but that is all right.

The Chairman. It is pretty difficult to discuss an organization without discussing some of the names that are associated with it, it seems to me. But, as I understand, the whole purpose here, or the primary purpose here, is to indicate the political characteristics of the activities of the organization, which is supported by tax-exempt funds.

Mr. Hays. Well, I will just give you a little example. We get over here, and he says Senator Douglas received an award, and he says he sent a speech up which would make interesting reading, implying there is something bad about it. When we come to that I am going to read it.

Mr. Earl. I was going to read it.

Mr. Hays. I would like to read it, and you may comment on it.

The Chairman. Proceed.

Mr. Earl. The LID, according to the luncheon program, "serves as a liaison between many liberal forces of this country and abroad." It is questionable if liaison work with political activists is "educational" within the limits of our statutes relating to tax exemption. It is even more doubtful that giving public relations support to the political leader of a Canadian Socialist Party is pure research.

The Chairman. It was my impression that the State Department served as liaison between this country and the forces abroad. Maybe I was in error in that.

Proceed.

Mr. Hays. From some of the comments I have read about the State Department, I would say that almost anything you might say about them could be in error.

Mr. Earl. Here is the league's citation to Thomas C. Douglas, Premier and Minister of Cooperatives, Saskatchewan, Canada:

In 1944, following a brilliant career as ethical leader and member of the Canadian Parliament, you were elected, against the powerful opposition of the forces of special privilege, the C.C.F. Premier of Saskatchewan.

Four and eight years later, you and your able and dedicated coworkers were returned to power with overwhelming majorities. Under your dynamic, creative and socially visioned leadership, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation Government assured to the people a clean and honest administration; enacted the most advanced legislation on the American continent in the fields of natural
resources, human rights, health and social insurance; worked out a harmonious relationship between the strong cooperative movement and expanding public enterprise; steadily improved the cultural and recreational services, and gave to the world an example of social and economic planning with freedom that has placed every democratic country in its debt.

In recognition of these historic achievements, the League for Industrial Democracy, at its 48th Annual Conference, takes pleasure in presenting to you its 1953 Award to a Distinguished Leader from Abroad, and looks forward to your continued pioneering services to your Province, your country and the democratic world.

Mr. Norman Thomas, in presenting citations to Paul Porter and Clarence Senior, said:

Today we wish to show our appreciation to two active student officers of the late twenties who have since been of great service to our country and the world. * * * nowhere in their career is it mentioned they were active Socialists. Paul Porter used to give me kind of a headache too about the kind of Socialist he was at times, but it's not mentioned now; he perfectly safe as far as I am concerned. And as for Clarence Senior, I read that "* * * following his graduation, after a decade of service in the fields of adult education * * * public housing and labor and Socialist political action, * * * he entered the field of Inter-American relations. Now this man must be told; he was once the national secretary of the Socialist Party and he did a very good job.

I am awfully proud to have known these men so long, and awfully proud of what they have done. They have done the kind of work that might have saved us if more people had done it. For instance, imagine if by their work in the days of their less reputable calling they could have made Texas or Louisiana Socialist?

Do you think we would have had to worry about who would own the oil? I don't. I am quite sure that there would have been an extraordinary change in our theory of States rights, Mr. Ex-Secretary Chapman, at this point. They did a grand job and they are doing it now. (From the luncheon program.)

The LID News Bulletin, January 1953, in announcing this forthcoming conference (referred to above) used this language:

At a time when the country is using up many of its natural resources at an unprecedented rate; * * * when powerful lobbies are seeking to take our offshore oil resources out of the control of the Federal Government, to return the TVA to private monopoly and to prevent the further public development of the Nation's vast hydroelectric resources, and when adequate aid in the development of resources of other lands is vital to the maintenance of world democracy, it is most fitting that the LID should give its attention this year to this important problem of conservation (p. 1).

If there is any doubt that the bulletin is anything other than a rallying cry for a militant lobby—rather than an educational journal—such doubt can be dispelled by turning to page 6 of this same issue. There the LID's program for "democracy in action for 1953" is set forth by Dr. Harry Laidler, executive director. It should be noted that the academic recommendations endorsed by the league just happen to deal with the issues then before Congress. Moreover, instead of presenting both sides, they urge action in behalf of a particular piece of legislation. Excerpts from this democratic program follows:

In presenting this program, Dr. Laidler declared that advocates of a strengthened democracy would be confronted in 1953 with powerful opponents, well supplied with funds, and that, for the first time in 20 years, the main body of the Nation's press would be aligned on the side of the party in control of our national government * * * (p. 6).

1. Conservation of natural resources: It urged the increase of forestland public ownership and control; the retention of offshore oil by the Federal Government and the use of revenues from oil resources for educational purposes; extension of the TVA principle to other river basin developments * * *

2. Social security: The program recommended that the Nation consider the enactment of a democratically operated national health insurance system * * *
and the strengthening of the old-age pension and unemployment insurance system.

3. Labor legislation: (reorganize child labor laws)

4. Economic stability: It favored the formulation of plans for the maintenance of economic stability when defense tapers off, by means of credit controls, progressive taxation, useful public works, social-security programs, and other measures.

5. Housing: It proposed Federal aid for the construction annually by municipal housing authorities of a minimum of 135,000 apartments for low income and middle income groups—

Mr. HAYS. That is the Eisenhower and Taft program.

Mr. EARL (reading):

6. Education: (Federal aid, better salaries for teachers, "freedom of inquiry," etc.)

7. Civil rights and antidiscrimination legislation: (stressed need for Federal and State FEPC laws, liberalization of our immigration laws, fair hearing to all public employees charged with un-American activities.)

8. Corruption: (Favored purge of dishonest officials.)

9. Foreign policy: The program favored, in addition to military aid, increased economic, social, and educational assistance to developed and underdeveloped countries.

10. Labor and cooperative movements: It urged labor unity, the strengthening of collective bargaining in white collar trades. It likewise urged the strengthening of the consumers' and producers' cooperative movement.

** the league report viewed as antidemocratic trends the increased influence of such public figures as Senator McCarthy on important Senate committees; the increased confusion among Americans regarding what should constitute a realistic democratic foreign policy; the bitter propaganda against the United Nations which had been witnessed on all sides during the year and the continued threats of men like Governor Byrnes to destroy their State's public school system rather than abolish segregation in the public schools (p. 6).

Whatever the merits of these proposals, they suggest the platform of a political party or the legislative guide of an organized lobby—not the reflection of an educational institution.

An examination of some of the pamphlets recently published by the LID reveals that the league is still marketing a product suspiciously close to "propaganda."

From—Needed: A Moral Awakening in America, a symposium; report on LID luncheon, April 25, 26, 1952—this is a summary by the editor.

August Claessens, national chairman of the Social Democratic Federation, took a dimmer view of trends in business morality than did Mr. Rennie, and declared that, in his opinion, "capitalism, now so inoffensively called 'private enterprise,' is essentially immoral. It is a source of corruption in business and politics. Private enterprise corrupts Government enterprise and the only effective steps toward the elimination of these immoral influences are the rapid extension of collectivism and the advance of the cooperative movement" (p. 28).

At the same luncheon, Walter Reuther presented a citation to Philip Murray on behalf of the LID. The citation was received by James B. Carey for Mr. Murray, who was unable to be present. Mr. Reuther referred to the Government seizure of steel as an example of the need for morality in American industry:

The steel industry cries aloud in protest against Government seizure, yet the steel industry fails to realize that in a free society there is no substitute for the voluntary acceptance and discharge of moral and social responsibility. It was the failure of the steel industry voluntarily to discharge its social responsibility by bargaining in good faith that created the crisis that compelled the Government, as the agency of the people and the guardian of the public good, to intervene. Never in the history of industrial relations has there been a greater need for,
and such a tragic lack of the moral leadership on the part of American industry (p. 7).

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO, made the following remarks in accepting the citation on behalf of Mr. Murray:

It is fitting, therefore, that a League for Industrial Democracy should honor a Congress for Industrial Organization. The aspirations and goals of our two organizations are more than similar—they are complementary. The steel barons of our day are determined to victimize not only their own employees, but all American consumers and wage earners. In their complete abandonment of moral and ethical sensibility, they would undermine the living standards of millions of Americans and even jeopardize the national defense program itself. **

Our country needs, and our world needs, collective indignation that takes on strength and crusading power only by the cohesion of brotherhood inspired by the common economic, political, and social goals that all working men and women share ** (p. 11).

Mr. Abraham Lefkowitz, principal of Samuel J. Tilden High School, made the case for progressive education as a means of fighting corruption. This is taken from pages 24 and 25.

Mr. Goodwin. Where is the Samuel J. Tilden High School?

Mr. Earl. The Samuel J. Tilden High School is in New York.

Democratic education creates social individuals, not individualists. The individualist works for a self and subtracts from others; but the social individual is most to be desired because of what he bestows upon others, through no loss to himself.

Having attracted first-class minds free to develop the highest spiritual ideals, how can our schools help pupils to be receptive to these values? We know exhortation is no more effective than mere possession of knowledge. Children must face vital social problems and participate in their solution, based on recognized social values that evolve from group planning, discussion, study, and action. Hence, our schools, now dominated by the competitive ideal of each for himself and the devil take the hindmost, must subordinate the competitive ideal with its marks and rivalry for individual gain to the social service ideal of cooperation for the common good or for group objectives or the development of talent (pp. 24, 25).

Perhaps there is no more succinct explanation of the interrelationship of progressive "education" and socialism.

Mrs. Frost. What connection does Mr. Lefkowitz have with LID?

Mr. Earl. I am not sure what his current affiliation is. I would have to check. H appeared as a speaker at this particular program.

Mrs. Frost. I beg pardon?

Mr. Earl. I say he appeared as a speaker at this particular luncheon.

Mr. Lefkowitz continues:

A critical study of social problems; emphasis on sports where the individual, despite his desire to shine, is taught to subordinate self to the team chosen without discrimination; or stress on creative arts or school group activity based on democratic planning, etc.—all these develop a social outlook and should make for spiritual values (p. 25).

Toward Nationalization of Industry, by Harry W. Laidler, executive director of the LID, was published in 1949 and represents a fairly recent explanation of LID views on this subject. Excerpts from this pamphlet follow:

One of the outstanding questions before the American people today is whether they should work for the increase or the decrease of the powers of the Federal Government over the economic and social life of the country (p. 3).
Among our public utilities, one corporation controls a practical monopoly of the telephone business and another of the telegraph business of the country. Great holding and investment corporations control much of our electrical industry, while a major part of the mileage on the Nation's railways is directed by a handful of large railroad systems and banking groups. One, two, three, and four overlords of industry control more than half of the business in many of our manufacturing industries, while a few large banks, centering in New York, possess an enormous influence over the industrial structure of the country (p. 4).

Mr. Koch. Mr. Earl, a pamphlet such as this, Toward Nationalization of Industry, is that for sale, or sold, by the LID, or is that distributed free of charge? Do you know?

Mr. Earl. On the front it reads, “Price 25 cents,” so they must have been for sale.

Mr. Koch. And, of course, we don't know whether they make money or lose money on some of their publications, but they do publish books, don't they, or pamphlets?

Mr. Earl. Yes, they have quite a list of pamphlets that they list on the back of each of their publications.

The selection of facts, the emphasis and the choice of vocabulary here combine to distort the picture of America in much the same fashion that it is distorted by the propaganda mills of the U. S. S. R. Dr. Laidler continues:

Under a system where the basic industries of the country are privately owned and run primarily for profit, therefore, much of the income of its wealthiest citizens bears little or no relation to their industry, ability, or productivity (p. 6).

Here is the familiar theme, common to all Marxists, that capitalists are drones and parasites. Moreover, it will be seen from what follows, that they are actual or potential fascists. Then we go on, on pages 8 and 9:

The development of our system of private industry, furthermore, has been accompanied by attempts at autocratic controls of economic, political, and social relationships by owners and managers of our giant industries.

Many of our great leaders of industry who have constantly and bitterly opposed the extension of Federal power and nationalization on the ground of “regimentation,” for years spent much of their time in an attempt to regiment their own labor forces and, through the use of the spy system, armed guard, police, constabulary, militia, injunction, and blacklists, to prevent the workers under them from exercising their American right to organize and to bargain collectively. Laws passed during the thirties have made illegal many of these practices, but ruthless and undemocratic procedures in labor relations are still resorted to in industry after industry by the possessors of economic power. These same leaders have sought to control and regiment political organizations, the press, the platform, the pulpit, the school, and university in the city, the State, and the Nation.

The industrialists of the Nation have frequently kept prices high and rigid, have kept wages down, have constantly chiseled on quality, and have run their businesses not for the service of the many but for the profit of the few. In many instances they have sought to involve the country in international conflict with a view of safeguarding their investments abroad (pp. 8, 9).

Dr. Laidler calls for nationalization of our forests, coal mines, oil reserves, railroads, electrical power, communications, et cetera:

Our forests should be brought far more completely than at present under Federal administration * * * (p. 9).

The forests of the country, under private ownership, are, furthermore, cut down faster than they are restored.* * * Public ownership and operation, on the other hand, would guarantee scientific forest management (p. 11).

Bituminous coal mines should be brought under the control of the Federal Government. * ** The condition of the industry under private control has long been chaotic (pp. 11, 12).
Anthracite coal is another resource which, in the interest of the Nation, should be owned and controlled by the Federal Government (p. 13).

The waste in the exploitation of our oil resources likewise necessitates further Federal control (p. 13).

The Federal Government should likewise increase its control over the Nation's power resources. * * * Dr. Isador Lubin some years ago suggested the creation of a Federal Power Corporation, which should have ownership not only of water-power, but of coal, oil, and natural gas, with the view of coordinating the efforts on a national scale of all of those industries which generate power (p. 15).

(Dr. Lubin, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics from 1933 until 1946, was the United States representative to the U. N. Economic and Social Council from 1946 until March of 1953.)

The case for the nationalization of the railroads is a powerful one. Such ownership, in the first place, would make possible the scientific planning of the transportation industry for the entire country (p. 16).

Only under Government ownership can a sensible plan be worked out. Only under such ownership can a foundation be laid for cooperation between the railroad system and busses, water transportation, airlines, trucks, and other forms of transportation, a cooperation absolutely essential to the health and welfare of the Nation's transportation system (p. 17).

If this means anything at all, it means rigid Government control over all forms of transportation, not just railroads. Note also the wholly unreal assumption of bureaucratic infallibility which underlies the case for continental coordination of transportation.

And to quote from page 18:

Only under Government ownership will it be possible to secure enough cheap capital adequately to modernize the railroad system.

Finally, Government ownership would serve the interests of democracy by taking this vitally necessary industry out of the grip of a mass of holding companies and financial interests intent on profits and placing it in the hands of representatives of the 150 million people in the United States. Surely an industry on which the health of the whole continent system is so dependent should not be the plaything of small groups of railroad magnates and financiers. * * *

Statements to the effect that American railroads are the "plaything" of financiers do not belong to the realm of responsible scholarship.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Earl, I would like to interrupt you right there and just ask you a question or two about that last editorial statement of yours.

Are you familiar with such characters as "Bet a Million" Gates, Diamond Jim Brady, Commodore Vanderbilt, and a fellow by the name of Grew, and so on, who played around with the railroads for a great many years?

Mr. EARL. I have heard some of their names, yes.

Mr. HAYS. Did you ever hear about the time one of them bundled up $5 million in securities and crossed the river in New Jersey so that the opposition crowd couldn't get hold of the money it was felt belonged to the new board of directors? Did you know that the Erie Railroad only within the last 10 years or so paid off the indebtedness caused by water that was put into its stock by some of these same people? I mean, if you are going to editorialize, I think you ought to perhaps be a little more familiar with your subject.

Mr. EARL. Well, I point out here that I still contend that these are things that these people in a tax-exempt organization shouldn't be indulging in.

Mr. HAYS. Which people? You mean the manipulators shouldn't have indulged?

Mr. EARL. No, I am talking about Mr. Laidler.
Mr. HAYS. All right. That is all. Go ahead.
Mr. EARL. Quoting from page 19:

Similar arguments may be advanced for the public ownership of our electrical power. The experiments by the Federal Government in hydroelectric power in the TVA in Boulder (now Hoover) Dam and Columbia Basin, as I declared before, should be extended and the city, State, and Federal Governments should secure all control over the electrical resources of the Nation.

Public ownership of our electrical industry, as of our railroad industry, would make possible a unified control of the industry throughout the country. It would lay the foundation for a coordination of the power industry in general (p. 19).

Communications, manufacturing, banking and credit are not ignored by Dr. Laidler’s proposals for nationalization. (See p. 20) And on page 22 Dr. Laidler calls for a housing bill which stirs the imagination. Dr. Laidler would not nationalize the composition of symphonies or the writing of novels, but his language suggests that “thought control” would follow “industrial control.” (See p. 23.)

Dr. Laidler goes on to say:

If public ownership is to be truly democratic, furthermore, each socially owned industry should be administered democratically. That does not mean that the workers in each industry should completely control that industry. * * *
The final control of a publicly owned industry should be in the hands of society as a whole (p. 24).

Dr. Laidler goes on to admit that:

Of course the exact type of democratic control which should be adopted would have to be worked out on an experimental basis over a long series of years (p. 25).

Answering the charge that socialism will eliminate and frustrate the range of consumer choice, Dr. Laidler replies:

Of course under public ownership consumer choice should be made as free as possible. In ordinary commodities and during ordinary times, the Government should merely try to chart the past trends in the field of consumer demand, and, on the basis of past demands, decide how much of various types of commodities should be produced in the immediate future. In the nature of the case, Government agencies and voluntary groups and individuals should do their part to educate the public regarding the value of certain commodities; to encourage the purchase of socially desirable goods and discourage the purchase of “illth.” * * * instead of wealth. But all regimentation in this field of activity should be avoided (p. 26.) [Italics added]

It is difficult to reconcile the pious declaration against “regimentation” with the suggestion that Government agencies should “educate” the public to accept “socially desirable” goods. Incidentally, who writes the definitions? Who decides that the times are “ordinary”? For notice that it is only during “ordinary” times that the choice will be as “free as possible.” Finally, where is the guaranty that linking future production to “past trends” will benefit the consumer?

In analyzing the propaganda themes of the League for Industrial Democracy, it is instructive to see what prominent members of the league have had to say about communism. And I would like to say first here that I have included these references concerning this subject as a demonstration of socialism’s constant search, at least what I think is its constant search, for the silver lining in the Communist cause. Since Marx’s manifesto is the foundation of both socialism and communism, socialists feel very badly about seeing their first cousin go astray. And further I have included them because communism is
one of the powerful political issues of our time; that most people
are now agreed that communism is an international conspiracy.

Hence, it is interesting to read what certain people have had to
to say about it. And if you want me to, I shall go through it. It is
contained on page 20 through the middle of page 24 of my statement,
and contains first the statement of Mr. Alfred Baker Lewis, who was
chairman of the LID board in 1943 and 1944. This pamphlet, en-
titled, "Liberalism and Sovietism," was published in 1946.

This essay represents an attempt by socialist intellectuals to dis-
associate themselves from the terror and cruelty of Russian com-
munism. An uncautious reader is left with the feeling that, while
Russian foreign policy is evil, the economic program of the Soviets
is really quite acceptable.

Excerpts from the above pamphlet follow. Mr. Lewis explains to
his fellow liberals just how the Bolsheviks came to be unfriendly:

The governments of every capitalist nation, i.e., of every nation in the world
but Russia, immediately upon the Bolshevik's seizure of power in that land,
turned against the Bolsheviks, or the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, to
use the official title. They did this partly from determination to preserve the
right of capitalist ownership of industry, banks, and natural resources.

Since every government was against them ** the Russians naturally were
against every government. They therefore sought to set up out-and-out revolu-
tionary parties in all other countries (pp. 3-4).

Such was the call to revolution. It was not unnatural; in fact, it was largely
a defense measure, since all the Russian Government was doing was building
backfires against the governments which were conducting either directly or
through agents military invasions against it (p. 4). [Italics added.]

Now, let me digress for a moment and say that Mr. Lewis was very
rough on the Communists in here for their terror and all of the other
things that we know that Russia is doing. But I think this first thing
demonstrates in a small way the fact that he was trying somewhere to
find a silver lining.

Substantially the same argument was used by Communists to ex-
plain the Soviet war against tiny Finland, and the knife thrust into
Poland's back. All Russia was doing was protecting herself against
Fascist invasion by seizing another broad band of territory across
which Nazi armies would have to march. Similarly, subversion to-
day is merely the Kremlin's method of combating the aggressive war
plans of American imperialism.

Throughout the booklet, Mr. Lewis shifts the emphasis from the
international Communist conspiracy as a threat to world peace and
stresses the danger of Russian imperialism. In effect, this kind of
argument produces the kind of psychology in, say, America, that might
unify the Russian people behind their Communist overlords, in much
the same way that the dogma of "unconditional surrender" unified the
German people behind the Nazis. Russian "imperialism" is lightly
chastized as a modern form of British imperialism. Slave labor, gen-
ocide, brain-washing, espionage, kidnaping, political assassination—
all the instruments of total and unlimited terror are, by implication,
equated with the rule of the English sahib, sipping gin in the Indian
sun.

And then to go on, from pages 16, 18, and 19:

Russian imperialism is also evident in Bulgaria (p. 16).

In another part of the world, in Manchuria, the Russians are pursuing the
policy of Hitler ** In addition, directly reversing the policy of the Soviet
Government under Lenin when the Russians ceded their Imperialist rights in the
Chinese Eastern Railway to the Chinese Government, the Russians got from the Chinese Government an agreement giving them a half interest in the Manchurian port of Dairen ***(p. 18).

The British Labor Government and the American Government have usually opposed to some extent the extreme demands of Russia ***(p. 18). On numerous other minor issues the British and Americans have differed with the Russians. Consequently, the Russians have done all they could to embarrass the British and American Governments, especially the British. For that is simply the psychology of you oppose me and I'll oppose you (p. 19). [Italic added.]

The “master plan” for world conquest, it would seem to Mr. Lewis, is nothing more than simple retaliation for British and American rudeness.

Mr. Lewis concludes his study with suggestions as to what “real progressives” should do in the fight against communism. He urges them to oppose Communist penetration of liberal groups and, at the same time, to “loyally defend the civil rights of Communists.”

Liberals should not be afraid of being called redbaiters. Strictly speaking, no one is a redbaiter except a person who tries to deny to Communists their civil and political rights. Liberals should and most of them do loyally defend the civil rights of Communists as well as others ***(p. 25).

You are not a redbaiter because you oppose Communist penetration in the guise of liberals into other organizations or oppose the Communist Party’s influence in its “innocents clubs” or transmission belts or because you oppose Russian imperialism. You will be called such, but do not let that worry you. You would only be a redbaiter if you tried to prevent by law the Communists from establishing their own organizations (p. 25).

After arguing that the way to stop Russian imperialism is by strengthening the United Nations, Mr. Lewis ends on a note of hope. After all, he says, the Communists are not as bad as the Nazis; there is, therefore, “a real possibility of peace.”

***(p. 28) there is one important and vital difference between the Russian totalitarian dictatorship and the Nazi one. The Communists never were racialists, even though the Soviet Government refused to admit Jewish refugees from Nazi persecution. ***(p. 28) Far from being racialists the Communists both in Russia and elsewhere are sturdy opponents of racial discrimination, and active propagandists against race prejudice (p. 28).

Mr. Lewis then advances an ingenious argument to demonstrate that aggression and war are not necessarily part of the Communist plan. (See pp. 28, 29.) The statements of Soviet leaders that the destruction of either the Communist or the capitalist world is inevitable are, apparently, as irrelevant as their acts.

We may reasonably have some hope, therefore, that Russian Communist leaders can be persuaded ***(yet all competition between them could be kept on a civilized basis of raising higher their respective standards of living, and that would not necessarily lead to war ***(p. 29).

The invasion of Korea, the seizure of Tibet, the use of Chinese Communist arms and cadres in Malaya and Indo-china seem to sing a contrary song.

(Note.—Alfred Baker Lewis, author of above statements, is listed as chairman of the board of the LID for the year 1943-44.)
There seems to be some inner compulsion which prompts even tough-minded liberals, who understand and despise the Soviet police state, to search desperately for the silver lining. Here is Norman Thomas, another chairman of the board of the LID, writing in Democracy Versus Dictatorship, published in 1937.

This pamphlet, entitled "Freedom and the Welfare State," which was published in 1950, still carries "Democracy Versus Dictatorship" as one of their current pamphlets.

This is a quote from page 11:

* * * it is still true that between the Fascist and Communist types of dictatorship there are important differences. Both accept in practice the doctrine of the totalitarian state, under the dictatorship of one party which form of government, and communism as an instrument for achieving the final Communist society in which the coercive state will have become unnecessary. The Fascist dictatorship is bent upon preserving in a large measure the profit system and the class divisions of society. The Communist dictatorship has already practically abolished the profit system and the older class divisions of society. Neither Italian fascism or German nazism has any such record of social achievement in the education and industrialization of a backward people as the U. S. S. R. since 1917. If there is danger in Russia of a new type of class-driven society at least communism, like Christianity, carries along in its own sacred books the dynamite for the overthrow of the hierarchies it may develop.

Mr. Thomas leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that socialism is to be achieved at the polls:

It will be the business of the workers with hand and brain, the lovers of true peace and true democracy, to make the wars and confusions of a bankrupt society, the society of a federation of cooperative commonwealths.

That cannot be done simply by the ballot in a world gone mad. Indeed, under no circumstances can the working class put its trust simply in the political democracy of which the ballot is the symbol.

In another booklet, Russia—Democracy or Dictatorship? published by the LID in 1939, and I think still on their current list, Norman Thomas documents the case against the Soviet slave empire. The piece is a detailed indictment of most, if not all, of the horrors of the Stalinist regime. Nevertheless, the concluding paragraph ends on this somewhat curious note:

One can hope that the Russian revolution, stolen from the masses by a Stalinist bureaucracy, will some day be rewon by them. One can hope that democracy can be achieved within the Communist Party, and that other parties will win the right to function. One can hope that the material benefits of state ownership will be more equitably shared by the masses, and supplemented with the liberty that Socialists believe to be equally important. One can still hold communism superior to fascism, while rejecting the continuing totalitarian terror that is a common feature of both, and that tends to reduce life under it to a common denominator of servitude to the state. Above all, one can hope that the western democracies, including the United States, will some day enjoy the blessings of socialism without having first to endure the agony of the transition period, through which Russia has been passing for more than 20 years.

Mrs. Prost. Mr. Earl, if you put in this quote here, why did you not put in the quote that gave the detailed indictment of most, if not all, the horrors of the Stalinist regime? We will all agree that certainly we would not want to live under his regime, and if you are going to quote the one section, why did you not quote the other, to give us both sides of the picture?

Mr. Earl. I am going to submit for the committee's use all of the pamphlets to which I have referred, so that you will have that material. I mentioned that he had done that, but I put this concluding paragraph in to demonstrate once again this great hunt
for the silver lining that they find in communism; and that they hope that socialism can be achieved here without our having to go through that terrible period that Russia is passing through. Does that answer your question?

Mrs. Pfost. Yes. I just couldn't understand, if you were going to give the true picture, why you would put one quote in and leave the other out.

Mr. Earl. I think we all understand what Russia is.

Mrs. Pfost. Yes.

Mr. Earl. And that it is a dictatorship, and that there are a great many terrors there, and he does a beautiful job of documenting those.

In the preface to this work, the editors state they have tried to publish a work which would contain two viewpoints, one "more sympathetic to the present Soviet Government" than the one offered by Mr. Thomas.

Among those who have been invited to present the other side of this controversial subject are Maxwell Stewart, Corliss Lamont, Robert Dunn, Mary Van Kleeck, Jessica Smith, and Earl Browder (p. 3).

When there were no takers, the LID, after delaying for nearly a year, finally decided to publish the Thomas essay, which is highly critical of the Russian experiment. Apparently, however, the editors could not resist at least one word of explanation in the preface which might soothe the outraged feelings of the pro-Soviets.

The authors will be the first to insist that ideal democracy exists nowhere, and certainly not in the United States, with its unemployment and labor injunctions, its treatment of Negroes and sharecroppers, and its many other problems. They will be the first to admit, likewise, that the U. S. S. R. should be examined and judged, not by American standards, but in the light of Russian history and conditions. It must also be admitted that democracy everywhere is more limited during war than in times of peace, and that the Soviet leaders, living for many years in almost constant fear of attack, had a war psychology long before hostilities began (p. 4).

Mr. Hays. In order to know what that paragraph means, Mr. Earl, could you give us the year when it was published or written?

Mr. Earl. I believe I referred to the year of 1939. Just a second. Yes, December 1939.

A Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy, held at the Hotel McAlpin, New York City, on May 8, 1943, brought together a number of labor leaders, Socialist professors and foreign politicians. They met to emphasize the need for postwar planning if the free world was to be spared mass unemployment and depression. The presence of so many Socialist leaders from abroad emphasized the reality of the world movement against capitalist society, a movement in which allies join hands across national frontiers to combat their own countrymen.

The proceedings of the conference were published in an LID pamphlet entitled "The Third Freedom: Freedom From Want." A list of outstanding participants, together with significant excerpts from their speeches, follows:

1. The Right Honorable Arthur Greenwood, leader of the British Labor Party in the House of Commons, broadcast a message from England which was rebroadcast during the LID luncheon. (Mr. Greenwood was elected treasurer of the British Labor Party in the summer of 1943; as a Minister in the War Cabinet of 1941, he ap-
pointed Sir William H. Beveridge chairman of the committee which used the Beveridge report on social insurance.) Greeting his friends in the LID, Mr. Greenwood remarked:

The significance and importance of your work will not be limited to the United States. We over here are greatly interested in it, too. The subject you are dealing with vitally concerns people everywhere because it expresses one of the deepest aspirations of the masses of all peoples (p. 3).

It is our duty, according to the British Labor Leader, to make freedom from want—

inalienable through the law of nations. To provide freedom from want is one of our chief tasks. It is an urgent problem that concerns the society of nations and national communities, and is not merely one of individual responsibility (p. 4).

It is very clear that Mr. Greenwood, like many of his colleagues, sees the necessity of pressing for socialism at the strategic level (i.e. world cooperation as well as socialism within nations).

A new inspiration and impetus was given to social planning by the declarations of the Atlantic Charter. But important as these individual national preparations and plans may be, it is of the first importance that we should keep constantly in our minds that the indispensable basis of a universal forward movement toward social security and social justice for the peoples is to be found only in the concerted action of the nations working in the closest and most effective cooperation (p. 4).

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Chairman, we have been here now a little over an hour, and we have covered 12 pages, and there have been very little in the way of interruptions. We have 13½ pages yet to go. Do you think it is necessary for us to sit and listen to the material read to us? Couldn't Mr. Earl submit this for the record?

The Chairman. Mr. Earl would have preferred to have spoken offhand, but in order to give the committee members the testimony in advance, it was necessary for him to make a written statement, so as not to fall into the position for which some of the previous witnesses have been criticized. And the mere fact that at the instance of the committee as well as its insistence it became necessary for him to prepare a transcript, I hardly think it is fair to the witness to suggest that there is anything odious about reading a statement.

Now, so far as I am concerned, I have not had opportunity to read this, myself, and it takes no more time for me to listen to it than it would for me to read it myself.

Mrs. Pfost. The reason I brought it up was in view of the fact that we did have the material in advance, and I have gone over it, and I was hoping that he might be able to expedite the hearing just that much; because we do have the context of what Mr. Earl is trying to convey to the committee, and in view of the fact that the House is in session, I thought perhaps it would speed us up considerably if we would be able to offer the statement for the record, and that we might question him a little.

The Chairman. Well, he has certain passages marked, I think, to have included in the record, and has included some of them, and is only going to read what he thinks would be of more particular interest.

Mr. Earl. How would it be if we compromise, and I will go through and just refer to some of them. Of course, whatever the committee decides is agreeable with me.

Mrs. Pfost. It was my understanding last night that he expected to sort of hop through the testimony, and I for one am appreciative
that we do have this transcript before us and that we have had an opportunity to have a few hours. We didn't get very many hours before your testimony started.

Mr. Earl. I got it to the committee as quickly as I could.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Earl. Two. Dr. Carter Goodrich, chairman of the governing body of the International Labor Office and professor of economics at Columbia University, reinforced Mr. Greenwood's thesis:

I wish to argue, first, that attaining freedom from want for our own people, as well as for others, requires international cooperation as well as national action; and, second, that in this cooperation we should make large use of an agency, the International Labor Organization, which is itself, in its structure and way of working, a notable example of industrial democracy (p. 6).

3. Mr. Robert J. Watt, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, produced a typical propaganda assault on capitalist society:

Freedom from want is the No. 1 of the goals toward which civilized man has worked through the centuries. The present paradox of want amid plenty is evidence of negligence, of laziness and leadership, of stupid, unthinking acceptance of an economic fetish from the laissez-faire cult. Democracy cannot survive if it bends its economic life to the taboo of an ancient medicine man (p. 10).

He also poses an economic and political solution to the problem of want:

For freedom from want, workers must be paid such wages as represent their true productivity in order that their purchasing power can sustain the circulation of goods. Wages of capital should go down to the measure of its actual social value (p. 11).

Yes, for freedom of our people from want, the Nation cannot pay too high a price. What we cannot afford is to ignore or be overly timid in preventing such want (p. 12).

Of course, in skipping around here, I don't want any inferences that I am just trying to pick out some juicy parts. I think it is all important, or I wouldn't have written it.

Mr. R. J. Thomas, chairman of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, sent an address, and I am just going to quote the last quote in pages 14 and 15. He tells, first, that after the war he figures that there will be a lot of trouble and depression, et cetera, and then he has this to say:

There is another alternative: That alternative is to insist that our great productive machinery shall be used—as it has never been used before—for the sole purpose of providing abundance for our people. This second alternative must be based on the principle that industry should serve the people, and not merely the chosen few who own industry and operate industry for private profit (pp. 14–15).

While it is perfectly proper in the political arena to assert dogmatically that, unless the opposition is overthrown, there will be chaos and dictatorship, it is quite another matter for a tax-exempt organization to publish this quackery in an educational pamphlet. The postulating of the socialism-or-dictatorship dilemma is, of course, a standard theme in the propaganda schools of the left.

Let's go to the next page, page 27.

Mr. Hays. Let's not go to the next page too soon, because I have a question.

Mr. Earl. Go right ahead.
Mr. Hays. You mention this Dr. Eveline M. Burns in here, and I don't know whether you are skipping her for any reason. You have put her name in. Who is she?

Mr. Earl. All I know about Dr. Burns is that she is the Director of Research, Security, Work, and Relief Policies of the National Resources Planning Board, and I mentioned her because of what she said.

Mr. Hays. Do you know anything else about her?

Mr. Earl. No; I do not.

Mr. Hays. Would you be surprised to know that Mrs. Hobby picked her as one of the members of her Board to make recommendations for the new social-security law which just passed the House?

Mr. Earl. I wouldn't be a bit surprised; no, sir.

Mr. Hays. Well, I know you are hard to surprise. For the record, it might be interesting also to put in that she is the wife of Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I don't mean any leftwing president, either. That doesn't surprise you, does it?

Mr. Earl. I was not aware of it.

Mr. Hays. And you are not questioning my veracity?

Mr. Earl. No; I am not.

The Chairman. There is nothing in here characterizing Mrs. Burns in any way, as I see it. It is merely quoting from her speech.

Mr. Hays. You editorialize about it as you please, Mr. Chairman, but I will tell you if my name were mentioned in this document any place, I would resent it. I would think it was an attempt to show I was a leftwinger.

Mr. Earl. Do you want me to skip around? I don't want to be accused of skipping something.

Mr. Hays. I just didn't want you to skip Dr. Burns. Now you can skip from here on if you want.

Mr. Koch. The quotation on page 24 that you mentioned. What does that come from? You quote from the lady and give it as page 24. And I just wanted to find out whether that is page 24 of some LID document.

Mr. Earl. That is page 24 of the document from which we are reading right now, The Third Freedom, Freedom From Want.

Mr. Koch. And that is an LID publication?

Mr. Earl. That is an LID publication.

Mr. Hays. When you say she admonishes her colleagues, who are you talking about, her colleagues down from Mrs. Hobby's office, or who?

Mr. Earl. She is speaking here at an LID conference, so I am talking about those people.

On page 27, item 6: Dr. I. S. Falk, Director of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board, argued that:

A strong system of social insurance is necessary to prevent want in the post-war period, even if full employment is achieved.

Now, again, I am not arguing with social security right now. I am just indicating here that social security is a political subject, and it is one that has current legislation before Congress, and did at that time.

Next I point out some of the subjects that were discussed.

Henrietta C. Epstein, vice president of the American Association for Social Security——
Mr. Hays. Mr. Earl, I might ask you a question right there? In view of Congress's penchant for investigating practically anything and everything, do you think there is any subject we could discuss that wouldn't have some kind of overtone or implication? If we are going to be that broad, there is no way to get away from it.

Mr. Earl. I think it is much narrower than that, because the law under which these organizations received their tax-exempt status indicated that they received that status provided that no substantial part of their activities were devoted to political purposes, et cetera. It is my thesis that more than a substantial part of the LID's activities have been devoted to attempts to influence legislation and political purposes.

Mr. Goodwin (presiding). The second bell has now sounded for a quorum call.

The committee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, probably for about 15 minutes.

(Short recess.)

The Chairman. The committee will come to order, please.

You may resume, Mr. Earl.

Mr. Earl. We were speaking about the symposium held in 1943 by the league.

As to the subjects discussed: Henrietta C. Epstein, vice president of the American Association for Social Security, spoke on the subject, Health Insurance Our Next Forward Step; Dr. Arne Skaug, Director, Norwegian Government Disability Services, explained The Norwegian Crusade for Social Security; and Dr. J. Raymond Walsh, director of research and education, CIO, urged that labor “find the media and words to articulate and implement” its aim. (Dr. Walsh's address, published in the Freedom from Want pamphlet, was made before the Washington chapter of the LID on March 5, 1953.)

Then Alfred Baker Lewis, chairman of the board of the League for Industrial Democracy, continued his bit:

To get freedom from want in the postwar world we must be clear that we cannot do so by reestablishing complete freedom of enterprise, the fifth freedom which ex-President Hoover and the National Association of Manufacturers want to add to the four freedoms (p. 53).

Mr. Lewis explained why private enterprise could no longer avert terrible depressions. He indicated that they had gotten us jammed up before, and that they just didn’t have the capacity to pull us out of the hole.

Thus the free land in the West acted as a safety valve for unemployment and depression. But by 1930 that free land was no longer available except for mountain tops and deserts. The automatic safety valve upon which we relied comfortably before World War I and which gave rise to the belief in the efficiency of rugged individualism as a cure-all for our economic ills, has gotten jammed and needs to be regulated by careful Government planning and vigorous Government action if we are to avoid an explosion of suffering and unemployment again (p. 54).

George Baldanzi, executive vice president of the Textile Workers Union of America, seemed to feel that Hitler and his Nazi henchmen had little to do with bringing on the war. Nor, presumably, were the Japanese responsible.

Business and industry are looking for a solution to the problem of full employment within the framework of what they call free enterprise. What they mean, of course, is their old freedoms to exploit. But free enterprise is drawing its
last gasp. This very war we are fighting, and the causes of the war, are indications of the breakdown of the economy of free enterprise (p. 57).

Labor believes that special privilege will have to accept a planned economy, that the days of laissez-faire are gone with the winds of war. We believe that production will have to be geared to social need rather than to private profit (p. 57).

History has shown us that full employment is not possible under a system of free enterprise. * * * The free enterprisers are interested in profits, not people (p. 57).

Whether it is established on the basis of democracy or on the basis of monarchy or on the basis of fascism, the system of free enterprise inevitably leads to war. When they dry up at home, entrenched privilege must look for them abroad. War inevitably follows, and another war will follow this war unless the leaders of the United Nations begin to think in terms of changing the economic pattern as well as the political pattern of liberated and conquered nations (p. 58).

Participants in a roundtable discussion on social insurance and full employment included Dr. Oscar Lange, associate professor of economics of the University of Chicago; Donald S. Howard, of the research staff of the Russell Sage Foundation; Dr. Herman A. Gray, chairman of the New York State Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee; E. J. Coil, director of the National Planning Association; Charles Abrams, a director of the National Public Housing Conference; Ellis Cowling, educational director of the Consumers' Cooperative Services of New York; and Charles C. Berkley, executive director of the New York Committee on Discrimination in Employment.

The subject, I think, is the important thing here, social insurance and full employment.

The conference also discussed another program under the heading "Mobilizing Our Forces in Behalf of the Third Freedom."

Nathaniel Minkoff of the ILGWU, who is this year's president of the LID, called for a new party:

So much for the present. The real test will come immediately after the war, when, what with sudden deflation, demobilization and shrinkage of production, as well as with the inevitable worldwide confusion, our Nation will face the grave danger of economic collapse. Only a courageous, farsighted economic policy, based on long-range social planning, can save us from disaster. It is not my purpose now to discuss what this postwar planning should consist of nor how it should be undertaken. I merely want to stress that it is not merely an economic or technical question, least of all a more question of technical expertness. It is primarily a political question, for even the best program in the world must remain a mere scrap of paper unless it is implemented with political power (p. 71).

We must organize independently of old, now meaningless party affiliations into a compact and mobile force able to exert its influence where and how it will do the most good * * * (p. 72).

Above all we must be clear as to our social basis. What we want, I think, is a democratic coalition of all functional groups in the community with organized labor as its backbone and basis. I am not holding out to you any perfect models but, with all its faults, I think the American Labor Party of New York State is something of the sort we have in mind (p. 72).

He, of course, was calling for the formation of a new political party in America, and I question the legitimacy of that for an educational association.

Mr. Samuel Wolchok, president of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, CIO, also demanded political action. His address, printed in this same booklet, was made to the Washington Chapter of the LID in March 1943. The tone is scarcely academic.

There is the sharp line of cleavage as to the future of the postwar world, between the idealistic forces of the liberals on the one hand, and the blind, cruel forces of the reactionaries on the other.
The reactionaries are well organized. They have power, the press, the radio, money and ruthlessness on their side. They are well-armed for battle. They are far more interested in controlling the peace than in winning the war and their energies are solely directed to that end (p. 73).

The reactionaries in this country have no program to solve this country's ills and the ills of mankind. Their program can only culminate in fascism and dictatorship here, followed by revolution (p. 77).

Mr. Wolchok then adds his voice to the swelling chorus demanding political action:

The solution then lies in a third party—a party supported by trade unions and true farmers' unions, by welfare organizations, by civic bodies, and by other social-minded groups and committees (p. 74).

He mentions further that there is already a great nucleus here for the formation of a third party. He refers to the CIO, the A. F. of L., the National Farmers unions, and then suggests that to this could be added the liberal, civic, and welfare organizations spread throughout the country.

Prof. Frank H. Underhill, professor of history, University of Toronto, Canada, pictured the advantage of having a political party to implement liberal and Socialist goals. Then he described the success of the CCF in Canada, and suggested that they have a program there but it works much better when they have a political party with which to carry out that program. He lectured his audience on the advantages of having that political party and the things that they should try to accomplish.

On page 31 of my prepared statement, following the quotation, I mentioned that Mr. Leroy E. Bowman, supervisor, Bureau of Adult Education, New York State, spoke on the subject "Educating for the Abolition of Want," and I would just summarize by saying that his speech, in his speech, he visualized a vast interlocking directorate of labor, consumer, and Government interests in control of the mighty apparatus of adult education. His theme throughout was that we must educate the adults in America to accept this social planning over all of our economic extremes in the country.

Next, Mr. Mark Starr, educational director of the ILGWU, and Dr. John L. Childs, professor of philosophy of education at Teachers College, and a member of the postwar planning commission of the A. F. of L., presided over a roundtable with the title "Mobilizing Our Forces, Economic, Political, Cultural, In Behalf of the New Freedom."

He suggested that all organized groups must be mobilized and used. And to quote 95 and 96, "I wish we had the outlook for a CCF in America. There is no such adequate approach available here."

Another pamphlet published by the LID is entitled "Toward a Farmer-Labor Party," and the author is Harry W. Laidler. It was printed in 1938. However, it is still on the current list of LID publications and I presume has not been repudiated by the league.

To summarize what this pamphlet calls for, I think that it would be rights to say that it calls for the formation of a political party with the labor groups and the farmers as the basis, and that only through such a coalition could they reach the goals that Mr. Laidler would have them reach.
He indicates, as I have said on the bottom of my statement, on page 32, and he is quoting here from another magazine:

To delay the building of a new party of the masses because of the possibility or probability of the selection of a "liberal" candidate by the Democratic Party, these students of politics contend, "is to repeat the error of past years." "Similar arguments," Oswald Garrison Villard maintains, "have postponed the organization of that third party ever since 1924 * * *. Now once more, progressives are called upon to stay in the party fold. Frankly, it seems to me shortsighted reasoning."

And then he goes on to say that he would much rather they formed this new party rather than try to stay within the framework of any of the parties then in existence.

To me agitation for the formation of a new party scarcely qualifies as legitimate project of a tax-exempt organization.

Now, if we can go down to the middle of page 34, just below the middle, speaking of the Forward March of American Labor that was published by the league in a revised printing as recently as 1953. It is supposed to be a history of the American labor movement. The text, however, is embellished by a remarkable series of cartoons which, in the year 1953, strike an impartial reader as a crude effort to discredit today's business with faults that have long since been corrected.

Mr. HAYS. When were those cartoons originally published, approximately?

Mr. Earl. I mention that the pamphlet was originally published a long time ago.

Mr. HAYS. I mean the cartoons.

Mr. Earl. I don't know, sir. I would have to check that and see.

Mr. HAYS. They did just what you are doing. They went back several years and lifted up some cartoons that give a kind of a wrong impression in 1953, much as your quotations of 1932 might give.

Mr. Earl. The point is, though, that they haven't disavowed many of the things that I pointed out in yesterday's testimony concerning their aims and goals stated in the 1930's.

This pamphlet struck me as not particularly setting forth the true picture of the situation as it is now.

On April 25 and April 26, 1951, the LID held another of its annual conferences in New York. The proceedings were published in a pamphlet entitled "World Cooperation and Social Progress." The league presented the citation to Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Director of the Trusteeship Department of the United Nations, and awarded another citation to President William Green of the A. F. of L. And it gave a John Dewey award for distinguished LID alumni to Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois, who "in his graduate days," according to the pamphlet, had been—

leader of the league's chapter at Columbia University, and, since his university days, has done distinguished work in the fields of economics, civic reform, social legislation, and international peace.

Senator Douglas was not present and he accepted the award in absentia, and an address extolling the LID, sent by Senator Douglas, was read at the conference.

Now, I believe that both the gentleman from Ohio and myself would like to refer to that.
Mr. Hays. Yes. I have some photostatic copies here that Senator Douglas made available to me from his files of the letter that he sent up. I think that we ought to just read that, and then have you tell me what is wrong with it. We will give these to the press. He says:

I want to express my heartfelt appreciation to my friends in the LID that they should have honored me with a John Dewey award for contributions to social progress. When I see the slow rate at which we advance toward the social goals of democracy, I sometimes wonder if the making of such awards should be held in abeyance until we have greater achievements to celebrate. The understandable and essential efforts to meet the military and strategic threats to free nations, in World War II, and, now again, as we face an aggressive Communist totalitarianism, have absorbed our attention rather completely. We must turn back the Communist threat of a police state and in the process social progress has, therefore, been accorded a subordinate place, and has been possible ordinarily only when it can be related to defense needs. In some areas, it has suffered serious setbacks.

Where we have made gains, however, as in housing, social security, reduction of racial discrimination in the Armed Forces, resistance to monopoly grabs, sounder fiscal plans that do not destroy essential welfare programs, and foreign economic assistance, they have come as the result of the thinking and planning and working of many persons and many groups. Your award to me, therefore, is fitting, only if today you treat me as merely one representative of that great company of persons, in public office and out, who have tried, however imperfectly, for a better society in a better world.

I want also to pay a brief tribute to the LID for the nearly half century of educational work it has done. It has undertaken research in, and analysis of, many of the basic economic problems of our times. It has stimulated students and statesmen, members and leaders of many groups, to a more thoughtful consideration of democratic objectives. It has brought a much-needed emphasis on extending democratic principles and practices into the economic and industrial phases of American life, lest the power of monopoly or of unrestrained managerial domination, challenge our political democracy and threaten freedom itself. Even when we have not agreed with all of its conclusions or recommendations, we have found the LID a valuable goad, a stimulating source of information, and a place for frank discussion of basic problems. For his writing, his research, his speaking, his editing, and countless other services, I'm sure we would all agree that our good friend Harry Laidler deserves the major credit for this record of LID achievement.

Yet to list the contributions of the past is to remind us of the great tasks that still lie ahead. I'm glad your conference has put these into the international setting in which all issues must now be resolved, for peace, as well as economic and social progress, must be won for the world if we are to enjoy them in our own country. We must recognize that freedom is about the most precious possession mankind can have and that we should determine that the State is made for man and not man for the State.

These jobs ahead are gigantic ones. To halt the pell-mell rush of inflation; to achieve a greater equality of sacrifice and of participation in our defense effort; to advance the elimination of racial and religious discrimination; to check the thrust of special interest for special privilege and power; to keep the public interest central in Government operations; to weed out graft and special privilege; to guard the civil liberties of individuals while maintaining the security of the Nation; to make what increases we are able, in low standards of living here and abroad—these aims must also be kept in view, even as we strive to keep the free world united in effective resistance to Communist aggression. It requires, as you all recognize, the fresh thinking, geared to the needs and conditions of this day, which we associate with John Dewey's approach to issues.

If this occasion can serve to evoke a rededication on the part of us all to these great aims of democracy, I shall feel well compensated for the role in which you have so kindly cast me today.

Is that an accurate reading of the letter?

Mr. Earl. That is an accurate reading.

Now, I presume that you will want to know what I find interesting in that.
Mr. Hays. I would be interested to know what you mean by the word "interesting"?

Mr. Earl. First, I mean this: that it sounds more like a speech at the Democratic convention, or perhaps even the Republican convention, than at an educational luncheon and seminar.

Next, at the bottom of the first page, in the center, where he has this to say, speaking of the LID:

It has undertaken research in, and analysis of, many of the basic economic problems of our times. It has stimulated students and statesmen, members, and leaders of many groups, to a more thoughtful consideration of democratic objectives.

Right there, I was just wondering to myself whether or not when he speaks of "democratic objectives" he is speaking of them in the sense that the LID understands democratic objectives.

You will recall from yesterday's testimony that democratic objectives, as understood by the LID included some things we mentioned today, the nationalization of a great many of our basic industries, and—

Mr. Hays. Senator Douglas points out that he has not agreed about all of its conclusions or recommendations.

Mr. Earl. Yes; he does that at the top of the next page, and he says:

Even when we have not agreed with all of its conclusions or recommendations—

However, I think it is probably common knowledge that he espouses a great many of their common objectives mentioned in both his second paragraph and in his next to the last one.

That is fine, and I don't quarrel with Senator Douglas' privilege or right, or anything else to espouse those.

Mr. Goodwin. I did, however, Mr. Chairman, if I listened correctly, understand that the Senator was looking forward to that depression even then.

Mr. Hays. What are you trying to say? Is it that he was a pretty fair prophet, or what?

We have 20,000 unemployed in my district. And I don't know what you want to call it. You can call it a depression or recession, or whatever it is. But the people are out of work. And they have a lot of names for it, and none of them very complimentary to this administration.

Mr. Goodwin. The reports are that this year of 1954 is the most prosperous in the history of the Republic, with one exception, and that one exception was 1953.

The Chairman. I don't want you to lose your role as defender of this administration.

Mr. Hays. Don't worry about that because I have been just about as critical of the administration as I have been in its defense. I only come to its defense when I think it needs defending from its own party. And then I feel free to criticize it any time I think it is wrong. It casts me in an independent role, one which I find seems to suit me better. Perhaps it is better than endorsing everything in either party.

The Chairman. You may proceed.

Mr. Earl. Luncheon speakers included M. J. Coldwell, member of Parliament and president of the CCF of Canada; H. L. Keenley-side, Director-General, Technical Assistance Administration, United
Nations; Paul R. Porter; and Ralph Wright, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

I think rather than read what they say, it is just more of the political platform and a demonstration of political action.

On the next page, page 36, Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of the Department of Education and Research of the CIO, observed:

It is not certain that this mobilization program will develop into an all-out undemocratic force, but it presents certain dangers. One of these dangers is the dominance of representatives of big business in key positions **

Mildred Perlman, secretary of the Student LID, called upon labor to finance the socialistic apparatus. According to the editor:

Mrs. Perlman concluded with an appeal to labor which has been closely allied over the years with the struggle for democratic education, to build a war chest in behalf of democratic education on the campus and in the community. In so doing it will ** help train a democratic leadership for the future.

If this is a legitimate undertaking, under the tax-exempt banners of the LID, there seems to be no valid reason why Young Republican Clubs or Young Democrat Clubs should not also solicit contributions which can be deductible from income tax returns. Tax law, in a capitalist and free enterprise society, should not show undue partiality towards those who are trying to abolish that form of economic organization.

The final session of the conference was given over to a "consideration of labor political action." In this case they were concerned with the problem of how they could give increased emphasis to their policies and their program, and how they could implement it through other parties than those that were in effect and in existence at the time.

The president of the CCF of Canada, Mr. Coldwell, gave his Fabian friends some advice about how they could organize this. He mentioned, at the end of this statement that I have chosen from page 36, that during the last 4 or 5 years the Canadian Congress of Labor had designated the CCF as the political arm of that labor organization and that the CCF had a growing support.

Mr. Robert Bendiner, former managing editor of The Nation, argued that, on page 38—

labor should aim at political action that would not be confined to a narrow program of wages and hours, but would be directed to the achievement of public welfare in the broadest sense. Labor should show more and more independence than has been hitherto the case.

Now, the LID's latest annual conference, held April 9, 10, and 11, in New York—since I wrote this I have received a copy of the LID news bulletin covering this conference. The news bulletin was published in June of 1954 and reports this conference.

It indicates that George Meany, president of the A. F. of L., and Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, were honored by the LID, and that this 49th annual conference discussed domestic and foreign policy and made certain awards.

In going through this, they had a great number of people there, of course, and a lot of important people. I think that if anyone were to take this and take a look at it, then go back to 1952, to the Democratic National Convention, or the Republican National Conventions in Chicago, and get a report of some of the things that happened there, that
this would turn out to be a minor political convention, so to speak, because of the themes that they discussed.

Now, the theme of the conference's main panel was entitled "How Free Is Free Enterprise." And various speakers took the capitalist system to task and indicated that they wanted more Government intervention in a great many fields.

I am going to submit this to the committee along with the other items that I have already submitted.

Incidentally, the reference I make here to Mr. Mark Starr's press release is included in here, of course, after it had happened, and there would be no need to refer to that.

They indicate that the pamphlet covering this session will not be available until fall.

Mr. Goodwin. What is that?

Mr. Earl. It will not be available in print until fall, that is the report of the various speeches.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, let me say that in this presentation I do not quarrel with the right of these many people in the LID, and all of those who have been its recipients of awards or have spoken to it, and I don't quarrel with their people, to say and write the things which we have discussed, though I disagree with many of the things which they advocate.

My thesis is this: If the LID is to continue to fill the air with propaganda concerning socialism; if it is to continue stumping for certain legislative programs; and if it is to continue to malign the free enterprise system under which we operate—then I believe that it should be made to do so with taxed dollars, just as the Democrats and the Republicans are made to campaign with taxed dollars.

Now, rather than burden the text of my statement with further excerpts from a great many other LID pamphlets, I have taken the liberty of preparing a list of those pamphlets in which fruitful reading might be had.

I have listed them on the last page of my statement. I have them here and I would be glad to offer them to the committee for whatever help they may be to the committee.

That concludes my testimony.

The Chairman. Without objection, the pamphlets will be accepted but not all are to be printed with the record. Mr. Earl's statement will be included in full.

Mr. Earl. That is right.

Mr. Hays. Mr. Chairman, before we go any further, I want to correct the record on one statement that I made today. I do so because I don't like to let anything stand that I have said that is wrong when I find out it is wrong and also because I don't want to be put in the position of having our record make anyone seem an adulteress or bigamist.

Going back to Dr. Eveline Burns, I find that in checking her biography in Who's Who that she is the wife of an economist. He is not Dr. Arthur F. Burns. He is Dr. Arthur R. Burns. And in checking the biography of Dr. Arthur R. Burns in Who's Who there are three Dr. Arthur R. Burns. And my staff got the wrong Dr. Burns. I checked his biography and so I had a lady married to someone she is not married to. She is not the wife of the President's economist but the wife of another economist whose middle initial is the only difference in their names. And in saying that let me say that I have checked
further and she was on Mrs. Hobby's committee. But she is not the wife of the President's economist.

Mr. Earl. I wasn't sure of that myself. I had here that she wasn't the wife, but I wasn't certain, and so I didn't know.

The Chairman. Are there any further questions? Do you have any questions?

Mr. Wormser. I have none.

The Chairman. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

Mr. Hays. I have a statement. And if Mr. Earl cares to comment on it, I am sure it would be all right with me. I might say, Mr. Earl, I have more or less patiently listened to you and I have just heard you deliver a valedictorian in which you attempted to summarize what you allege to have proved by your testimony: To say that your thesis is that the LID is to continue to fill the air with propaganda concerning socialism; and continues its stumping for certain legislative programs; and if it is to continue to malign the free enterprise system under which we operate, then you believe that it should be made to do so with taxed dollars.

I would like to analyze now what you have testified about. In the first place, I read yesterday excerpts to you from the testimony of Commissioner Coleman Andrews of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and Mr. Sugarman, his principal assistant, who is charged with the responsibility of these tax-free foundations. And by the way I might just put in there that we have more or less agreed this isn't a foundation. But we are investigating it anyway. It is clear from that testimony the following: First, if one of these foundations receiving tax exemption is found to be subversive, then upon that finding the tax exemption can be removed.

Now we know that this organization, the League for Industrial Democracy was challenged in 1931 in the courts, and I am just trying to bring out the facts, and not to defend this organization, because many of the things, that it apparently espouses, I don't favor. It was challenged in the courts as to its tax-exempt status. And in that case, although the law has been changed, that case still stands and it hasn't been challenged again, and so that that still is part of the law—

Mr. Earl. I would like to see it challenged today. But go ahead.

Mr. Hays. Which is reported in the Federal Reports of the Circuit Court of Appeals, 2d Circuit of New York, following the argument that you made here, found that the contrary as follows—and I am quoting from page 812 of the 48 Federal Second:

The fact that its aims—

meaning the LID—

the fact that its aims may or may not resemble that of a political party does not of itself remove it from the category of an association engaged in educational work.

Now understand, I am not a lawyer; nevertheless, I recall from the testimony of the people from the Bureau of Internal Revenue that this law was changed in 1934. And as I said, but it in no way affected the validity of the ruling of the court that I have just read.

So it is perfectly clear that so far as the Bureau of Internal Revenue is concerned this organization, the League for Industrial Democracy, is not subversive. Otherwise, we have a right to assume that, with the
vigilance of the Internal Revenue, the tax-exempt status of this organization would have long since been denied.

It is further clear that its program in no way has been found to be one affecting legislation in the Congress or else, under the terms of the decision I have read you, the tax-exempt status would have been removed.

Now the third point that we get from the testimony of the people of the Internal Revenue is that, if such organizations are neither subversive nor have they invaded the field of legislation so as to deny their status as educational foundations, then if their advocacy is either to the left or to the right their status is left untouched as it properly should be under any constitutional concept of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and propagation of ideas.

Let me summarize what I have told you. Under the law establishing the tax exemption of LID, the regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the decisions of the court concerning this specific association, it has in no way violated the provisions of either the law nor the regulations and is in all respects entitled to the tax exemption which it now receives. And I will remind you, further, that the people from the Internal Revenue we questioned about this stated unequivocally that they did not want to see the law changed, and stated that in answer to a question by Mr. Goodwin, so as to put them in the position of being censors of the authority or actions of the foundations in this category.

The only thing they were interested in was to prevent tax dollars from going for the purposes of subversion and evasion schemes to be set up under the guise of foundations.

Now, Mr. Earl, I would like to challenge you on one point, and this has been a summary so far. You have taken quite a bit of time to pick out those quotations from the literature of this organization and people who have spoken or written under its auspices to lead this committee to believe that either, one, this association is subversive, which it is not, or that it has gone into the field of legislation under the field of organizing a political party.

I have not had the opportunity of reading all of the literature that has come out of this organization. But I feel that, if it were put into the record, it might well log water down and might miss some of the things you have read. But I am only taking the record you have made.

And now I ask you to show me one iota of proof that the LID at any time has taken legislative action, created a political party, or done anything more than to express its belief in the economic and social aims which they think can be best achieved by the political route.

I admit they have done that. If you cannot establish these facts, I think that your whole summary argument falls. Because it is clear from the law and the regulations of the Internal Revenue and the decisions that the tax-exempt status of this organization in no way can be taken from it simply because it advocates that its ideas have been made through persuasion to become the law of the land.

I hope to God the day will never come when anyone challenges the right freely of organizations and people to do that. Let me recall to you that just prior to our entry into World War II an organization known as America First was established under the sponsorship of Colonel McCormick, General Wood, and many others, which organi-
zation violently opposed our entry into the war against Germany. You may recall that one of the chief spokesmen of that organization was then Col. Charles E. Lindbergh, and I am sure that there must be many Americans today who look back with shame upon the derision they heaped upon that great man's head because his ideas did not happen to conform to theirs.

Thank goodness the Government today has taken steps to remove the onus which was placed upon him during the war, simply because he disagreed with the majority.

Now my recollection is that the America Firsters started as a tax-exempt organization. I want you to understand from me clearly that I am perfectly consistent in my belief that such organizations as that, and I understand the organization is being revived, should receive the same tax-free status as the League for Industrial Democracy.

I only make this statement because I believe in openhandedness and I don't think the Government should favor or take favors away, through its tax-exemption laws, from any organization on either side of the political spectrum so long as that organization is not subversive and does not advocate the violent overthrow of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

We appreciate very greatly the efforts which you have made to present this presentation. The committee will evaluate in due course your presentation, together with the pamphlets which have been submitted.

In order that the record may be complete, the last pages which you did not read will be inserted here in the record.

(The material referred to follows:)

To people who use one tax-exempt organization for politics and propaganda, there is apparently nothing incongruous in suggesting that "welfare organizations" support a new party.

"There already exists in this country a powerful nucleus for such a third party. One does not need too vivid an imagination to visualize the strength behind a third party backed up by the might of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the National Farmers Union. Add to this the many liberal, civic, and welfare organizations that are spread throughout the land and we have a force powerful and strong enough to decide elections in every county, State, and even in the Nation" (p. 75).

In defining the third party, Mr. Wolchok again emphasizes the necessity of international collaboration with fellow Socialists:

"The third party's program must be international as well as national in scope. Its program must provide for collaboration with the liberals of other nations * * * Its program must strive for the liberation of those countries now subject to imperialism, as well as of those conquered countries now under the Nazi, the Fascist, and the Japanese yoke. Its program must provide for assistance to the downtrodden of all nations. It must promise succor to the forgotten man of every land" (p. 76).

Prof. Frank H. Underhill, professor of history, University of Toronto, pictured the advantage of having a political party to implement liberal and Socialist goals. He described the success of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Canada's Fabian party):

"In Canada we have gone further toward building up an effective political party of the left. In 1942 the CCF (Cooperative Commonwealth Federation) celebrated its 10th birthday. In its early years it seemed a rather sickly child, but during the past few years it has been growing rapidly. There are several points about the structure of the CCF which are worth noting. In the first place it is a definitely Socialist Party, speaking the language of Fabian rather than of Marxist socialism, with a program based on the Canadian situation presented in terms which the Canadian public can understand" (p. 80).

Professor Underhill then explained the facts of political life of his American hosts:
“The value of having an organized Labor Party is shown again today in the different receptions given in Britain and the United States to new schemes for complete social security. The Beveridge report in Britain has aroused widespread discussion among all political groups; the report of the National Resources Planning Board has been received in a conspiracy of silence in this country * * *" (p. 79).

“If there is a general reaction toward the right in the United States in the next few years, the forces of the left have no reserve with which to organize a counterattack. In fact, the left has no army of its own at all, though it seems to have a good supply of willing generals. In Canada the army is in existence and has learnt by 10 years experience how to overcome its own internal differences and to make an effective fighting force out of itself * * *" (p. 80).

Mr. Leroy E. Bowman, supervisor, Bureau of Adult Education, New York State, spoke on the subject, "Educating for the Abolition of Want." So far, according to Mr. Bowman, this "idea has not been taught in the schools," partly because "economically successful persons" have accepted the fact that poverty (for others) is "an ineradicable part of existence."

"* * * the necessities of business operations under present circumstances and the understandable reluctance to see change occur have led to the conclusion by them that want is inevitable. So those who suffer want have been wholly engaged in coping with it, not in eliminating it. And those not suffering from want have had resistance to the idea that it could be done away with" (p. 87).

From Mr. Bowman's point of view, it would seem that control over consumption, the planning of production, and the use of government to achieve economic welfare for the masses are not "ideological" notions, but part of the external structure of the universe. (See pp. 88 and 89.) Mr. Bowman visualized a vast interlocking directorate of labor, consumer, and government interests in control of a mighty apparatus of adult education (p. 89).

Mr. Mark Starr, educational director of the ILGWU, and Dr. John L. Childs, professor of philosophy of education, Teachers College, Columbia University, and a member of the postwar planning commission of the A. F. of L., presided over a round-table discussion on Mobilizing Our Forces—Economic, Political, Cultural—in Behalf of the New Freedom. Said Dr. Childs:

"1. Freedom from want is related to other objectives. We cannot progress far on that front unless we progress also on other fronts of our domestic economy. * * *

"3. We cannot make progress unless we can create a political situation which will stop attacking liberals in Government, and the baiting of labor. * * * All organized groups must be mobilized and used. I wish we had the outlook for a CCF in America. There is no such adequate approach available here. * * *" (pp. 95-96).

One of the most extraordinary documents published by the LID is Toward a Farmer-Labor Party by Harry W. Laidler. Although the booklet was first distributed in 1938, it is on the current list of the LID pamphlets and cannot, therefore be repudiated by the league. Excerpts which demonstrate the political and propaganda nature of this work follow:

"The reasons for these developments toward a party of workers of hand and brain on the farms, in the factories, mines, shops, and offices are not hard to find. * * * They have witnessed the two-party judiciary handing down decisions which well-nigh paralyzed labor's efforts to organize. They have observed the officers of the law breaking up their meetings and their picket lines and denying them their elementary constitutional rights. * * * And they have witnessed America, under the political control of the parties of the property interests, subjecting the masses of its people to widespread insecurity, poverty, and the threat of war, at a time when the natural resources, machinery, and trained labor of the land could, if fully utilized for the common good, insure a life of abundance and security to all" (p. 5).

Dr. Laidler equates genuine labor and Socialist movements with the dictatorship of the criminal elite in the Kremlin who, by the testimony of a U. N. Commission on Slave Labor, are the most savage exploiters of labor since the Pharaohs of ancient Egypt. It is fair to inquire why such a scholarly institution as the LID if it no longer entertains its pro-Russian view, has not withdrawn this pamphlet and prepared another.

"American labor and farming groups in this country are on the move politically as well as industrially. * * * Representatives of labor are today the premiers in the three Scandinavian countries. * * * Labor and Socialist Parties
TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

now constitute the largest single parties in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Finland. In Great Britain, the British Labor Party is 'His Majesty's chief opposition.' * * * In far-off New Zealand, labor in 1935 captured 55 percent of the 80 seats in the New Zealand House of Representatives. * * * In Russia, the Communists Party dominates. * * *” (p. 3).

The reforms of the New Deal were not radical enough to suit Dr. Laidler, or those for whom he acts as spokesman:

“There are others who contend that millions of workers in the city and on the farm are rapidly coming to the conclusion that New Deal democracy offers no solution for unemployment or for any of the other grave evils of our economic life but, on the other hand, that it is heading this country toward another war” (p. 6).

Dr. Laidler quotes an article from the Nation which urges no delay in building a “new party of the masses.”

“To delay the building of a new party of the masses because of the possibility or probability of the selection of a 'liberal' candidate by the Democratic Party, these students of politics contend, 'is to repeat the error of past years.' ‘Similar arguments,’ Oswald Garrison Villard maintains, ‘have postponed the organization of that third party ever since 1924. * * * Now once more progressives are called upon to stay in the party fold. Frankly, it seems to me shortsighted reasoning. * * * No one can foretell where Franklin Roosevelt will stand in the next 3 years. * * * For one thing the President is steadily undermining democracy by encouraging the growth of militarism in the United States. Wherever you find large armies and navies, there you find enemies of democracy. * * *’” (p. 6).

Agitation for the formation of a new party scarcely qualifies as a legitimate project of a tax-exempt foundation. And one may also wonder if the Communist conspiracy should be described as a “working class political movement,” as in this paragraph:

“Other working class political movements organized during the present century were the Communist Party, formed in 1919, following a split with the Socialist Party, and a small and temporary Farmer Labor Party, in 1920. * * * Socialists and Communists are still actively at work on the national field, although the combined votes of the Presidential candidates of minority parties in 1936 constituted only from 2 percent to 3 percent of the total.

“The next farmer-labor alinement on the political field of the future, it is hoped, will not only wrest concessions from the old parties in power but will supplant the parties of business with the party of the masses” (pp. 7, 8).

Dr. Laidler offers practical suggestions for political action:

“Everyone interested in the development of a Labor, Farmer-Labor, Socialist, or other political party representing the interest of the masses in his State, should make a survey of present laws and immediately begin educational and agitational work for improvement” (p. 9).

“A second problem confronting the organizers of a new political party is how to insure that the party and its elected officials shall be democratically controlled by those economic groups that obtain their living through their labor of hand or brain and not through ownership of the means of production and distribution” (p. 9).

“Whatever the form chosen for representing the will of the masses in these organizations, the particular organizational structure adopted has usually been developed with the view of keeping control in the hands of the working class and farmer membership or leadership and of preventing the party from becoming a nebulus ‘liberal or ‘progressive’ organization with no class basis or from being employed as an instrument to keep in power a few political leaders” (p. 11).

Dr. Laidler discusses tactical procedures which he recommends to Socialist politicians:

“* * * frequently, after helping to elevate an old party candidate, through labor's endorsement, to a high political position, the Farmer-Labor Party finds that it has ‘built up’ a political figure who, as a representative of a capitalist party in subsequent elections, might be in a position greatly to retard the development of a party of the masses. The Farmer-Labor Party, by such political trading, thus tends to perpetuate the 'good-man' concept in politics.

“Moreover, when a Farmer-Labor Party throws its support to a capitalist party candidate, it is difficult for it in the same campaign to put forward with vigor the main arguments for the existence of, and the imperative need for, a party of labor of hand and brain” (pp. 13, 14).
“An even more important problem facing the new political alinement is that of bringing about a genuine understanding between city and agricultural producers of hand and brain. * * * Both are exploited by those who live primarily by owning and not by working” (p. 14).

The executive director of the LID warns Socialists of the dangers of forming a coalition with the petit bourgeois:

“A problem facing most Farmer-Labor parties, likewise, is the place of the small-business man within its ranks. Some businessmen join with labor political groups because they are convinced that there is no security under a competitive system, and that they must unite with the masses to inaugurate a planned society. * * * Others, on the other hand, ally themselves with labor for the purpose of inducing labor to join with them in a general ‘trust-busting’ campaign, a campaign against big business, in behalf of the restoration of small industry. Intelligent labor, however, realizes that all such efforts in the past have led to futility. * * * Not in trust busting, but in community ownership lies labor’s salvation. Control of labor party policy by the small-merchant class anxious to turn back the wheels of industry leads to nothing but confusion. Merchant groups animated with this purpose constitute a danger to any healthy growth of labor or farmer-labor partyism” (p. 15).

In conclusion, Dr. Laidler says:

“At the present moment, the divisions in the ranks of labor and the belief that labor should support the Rooseveltian New Deal against big-business attacks have somewhat retarded developments on a national scale * * * ** * only a fundamental change in property relations will bring security, economic justice, and a high living standard to the working masses” (pp. 53, 54).

All in all, Toward a Farmer-Labor Party is a field manual for applied Socialist political action.

The Forward March of American Labor was published by the LID in a revised printing as recently as 1953. It is supposed to be a history of the American labor movement. The text, however, is embellished by a remarkable series of cartoons which, in the year 1953, strike an impartial reader as a crude effort to discredit today’s business with faults long since corrected. I refer the committee to the pamphlet for both its text and the cartoons mentioned.

On April 25-26, 1951, the LID held another of its annual conferences at the Hotel Commodore. The proceedings were published in a pamphlet entitled “World Cooperation and Social Progress.” In addition to discussion of international cooperation and how to curb “antidemocratic forces at home,” there was the usual technical consideration of how to produce more effective political action.

The league presented a citation to Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Director of the Trusteeship Department of the United Nations. It awarded another citation to President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor. It gave a John Dewey award for distinguished LID alumni to Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, who “in his graduate days,” had been “leader of the league’s chapter at Columbia University, and, since his university days, has done distinguished work in the fields of economics, civic reform, social legislation, and international peace” (pp. 3, 4). Senator Douglas accepted in absentia, and an address extolling the LID, sent by Senator Douglas, was read at the conference. I refer the committee to that address, found on pages 12 and 13, for some interesting reading.

Luncheon speakers included M. J. Coldwell, M. P., president of the CCF of Canada; H. L. Keeneleyside, Director General, Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations; Paul R. Porter, Assistant Director, Economic Cooperation Administration; and Ralph Wright, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Following are excerpts:

From Dr. Bunche: “Unfortunately, there are those who attempt to take advantage of the public anxiety caused by the East-West conflict and the worldwide ideological struggle between democracy and communism, to stifle progressive thought and honest criticism, to circumscribe our traditional freedom, and to restrict the enjoyment of our civil rights. We must be ever vigilant against internal as well as external threats to our traditional liberties” (p. 7).

Clarence Senior presided over a panel discussion on Counteracting Antidemocratic Forces in America. President A. J. Hayes, of the International Association of Machinists, lectured his associates on the need for a more aggressive psychological warfare program on the domestic front:
Radio and television are today unduly controlled by big business. The voice of liberals must be heard and strengthened. When one considers the 15 million trade unionists and their families, labor can be far more influential in the field of public opinion than it now is. One way of increasing that effectiveness is through the publication of a labor daily, especially for the group of active leaders who make all national trade union organizations tick. There are thousands of articulate men and women in this group. Its great need is for rapid, up-to-date information to help them understand the quickly shifting scene. A labor newspaper would not be a substitute for a regular daily press, but a supplement to it" (p. 30).

President Hayes argued that the mobilization defense program was a "glaring example of the undemocratic process":

"I think that you can find some of the antidemocratic forces in America in the atmosphere which set up that program. The security measures, which, in some rational form, are necessary in this peculiar situation, have given the enemies of all progressive measures an ideal opportunity to block and hamstring all progress, and so to smear and attack all progressives that decent people are tending to withdraw from the central liberal cause. As they do so, the victory of the evil forces becomes more sure" (p. 30).

Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of the department of education and research of the CIO agreed with Hayes. He observed:

"It is not certain that this mobilization program will develop into an all-out undemocratic force, but it presents certain dangers. One of these dangers is the dominance of representatives of big business in key positions * * *" (p. 31).

Mildred Perlman, secretary of the student LID, frankly called upon labor to finance the socialistic apparatus on the campuses. According to the editor, "Mrs. Perlman concluded with an appeal to labor which has been closely allied over the years with the struggle for democratic education, to build a war chest in behalf of democratic education on the campus and in the community. In so doing it will * * * help train a democratic leadership for the future" (p. 33).

If this is a legitimate undertaking, under the tax-exempt banners of the militant LID, there seems to be no valid reason why Young Republican Clubs or Young Democrat Clubs should not also solicit contributions which can be deductible from income tax returns. Tax law, in a capitalist and free enterprise society, should not show undue partiality toward those who are trying to abolish that form of economic organization.

The final session of the conference was given over to a "consideration of labor political action," with Murray Baron in the chairman's seat. The first speaker was Tilford E. Dudley, assistant director of the political action committee of the CIO, who "urged more effective labor political education and increased labor activity in politics" including consideration of a new party (p. 33).

Gus Tyler, director of the political department, ILGWU, A. F. of L., declared that labor should "give increased emphasis to educating the rank and file on political issues, to more effective fund raising, to the registration of voters and to the directing of votes along proper channels. This series of steps, he believed, might lay the foundation for statewide 'third parties', and 'accelerate party realignment and party responsibility.'"

The president of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada ("a farmer-labor party with a democratic socialist program"), Mr. M. J. Coldwell, gave his American Fabian friends some practical advice. The editor summarized:

"Mr. Coldwell declared that the remarks of the previous speakers reminded him of political discussions he used to hear in Great Britain in 1906. "No matter how good the men we elected in Britain in 1906 on the ticket of the Conservative and Liberal Parties, we found that their programs were inevitably controlled by those who appointed the machines. Consequently, in Great Britain and Canada, and, indeed, in most of the countries where we have the same kind of parliamentary institutions, labor and progressive elements were forced to organize their own political movements. He declared that, in Canada, the Canadian Congress of Labor, a counterpart of the CIO, had, during the last 4 or 5 years, designated the CCF as the political arm of that labor organization and that the CCF had a growing support" (p. 36).

Mr. Coldwell then revealed the international linkage of the Socialist movement. "This afternoon I want to go outside of my own country and outside of the United States, and to say to this group of American Progressives that we are
associated together in a group of Socialist parties which have been meeting continually ever since the war ended. The representatives of these parties are now preparing a modern manifesto of Socialist principles with a view of establishing a common basis of thought and of assisting the backward people of the world in organizing for similar objectives" (p. 37).

Robert Bendiner, former managing editor of the Nation, argued that "labor should aim at political action that would not be confined to a narrow program of wages and hours, but would be directed to the achievement of public welfare in the broadest sense. Labor should show more and more independence than has been hitherto the case" (p. 38).

The LID held its latest annual conference April 10, 11, 1954, at the Hotel Commodore in New York, according to a press release, dated April 9, 1934, one of the sessions at the conference was to deal with the subject How Free Is Free Enterprise? Mr. Mark Starr, educational director of the ILGWU, and a member of the LID, was to lead the discussion. According to the release, Mr. Starr had this to say:

"On the other hand, those believing in more collectivism must work out ways and means of attaining planning plus the Bill of Rights * * *"

In conclusion, let me say that in this presentation I do not quarrel with the right of these many people in the LID to say and write the things which we have discussed, though I disagree with many of the things which they advocate. My thesis is this: If the LID is to continue to fill the air with propaganda concerning socialism; if it is to continue stumping for certain legislative programs; and if it is to continue to malign the free-enterprise system under which we operate—then I believe that it should be made to do so with taxed dollars, just as the Democrats and the Republicans are made to campaign with taxed dollars.

Rather than burden the text of my statement with further excerpts from a great many other similar LID pamphlets, Mr. Chairman, I have taken the liberty of preparing a list of those other pamphlets in which fruitful reading might be had.

Other LID publications

Socialism in the United States, by Harry W. Laidler, 1952
A Program for Labor and Progressives, symposium edited by Harry W. Laidler, 1946
The Atomic Age, by Aaron Levenstein
Canadian Progressives on the March, by M. J. Coldwell, 1945
Recent Trends in British Trade Unionism, by Noel Barou, 1945
40 Years of Education, symposium edited by Harry W. Laidler, 1945
What Price Telephones, by Norman Perelman, 1941
Labor Parties of Latin America, by Robert Alexander, 1942
British Labor, by Harry W. Laidler
The Road Ahead, a Primer of Capitalism and Socialism, by Harry W. Laidler, 1950
America's Struggle for Electric Power, by John Bauer, 1935
Toward Independent Labor Politics in Britain, by Edward M. Cohen, 1948
Democratic Socialism, by Norman Thomas, 1953
National Health Insurance, by Seymour E. Harris, 1948
World Labor Today, by Robert J. Alexander, 1952
British Labor on Reconstruction in War and Peace
Public Debt and Taxation in the Postwar World, by William Withers, 1945
Labor Government at Work, by Harry W. Laidler, 1948
Canadians Find Security With Freedom, Thomas C. Douglas, 1949
A Housing Program for America, by Charles Abrams
Our Changing Industrial Incentives, by Harry W. Laidler, 1949

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very kindly indeed.

Mr. Earl. May I now be excused from the subpoena, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; you are excused.

The committee will meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon in this same room.

(Thereupon, at 12 noon, the special committee recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m., this day.)
(The hearing was resumed at 2 p.m.)

The Chairman. The committee will come to order.

Who is your first witness, Mr. Koch?

Mr. Koch. Mr. Pendleton Herring, the president of the Social Science Research Council; and the gentleman on his right is Mr. Paul Webbink, the vice president; and the gentleman on his left is Mr. Timothy Pfeiffer, counsel for the association.

The Chairman. We have had the policy of swearing all witnesses. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you give in this matter shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Herring. I do.

Mr. Koch. I believe Mr. Herring would like to read a statement which he has prepared, and which has been distributed among the committee.

Is that right, Mr. Herring?

TESTIMONY OF PENDLETON HERRING, PRESIDENT, SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, ACCOMPANIED BY PAUL WEBBINK, VICE PRESIDENT, SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, AND TIMOTHY PFEIFFER, ATTORNEY, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. Herring. Yes.

The Chairman. You may proceed in your own way, and unless someone is moved to do otherwise we will permit you to make your presentation and then be questioned.

Mr. Herring. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hays. I think it might be well, in conformity with the procedure we have had, if Dr. Herring might, unless counsel wants to ask him some questions, just give us his general background, and so on, which would keep the thing in conformity with the testimony of the previous witnesses.

Mr. Herring. Mr. Chairman, I would like first to express my appreciation of the opportunity of being here today. A good deal has been placed before the committee that I find some difficulty with.

Mr. Wormser. I think Mr. Hays made a good suggestion. You might just first qualify yourself with biographical data.

Mr. Herring. I will go to that immediately, then.

My name is Pendleton Herring. I am the president of the Social Science Research Council, with an office in New York City.

As I started to say, I feel that it might be helpful to the committee if I placed before you a few facts about my previous experience, since I want to be as helpful to you as I possibly can and try to speak directly against the background of my own experience and observation in these fields.

I was born in Baltimore, attended the public schools there, attended Johns Hopkins University, got my A. B. in 1925 and my Ph. D. in 1928.

It might possibly be of interest to the committee if I said that during my college years I went off as a merchant seaman and worked my way to various parts of the world. And I mention that here, because at that rather early stage I got the impression that the world
was a pretty big place and there were a good many different kinds of people in it. I also did some newspaper work for the Baltimore Sun paper. And then I went off to Harvard in 1928 and taught there until 1946, when I went with the Carnegie Corp., from 1946 to 1948, when I took over my present responsibilities with the council.

During those years I wrote a number of books, not quite as many as Mr. Wormser, but a number; and I also served as a consultant for various governmental agencies, the Air Force, the Army—

The Chairman. What were the titles of some of your books?

Mr. Herring. Well, my doctoral dissertation, Mr. Chairman, was on group representation before Congress, and I wrote a book a little later on entitled "Public Administration and the Public Interest." That was a book that took me to the other end of town, and I visited a good many administrative agencies. A little later on, I wrote a book entitled "Presidential Leadership," on the relations of the Chief Executive and Congress. I found that rather a complex and fascinating subject. And I wrote a book in this instance considerably, shall I say, in the empirical vein, on our Federal commissioners. I just wanted to know who they were and where they got their education and what their previous experience had been, and I wrote that up in a little book.

And I also wrote a book on the impact of war, that developed the idea that a democratic government, as of this country, has proved its capacity in the past to fight for its principles, and that our system, with its faults, that are as dear to us as other aspects, is yet able to face up to danger when the challenge comes. That book was written on the eve of the last war.

Well, don't let me go on this way. It is a subject I like to talk about.

Mr. Wormser. Mr. Herring, weren't you too modest about your teaching career? Will you tell us something more about that?

Mr. Herring. I was in the department of government. In Harvard we call it political science-government. I was in the department of government there. And in 1936, M. Littauer, whom some of the members of the committee may recall, a prominent Member of the Congress for many years, established the Littauer Center of Public Administration. I was the secretary of that school during its first 10 years, and during those 10 years we faced right up to the problem, How do you train them for the public service? We found that was a very complicated problem. There were no easy pat answers. But that school was started by Mr. Littauer and has turned out a number of people who are serving their country in various governmental posts.

Is that adequate on that?

Mr. Wormser. I thought you had professorial status.

Mr. Herring. That is right. I was a member of the faculty.

The Chairman. That is very good. Thank you very much.

Mr. Herring. Now, what I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, is read this introductory statement to the committee, and then I will say a word or two about other documents, and so forth.

The Chairman. We would be very happy to have you do so.

Mr. Herring. In this introductory statement to the committee, I hope that I may have the opportunity to present my views concerning the general thesis that the staff of the committee and other supporting
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witnesses have developed. In the light of my own experience, I would also like to comment briefly on social scientists and their ways of working. But first, may I explore with the committee what common ground we all share in the problems under investigation.

In the investigation, thus far, most of the basic questions raised are within the traditional discourse and debate on public policy. Time and again, in the past, attacks have been leveled at wealth and bigness; debates on such matters are almost traditional. In this present instance, there is, to be sure, a modern twist to suit the times: Big foundations are the target rather than big business. We meet again the recurrent problem of how far to extend Federal regulation. In view of the references to collectivism, I am sure that we share a feeling of caution concerning governmental intervention and control over education and research. However, it is certainly in the public interest to give thoughtful consideration to such matters and also to whatever attitudes may affect the course of foreign policy. All would agree these are proper topics for public discussion, particularly if these broad matters can be reduced to specific terms.

Hence, I hope you will not feel me unduly critical if, at the very outset, I call attention to one disturbing aspect of this investigation that is rather vaguely sketched in Mr. Dodd's opening statement and referred to by other witnesses in indirect and somewhat baffling language. In effect, the committee has been presented with an effort on the part of their staff and supporting witnesses to rewrite American history and to explain what has happened in the United States since the turn of the century in terms of a conspiracy.

To assert that a revolution has occurred without violence and with the full consent of an overwhelming majority of the electorate, and to imply that peaceful change overwhelmingly supported by the voters of the country is the result of a conspiracy, would strike us as a more outrageous error if it were not such a fantastic misreading of what we have all witnessed and experienced.

To imply that an interlock of individuals unknown to the American public is responsible for basic changes in our national life over the last 50 years, is to belie the responsible statesmanship of the Republic, the lawmaking authority of the Congress, and the good sense of the American people. The whole tenor of the ambiguous charges set forth by the staff strike at the very integrity of our system of self-government. These allegations suggest that the American people are dupes and that our elected officials are puppets. To underrate the valiant and thoughtful response of the American people and their Government to two world wars and a great depression, and to imply that the legislative enactments and governmental policies worked out through the process of democratic self-government is the result of a conspiracy operating through American education, is not only a travesty of history but a travesty of the very principles by which we live as a free Nation. This line of innuendo I am confident must be uncongenial to the fundamental principles of all the members of this committee. As experienced lawmakers, you know how public policy emerges through established constitutional forms, and the interplay of politics, and I know that no committee of the Congress will countenance unmaking the facts of history to suit some special purpose.

Hence, the question is promoted as to why such a travesty of American principles and politics is presented at this time. I think the thesis
being developed by the staff is better understood as symptomatic of a troubled state of mind on the part of a few persons than as a logical statement to be refuted literally.

The committee has been reviewing developments in education and the intellectual life of the country, since the turn of the century, and I think we can all agree that during these decades changes of great moment to this Nation have taken place. None of us, of course, can be opposed to change as such. Life is constantly changing. But there are important questions concerning the direction of change, of the forces that may affect change, and what can be done by way of public policy to direct change in the public interest. This latter responsibility is essentially the responsibility of Government, particularly of the Congress, and I would not presume to comment on these matters. It seems to me, however, that some of the disquietude and worries of previous witnesses may be taken as symptoms that may direct constructive thought to underlying problems of general common concern. I can identify two.

The first is the spectacular advance in science and a great increase in educational opportunities throughout the country. The full impact of a great increase in new knowledge, and its dissemination throughout all our society, creates a dynamic force that none of us can fully understand. No nation that I know of has advanced, disseminated, and applied so much knowledge so widely and so rapidly as has the United States since the turn of the century. This has inescapably affected traditional attitudes and ways of doing things. It raises questions of interest to the Congress, to industry, labor unions, churches, and other organizations, as well as to educational institutions. How can progress in knowledge both of natural and human affairs be absorbed, digested, and utilized so as best to advance the general welfare?

There are many, many particular questions that can be brought under this broad one. I gather that this committee is particularly concerned with whether or not certain particular viewpoints have had an undue importance upon our intellectual life. Have we become the victim of special pleaders, advancing their special "isms"? For example, have internationalism, collectivism, or socialism, as bodies of thought, exercised undue weight? I know of no way, in entirely objective terms, of weighing or measuring such influences. I know of no reliable method of analysis for establishing cause and effect relationships between such ideas and what has happened in our recent history. For my part, I find the best safeguard in the maintenance of a free market place of ideas so that truth can prevail in the resultant competition of ideas. If there has been interference with this free interplay, it is well that the country hear about it. The first problem, then, in which we all share a concern is our great national harvest of the tree of knowledge and how the fruits of knowledge may best be used to strengthen and nurture our society.

The second great factor of our generation is the evil force made manifest by international communism and Soviet imperialism. How can we reckon with tyranny of this order of strength and complexity and, at the same time, keep our own institutions free and strong? Here, again, the answer comes not from 1 school of thought or 1 political party, but rather from our united endeavors as responsible citizens of this Republic. Moreover, the essential part that knowledge and reason can play in increasing our national strength and overcom-
ing the communistic menace needs wider public support. Finally, we need perhaps to appreciate more fully the fact that the free study and inquiry carried on in our great educational institutions constitutes in itself one of the essential American values that we must protect from the evil forces at large in the world.

I think we can all agree that thoughtful attention should be given to the problems of relating scientific advance to education and that great attention should be given to safeguards against communism. We all want to maintain freedom and pursue truth. We are all concerned with justice and the good life. We are all concerned as citizens with national security.

The problems before this committee are much more specific in character. This investigation is concerned with ways in which foundation officers and trustees and educators and social scientists have discharged their responsibilities.

When I turn from this broad statement of common objectives and basic purposes to much of the testimony that has been offered, and to the statements that have been made with respect to the social sciences, I must confess to a sense of bafflement. The staff has tried to call into question the efforts of the very individuals and institutions who are devoting their resources and energies to the increase and dissemination of knowledge and the protection of the American way of life. The picture that has been presented to the committee does not accord with my own observation and experience. The most charitable explanation that comes to mind is that they speak from ignorance rather than malice. Perhaps I could be most helpful to the committee by sketching very briefly my own sense of reality about the kinds of problems dealt with by the staff and other witnesses. The committee has been presented with statements about an alleged interlock, financed by the foundations and controlled from the top in such a way as to foster educational theories along certain definite lines. We are told, in effect, that a few organizations constitute an efficient integrated whole, tending to work against the public interest. I shall limit my observations to the kinds of individuals, fields, and organizations that I know something about at first hand, and I must say flatly that my experience here contradicts the views that have been suggested by the staff.

My contacts are largely with the social scientists over the country and with the limited number of foundations interested in social sciences and closely related fields. Most of the social scientists with whom I work are on the faculties of our universities and colleges. I come into contact, also, with a smaller number employed in industry and governmental agencies. These individuals are men and women of independent judgment and integrity. They have dedicated their lives to research or teaching, or both. They have an extraordinarily high sense of civic duty and respect for truth. Their primary objective is to attain a greater understanding of human behavior and social relationships and to share this knowledge. They are sensitive to any impairment of freedom of inquiry. They bring sharp critical judgments to bear on the work of their fellow-professionals in various fields. No other country has such professional groups, so highly developed, and so widely concerned with an analytical approach to human problems. While our debt to European scholarship, particularly of the 19th century, is very great, the 20th century development
of the social sciences is widely recognized abroad as a distinctively American contribution. This growth has been large since the turn of the century. While many traditionally minded European scholars remain somewhat skeptical of much that has happened here, there is an increasing interest among the younger university men in other countries about American developments. Just as in the natural sciences, the tide has turned from Europe and scholars from all over the world come to the United States for advanced work in the social sciences.

This development was possible in the United States because of our greater willingness to experiment. Our expanding universities could give opportunity to research men who wished to explore new leads. They were not forced into the conformity set by a ministry of education; they were not trammeled by faculties firmly set in old ways. It was the very absence of control under national educational systems, that provided the conditions favorable to growth and exploration. Hence, the big fact that impresses me is not a system of interlocking cartels, but rather, an extraordinary degree of individual initiative.

The individual social scientists over the last 50 years or so, have organized professional associations for the purpose of sponsoring professional journals and holding annual national conventions. But, here again, the interests of individuals could not be contained in a single professional organization. Many members of these associations also belong to many other associations that have little or nothing to do with their professional concerns. Even within the area of professional interest, regional associations have been formed, and wholly separate societies have been established within each field. The problem has not been that of authoritative control, but rather, of maintaining enough unity of purpose and focus of attention to keep the associations reasonably harmonious.

The social scientists in the United States, in recent decades, have had a wide range of opportunities for their skills. Their work is so much in demand that their problem is essentially one of choice. The demand for the services of outstanding economists, psychologists, demographers, and the rest has been for years far in excess of the supply. For those interested in applied research, there is a wide range of opportunities in government, business, labor unions, and a great variety of organizations concerned with social problems. Students turn with lively interest to those fields that attempt to advance our understanding of human affairs and student interest in these subjects has been so great that our universities and colleges must compete in recruiting able social scientists to their faculties.

Our economy of abundance seems to operate in intellectual matters as it does in other fields. Teaching, applied research, and consultation in various practical fields tend to absorb the energies of social scientists. For the limited number who are carrying on original and costly research, foundation aid is very welcome. Such social scientists need foundation support unless they are to be largely dependent on industry or government. They are not dependent on foundations to provide opportunities for their skills and abilities; they have many alternatives. Even if they desired to, foundations could not possibly control the interests and attention of the social-science professions. However, I know of only 10, or so, foundations with a real interest in social-science research.
I have emphasized the independent of social scientists and I have called attention to their diversity of interest and the broad range of opportunities open to them and their development in the United States, in order to get before the committee a better sense of perspective and proportion about the problems under investigation. In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that it is the men and the women in these fields of learning who are our strongest national resource for advancing the ranges of knowledge that will make us better able to understand our common problems. They command the analytical methods for most effectively getting at such questions in basic and tangible terms. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and social-science research is an essential tool for the vigilant.

The social scientists have an essential contribution to make. They don't know all the answers, but they can explore many of the significant problems and offer highly relevant facts on a variety of important questions. But since the committee's staff and other witnesses have brought into question the methods of the social scientists, particularly their use of empirical methods, I would like to clarify what is meant by the empirical approach.

To approach a problem empirically is to say: "Let's have a look at the record." To employ the empirical method is to try to get at the facts. Where feasible, counting and measuring and testing is undertaken. There is nothing necessarily technical about empirical methods and there is no simple distinctive empirical method as such.

Congressional investigating committees normally follow an empirical approach. To imply something immoral about using an empirical method of inquiry is like implying that it is evil to use syntax.

One thought occurs to me. It came to my attention the other day. Our system of self-government is based on the necessity of the apportionment of congressional seats, and you might say at the outset it was necessary to count noses; and our census is built into our congressional structure. You have there a quantitative approach, if you will, that is simply integral to popular self government. You have to know how many people there are, in order to go forward. I just mention that as a thought that might have some pertinence here.

There is another entirely separate question, namely; is fact-finding enough in itself? Obviously not. Logically and necessarily, a position must be taken on a priori grounds as to whether a problem is worth investigating. In strictly research terms, this involves the investigator's assumptions as to what is significant or worth while to study. In terms of applied research, it involves a determination by the responsible decisionmaker, to tell the research man what body of fact he wants investigated and what questions he would like answered, if possible.

Neither the Social Science Research Council nor any responsible research organization that I ever heard of has ever made fact-finding an end in itself. Here fact-finding is obviously open to the charge of aimlessness. On the other hand, the scientific investigator does not work to establish predetermined conclusions. He may follow his hunches. He may go from one experiment to another. His intuitive or rational knowledge of his field helps direct his curiosity toward those avenues of inquiry that seem promising. He guards against wishful thinking. He will not let his hopes of what should be get
in the way of his concern with what actually exists and what can be observed. From his background of work in his particular field, he follows leads concerning what may be most significant to investigate. He seeks to array the facts, and he remains sensitive to the hypotheses that seem to be suggested by the facts and that way point to certain tentative generalizations. Once having gained some sense of direction or relationship from this initial inquiry, he may formulate other hypotheses that suggest meaningful relationships among a wider range of factual data. Out of all this, there may or may not emerge a theoretical formulation. It frequently happens in science that theories are established that can be tested experimentally and where other workers in the same field from their independent work arrive at the same conclusions. When this takes place, theories can be built into larger conceptual schemes, behavior can be predicted, and practical ways of putting the theories to work can be stated.

This method of analysis for many years has been applied to the study of human beings and social interrelationships with varying degrees of success. No responsible witness would predict that all human problems can be scientifically studied, and no responsible-minded social scientist would argue that all human problems can be solved by science. All would agree, however, that knowledge is better than ignorance, and the attempt to analyze in more orderly and systematic fashion the problems that confront man and society is well worth the effort. Some people working in the social sciences are more optimistic than others concerning our present stage of advance and our prospects for the future.

To deny that the social sciences have a contribution to make, or to cast doubt on the capacity of man to guide his destiny by applying thought to human problems, in secular terms at least is to embrace either an obscurantist or anti-intellectual position, or to adhere to a determinist position. The current and most menacing school of thought that denies the fundamental premises of the social sciences is the Marxian philosophy of history. The obvious unreality of their dogma seems to have no effect upon the adherents of communism, despite the fact that it has led to the triumph of statism and the worst tyranny of modern times. The point here is that it denies the validity of empiricism as a relevant method of inquiry because it asserts that the course of history is inevitable and individuals can do nothing to basically affect the outcome.

Mr. HAYS. Dr. Herring, would you mind if I interrupted you right there for a question along that line? Do you have any knowledge of whether the Communists—I am speaking now of the Russian Government—object to empirical research?

Mr. HERRING. Mr. Hays, I have with me some rather interesting data on this point, and if it would meet with the pleasure of the committee, I would like to submit it to you a little later. I can summarize on the point now.

Mr. HAYS. Just very briefly, if you could answer the question.

Mr. HERRING. The gist of it is that they do object to it most violently; that the one thing that anyone believing in this predetermined course of affairs or any one committed to a politically dictated course of policy cannot tolerate is an objective analysis of the facts. And the Russians certainly have a way, in their publications, of coming up with some interesting fulminations.
Mr. HAYS. I do not want to disrupt you too long, but would you care to just briefly comment on why you think they object to empirical research? Is it because they are afraid that the findings will not coincide with what they say is right, with their dogma?

Mr. HERRING. Here you have an authoritative line of policy that is enunciated by the Kremlin, and whatever is called for by that predetermined line is produced, or else. That is one aspect of it, in sort of practical terms.

The other side is that here is a system of belief, of view, that fits in with the philosophy of history that makes this kind of free inquiry as to what is going on something that cannot be entertained by people who have that cast in mind. But this sort of point can be documented over and over again by people who have a first hand familiarity with what has spewed out of Russia.

The Marxian dialectic confuses the issue by asserting a scientific validity to their doctrine. And it may be just as well to emphasize this point, because it does confuse matters. This is wholly false and misleading. It is based on the argument of Marx that his theory of class struggle was arrived at by reviewing the efforts of the laboring man through revolution and other means to achieve a relatively stronger degree of political and economic power.

The social sciences stand four-square in a great tradition of freedom of inquiry which is integral to American life, to the Anglo Saxon tradition of self-government, and to the concern with the individual fundamental to both Western civilization and its ancient heritage stemming back through the Renaissance to the Classic World and to Judaic-Christian concern with human dignity.

To spell out the full course of historical events that would provide the empirical evidence for this assertion, would unduly tax the time of this committee and it is obviously not necessary to argue this case before a committee of the Congress of the United States.

This is the sort of thing that could be pursued perhaps in a seminar room.

However, since the issue of empiricism has been raised by other witnesses, a brief explanation may be helpful. I have been discussing the empirical method as a tool of analysis and I have indicated that our American tendency to get at the facts, to have a look at the record, to separate mere speculation from factfinding, is so embedded in our habitual ways of doing that that it really needs no defense.

It has been suggested, however, that there has been an overemphasis on this method and that it may somehow, in a manner unspecified, lead to undue control, the corruption of moral principle, the confusion of the public, the domination of education, and the corruption of ethical principles and spiritual values. It is somewhat difficult to come to grips with this broad allegation, since it is presented in terms of inference and innuendo. The charge is not made flatly, but rather in terms of overemphasis or possible deleterious effects in the future if an empirical approach is carried too far.

I would agree, as a logical proposition, that extremism in any subject is, by definition, bad. Hence, the problem, I suggest, is one of balance and degree. Witnesses have asserted that overemphasis has been placed upon an empirical approach. This remains a matter of opinion and I know of no way in which such a charge can be definitely established one way or the other. In my opinion, there is not
an overemphasis upon empirical research. In my opinion and ex-
perience and observation, quite the reverse is true. I observe a strong
human tendency on the part of a great many of us, as individuals, to
see what we choose to see and to believe what we want to believe. I
observe a readiness to speculate, to guess, to haphazard opinions, and
to come to judgments on the basis of very inadequate evidence. It is
my observation that this is a very human tendency, if not indeed a
common human weakness. This tendency is found in all walks of
life. It becomes a matter of high moment in policy decisions and in
the formation of public opinion.

Social scientists working as economists, historians, statisticians,
sociologists, or what not, are prone to this weakness as individuals, just
like anyone else. In their professional capacity, it is their duty to
guard as best they can against letting wishful thinking get in the way
of objective analysis. Sometimes they fail, but in my opinion more
often than not they succeed. In their work as scientific investigators,
they operate within an appropriate system of values, to wit: They
cannot be unmindful of the ethical principle of seeking the truth and
of honestly analyzing their evidence. They cannot be oblivious of
spiritual values of freedom, because their work as investigators is de-
pendent upon a full sense of truth and freedom and justice. They are
the first to suffer if their fellow-citizens relinquish a common loyalty
to truth, to freedom, and to justice. The evidence of this is obvious
when we recall that after dictatorships arose in Russia, in Italy, and
in Germany, the freedom of scholars and research men to pursue the
truth as they saw it on matters of public policy, of economics, of his-
tory, and of the nature of man and society, was immediately curtailed
and ultimately destroyed. It was impossible for them to carry on
empirical work. The facts could not be arrayed in terms designed to
bring out their true meaning. The ends were dictated by the State and
either incompetents or prostitutes in the social science fields were
ordered to produce the results demands by the dictators and to array
evidence in accordance with the principles predetermined by the single
party in power. The social sciences were destroyed before the dicta-
tors began their perversion of the natural sciences, particularly biol-
ology and genetics, and their erosion of the church and religious beliefs.

I repeat that eternal vigilance is the safeguard of liberty, and recent
history proves that particular vigilance must be exercised if the free-
dom to study human problems is to be maintained. The dangers here
are not simply the obvious threats of totalitarian rule, but likewise
(and more insidious for us in the United States) the dangers of preju-
dice, malice, and wishful thinking. Authoritarianism that denies the
freedom of the individual to study, to question, to inquire, to form his
own opinions on controversial matters, is not always expressed through
conspiratorial parties, concentration camps, and secret police. Author-
itarianism is found in many less obvious ways in the United States
today. It is expressed in Mr. Dodd’s statement in an indirect and
subtle fashion, and is all the more dangerous for that reason. It is in-
sinuated rather than asserted, when he states (on p. 26) “that it may
not have occurred to (foundation) trustees that the power to produce
data in volume might stimulate others to use it in an undisciplined
fashion without first checking it against principles discovered in the
deductive process.” This assertion is so elliptical in character that,
here again, it is hard to bring the charge out into the open. There
is an inference, however, that principles exist which can only be arrived at through the so-called deductive process, and that must serve as an authoritative basis of truth against which truths arrived at through the inductive process should be subordinated. This is not flatly stated but, in my opinion, it is clearly to be inferred.

In philosophic terms, if this statement means anything (and this, of course, is debatable) Mr. Dodd is asserting that one theory concerning the philosophy of knowledge is superior to another theory concerning the philosophy of knowledge. He seems to be saying that deductive thought is somehow superior to inductive thought. He seems to identify inductive thought with the social sciences and thereby suggest that their findings cannot be valid unless substantiated by the principles discovered through the deductive process.

Now, I am not choosing sides between these two. I am just trying to get the issue before you.

In the first place, this line of reasoning discloses his ignorance of the methods employed by the social scientists. Social scientists do not limit themselves to either inductive or deductive reasoning, as such. They employ deductive principles, for example, when they decide upon the importance of subject matter for study. They tend to follow the inductive method when they analyze their data. They are not, however, victims of any single school of thought, nor are they limited to any single line of reasoning. They use whatever methods of logic they, in their competence as scholars and research men, feel may help with the job in hand. By and large, they tend to limit their inquiries to topics that they regard as researchable: that is to say, they seek questions that they think are susceptible of systematic analysis and of subject matter that preferably can be observed. This leads them to study the behavior of men and of institutions and of the activities of business firms, labor unions, governmental agencies, and individuals, singly or in groups. Some devote their attention to analyzing the beliefs that people hold and the attitudes they take on various issues. Some social scientists are more interested in the theories that men express than in the activities in which they engage. But their general inclination is to try to find out what is going on rather than what should take place. Many students of social phenomena offer their interpretations about desirable alternative courses of action, and some offer their informed individual judgments on the basis of their studies.

By and large, this work in the social sciences tends to go from a consideration of particular facts to the larger interrelationships among these facts and the generalizations that might be offered concerning them. In this sense, it is empirical and comes within a common American habit of mind. At the risk of oversimplification, I would say that the views of Mr. Dodd might be characterized as rationalistic because of his alleged faith in principles deductively arrived at, and the views perhaps of most social scientists tend to be arrived at empirically. I repeat that it is difficult to restate with precision just what Mr. Dodd's position is and that it is also difficult to generalize with any precision about fields of knowledge so varied, so dynamic, and so fluid as the social sciences. The point I wish to make is that, to the extent that the line can be drawn between empiricism and rationalism, empiricism tends to be more in the American tradition than rationalism. To sustain this view, it is necessary to recall that the father of empiricism, as a distinctive field, is John Locke. Its
antecedents, of course, go back to Francis Bacon and can be clearly traced to Aristotle. It was John Locke, however, who stated this school of thought most clearly, and it was John Locke who also set forth the philosophy most widely accepted by the Founding Fathers of this country. Locke found himself in conflict with the philosophers of rationalism in Europe. From the standpoint of the history of thought, Locke's views were in conflict with those of Leibnitz and Spinoza. Were Locke here today, he would probably repeat a comment he made to a friend apropos of some rationalistic speculation of Leibnitz, when he said: "You and I have had enough of this kind of fiddling."

I respect the great contribution to Western thought made by European philosophers, but I know that they likewise would be critical of much of the research that has been carried on in this country over the last hundred years, or so. Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibnitz, among others, championed the ability of the mind to know reality by means of its faculty of reasoning which, for them, was independent of experience. It was John Locke, the philosopher of the glorious revolution of 1688 in Great Britain, who developed the political philosophy so meaningful to the Founding Fathers of the United States who also developed the doctrine that knowledge is derived from experience.

This faith that the future is not foreordained, and that man can learn by doing, is the viewpoint that has motivated so much of our history. It was in the Age of the Enlightenment at the end of the 18th century, that men began to nourish the hope that human institutions might be brought within the scope of science. And it is not surprising that this search for a science of society should have been taken up and carried further in the United States than anywhere else in the world. If we had time, it would be very interesting to develop this further. Because if you think back to the attitudes of the Founding Fathers, it was empiricists such as Benjamin Franklin, who went out and flew a kite in order to find out what was going on in the thunderstorm, and it was that kind of "let's get at the facts" attitude that was in the minds of men like Washington and Adams and Jefferson. They were people, in that period, who were enlightened and informed by that attitude. And, as I say, if we had time to go into the history of thought, it is a fascinating story, this contrast between the rationalists on the continent of Europe, the encyclopedists, who found themselves at odds with the government at the time.

Contrast the problem that they faced there with what went on here, where we had a meeting of minds and an understanding on the part of scholars and scientists in this country, and our Statesmen. There was no conflict of mind between the schools of thought. They were in the same tradition. And the interest that George Washington expressed in a national university, for example, and the interest that Alexander Hamilton expressed in subsidies to inventors and to the encouragement of science at that time, the interests of Adams, all go back into this same thing.

One could go on at a great rate about the very interesting historical antecedents. But the point is that here was a new land, untrammeled by old conflicts and ancient grudges, where man was offered an opportunity to realize his destiny. Nature conspired with human intelligence and imagination to realize the potentialities before us as a Nation. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness were to be achieved
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if the individual but used his good sense and worked with his fellow-
citizens to maintain democracy.

The social sciences, as they have developed in recent decades have
contributed, within the limits of their capacity to the high purposes
set forth in the preamble to the Constitution; namely—

* * * to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tran-
quillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and
secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. * * *

Political science, by enabling us to understand the nature of our
Government and laws more clearly, has contributed greatly to good
government and the preservation of representative institutions.
Economics, by adding to our knowledge of the business cycle and
storing up great bodies of statistical and other data, has enabled
industry and government to find ways of achieving a more stable
economy. Industrial relations research has helped find methods for
reducing the conflict between management and labor. Sociology has
provided facts about family life, juvenile delinquency, and race rela-
tions that have time and again substituted reason and knowledge for
bias and prejudice. Demography has provided knowledge of popu-
lation trends of enormous practical importance. Penology has helped
us to deal more reasonably with the control of crime. This list could
be elaborated at great length. The main point is to emphasize the
American habit of saying, "Let's have a look at the record. Let's see,
in a given instance, what is practical and feasible. Let's see what
we can accomplish by taking thought together. Let's have done with
fiddling, with mere speculation, and see what can be done through
commonsense, fortified by whatever orderly array of facts can be
introduced, to find a reasonable solution."

In this endeavor, the principles of truth, freedom, and justice serve
as a guide. In these terms, I can ask no more of this committee than
an empirical approach to this inquiry into the activities of the founda-
tions and related agencies.

Since various references have been made to the social sciences and
specific allegations have been directed at the Social Science Research
Council, I respectfully request an opportunity to present to the com-
mittee statements on these matters, either orally or in writing, and
preferably in both forms. The council is not, in any sense, the formal
spokesman for either the seven associations that designate members
to our board of directors or for the 10,000 individuals engaged in the
social sciences over the country. Our focus is on the advancement of
research. If the committee wishes to pursue its inquiry about the
social sciences in this country, this might best be done by calling upon
leading social scientists to present their views.

I have before me brief statements from annual reports of the council
that describe our aims, organization, and general attitude, and data on
this has been distributed in advance to the committee, as a general
statement from our annual report about the organization. And I
would be glad further to supply whatever specific facts I can concern-
ing council activities that may be of interest to the committee. We
have also prepared a more extensive statement, dealing with certain
allegations that have been made.
This statement to which I refer is entitled supplementary statement A. It was distributed in advance to the committee and takes up and offers specific replies to specific points.

I know you want to conserve your time, and I would not undertake to read this document to you, since you have it.

The Chairman. It may be presented as part of your statement.

Mr. Herring. If I may offer, then, for the record, supplementary statement A and supplementary statement B, I think it would be helpful to the committee.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

**Supplementary Statement A on Behalf of the Social Science Research Council—Replies to Specific Points**

There are a number of particular criticisms of the social sciences in the report of the research director for the committee on which we offer comments. He states:

"The broad study which called our attention to the activities of these organizations revealed not only their support by foundations, but has disclosed a degree of cooperation between them which they have referred to as 'an interlock,' thus indicating a concentration of influence and power. By this phrase they indicate they are bound by a common interest rather than a dependency upon a single source for capital funds. It is difficult to study their relationship without confirming this. Likewise, it is difficult to avoid the feeling that their common interest has led them to cooperate closely with one another and that this common interest lies in the planning and control of certain aspects of American life through a combination of the Federal Government and education" (stenographic transcript, ibid, p. 47).

If this statement intends to say that the organizations listed in the report are able to exert such power as to bring about a combination of the Federal Government and education so as to permit the organizations to plan and control some aspect of American life, then the statement is absurd. Education is controlled by local school boards and by departments of education in the 48 States, and the Federal Government is controlled by a large number of competing interests among which the influence of the organizations mentioned is certainly not great. With respect to the specific objectives or effects attributed to the interlock the council has had no part, or inclination, in bringing about such alleged changes through education.

The council is concerned primarily with improving the quality of research in the social sciences—that is, with the reliability, rigor, objectivity, and honesty of social-science research. Necessarily related to this objective is a concern with improving the quality of the research workers in these fields, with studying the conditions under which research is carried on, and with intelligent discussion and understanding of what research can and cannot do. The council is not engaged in developing or in advocating public policies or political programs, or in directing or shaping educational objectives and policies.

The Social Science Research Council has not cooperated with similar agencies in other fields of research for the purpose of planning or controlling certain aspects of American life. It has not sought, nor does it seek, control over any aspect of American life, including research in the social sciences. The council has participated in encouraging various types of planning in research, particularly with the intention of making research more productive. This has been done through the preparation of publications which help to summarize the existing accomplishments of research in a given field, and through efforts to help research men find the most promising lines of future research on which they might concentrate their attention.

The Social Science Research Council accepts grants from several foundations for the administration of fellowships and for other forms of financial support for research in the social sciences. However, foundations make grants for similar purposes to other organizations concerned with research in the social sciences, such as universities and research institutes of many kinds, and foundations also administer fellowship programs of their own. In addition, individual research men in universities are frequently financed by university committees from en-
dowment funds, and research institutes also are financed by funds from private sources, such as business firms concerned with market research problems, and also by the Federal and State government. (See, for example, the Directory of Social Sciences Research Organizations in Universities and Colleges, published by the Social Science Research Council in 1950.)

There is the allegation in the report that the staff's study of the foundations and the organizations mentioned "seems to warrant the inference that they constitute a highly efficient, functioning whole. Its development and production seems to have been largely the work of these organizations engaged in research, such as the Social Science Research Council and the National Research Council" (ibid., p. 47). This charge as worded here is a vague one. The inference that such a "highly efficient, functioning whole" exists is not warranted. We admit that in our operations we do seek to be efficient. The nature of this "whole" and the extent of the "interlock," however, need some rigorous examination if the committee is to have a fair and accurate view of just what does and what does not exist.

There is first of all the statement in the staff report that the council "acts as spokesman for seven constituent member associations." The fact is that the council has never been designated as a spokesman by the seven associations which elect part of the council's board of directors, that the council has never sought to arrogate to itself the role of spokesman for these associations or for social science as a whole, or for anyone except itself, and that actually save for an occasional individual member of one or another of the associations no one has ever seriously proposed that we or anyone else act as spokesman for them.

The suggestion that the council is such a spokesman rests upon a very fundamental misunderstanding of the way in which learned associations function as well as of the entire academic population. It is only on very limited matters that the associations try to act as spokesmen for their members as a whole. The programs of their annual meetings, the contents of their journals, or the nature and substance of any other activities which they carry on are not cleared with the council or conducted in accordance with policies discussed with the council or influenced by the council as such in any other single way. Consultation does occur occasionally in matters of mutual research interest but these occasions have arisen with any particular association not more than about once in 3 or 4 years.

The one continuing relationship between the seven associations and the council consists of the designation by each of them each year of a member of the council's board of directors for the subsequent 3 years. The origins of this relationship are very simple if one understands the situation in the social sciences at the beginning of the twenties. There were then seven well-established associations some of whose members wanted to see the establishment of an agency more actively engaged in fostering better research. The associations themselves could not undertake this because they were not organized to carry on from month to month and from year to year the tasks to be undertaken by the council, because of a view that a single agency concerned with all seven fields was desirable, and because actually research always has been and must be only one of the concerns of the associations many of whose members are interested primarily or solely in teaching or in other vocations.

Leaving then the "spokesman" angle of this allegation as the committee may reasonably be concerned with the extent to which the council and the other organizations called to its attention cooperate. Ten years ago the conviction arose that the councils (the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council) ought not to work in total isolation from each other and that they ought occasionally to talk over ideas and activities which might be of interest simultaneously to two or more of them. This led to the creation of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, a body to which some prior reference has I think been made in these hearings. Over its entire life it has held an average of three meetings—sometimes a day in length, sometimes half a day—a year. The conference board has no staff beyond the volunteer services provided by the councils themselves. It is therefore certainly far short of a tight "interlock." Some measure of criticism may well be justified and might better be directed against the limited communication and cooperation which has occurred between the councils. Close and more frequent consultation might assist in making contributions of national benefit. So far, however, we have not found a highly efficient way of achieving this close working together, and certainly no funds for providing the conference board with even minimal staff resources.
The four councils do cooperate under a contract with the Department of State in the preliminary selection of postdoctoral lecturers and research scholars to receive awards under the Fulbright Act. This process of selection is made from among persons who apply in an open competition, publicly announced throughout the United States. The committee of selection consists of 12 members, usually university professors, appointed by the board, and 4 members of the staffs of the councils, all of whom serve without compensation other than expenses. The final selection of Fulbright grantees, however, is made by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the members of which are appointed by the President of the United States.

The conference board has sponsored the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training which has for the past 5 years been studying problems of the supply of and demand for American professional persons over a wide range of fields of learning. There are also other ways in which the four councils work together. There have been over the past 15 years a number of joint committees between 2 or more of the councils as such, and some 5 or 6 conferences sponsored by 2 or more of them. For example, we and the National Research Council some years ago set up a joint committee to try to foster more accurate ways of measuring attitudes and consumer wants. A few months ago the Social Science Research Council and the National Research Council jointly sponsored a small conference to discuss whether significant studies of twins could perhaps be worked out. Other examples are the formation by the National Research Council and the Social Science Research Council of a temporary committee to make arrangements for a conference on research in contemporary Africa, held in October 1953, to which were invited some 50 specialists in biology, geography, anthropology, sociology, economics, and political science.

With the American Council of Learned Societies we have had joint committees which tried to improve communication between scholars engaged on studies of Latin America to ascertain whether something could be done to increase the number of Americans with competent knowledge of India and its neighboring countries, and to aid American scholars in critically analyzing such materials as can be drawn out from behind the Iron Curtain. These joint committees represented a recognition that there are problems on which humanists and social scientists, or social scientists and natural scientists ought to have something to contribute to each other. At the same time, however, the joint committees have always been very minor elements in the current work of any one of the councils concerned.

With the other organizations mentioned in the report, aside from the other three councils, and the American Historical Association, which is one of its affiliated societies, the Social Science Research Council has had almost no formal contact, and little informal contact.

Another allegation in the report of the research director is given in these terms:

"In what appears from our studies to have been zeal for a radically new social order in the United States, many of these social science specialists apparently gave little thought to either the opinions or the warnings of those who were convinced that a wholesale acceptance of knowledge acquired almost entirely by empirical methods would result in a deterioration of moral standards and a disrespect for principles. Even past experience which indicated that such an approach to the problems of society could lead to tyranny appears to have been disregarded" (ibid. p. 48).

This statement contains a number of suggestions and charges which involve questions of extended scope. What is the "radically new social order" suggested? Has there been a wholesale acceptance of empirical knowledge which has resulted in a deterioration of moral standards and a disrespect for principles? In the experience of which countries has an empirical approach to social problems led to tyranny? These questions raise broad and vague issues, and the present report of the research staff provides an insufficient basis for their analysis. However, there is a tone of accusatory implication in these statements which may be noted at this time. It might be inferred by a casual or predisposed reader of the paragraph quoted above that radical social scientists, undeterred by criticism of their use of empirical methods, were responsible for an alleged deterioration of moral standards, and disrespect for principles, and might become responsible for a tyrannical regime in the United States.

Implications of this kind can only be met by positive statements, in order to present the issues in their clearest light. For example, it may well be noted that certainly very few social scientists have shown zeal for a radically
new social order in the United States. A second statement which may be made to move the discussion to a plane more productive of a sharp definition of real questions, is that, if there has been a deterioration of moral standards and a disrespect for principles, and this statement should by no means be conceded, social scientists have no greater share in such a development than have the members of many other groups in society. Furthermore many persons with deteriorated moral standards and a disrespect for principles have been totally oblivious of knowledge acquired by empirical methods or by any other methods. Finally, social scientists wish neither to be controlled by governmental restrictions on their freedom of inquiry, nor to exercise control over other human beings. They wish, rather, to widen the area of free choice open to human beings, by the discovery of knowledge. It is no accident that it is in the United States that the social sciences have flourished more than in any other country in the world; it is in the freest of societies that the study of man can be most freely made. Only where knowledge may be sought for its own sake, spurred by curiosity and enthusiasms of individuals, can research most fully contribute to the widening of human horizons and the realization of man’s best self.

It has been alleged that the foundations and the “accessory agencies” have “directed education toward a new international frame of reference.” I have been unable to find in the hearings just what this new international frame of reference is supposed to be. The council has not sought to direct education, since this is not within its scope of operations, and its effectiveness in doing so would certainly be limited if it mistakenly undertook such a mission. The council has several times tried to find ways of encouraging more systematic and more searching inquiry into problems relating to the economic and political position of the United States and better knowledge of other areas of the world. We shall undoubtedly make new attempts in this direction if and as constructive ideas arise. The council’s attempts to study the research which has gone on and to figure out ways of doing better research have, however, had no relation which I can discern to any particular “international frame of reference”—new or old. The choice of this country’s international frame of reference has been made and will we are sure continue to be made by its legislative and executive policymakers and by its citizens through established constitutional procedures. Of course, the council will continue its interest in working out better and more significant research plans relating to problems of international relations—not to any particular international frame of reference—in view of the obviously increasing importance of these relations to the security and welfare of the United States.

Here, for example, is a current council undertaking. Foundation officers became concerned with problems of foreign students at American universities. As a means of learning more about these problems, and how improved methods of dealing with them might be found, three foundations have made grants to the Social Science Research Council. A grant of this type is made to the council for several reasons. The council has experience in the administration of funds; it has knowledge of individual scholars engaged in various fields of research; it has their confidence, and is therefore able to enlist their collaboration in the carrying out of research projects. The result of the council’s development of this research project will be several publications useful, we hope, to foreign student advisers in universities, to Government officials planning exchange of persons programs, and to teachers and others who have contacts with foreign students. These publications will be primarily descriptive in nature; they will summarize the results of observation, of interviews and of different types of psychological and other tests. They will also include some comments of a summary character, which it is hoped may assist those responsible for policy in choosing among alternate courses of action. The use of these findings will of course depend on the judgment of those who have responsibility for policies and activities directly connected with foreign students.

Nowhere in the report is the statement made flatly that social scientists, by themselves or with others, are engaged in a concerted political movement to modify the American way of life. Nevertheless, there are suggestions, some of which have been quoted above, which when taken as a whole give the impression that Mr. Dodd feels that social scientists as a group exert a sinister influence on American social life and institutions. An additional hint of this order is found in the following paragraph:

"We wish to stress the importance of questioning change only when it might involve developments detrimental to the interests of the American people, or when it is promoted by a relatively small and tightly knit group backed by a
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disproportionately large amount of money which could threaten the American ideal of competition” (ibid., p. 47).

In this and other parts of the staff report, a case is sought to be made against the social sciences, and against organizations in other fields, in terms of innuendos, or suspicions that social scientists may be desirous of exercising control over some aspects of American life. Social scientists reject such an attack on their work and on their motives.

The paragraphs which follow are offered in order to indicate to the committee the nature of the fellowship program of the Social Science Research Council, in view of the comments made by Dr. A. H. Hobbs, assistant professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, in his testimony at the hearings on May 20-21, 1954.

Before answering these allegations, which reflect Mr. Hobbs' personal opinion and not detailed knowledge of the purposes and operation of the council's fellowship program, it may be well to state that the council is only one of a great number of organizations, many supported by foundations, which offer fellowships for training and research in social science. Therefore, the trends in types of training and methods of research, if any, that may appear in the projects of council fellows do not necessarily attest to the general character of training and research in the social sciences.

Throughout its career the council has been concerned with developing more rigorous methods, among which statistical procedures can be numbered. Few scholars would deny that the social sciences have benefited greatly by the use of quantitative methods. The council has been and will continue to be interested in their development, as it would in the fostering of any productive approach. Whether the council has overemphasized the quantitative approach is, and must remain, a matter of opinion. To some reputable social scientists any use of numbers is abhorrent; to others, of an opposite persuasion, work without a quantitative basis seems of little value. It must be strongly emphasized, however, in spite of misconceptions prevalent in some places, that the council has never been concerned exclusively with the development and promotion of only one methodology, statistical or otherwise.

Even a casual reading of the appointments made in the council’s programs of faculty research fellowships and research training fellowships during the past 2 years would reveal that projects of many kinds have been supported, entailing a wide variety of research techniques. They range from problems utilizing refined statistical analysis to inquiries of a theoretical or descriptive nature in which quantification would be inappropriate. It is, in fact, exceedingly difficult to determine the extent to which statistical methods will be involved in any particular research. As one tool among many, the statistical approach is used by scientists when they feel it will yield significant information about the question under consideration. It is, on the other hand, scrupulously avoided by scholars when the area of interest calls for other research methods. Ordinarily, even the most devoted exponent of quantitative techniques finds that certain aspects of his problem call for other strategy, for library research, or interviewing or observation. Particularly in new areas of research interest scientists often find that less rigorous methods are essential to describe the problem and explore its implications, perhaps using statistics at a later stage of the research to pin down the more important features of the situation.

Although the research projects supported by the council embrace a wide range of interests and methods, one can distinguish varying degrees of adherence to a quantitative approach. The following classification represents the distribution of projects in the faculty research fellowship program since 1950, and in the research training fellowship program for 1953 and 1964, according to their use of statistical techniques:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty research fellowship</th>
<th>Research training fellowship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily quantitative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily nonquantitative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Hobbs' principal allegation is that the council, in its fellowship program, but especially in its announcement of awards for 1953 from which he quoted, has
overemphasized empiricism, specifically statistical computation (transcript, ibid., pp. 169-170). He further states that a social scientist reading the announcement "would interpret it to mean that probably, almost certainly, what (SSRC) are interested in is only statistical computations."

The statement that "fellows will be selected on the basis of their actual and prospective accomplishments in formulating and testing hypotheses concerning social behavior by empirical and, if possible, quantitative methods" applied in the 1953 announcement, from which Mr. Hobbs quoted, to only one type of fellowship, the faculty research fellowships. From Mr. Hobbs' statement one might easily gain the impression that all of the five programs of the council described in the 1953 circular are qualified by this emphasis on a quantitative approach. Notwithstanding this stated preference for projects utilizing quantitative methods, a number of appointments to faculty research fellowships, as already noted were made for work of a nonstatistical nature. In selecting the recipients of fellowships and grants primary importance has never been attached to the methods to be employed, but rather to the intellectual promise or achievements of the applicant.

The audience of professional social scientists and advanced students to whom the announcement quoted is addressed certainly does not construe the term "research" to mean "only statistical computation." This is demonstrated by the variety of applications received and by the diversity of projects and methods for which fellowships have been awarded. It should also be noted that Mr. Hobbs himself was the recipient in 1946 of a council fellowship, a demobilization award for the purpose of making a study of the "trend of emphasis in sociological teaching: 1932-41." Presumably he would approve the subject of his own study for which he sought and gained support from the council as well as the methods he employed.

In one place in his testimony (transcript, ibid., p. 168) Mr. Hobbs states that graduate students "are encouraged through the situation (the giving of large foundation grants) to embark upon study projects which are extremely narrow. * * * He also states (p. 169), "furthermore, these projects aid these students to a disproportionate degree. Other students who, through differing interests, through a broader viewpoint of society and behavior, who do their work and who don't have such assistance, are handicapped in comparison with the ones who receive the aid through foundation grants."

The council's research training fellowships, to quote the 1953 announcement from which Mr. Hobbs also quoted, are intended precisely to afford persons an opportunity "to obtain more advanced research training than that which is provided in the usual Ph. D. program." We have been mindful of a tendency at times to use graduate students essentially as clerical assistants on large research projects. We have made our concern explicit in letters which accompanied many thousands of announcements mailed to social science colleagues in recent years.

The following quotation is from one of these letters written by Elbridge Sibley and dated November 1, 1951:

"We often fail to get in touch at the right time with extremely able graduate students and young Ph. D.'s who might profit greatly by a year's fellowship. With distressing frequency we hear from academic friends that the best students in their departments are not among the applicants for fellowships because they are already employed in doing things which someone else wants to have done. It is ironic that the ablest individuals seem to run the greatest risk of being prematurely diverted from training for research by offers of employment which, although attractively remunerative, do not foster the optimum development of their research talents. A timely suggestion from you might well lead such a person to take advantage of an opportunity for further training which would in the long run greatly enhance his preparation for a more effective career."

The same point was made in a similar letter circulated the following year:

"To repeat what has been said in similar letters in past years, it is too often true that the very persons whom we are seeking tend, precisely because they are unusually able and hard working, to be diverted from achieving their own maximum development or productivity as research scientists. If you can encourage one or more of these to become candidates for fellowships or grants, you may be doing a significant service both to the individuals concerned and to social science."

In brief, the research training fellowships are designed to give students a broader type of training in methodology. Furthermore, the stipends are paid directly to the fellow who is responsible himself for the conduct of his research or study program.
In the first printed report of the Social Science Research Council, we find this excellent statement about how the council came into being:

"For those unfamiliar with the Social Science Research Council, the following statement of its genesis, aims, and organization is set down:

"As man's study of his physical and institutional surroundings has become more intensive, the comfortable wholeness of his earlier world has disintegrated. We no longer have 'natural philosophers' who 'take all human knowledge as their province.' They have given place to troops of 'specialists,' whose achievements are unquestioned, but who are painfully aware of how small a fraction any individual knows of what mankind has learned. Men 'who know more and more about less and less' are pushing forward the refined researches of today at every point along the deploying line of scientific advance. But even as a device for gaining more knowledge, specialization is acknowledged to have its drawbacks. We are in danger of distorting our vision when we wrench a section of the world loose from its context to facilitate its intensive scrutiny. We risk waste effort when we use our narrowly limited individual resources in attacking problems which might yield to joint endeavors. The mathematical, physical, and biological sciences were first in this country to organize in an effort to see their problems whole and to facilitate cooperation among specialists concerned with clusters of problems. But shortly after the National Research Council was formed, several representatives of political science, economics, sociology, and statistics came together for a similar purpose. Out of this informal beginning the Social Science Research Council developed in 1923. It was presently strengthened and broadened by the accession of psychologists, anthropologists, and historians."

WESLEY C. MITCHELL, Chairman.


The following statement is reproduced from the 1952–53 annual report of the Social Science Research Council:

"The council is organized as a private corporation, and governed by a board of directors. The board meets twice a year to review all operations of the council and related matters. The members of the board are drawn from among outstanding representatives of the various social sciences and closely related fields. The content of the program of the council reflects their informed and responsible judgment. The actual process of selecting topics and determining procedures is carried on with the aid of a small professional staff, cooperating with committees and consulting directly with many research workers. The suggestions and recommendations from council committees or from less formalized sources of advice are examined and discussed by the council's committee on problems and policy. This committee meets about six times in the course of the year to consider the current work of the council and to develop further, with the aid of the staff, proposed new projects, programs, and preliminary explorations.

"Most members of the council are active on one or more of the 30 or so committees described in subsequent pages of this report. As the committee lists demonstrate, the membership is drawn from a wide variety of institutions and disciplines and in recent years has involved services annually by some 200 members of 50 or more university and college faculties and of the staffs of scientific, business, and governmental organizations. Committees concerned with the planning and appraisal of research in different fields are appointed by the committee on problems and policy, while administrative committees are elected by the board of directors. Participation is based upon competence of individuals in their fields, known interest in the subject at hand, and willingness to give time and attention to cooperating with fellow scientists. Committees serve without compensation, except for actual expenses in attending meetings. The appointments are on an annual basis, and are usually reviewed and revised each autumn.

"The initial leads from which the council's research planning activities evolve arise from the ideas and research goals of the research workers who identify themselves with the objectives of the council, irrespective of whether they are at the moment members of it, or of its committees. Research planning would be artificial and sterile if it were not directly related to the motivation of research workers to carry their own inquiries forward. The council endeavors to fulfill its basic purpose through the process of selecting ideas and individuals and providing opportunities for the development of whatever cooperative relationship will advance research in specific areas. In a sense, this process has an
architectural quality in that the council seeks to relate the skills and objectives of the individual specialist to building a structure of ideas and knowledge of more general significance.

"The foundations supporting the council over the years have recognized the value and utility of an organization that can bring together the initiative and judgment of social scientists on problems of research development directly related to their own concerns. Fruitful leads for scholarly inquiry and constructive suggestions for strengthening research personnel and improving their training most appropriately come from the responsible academic leaders who are devoting their lives to these problems in the universities and colleges. The council provides a means of ready communication among scholars in different institutions who, because of the very fact of their specialized research interests, often work in relative isolation among their immediate colleagues and hence welcome an opportunity to discuss their problems with persons developing similar interests at other institutions. Education in the United States is not organized under a unified national ministry of education; rather, there are a considerable number of national organizations, each dealing with distinctive facets of education and research. The Social Science Research Council is one of perhaps a dozen or so such organizations. Its distinctive contribution rests in its concern with the advancement of research in the social sciences.

"The grants made directly to the council by foundations are usually for specified purposes. Hence, the council is not in a position to consider many requests for financial assistance that a foundation might find appropriate. The council's concern is with ideas for research and with preliminary aspects of research which may or may not lead to well-planned projects worthy of support. Many of the council's appraisal and planning efforts are focused not on the development of specific research projects but on calling attention to needed work. The publications of the council resulting from these efforts are fertile sources of suggestions for research. In other cases, relatively precise plans for research may be outlined. If specific research projects are developed and funds are needed, the individual or group prepared and qualified to execute the plan may seek funds directly from a foundation, and the funds, if made available, go directly to the applicant or his own institution.

"Only in exceptional instances does the council accept funds for the direct support or supervision of research. It sees its functions as those of planning, stimulating, and initiating research rather than conducting projects than can be done more appropriately by other organizations.

"At the September 1953 meeting of the board of directors, particular consideration was given to the present status of the social sciences in the light of the current demands upon them and prevailing methods of support. There was no disposition on the part of the board to attempt to modify the objectives for which the council was founded; it reaffirmed its continued concern with basic research and development of the social sciences.

"The trend of the times is toward increasing recognition that the social sciences afford means for better understanding and analysis of many complex social, political, and economic problems. The economists, the psychologists, the statisticians, and members of all the other social disciplines are the specialists whose aid is sought, because theirs is the relevant training. Many organizations offer opportunities for social scientists to work on pressing current problems that call for study by trained personnel. In attacking such problems, at the behest of philanthropic, business, or other organizations, specialists from many fields apply their knowledge and the techniques and theories of analysis that are now available in social science. But all will agree that valuable though such inquiries are—and indeed essential for bringing available thought and information to bear—the complexity of the problems involved does not permit anything more than a partial analysis.

"It is the council's primary function to provide for the development of better methods of research, more effective means of gathering necessary data, and more adequate theoretical formulations. Unless research men are encouraged and stimulated to give some portion of their time and energies to these purposes, the agencies that seek quick 'answers,' facile solutions, or practical judgments may tend to crowd more fundamental problems from the forefront of consideration.

"The council has long been concerned with improving the training of social science research personnel; but not enough attention is given to their opportunities for lifetime careers and to the frequent lack of research continuity in such careers. As research institutes attain more financial stability they can offer
competent staff employees continuous careers in research, but most social science research organizations in universities today lead a hand-to-mouth existence. Moreover, well-qualified social scientists often follow a seemingly erratic career line as they are attracted from one brief research opportunity to another at different institutions.

"As the September discussion revealed, the increase in contract funds for research has led to undue emphasis on developing special projects as distinct from continued basic work. Basic research can be encouraged only by providing an environment for research scholars conducive to continuity in their work. There should be clearer recognition by the universities that research is just as much a part of the professor's career as is teaching, and that provision of opportunities and funds for research is just as important as for teaching. In order to obtain university funds for research at the present time, there is too much emphasis on shaping a project that has 'appeal.'

"The best working conditions for social scientists generally are to be found in a university setting, and maintaining that setting with its original advantages is of first importance. University personnel should not be dependent on funds from contracts with outside agencies to sustain their research interests. Short-term support for particular or limited research jobs results in the abuses that have been described as 'projectitis.'"

"The council's concern with basic scientific research and with matters of paramount interest to research workers, in accordance with the purpose for which the council was incorporated, means that questions of public policy must be left to other organizations. Of course, social scientists in their teaching and writing pursue a variety of interests and concern themselves with a wide range of problems. But within the council our common purpose is the advancement of research in the social sciences."

"The decision taken 20 years ago with respect to current public problems still holds: The council determined not to avoid current issues by reason of their generally controversial character, but rather to give weight to the promise of particular research to contribute to an understanding of contemporary questions. This decision involved no intention of abandoning more remote and fundamental research in favor of that applied wholly to immediate ends. It simply recognized that in research, as in so much human activity, a measure of value is benefit to mankind.'"

"In these terms, perhaps no greater benefit to mankind can be envisaged than advance in our capacity to understand ourselves, our society, and the other cultures and nations of the world. Such a capacity, we believe, rests significantly in better methods of analysis. Recognizing the difficulties created by power conflicts and irreconcilable goals of human societies, still the challenge of improving the means and methods of social science analysis offers wide and constructive scope for continued research effort. Facts are to be preferred to guesses, and knowledge to ignorance. More systematic ways of ordering knowledge about human affairs are better than speculation or special pleading. It is upon such obvious common assumptions that the structure of the social sciences is erected. Technicalities and refinements sometimes make these fields appear confusing to the layman. Misunderstandings now and then occur. But the social sciences, as fields of knowledge, point to no particular form of society as ultimate, or any prior set of public policies. These sciences are premised on the faith that logical thought, established facts, and various forms of analysis can contribute to a clearer understanding of human problems. The social sciences provide no complete answers to any practical problem, but they offer relevant facts and ideas to all who would prefer to see human affairs worked out through reason, through faith in their fellow men, and through methods of persuasion."

"There are various schools of thought within different social science disciplines. There is disagreement and competition in these fields, just as in other walks of life. There are no authoritative groups to say with complete finality: This is economically sound or that is socially valid. But there are more, and less, rigorous methods of analysis and better—and less well-qualified analysts. Some research workers are more objective than others. By keeping the competition keen and free, some win the hard-earned recognition of having achieved a scientific approach to the study of human behavior and social relations."

"The problems of the individual research worker remain of constant concern to the council. No research team is better than its individual members, and no research plan has much meaning beyond the capacity of individuals to carry it through."

"The council has not produced a generalized blueprint for the overall development of the social sciences, nor does it think that it would be desirable to do so,
Rather, it seeks to stimulate inquiries into new fields of knowledge; to discover and encourage social scientists who wish to try to apply new methods to traditional studies; to grasp and further opportunities provided when competent people in widely separated places have similar research interests and the effectiveness of their work may be enhanced through pooling of ideas and experiences. The strategic employment of small funds in such circumstances may be productive of research that otherwise might emerge only at a much later time, or not at all. The council thus serves mainly as a cooperative agency through which individual social scientists voluntarily collaborate to advance the progress of research. The council does not seek to impose upon them a program of its own but seeks to bring into focus and develop their interests and judgments. If the council is defined in terms of its work, its effort is concentrated not in its offices in New York and Washington but in the colleges and universities where a new generation of social scientists is being trained and where persons associated with council committees and other activities of the council engage in research."

Mr. HERRING. I think if it suits your pleasure, the most helpful thing I could do perhaps would be to say something about the council and try to get some factual material before you that would give a clear understanding of what it is we are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Koch, did you have some questions?

Mr. KOCH. You just continue making whatever oral statements you wish.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. Chairman, I will go right ahead, but let me say that I would be very happy indeed if any member of the committee or of counsel would like to ask any questions. Because what I have here are just rough notes. So I will go ahead, and if there is any point you would like elaborated, or any question you would like to ask, I hope you will do so.

Well, I assume that you have read or browsed through this statement about the nature and purposes of the Social Science Research Council. I don't want to repeat material. But I have identified a few points that I would like to bring to your attention.

In preparing for this hearing, I read somewhat more of our past records that I had, and I came across a very interesting statement by Wesley Mitchell in the first council printed report. It is just a paragraph, and I would like to read it, because I think it is illuminating.

For those unfamiliar with the Social Science Research Council the following statement of its genesis, aims, and organization is set down. As man's study of his physical and institutional surroundings has become more intensive, the comfortable wholeness of his earlier world has disintegrated. We no longer have natural philosophers who take all human knowledge as their province. They have given place to troops of specialists, whose achievements are unquestioned, but who are painfully aware of how small a fraction any individual knows of what mankind has learned. Men who know more and more about less and less are pushing forward to refined researches of today at every point along the deploying line of scientific advance. But even as a device for gaining more knowledge, specialization is acknowledged to have its drawbacks. We are in danger of distorting our vision, when we wrench a section of the world loose from its context to facilitate its intensive scrutiny. We risk waste effort when we use our narrowly limited individual resources in attacking problems that might yield to joint endeavors. The mathematical, physical, and biological sciences were first in this country to organize in an effort to see their problems whole and to facilitate an organization among specialists concerned with clusters of problems. But shortly after the National Research Council was formed—that is, for the natural sciences, several representatives of political science, economics, sociology, and statistics came together for a similar purpose. Out of this informal beginning, the Social Science Research Council developed in 1923. It was presently strengthened and broadened by the accession of psychologists, anthropologists, and historians.
The interesting thing that I want to emphasize here is that this objec-
tive that I have just read, this statement of objective, reflects the
initiative of a group of leading social scientists. They had a sense of
need, this high specialization developing. There are things that we
share. We need some way of getting away and talking shop. How
can we get a better grasp of these problems? Here is a man working
as a specialist on a university faculty. The specialist who would
know most about his field might be 100 miles or 500 miles across the
continent. Isn't there some way in which we can get together and
talk about the common problems we share as specialists in these fields?
Well, it was that sense of need that brought this organization into
existence.

The first point, then, that I want to emphasize, is that that is where
the initiative came from.

The second point I want to emphasize is the consistent attention
that the council has maintained to its objective.

Now, a little documentary quote on that is found in our decennial
report. In 1933, we published a somewhat smaller report on the com-
pletion of the first 10 years. And the director, in that report, repeats:

The council is confident of the validity of its objectives of better and more
broadly trained personnel, the improvement of research materials, of the devel-
opment of research methods over the social field as an integrated whole.

This consistent interest in better training, helping able people to
develop, better data, a lot of technical problems there of how to get
at the facts, better methods, what to do with the facts after you get
them—it is that kind of thing; and I can certainly sympathize with
perhaps the difficulty in the great array of organizations over the
country, of knowing, "Well, now, just what is this organization con-
cerned with?"

It has a unique interest in the advancement of research in these
particular fields. And there are a great many technical problems
there, of how to get at this subject matter more adequately.

Well, that is one point. Another point I would like to emphasize
about the organization is that in an organization of this character you
need to try to maintain, be aware of the importance of, continuity,
stability, on the one hand, and rotation of membership on the other.
How can you be sure that the organization is pursuing its ends?
Well, you can only be sensitive to the problem.

But some of the questions that were raised as a result of this in-
vestigation prompted me to look at the record a bit here and see
just what the story is so far as the membership of our board of
directors is concerned.

Over the last 30 years, we have had about 160 members or 159
members on the board of directors, and at the present time only 4
members of the board have served more than 6 years and only 11
more than 3 years. But if you work out a little chart—1 term, 2
terms, 3 terms or more of this membership—you will find that about
half of them served for 1 term and about 40 out of the 160 served
for 2 terms, and about 20 served for 3 terms. I just mention that
to indicate the problem of rotation and the problem of continuity of
attention.

Well, now, I can go on with further exposition about the organiza-
tion. If you would like to have me present to you information about
the selection of this board, I can do so.
Mr. Koch. Why don't you do that? And also name the constituent members, will you please?

Mr. Herring. Well, the board of the council is composed of 30 individuals. We have seven associations that designate, from panels that we submit to them, their selection for membership on our board, and those associations are the American Anthropological Association, the American Economic Association, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Statistical Association. And then we have 8 members at large, and I am a member of the board, so that brings it up to 30 individuals. These members from the associations are appointed or designated for terms of 3 years, so that we have a new designation or reappointment each year.

Mr. Koch. When you said a panel—how many names are on the panel?

Mr. Herring. There have to be three names, under our bylaws, and our practice is always to discuss this matter, and frequently there is quite a roster of names.

The important thing to keep in mind here is that here is an organization that is meaningful if you have people serving on the board who are interested in what we are doing, and who are interested in the advancement of research and who are working on research rather than other things. And therefore we have on these panels the names of people any one of whom would have an interest in the sort of thing we are trying to do. It is pretty obvious that you would not want to put on the panel the names of people who were interested in something else. And this system has been in effect now since 1935, and until some questions were raised here about it we never gave it a second thought. It is a system that has proved quite workable and satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. Wormser. Why don't you permit the societies, the constituent societies, to determine their own representatives? Aren't they aware of what the special purposes of your organization are?

Mr. Herring. Well, that is a perfectly reasonable question, Mr. Wormser. There are all sorts of ways in which this thing could be done. I gather from some of the men who were around at the time that it was suggested a good many years ago that this organization ought to handle its members on some other basis.

Mr. Wormser. It was suggested that a panel would be named from which you could get the particular type of representative wanted.

Mr. Herring. We want the type who can give some time and thought to the sort of work we are doing, and who has research interests rather than interests of some other kind. And every now and then somebody may serve on the board who is more interested in other things.

Mr. Wormser. Well, the suggestion has been made specifically that you are interested particularly in not getting professors, let us say, who might be more of the rational school than the empirical.

Mr. Herring. Well, you present that as a problem. It has not been a problem, in my experience. I have not been aware of that as a problem. And there is the freest interchange of opinion and discussion about these matters.

Well, I think one way of getting before the committee fairly graphically, perhaps, the sort of thing we do would be to say to you first
that this board of directors meets twice a year. They review the program. We have discussion on research problems. And our day-to-day work is conducted through committees. We have about 30 committees that are quite active, and these committees are set up to consider problems where we think there is some research significance.

Mr. Hays. What sort of questions do these committees consider?

Mr. Herring. I have here before me types of questions considered by my committees, because I thought that would be the most down-to-earth way of getting at it. I will just sample this and offer for the record a fuller statement, so that you can get the thing in that fashion.

Let us take, for example, agricultural economics. We have a committee on agricultural economics. And the membership of this committee is made up of agricultural economists in this instance over the country, who are interested in doing a better job in that particular field. The common practice in the organization is that whatever member of our board is interested in whatever committee would determine whether or not he would serve on it.

Agricultural economics, then, was in response to the opinion expressed over the country, particularly in our land-grant colleges and other institutions where good work in agricultural economics is going forward, that there be an opportunity provided for reexamining some of the assumptions underlying research in the agricultural field, and for critically restudying the research methods used by agricultural economists. So we brought together 20 of the younger outstanding men in the field for a 2-day conference last January. They talked shop for 2 days, and on the basis of their recommendations we set up a committee which is currently concerned with two jobs: a critical, fresh look at past research on low-income farms and farming areas—its report is still in preparation—and an attempt was made also to bring together the thinking of a larger number of experts on the usefulness of various types of research, with particular emphasis on finding the advantages of relatively simple methods over more intricate ones for the analysis of agricultural problems.

What I am trying to emphasize here is that these men were approaching the problem essentially as technicians, and they wanted to see how they could improve the methods of analysis. I do not know whether I need to emphasize that greatly, but we are not interested in talking about: what should agricultural policy be? This group is talking about how to use better methods for doing further research, knowing what has already been done.

Mr. Hays. In other words, they would not be very helpful to Mr. Benson in his present dilemma.

Mr. Herring. That is right.

Mr. Goodwin. What do you mean, "dilemma"?

Mr. Hays. Mr. Goodwin, the only thing I think I could say charitably is that if you had some farmers in your district you would know what his dilemma is. I am very keenly aware of it. His dilemma is either finding a reasonable solution to the farm problem, or finding a new job.

Mr. Goodwin. I am sorry I started it.

Mr. Herring. I will offer you one or two other illustrations. Here is a committee. I sat in on a few of its meetings. It is a committee on economic growth. This committee brings together several economists, sociologists, and anthropologists to find how and under what
conditions economic systems grow. These include not only what are thought of as purely economic factors, but also the customs and traditions and attitudes of people. We know that some parts of the world have grown more rapidly economically than others, and this group is interested in the questions: Why? Why is that? What is economic growth? Can you measure it? Can you identify it, even? What are we talking about?

One of the first problems is really to figure out how you can talk about some of these matters.

Now, in the case of economic growth, there are not only the economic factors of capital and so on, and credit, and whatnot, but there are problems that involve motivation. Some peoples in some parts of the world just seem to like to work harder than other peoples in other parts of the world. Is there any way of better understanding these motivational factors? In some parts of the world people put their money in a hole in the ground. In others, they put it in the stock market. What can you find out about the readiness of people to invest? What do they do with their savings? That may suggest, in a very crude way, the kind of concerns this group is interested in. And I will say this, that where they can find any statistical data on this, they have a hard look at it, a very hard look. Because the statisticians on that committee want to know whether these statistics are any good or not. And if you want criticism of statistics, I can refer you to some statisticians who are the most critical minded people when it comes to the quantitative approach.

Mr. HAYS. I might ask you, right at that point: Is the council interested in the individual, the so-called lone-wolf type of research, that we have heard referred to here?

Mr. HERRING. Well, we are very much interested in that. And if I have given you an adequate enough indication of the kinds of questions, I will just offer you this memo of illustrative questions.

Mr. GOODWIN (presiding). In the absence of objection, it will be admitted.

The Chair hears no objection.

(THE MATERIAL REFERRED TO IS AS FOLLOWS:)

**TYPES OF QUESTIONS CONSIDERED BY SSRC COMMITTEES**

**Agricultural economics.**—For 2 or 3 years various agricultural economists at State colleges and elsewhere urged that the council provide an opportunity for reexamining some of the assumptions underlying research in the agricultural field and for critically restudying the research methods commonly used by agricultural economists. We brought together about 20 of the younger outstanding men in the field for a 2-day conference a year ago last January. On the basis of their recommendations we set up a committee which is currently concerned with two jobs:

*(a)* A critical fresh look at past research on low-income farms and farming areas. Its report is still in preparation but it will, we understand, for instance, question whether a failure to study closely enough the existing statistics of agriculture and of income has not exaggerated the extent to which low-income farms really exist.

*(b)* An attempt to draw together the thinking of a large number of experts on the usefulness of this or that type of research of a variety of research methods, with a particular interest in pointing out wherever possible the advantages of relatively simple methods over more intricate ones.

**Business enterprise research.**—Because psychologists and sociologists as well as economists are turning to what they view as a more realistic view of the business enterprise as an integral and essential part of the American system, it seemed useful just a year ago to bring together a number of those most interested
for a preliminary conference. On the basis of that conference's discussion, we set up a committee which is now in process of a critical stocktaking of the work heretofore done by economists and others on the business enterprise, in the hope that more significant and constructive directions for future work can be suggested. (It should be unnecessary to point this out, but the committee's discussions have involved neither Marxism nor economic determinism, and instead are concerned with promoting a better general understanding of the nature of and contributions of American business enterprises.)

**ECONOMIC GROWTH**

This committee brings together several economists, a sociologist, and an anthropologist in an effort to devise ways of better understanding how, and under what conditions, economic systems grow. These conditions include not only what are usually thought of as purely economic factors such as capital, raw materials, and the like, but also the customs, traditions, and attitudes of the people. The American tradition of free enterprise developed and flourished under conditions of rapid economic growth. If it is to continue to flourish, or if economic progress is to be fostered in so-called underdeveloped places, there is need for more adequate knowledge of the complex factors which produce growth in some situations and stagnation or decline in others, and for understanding of the reasons why industrialization has taken root readily in some environments and failed to do so in others. There is even need for an acceptable method of measuring economic growth, whereby meaningful comparisons can be made between different economies. The committee, needless to say, does not presume that it will finally solve these problems; it serves to focus the interests and pool the experience of scholars in many places who are working on these problems.

**Historiography.**—This is a committee of historians who believe that their profession may be able to sharpen its insights and make more significant interpretations of historical events by drawing upon the skills and knowledge developed by other social disciplines. It is engaged in preparing a book for historians, describing possible applications of the methods and data of such disciplines as economics, political science, and sociology.

**Identification of talent.**—In view of the large sums devoted to scholarships and fellowships for the education of youths who may become leaders of future generations, it would be obviously desirable to be able to identify more confidently than is now possible those boys and girls who possess in undeveloped form the talents requisite for high-grade leadership. Already much progress has been made in developing tests of intelligence which indicate with considerable reliability a pupil's capacity for higher academic study, but it is a matter of common knowledge that leadership in business, government, and civic affairs calls for traits of personality other than the ability to make high grades in school. The committee on identification of talent is sponsoring several research projects on particular aspects of the broader problem of identifying at, say, high-school age, boys or girls who may be capable, with suitable education, of becoming business leaders or statesmen. It is characteristic of the scientific approach to such a problem that the problem must first be analyzed into smaller underlying problems which can be effectively studied by scientific methods. A head-on attack on the problem as a whole would be premature at this stage. Thus, for example, one investigator sponsored by the committee is making intensive studies of high-school boys of equal scholastic standing but from different social backgrounds, in an effort to discern why some of them aspire to higher goals than others; another investigator is attempting, by observing the behavior of participants in a community organization, to define more precisely a trait of leadership which he calls social sensitivity—the ability of a leader, so to speak, to sense the unspoken feelings of members of his group. Out of the results of such limited but carefully controlled observations it is to be hoped that gradually a more adequate solution of the complex practical question of identifying undeveloped talent can be achieved.

**Mathematical training of social scientists.**—The field of interest of this committee is clearly indicated by its name. Its major projects thus far have been a seminar in which a group of mathematicians and social scientists devoted the summer of 1952 to preparation of teaching materials adapted to use in courses for social-science students, and a summer institute in 1953, at which about 40 social-science teachers and graduate students received intensive instruction in certain mathematical subjects. Not all branches of social science make use of mathematical principles and methods, but their use is steadily growing, and there is consequently an increasing need for mathematical instruction by which social
scientists can gain useful competence in specific areas of mathematics without devoting years to curricula which are traditionally prescribed for professional mathematicians.

**Measurement of opinion, attitudes, and consumer wants.**—This committee exemplifies the council's role as a meeting place for research workers who have common interests and problems but are separated geographically or by their different vocations and educational backgrounds. The committee, when it was organized in 1945, brought together for the first time leaders in the use of opinion and attitude surveys (polls, as they are popularly known) in governmental, commercial, and academic organizations. While interested in different kinds of subject matter, the members of the committee recognized many common problems of method. All were interested in methods whereby the opinions and attitudes of groups of people can be efficiently and economically ascertained, and how to avoid the pitfalls which beset early ventures in public opinion polling. Three major research projects were sponsored, touching on such matters as the reliability of data obtained by questioning small samples of individuals, and the kinds of bias which may be introduced by the interviewer who asks the questions. When the final reports of all of these studies are completed and reviewed, it is expected that the committee will be discharged in accordance with the council's usual policy of maintaining each research planning committee only so long as it appears to provide the most effective means of advancing research. The frontiers of research are continually shifting, and each new forward thrust calls for some special combination of skills, interests, and experience. When the Committee on Measurement of Opinion was established, it was almost alone in the field; subsequently, two major professional associations have come into being, which can be expected to serve on a wider scale many of the purposes for which the council's group was set up.

**Migration differentials.**—About 15 years ago, the council issued a bulletin on research on the migration of population. The present committee was established in 1950 to review again the status of research on this subject, which is of great timely importance in view of the tremendous volume of migration during and following World War II. The committee, following a typical pattern of council activity, is preparing a volume which will not only review and assess the significance of previous studies of migration but also point to gaps in existing knowledge of the subject which need to be filled if the causes and effects of movement of people from place to place are to be understood. The committee is interesting itself not merely in how many people have moved whence and whither, but also in the factors which prompt people to move, the kinds of persons who move as compared with those who reside permanently in one place, and the social and economic consequences of this continual reassortment of people in different communities. Do people, for instance, move from their homes because business is poor where they are, or simply because they hope to achieve greater satisfactions elsewhere? Is the average migrant a restless energy person, or a ne'er-do-well who drifts about in the vain hope of finding easy success somewhere?

**Labor market research.**—This committee in the past 2 or 3 years has conducted a highly significant research experiment in carrying through a major study of labor mobility in 6 cities through the entirely voluntary cooperation of research men and institutes in 7 different universities. It has, at the same time, sponsored an entirely independent and critical study of the research which its members and others have done on labor mobility, to ascertain what has and what has not been proven, to raise questions about the research methods used, and to suggest recommendations about future more efficient work in this field. The results of this appraisal are being published this summer as a typical number in the council's series of research bulletins, and the results of the first project are also currently being made available.

**Scaling theory and methods.**—This committee addresses itself to the highly technical problem of devising methods by which the statements which people make in everyday language about their opinions and attitudes can be translated in quantitative terms. For example, if a number of persons are asked to state their opinions on some public issue, their responses may range all the way from strong approval, through indifference, to strong disapproval. In an election, the voters may be required simply to vote "yes" or "no," but a social scientist seeking to understand their attitudes needs some means of comparing the infinitely variable degrees or shades of opinion which lie between these extremes. "Scaling" is the term applied to what might loosely be called "measuring" such differences. It involves the use of various methods which are still in an experimental
Mr. HERRING. I am delighted to turn to some discussion of our concern with the individual and what we have done to encourage individual research. It is a topic that I find particularly congenial.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Herring, unless you were coming to it later, maybe it is more curiosity on my part, but could you tell us from whom you get your money, and roughly how much that is? Could you show what other organizations support you? In other words, you get moneys not only presumably from the seven constituent members, but also from some of the foundations. If you were going into that later, that is all right.

Mr. HERRING. I will come to that. I would like to answer the Congressman's question first.

I think it would be most informing perhaps if I could give you a picture of what our activities were and then talk about the logistics.

Mr. KOCH. All right.

Mr. HERRING. Well, the aid to the individual through the fellowship program, I suppose, is the most direct thing, the one that first comes to mind. For many years, we have had grants from foundations to administer in order to appoint people to fellowships.

Mrs. PROBST. Right there, Dr. Herring: What procedure do you follow in granting fellowships?

Mr. HERRING. Well, the aid to the individual through the fellowship program, I suppose, is the most direct thing, the one that first comes to mind. For many years, we have had grants from foundations to administer in order to appoint people to fellowships.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Herring, unless you were coming to it later, maybe it is more curiosity on my part, but could you tell us from whom you get your money, and roughly how much that is? Could you show what other organizations support you? In other words, you get moneys not only presumably from the seven constituent members, but also from some of the foundations. If you were going into that later, that is all right.

Mr. HERRING. I will come to that. I would like to answer the Congressman's question first.

I think it would be most informing perhaps if I could give you a picture of what our activities were and then talk about the logistics.

Mr. KOCH. All right.

Mr. HERRING. Well, the aid to the individual through the fellowship program, I suppose, is the most direct thing, the one that first comes to mind. For many years, we have had grants from foundations to administer in order to appoint people to fellowships.

Mrs. PROBST. Right there, Dr. Herring: What procedure do you follow in granting fellowships?

Mr. HERRING. Well, in the first place, these programs are national competitions, and therefore it is exceedingly important to get the word around that there are fellowships available.

So over the years we have developed ways of bringing the announcement to the attention of possible candidates over the country. We have bulletins that we send out and put on the bulletin boards of the universities and colleges, and we send leaflets by mail. In 1953 about 4,600 copies were distributed in the initial mailing and many hundreds more were later sent in response to inquiries. The initial mailing list includes the heads of all accredited universities and 4-year colleges in the United States and leading institutions in colleges, graduate school deans, heads of social science research organizations, some fifteen hundred or more individual scholars believed to be interested. That is a mail distribution of announcements. Then we send a covering letter that urges the recipients of the letter to call the offerings to the attention of their colleagues and students. An announcement is published in the council's quarterly publication, that has a circulation of 5,100 copies among our educational institutions. And an advance release of the announcement is sent to the interested professional societies, suggesting that it be published in their journals. So that is a way of bringing it to the attention of at least 40,000 people with especial interest in this field.

The persons apparently eligible to file applications are furnished appropriate forms. The applicants give the names of references. We carry on extensive correspondence with professors and others who know these people. And then members of our staff travel over the country and interview as many of the applicants as they possibly can.

So we go into this very systematically, very carefully, and for each fellowship program that we have—and the ones that we have vary over the years—we have special committees set up. These committees are
composed of people from the universities and colleges, and we try to get in the committee the array of knowledge that would enable the members of the committee to pass on the qualifications of the scores of applicants that they have to consider.

Mr. Hays. So you do, then, pay considerable attention to the individual or lone-wolf type?

Mr. Herring. As for our interest, we have at the present time, I am happy to say, a fellowship program that enables us to give some attention to some men in their undergraduate work, and then we have predoctoral, postdoctoral, and we have our faculty award fellowship program. That is designed for a few people further along.

Now, I think it is important to get before you again some sense of proportion about all this. This is a big country, and there are hundreds and hundreds of educational institutions. We appoint something under 150 people, counting all of our fellowship programs at the present time, and we have more annually, and we have about five fellowship programs at the present time. In other words, under 1 of these programs we would appoint 30 people. You can imagine, then, that the competition is keen.

Mr. Koch. On that point, Mr. Herring, do they have a uniform examination, or does each one present a thesis, or something? Just what does the committee have before it in making their selection? Just how hard is it to weed them down to those 30? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Herring. If the committee would be interested, I can file with you the forms that we use. We have them here, and you can look at them. But essentially what we are getting at is the man’s academic record. We give particular attention to his plan for study. We want to know what he would like to do under this program. We get a very good line on his ability and his record from the people with whom he has been working. I would say that the question would be what the stage of the man is, what training would be most helpful. If it is predoctoral, then he has completed the preliminary requirements for the doctorate. What additional training would be helpful there? The criteria are broad and flexible. We are trying to find people of promise and ability, men who have some imagination and have an idea that they want to pursue. We were interested essentially in finding able people who have a dedicated interest in carrying forward their research.

Mr. Koch. What I am getting at is: Do they submit any essay from which you determine that they have imagination, or is it more from their background record?

Mr. Herring. No, whatever their publication record may be, or some manuscript they might want to offer.

Mr. Koch. There is no uniform material that you distribute among all of the applicants, is there?

Mr. Herring. It is a very uniform picture. We get all the tangible evidence we can and the committees read the writings and so on.

Mr. Hays. Dr. Herring, there has been frequent complaint from previous witnesses, and apparently it is a complaint that a good deal of cognizance has been taken of by those reporting on these hearings, that these previous witnesses have made this complaint over and over
In fact, there was even an editorial in the June 11 edition of the Chicago Daily News, in which they say, and I quote:

Frequent complaint against the foundations is that they have been more generous to the liberal viewpoint than to the conservative.

If you have followed these hearings or have read any of the transcripts, you will know that that has been made here. Would you care to comment on that at all?

Mr. HERRING. Well, my comment would be that what we are interested in is the man's ability, his growth potential, his training in his field; and what his personal political views are or whether he is to the left or the right is just something that isn't relevant to this sort of consideration.

Mr. HAYS. Well, the editorial goes on and gives their solution, which I wish were original with me. I love this phrase, but I have to give credit where credit is due. I wish I thought it up. They say: "Perhaps the only way the foundations could overcome conservative objections to this would be to label such studies as research into 'psychoceramics'; in simpler English, the study of crackpots." They feel there are specimens in both camps.

You don't have to comment on that. I really don't think it needs any. It sums up my feeling. In other words, as I see it, the kind of people you are looking for are people who are going forward into new fields, not reworking fields that have already been plowed.

Mr. HERRING. And in the fields of their professional competence and development. It is within the context of their professional growth and development that we approach these things.

I don't want to forget Mrs. Pfost's question, and if I may, I will offer for the record a 2½-page description of the procedure followed in the administration of these fellowships, which might be useful. (The material referred to is as follows:)

The following procedures are involved in the administration of fellowships and grants-in-aid of research by the Social Science Research Council.

1. In the early autumn of each year offerings of awards for the ensuing year are publicly announced through several channels. The published announcement briefly describes each type of award and the eligibility requirements for candidates, and sets a closing date (early in January) for acceptance of applications. It is explained that later applications will be considered only if time permits after prior attention is given to those filed on time.

(a) Leaflets are widely distributed by mail. In 1953 about 4,600 copies were distributed in the initial mailing, and many hundreds more were later sent in response to inquiries. The initial mailing list includes the heads of all accredited universities and 4-year colleges in the United States and leading institutions in Canada; chairmen of social science departments in the larger institutions; graduate school deans; heads of social science research organizations and institutes; and some 1,500 or more individual scholars believed to be interested.

A covering letter urges recipients to call the offerings to the attention of their colleagues and students.

(b) An announcement is published in the council's quarterly publication, Social Science Research Council Items, which has a circulation at present of about 5,100 copies.

(c) An advance release of the announcement is sent to the interested professional societies suggesting that it be published in their journals.

2. Persons apparently eligible to file applications under the announced terms of the fellowship and grant programs are furnished appropriate application blanks at their request. The council staff routinely declines to furnish blanks to persons who clearly do not meet the announced objective requirements with respect to age, previous education, permanent residence in the United States or Canada, and the nature of the project or study for which aid is sought; but the
staff does not refuse to accept applications from candidates who are technically eligible, even though they appear to be unlikely to receive awards.

3. Applicants are invited to name sponsors from whom letters of recommendation can be had (three in the case of most types of awards). In addition, the council staff frequently solicits written reports from other scholars whom it believes to be qualified to offer informed and honest judgment. The form used for references on fellowship applicants includes questions concerning both the applicant's character and his qualifications as a social scientist.

4. Between the closing date for filing applications and the time of meetings of the selection committees in March, an effort is made to arrange an interview with a member of the council staff with each candidate for a research training or faculty research fellowship who is not so obviously unqualified that favorable committee action is out of the question, or so far away that the time and expense required would be prohibitive.

In 1954 about 90 percent of all applicants for these 2 types of awards were interviewed. Applicants for undergraduate research stipends or for grants-in-aid of research (both of which involve much smaller sums than the fellowships) are not routinely interviewed by the staff, but the procedures are similar in other respects. When traveling throughout the country to interview candidates, staff members endeavor also to secure from teachers and associates of the applicants such additional insight as can be gained into their qualifications and personal characteristics. It is our experience that more incisive appraisals are often made in these conversations than in written communications. Long-distance telephone calls to mutually acquainted scholars of known insight and judgment often add significantly to our information about candidates.

5. In the case of applicants who have not completed their formal education, official transcripts of college and university records are required. Under the faculty fellowship and grant-in-aid programs, candidates are routinely asked to submit specimens of their publications or writings for scrutiny by the committees; the same is done under the other programs in individual cases in which such further evidence seems desirable.

6. About 2 weeks before the meeting of each fellowship or grant committee copies of applications and letters of reference are sent to each committee member for study. When large numbers of applications must be acted upon by a single committee, it has been our practice to distribute in advance copies of clearly inferior applications to 1 or 2 committee members rather than to all. This is done in such a way, however, that the member or members receiving such applications are not aware that they are the only readers and are therefore not prejudiced by the staff's action. Unless the committee member or members reading these applications immediately recommend their rejection, copies are made available for review by the whole committee.

7. Each committee meets for 1 or 2 days, depending on the volume of work to be done. Each application is taken up and voted upon after as much discussion as appears necessary. Usually a substantial proportion of applications are quickly rejected by unanimous consent on a first reading of the names in alphabetical order.

Members of the council staff who have interviewed candidates attend the committee meetings and are called upon to supplement by their comments the documentary materials. (In a minority of cases someone other than a member of the Washington office staff of the council interviews candidates in remote parts of the country but cannot attend the committee meetings. His comments are submitted in written form.) It can be said that committee members have, almost without exception, conscientiously studied the documents before coming to meetings, and that proceedings of the committees are in no sense a perfunctory ratification of selections made by the staff. In fact, it is a well established and frequently reiterated policy that the staff shall not attempt to prejudge the committee's decisions.

8. As quickly as possible after each committee meeting each candidate is notified by mail of the action taken. If an award has been recommended, the conditions governing tenure are enclosed, and must be agreed to in writing before the award may become effective.

9. Shortly after each meeting minutes are circulated to all committee members and to the president of the council.

Mr. Wormser. You do, then, consider the project offered by the applicant without regard to the man himself. In other words, you
might find an exceptionally able candidate and yet turn him down because of the project which he suggests.

Mr. HERRING. I wouldn’t say that at all, no.

Mr. WORMSER. No, I am asking you that.

Mr. HERRING. Well, we are interested in the man and his promise and the way he goes about his planning of his own research, and I would say that his plan for study is a very important indication of his competence as a potential research man, as to what is researchable and what further training he needs. But I would not use the term “projects” in this context, because this is not the financing of projects. It is the financing of men and women, individuals.

Mr. WORMSER. Mr. Herring, I don’t mean to be obscure in any of my questions, and my reason for asking that is again the criticism that has been made, that has various facets, that an organization of your kind does to a certain extent exercise control over the direction of research. Now, if you had an exceptionally able man, would you turn him down merely because you did not like the nature of the project which he suggested? Or would you perhaps try to turn him to another type of program?

Mr. HERRING. As I say, the judgment is on the man and his development. And if you want a pointblank answer to the question, “Would we turn a man down because we don’t like his project?” I would say “No.” The answer isn’t a particular project. The only way I can answer your question responsively, Mr. Wormser, is to say we are interested in the individual and his growth and his training and how he can become a better worker in his professional field.

Mr. WORMSER. He suggests the subject for research. And you may think that is an entirely inadequate or impossible or useless piece of investigation. What do you do in a case like that, where he is an awfully good man?

Mr. HERRING. Well, in a case of that sort, you see, there is really an internal contradiction there. If he is an awfully good man and has an awfully bad subject, I don’t see how he could be an awfully good man.

Mr. WORMSER. You may think it is awfully bad.

Mr. HAYS. Well, Mr. Wormser, we are getting back to thought control there, are we not? You cannot sit here and pick out any witness’s thoughts as to good or bad. There has to be some standard.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, Mr. Wormser, if you will permit me to clarify the question, from the brief time that I have had an opportunity to assimilate it, we have a very good man, recognized as capable. He comes up with a project. There might be a difference of opinion about the project. He thinks it is good. Another good man, Mr. Herring, would not think it a good project. There is a difference of opinion. Does Mr. Herring’s view with reference to the desirability of the research project prevail, or that of the man who initiated it?

Mr. WORMSER. Merely to pinpoint what I meant: Is the emphasis upon the man or upon the subject?

Mr. HAYS. Of course. But you are getting into a field where I don’t think anyone can give you a specific answer to a general question. Suppose someone came up with a project to do research into the fertility of ostrich eggs.
Mr. Koch. But you may exercise thought control by refusing to let him go ahead with it.

Mr. Hays. You can tell him to go ahead with it if he can find somebody to finance it, but you do not happen to feel you should. I think you have to have some responsibility as to how you hand out this money. Or else if you want us to pass a law saying you have to give the money to the first 150 applicants who come in, that is about the only other way you could do it.

Mr. Wormser. I want to explain my question. I am just interested in the methods you used. I am not trying to attach any significance to them.

Mr. Herring. I would like to spend all the time on this that you will permit, because I think it is important to clarify it. We are talking now about fellowships. And in the administration of fellowships, we have committees of men drawn from universities who are competent to deal with the fields under consideration. So it is a committee judgment. That is one thing.

Secondly, we are thinking of young men and women in their professional training. We are not thinking of projects. So we want to know what the previous academic record has been, what further training is needed, and what research interests the man has. So that we are not passing judgment on whether this project or another is good in the abstract. We are looking at the man's interest, and we want to see what will help him most.

Now, I will tell you one proposal of a candidate that rather attracted my attention. As I say, I don’t sit on these committees, but I was rather interested in this, as a human interest facet. We heard of a young chap at the University of Texas who had thumbed his way to the eastern seaboard because he wanted to look at some of the records that Charles Beard had looked at when he wrote his Economic Interpretation of the Constitution. And we were interested in this young man as a research man. He got a fellowship. But what impressed me there was the eagerness and the zest and the energy of this chap, who was thumbing his way to archives. I have heard of people thumbing their way to various people, but the picture of a young fellow thumbing his way to the archives in order to have a look at the record, I thought was a rather interesting picture.

Well, now, may I go back to this interest in the individual? Because fellowship is one thing, and it is a long story. We have directory of fellowships that we can offer as an exhibit, giving you the record of the over 1,200 people over the years who have had these fellowships. But mark you, that is a 30-year period. So that keeping the sense of proportion again, this organization is dealing with a very small number. I could not give you the total number of graduate students in the United States in these fields. I tried to get it, but we are not sufficiently organized here from the national standpoint even to have figures of that sort.

But there are other ways of helping the individual. For many years we have had a very modest grant-in-aid program, $25,000; up to date, that has been the size of that sum, and we have a little bit more for next year.

Grants-in-aid to help people complete some work engaged in are allocated by a committee, again, of competent scholars, and they do the best they can in dividing up $25,000 in $500 or $1,000 grants.
So you can see how far that money goes. We really need more money for that sort of thing; and we have a bit more money for next year, and I hope I can scratch around, and I hope we can find some more foundations for this grant-in-aid, because it is very helpful indeed to get that few hundred dollars to do the final typing or consult the documents or get the manuscript ready for publication.

Now, within the last few years we have had summer seminars. The idea there is to find out whether there are a number of people, younger men again, who have some common research interests. They want to improve some method, or they want to discuss some theory in their field. What normally happens?

Well, the summer recess, as the traditional period when the scholar could do further study and catch up on his reading, and so on, is fading. Economic necessity, balancing the family budget, comes into it, so that more and more you find professors teaching in summer school. Well, now, we have a little grant that enables us to offer to research men who participate in these seminars the equivalent of what they might otherwise get if they taught summer school, a few hundred dollars, and that enables them to work together through the summer and talk through some problem.

Mrs. Pfost. Dr. Herring, why don’t the foundations just divide up their money among the universities and colleges of the country and let them spend it, instead of setting about it in this way?

Mr. Herring. I guess the quick answer to that would be that there isn’t enough money. If you took all the colleges and universities, you would have about 1,700 institutions, and it is awfully hard to say with precision just how much foundation money goes into the social sciences, but the best figure I can arrive at by consulting annual reports, and so on, would be: somewhere in the neighborhood of $12 million.

Mr. Koch. Annually?

Mr. Herring. Annually, yes. And you would divide $12 million, let us say, by 1,700 institutions, and you would come out at about $7,000 per institution. In other words, you could divide and dissipate. You could escape responsibility. You could say, “Well, we will just leave it to the other fellow and spread it thin.” Or you can face up to the difficult decision of saying, “Well, this institution is doing better work, in our judgment, than the other institution.”

The Chairman. But, Doctor, if the idea of working through the established universities, as raised in the question by Mrs. Pfost, should be favorably considered by the foundations, do you think it is logical to conclude that they should adopt purely an empirical attitude and divide it evenly among the 1,700 colleges of the United States? That would not be the method by which they would go about it; would they?

Mr. Hays. Would you permit me to interject there? If they did not, that would be about the only way in the world they could keep from being investigated at some time in the future by somebody who said they were not dividing it up the way it ought to be. The people who did not get it would be the people complaining; would they not?

The Chairman. They have made substantial grants for buildings and for the general funds of educational institutions.

Mr. Hays. But $7,000 a year would not build a Chic Sale for them at today’s prices.
The CHAIRMAN. But, in the first place, when they make a grant to a college or university, that institution has to meet certain requirements, as I understand it, that show that it is in a position to utilize the money advantageously.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. Chairman, that is where the money goes. It goes to universities and colleges. But some foundations have to make responsible decisions as to which ones.

The CHAIRMAN. But do you not think the suggestion is not quite fair, that they would be put in a position where they would have to divide the money between the 1,700 colleges of the United States?

Mr. HERRING. I confess I just offered that by way of emphasis. I concede you would not want to see them do that.

Mr. WORMSER. Do you think your organization is more capable of selecting these desirable fellows than their own universities?

Mr. HERRING. I think the first point to emphasize there, Mr. Wormser, is that, as I recall my days at Harvard, there were more fellowships at one institution there—you know. They had scores of fellowships. I wish we had it here with us. There are so many scholarships and fellowships available through so many organizations and so many requests and endowments over the years that it is a book about that thick. In other words, we have to get this thing in perspective again. There are just scores and scores of ways for able young men to get fellowship and scholarship support; and most of it is through our colleges and universities.

Mr. HAYS. Dr. Herring, right there: The point is that you do not handle all of the fellowships or any major part of them in the social science field; is that not true?

Mr. HERRING. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. You handle a very minute number, and various colleges and universities have some of their own, and the foundations perhaps make some directly. I don't know.

Mr. HERRING. That is right. The foundations would make a grant to an institution, perhaps four fellowships. The institutions have an array of scholarships and fellowships. The point I would like to emphasize, that I think might be helpful here, is that our programs in fellowships offer opportunities perhaps to people who are not at some of the institutions that may have larger funds. It is a national competition, whereas the fact is that most young people get their fellowship support from the colleges and universities. And we have a total of around 150 appointees a year for the whole United States.

Now, just put that little corporals' guard in the perspective of the phalanxes of American students, and you can see that it is a very limited thing. I wish we had substantially more. I think it is very important that we do have greater fellowship resources. I think it is rather wasteful when we have twice as many qualified people applying as we can take care of.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any other questions?

Mr. KOCH. You were going to continue, Mr. Herring.

Mr. HERRING. I am still hammering away at helping the individual through fellowships.

Mr. GOODWIN. Do you ever have to meet the criticism that favoritism is shown? If some bright young fellow gets an award, and somebody discovers that he is a nephew of Dr. Black at Ivy College,
who holds down the Chair of Sociology, and somebody says, “Uncle William may have put in a word for him”?

Mr. HERRING. No, sir, I can't think of any such cases.

Mr. GOODWIN. You keep very clear of that, do you?

Mr. HERRING. You see, it is kind of competitive. In this spirit of competition, you have these self-correcting things, you see. You have people on the different committees from these different institutions, and there is a good deal of competition among our various colleges and universities. So you can imagine that Professor Y from Siwash keeps an eye on the situation, and there is a certain competitive element there that is a protection against the kind of dangers you refer to.

Well, there is still another one of these summer programs we are getting under way. That is to present to groups of people who share some interest an opportunity to get a little better research training. We had an experience that was encouraging along that line, in the field of mathematical training, not statistical training but mathematical training. And we had a seminar, a training institute, if you will, that brought together 40 or more people. And the summer was spent in getting a very intensive training in mathematics, so that men could apply that in their work as they saw fit later on.

Now, there may be some other training methods that we can work out, and offer this opportunity for men to spend the summer recess at that sort of thing.

Mrs. Prost. Dr. Herring, do you concentrate on the so-called empirical research, or the quantitative, to the exclusion of the other kinds?

Mr. HERRING. I could perhaps indicate the range of topics. The answer is “No.” We do not. But I would like to develop that thought a bit by giving you some illustrations of the varieties of topics.

And I will say, Mr. Wormser, that here we are talking not about fellowships and the training of the young man as he goes forward, but we are talking about this grant-in-aid program, where people are further along. And it might be of interest to the committee if I just gave you some illustrations of the sorts of things.

Mr. WORMSER. Does your answer “no” apply only to the grants-in-aid, or all these fellowship grants? You said “no,” that you do not specialize in empiricism.

Mr. HERRING. That is right. I want to come to this facility research fellowship that has been mentioned. I think you might be interested in some further light on that.

Here is a man at Mount Holyoke: Study of the Influences in Roman Life and Law. Here is a professor at the University of Toledo: Study of the Latin American Philosophy of Law. A man at Northwestern: Preparation of a Revised Edition of a Guide to the Study of Medieval History. Here is a man at Louisiana State University: History of Political Ideas.

Here is a professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame: Theoretical Study of Ethnic Groups. Another man, at Wells College, Research on the Organization of Medieval Trade. A man at Oglethorpe: Study of the Conditions of Political Freedom. And so on.
Now, in our annual report each year, we have a list of the topics and names of individuals. It is all spread in the record here, and if I may offer as an exhibit, Mr. Chairman, copies of our annual report, you would find this spelled out in the variety of institutions and so on indicated.

The Chairman. It will be accepted.

(The Social Science Research Council Annual Report, 1952-53, was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. Herring. Another way the individual is helped is through the conferences that we sponsor from time to time. We had quite an interesting conference at Princeton, a meeting place for some 60 or more people over the country who had some kind of special interest in Africa as an area. And that brought together people who could sit around a big table and say "All right. This is what I am interested in." And they could exchange views that, it seems to me, would fall in this same category of encouragement of the interests of individuals. We have a study Mr. Sibley did of Aid to Individuals. We made a study of the problems there, of getting financial support, and if you would like to have that as an exhibit, that also could be offered for the record.

I have just a seven-line statement that I rather like as expressing the spirit of this thing. It was written back in 1926, but I think it reflects the spirit we try to adhere to.

Nothing is more certain that that individual insight, flash of genius, brilliant statement of a problem, a patient pursuit of an obscure trail to a great truth, will be an indispensable part of the development of the social sciences if they are to attain the goal toward which we all look. The whole purpose of the council will be lost if we cannot aid those creative spirits, if we cannot provide for them better facilities, if we cannot help them in the discovery and solution of problems.

I just offer that, going back many years, as a statement of the faith that we have that if you can help the individual develop, you have come a long, long way.

Mrs. Prost. Dr. Herring, right there: How many social scientists would you say there are today? And could you tell us where they are employed?

Mr. Herring. Well, I could offer you an estimate. If you take the membership of the associations in these fields, it adds up to around 40,000. Now, that figure may err on the large side, because there are some duplications. Some people belong to more than one association. Our chairman belongs to two of the associations, for example, so he would be counted twice in this figure of 40,000. And there are some that belong to the associations but are not actively engaged in the work, though well disposed toward the field, you see, and holding membership.

So with those qualifications, I would say roughly there are probably about 40,000. There are some people, of course, that are active in these fields but don't belong to the association; however, I think that would probably be the exception.

Mr. Goodwin. At this point, what does social science embrace? I assume it is sociology, philosophy—

Mr. Herring. Some aspects.

Mr. Goodwin. Economics—

Mr. Herring. Economics, yes.
Mr. Goodwin. Political economy.

Mr. Herring. That is right. Anthropology, statistics. We feel that the seven associations that I mentioned before are those that are most directly concerned, and then there are others, so that would be economics and political science and anthropology and statistics and psychology and history.

Mr. Goodwin. I would think history would be more of an exact science. History is a statement of facts, things that happen. On the 16th day of June, the gentleman from Tennessee presided over a hearing of the Banking and Currency Committee. Certain things happened on a certain day. I am curious to know why that comes to sociologists.

Mr. Hays. It comes in this way, if you will permit me to interject.

Mr. Goodwin. I would just as soon have your opinion as the doctor's.

Mr. Hays. I am not trying to be facetious, either.

Mr. Goodwin. Neither am I.

Mr. Hays. Ten people witnessed a hearing of the House of Representatives, and all 10 of them write down to the best of their ability what they saw. You might get considerable variation in the historical account of it. And that is why history, although apparently it would be in some phases—I am speaking as one who has done research in it—is not an exact science. You cannot tie down specific dates, everything about it, because some of the individuals who observed or wrote about it, saw it one way, and others another way, so there are certain areas that you have to evaluate.

Mr. Goodwin. I am a little at a loss, here. My few associates have had experience in the teaching field. And if Mrs. Pfost has not, she should have had.

Mr. Hays. I did not mean to take the answer away from you, Doctor. I would just be interested to see whether you agree generally.

Mr. Herring. That indicates that it is a subject that not only here but elsewhere one can discuss. As far as we are concerned in the Council, we include history as one of the social sciences, but it also is included as one of the humanities, and I do not think you can draw any precise line. There are historians and historians. Some would be concerned more with the chronicle of dates, and some would be concerned more with efforts of interpretation. But we feel that the time factor is terribly important and the sense of perspective that you get through approaching matters historically. And over the years there have always been historians who have found it congenial to work with their colleagues in other fields. So that we do not treat it as a matter that you settle in either/or fashion. The historian may take up economic history as a special field. Some historians go at matters more in terms of a literary approach, an artistic approach.

Mr. Goodwin. That brings up one question I had, another one perhaps to expose my ignorance or the fact that I may not have followed closely the prior hearings. But you mentioned in your statement the empirical approach and the rational. Now, you say that the empiricist says, "Look at the record." Now, I can grasp that. I know what that means. Can you put into easy English and into a phrase equally succinct a definition of the rationalist?

Mr. Herring. Well, Mr. Goodwin, I will try, but I didn’t bring the rationalistic approach into this, so I don’t think I can qualify too well.
But what I think we are talking about: If you are going back to the rationalistic school of philosophy, and that is how this got in, that was a school of thought that emphasized the capacity of the human reason to grasp reality directly, through ratiocination rather than through sensation. It is a little bit mystical, perhaps, but there was an important school of thought. So most of us sort of compromise on saying, “Experience has been quite a teacher, and we will be as rational as we can, but we won’t worry ourselves about a philosophy of knowledge that gets into these intricacies.”

Now, that is really something for the seminar room rather than for this hearing room, I suppose.

Mr. Wormser. Could I interject something there? Because this may help Mr. Goodwin. In the sense that empiricism has been used here, we have been using it in relation to research.

Is it not essentially and plainly the inductive method as against the deductive method? And before you answer, I want to make one statement in regard to your statement, in which I think you rather gave the impression that the staff or Mr. Dodd or someone connected with the committee meant to derogate empiricism as a method of inquiry. I want to assure you that the staff is fully aware that empiricism is not only desirable but a necessary component of scientific research. We quite realize that. Our only concern in that area is whether there has been an excess, in the sense that empirical studies which did not take into account what you might speak of as some of the premises in a sound syllogism. But to illuminate Mr. Goodwin further, aren't we talking about primarily research methods? And there, isn't it induction against deduction?

Mr. Herring. I tried to develop that in my statement. I don't think I would agree with that. I tried to spell it out in the statement. I think that would be an oversimplification.

Mr. Wormser. An oversimplification?

Mr. Herring. Well, I don't see quite, Mr. Chairman—pardon my saying so, but there is a question that Mrs. Pfost raised some time ago, and I haven't gotten through with it. We are getting over to philosophy of knowledge, and she was saying, “Where are these people living?”

You remember, she said, “Where are these social scientists, and where are they employed?”

So, if I may go back to that original question, I would like to do so.

Well, they are employed in our universities and colleges in teaching, and we may think of that first. But I want to emphasize that while you cannot say with precision just what percentage are employed outside of our universities, I think it would be reasonably accurate to say about 40 percent of these people are engaged in activities where they apply their training as social scientists not in the classroom but in the marketplace. They are employed by business, in market analysis. They are employed by Government, and a whole host of agencies where economic analysis and other forms of analyses are necessary. So I do not want you to think of this group as strictly a professional group. They are engaged in many businesses and public agencies.

The Chairman. If I might interject, with reference to procedure, it is now 4 o'clock, and some members of the committee have some engagements, and some work has to be done in the offices.
Mr. Koch. I think Mr. Herring is willing to be here tomorrow. As far as we are concerned, we recognize that we have a real expert as a witness today, and also he is a very agreeable witness to deal with, and we feel that if we go into these various criticisms with him thoroughly, maybe the examination of succeeding foundations may not be so long. And we would like very much to get the benefit of all of the education that he can give us on this. All of which adds up to this: that I would like to examine him for a couple of hours tomorrow at least. That is why we can’t finish with him tonight.

The Chairman. It is convenient for you to be here tomorrow?

Mr. Herring. Quite convenient. And if it is as pleasant an experience as today, I would be delighted.

Mr. Hays. Then you have 2 hours of questioning?

Mr. Koch. Yes.

Mr. Hays. We had better plan on being here all day, then.

The Chairman. I think you have made a very splendid presentation. I know you are a man of very great ability, with a splendid background and training.

There was just one sentence in your statement that I thought was out of cast, Doctor.

Mr. Herring. I would appreciate knowing what it is.

The Chairman. You have made an analytical study of the statement that was presented by a member of the staff. One is impressed by it. But what appeared to me to be out of cast in your statement was your characterization of the individual.

For example, beginning with the last sentence on page 5:

The most charitable explanation that comes to mind is that they speak from ignorance rather than malice.

That is not like you.

And the other is on page 3, referring to the work of the staff as—symptomatic of a troubled state of mind on the part of a few persons * * *

I do not think that is characteristic of a man of your position and great capacity. Because you are interested in analyzing what was presented, and not analyzing the individuals who presented it. And I rather regret that you permitted those two sentences to creep into your statement.

As you grow older you become more understanding of people who differ, and I seldom take exception to people differing with me.

The committee will meet in this same room tomorrow morning at 10 o’clock.

Mr. Hays. May I make a minute statement about Dr. Herring’s statement?

I would just like to compliment you on your statement, Doctor, and say that I was especially pleased to see that you took a positive approach to this problem rather than a negative approach; that you did not spend a lot of time quoting a lot of paragraphs in answer to a lot of allegations that have been made about the foundations. And I do not really refer so much to the staff’s reports as I do to some of the witnesses who have made some fantastic charges, which have failed to stand on their own feet, because of the absence of any fact. I am very happy that you did not waste any time refuting those things, which had already fallen flat on their face, but that you did take a positive approach.
Now, I am sure that from what little I know about you and have been able to find out, you did not mean to hurt anybody's feelings by any statement that you made, and as far as saying something about someone's troubled state of mind, I do not feel there is any implication involved there. As a matter of fact, I was rather amazed to notice that one of the great dailies picked up a phrase that I had more or less pulled out of thin air. I called some of this testimony "a plot psychosis," in which some people apparently could see a great plot on the part of some of these foundations to reorient the whole social-science field. And I certainly meant no implication by that. It was just an effort on my part to try to describe the situation as I saw it. And I am certainly not trying to put words in your mouth. And I feel, for the benefit of the staff, Mr. Reece, Mr. Goodwin, or anyone else, that the words "troubled state of mind" were simply an attempt on your part to describe the picture as you saw it, and that you certainly did not mean any implication or bad connotation or unfavorable impression to be left.

The Chairman. I would not take exception to being said to have "a troubled state of mind." A man who does not have a troubled state of mind in these days is abnormal, I think.

The committee stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. (Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the hearing was adjourned until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 17, 1954.)