

THE ATTACK ON UNESCO: 1957-1957

Draft submitted May 2, 1963  
To Prof. Lawrence A. Cremin  
By Robert Mc Clintock

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: THE INGREDIENTS OF THE ATTACK ON UNESCO	5
CHAPTER III: LOS ANGELES AND EDUCATION AND UNESCO	21
CHAPTER IV: THE AMERICAN LEGION — PATRIOTISM AND UNESCO	42
CHAPTER V: THE GROWTH OF DIALOGUE OVER UNESCO	65
FOOTNOTES	71

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The Congressional Record serves as a useful indicator of the issues the agitate "We, the People" -- provided, of course, that one is not particular about statistical correlates. Session by session, its "Index" reveals popular concerns by the expansion and contraction of the entries beneath its many headings. The listings under the United Nations display these fluctuations. A casual examination shows that during the late 1940's many people were concerned with strengthening the United Nations. Some even talked of making it an effective ~~global~~ government. Examination of the entries for the early 1950's indicates that similar interest was devoted to the proposition that the United States should weaken, or withdraw from, the United Nations. Within this shift of opinion, one finds that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization rose from near obscurity when world government was in favor to a strange infamy when internationalism was under attack. During the 1949 session of Congress there were only four references to UNESCO. All of them were favorable. But each year from 1952 through 1956, the Congressional Record printed a wealth of material from pressure groups and ~~thousands of~~ citizens interested in UNESCO. Most of these words were impassioned attacks on one or another facet of the institution. The defenses of the organization were slow in coming and generally lacked the mysterious vitality and awareness a winning cause must have. A denounced Devil that persist in acting benignly can not long remain the Devil in the

eyes of most people. In the long run that was UNESCO's best defense.

From October 1951 through mid 1956, UNESCO was subject to sharp attack throughout the nation. This attack was brought to bear in two main ways. The first was the involvement of UNESCO in the widespread questioning of the public schools during the early 1950's. The questioners aimed to achieve specific, local results. Sometimes these results were the removal of real or imagined "internationalist" influences from the schools. These were blamed on UNESCO. This type of attack was generally local, sometimes ineffective, or very quickly a complete success. Therefore, its full history is partly lost and partly beyond the scope of this essay. Because it happened as dominantly local events, its record is kept best in local sources. It is a question ~~because~~ the "papers of record" did not give full coverage. Only those were fully available for the research of this essay. Therefore it was necessary to concentrate on the most widely publicized school-UNESCO controversy, which occurred in Los Angeles from 1951 through 1954. Discussion of it will occupy about one third of the essay. The effort will be made to narrate what happened and ~~to~~ find the reasons why it happened. In order to facilitate the achievement of this understanding, another school controversy, in Pasadena, California, ~~during~~ 1949-50, will be examined in less detail. While UNESCO was only marginally involved, it is of interest because all the ~~arguments~~ of the eventual attack on UNESCO were involved except for the anti-UNESCO ideology that was put to be formulated and disseminated. This ideology was created in October 1951 and widely distributed

in the months afterward. The plan of the next two chapters will be, therefore, as follows: Chapter Two will describe the ingredients of the attack on UNESCO by examining the pattern of the attack on the Pasadena schools and the anti-UNESCO ideology put forth by the American Flag Committee "Report to the American People on UNESCO;" Chapter Three will be a longer description and analysis of the school-UNESCO controversy in Los Angeles.

From 1951 to 1956 another, related attack on UNESCO was common. UNESCO offended many patriots. Most patriotic organizations passed resolutions expressing disapproval of various alleged activities of UNESCO. It took little time for a fear of UNESCO to develop among patriots once someone suggested that UNESCO should be feared. The charges of the "Report to the American People on UNESCO" were quickly taken up, expanded and refined. One after another, the patriotic organizations, large and small, went on record as opposed to UNESCO or its supporters. With respect to the patriotic attack on UNESCO this essay will examine first the general lines the opposition took. It will be established that the patriotic organizations were widely on record as opposed to UNESCO and that the opposition tended to be on the same grounds among all of them. Then the opposition of the American Legion will be examined in detail. From 1955 to 1975 the Legion passed four resolutions on the national level opposing UNESCO. The effort will be made to narrate and analyze the development of these national resolutions, bringing in state and local Legion opinion where relevant. The Legion attack is of special interest for several reasons. There was a significant minority in

the Legion in favor of UNESCO that effected Legion policy. Under this effect the stand the Legion took came to diverge from that common to most patriotic groups. It also became the most widely known of the attacks on UNESCO; and it failed. To learn why, in the long run the Legion attack on UNESCO failed, it is necessary to analyze its policy development with knowledge of what happened in Los Angeles. Chapter Four, therefore, will not only present material on the patriotic organizations and the American Legion, but will draw on material given in previous chapters.

While the attack on UNESCO has died down in the late 1950's and early 1960's it can be shown to be still alive in the more vitriolic journals of the American right-wing. Furthermore, it can be shown that the failure of the attack came not from the brilliance of UNESCO's defense. It was the result of tactical errors by UNESCO opponents and the change of certain factors beyond the control of either group. In the light of this it might prove prudent to speculate on how UNESCO might defend itself against attacks such as those examined below. This speculation is given in Chapter Five in the form of a policy proposal for UNESCO. This proposal is advanced with the realization that UNESCO is an organization whose first need is not for new ideas of potential projects. But the proposal will at least be useful for making a point about the conditions of the realization of UNESCO's ideals in a highly politicized world, and; who knows? perhaps....

CHAPTER II: THE INGREDIENTS OF THE ATTACK ON UNESCO

The first ~~of the~~ nationally publicized "attacks" on public education" happened in Pasadena, California. ~~From~~ April through November, of 1950, strong local pressure first defeated a needed change in the school-tax structure, and ~~then~~ forced the resignation of the Superintendent of Schools. The attack was the first ~~of a~~ ~~series~~ of similar occurrences in Englewood, N.J.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Houston, Texas; Denver, Colo.; Eugene, Or.; and other localities.<sup>1</sup> ~~This~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~beginning~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~involvement~~ ~~of~~ ~~UNESCO~~ ~~in~~ ~~attacks~~ ~~on~~ ~~public~~ ~~school~~ ~~systems.~~

Willard E. Goslin, President of the American Association of School Administrators, was hired on April 22, 1948, as the Superintendent of Schools by the Pasadena Board of Education.<sup>2</sup> Goslin was given a four year contract after considerable discussion between him and the Board members clarifying what each expected of the other. July 25, 1948 Goslin took office. He ~~was~~ found Pasadena's school system, widely noted as one of the best in the nation, ~~was~~ facing heavy expansion pressures on its plant and personnel. ~~A~~ \$5,000,000 bond issue was easily passed, personnel changes were made, and plans for a "core program" and "in-service training" set underway. In the spring of 1950 it became clear the ~~growing~~ ~~system~~ ~~could~~ ~~not~~ ~~continue~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~financed~~ ~~by~~ ~~the~~ ~~present~~ ~~school-tax~~ ~~structure.~~ ~~At~~ ~~Superintendent~~ ~~Goslin's~~ ~~recommendation~~ ~~the~~ ~~Board~~ ~~of~~ ~~Education~~ ~~on~~ ~~April~~ ~~22,~~ ~~1950,~~ ~~as~~ ~~the~~ ~~date~~ ~~for~~ ~~a~~ ~~vote~~ ~~on~~

a proposal to raise the tax levy limit by fifty percent.<sup>3</sup>

Meanwhile, this rapid series of changes in the educational system had <sup>become</sup> the focus for ~~some of the most~~ <sup>public</sup> dissent. In early 1949 some citizens had organized the School Development Council. The Council <sup>was</sup> conservative; interested in guarding against "socialists," upholding the American way, and keeping the school budget as low as possible. <sup>in the</sup> ~~late~~ summer of 1949 the Council managed to have the funds for pre-term training cut from \$100,000 to \$30,000.<sup>4</sup> Aside from this, the School Development Council ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> little activity <sup>up</sup> to the announcement of the school-tax vote.

The Independent, Pasadena's tabloid newspaper, had invited parents <sup>to send letters</sup> ~~to write~~ in their complaints concerning the schools. Several <sup>The School Development Council received</sup> weeks before the tax vote was announced, the list of these dissatisfied parents <sup>was</sup> ~~given~~ <sup>to</sup> the School Development Council.<sup>5</sup> They were <sup>many</sup> ~~not~~ invited to the Council's meetings. ~~This~~ <sup>She</sup> revitalized the School Development Council. A new president was elected, Frank Wells. He attended the April 12 meeting of the Board of Education in which the tax vote was ~~not~~ <sup>announced</sup>. At the next meeting he demanded ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> vote be postponed. The School Development Council wanted more time to study the proposal. <sup>The</sup> ~~the~~ request was denied. <sup>It</sup> was obvious the Council's attitude was set against the tax increase and for a return to "basic subjects" in education. "We believe that education in Pasadena needs not only our dollars, but our principles and our personal time and interest, and ~~this we are going to give you...~~"<sup>6</sup> In practice, the application of their principles would ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> cut back the school program



that no addition of their dollars would be needed. A hasty budget analysis commissioned by the Council concluded \$225,000 could be cut from the <sup>existing</sup> present budget. No tax increase was necessary. By a vigorous campaign for financial parsimony justified by anti-<sup>propaganda</sup> <sup>against progressive education,</sup> progressive education propaganda, the School Development Council laid the defeat of the tax proposal. <sup>by</sup> the vote was overwhelming: 10,052 "for" and 22,210 "against."<sup>7</sup>

The defeat of the tax proposal did not resolve the conflict <sup>which</sup> that had been set in motion by the anti-progressive education justification for voting "No." If progressive education was so bad, something should be done about it. ~~What~~, In the world of reality, Pasadena's school system had been "progressive" for over twenty years, a real change would be drastic. ~~Therefore~~, It was expedient <sup>for</sup> that the anti-progressive campaign discover a less realistic threat. <sup>Threat</sup> This was found in Superintendent of Schools Goslin and his <sup>recent</sup> adjustments of the system <sup>to meet various problems.</sup> Goslin was attacked. He was accused of <sup>having</sup> ~~being~~ a socialist, Professor William Heard Kilpatrick, ~~to~~ speak to the in-service training groups. The School Development Council demanded that the "political-social aims" of the school administration, curriculum, and personnel be <sup>conducted</sup> investigated by the Board of Education under the direction of the local chapters of the American Legion, the Sons, and the Daughters of the American Revolution.<sup>8</sup>

Pressure against Goslin mounted during the fall of 1950. <sup>beginning of November</sup> ~~On November 9~~ <sup>the</sup> Board of Education sent <sup>him</sup> a telegram to Goslin, <sup>his resignation.</sup> requesting him to resign. The Board

had agreed on this course. <sup>They said</sup> ~~But~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~basic reason was that~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~controversy had come to settle upon Goslin,~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~feeling that this~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~public should have the opportunity to take a position~~ <sup>He</sup> ~~on,~~ <sup>he</sup> ~~public~~ released the telegram to the press. A large group of Pasadena citizens felt the Board was treating the ~~Board~~ <sup>Board</sup> shabbily. They formed a Committee on Public Education which lobbied for Goslin's retention. At the same time California's Senate Investigating ~~Committee~~ <sup>probe for</sup> on Education came to ~~inquire~~ <sup>inquire</sup> about subversive influences in Pasadena schools.<sup>9</sup> Neither of these developments affected Goslin's tenure as Superintendent. He resigned on November 20 when efforts <sup>failed</sup> by citizens <sup>failed</sup> to persuade the Board to ~~change~~ <sup>change</sup> its request. ~~Failed.~~ <sup>Failed.</sup> A superintendent should not stand, Goslin said, "... in contempt of the elected representatives of the community..."<sup>10</sup>

Analysis of the controversy in Pasadena often stress the conservative resistance to rising property taxes and the growth of racial minorities in the area. These were of basic importance; <sup>usually</sup> for a study of the attacks on UNESCO, it is more profitable to examine the modes of reasoning employed <sup>during</sup> in the ~~controversy~~ <sup>controversy</sup> ~~after~~ <sup>after</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~controversy~~ <sup>controversy</sup> than to look at such basic causes of the controversy as those mentioned above.

Educators <sup>found</sup> ~~found~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~attack~~ <sup>attack</sup> in Pasadena and other localities by ~~finding~~ <sup>finding</sup> beneath their ~~similar~~ <sup>similar</sup> pattern a conspiracy against public education. ~~Certain~~ <sup>Certain</sup> Quasi-Fascist publicists were seen fomenting attacks on local school systems by playing <sup>on</sup> ~~fears~~ <sup>fears</sup> of conservatives for both traditionalism and their bank account.<sup>11</sup>

The plot theory could not stand for long and came under heavy criticism

in 1952. But the idea <sup>of</sup> that there was a pattern to the attacks is ~~very~~ useful, for in Pasadena and throughout the attack on UNESCO there is a failure of communication which produces the characteristic unreasonableness that <sup>was</sup> in the pattern <sup>to</sup> of the attacks. The educators turned to a plot theory for an explanation <sup>and</sup> because <sup>that</sup> only conspirators could persist in acting so irrationally. <sup>But there was no conspiracy.</sup> ~~But~~ The key to understanding the situation is ~~to realize~~ that both sides believed in their reasonableness and questioned that of their opponents. Their sources of evidence, the direction of their questioning differed. ~~In short,~~ they were neighbors in different worlds.

The attack was ~~essentially~~ a local controversy. The local personality of the participants was involved. The national prestige of Gealin <sup>meant</sup> ~~made~~ little <sup>little</sup> difference <sup>to</sup> with his opponents. While general issues infused the rhetoric of the attack, it focused on local questions, relating them to general issues when expedient. The opponents of the tax proposal did not start from the conviction that progressive education was a bane to the nation and, therefore, it was their duty as ~~the~~ citizens to strike a blow at that cancer through the Pasadena tax vote. On the contrary, the human relations program, the summer workshops, <sup>and</sup> liberals, re-seeing, and - above all - increasing school budgets and taxes were ~~not~~ liked. ~~When~~ <sup>was</sup> asked why these these bad things had come to be, it was answered that ever since Superintendent Gealin and progressive Education came to town the evil had spread. In that way the general theory is introduced into the local controversy, concretely manifested in the local presence of Willard Gealin.

This local orientation of the attacks explains, at least in part, why the defense against the attacks was not more effective. Those susceptible to the appeals of the attack concentrated on the local ~~appeals~~ involved subjects. They judged on the basis of immediate evidence. Those who were not susceptible to the attacks tended to discount the local specifics in terms of the wider whole. They would reason that ~~if~~ progressive education was <sup>could not be so</sup> all that bad, if ~~for~~ Pasadena and the nation <sup>permitted</sup> got along with it for so long <sup>presumably in the</sup> ~~that~~, many would dismiss the whole controversy as essentially inane. Likewise, they would <sup>reason that</sup> ~~not~~ how could a man as wrongheaded and incompetent as Goslin <sup>could not</sup> be said to have risen to the professional stature he had attained.<sup>12</sup>

This ~~discrepancy~~ in the <sup>was</sup> possession of judgment ~~is~~ reflected in the various reactions to the two major outside influences in the controversy: William Heard Kilpatrick and Allen G. Zell, an anti-progressive pamphleteer. In both cases ~~there~~ the real or imagined influence of these two men in Pasadena ~~was~~ caused concern. But the basis on which that influence was criticized or defended ~~is~~ <sup>reveals</sup> differing styles of thought <sup>revealing</sup> of the point here at issue.

Professor Kilpatrick spoke to a select group at the 1949 Summer Workshop. His lectures were widely reported <sup>and</sup> published by the schools in a small volume called We Learn What We Live. Soon he was being accused of having impinged patriotism and of advocating liberal, un-American ideas to the teachers of Pasadena. The conservative <sup>reaction</sup> ~~was~~ that he propounded <sup>these</sup> ~~his~~ ideas to "our" teachers.<sup>13</sup> <sup>contrary</sup> to this, those who <sup>depended</sup> ~~upheld~~ Kilpatrick's presence

in Pasadena appealed to his national reputation. <sup>For instance</sup> ~~when the Board~~  
 of Education and Gealin were asked to suppress the text of Kilpatrick's  
 lectures, they refused, by saying "the board and administration knew  
 only Dr. Kilpatrick's unquestioned reputation as one of a number of  
 outstanding figures in contemporary American education."<sup>14</sup>

The difference may best be explained as a tendency among  
 the attackers <sup>to</sup> judge local specifics and to quote broader generalities  
 to support their local judgment. ~~They~~ <sup>They</sup> ~~of his~~ ~~lectures~~ ~~have~~ ~~had~~ ~~implications~~ <sup>to the teachers</sup> ~~His un-American citations~~  
 bear this out. Those not susceptible to these attacks tended to  
 judge broad generalities and to quote local specifics to support  
 their judgment. 'Since Kilpatrick is a leader in American education,  
 he will make a good lecturer at our workshop. The ~~general~~ satisfaction  
 of those who took part indicates the validity of this judgment.'  
 This divergence of intellectual tendencies ~~is~~ reflected in the different  
 reactions to the influence of Allen K. Zell.<sup>15</sup>

Zell became involved in the Pasadena controversy through <sup>when the school</sup>  
~~the use of one of his pamphlets~~ "Progressive Education Increases  
 Delinquency." This pamphlet attacked progressive education, claiming  
 it was an effort to train children for a ~~type~~ <sup>type</sup> of society that did not  
 exist in America. ~~Because of this educational irrelevancy,~~ <sup>Because of this educational irrelevancy,</sup> ~~students~~  
~~prone to delinquency.~~ <sup>students</sup> ~~Therefore, they were~~ <sup>because</sup>  
 prone to delinquency.<sup>16</sup> The pamphlet was distributed and quoted by  
 the School Development Council.<sup>17</sup> ~~It is clear~~ <sup>It is clear</sup> ~~the Zell material was~~  
~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> opportuntely fit the needs of the School Development  
 Council's argument. The local judgment that school taxes should not

rise was buttressed by quoting the generalities in support of it; progressive education is bad, it increased delinquency and many other undesirable consequences, we should not pay for it. <sup>it</sup> Dr. Brewer, the successor to Wells as president of the <sup>was</sup> ~~School Development Council~~ Council, said: "we ran across the pamphlet, we read the contents, we agreed thoroughly with ~~the contents of~~ the pamphlet, and we felt it would be proper literature for us to use at our meetings...."<sup>18</sup> It was, they felt, a good general source to quote <sup>in order</sup> at their meetings to help attain the defeat of the tax proposal. In their favorite slogan, "Progressive Education Means Progressive Taxation,"<sup>19</sup> the immediate impact of the latter part was the controlling factor.

~~The conspiracy interpretation of the Pasadena controversy~~  
~~has obscured the original reaction of those for the tax to the use~~  
~~of the Zoll material by their opponents. The conspiracy interpretation~~  
 pictures Zoll and other extremists fomenting the attack by the distribution of their pamphlets and the undercover organization of local groups such as the School Development Council. It is an absurd theory invented <sup>in the late</sup> after the tax vote to explain the "liberal" <sup>in the late</sup> defeat. The original reaction ~~by those who opposed the tax proposal~~ to the tax proposal was quite different. Goslin said: "All of these attacks have been a smoke screen. The point has long since passed where we are debating honest differences of how much money we will spend for education."<sup>20</sup> A general proposition was up for judgment, that the school system <sup>needed</sup> needs more money. Goslin, and those backing him, judged more money was necessary. The appeal against them to generalities about progressive education was irrelevant. <sup>1-7-70</sup> "Additional children,

higher costs, larger classes and double sessions are facts.<sup>21</sup> Zoll's quasi-Fascist background was given, but not stressed <sup>emphatically</sup> in the days preceding the tax vote. It was ~~not until~~ two weeks after the vote that the Zoll literature was strongly criticized by the defeated Yes-voters.<sup>22</sup> Before the vote, Goslin pointed to the specifics of enrolment, operating costs, and tax revenues. "The basic facts ... necessitate an increase in the elementary tax rate."<sup>23</sup> The attacks on progressive education were irrelevant generalities.<sup>24</sup>

The opponents of the tax proposal started from their personal judgment concerning the tax burden ~~on the system~~ justified ~~the proposal~~ to general criticism of the system of education. The proponents of the tax proposal made the general judgment that the schools needed more money and justified it by reference to the specifics of revenue, costs, and population.

This divergence of intellectual orientation apparent in ~~the two sides of~~ the Pasadena controversy <sup>will be</sup> important <sup>throughout</sup> for the ~~entire~~ study of the attack on UNESCO. This shall become clear ~~below~~. Here it is necessary to stress that neither orientation has a monopoly over intellectual efficacy. The genius of the western intellectual tradition may be ~~considered to be~~ the continuing tension between the two methods of working from the specific to the general and ~~from~~ the general to the specific. The interchange between these two methods has been the permanent dialogue of our civilization. The danger of a controversy <sup>The Pasadena</sup> like that in Pasadena <sup>was</sup> is not that one side or another wrongly exists. The danger <sup>lies</sup> is in the lack of communication between the two fundamental intellectual orientations

which tends to break the <sup>community</sup> ~~enterprise~~ from its traditional line of development. In Pasadena, neither side was free of responsibility for this lack of communication.

The School Development Council has received a very unfavorable press, which has not been helped by the extravagances of its defenders such as Mary L. Allen.<sup>25</sup> Despite its exaggerated suspicions, its demagogic tendencies, and its anti-social purposes, the Council should not be rejected as easily as it has been. Its negative manifestations <sup>were</sup> seem invalid. But its positive side, then lost in the noise, <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ much less extreme and closer to the mainstream than its opponents were willing to grant at the time.

We are alarmed and deeply concerned over the program of education as it is being developed in this community. We feel that definite steps must be taken to develop a program of teaching and learning that will produce boys and girls who are better prepared to function adequately in all they do. This involves a more thorough mastery of the fundamental tools in addition to the ways they will be used.

We believe the best way of attaining this is in classes where the basic subjects, taught thoroughly and individually, make up the bulk of the activity.... When we mention subjects we refer to English, reading, spelling, penmanship, geography, civics, historical background of American life, and the sciences.

We believe that grades are the best measure of a pupil's achievement and should be maintained in as objective a manner as possible.... We further believe that if teachers could be relieved from so many 'meetings' to devote time to their actual class work or to relaxation, that better results would be obtained in the classroom learning situation....<sup>26</sup>

Today, such a program would be considered open to debate over "honest differences." Advanced on a platform of opposition to school-tax increases, it is bizarre, out of place, and ill-timed. But as an



educational possibility, the program was not outside the legitimate line of debate. On the contrary, time has put it in the very center of the mainstream.

This is a significant ~~feature~~ to keep in mind while treating the attacks on UNESCO. These are very easily ~~passed~~ *frustrated* with partisan outrage at the unnecessary deprecation of high ideals. *But* there are different ways to look at the same problem, both of which partake of truth and falsehood. The dialogue of these ~~different~~ methods constitutes the ~~actual~~ process of development. The purpose of this essay is to bring the opponents of UNESCO into actual dialogue with it, not in the hearty good cheer of uncritical agreement, but by seeing what the opponents say and why so that UNESCO may ~~learn~~ *hear* from it.

*The attack on Pasadena is a result of a progressive education*  
UNESCO was involved in the ~~attack on~~ *started* progressive education *at* Pasadena. One of the summer workshops ~~begun~~ by Goslin concerned UNESCO.<sup>27</sup> It came under the criticism of his opponents. Goslin ~~himself~~ was criticized before the California Senate Investigating Committee on Education for affiliations with UNESCO.<sup>28</sup> These were minor attacks, incidental points upon which Goslin and the Pasadena school system could be criticized. They were easily cited, and those who did not like UNESCO, who vaguely felt it was a un-American institution, would accept *it* as a further indication of the ill-times descending on Pasadena.

The criticism of UNESCO shows ~~that~~ there was animosity towards it on the local level. But there was lacking a general theory to which appeal for proof could be made. There was no equivalent of

the theory that progressive education <sup>caused delinquency</sup> ~~is bad~~ ~~At that time~~ right-wing literature <sup>secretly noticed</sup> made ~~little note~~ of the involvement of UNESCO in the Pasadena controversy. For instance, Ames A. Fries, in the July, 1951 issue of his Friends of the Public Schools, indicated that ~~it~~ ~~was~~ no ~~defense~~ of progressive education for the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education <sup>could not defend progressive education by showing</sup> to allow that UNESCO was a subject of the Pasadena attack.<sup>29</sup> He ~~may~~ <sup>probably</sup> have felt ~~that~~ the mention of UNESCO in the Commission's recently published ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup>  Pasadena Story was an effort to make the critics of progressive education ~~appear~~ ~~not~~ ~~like~~ ~~crackpots~~.<sup>30</sup> Fries wrote before the American Flag Committee had articulated the theory of UNESCO's ~~conspiracy~~ <sup>plot to subvert</sup> of the subversion of the United States.

"The Report ~~to~~ the American People on UNESCO" was ~~published~~ ~~in~~ ~~October~~, 1951. As an introduction, ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~valuable~~ to see the effect of this theory on the importance ~~a~~ ~~descriptive~~ ~~writer~~ placed on the <sup>Editorial 1951 Times Magazine - Write from ~~Frank Ferrer~~ ~~James Ferrer~~ does not refer to</sup> critics of UNESCO in Pasadena. <sup>Mary L. Allen stresses the UNESCO</sup> <sup>In Miss Mary L. Allen's ~~book~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~UNESCO~~</sup> "danger" in her anti-Godlin analysis of the Pasadena controversy,<sup>31</sup> Education or Indoctrination, she devoted two pages to setting forth "the UNESCO plan for world domination through education."<sup>31</sup> ~~Discussing~~ the criticism of UNESCO in Pasadena, she notes that it was minor. She stated that the educational implications of the "presence" of UNESCO in Pasadena "were either not presented or not recognized by the citizenry." She continued: "There was some evidence that the schools were being used to sell UNESCO, a policy which created widespread furor in Los Angeles under Superintendent Stoddard...." She attributed the lack of such furor in Pasadena to the greater

subtlety with which the program was introduced ~~shown~~

~~There were~~ <sup>were present</sup> Most of the needed ingredients for a furor over UNESCO in Pasadena. But it was not the subtlety of the UNESCO program that prevented this upheaval. <sup>See</sup> That system of ideas that lead Mary Allen to read <sup>back</sup> into the Pasadena situation <sup>(a subtle arm of</sup> the UNESCO plan for world domination <sup>which</sup> did not exist at the time the Pasadena controversy was in full swing. The incident ~~preceded~~ <sup>the</sup> anti-UNESCO literature. No group could happen upon a pamphlet, read it, and find their animus against UNESCO corroborated as the School Development Council did in the <sup>in the way</sup> ~~anti~~ <sup>pamphlets by Zell against</sup> progressive education pamphlets ~~by Zell~~. Such literature soon came.

The American Flag Committee was organized by W. Henry MacFarland, Jr., in August, 1950 to combat efforts to strengthen the United Nations. MacFarland had many connections with the most extreme of the post-war nationalist organizations; with Gerald L.K. Smith, chief of the anti-Semitic Christian Nationalist Crusade and its monthly publication The Cross and the Flag, and with Conde Mc Ginley, editor of Common Sense, a short monthly devoted to anti-Semitic attacks on the UN.<sup>33</sup> These organizations had ~~been~~ <sup>been</sup> agitating for some time without much success. But response was picking up. The frustrating war in Korea had <sup>yielded to more</sup> moved into more frustrating armistice negotiations which showed every indication of leading to a peace without victory. The popularity of the United Nations and everything connected with it was declining. In this atmosphere of October, 1951, the American Flag Committee hit upon an odd, but winning, combination. Its Philadelphia Newsletter, No. 13, was the "Report to the American People on UNESCO." 34

The "UNESCO Report," at first, had a small readership, estimated at under a thousand.<sup>35</sup> The "Report" impressed one of these readers, the Honorable John T. Wood, United States Representative from the First District of Idaho. He inserted the full text of the "UNESCO Report" in the Appendix of the Congressional Record, entitling it "The Greatest Subversive Plot in History." Wood ~~went out of his way~~ <sup>frankly called</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>Report on UNESCO</sup> attract attention to the "UNESCO Report." He mentioned it a few days later in his "Remarks."<sup>36</sup> His Washington Impressions, <sup>a weekly</sup> ~~weekly~~ message to his constituents, told of the availability of the "UNESCO Report."<sup>37</sup> Its widespread distribution was underway. By the late spring of 1952 ~~it has been estimated that~~ <sup>begin</sup> over 500,000 reprints of "The Greatest Subversive Plot in History" were in circulation.<sup>38</sup> Not until April 1, 1952, was the veracity of the UNESCO Report <sup>Report on UNESCO</sup> disputed in the House of Representatives, when the Hon. A. S. J. Carnahan, Rep. from Missouri, pointed out the distortions of the "Report."<sup>39</sup> Three days later Wood replied: "The internationalists, unable to deny or refute the report of the American Flag Committee, are resorting to the shop-worn left-wing technique of shrieking 'isolationist' and 'Fascist'.... Copies ... will be mailed on request."<sup>40</sup>

What would the interested citizen receive if he requested a copy? Above the Congressional Record masthead ~~was~~ <sup>over</sup> Wood's title, "The Greatest Subversive Plot in History." Wood enthusiastically introduced the "Report": "Mr. Speaker....

Just how careless and unthinking can we be that we permit this band of spies and traitors to exist another day in this land we all love! Are there no limits to our callousness and neglect of palpable and evident treason stalking rampant

through our land, warping the minds and imaginations of even our little children, to the lying propaganda and palpable untruths we allow to be fed to them through this monstrous poison!<sup>41</sup>

*Report on UNESCO* by *University*  
The "~~UNESCO Report~~" opened with the assertion that UNESCO was a subversive organization. "It is consciously furthering a campaign calculated to pervert the teaching profession in this country, and so destroy the worth and integrity of America's first bulwark of freedom -- our tax supported schools."<sup>42</sup> It was argued ~~that~~ proof of this intention appeared in the nine (now twelve) volumes of Towards World Understanding, a series of booklets <sup>or pamphlets</sup> published by UNESCO. <sup>These reports</sup> that report the proceedings of some international seminars on education, <sup>sponsored by UNESCO</sup> by taking various short quotations from these pamphlets, mainly Volume V, "In the Classroom with Children Under Thirteen Years of Age," the ~~"Report on UNESCO"~~ <sup>"Report on UNESCO"</sup> claims to "prove" that ~~UNESCO's pedagogy is~~ <sup>UNESCO's pedagogy is</sup> ~~subversive.~~ <sup>subversive.</sup> Its central contention is that UNESCO's pedagogy, applied to American education, would involve the elimination of "any and all words, phrases, descriptions, pictures, images, classroom material or teaching methods of a sort causing ... pupils to feel or express a particular love for, or loyalty to, the United States of America."<sup>43</sup> <sup>The "Report on UNESCO" also reported</sup> ~~It was stated in the UNESCO Report~~ that those who doubted or disagreed would refer to the disclaimer printed by UNESCO in the pamphlets. UNESCO said that the opinions in the booklets were to be attributed to the authors, not the publishers. This presented little difficulty. "If this weak-kneed attempt ~~to~~ avoid responsibility is brought to your attention by a UNESCO apologist, tell him that one who administers poison to a Nation's youth is guilty of a crime, whether the prescription is official or other."<sup>44</sup>

The "UNESCO Report" asked local groups to "prepare your own report and submit it to your local school board." It continued: "Introduce the matter before your parent-teacher association. Interview the teachers in your community.... Join with the American Flag Committee.... Help safeguard our American system of public education from infiltration and undermining by UNESCO's America-hatred propagandists."<sup>45</sup>

This advice was taken seriously by groups in Los Angeles similar to those <sup>such</sup> that had attacked the schools in Pasadena.

CHAPTER III: LOS ANGELES -- EDUCATION AND UNESCO

During October 24, 1951 opposition to the United Nations appeared in Los Angeles. It was United Nations Day, the celebration of the sixth birthday of the world institution. The City of Los Angeles held a ceremony in which the accomplishments of the U.N. were recognized and a Book of Valor, to cite the honor of those who died fighting in Korea beneath the U.N. Flag, was opened. The ceremony was marred only by a small group of picketers who stalked outside the Town Hall, carrying placards such as "Kick the U.N. Out of the United States!" and "U.N. Means National Suicide." After the civic ceremony had finished, the picketers held their own meeting. Few but their own members came.<sup>1</sup> At the meeting Miss Florence Fowler Lyons gave a speech on subversion in the Los Angeles Public Schools.<sup>2</sup> Her speech showed the influence of the "UNESCO Report" which Congressman Wood had recently inserted in the Congressional Record. She linked the Los Angeles Curriculum Division publication, The E in UNESCO, with the UNESCO publications, Towards World Understanding, arguing that both were evidence that UNESCO had infiltrated the Los Angeles schools with subversive teachings.<sup>3</sup> This line was picked up by the Hearst papers in Los Angeles and given considerable copy.

The next day Lyons spoke to the Southern California Republican Women. She focused her attack on The E in UNESCO. The cost of the publication was exorbitant. It was printed in quality paper. She condemned its bibliographical reference to authors and works cited

for "Communist front affiliations" by the California Senate Investigating Committee on Education.<sup>4</sup> She harkened back to the good fight they had had in getting rid of the textbook series Building America. Now these were new books. "I charge that there is open advocacy of one-world government in these books. Our children are being trained not as citizens of American but as faceless citizens of the world."<sup>5</sup> Miss Lyons stood before the Republican women, a blackboard behind her carefully charted with the subversive steps UNESCO was taking in Los Angeles, a copy of The E in UNESCO in her hand.<sup>6</sup> "Children are daily being fed doses of Communism, Socialism, New Dealism and other isms."<sup>7</sup> UNESCO was under attack.

Perhaps strong, immediate debunking could have stopped the attack before it was established. The Los Angeles Times did get the reaction of the Los Angeles Curriculum Division to the speech by Lyons. This rebuttal said the schools has a duty to deal with the facts of the world. The U.N. and UNESCO were facts; and, therefore, the schools dealt with them factually. This was convincing, but it was buried at the end of the article reporting Lyons' talk.<sup>8</sup> No headlines pointed to it, no picture high lighted it, no editorial position was taken. The Hearst papers did even less. Instead, they played up the accusations by daily running little exposes of "subversive" quotations such as those used in the "UNESCO Report."<sup>9</sup> Before any opposition to the attacks formed, the Board of Education was involved. On October 26 it was asked to halt all teaching about the U.N. and UNESCO.<sup>10</sup> This gave the attack a focus. Agitation



would continue, but the agitation now had a purpose. It had become a campaign to remove the U.N. and UNESCO ~~presence~~ from the Los Angeles schools. That presence, whatever it was, was symbolized by the E in UNESCO and the widely misunderstood "UNESCO program."

In the next months agitation against UNESCO continued among conservative, right-wing, and nationalist groups. On January 9, 1952 the Board of Education temporarily withdrew the E in UNESCO for review of its suitability by the Curriculum Division.<sup>11</sup> That April the Board withdrew the Los Angeles schools from participation in the U.N. Essay Contest. The campaign of criticism had intensified leading up to this action, and the Board had heard pronouncements both for and against the Contest by various partisans of the issue. Criticism continued, but less intensely, into the summer. The period from late October, 1951 until late July of 1952 was the time of gestation of the attack on UNESCO in which the basic ideas were propagated, focused, and spread. By the summer of 1952 a wide range of organizations were ready to declare their opposition to UNESCO and its nefarious influence in the Los Angeles Schools. This opposition had a minor victory in the withdrawal from the U.N. Essay Contest. But the verdict on The E in UNESCO was not yet clear. The results of the review were unknown and it was the real focus of the attack at that time. On July 24 the Curriculum Division submitted a memorandum to the Board on "The Study of World Affairs in the Schools."<sup>12</sup>

The "Memorandum" stated that UNESCO had been treated in a normal manner in developing the curriculum. That curriculum, and UNESCO's place in it would continue. There had been no special course

on UNESCO; there was no attempt to develop loyalties to the U.N. or UNESCO; there had been no advocacy of world government. As for the E in UNESCO, the Curriculum Division stressed that it was a manual for teachers and not for pupil use. After standard revisions to incorporate new materials, The E in UNESCO should be reintroduced for use by school staffs.<sup>13</sup>

The "Memorandum" to the Board caused unintensification of debate over UNESCO. Even before it was submitted, the Board of Education was receiving exaggerated interpretations of it. On July 21, Mrs. Edward Schuman, a Liberty Belle,<sup>14</sup> warned the Board to be wary of UNESCO supporters; "Give into this gang and Russia will be able to take us over without firing a shot.... Just give the green light to this foreign ideology and Joe Stalin will be sitting in the Kremlin laughing."<sup>15</sup> The day the Board was to receive the "Memorandum," the Los Angeles Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution submitted a resolution deploring the de-emphasis of American History caused by UNESCO and its propaganda for world government.<sup>16</sup>

"The Study of World Affairs in the Schools" was read before the Board of Education and a large audience on the 24th of July. The part that denied teachers advocated world government was received by many in the audience with laughter. After the "Memorandum" was read and unanimously accepted by the Board for further study, informal comments were heard. These ran both for and against UNESCO. Most of those in favor argued that UNESCO was a respectable fact of life, backed by our government, which the schools should teach about. The arguments against UNESCO generally took the position that UNESCO is

an evil institution and Los Angeles children should have no contact with it. A former school teacher complained that UNESCO was "dedicated to breaking down the fiber of the home, love of family and country." Its materials were being used for improper sex discussion.<sup>17</sup> A representative of the Southern California Republican Women accused UNESCO literature of following the Communist line. "I have good news for you," she said. There's going to be a probe of Reds in the public schools and we can all take part in that."<sup>18</sup> Another called UNESCO "a wolf in sheep's clothing."<sup>19</sup> A Liberty Belle, declaring her organization was pledged to drive from this land all exponents of foreign ideas," claimed to have documented proof "that UNESCO seeks to break down the walls of national sovereignty."<sup>20</sup> Mrs. I.P. Turner argued that the "Memorandum" denials meant nothing. "A Congressional investigation will soon prove that the program of study for children based on The E in UNESCO is based solidly on Towards World Government Vol. V."<sup>21</sup>

Throughout the rest of July and August debate continued as the Board of Education pondered what to do with The E in UNESCO. July 30, the Vice Commander in Chief of the VFW spoke out against UNESCO at their annual Encampment which was being held in Los Angeles.<sup>22</sup> The Veterans passed a resolution condemning the use of UNESCO materials in the schools. A resolution by the Knights of Columbus called for a "careful scrutiny" of UNESCO.<sup>23</sup> Meetings of the Board of Education on August 14, 18, 21, and 25 were marked by intense partisan involvement. On the 21st the Board announced that on the 25th the last public debate on UNESCO would be held.

Even by the 21st debate was extreme and of uncertain usefulness. Forty speakers were heard, each for two minutes. Confusion reached a high point when P.A. Horton, Chairman of the Americanism Committee of the California American Legion, exceeded his two minutes in the attempt to read into the record a resolution that ~~the California~~ Legion was opposed to UNESCO. Pandemonium broke out. UNESCO partisans chanted "Time's up!" Dr. Rosalind Goodrich Bates, a speaker for UNESCO ran to the microphone shouting, "It's un-American for any organization to have more time here than any other organization. Board President Burke hammered for order while Horton vainly tried to continue reading his resolution while Dr. Bates imprecated ~~the~~ un-Americanism of the Americanism chairman. Finally quiet returned when Horton gave up and left the podium.<sup>24</sup>

On the 25th of August both sides were well prepared for their final arguments. People in the audience came equipped with signs, one doughty little woman carried a big placard reading "'UNESCO Promotes the Welfare of the ENEMIES OF AMERICA!' -- Senator McCarran."<sup>25</sup> The first speaker was Paul G. Hoffman, then director of the Ford Foundation. By special agreement he was given three minutes in which to speak; and, in the light of the previous meeting's disorder, it was not surprising he was often interrupted by shouts and boos. The interruptions became so bad that President Burke had to threaten to adjourn the meeting to achieve calm. Hoffman pointed out that, if UNESCO was a subversive, Communist organization, it was strange that the U.S.S.R. would not join it. He said support of UNESCO symbolized our determination to bring about world understanding.

Warning it would be the equivalent of setting up an iron curtain in the United States. After Hoffman spoke, an incident occurred that caused the brief adjournment of the meeting. People who had spoken at previous meetings were not permitted to speak at this one. A local VFW member, unable to contain himself, broke this injunction. President Burke, after unsuccessfully ordering him to stop, adjourned the meeting and stomped off the podium with the rest of the Board behind him. The illicit speaker stopped and the Board returned, bringing four policemen into the auditorium to ensure further order. In all, fifty five speakers gave their say, pre and con.<sup>26</sup>

On August 28, 1952 the Board decided to permanently withdraw the E in UNESCO. It was an anti-climatic end to over a month of sharp debate: "Resolved, that the temporary withdrawal of publication NO. 498 -- The E in UNESCO -- be made permanent."<sup>27</sup> This resolution represented the peak of the anti-UNESCO power, for the Board had over-ruled its Curriculum Division in favor of the position of the opponents of UNESCO. It was also the beginning of widespread interest in the Los Angeles attack. The New York Times carried an article on the resolution August 30 and included the controversy in the "Topics of the Times" for September 7.<sup>28</sup> But this increased interest was inopportune in one way, for the issue was becoming clouded and increasingly open to misinterpretation.

The opposition to UNESCO had won its tangible victory, The E in UNESCO was gone. But teaching about UNESCO remained; and, after all, that was what offended them. They were not yet satisfied, but had to agitate for the end of the "UNESCO program;" a much more

amorphous target. The Board of Education also had a problem. The E in UNESCO could be banned, but that left a gap in the curriculum material for the schools. Should the gap be left as it now was, increased by removing all reference to international organizations, or filled by the preparation of new materials by the Curriculum Division? In order to reach a decision on this, a Special Investigating Committee, composed of three members of the Board, was appointed to "ascertain the extent to which, and the manner in which, the curriculum ... was affected by the UNESCO program during ... 1951-1952."<sup>29</sup> The three members were Arthur F. Gardner, slightly pro-UNESCO; Harry H. Hillman, slightly against UNESCO; and H.C. Willet (chairman), who was a new member whose views on UNESCO were not set.

The committee studied the UNESCO situation for four and a half months. The Board had learned a lesson from the disorder preceding the August resolution; and when it revealed that on January 15, 1953 the Report of the Committee would be submitted, it said there would be no speeches by the public before the Board until after final action had been taken on the Report. When the "Report of the Committee" was presented, an effort to have its recommendations immediately adopted failed. Those members who were not on the Committee wanted more time to study it.<sup>30</sup>

The "Report of the Committee" was divided into two parts, findings and recommendations. It was found there had been a program dealing with UNESCO from 1946 to 1952. The program was planned and promoted by school personnel. The materials used were published by the curriculum division. The program was voluntary; no principal

was required to make use of it. There were fourteen elements to the program which accounted for its organization, content, and procedure. Parts of the UNESCO program dealt with questions that did not directly pertain to UNESCO, the U.N., or international organizations. These were matters such as intercultural and interracial relations and the fostering of world friendship. No evidence of advocacy of world government was found. No evidence was found that the UNESCO program was detrimental to the patriotism of pupils or the teaching of American history.

The recommendations of the "Report of the Committee" are the most important. These became the basis of the highly publicized resolution passed ~~just~~ days later by the Board. There were seven recommendations which aimed to provide a strong educational program dealing with the U.N. and the Specialized Agencies. The first pointed out that the U.N. and the Specialized Agencies were significant facts, not to be ignored by the Los Angeles Schools. The second said there should be instruction programs on all levels "for the factual study and impartial discussion of the history, organization, purposes, and activities of the United Nations and its agencies." The third advised the Curriculum Division to prepare publications only when a clear gap was needed to be filled. The fourth recommended normal in-service training on the U.N. The fifth recognized the value of participation in non-curricular activities that may be controversial. If they are, the Board should require impartial involvement. The last two recommendations are the most important, as they were changed in the final Board resolution. These changes have led to misinterpretation.

6. It is ~~the~~ interests of a well balanced school program that the staff should not give undue emphasis to any particular contemporary ~~social~~, economic, or political movement. Furthermore, the staff should avoid undue emphasis on labels for special activities (e.g. the UNESCO program) which might create the false impression that certain ideas or activities are being given emphasis out of proportion to their significance in the entire educational program.

7. If the board should adopt the foregoing suggestions there would be no further need for the presently inactivated central advisory committee and UNESCO chairmanships.<sup>31</sup>

The "central advisory committee" and "UNESCO chairmanships" were special positions that made the UNESCO material a program, for it was these special functionaries who constituted the out of the ordinary procedures, and thus the "program," for the material labeled UNESCO.<sup>32</sup>

The "Report of the Committee" was taken as being favorable to UNESCO. The Los Angeles Times reported it under the headline "Continuation of UNESCO Plan Urged; Board of Education Committee Proposes Modified Program."<sup>33</sup> January 19 the Los Angeles Times reported that opponents of UNESCO were unhappy over the "Report." It said the Committee "virtually vindicated UNESCO from charges that it is Communist dominated and slanted toward the 'one-world' philosophy."<sup>34</sup>

On January 19, the Board of Education, ~~at the~~ end of a four hour session, passed a resolution based on the recommendations of the "Report of the Committee." The session was spiced with partisan cheers and applause from the audience. The first six points of the resolution are almost word for word reproductions of the first six recommendations. The only changes were a minor addition



in No. 2 and the dropping of "(e.g. the UNESCO program)"<sup>34</sup> from No. 6. The seventh point was amended and read: "There shall be no official or unofficial UNESCO program in the Los Angeles city schools; and the presently inactivated central advisory committee and UNESCO chairmanships are hereby permanently discontinued."<sup>35</sup> The first clause stated forcefully what the "(e.g. the UNESCO program)" of the sixth recommendation had gently implied. The second clause repeated in slightly different language the seventh recommendation.

This resolution was hailed as a great victory by the opponents of UNESCO. The Los Angeles Times reported "the policy constitutes a victory for ~~the~~-UNESCO forces which had been battling for more than a year."<sup>36</sup> The facts do not substantiate this interpretation ~~shown~~ to the resolution in the press; and elementary mistakes in reporting it indicate that incompetence, not error, was at fault. As Max McCullough has pointed out, the ambiguity of "the UNESCO program" has plagued the interpretation of the Los Angeles controversy.<sup>37</sup> It was a widespread misconception that UNESCO had been called in to design and implement a program -- the UNESCO program -- in the Los Angeles Schools. This is a complete fallacy; yet the furor over the Board resolution rests upon it. The so-called UNESCO program was something that began and ended in the Los Angeles Schools. It was the title denoting a range of teaching activities in the schools. The resolution directed most of these activities to be continued. Operating procedure for them was to be re-integrated into the standard procedures. Henceforth there would be no UNESCO program (e.g. no "undue emphasis on labels for special activities").

The activities would remain.

The Los Angeles Times made some serious errors with respect to the resolution. "UNESCO will be taught by the school system's own curriculum standards. The study of the United Nations is removed from the influence of the organization."<sup>38</sup> The fact was that UNESCO and the U.N. had always been taught by the school system's own curriculum standards. Neither organization had any influence to be removed. This had been made clear in the findings of the "Report of the Committee" on which the Los Angeles Times had run two articles. One of these had carefully summarized the findings; and, in a critical analysis of the [Report," it ~~did not~~ point out that the Committee was wrong in asserting that the so-called UNESCO program was a program conceived and conducted by the Los Angeles schools, not by UNESCO or the U.N."<sup>39</sup> But the next day the Times was casting the resolution as a radical step that removed the study program from the influence of UNESCO. Nor did that paper make any effort to correct this misinterpretation. On the contrary, in an editorial on the 22nd commending the resolution, it reinforced the basic misconception of the nature of the "UNESCO program" that had been stopped. "From now on the fact of UNESCO's existence in its proper proportion to the whole subject of the United Nations' role in recent history, may be taught in Los Angeles classrooms, without making undue fuss over UNESCO or employing its own self-serving curriculum."<sup>40</sup> The impression was being created that something significant was involved in "there shall be no ... UNESCO program in the ... schools."

This misinterpretation went further than Los Angeles. The "Special" to the New York Times produced an article very similar to that in the Los Angeles Times, so similar that most of it was word for word the same.

Among partisan cheers and applause the Board of Education virtually abolished the controversial UNESCO program from the Los Angeles school system.

The UNESCO program had been set up by the United Nations to promote the interchange of science and culture among nations....<sup>41</sup>

Thus in its two lead sentences the New York Times gave the impression that official UNESCO activities, to promote science and culture among nations no less, had been banned from Los Angeles. It added to that impression by paraphrasing the passage from the Los Angeles Times that stated "the study of the United Nations is removed from the influence of that organization [UNESCO]<sup>42</sup> As the resolution was reported it appeared to order a substantive reduction in teaching about the international organizations. In fact, it probably opened the way to a substantive increase in the place of international organizations in the curriculum.

For a year the so-called UNESCO program had been in abeyance, awaiting instruction from the Board. Since up to the resolution the "UNESCO program" ~~decreased~~ the teaching about international organizations in the curriculum, there was little education concerning these institutions at the time of the resolution. Therefore, the resolution would obviously result in a major immediate increase. Further, a case could be argued that over the long run the new directives on teaching about the international organizations

promise to be a more effective guide than the conceptions of the UNESCO program. Set apart in a special program in the teaching structure, the international organizations can become an overly idealistic study. The ideals of internationalism, peace, and good will among men need no separate hot-house to flourish in this troubled world. What is needed is a realistic conception of these ideals in relation to the many facts of the world: local, national, and international. Re-integrating the subject of international organizations into the standard curriculum process probably enhanced the probability of effectively furthering international ideals through education in Los Angeles.<sup>43</sup> But the victor and the vanquished can be debated endlessly; whoever ultimately won, the clash appeared to result in a defeat for UNESCO. It is more fruitful to ask what was the actual role of UNESCO in the clash.

As an organization UNESCO had no part in the controversy over it in Los Angeles. Four UNESCO employees had been consulted in the preparation of the E in UNESCO.<sup>44</sup> Nevertheless, it is clearly a product of the Los Angeles Curriculum Division. There were no UNESCO personnel attached to the Los Angeles schools, no official presence of UNESCO whatever. UNESCO was involved in the Los Angeles clash as an idea. Conflicting ideas about UNESCO were the substance of the controversy.

The supporters of UNESCO saw it as a symbol for ideals to which one should aspire. UNESCO represented the hope for good will and peace among men. ~~It~~ came to represent the ideals of academic freedom and the open society. Miss Pamela Painter, who had

just graduated from the Los Angeles schools, asked the Board that they not deprive students of the opportunity to learn about the world, including UNESCO.<sup>45</sup> The Southern California Council on UNESCO said such deprivation would be "incredible."<sup>46</sup> The question was defined as one of academic freedom;<sup>47</sup> and Paul Hoffman, in his reference to the threat of establishing an American Iron Curtain, called upon the ideal of an open society.<sup>48</sup>

UNESCO as a symbol of ideals is even more clearly seen in the design and demise of the UNESCO program. The E in UNESCO does not involve primarily UNESCO in ~~the~~ narrow organizational sense. The programs of the institution are not dealt with in depth. First teachers are given guidance on the institutional realities of international cooperation. Of the twenty four publications listed as sources for more information, sixteen are on the United Nations, four on UNESCO, and four on general aspects of international cooperation.<sup>49</sup> The main parts of the book seek to introduce the teacher to material on the problems of reducing tensions that separate people and cause strife in the world, of improving communications throughout the world, of increasing concern for human rights and for conservation, and of developing programs for cultural exchange.<sup>50</sup> These are all concerns that UNESCO, as an institution, attempts to deal with. But they are not a full representation of the educational activities UNESCO was, in fact, performing.

Thus the UNESCO program was a denotation for a range of idealistically oriented educational concerns. As was intimated above, the substantive content concerning UNESCO was low. Aside from the

four publications concerning UNESCO, The E in UNESCO had one page that gave a factual summary of UNESCO's work in "education for international understanding," and a half page quoted the "main tasks of UNESCO" as listed by the 1950 UNESCO General Conference.<sup>51</sup> UNESCO, in the Los Angeles UNESCO program, was a symbol under which a spectrum of activities were grouped.

The opponents of UNESCO were fighting an idea. UNESCO was a symbol of the unwanted complexity of the world. For its opponents, the symbol of UNESCO incorporated many of those features of the world that are causing change. "Communism, Socialism, New Dealism and other isms," "foreign ideologies," "birth control," "foreign ideas and methods," "improper sex discussion," "one-world government," "breaking down the walls of national sovereignty," "playing down the glorious chapters of our country's history"; all are slogans against a changing ~~world~~ <sup>51</sup>.

Yet, there was something deeper than a simple animus against change. The activity of campaigning against UNESCO was an effort to regain a personal involvement in public affairs. The proclamation by Mrs. Knight of "good news" is revealing. "There's going to be a probe of Reds in the public schools and we can all take part in that." The good news was that all could take part. The presence of a conspiracy, Communist or UNESCO, made "our part" all the more important. The American Flag Committee "UNESCO Report" played on this desire for local involvement in the general destiny.

Firstly, prepare your own report and submit it to your local school board. Introduce the matter before your parent-teacher association. Interview the teachers in your community and ask their assistance in obtaining action. Join with

the American Flag Committee in demanding that your United States Senators introduce and support legislation withdrawing our government from UNESCO membership and terminating its activities in this country. Many other ways will occur to you, in which you can help safeguard our American system of public education from infiltration and undermining by UNESCO's American last propagandists.<sup>53</sup>

UNESCO became a symbol for the wide forces seen as a danger to the American nation. Through a theory of conspiracy it was given local presence. The, without leaving their homes, without even accounting for facts and events outside of their locality, people believed themselves personally involved in the defense of the nation against its menacing opponents.<sup>54</sup>

The importance of local involvement helps to explain some curious facts. These attacks on UNESCO came during the McCarthy period, yet he had nothing to say about UNESCO and the UNESCO opponents seem never to refer to him. There are good reasons why McCarthy played no role. McCarthy provided a vicarious involvement to multitudes of television viewers and newspaper readers. The opponents of UNESCO in Los Angeles did not want vicarious involvement in a conspiracy on the national level. There is here the differentiating factor between "McCarthyism" and "Birchism." The many groups that took part in the campaign against UNESCO in Los Angeles can be viewed as potential Birch cells. They were organized and operated from national centers, the American Flag Committee in Philadelphia or the Liberty Bells in New York City. But they operated locally. Pressure on Congressmen, state and national, was not ruled out. But personal, local action was the reason for being.

**PARENTS — Read your children's textbooks!  
Check the for subversive and partisan propaganda.  
Demand to see the books and the teaching  
materials used in the teaching of the SOCIAL  
STUDIES and the UNITED NATIONS in particular!  
REPORT YOUR FINDINGS TO THE LIBERTY BELLE OFFICE.<sup>55</sup>**

The organization offers concrete, local activities and gains a grass-roots power. This is the Birch formula, less effectively organized and over-shadowed by McCarthy.<sup>56</sup>

The Los Angeles controversy should not have been as serious as it became. On both sides perspective was lost or lacking. The split between local orientation and general orientation should have developed into a useful dialogue. It did not, for neither side listened well. Neither attempted to stress the strong points of their opponent's view in conjunction with complementary points in their own and thus drive toward consensus. Both adopted the most irreconcilable position, fully free to speak, wholly beyond the need to listen.

From the very start the opponents of UNESCO came armed with a very general theory. UNESCO was subverting the world through education for world government with a Communistic tinge. People with only a slight acquaintance with the problems and possibilities of both education and international cooperation immediately recognized the impossibility of that theory. Yet the theory convinced some people. It indicated that the general problems and possibilities were not the important criteria for them. If the local application of the theory gave the appearance of good evidence, they believed it properly proved.<sup>57</sup> If the conspiracy was tangibly in Los Angeles, why bother about fuzzy thoughts over the organization, policy, and procedures of UNESCO? Reactions to criticisms of the UNESCO decision



reflect this outlook. The Los Angeles Examiner replied to the accusation that the decision was based on an outrageously false theory of conspiracy. How, ~~the~~ Examiner asked, could the presence of the conspiracy in Los Angeles be denied when all the local patriotic organizations had given unqualified support to its removal?<sup>58</sup> A Special Committee of the Los Angeles American Legion reacted in a similar way to the argument that UNESCO was not indoctrinating Los Angeles school children. "... By a method of thought known only to the Murphy committee [It] comes up with the conclusion that it was all a tempest in a teapot; there was never any problem of UNESCO in the schools of Los Angeles. Therefore, a total of 67 civic organizations, 5 metropolitan newspapers, the members of the board of education, and the entire membership of [the] Los Angeles County Council [of] the American Legion were all running around in circles trying to make noise."<sup>59</sup>

There was a clear lack of perspective among these opponents of UNESCO. Local evidence can be important. But the near-sighted fixation upon it ruins perspective by cutting off the dialogue between the general and the specific. If the opponents of UNESCO had entered such a dialogue at the cost of their theory of conspiracy, their local perspective may have brought some constructive criticisms of the so-called UNESCO program. But that is the fond hope of an optimistic mood. The fact was different. There was no effort to relate the local to the larger scene.

The proponents of UNESCO also lacked perspective. They suffered a "defeat" by staking their position on a label, "the UNESCO

program." Their position was so grounded in a general judgment it was unmaneuverable in the face of local pressure. A sin of politics was committed; they allowed their opponents to define the terms of debate and ~~were~~ with defeat when the label fell. It should have made no difference to UNESCO that the UNESCO program ended, for the same things could be taught. It should have made no difference to the schools; they were not forbidden to teach anything previously taught; they simply could have no UNESCO program, no UNESCO chairmen.

The difficulty arose because UNESCO generally was held to be such an admirable institution that its admirers were unable to grasp the emptiness of the attack against it. They thought the idea that UNESCO was indoctrinating Los Angeles school children was a ridiculous accusation. The withdrawal of the E in UNESCO and the abolishment of the UNESCO program would deny the reality of the world. It would violate academic freedom and the basic ideals of good men. It was clear to them the controversy was not over any legitimately debatable issues.

It did not occur to them that the Education in UNESCO was an all pervasive enterprise which might have merited the attempt to carry it to the opponents of UNESCO. ~~The~~ by the Los Angeles Schools of UNESCO's influence over the curriculum was really no reply to the attacks. It was in effect a refusal to accept the question, for it ~~was~~ satisfactory to both positions. If one doubted the accusations, the denial would be taken at face value to confirm the doubt. If one believed the accusations, the denial would give further confirmation to the theory of conspiracy. What

conspirator would proclaim his conspiracy.<sup>60</sup> From the very first the curriculum division took the position that UNESCO was a fact, it should be taught because it ~~was a fact, and it was a conspiracy~~ connected with the teaching.<sup>61</sup> The efficacy of this rebuttal required the prior assumption that UNESCO was not conspiratorial. The defenders of UNESCO lacked the perspective to avoid a defense which assumed the one thing their opponents did not grant. ~~An~~ successful reply to the attacks needed to elicit from the attackers the admission that UNESCO had no conspiracy to indoctrinate through the public schools. The course should have been to bring the opponents of UNESCO to a comprehension of the general impossibility of such a conspiracy.

IP The opportunity was missed in Los Angeles. But the attack on UNESCO did not end there. The patriotic organizations throughout the nation were being drawn into it. The local chapters in Los Angeles were becoming committed to the struggle against the "UNESCO menace." The national memberships were becoming aware of this struggle through communication with their Los Angeles compatriots and through the national publicity given to the controversy. It would reach its decisive stage in the patriotic organizations.

CHAPTER IV: THE AMERICAN LEGION - PATRIOTISM AND UNESCO

Los Angeles was not the only place that UNESCO became involved with attacks on the schools. In Houston, Texas there was a controversy that lasted several years which involved the schools, the U.N. Essay Contest, UNESCO, and local organizations whose speakers were objected to by pressure groups. The attack there had no central focus similar to the Los Angeles Board of Education. The arguments against UNESCO were much the same as in Los Angeles, UNESCO was plotting to overthrow the United States by subverting the educational system.<sup>1</sup> Houston and Los Angeles became centers from which the opposition to UNESCO spread in the patriotic organizations.

The grounds for the patriotic attack on UNESCO were largely the same as the educational attack; UNESCO was working for world government by trying to pervert the educational transmission of love for the nation. The patriotic emphasis was in the theory of UNESCO's conspiracy from the very start. The "Report to the American People on UNESCO" documented its case with quotations from Towards World Understanding which criticized nationalism:

... It is ~~subsequently~~ the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism.<sup>2</sup>

And:

The study of history ~~is postponed until the pupil is freed~~ which are better postponed until the pupil is freed

from the nationalist prejudices which at present surround the teaching of history.<sup>2</sup>

"The poisoned air of nationalism" became the phrase that could be counted upon to raise the patriot's ire. The Hon. H.R. Gross, Congressman from Iowa, recited it with a few embellishments before the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference. "... I quote from a UNESCO publication:<sup>3</sup>

Our children should be educated to prepare themselves for citizenship in a world society. As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world mindedness can produce only precarious results.<sup>4</sup>

The danger was clear: UNESCO distrusted extreme patriotism. Many members of patriotic organizations admired extreme patriotism. As it was put in an American Legion Resolution: "Those who support the theory of UNESCO [concerning nationalism] are at war with the principles of the American Legion."<sup>5</sup>

There are many patriotic organizations in the United States. Most of these opposed UNESCO. Their opposition went through a process of development. It started with the small, tight organizations which are quick to react but normally exert little influence. The American Flag Committee was the parent of the trouble. The coverage of its Newsletter was put at under one thousand.<sup>6</sup> The National Economic Council, Inc., the Christian Nationalist Crusade, the Minute Women, the Liberty Bells, the American Heritage Protective Society, and many community organizations such as the Small Property Owners League in Los Angeles and the Englewood (N.J.) Anti-Communist League were some of the smaller groups opposed to UNESCO.<sup>7</sup> These vary

in the extremeness of their position, although most are very, very far to the right.

These organizations opposed UNESCO in two ways. Some worked mainly by publishing anti-UNESCO material: The American Flag Committee, "Support on UNESCO," the Christian Nationalist Crusade, The Cross and the Flag; the National Economic Council, The Economic Council Newsletter. These were joined by other propagandizing organizations and the extreme right-wing press: American Mercury, The Freeman, The Southern Conservative, and others. The second function of the small organization was as a local action group. The Liberty Belles and the Small Property Owners League in Los Angeles and the Anti-Communist League in Englewood may be singled out as prime examples. Here friends and neighbors are given "information" and "literature," alerted to the menace; targets are selected and taken to task; pressure is brought to bear. The two functions overlap. The action groups publish and the publishing groups take action. Thus there was an American Flag Committee group active in Los Angeles and the Liberty Belles' national center had a ~~Headquarters~~<sup>8</sup>. Nevertheless, the general distinction is valid. Through these two functions the small organizations carried the brunt of the attack on UNESCO and the schools. Local chapters of large organizations helped, but on this level they operated more as the small groups did. The special function of the local chapters was to bring the attack to the large organizations. Only these latter societies could create a substantial "patriotic" opposition to UNESCO.

The Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the

American Revolution, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion were the most prominent large groups opposing UNESCO. These passed resolutions expressing opposition to UNESCO, to the United Nations, to activities, real or imagined, carried out by these international organizations. The large patriotic societies are conservative in outlook, but harbor a wide range of opinion within their membership. Because of this they operate with less intensity than the small groups and take somewhat longer to react. Local pressure was exerted on the Los Angeles Board of Education less than one month after the American Flag Committee published its "Report on UNESCO." The Daughters of the American Revolution responded first among the large groups to the UNESCO challenge. They needed six months from the start of the attack in which to react.

On April 16, 1952 the D.A.R. passed the first national resolution against UNESCO. Whereas the UNESCO series Towards World Understanding was found to "propose to educate the child to be a world citizen in preparation for world government," the Daughters resolved to oppose the use of these pamphlets in the public schools and libraries.<sup>9</sup> Five days later Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt began her long series of replies to attacks on the U.N. and UNESCO by admonishing the D.A.R. for this resolution.<sup>10</sup>

The next of the large organizations to register its distrust of UNESCO was the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Their annual Encampment was in Los Angeles during early August, 1952. The location of the Encampment was inauspicious for those Veterans who supported UNESCO. Many arguments against the international institution were available

from the groups carrying on the fight in the Los Angeles schools. Miss Florence Fowler Lyon, who had started the Los Angeles attack, was asked to address the Encampment. She told the Veterans that UNESCO was "daily training our American children as soldiers who will one day march in a bloodless revolution" to overthrow the United States and establish world government. So effective was her speech, the cheering crowd called up and passed by acclaim a resolution against UNESCO. Public schools were ~~to be~~ removed from their curricula consideration of UNESCO and its activities. The resolution found such study was a menace to the security of the Nation.<sup>11</sup> Two weeks later the Knights of Columbus, also convening in Los Angeles, resolved against the activities of UNESCO.<sup>12</sup>

The American Legion did not join its fellow patriots in resolving against UNESCO until May of 1953. Then the National Executive Committee passed Resolution No. 33. "Those determined plotters who wish to destroy our way of life, capture our wealth, and enslave our people have declared war against our Americanism.... They have infiltrated into the United Nations and are using the UNESCO to corrupt the minds of our children by destroying their love of country."<sup>13</sup> "In ~~the~~ 1953" gave several quotations from UNESCO publications to prove its case, and then resolved to deplore the use in schools of materials prepared or published by UNESCO. The Legions struggle with UNESCO had begun. It would continue for three years.

The American Legion had a membership of about 2,800,000 at that time. The organizational structure started with local chapters throughout the country. These send delegates to the



to the state Departments and to the National Convention through those Departments. In some ways the organization seems to be similar to the two major political parties in the United States. The National Convention is composed of delegates from the entire country chosen by State. The size of the Convention body, several thousand delegates, leaves a great deal of room for committee direction. The resolution is the standard means by which the Convention expresses its consensus.

To give the national organization continuity there are executive committees and offices as well as permanent commissions on important issues such as Foreign Relations and Americanism. The National Convention elects a National Commander who serves as executive officer of the Legion for one year. The National Executive Committee is composed of important Legionaires who meet periodically throughout the year. They can direct the National Commander or permanent Commission to specific business that falls within the broad guidelines set up by the resolutions of the National Convention. Also, within the guidelines of the Convention resolutions the National Executive Committee can pass resolutions that speak for the Legion. "Resolution 35, 1955" was this type of resolution.

Although it was this very centralized organ of the Legion that first put it on record as opposed to UNESCO, it is important to realize that was not on that level. The resolution would originate on the local level, by all indications with the Los Angeles Chapter in this case.<sup>14</sup> The local chapter would send draft resolutions to the state Department. Recall that August 21st, 1952 P.A. Holtan caused

raucous disorder in a Los Angeles Board of Education meeting by taking too long in reading a resolution against UNESCO passed by the California Department of the American Legion.<sup>15</sup> Local chapters also send in draft resolutions to the National Executive Committee. These drafts will be referred to a suitable permanent commission. In the case of UNESCO mathematics was referred to both the American Commission and the Foreign Relations Commission. These commissions will conduct research on burning issues, collect and organize material, and begin to synthesize various draft resolutions on a subject. There are Committees appointed by the National Convention on the same subjects as the Commissions that take over the draft resolutions and prepare a single resolution for submission to the Convention where it may be passed, amended, or rejected. Thus by a tortuous route the local initiative arrives at a resolution by the National Convention.<sup>16</sup>

"Resolution 33, 1953" by the National Executive Committee represented the notice by the more politically articulate portion of the national organization that the Legion was moving in an anti-UNESCO direction. Most of its members probably were not yet highly aware of UNESCO and its threat unless they lived in a region in which anti-UNESCO agitation was present.<sup>17</sup> Its bark, "these determined plotters," was greater than its bite, school use of UNESCO materials was deplored. No resolution concerning UNESCO was passed at the next National Convention in St. Louis, September, 1953. For the time being the National Executive Committee resolution was sufficient. Instead different groups were busy studying the problem. One of these was the Special Committee on Covenant of Human Rights and United Nations

of which Ray Murphy, Past National Commander, was chairman. The other five Committee members were important Legionaires: two Past Department Commanders, a Past Department Chaplain, a National Executive Committeeman, and a Past National President of the Women's Auxiliary.<sup>18</sup> This "Murphy Committee" was directed by the Foreign Relations Commission to study UNESCO. Two reports were made to the National Executive Committee on UNESCO, the first in May, 1954, and the second in May, 1955. The first was considerably shorter than the second, but it covered the same points. Both reports were highly competent and received wide backing throughout the country. The lack of communication within the Legion between this Committee and the opponents of UNESCO is startling.

After "Resolution 33, 1953" directed at the UNESCO conspiracy in the schools, there was a period of relative calm. The Los Angeles controversy had passed its crucial stages. It was a period of study. UNESCO's opponents were refining their concatenations of quotations by which to prove the perfidy of UNESCO. The Murphy Committee was its first report. It was presented to the May, 1954, meeting of the National Executive Committee.

"The First Murphy Report" was critical of "Resolution 33, 1953." It said that too much had been attributed to UNESCO. That institution had no activities in Los Angeles. The controversy there was a local affair over publications and programs dealing with UNESCO which were written and conducted by the Los Angeles City Schools. The favorable "Salomon Report on UNESCO" by a Special Committee appointed by President Eisenhower was cited.<sup>19</sup> The charges

that UNESCO worked for world government, atheism, and subversion were found mistaken. The origin of these charges were said to be in the American Flag Committee "Report on UNESCO" and the propaganda of men such as Gerald L.K. Smith. Congressman Carnahan's debunking of the "Report on UNESCO" was cited. Briefly it was urged that the American Legion should seriously consider accepting a seat on the United States National Commission for UNESCO.<sup>20</sup> "The First Murphy Report" was filed but not adopted by the National Executive Committee. Although "The Report" opposed "Resolution 33" passed by that Committee the previous year, no opposition or exception to "The Report" was voiced by members of the Executive Committee.<sup>21</sup> The question rested until the National Convention in Washington, D.C., September 1954.

The National Convention did not follow the advice of the Murphy Committee. Instead, Resolution 322 was passed. This affirmed that contrary to recent indications to the opposite effect, the American Legion opposed the use of materials provided by UNESCO in the schools. UNESCO propounded world government and was subversive. The resolution also advised against sending a representative of the Legion to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.<sup>22</sup> "The First Murphy Report" was solidly rebuked. But despite this the Foreign Relations Commission directed the Murphy Committee to continue its study of UNESCO.<sup>23</sup>

The National Executive Committee met one month later. A member of the Murphy Committee urged that the Legion send a representative to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. His position failed. The Executive Committee voted 51 to 6 for Resolution

33, 1954<sup>24</sup> which reaffirmed its 1953 resolution of the same designation.  
The Murphy Committee continued its study.

During the next eight months the Murphy Committee prepared its 40,000 word, definitive critique of the attack on UNESCO. It went deeply into the charges against UNESCO, analyzed them clearly, and showed them lacking.<sup>25</sup>

The Murphy Report began by briefly explicating the organization of UNESCO and its relation to the United States government and people.<sup>26</sup> The Los Angeles controversy was analyzed, showing clearly that UNESCO was not involved as an institution. The Murphy Committee criticized twenty three specific charges against UNESCO found in the work of Florence Fowler Lyons.<sup>28</sup> Each of these charges was refuted.<sup>29</sup> The parent attack of the American Flag Committee was summarized and criticized. It was shown not only that Towards World Understanding was distorted, but that they were insignificant: from 1946-1955 Volume V, the major focus of criticism, sold about 3000 copies, while in 1953 American institution of education purchased over 141,000,000 books.<sup>30</sup> The neo-fascist and hate groups that instigated attacks on UNESCO were described.<sup>31</sup> The charge that UNESCO works for world government was described as having no basis; and Reports of the Special Study Mission on International Organizations and Movements (a group of Congressmen), the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the Eighth Session of the General Conference of UNESCO were summarized to show their findings and actions relevant to this world government contention.<sup>32</sup> The charges that UNESCO favored atheism and Communism were shown to be fallacious.<sup>33</sup> The Murphy Report concluded with no specific recommendations for policy changes, but

plead for moderation and concentration on the really important issues. "We of American and the American Legion have work to do. Let us be about our Master's business."<sup>34</sup>

The Murphy Report was read to the National Executive Committee, May 5, 1955, in a two and one half hour session. The members of the Executive Committee, who had consistently opposed UNESCO, stood for several minutes in a rising ovation at the end of the Report. There was no immediate comment adverse to it and some very favorable reactions.<sup>35</sup> The Report was printed in the Minutes of the National Executive Committee meeting. At the same time distribution of "carefully documented research report on UNESCO" prepared by the National Americanism Commission was ~~announced~~ ~~made~~ ~~discontinued~~. The next day all copies of it were impounded.<sup>36</sup> The Murphy Report was printed on the initiative of the Murphy Committee and without cost to the American Legion in order to make it readily available to the public and the delegates to the 1955 National Convention.<sup>37</sup>

The Murphy Report became available to the public in mid September, 1955, a month before the National Convention. The New York Times received an advanced copy in late August and September 1 printed an editorial "UNESCO and the Legion." This previewed the Report and expressed the hope that the Legion would reverse its previous "ill-considered action in attacking UNESCO."<sup>38</sup> September 11, the Times announced the availability of the Report, summarizing the key findings in it.<sup>39</sup> Two days later another editorial was run. It praised The Murphy Report highly and said it was encountering prejudiced resistance both in and out of the Legion. The Times

asked the Legion to accept the Report, if for no other reason, at least for the sake of its own prestige.<sup>40</sup> The highly favorable response of the public to the Report was beginning. A Mapping service found 135 newspapers throughout the country that gave editorial reactions to the Report. Of these 118 were favorable to it. The combined circulation of these numbered 23,736,702. Eight papers (circulation 671,1177) opposed the findings of the Report. Fifteen took a neutral stand before 928,362 readers.<sup>41</sup>

As the date of the National Convention approached, interested groups put their positions before the public. Interest in the possibility of a change in Legion policy rose. Seaborn Collins, National Commander of the Legion, bitterly attacked the Fund for the Republic. As an analyst for the New York Times saw it, this attack was a tactic on the national leadership of the Legion to bring the rank and file in line against the liberal minority in the Legion. The Illinois Department of the Legion had been so cooperative with the Fund that the president of the latter, the noted liberal, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, had become a Legionaire. On top of the Murphy Report, this was too much! It was time to make clear that that no extensive infiltration of liberalism would be tolerated by the leadership.<sup>42</sup>

The New York Daughters of the American Revolution met at the end of September. On the 28th they were addressed by Godfrey P. Schmidt, President of AWARE, Inc., on the subject of Ray Murphy and his Report. "When you say that UNESCO is not atheistic, not obviously one-world minded or communistic, Mr. Murphy, I say your

answer is negligible."<sup>43</sup> The next day the Daughters passed two resolutions concerning UNESCO. The first reaffirmed opposition to UNESCO "as a plan especially directed toward the purpose of mentally conditioning teachers and students to accept the philosophy of World Citizenship and World Government." The second reflected Schmidt's warnings. Commander Collins and certain state Departments of the American Legion were commended by the aware and appreciative Daughters for having opposed The Murphy Report.<sup>44</sup>

The Report had support, as well as opposition, from organizations in the days approaching the National Convention. The United States National Commission for UNESCO predictably commended the Report as "a significant contribution to American understanding of UNESCO" in a resolution passed on October 4.<sup>45</sup> Magazines were expressing favor for the Report. In an article "Legion and UNESCO," American intimated a time for a change might be at hand.<sup>46</sup> The Reporter, in "Never Mind the Facts," warned against the possibility that the Legion might ignore the Report.<sup>47</sup> ~~Public interest in Convention was high~~ Public interest in the Convention was high; and, if its feelings mirrored the press, many were strongly in favor of a change in the Legion stand on UNESCO. Among them The Murphy Report commanded respect. Hopes were high that reason would reign. But ~~public sentiment~~ and hopes for reason do not change Legion policy. The Murphy Committee had not recommended any policy changes. They were content to report and to see what would then result from the membership and the national leadership. The signs indicated that the Report had a strong impact, but that it nevertheless faced a strong opposition.



When the Report was submitted, there was prompt reply from some of the local groups in the Legion. One of these responses came in a resolution of the American Legion, Department of Texas, Second Division, "Regarding UNESCO." This emphatically denied the Murphy Report, ~~without~~ referring to the arguments of the Report, ~~implying that~~ ~~opposed~~ stated the opposite conclusions. These contentions were "proved" with several ~~quotations~~ That UNESCO advocates world government was proved by quotations from speeches by William Benton, William G. Carr, and Milton Eisenhower delivered while they were associated with the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. These same quotations given as proof that the Murphy Report was wrong already had been dealt with in detail in the Report under Charge 1, 18, and 20, as well as Exhibit 4 in the Appendix.<sup>49</sup> The evidence "Regarding UNESCO" presented to show UNESCO was communistic and atheistic was of similar quality. Julian Huxley had written that UNESCO should base its philosophy on a humanistic outlook, for the multiplicity of spiritual faiths precluded the possibility of a world organization adopting any particular creed.<sup>50</sup> With this in mind it was noted that Harold R. Rafton, member of the American Humanist Association, had written in The Humanist, No. 3, 1953, that Humanism rejects belief in a supernatural God. ~~Erge~~ UNESCO is atheistic!<sup>51</sup>

Another local reaction to The Murphy Report was submitted to the National Executive Committee soon after the Report was presented. It came from a Special Committee of the Los Angeles American Legion of which P.A. Horton, active in the fight against UNESCO in Los Angeles, was chairman. The Special Committee expressed more outrage than reason

on the Murphy Report. The Report was a "typological filibuster," "an attempt at character assassination." Being insiders, the Special Committee took strong exception to the analysis of the Los Angeles controversy in the Report.<sup>53</sup> To the contention of the Murphy Committee that words of William Benton had been used in attacks out of context, the Special Committee replied: "Benton said it; Benton was in an official capacity when he said it; we must believe that he said or else throw out every official act and statement of this man."<sup>54</sup> Consistently they asserted the position diametrically opposed to the Murphy Report with little reasoning or evidence to buttress their contentions. They found the suggestion that the attacks on UNESCO have a common source in the American Flag Committee and Gerald L.K. Smith was an attempt to use the smear technique for character assassination. "The American Flag Committee has no connection with the American Legion." The Murphy Report is "a smear of the character."<sup>55</sup>

These local reactions to the Report seem to merit fully the characterization of them given by Ray Murphy:

Some pretended replies to the special committee report have appeared from a few sources, and at least one has appeared in the Congressional Record. I can say to you that such as I have seen range from the scurrilous to the ridiculous, and have been put together under a false front of alleged documentation that is in essence odiously fraudulent.<sup>56</sup>

But not all of the response to the Report by the Legion membership was unfavorable. This is indicated by the difficulty the responsible committees had in drafting a resolution on UNESCO. A multitude of proposed resolutions had been submitted. After the permanent commissions for Foreign Relations and Americanism had

winnnowed out repetitions, there were still twelve proposals concerning UNESCO to the Foreign Relations and Americanism Committees of the National Convention. Their duty, in a joint session, was to reduce the twelve to one which could be voted on by the Convention. The day before the opening a long meeting was held. The problem was to reconcile the pre-UNESCO and the anti-UNESCO resolutions, an impossible problem which necessitated a basic choice in favor of one of the fundamental positions. Each "side" was given an hour and a half for argument and an hour for rebuttal.<sup>57</sup> The meeting became too ~~unmanageable~~ and failed to achieve one resolution. Instead the Committees appointed a ten-member joint subcommittee which was directed to prepare a report and resolution for debate on the ~~Convention~~ floor. ~~by~~ ~~the~~ ~~subcommittee~~ presented its draft resolution to the joint session of the Foreign Relations and Americanism Committees. It was there accepted 55 to 5 and thus cleared for presentation to the Convention the next day. The Committee members agreed not to divulge its stand, but soon rumor predicted it would oppose UNESCO.

The delegates generally assumed there would be an exciting debate over the UNESCO question. While most of them had not read The Murphy Report, they knew it was a solid document which argued strongly in favor of UNESCO. They also knew that there was a hard core powerfully in the Legion that was inalterably opposed to UNESCO. Many had encountered people distributing leaflets denouncing UNESCO. Debate would be conducted with each speaker allotted five minutes, no more. Ray Murphy, a popular and respected figure among Legionnaires, was ready to debate. Delegates were waiting to hear what he had to

say. That was one of the problems: a lot had been said about the Report, but few read it. John Dwight Sullivan, Past New York State Commander, reported that of the 227 delegates from New York he was able to find only one beside himself who had read the Report. Instead, delegates felt that if ~~they finished the~~ the ~~debate~~, the delegation could caucus, debate the issues uncovered, and then reasonably decide which way to cast New York's votes.<sup>59</sup>

There was also wide opposition to UNESCO among the delegates. The Murphy Report was just a report, talked about, but little read. The National Convention had once resolved against UNESCO, the National Executive Committee had done so twice. When "Resolution 33, 1953" was first passed the controversy may have been obscure to most Legionaires. But after two and a half years they had become accustomed to the idea that the Legion, they and all their 'buddies,' were opposed to UNESCO. The Legion is a conservative organization, not ready to champion a long opposed liberal cause just because of one report. The night of October 10-11 had been spent by a small group drafting the still secret UNESCO resolution. The day of October 11 and the night of 11-12 was spent sounding our delegates. Insiders were circulating, talking with small groups of delegates, planning the strategy for debate.

The Convention assembled for its final session with UNESCO as first business. Rogers Kelley, of Edinburg, Texas, co-chairman of the Joint Foreign Relations and Americanism Committees read the summary of the committees' work problems to the growing crowd of delegates. Then his fellow co-chairman, Archie Glesson, of Lido,

California, came to the microphones and read the UNESCO resolution, <sup>60</sup>

whereas, the opposition of the American Legion to the teaching of UNESCO was clearly stated by Resolution No. 33, ... 1953....

whereas, resolution No. 322 ~~was~~ passed....

whereas, the National Executive Committee ... adopted resolution No. 33 of 1954 declining membership in the United States National Commission for UNESCO....

whereas, a documented report ~~exposing UNESCO~~ was prepared by ... the National Americanism Commission....

whereas, certain segments of the press ... unduly publicized ... a misrepresentation ... ~~of~~ the effect of the report on UNESCO made by ~~the Murphy Committee~~....

whereas, this report was received but not adopted; and, therefore, the American Legion's policy is now, as it has always been, in opposition to UNESCO, ... be it

Resolved....

That the American Legion reaffirms its opposition to UNESCO as set forth in Resolution No. 33, ... 1953....

That the American Legion will not name a delegate to the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

~~And~~ the ... Legion urges Congress to repeal the laws creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO...; and ~~to stop~~ further dissemination of UNESCO ... materials, reports, and programs within ... the United States.

That Congress be urged to make a complete ... investigation of UNESCO.... And if ... UNESCO has violated ... the conditions ~~of U.S. participation~~ ... Congress be urged ... to enforce compliance therewith.

That the National Headquarters ... immediately make available ... the documented reply on UNESCO ... <sup>60</sup> prepared by ... the National Americanism Commission....

As Clossen finished reading the resolution draft, Kelley immediately moved for the adoption of the resolution. Co. Roene Waring, a Past National Commander, rose to second the motion. He was immediately recognized by Seaborn Collins, chairman of the Convention. The motion seconded, someone cried out from the floor that the question be moved. Collins called for a voice vote. The "Ayes" resounded clearly over the "Nays." As the New York delegation "sat

in stunned silence," still waiting for debate, Churchill T. Williams, Commander of the Iowa Department of which Ray Murphy was a respected delegate, was recognized to speak. He asked that the record show Iowa's 109 delegates had voted unanimously against the resolution. Commander Cellins found the request no longer germane; the voice vote had been taken; the question was closed.<sup>62</sup>

The question was closed within the Legion, but it opened before the public. The debate, bypassed by the sharp parliamentary techniques of UNESCO's Legion opponents, erupted elsewhere. The Legion action received a large, unfavorable press. Former President Harry Truman gave reporters his reaction: "They're a fine bunch of kids... But they seem to have forgotten" what they fought for.<sup>63</sup> Dr. Luther Evans, Director General of UNESCO, denied the resolution charges, but refused to comment further, observing that comments might be called an undue interference in the domestic affairs of the nation.<sup>64</sup> General Milton G. Baker, member of the American Legion and Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, was angry: the resolution "questions the intelligence, the good name and integrity of the fine men and women who are members of the commission. It indicts the patriotism and loyalty of a noted group of Americans who have given selflessly of their time and their considerable talent to the national interest in peace and security."<sup>65</sup> The New York Times editorialized that the Legion's action did no credit to the organization. "The only apt description of such a performance is to term it a prize example of sophomoric xenophobia."<sup>66</sup> Life ran a story "Veterans' Views on UNESCO" and in an editorial

criticized the Legion position. ~~American~~ printed an article by Ray Murphy on the action ~~UNESCO~~ was strongly upheld and many of the motives for by-passing debate were exposed.<sup>68</sup>

The Legion leadership found itself with a serious problem of public relations. ~~In~~ the final draft there will be a few sentences here on articles in the November and December issues of the American Legion Magazine in which J. Addington Wagner carefully reported to Legionnaires that the Convention was not as lax and thoughtless in passing the UNESCO resolution as they may have been lead to believe from news accounts.<sup>7</sup> The new National Commander, J. Addington Wagner, less than a month after the action, addressed the American Legion Department of the District of Columbia, explaining the Legion's position. He stated in his speech three objectives he hoped to accomplish: to explain the "fundamental" principles which were the foundation of the position against UNESCO, to correct "distorted versions" of the "carefully considered" UNESCO action; and to give the reasons for believing UNESCO "the international sanctuary of impractical one-worlders, red-tinged radicals, and ~~the~~ the ranks of loyal Americans" which he thought it was.<sup>69</sup> Later in November Wagner appeared on the N.B.C. television program "Youth wants to know," informing them that UNESCO "propaganda" favors world government and calling for an investigation of UNESCO by Congress.<sup>70</sup>

The call for an investigation was the part of the "UNESCO Resolution" the Legion leadership chose to stress. It was a far less committal and drastic part than those on the abolishment of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and the prevention of American dis-

tribution of UNESCO publications. The mysterious "Reply" by the National Americanism Commission, so played up in the ~~publication~~,<sup>71</sup> made little impact. The stand against UNESCO was falling flat. Two Congressional Committees were requested to press for an investigation of UNESCO.<sup>72</sup> Nothing came of it. The D.A.R. did pass a resolution criticizing UNESCO and praising the Legion's "UNESCO Resolution."<sup>73</sup> But the momentum was declining. In the August 1956 issue of the American Legion Magazine Commander Wagner published "Another Look at UNESCO" which in substance was the same old glasse all over again. UNESCO harbored American communists; propagandized for world government, and sought to influence our educational system. Legionnaires were called upon to write their Congressmen asking for an investigation of UNESCO.<sup>74</sup> The requests of the National leadership had failed. In September Commander Wagner gave the opening speech of the 1956 National Convention. He claimed that "important ground" had been gained against UNESCO. The Legion would continue to press for "a complete investigation" of UNESCO by Congress.<sup>75</sup> The gained ground was not defined, nor was it apparent. The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements had listened to Commander Wagner, said a few generalities to the effect that Congress should pay heed to the request of an organization the stature of the Legion, and then let the matter drop. Even the call for an investigation by the 1955 resolution was unheeded. The 1956 Convention delegates felt no need for another tangle with UNESCO. No resolution came up ~~on the~~ Other questions came to absorb the interests of that "fine bunch of kids."



Looking back on the situation, Ray Murphy testified he was "quite definitely of the opinion that if the attacks could be compelled to state their case in a judicial atmosphere in a court of law, that case would be revealed ... for the preposterous fraud it is."<sup>76</sup> In effect, the Legion's "UNESCO Resolution" forced the attack into such an atmosphere. It shifted the grounds of the attack on UNESCO and committed it to a national action.

"Resolution 33, 1953"<sup>77</sup> as well as most of the anti-UNESCO resolutions by patriotic groups,<sup>78</sup> censured the use of UNESCO materials in schools, asked for the halt of world government propaganda, and accused UNESCO of conspiratorial intentions. "Resolution 322" and "Resolution 33, 1954" reaffirmed this basic position and added the easily implemented statement that the Legion would send no representative to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.<sup>79</sup> These resolutions are best understood as an expression by the national organization of sympathy and support for the opinion and action of certain local chapters. These signified that the Legion would support local effort such as in Los Angeles, parts of Texas, and wherever concern for the immediate threat of subversion by UNESCO were to break out. This was the fundamentally local orientation of the traditional Legion stand on UNESCO. It was reaffirmed as such in the resolutions refusing to send a representative to the UNESCO Commission. The Murphy Committee had pointed out that sending a representative to the Commission would not commit the Legion to support

of UNESCO, but would allow the Legion to get an inside look upon which to base an authoritative stance. <sup>79</sup> When this suggestion was turned down, it was an affirmation of the superiority of local evidence gathered by observing the effects in Los Angeles or Houston to general evidence by close observation of the source in Paris and Washington.

The "UNESCO Resolutions" of 1955 constituted a complete reversal in the orientation of anti-UNESCO policy. Whereas previous resolutions indicated permissiveness towards local action and apathy to national action, the new resolution sought to initiate national action. It was a new and difficult goal. It is not difficult to indicate agreement with local partisans in actions already underway. It is very difficult to request the nation to undertake an action for which it sees little need. It was nearly impossible to achieve the disbandment of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, the proscription of UNESCO publications throughout a land jealous of its freedom of speech, or even a full scale investigation of UNESCO by Congress. It would have required <sup>15-1</sup> a great number of people who were not committed to the Legion's position be persuaded of UNESCO's evil purposes. Here the attack forced itself into the judicial atmosphere, not of a court of law, but of true debate. Having previously flourished among committed partisans, the attack now had to convince non-partisans. "Evidence" that had formerly seemed profoundly ~~convincing~~ was suddenly unsuitable. The attack had grown by remaining apart from the larger dialogue. To fulfill itself it now had to enter debate and convince the unconvinced. This it had no hope of doing. The steps through which this change in orientation developed and died merit analysis.

CHAPTER V: THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DIALOGUE CONCERNING UNESCO

The Murphy Committee was the key to the transformation of the attack on UNESCO. ~~The~~ Committee introduced new kinds of evidence to which the attackers had to respond. The Murphy Committee seemed unaware of the effect they were having. They failed to convince the opponents of the shortcomings of the attack on UNESCO. The reports were rebuked by the Legion. In the heat of the battle it would be rare for a group to sense such a subtle shift by their opponents and to know the shift would mean eventual victory for the presently defeated.

After the Legion action was over, Murphy recognized that the proper course for UNESCO was to concentrate on its own business, for its supporters to keep heart. The Legion was only one group. UNESCO's work could still be done.<sup>1</sup> But there was no clear consciousness that the Legion stand actually checked the attack. Those who engineered the Legion policy were even less aware of the fundamental change in its orientation.

The "UNESCO Resolution" stated that "the ~~Legion's~~ Legion's policy is now, as it has always been, in opposition to UNESCO...."<sup>2</sup> But the opposition was different from what it had always been because it was an opposition to the UNESCO reflected in the Murphy reports, not in the writings of Florence Fowler Lyons and the American Flag Committee.

The strength of the attack on UNESCO was in Los Angeles.

There the arguments were formulated and advanced to an audience essentially unfamiliar with national and international affairs. This audience was asked to commit themselves to actions in Los Angeles. The arguments needed only to interpret the outside world so that it appeared in Los Angeles that the actions fit into a larger pattern. The actuality of the larger pattern did not matter. It could be avoided by limiting the focus of action. A grandiose case was made against UNESCO and all connected with it. But action was taken in Los Angeles against a phantasm called the UNESCO program whose only connection with UNESCO was the request of advice from four UNESCO officials in making up a school publication. The anti-UNESCO ideology and the Los Angeles attack were essentially unrelated. It was up to those who wished to do so to make the connection, not by reasoning, but by choice. It was this choice that the Los Angeles school officials persisted in denying. They gave reason after reason why UNESCO should be taught in the schools and denied that there was propaganda for world government connected with the program. But, as was shown above, the school authorities failed to compel the admission that UNESCO was not conspiratorial. Until this admission could be elicited, denials were useless against the attack.

What the Los Angeles defenders of UNESCO failed to do, the Murphy Committee accomplished. The most important sections of The Murphy Report dealt with the twenty-three specific charges and the three general charges that UNESCO favored world government, atheism, and Communism. Here the Report challenged the general anti-UNESCO ideology that local groups had chosen to apply to situations that



But the deleted words ameliorate the ominous tone of falling walls of national sovereignty:

We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty and of permitting the peoples of this world to study each other and to cooperate with each other. In this process....<sup>4</sup>

The Murphy Report went charge by charge, point by point, in a similar manner. At the end an open minded reader doubted the validity of the attack on UNESCO and gained a sense that UNESCO was undertaking a profoundly difficult quest for a subtle understanding, the attainment of which was highly problematical. The locally ominous appearance of UNESCO faded. In its place arose the appearance of a struggling international organization faced with a very open and difficult task.

This was a new challenge to UNESCO's opponents. At last their theory of a conspiracy by UNESCO was under question. ~~The~~ ~~opponents~~ could no longer assume its validity and concentrate on its local "effects" which in reality had nothing to do with the theory. To protect their position they had to meet the criticisms of The Murphy Report. In other words, they had to turn from Los Angeles, Houston, or Florida and confront the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, the Murphy Committee, and the Department of State. The specifics of The Murphy Report were well reasoned and could not be counted point by point. There were few pretensions that left the comments of the Murphy Committee vulnerable. A different defense was taken by the opponents of UNESCO.

The Murphy Committee was cast as the dupe of UNESCO on the

groups that ~~had been used~~ UNESCO were the main sources used in the Report. As the Special Committee of the Los Angeles American Legion asserted, the Murphy Committee went "to the interested parties in the UNESCO organization and in the United States Department of State with a listing of complaints against UNESCO, ... requesting instructions on how to answer.... The result is a report which is biased in favor of UNESCO...."<sup>5</sup> Murphy recounted a cruder statement of the same reaction: "Now, what do you say? UNESCO was conceived in the warped brain of Alger Hiss and it remained for suckers like you to fall for it."<sup>6</sup>

The tactic of UNESCO's opponents was quite simple. They denied the arguments of the Murphy Report by asserting that it was duped by the conspiracy. They asserted the old evidence. If it meant there was a conspiracy, they reasoned only a conspirator would deny its meaning. The "what conspirator would proclaim his conspiracy?" became "who but a conspirator would deny a conspiracy?" There was no need to meet the concrete charges. It was sufficient to say The Murphy Report was contaminated at its source. This was done with a vengeance.

This theme runs throughout the report of the Special Committee of Los Angeles. "The report of the Murphy committee is, rather than a report of its own investigation into UNESCO, an answer to charges ... by the American Flag Committee...." "Had the Murphy committee been conducting an investigation into UNESCO instead of a defense of UNESCO it might have found this speech." "There is no record of the Murphy committee having availed itself of previously

formed opinions and conclusions of any other American Legion group."<sup>7</sup>  
The Second Division of the Texas Legion had a similar reaction. "So  
in a 2-year investigation [the Murphy] committee can find no UNESCO  
in the schools. One might wonder where they looked."<sup>8</sup>

Reports of the debate before the Joint Session of the  
Foreign Relations and Americanism Committees at the National Convention  
indicate the same argument was employed there. Murphy said that  
"in the main the contents of the report itself were ignored by its  
opponents in the open discussion." The attacks were general.<sup>9</sup> The  
Murphy Committee was asked to apologize for daring to submit such a  
report. The United Nations should be tossed into the sea. Since  
much of the information originated with the State Department, it  
could be assumed the Report was invalid and UNESCO was proved malicious.  
The effort to call the foundations of the Report into question went  
so far as to suggest that when Secretary of State John Foster Dulles  
rose to address the Legion Convention every Legionnaire should rise  
to his feet and walk out.<sup>10</sup>

This response to the Murphy Report may be seen as a refusal  
from the very start to accept it as a legitimately debateable subject.  
Thus the Convention tactic of by-passing floor debate was implicit  
in the strategy ~~at the very start~~ from the very start. The National Executive  
Committee rose in ovation at the presentation of the Report. Murphy  
later called that ovation the emptiest honor he ever had.<sup>11</sup> There  
followed the attack on its foundations and thorough organization to  
prevent its adoption. "Beyond any shadow of a doubt the anti-unesecans  
had done a thorough job of organization prior to the opening of the



convention.... They were at work in every department of the American Legion under coordinated direction in which many others than Legionnaires had a part. The convention's American Committee, its Foreign Relations Committee and the joint subcommittee were heavily weighted with known opponents of UNESCO."<sup>12</sup> According to Murphy there was no chance for a favorable report on UNESCO from the Convention committees. "A good many Legionnaires who were responsible for that have boasted about it, of course."<sup>13</sup>

Given this inside strategy of avoiding a confrontation of the two points of view, the Convention tactics fit the pattern. There was more to it than the widely quoted "The sentiment was heavy against UNESCO, so why have a lot of wrangling when it isn't necessary."<sup>14</sup> Floor debate would have risked a substantive confrontation between the Murphy Committee and the stand of the UNESCO opponents. Nevertheless, the confrontation was occurring, in spite of the opponent's strategy.

In order to protect their position the opponents had to attack the foundations of The Murphy Report. If they ignored the Report and retrenched into the local areas of battle, the defenders of UNESCO in these localities could thereafter appeal to the Report and deny the whole system of justification behind the local attacks. Therefore the "UNESCO Resolution" had to actively attack the United States National Commission for UNESCO. As shown above, this new focus of attack made it an inevitable failure.<sup>15</sup>

It is possible to interpret this change in the attack as an accident of history. One could point out the irony that once the

opponents of UNESCO framed their new, misguided policy they chose to by-pass debate -- the one thing at that stage which might have prevented the adoption of a doomed policy. But there was more involved in the commitment to a new Legion policy than an accident. The attack on UNESCO is best understood if the Legion "UNESCO Resolution" is seen not as an accident but as the logical outcome of the preceding events. That outcome was justice.<sup>16</sup>

"Where there are three orders ... any plurality of functions or shifting from one order to another is not merely utterly harmful to the community, but one might fairly call it the extreme of wrong doing.... ~~It is~~... is injustice. And, conversely, let us repeat that when each order ... keeps to its own proper business in the commonwealth and does its own work, that is justice and what makes a just society."<sup>17</sup> The attack on UNESCO grew out of injustice and it was forced to a halt by the just analysis of the Murphy Committee.

The injustice leading to the attack did not occur only through the opponents of UNESCO. Both sides shifted from the order proper to their function. It has been the thesis that in both Pasadena and Los Angeles the local view and the general view of the problem became confused with each other. There was no dialogue over the problem. ~~For~~ created the problem as a local action justified by general terms. The other side viewed it as a general action justified by local terms. While the School Development Council saw the need for specific actions towards the Pasadena Schools and justified it in a general theory of the evil in progressive education,

the defenders of the schools came to see a general conspiracy against public education justified by references to specific attacks. In a like manner the specific attack against The E in UNESCO and the UNESCO program was justified by a far reaching plot theory. The defenders of UNESCO in Los Angeles reacted by seeing the attack one on academic freedom, the open society, and the ideals of international cooperation. They justified their position by denying that UNESCO was locally propagandizing. There was a shifting from the proper orders by both sides. This can clearly be seen operating in Los Angeles.

The upholders of UNESCO tried to attach a whole set of legitimately taught concepts to the title of UNESCO, whose proper plane of operation was far beyond the parochialism of a city school system. There were many real issues on the city level ~~through~~ the Curriculum Division could have attached the teaching program that dealt with international cooperation, reducing tensions between people, improving ~~communication~~, increasing concern for human rights and conservation, and developing programs for cultural exchange.<sup>18</sup> This involves UNESCO in a program for which it can not be responsible. The institution could not function on the level of the Los Angeles schools. By bringing the international level down to the local level the Curriculum Division was forced into a distorted view of UNESCO, making it the guardian symbol for all sorts of ideals it did not represent in the context of Los Angeles. Certainly the people of Los Angeles would have been misled if they came to view UNESCO as the institution they should look to, above all, for the reduction of

tensions between people. UNESCO was intended to have a long ranged, unobtrusive effect on this problem on a scale unlikely to cause intense community involvement. The same would hold for any of the other categories, including cultural exchange, which would be more concretely manifested in the Fulbright Program, or better yet, in the history of California's Asian minorities. This is not to say that UNESCO was not involved in these areas. Certainly it was. But the people of Los Angeles should have encountered this involvement not in the public schools, but filtering through the high level scholarly, scientific, and cultural communities for whom the international services of UNESCO made a real difference. The injustice of the Los Angeles friends of UNESCO was to try to ~~stunt~~ the international institution into the local schools.

The injustice of the opponents of UNESCO was to interfere in a local issue with a theory of international conspiracy. The over enthusiasm of UNESCO's supporters had created the potential of a legitimate issue over the misuse of UNESCO's name in the Los Angeles schools. But there was no reason to reflect that misuse on the character of UNESCO, ~~as the~~ attackers did. The very essence of the real issue was the absence of UNESCO in that which claimed UNESCO. It was attacking the right thing for the wrong reason to call the matter a plot by UNESCO. Justice called for the comparison of the actual effects of UNESCO in Los Angeles with the ~~misleadingly~~ leadingly connected to UNESCO by the program in Los Angeles. The action of the opponents was the direct opposite. Admitting the educational outcome of the UNESCO program might have been a confused idea ~~as the~~ ~~misleadingly~~

compounds error to use these confused ideas as "proof" of UNESCO's educational conspiracy against American sovereignty. The opponents of UNESCO improperly intruded this theory onto the local level. The opponents of UNESCO fastened upon the visible manifestations of the original, local misuse of UNESCO by its supporters and misused them in an argument concerning the nature and intentions of UNESCO. If UNESCO really was doing something in Los Angeles their argument might have been worth something. But it was patently unjust in joining the Los Angeles UNESCO program and the theory of the UNESCO plot, for one applied to the Los Angeles schools and the other applied to UNESCO.

The ingenious work of the Murphy Committee was to separate the attack on UNESCO from the supposed concrete manifestations of the educational plot. The importance of this separation is reflected in the reaction of the Los Angeles Special Committee. "... By a method of thought known only to the Murphy Committee ~~it~~ comes up with the conclusion that it was all a tempest in a teapot; there was never any problem of UNESCO in the schools of Los Angeles."<sup>19</sup> The Murphy Committee did not ignore the Los Angeles controversy.<sup>20</sup> ~~It~~ argued that UNESCO was not involved in Los Angeles; no proof lay in the UNESCO program. They examined the charges themselves, not in reference to Los Angeles, but in reference to the actual events to which the charges refer.<sup>21</sup>

The Murphy Report did justice to the charges against UNESCO in the very basic sense of the word. When the Committee dealt with the Los Angeles controversy, it went to the important facts ~~concerning~~

Los Angeles. The Committee looked at the realities of Los Angeles, The E in UNESCO, the actual attacks made, the analysis of the UNESCO program, the resolutions of the Board of Education. UNESCO was found not involved in Los Angeles. Therefore, the Committee went on to ask where else was UNESCO being charged of impropriety. The context of each charge was examined. Things were put in their proper place. Justice was done.

Without even calling for a change of Legion policy, the rendering of justice by the Murphy Committee caused those changes. The attack on UNESCO had been rendered vulnerable, for it was shown to be irrelevant to Los Angeles and invalid in general. The charge of invalidity had to be ~~reaffirmed~~<sup>22</sup> Reaffirmation of the old resolutions would not suffice. The Murphy Report said nothing of those. It stood over the old accusations. The opponents of UNESCO had to either make those accusations hold or watch them die a lingering death.

The opponents of UNESCO sincerely believed their accusations, having worked successfully with them in situations impervious to criticism. Unaware of their weakness, the opponents ~~chose~~ chose to try to make their charges stick. Their case was strongest against the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. At least their quotations from William Benton, William G. Carr, and Milton Eisenhower were from important members of that Commission. The Towards World Understanding case against UNESCO was insufficient. *It was stronger than the case based on writings disclaimed by UNESCO.* ~~It~~ It gave

them cause to hope that an investigation of UNESCO by Congress would produce the strong case the knew was needed to achieve American withdrawal from UNESCO. They knew from Los Angeles that UNESCO had many



real condition of justice. "But in reality justice ... is not a matter of external behavior, but of the inward self and of attending to all that is, in the fullest sense, a man's proper concern."<sup>24</sup>

The Murphy Committee attended to its proper business; it concentrated on its investigation. In doing so it created a situation in which its critics had to justify their views as their proper business. This is the strength of a just argument, for it requires dissenters from it to give a real justification of their view. Here true dialogue takes place. The process recognizes that men can entertain many interests as their own. It locates the problem in harmonizing these various interests with those orders of existence to which they pertain.

The Murphy Committee accomplished this within the field with which they were concerned, one small portion of the immense range of public affairs. Nevertheless, it was a valuable accomplishment. In an age that desires, but rarely achieves, a concrete example of its political theories at work, the justice done to the attack on UNESCO by the Murphy Committee ought not to go unnoticed.

But the value of a working example lies in learning from it. The Murphy Report resolved the particular attack that flourished in the early 1950's. It would be a mistake, an injustice of expecting more from the Report than is its proper business, to assume that it has precluded another attack arising at another time, another place, in another set of circumstances.

Right-wing literature shows the animus against UNESCO still survives among the more extreme ideologues. As the attack on UNESCO



began to falter, for many who believed in it the attack subsided back into a broader attack on the United Nations. Thus, Alvin Mansfield Owsley of Texas, a Founder and Past National Commander of the American Legion, addressed the National Executive Committee in Nat, 1957. He quote remarks against UNESCO from debate in the House of Representatives in the course of his condemnation of the United Nations. "... UNESCO is one of the most pernicious of the international ventures of the United Nations. It is an educational institution and therefore it has that pernicious influence on youngsters."<sup>25</sup> But Owsley was aiming mainly at the United Nations. "I know not what others will do, but as for me, I favor denouncing the United Nations as an international conspiracy or world agency inimicable to American security. I would urge the United States Government to get our of the United Nations; and invite the United Nations out of the United States; off our blessed land."

Arise you Legionnaires,  
Renew ancient faith in the land of your fathers....  
Keep up the fight for Americanism,  
Keep step with the National Anthem,  
Add new glory to Old Glory,  
Embrace America, my beloved,  
This is my plea --<sup>26</sup>  
This is my prayer.

In the extreme publications from which the attack on UNESCO began, one can find the old attack preserved. The American Mercury reminded its readers in the monthly feature "Mercury Warned You" of the UNESCO plot. In three consecutive issues during 1960 portions of ~~the~~ anti-UNESCO articles were reprinted.<sup>27</sup> Jo Hinderman, a frequent contributor of articles exposing conspiracies, revealed that the Florida PTA was promoting UNESCO "propaganda."<sup>28</sup> Almost

every issue of the Economic Council Newsletter comes out with articles indicting the U.N. system, including UNESCO, for creating world government. But, as has become typical, the U.N. is the central danger. UNESCO is seen as a specialized manifestation of the U.N. threat.<sup>29</sup> No longer does one find statements such as: "UNESCO is the greatest danger to free men. It is the most bewildering organization ever conceived... ~~unprecedentedly~~ <sup>30</sup> The U.N. had become the threat.

Among certain sections of the Catholic community the theory of UNESCO's educational conspiracy has been preserved. For instance, in the late summer of 1956, when the American Legion was pulling back from the stand taken in the 1955 "UNESCO Resolution," the Catholic War Veterans of America passed an even stronger resolution. They flatly called for U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO. The grounds were the old charge that UNESCO was "attempting to prepare the youth ~~for~~ the day when their first loyalty will be to a Godless world government."<sup>31</sup> An article in The Wanderer quoted Cardinal Mc Intyre in a lengthy denunciation of UNESCO. UNESCO was in the process of placing all American education, including private education, under Federal control, reserving ultimate control to itself. This destruction of "freedom in education" would come through the UNESCO resolution on "Discrimination in Education." The Cardinal compared it with the E in UNESCO which had been "eliminated ... by ... the people of Los Angeles." Such might be done to UNESCO, it was suggested.<sup>32</sup>

Lastly, in recent years, as the propagandistic aspects of the Cold War become more and more obvious, UNESCO has been criticized for being the dupe of the Soviet propaganda machine. Senator Dodd,

speaking before the Senate, threatened to call for American withdrawal from UNESCO if the institution did not make amends for the October, 1960 issue of the UNESCO Courier. That issue dealt with the problem of racism throughout the world. Dodd was angry because a picture showing anti-Negro prejudice in the South was not balanced by a picture showing Soviet anti-Semitism. This "perniciously one-sided presentation" was a provocation that had to be righted, or "withdrawal from UNESCO is the only honorable course open to us."<sup>33</sup>

Thus, animosity against UNESCO is not dead. The institution still has its extreme critics.<sup>34</sup> But presently they are isolated, lacking a powerful focus, forum, and momentum in their attack. They are, nevertheless, a base from which another attack on UNESCO can grow. The specific form and direction of such a potential attack can not be predicted. The friends of UNESCO will have to wait until the concrete need arises to frame their defense. What can be done, in preparation, is for UNESCO and its supporters to attend to all that is, in the fullest sense, their proper concern.<sup>35</sup>

The original vulnerability of UNESCO was greatly increased by over-zealous enthusiasts for the ideal of UNESCO intruding these ideals in improper places. The Los Angeles UNESCO program, like a disease, inverted the natural order. UNESCO is particularly vulnerable to the danger of not attending to its proper concern. Who knows what an international educational, scientific, and cultural organization should concern itself with? It might prove useful for UNESCO to examine its activities asking not whether this activity needs doing but is this institution the one in whose proper sphere this potential activity

falls. Most of the great educational, scientific, and cultural work of man has come in the quest of self knowledge. There may lie the ~~secret~~ of UNESCO.

Chapter I:

Chapter II:

- 1 Ernest O. Melby, American Education Under Fire, Anti-Defamation League, New York, 1951; John Bainbridge, "Danger's Ahead in the Public Schools," Mc Calls, October, 1952.
- 2 My account of the events in Pasadena is based mainly on David Hulburd, This Happened in Pasadena, Macmillan Co., New York, 1951; and the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, The Pasadena Story, Washington, D.C., June, 1951. A carefully selected account from an anti-Goslin point of view is in Catherine C. Halberg and Louise H. Padelford, "The Pasadena Story," in CRA, 82:1, 7/26/51, A4695-9. Mary L. Allen, Education or Indoctrination, Caxton, Caldwell, Idaho, 1955, is a more extreme conservative analysis.
- 3 Hulburd, op. cit., p. 63.
- 4 Ibid., p. 57.
- 5 Ibid., pp. 67-8.
- 6 Frank Wells before a meeting of the School Development Council at the American Legion Hall, April 24, 1950. Quoted in Hulburd, op. cit., p. 77.
- 7 Ibid., p. 98.
- 8 Ibid., pp. 105-6.
- 9 See: California Legislature, 1951 Regular Session, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, Eighth Report: Education in Pasadena, California, 1951.
- 10 Willard E. Goslin, Before the Board of Education, Nov. 20, 1950. Quoted by Hulburd, op. cit., p. 152.
- 11 A short summary of this reaction is given by Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School, Knopf, New York, 1961, pp. 341-3. Hulburd, op. cit., was highly susceptible to such an interpretation. Bainbridge, op. cit., is a short example of such a reaction. The theory probably began with the "Report on the Enemy," by Harold Benjamin, Chairman of the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, in Defense Bulletin, No. 35, Washington, D.C., July, 1950 (This can be found in Calif., Senate Investigating Committee..., op. cit., pp. 93-6).
- 12 In making a distinction such as this the case tends to overstate itself. There are exceptions. But the distinction has considerable evidence in its favor and is useful throughout

a study of the attack on UNESCO.

13 It is true that later a "communist affiliation" case was made against Kilpatrick, See: Ibid., 19-20. But this was a later reaction, not presented until the fall of 1950. The first reaction was to what Kilpatrick said and its presence in Pasadena. See: Ibid., pp. 31-2, and Halberg and Padelford, op. cit.

14 Quoted in California Senate..., op. cit., p. 20.

15 There is a problem in introducing Zoll. His past was one of involvement with anti-Semitic, semi-Fascist groups. One that he created was on the Attorney General's list as Fascist and subversive. He further has received a good deal of unfavorable publicity over attempts to extort money from the New York radio station WMCA. These are normally listed by liberal writers in introducing Zoll in a manner similar to the lists of un-American activities citations used by right-wing writers in introducing suspect liberals. It seems to me contradictory to deny the relevance of "past mistakes" by the liberal and to parade those of the reactionary as evidence of a hopelessly base character. At the same time it is not proper to deny the existence of such a past in either case. It would seem that in both cases the substantive works of the men deserve a reasoned judgment.

16 Allen A. Zoll, "Progressive Education Increases Delinquency: 'Progressive' Education is Subverting America," National Council for American Education, New York, N.Y. In: Calif. Senate..., op. cit., pp. 81-92.

17 There is considerable controversy over the extent of this quoting and distribution. I am inclined to accept the assessment of the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, op. cit., p. 21, of the extent this and similar material was used by the School Development Council. I do not accept the stress they put on the non-local origin of the material. The attack did not develop from the material. The material suited the attack, and therefore was used.

18 Calif. Senate..., op. cit., p. 35.

19. Hulburd, op. cit., p. 95.

20 Quoted by [REDACTED]

21 "News [REDACTED] No. 5," P.E.A. Committee on Information, June 1, 1950. In: Calif. Senate..., op. cit., p. 76.

22 Hulburd, op. cit., pp. 90-3.

23 Ibid., p. 93.

24 This divergence between local orientation and general orientation is further brought out by the analysis of Mary L. ~~Allen~~, Education or Indoctrination, which gives a reactionary view of the Pasadena controversy. She expresses dismay over the rapidity with which Reverend Morrison, who first denounced the Zoll material, was able to find out about Zoll's background. She checked all the local sources for articles on Zoll and found none. Evidence showed that the information must have come from the National Education Association. Both here and in the California Senate Investigating Committee Report (p. 35) it was implied that this was not cricket. It is interesting that Allen assumes the logical procedure in researching Zoll's background is from the local library out and that if the material came from the NEA it was by its, not Morrison's, initiative. Many people would assume that the best way to quickly find the background of a person such as Zoll would be by a long distance telephone call to the NEA, the ADA, or the Anti-Defamation League asking that full information be airmailed immediately.

25 Mary L. Allen, op cit.

26. Frank Wells quoted in Hulburd, op. cit., p. 76. The theory of local orientation among groups such as the School Development Council helps explain why they were among the first to form an alternative program to progressive patterns. They reacted to the actual classroom performance of the Pasadena system with vision not clouded with the tinted glass of contemporary theory. Starting with their local situation - recall the revitalizing effect of the Independent's campaign for school complaints - the School Development Council had an insight into the short comings of the contemporary schools well ahead of the times.

27 National Commission for the Defense..., op. cit., pp. 36-7.

28 Ibid., p. 19; and Hulburd, op. cit., p. 144. This is not mentioned in The Report, op. cit., which is a selective account of the hearings. Goslin's "UNESCO affiliation" was actually with the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO of which he was a member.

29 Quoted by Willard Givens, "The Fight on International Cooperation: An Analysis of Current Attacks on the United Nations and UNESCO," An Address to the NEA, Jan. 27, 1952. In SIOM, 83:1, pp. 287.

30 National Commission for the Defense..., op. cit., pp. 36-7.

31 Mary L. Allen, op. cit., pp. 49-50. She based her exposition of UNESCO on Paul Shafer and John Howland Snow, The Turning

of the Tides, Long House, New York, 1953, quoting their quoting of passages from Towards World Understanding, a series of reports of seminars on education published by UNESCO. She does not give the original references and Turning of the Tides is unavailable. Her quotes should be checked nevertheless.

32 Mary L. Allen, op. cit., pp. 80-1.

33 The full background of the American Flag Committee and kindred organizations is given in Gordon D. Hall, The Hate Campaign Against the U.N.: One World Under Attack, the Beacon Press, Boston, 1952.

34 The "Report on UNESCO" is found in CRA, 82:1, 10/18/51, A6550-2. For some reason the page references to the Congressional Record given by Hall do not agree with mine. He locates the above article on A6855-7.

35 Hall, op. cit., p. 9.

36 CRA, 82:1, 10/20/51, A6964.

37 Hall, op. cit., p. 30.

38 Ibid., p. 9.

39 CRA, 82:2, 4/1/52, A2075-7.

40 CRA, 82:2, 4/4/52, A2166.

41 CRA, 82:1, 10/18/51/, A6551.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid. In his refutation of the "Report on UNESCO" Carnahan attributed these words to the American Flag Committee saying they were claimed to be a direct quotation in the "Report" from Towards World Understanding. But the "Report" actually claimed that they were no more than the Committee's own summary of the import of Booklet V. So here Carnahan is unfortunately guilty of the distortion he was blaming the committee for. See CRA, 82:2, 4/1/52, A2075.

44 CRA, 82:1, 10/18/51/, A6552.

45 Ibid.



1 [redacted] Day Observed in Civic Ceremony," LAT, 10/25/51, I:2:5; and "Sixth Birthday of U.N. Celebrated in Lights," LAT, 10/25/51, I:3:picture story.

2 Max Mc Cullough, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State, in SIOM, 83:2, 3/11/54, p. 147; 3/17/54, p. 188.

3 Ibid., pp. 188-9.

4 See: California Legislature, 1948 Regular Session, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, Third Report: Textbooks, California, 1948. The suspect authors referred to in Building America include: [redacted] Charles A. Beard, Pearl S. Buck, Zachariah Chaffee, Jr., Stuart Chase, Owen Lattimore, Helen M. and Robert S. Lynd, Lewis Mumford, Lincoln Steffens, Granville Hicks, and Frank Lloyd Wright.

5 [redacted] Stoddard to Quit," LAT, 10/26/51, I:2:1-2.

6 Ibid., picture.

7 Ibid., I:1:5.

8 Ibid., I:2:1-2

9 Dr. George Shuster, SIOM, 83:2, 3/11/54, p. 147.

10 McCullough, Ibid., p. 189.

11 Ibid.

12 In: SIOM, 83:2, 3/17/54, pp. 190-2.

13 Ibid.

14 See: Hall, The Hate Campaign, op. cit., pp. 28-9 for the background of the Liberty Belles, Inc.

15 "Contenting Factions in UNESCO Row Argue Before School Board," LAT, 7/22/52. II:1:4; 3:4.

16 "Patriotic Group Raps UNESCO School Set Up," LAT, 7/24/52, II:3:3. Changes such as stem from the American Flag Committee "Report on UNESCO."

17 "Report on UNESCO Starts New Fight," LAT, 7/25/52, II:1:2, 20:1. These accusations are in the "Report on UNESCO"

18 Ibid.

- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Ibid. Another reference to the "Report on UNESCO."
- 21 Ibid. Yet another reference to the same source.
- 22 "VFW Leaser Urges Outlawing of Communists," LAT, 7/31/52, I:4:2.
- 23 "K of C Raps UNESCO on Birth Control Stand," LAT, 8/28/52, I:4:2.
- 24 "UNESCO Program Ruling Forecast for Next Week," LAT, 8/22/52, I:10:1.
- 25 "UNESCO Friends, Foes Clash at Board Meeting," LAT, 8/26/52, I:8:3, 5:3, picture.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 SIOM, 83:2, 3/17/54, p. 194.
- 28 "Los Angeles Bars UNESCO Handbook," NYT, 8/30/52, 15:1; and "Topics of the Times," NYT, 9/7/52, IV:10:4.
- 29 "UNESCO in the Los Angeles City Schools," Report of Committee, Board of Education, City of Los Angeles, Jan. 15, 1953. In: SIOM, 83:2, 3/11/54, pp. 134.
- 30 "Continuation of UNESCO Plan Urged," LAT, 1/16/53, I:2:5.
- 31 SIOM, 83:2, 3/11/54, p. 138.
- 32 The central advisory committee was a group in the curriculum division responsible for collecting information on international organizations and relations. The UNESCO chairmen were teachers appointed by each participating principal to distribute the information of the central advisory committee.
- 33 LAT, 1/16/53, I:2:5.
- 34 "Final Action on UNESCO Seen Today," LAT, 1/16/53, I:1:5.
- 35 "Resolutions Adopted by the Board of Education on January 19, 1953, Pertaining to the Subject of UNESCO," in: SIOM, 83:2, 3/11/54, p. 139.
- 36 "Schools' UNESCO Program Abolished," LAT, 1/20/53, I:1:1, 12:6.
- 37 SIOM, 83:2, 3/17/54, p. 194-5.

38 LAT, 1/20/53, I:12:6.

39 LAT, 1/16/53, I:2:5; and LAT, 1/19/53, II:1:5, 2:1.  
It appears to me that the reporter who covered the story on the Board resolution was not the one who had covered the controversy previous to that.

40 "The UNESCO School Decision," LAT, 1/22/53, II:4:1.

41 "Los Angeles Bans UNESCO Program," NYT, 1/21/53, 33:1.

42 As appears in Ibid. A few minor changes in order to make two sentences into one were made by ~~XXXXX~~.

43 This is my own judgment. We know too little as yet about the effect of education on public affairs to really argue one side or the other with surety. But the outcome I have out-lined is surely within the realm of the legitimately debateable.

44 Los Angeles City School Districts, Curriculum Division, The E in UNESCO, Publication No. 498, Los Angeles City School Districts, 1950-1, p. 5.

45 LAT, ~~XXXXX~~ 52, II:1:4, 3:4.

46 LAT, 7/35/52, II:1:2:, 20:1.

~~XXXXX~~ Ibid.

~~48~~ LAT, 8/26/52, I:2:3.

49 The E in UNESCO, op. cit., p. 16.

50 Ibid., pp. 19-79

51 Ibid., pp. 92-3.

52 See above: anti-UNESCO quotations given pp. 22, 24-5.

53 GRA, 82:1, 10/18/51, A6552.

54 Deleted.

55 Quoted in Hall, op. cit., p. 29.

56 It would be interesting for a student of the John Birch phenomenon to study the links of the local agitators against the U.N., UNESCO, and the schools with the John Birch society. I am not able to trace any names for lack of sources. I suspect a great deal of the Birch strength around Los Angeles and Houston is the same people who agitated against UNESCO and the schools. The "method" of "research" used by Robert Welch

is similar ~~to~~ that of the anti-UNESCO groups. In the privacy of his own council, he frames his theories, concatenations of quotations from obscure sources fashioned into a "proof" of incredible conspiracy. The combination of a far reaching plot, including the President, with appeal to local action, the "card parties" exposing Polish hams and other Communist goods in the local stores and such pressure on the schools is the repeat of the anti-UNESCO pattern.

57 It will be said that non-local sources such as the series Towards World Understanding, played an important role. They did have a basic part, but they were really local in their impact. A letter and a small check to the International Document Service, Columbia University Press, would procure the set, which was then studied at home or civic center.

58 "Speaking of Crackpots," The Los Angeles Examiner, July 23, 1953. In: CRA, 83:1, 7/28/53, A4749.

59 "Report of the Special Committee of Los Angeles American Legion," Submitted to the American Legion National Executive Committee, May 6, 1955. In: CRA, 84:1, 8/16/55, A5390. One of the authors, P.A. Horton, was the speaker who caused so much trouble at a board meeting by exceeding his time. See above, p. 26. The Murphy Committee will be dealt with at length in the next chapter.

60 There are, of course, examples of very successful conspiracies the entire plan of which was proclaimed at the outset. Hitler's Mein Kampf is the best known example. This does not alter the point here, for UNESCO was seen to be a very surreptitious conspiracy. Furthermore, the proclamation of conspiracy is a tactic for achieving the best of all camouflage, the appearance of a crackpot, by playing on the credulity evinced by the reaction of "What conspirator would proclaim his conspiracy."

61 See rebuttal to Lyons, LAT, 10/26/51, I:2:1-2.

Chapter IV:

The Houston controversy is very difficult to research for it had no clear focus. The above information is from the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, Houston, Texas, Washington, D.C., 1954, pp.15-6; and articles in the Houston Post listed in the Bibliography.

2 Quoted in the American Flag Committee "Report on UNESCO," op. cit., from Vol. V, p. 58, of Towards World Understanding.

3 Ibid., from Vol. V, p. 11.

4 Gross, "Let's Save America," Address to the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference, Washington, D.C., Jan 10, 1955. Int. CR, 8/17/55, pp. 435-7. The second sentence is a accurate quote from Towards World Understanding, Vol. 5, p. 58. I have been unable to find the first sentence.

5 National Executive Committee, "Resolution 33, 1953," Passed in Indianapolis, Ind., May 5, 1953. In: CRA, 84:1, 8/16/55, A5933-4.

6 Hall, The Hate Campaign..., op. cit., p. 9.

7 Most of these are mentioned in Hall, Ibid. He gives a good account of the background and activities of them.

8 See: LAT, 7/26/52, II:4:1, for Los Angeles American Flag Committee and Hall, op. cit., pp. 28-9 for the Liberty Bells' prospectus.

9 "D.A.R. Urges Drive to Win Korean War," NYT, 4/17/52, 32:2.

10 "D.A.R. Admonished by Mrs. Roosevelt," NYT, 4/22/52, 27:1.

11 "V.F.W. Scores Plan for UNESCO Study," NYT, 8/8/52, 5:2-3.

12 "Activities of UNESCO Condemned by K. of C.," NYT, 8/22/52, 4:2.

13 "Resolution 33," op. cit., A5933.

14 See below p. 51 and footnote 28, p. 110.

15 See above p. 26.

16 This is my own impression of the Legion organization and operation developed in the course of studying resolutions, speeches, magazine and newspaper articles dealing with the Legion and UNESCO. I find it adequate to cope with the Legion politics with respect to UNESCO. But it undoubtedly leaves out a good deal of actual Legion organization that is manifested in other kinds of issues.

17 There is considerable difference in the political sensitivity of the D.A.R. and S.A.R. and the Legion and V.F.W. The former two are primarily conservative political lobbies. The latter two are veteran's lobbies first. Their members seem sensitive to nationalistic questions if they appear locally, but are much more passive about what goes on in other localities. The D.A.R. give the impression of being more generally concerned with what goes on here, there, and everywhere. I think the V.F.W. resolved so quickly against UNESCO because it met in Los Angeles where delegates from all over the country were given a solid dose of anti-UNESCO propaganda.

18 American Legion, Special Committee on Covenant..., A Report on UNESCO, Indianapolis, Ind., May 5, 1955. Hereafter: The Murphy Report.

19 United States of America, Delegation to the Second Extraordinary Session of the General Conference of UNESCO, July 1-4, 1953, (Irving Salomon, Chairman), "AN Appraisal of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation," In: SION, 83:2, 3/31/54, pp. 355-73.

20 American Legion, Special Committee on Covenant..., "A Report of UNESCO," prepared for the May 2, 3, and 4, 1954 meetings in Indianapolis, Ind., of the National Executive Committee of the American Legion. In: GRA, 83:2, 6/2/54, A4124-6. Hereafter "First Murphy Report."

21 Ray Murphy, "Statement," SION, 84:2, 3/9/56, p. 363.

22 "Resolution 322," passed by the National Convention, the American Legion, Washington D.C., August 30 to September 2, 1954. In: GRA, 84:1, 1/26/55, A448.

23 Gross, "Chronological Sequence of Actions by the American Legion on UNESCO," GRA, 84:1, 8/16/55, A5933.

25 ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

26 Ibid., pp. 1-5

27 Ibid., pp. 5-10. This analysis follows the testimony and documents submitted by Dr. George Sehuster and Max McCullough to SION. SION, 83:2, 3/11/54, pp. 84ff; 3/17/54, pp. 181ff.

28 The Murphy Report does not refer to her by name as the source of the charges, but in testimony to SION, Ray Murphy stated that "She is the author of the numbered 23 charges which we specifically answer in our report." SION, 84:2, 3/9/56, p. 389.

- 29 The Murphy Report, op. cit., pp. 10-6
- 30 Ibid., pp. 17-22. Figures from p. 21.
- 31 Ibid. pp. 22-5.
- 32 Ibid., pp. 25-33.
- 33 Ibid., pp. 33-8.
- 34 Ibid., p. 39.
- 35 Murphy, SION, 84:2, op. cit., p. 378.
- 36 Gross, 8/2/55, op. cit., A5933. The reasons for the impounding are not clear. Congressman Gross, very much opposed to UNESCO, speaking previous to the National Convention, hinted of some conspiracy to topple the Legion's transitional policy on UNESCO. This is completely untenable. It is more likely that the competence of The Murphy Report took the opponents of UNESCO by surprise. THE AMERICANISM Commission probably realized immediately that its "Report" could not stand ~~up~~ comparison with the Murphy Report. The opponents of UNESCO could then refer to their imprisoned "Report", locked by their own key, such as Congressman Gross did, implying that not the argument, but the intrigue, of the UNESCO-ites was superior. This interpretation seems upheld by what later happened. In the resolution offered to the National Convention the distribution of the "Report" was specifically ordered. This indicates a widespread concern in the Legion over the impounding of the "Report." But in the months after the Resolution was passed during which the Legion worked very hard to justify its position to the public, this mysterious "Report" was rarely used.
- 37 The Murphy Report, op. cit., "Foreword."
- 38 NYT, 9/1/55, 22:2.
- 39 NYT, 9/11/55, 1:26:1-3.
- 40 "Legion and UNESCO," NYT, 9/13/55, 30:3.
- 41 Murphy, SION, 84:2, op. cit., p. 372. The full tabulations with reference to each article are given in the Appendix to SION, 84:2.
- 42 "Legion v. Fund," NYT, 9/18/55, IV:2:5.
- 43 "State D.A.R. Hears Attacks on the U.N.," NYT, 9/29/55, 37:6-7.
- 44 "D.A.R. Would Ban Red China in U.N.," NYT, 9/30/55, 15:2-3.

- 45 "Report By Legion on UNESCO Hailed," NYT, 10/5/55, 14:1.
- 46 "Legion and UNESCO," America, September 24, 1955, pp. 610-1.
- 47 "Never Mind the Facts," The Reporter, October 6, 1955, p. 4.
- 48 "Resolution of the American Legion, Department of Texas, Second Division, Regarding UNESCO," In: GRA, 84:1, 7/7/55, A4976-8.
- 49 The Murphy Report, op. cit., pp. 10, 14, 15, and 43-5.
- 50 See Julian Huxley, UNESCO: Its purpose and Its Philosophy, p. 4.
- 51 UNESCO, op. cit. GRA, A4976-8.
- 52 See above, p. 26.
- 53 See above, p. 39.
- 54 "Report of the Special Committee of Los Angeles American Legion on UNESCO," In: GRA, 84:1, 7/16/55, A5931.
- 55 Ibid., A5931.
- 56 Murphy, SIGN, 84:2, Op. cit., p. 371.
- 57 The reports of the time given for presentation vary. I have taken an average. NYT, 10/10/55, 20:2; SIGN, 84:2, pp. 320-30, 378.
- 58 "Legion Meeting Split on UNESCO," John N. Popham, NYT, 10/10/55, 20:2.
- 59 Letter to the Editor of the New York Times from John Dwight Sullivan, October 26, 1955, NYT, 11/7/55, 28:7. The other material used comes from background details given in newspaper and magazine articles and in testimony by Wagner and Murphy: See bibliography.
- 60 "Legion Urges U.S. to Cut UNESCO Tie," John W. Pophain, NYT, 10/14/55, 2:4-6.
- 62- Ibid., 18:7-8. Reaction of New York delegation see NYT, 11/7/55, 18:7.
- 63 "Truman Rebukes Legion on UNESCO," NYT, 10/14/55, 2:7.
- 64 "UNESCO Director Replies to Legion," NYT, 10/14/55, 3:1.



- 65- Ibid.
- 66- "The Legion and UNESCO," NYT, 10/14/55, 16:2.
- 67 "Veteran's Views on UNESCO," Life, October 14, 1955, pp. 42-4.
- 68 Ray Murphy, "American Legion and UNESCO," America, Nov. 26, 1955.
- 69 J. Addington Wagner, "The American Legion's Stand on UNESCO," An address delivered to the American Legion Department of the District of Columbus at the Shoreham Hotel on Nov. 10, 1955. In: GRA, 84:2, 1/12/56, A240. The speech was reported in NYT, 11/11/55, 13:3.
- 70 "Legion Chief Urges Inquiry into UNESCO," NYT, 11/26/55, 17:6.
- 71 It is so obscure that I have been unable to find a copy of it.
- 72- See: "Legion Assails UNESCO," NYT, 3/8/56, 58+ 7; and "Veterans Score UNESCO," NYT, 5/17/56, 31:1.
- 73 "D.A.R. Supports United Nations," NYT, 4/19/56, 7:2.
- 74 Wagner, "~~Another~~ Look at UNESCO," American Legion Magazine, August, 1956; In: GRA, 84:2, 7/21/56, A6180.
- 75- "Legion Criticizes U.S. on Benefits," NYT, 9/5/56, 11:3.
- 76- 84:2, op.cit., p. 372.
- 77 See above: p. 46.
- 78 See above: pp. 45-6.
- 79 See above: pp. 50-1, 59.
- 80 "First Murphy Report", OP. Cit., GRA, 83:2, 6/2/54, A4126.

Chapter V:

- 1 Murphy, "The American Legion and UNESCO," American, Nov. 26, 1959, p. 239.
- 2 "UNESCO Resolution," 1955, op. cit., Seeabove, p. 59.
- 3 See: Ben H. Bagdikian, "How the Legionnaires Were Duped," The Atlantic, Vol. 198, No. 1, July, 1956, pp. 53-5 for an account of which Legion groups formed the hard core opposition to The Murphy Report. His understanding of how the Legionnaires were duped is elementary and he underestimates the significance of the Los Angeles sector, but nevertheless is useful for background.
- 4 See: The Murphy Report, pp. 10, 43-5. See above: p. 51.
- 5 Special Committee..., op. cit., A5930.
- 6 Murphy, "The American Legion and UNESCO," op. cit., p. 239.
- 7 Special Committee..., op. cit., A5930-1.
- 8 "Resolution Regarding UNESCO," op. cit., A4977.
- 9 Murphy, "...Legion and UNESCO," op. cit., p. 238.
- 10 Ibid., pp. 236-7.
- 11 Quoted in "Never Mind the Facts," The Reporter, Vol. 13, No. 5, October 6, 1955, p. 6.
- 12 ~~Murphy~~, "...Legion and UNESCO," op. cit., p. 238.
- 13 Murphy, SIOM, op. cit., p. 278.
- 14 Remark of floor organizer quoted in NYT, 10/13/55, I:18:8.
- 15 See above, pp. 63-4.
- 16 The following analysis uses Greek political theory as developed especially by Plato. While some contemporary scientists of society, politics, and the psyche might find this philosophy dated, it nevertheless is more useful in this case than attempting to apply interpretations based on the isolationist traditions, status tensions, or psychic tensions. It seems that the data needed to apply these modern, supposedly empirical theories is impossible to gather. On the other hand, the data necessary to apply the supposedly idealistic, Platonic theory of justice is available. At this point my debt to Martin S. Dworkin and Lawrence A. Cremin should be specifically acknowledged. Through his teaching the former has opened to me the significance of Plato and especially

The Republic after it had been closed needlessly by the one-sided view of Karl Popper and his The Open Society and Its Enemies. To both, by their example of taking a classic view of modern phenomena, I am indebted for the idea that perhaps a Greek view might be best for this problem.

17 Plato, The Republic, iv. 434, Cornford, trans., New York: Oxford University Press, 1945, p. 129.

18 See above, pp. 28-30, 35-6, for discussion of the contents of the UNESCO program.

19 Special Committee..., op. cit., A5930.

20 The Murphy Report, pp. 5-10.

21 Ibid., pp. 10-45.

22 The Legion could not do nothing for the Murphy Report was tending to become Legion policy in the public view. Thus there were the wide range of newspapers that backed it and the clauses in the "UNESCO Resolution" saying that, contrary to misrepresented reports, Legion policy was in opposition to UNESCO.

23 Plato, op. cit., iv. 444, p. 143.

24 Ibid., iv. 443, p. 142-3. Here it might be helpful to note that this concept of justice is less ambitious than those frequently used in discussions of justice. See, for instance, Hans J. Morgenthau, "On Trying to Be Just," in Commentary, Vol. 35, No. 5, May, 1963, pp. 420-3, who sets up his "realist" stand by using a very demanding concept of justice: "... it is of the very essence of justice to require an objective standard of distribution of retribution which allows us to say: I have received what is my due, and I have given what is the other's due" (p. 423). While there is a long tradition to justify such a definition, dealing with it is beyond the scope of this essay. Here it is necessary to be content with justice as an internal condition of harmony rather than justice as an external condition of fit rewards.

25 Quoted by Alvin Mansfield Owsley, "America, My Beloved," An Address delivered May 2, 1957, at a meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., of the American Legion National Executive Committee. In GR, 85:1, 5/28/57, A4125-7. The quote is by Rep. Mason during debate on "Independent Office Appropriations Bill, 1958," H.R. 6070. GR, 85:1, 3/20/57, 4045. It is slightly misquoted.

26 Owsley, op. cit., A4127.

- 27 "Mercury Warned You," The American Mercury, Jan. 1960, p. 60; Feb. 1960, p. 56; Mar. 1960, p. 105.
- 28 Jo Hinderman, "PTA: Tower of Babel?" The American Mercury, Feb. 1969, p. 33.
- 29 The full series of The Economic Council Newsletter was not available. Examples will be found in Nos. 484, 489, 490, 492, 499, 500, 512, 513, 518, 519, 522, and especially 510 and 511: "World Government -- At Our Very Door!" Sept. 1, 1961, and "World Government Closing the Trap," Sept. 15, 1961.
- 30 Joe Worthy, "Worthy Speaks Out," Radio broadcast September 10, 1953, in Houston, Texas. Quoted in National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education, Houston, Texas, Washington, D.C., 1954, p. 48.
- 31 Quoted in "Catholic Vets on UNESCO, America Vol. 95, No. 24, September 15, 1956, p. 550.
- 32 "Discrimination in Education," The Wanderer, n.d., In: GR, 87:1, 8/1/61, 14,306-7.
- 33 Remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, D. of Conn., GR, 87:1, 7/25/61, 13362.
- 34 An article in the New York Times, 1/1/62, reports a summary of these more recent attacks given to the press by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.
- 35 See above, pp. 76-8.