

No. 9335. ¹/_a 207

Pts. 1-4



GIVEN BY

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG PROFESSIONAL
GROUPS IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—PART 2

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

May 22; July 8, 1952

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG PROFESSIONAL GROUPS IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—PART 2

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1952

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment, at 10:40 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood and Harold H. Velde (appearance noted in record).

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; William A. Wheeler, investigator; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will come to order, please.

Let the record show that because of the unavoidable absence of the other members of the committee, I am setting up a subcommittee composed of the chairman, for the purpose of the hearing.

Whom do you have as a witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Alice Bennett, please.

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Bennett, will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give to the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, I do.

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. BENNETT. No, I am not.

Mr. WOOD. Should you determine you need counsel, you have the privilege to be so represented.

You may proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

TESTIMONY OF ALICE K. BENNETT

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. BENNETT. Alice K. Bennett.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mrs. BENNETT. I was born in Oakland, Calif., on June 15, 1912.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mrs. BENNETT. Torrance, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mrs. BENNETT. All my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you formerly the wife of Charles W. Judson?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Judson testified before this committee on January 26, 1952.¹

What has been your education and training, please?

Mrs. BENNETT. I am a college graduate, with an A. B. degree, and I have done social work several times for a period of several years. I think I have a total of about 8 years probably of experience.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak a little louder, please?

Mrs. BENNETT. I say I am a college graduate, with an A. B. degree, and I have worked several times as a social worker, for a total of about 8 years, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you work as a social worker, and over what period of time?

Mrs. BENNETT. My employment has always been in Los Angeles County, and I worked from 1934 until 1938 for first the SRA, later LA County Welfare.

Then I resigned after the birth of my first child, and I did not work again until August 1948, when I returned to work with LA County Charities Department.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said that you worked for SRA. What do the initials SRA signify?

Mrs. BENNETT. State relief administration.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the State of California?

Mrs. BENNETT. That is right. It is no longer in existence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you employed by the SRA?

Mrs. BENNETT. Well, I haven't checked the exact dates of my employment, but I think it must have been from either late 1934 or early 1935 until sometime in 1937, or possibly the end of 1936.

I was discharged from there at the time of a large reduction in staff, and shortly after that went to work for Los Angeles County. I worked for about a year or a year and a half for Los Angeles County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Beginning in 1937, was that?

Mrs. BENNETT. I am quite sure it was sometime in 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. And your employment then was that of a social worker?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has, in the course of its investigation of communism in Los Angeles, obtained evidence indicating that you were at one time a member of the Communist Party. Is it correct that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member?

Mrs. BENNETT. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you a member of the party?

Mrs. BENNETT. For a period of about 5 years, from—well, sometime in 1936, I believe, I joined, and I was a member until possibly the spring of 1942. It may have been a little earlier that I dropped out.

¹ Testimony of Charles W. Judson, January 26, 1952, is printed under same title, pt. 1, pp. 2631-2652.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed at the time you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. BENNETT. Part of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a member of the party and how you were brought into the party?

Mrs. BENNETT. I joined at the time that I was working for the SRA, and I think it was the extremely upset condition of the country at that time that probably impelled me to join, because I felt convinced of the necessity of doing something that would seem to be constructive about straightening out the conditions of extreme unemployment, low wage standards, and so forth, that prevailed then.

Of course, I felt this way in my thinking for a considerable period of time from even before the time I went to work, and when I was asked about whether I wanted to join the party, I felt that I did, because it seemed to me then that their beliefs and programs would accomplish social betterment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Our information is that Mr. J. E. Jeffery was instrumental in recruiting you for the party.

Mrs. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was Mr. Jeffery employed at the time of your recruitment?

Mrs. BENNETT. I believe that he was also employed by the SRA, or if he wasn't at that precise time, he was very soon after.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any additional circumstances regarding his recruiting you in the party?

Mrs. BENNETT. Just what do you mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any representations made by him of any particular character in influencing you to become a member?

Mrs. BENNETT. No; there were not any particular representations made. The particular point of interest that initiated the Communist Party organization among social workers was that of organizing the social workers into protective groups. In other words, there were a group of us social workers who were interested in helping to develop a social workers' organization, of which there was none at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Upon your being recruited into the party, were you assigned to any particular group or cell?

Mrs. BENNETT. Well, the group of us, which was very small indeed—well, let's see. There was a very small group of us social workers, and we were organized as a group of social workers. Only social workers were admitted to the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you speak of a group of social workers, of what government or departments were those social workers employees?

Mrs. BENNETT. At the first, when I first joined the party, all of us, the few of us that were, were working for the SRA.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the State relief administration.

Mrs. BENNETT. State relief administration.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the State of California?

And then later the field was broadened, do I understand?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. As more people were interested in becoming members of the party, the unit grew and began to take in members who worked for other social work agencies, such as the Los Angeles Charities Department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us that again? I did not quite get it.

Mrs. BENNETT. As we recruited more members, some of the people worked for other agencies, such as the Los Angeles Charities Department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Los Angeles County Charities?

Mrs. BENNETT. It was not known by that name. I don't know whether it was called the bureau of indigent relief at that time.

Let's see. It was called the charities department, but the agency that we recruited members from was called the bureau of indigent relief. That is part of the charities department, and also a number of people working for private agencies; that is, agencies supported by funds other than tax-collected funds.

Mr. TAVENNER. What organizations, for instance, of a private character?

Mrs. BENNETT. Well, it is my recollection that most of them were connected with the various Jewish agencies, the agencies that were financed by the Jewish Federation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not the group to which you were originally assigned had a name or number?

Mrs. BENNETT. No; I don't recollect the number of the unit. I imagine it had a number.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a Communist Party name?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name?

Mrs. BENNETT. I think it was Alice George, but I had forgotten that name until recently.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the circumstances under which you were given that name?

Mrs. BENNETT. I picked it myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of your using a name other than your own?

Mrs. BENNETT. It was quite necessary for many Communists to use fictitious names for their actual membership registration.

Mr. TAVENNER. About how many persons comprised this original group to which you were assigned and which was composed of employees in the State relief administration?

Mrs. BENNETT. We started out with just three or four people at the beginning. It grew in the course of a year or so to a considerably larger number—although I don't have any exact recollection of how many.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any of the group of members hold office in what was known as the Social Service Employees' Guild, and were any of them members of that guild, in addition to those who may have been officers?

Mrs. BENNETT. I think that probably we were all members of the guild. Whether any of the Communist Party unit members held office, I don't recall. If you could name them, perhaps I could tell you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Presently I will ask you about the names of those who were members.

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether all of the members of your group were members of the guild; that is, the Social Service Employees' Guild?

Mrs. BENNETT. I have no exact recollection, but I feel sure that all of them were, because our chief interest in being a unit was to, as I say, was to promote the organization of the social workers into a protective or union group.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the chief purpose for the organization of the Communist Party within your field; is that what I understand you to say?

Mrs. BENNETT. To me, that was the most important aspect, in a way, and I think it was to the other members, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become aware of any other purposes that the Communist Party had in organizing the Communist Party within your guild?

Mrs. BENNETT. At that time, I can't say that I felt any awareness of any other objective. The organization of the social workers into a union and an opportunity to discuss and understand the world situation was apparent to me as the chief benefits of being in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any directions or instructions, as members of the Communist Party, as to how you were to function in the performance of your ordinary duties as a social worker?

Mrs. BENNETT. My recollection now is that the field of our actual work was not covered by any such instructions. We were assumed to be discharging our job according to the job requirements.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the performance of your duties as a social worker, either you individually or other members of your group, did you at any time use your position in order to recruit persons into the Communist Party directly or indirectly, or in any other way aid the Communist Party in the course of your work?

Mrs. BENNETT. Not that I can recollect now. We functioned as a secret group; that is, we did not reveal our membership in any way and we had very little connection with the main Communist organization in the country. We did not attend any open meetings and, as I said before, our membership was limited exclusively to other social workers. That was to protect us so that our membership would not be known in general.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why was it that such an effort was made to protect your names from being identified with the Communist Party movement, even on the part of other Communists?

Mrs. BENNETT. I presume it was because it would jeopardize our jobs and therefore our possible value to the party if our membership was known.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, that is the same reason as assigned for the establishment of Community Party cells within the professions?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. That is right, after the professional section was organized, which was some months, maybe a year or so, after the social workers' unit, our unit, became part of the professional section of Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there occasions when members of your group or unit gave information to the Communist Party regarding the clients that you had as social workers which might have been of aid or assistance to the Communist Party in its program?

Mrs. BENNETT. It was possible that there were such incidents. I can recollect none in connection with myself, but it is possible that that was done occasionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any office or position in the first group, composed of employees of the State relief administration?

Mrs. BENNETT. Frankly, I don't recall. It seems to me that at one time I was what was called a literature agent, but I don't think that was so very long. It was a minor post.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have meetings at which Communist Party literature was distributed?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that Communist Party literature consist of the usual works of Lenin and Marx and Engels, which were studied as part of the Communist Party program?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, that is right, although we did not devote as much time to general study of Marx and Lenin, I believe, as most of the other units.

Mr. TAVENNER. I stated a moment ago that the staff of the committee had ascertained that J. E. Jeffery was the person who was instrumental in bringing you into the party, which you confirmed.

Now, I want to ask you whether the persons I am now going to name were also connected in any way with the Communist Party group to which you were assigned and of which you were a member.

Betty Selden.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify her first, please?

Mrs. BENNETT. I can recollect the name. She was employed in one of the public agencies. I am not sure now whether it was the county, or the SRA.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether she held any position at any time in the group of the party?

Mrs. BENNETT. I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, our investigation shows that this person is presently employed by the county of Los Angeles as a social case worker.

Henrietta Pally.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. By the SRA, as a social worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Florence Covey.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. I believe she worked for a private agency, and I think also at one time the county, but I am not too sure of the county.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the name of the private agency?

Mrs. BENNETT. Frankly, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bob Cohn.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Also known as Bob Cole.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, I recollect him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify him further?

Mrs. BENNETT. He worked for a Jewish agency.

Mr. WOOD. Raise your voice a little bit. We are having a little difficulty in hearing you.

Mrs. BENNETT. He worked for a Jewish agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he held any position within the Communist Party?

Mrs. BENNETT. If he did, it was only in the unit that he was in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Milt Kashner.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. As a social worker, by SRA.

Mr. WOOD. I believe you said that SRA meant the State relief administration.

Mrs. BENNETT. State relief administration.

Mr. WOOD. Of the State of California?

Mrs. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Max Bogner.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. As a social worker. I believe he was employed by SRA for a while and then later went to a Jewish agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Marta Bogner.

Mrs. BENNETT. Max Bogner's wife. I don't recall that she was employed at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sara Reznick.

Mrs. BENNETT. A social worker for a Jewish agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dorothy Pezman.

Mrs. BENNETT. A social worker. I believe she worked for SRA.

Mr. TAVENNER. Maurice Ryan.

Mrs. BENNETT. I think that was Maureen Ryan, isn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Maureen?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. She is the one whom I recollect with a name something like that. Yes, she was a social worker; I don't remember where.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sonia Solotoy.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. She was a social worker who gave up employment during the course of time that I knew her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether she was the wife of Percy Solotoy?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, Percy Solotoy was a witness before the committee in September 1951, in Hollywood, but he refused to testify, on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him.

Rose Most.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, I recollect her, although I didn't know her well. I think she worked for a Jewish agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Rose Segure.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. To my best recollection, she worked for a Jewish agency also.

Mr. VELDE. Where did she work, in Los Angeles, or in San Francisco?

Mrs. BENNETT. She was working in Los Angeles. I believe she had come from San Francisco.

Mr. VELDE. What year was this that she worked in Los Angeles?

Mrs. BENNETT. 1937 and 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. Branislaus Zukas.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes; I remember him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify him more fully?

Mrs. BENNETT. To my best recollection, he is now employed as a social worker in Los Angeles, but worked as a union organizer, as a paid union organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know with what union he was connected?

Mrs. BENNETT. I think it was the now defunct State, Municipal, and County Workers of America.

Was that the correct name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any other employment of his?

Mrs. BENNETT. He may have worked for SRA, but I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gladys Liefchild.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify her more in detail?

Mrs. BENNETT. Only that she was not a social worker, but was employed in some technical capacity at the Los Angeles General Hospital.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the name of the hospital?

Mrs. BENNETT. Los Angeles County General Hospital.

Mr. TAVENNER. Our investigation showed she is not now employed by that hospital, Mr. Chairman.

Gerald Liefchild.

Mrs. BENNETT. That would be Gladys Liefchild's husband. I can say only the same thing about him, that he was not a social worker, but was a technician at the hospital.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the record, I should state that he likewise is not now employed by the Los Angeles County Hospital.

Mercier Reese.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes; I dimly recall him. My recollection is that he was not a member of the social workers' unit very long. I don't recall whether he left town, or what.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall anything further regarding his employment?

Mrs. BENNETT. I am afraid not. He worked either for SRA or the county, but I don't feel able to state definitely which.

Mr. TAVENNER. Katherine Foreman.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. She worked for a Jewish agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miriam Solomon.

Mrs. BENNETT. I recall the name, but I can't recollect where she worked.

Mr. TAVENNER. The important thing is was she a member of your group in the Communist Party?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't believe that she was ever a member of the unit that I was in; however, I knew her as a Communist, and she must have been a member of the unit that comprised the private agency workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Freda Marcus.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. By a Jewish agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether she held any other position at any time in Los Angeles County? Do you know whether or not she was deputy probation officer for Los Angeles County?

Mrs. BENNETT. No; I don't know at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think I should state for the record that our investigation has disclosed that of the persons named as having been members of the Communist Party group with the witness, none is now employed by the State of California, or city of Los Angeles, with the exception of the first one named, Betty Selden.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, did I understand correctly that all of the names that have been mentioned have been identified by the witness as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; as members of her group, with the exception of one person, whom she identified as a person known to her to be a Communist, but not a member of her group.

Mrs. BENNETT. I think I should elaborate a little further by explaining that a good many of these people connected with private agencies, the Jewish agencies, were not at any time members of the group that I was in, but we occasionally held joint meetings and, therefore, I met them as Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you a question in the early part of your testimony as to whether any of the persons who were members of your group of the Communist Party were officials of the Social Service Employees' Guild. Can you now identify any of these persons as having held such positions?

Mrs. BENNETT. The only one I think of who would probably have held office would probably be Mr. Jeffery.

Mr. TAVENNER. What office did he hold, do you know?

Mrs. BENNETT. Frankly, I don't recollect. My recollection of the guild is that it was a very short-lived organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that you remained in this first group until at least 1937, or maybe it was even a later date.

Mrs. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean, what date did you leave that group?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't recall exactly, but it was sometime late in 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what group were you then assigned?

Mrs. BENNETT. I was transferred to a newspaper group.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for your transfer to the newspaper group?

Mrs. BENNETT. I was married at that time to a newspaper man, and after the birth of my son, when I gave up employment as a social worker, there was no longer any value to my remaining in a social worker's group.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was a Communist Party unit within the newspaper field, was it?

Mrs. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. May I ask something at that point, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. At the time you left the unit of the social workers, approximately how many social workers were there employed in Los Angeles? Or do you know?

Mrs. BENNETT. How many social workers were there employed?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mrs. BENNETT. I imagine that would be a matter of several hundred, counting the private and so-and-so agencies.

Do you mean the total number of social workers employed?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mrs. BENNETT. I have no way of knowing that. The total would have been quite large.

Mr. WOOD. What percentage of those that you knew were members of the Communist Party at the time you left the union of the social workers?

Mrs. BENNETT. What percentage of the total number of social workers were Communists?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; that you know.

Mrs. BENNETT. I would say that the largest number of social workers whom I knew personally were Communists. But that would not be a matter of—no, it wouldn't be accurate to say that the large number I knew were Communists, because I knew many who were not.

Mr. WOOD. I cannot hear you.

Mrs. BENNETT. I will retract that statement. I don't think it would be accurate to say that the large number that I knew were Communists, but a considerable portion of the ones I knew.

Naturally, I had association with a good many social workers who were not Communists. I think there were a total of perhaps 30 who were Communists.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. WOOD. Have you named all that you can now recall that were members of the Communist Party that were in the social workers' field at that time?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't recollect any specific names that haven't been mentioned.

Mr. WOOD. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I take it that there were 30 Communists among the social workers' group. What percentage was that of the whole, of all the employees who were classified as social workers, as nearly as you can judge?

Mrs. BENNETT. It would certainly be well under 1 percent, I am sure, because counting the unemployment relief organizations, such as the county welfare and SRA, plus the smaller staffs of the private agencies, I am sure there must have been several thousand social workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any way of knowing, through your Communist Party connections, of the exact proportion of members to the total employees? I mean by that that you may know of 30 who were members of the Communist Party of the vast number in addition, who were employees, you may not have had any means of knowing whether they were members of the party, or not. Is that correct, or not?

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mrs. BENNETT. That is correct, in a way. Actually, I presume that any social worker who was a Communist would have been assigned to social workers' units, as I mentioned earlier, because it was considered necessary they be in protected units.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us any more of the organization of the Communist Party within the field of the social workers, as to how many cells there were, if you know, or any other organizational information?

Mrs. BENNETT. At the time that I was transferred to another group in 1938, there were, to my recollection, three units of social workers, one comprising county employees, of which I was a member; one comprising SRA employees, and one comprising workers in private agencies.

I am not very sure of the organization of the private agency group at that time because I had very little connection with it.

The social workers had started out as one unit, taking in everybody connected with any sort of social work, but as more members joined, it seemed advisable to break the organization down into more specialized groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then do I understand that the total membership of the three groups was about 30, as far as you know?

Mrs. BENNETT. Somewhere in that neighborhood. Possibly a few more, counting private agency workers whom I did not know.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the unit within the newspaper field?

Mrs. BENNETT. Approximately 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time, what opportunity did you have to observe the workings of the unit? Were you regular at attendance at meetings?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, I was quite regular in attendance at meetings, and that was the only opportunity I had to observe the workings of a newspaper unit, was by physical attendance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not being in the newspaper field yourself, you are, of course, not a member of the Newspaper Guild; is that right?

Mrs. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Although your husband at the time was a member of the guild?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee the extent to which you observed the workings of the Communist Party group, with reference to the Newspaper Guild?

Mrs. BENNETT. I can only say that I heard discussions of the guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with any of the issues in the Newspaper Guild which were discussed in the Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. BENNETT. I heard the discussions at that time. I have no recollection what the specific issues were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted well enough with the issues to learn whether the Communist Party was endeavoring to control and influence the decisions in the guild on those issues?

Mrs. BENNETT. I think it would be honest to state that they tried to influence the decisions of the guild, but as to whether I can say that they tried to control the guild, I don't think that would be quite accurate to say that they tried to control the guild, although they were intensely interested in the guild policy in many issues, being favorable, at least, to them.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by the term "to them"? Do you mean to the Communist Party?

Mrs. BENNETT. That it could be somewhat similar to policies that were approved by the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many members were there in this unit while you were a member? That is, the unit within the guild, or the newspaper field?

Mrs. BENNETT. The membership, I would say, was somewhere around 20, approximately. Perhaps not that many much of the time.

Mr. WOOD. Did you understand that that was the only Communist unit within the newspaper field in Los Angeles County?

Mrs. BENNETT. That was my understanding.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony before the committee regarding the membership of the following-named individuals in the Communist Party in the newspaper field. I want to read you the names of those persons and ask you whether or not you can identify them, from your own personal knowledge, as having been members of the group to which you belonged.

Charles Daggett.

Mrs. BENNETT. I have no personal knowledge of his membership because he was not in Los Angeles during those years that I was in the unit, but I have heard of him by reputation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. I only want you to answer in regard to what you know of your own personal knowledge.

Mr. Daggett, of course, has appeared before the committee and has admitted his membership.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But I do not want you to base your testimony on what you heard or understood from some other person.

Mrs. BENNETT. Well, during the time that I was a member of that unit, he was not a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sidney Burke.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how he was employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. I am not quite sure of how he was employed at that time, during those particular years that I was a member.

Mr. WOOD. Is that B-u-r-k?

Mr. TAVENNER. B-u-r-k-e, S-i-d-n-e-y.

Leo Simon.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dolph Winebrenner.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how he was employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. He worked for the People's World.

Mr. TAVENNER. Urcel Daniel.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what positions she held within the cell, if any?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't recall that she held any position in the unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how she was employed at that time?

Mrs. BENNETT. During part of the time, anyway, I think she was the paid secretary of the guild.

Mr. WOOD. The Newspaper Guild?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Herbert Klein, K-l-e-i-n.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't remember. He was not working for a metropolitan newspaper.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what his employment was in New York before he came to California?

Mrs. BENNETT. No; I don't. I only recall of one time, prior to being in Los Angeles, he had been a foreign correspondent for the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. TAVENNER. Minna Klein.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, for the record, I should say that Herbert Klein was a witness before the committee in California in September 1951, but he declined to answer questions regarding his alleged Communist Party activities.

G. H. Garrigues.

Mrs. BENNETT. I never knew Mr. Garrigues.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tom O'Connor.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed at that time?

Mrs. BENNETT. As a reporter for the Daily News.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he hold any position, to your knowledge, in the Newspaper Guild?

Mrs. BENNETT. I recall that he did hold an office, but I don't recall which.

Mr. TAVENNER. Darr Smith.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. As a reporter for the Daily News.

Mr. TAVENNER. Philip Connelly.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. I think at that time he was still a reporter for the Herald Express.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dorothy Connelly.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Philip Connelly was married twice, and the first name of both wives was Dorothy.

Mrs. BENNETT. This is his first wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Cohee.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Alice Cohee.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, his wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Morgan Hull.

Mrs. BENNETT. He was not a member of the union at the time that I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not understand you.

Mrs. BENNETT. I never knew him as a unit member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pat Killoran.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. She worked for the Hollywood Citizens News. I am not quite sure what her capacity there was.

Mr. WOOD. How do you spell that name?

Mr. TAVENNER. K-i-l-l-o-r-i-a-n.

Mrs. BENNETT. I think it was Killoran.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Bill Oliver?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of of the newspaper unit?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, during part of the time that I was.
It is my recollection that he joined after I was in the unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. As a drama critic for the Herald Express.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he is still employed in that capacity?

Mrs. BENNETT. No, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ed Robbins.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tom Cullen.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were these two persons employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. Peoples' World.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both of them?

Mrs. BENNETT. During part of the time, at least.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to those persons named as members of your group, can you identify Pettis Perry as a person who attended your meetings?

Mrs. BENNETT. I cannot recollect that he attended any of the unit meetings, but I knew him as a Communist Party functionary. That is, I knew he was a functionary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Paul Cline, C-l-i-n-e?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. I knew of him and had met him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he was a member or functionary of the Communist Party?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes, he was known to be the county organizer.

Mr. VELDE. What did Pettis Perry do? What was his function?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't recollect his exact title, but he was in the county organization of the party.

Mr. VELDE. Did he ever hold a job in district 13?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Paul Cline attend and take part in any of your meetings?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't recollect, I am afraid, that detail.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to those persons as to whom there has been testimony of Communist Party membership and who had been identified by you, I want to ask you about several other persons to see if you know whether or not they were members of this unit.

Vern Partlow.

Mrs. BENNETT. To my recollection he was a member toward the latter part of the time I was in the unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how he was employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. I think he worked for the Daily News. I am not entirely sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gale Knappen.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. He was a member for a short while.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mrs. BENNETT. In the circulation department of the Daily News.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have already mentioned Bill Oliver and you have identified him.

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your former husband testified that after being a member within the newspaper field for a period of time while he was

city editor of the Daily News, he felt that he would have to withdraw from membership, that is, membership in that group of the Communist Party, because of the conflict that he would necessarily be involved in as a city editor, and that after withdrawing from this group he met with another group of the Communist Party.

Did you follow with him to another group, or did you remain, during your entire Communist Party membership, in the group within the newspaper field?

Mrs. BENNETT. No; I went with Mr. Judson.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of group within the Communist Party was this third group with which you were identified?

Mrs. BENNETT. It was a very small unit, comprised of people whose professional activity did not seem to fit into any other group. It was sort of a catch-all little group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Davida Franchi a member of that group?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her position, if any, in the professions?

Mrs. BENNETT. I don't recollect at that time that she was employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that these persons were members of various professions. Do you know what profession she had been a member of?

Mrs. BENNETT. At that time, I don't believe she was a member of any specific profession, but she represented more or less our connection with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Represented what?

Mrs. BENNETT. This unit's connection with the party organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall her husband's name?

Mrs. BENNETT. Fred Franchi.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he also a member of this group?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Raphael Konigsburg?

Mrs. BENNETT. Yes. He was a member of this unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed at that time?

Mrs. BENNETT. To my recollection, he was employed in an executive capacity with the Jewish agency. I am not very sure of that, however.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he had at any time been the head of the California State Relief Administration, or held any official position in that organization?

Mrs. BENNETT. I am quite certain that he had not held any such post as that during the years that I was a member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you left the party certainly not later than 1942.

Mrs. BENNETT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee your reasons for leaving the party?

Mrs. BENNETT. Well, they were partly personal and partly ideological. After the great acceleration of events in 1939, it became increasingly distasteful to accept opinions handed down from on high about the significance of various world events, and, therefore, the belief that I had in the Communist program ceased to be very important to me.

And also at that time, in 1941 and 1942, I was very much wrapped up and very busy as well with caring for two small children. So that the political activity ceased to be of particular importance to me.

But the general trend of world events made the Communist Party interpretation of these events seem less valid to me than it had been in earlier years, and the idea of believing the Communist Party interpretations even though they might not coincide with my personal ideas became very difficult. The whole idea of being told that such and such was a good policy became distasteful, of taking an opinion without being able to doubt it or criticize it, especially when it seemed to conflict with personal ideas or personal feelings.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask Mrs. Bennett to appear before the committee in executive session sometime later today for a type of questioning that probably should not be opened at this time.

Mr. WOOD. The subcommittee is very appreciative of your cooperation here, Mrs. Bennett, and I will ask if you can be here at two-thirty?

Mrs. BENNETT. At two-thirty?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mrs. BENNETT. In 226, you mean?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. The committee feels very grateful to you, Mrs. Bennett, for your willingness to come here and to cooperate with us and give us such information as you are able to give us in a frank and straightforward manner.

As I have previously expressed, and other members have previously expressed, and I feel sure this view is held by the entire membership of the committee, I sincerely trust there will be no economic reprisals against any person who, as you seem to have done, unwittingly got into this organization at the time you did get into it, and after you became disillusioned as to its purposes and aims got out of it, and have cooperated with the committee. I hope it will not mitigate in any way against you and yours in the question of employment. You have our sincere thanks for coming here.

Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tom O'Connor.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. O'Connor, will you please rise and raise your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give to the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CAMMER. Mr. Tom O'Connor, represented by Harold I. Cammer, 9 East Fortieth Street, New York 16.

TESTIMONY OF TOM O'CONNOR, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, HAROLD I. CAMMER

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Tom O'Connor?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. O'Connor?

Mr. O'CONNOR. July 28, 1914, in Nampa, Idaho.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Jamaica, N. Y.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly, please, what your educational training has been, your formal educational training?

MR. O'CONNOR. I went to public schools in Nampa, Idaho, and in Long Beach, Calif. Went through junior high and high school in Long Beach.

I went to Harvard College, received a degree of bachelor of science from Harvard College.

MR. TAVENNER. What has been your record of employment since 1935?

MR. O'CONNOR. I went to work in 1935 on a newspaper called the Los Angeles Post Record, as a reporter and rewrite man. I stayed there until February of the following year, when I returned to college to finish one semester of remaining work.

After I finished that, I came back to the same paper, which later, under the same ownership and management, became the Evening News in Los Angeles, and later that name was dropped. It was amalgamated with another paper under the same ownership called the Daily News and it became just the News, a 24-hour paper.

I worked for that organization—which was really only one paper, one organization, as a reporter, and rewrite man, until 1940.

I came to New York and joined the staff of the newspaper PM as a reporter.

MR. TAVENNER. In 1940?

MR. O'CONNOR. In 1940.

I worked on PM in that capacity until, I believe, the spring of 1943, with a period of a few months out while the Army was making up its mind about my draft status.

After I was eventually 4-F, I went back to working on the paper for a few months. Then I joined the merchant marine. I put in a little under a year in the merchant marine.

I returned to PM in the spring of 1944. I remained working on PM in various capacities until PM ceased to be. I was reporter for a year and assistant city editor.

MR. TAVENNER. When did PM cease to be?

MR. O'CONNOR. If you will give me a moment to go backward—

MR. TAVENNER. All right.

MR. O'CONNOR. I remember that the Star folded in January or February of 1948. It lasted 9 months. So it was sometime in 1947, about the middle of the year, I guess, or late spring, that PM changed ownership and became the New York Star.

As I say, I put in about a year as assistant city editor of PM, about a year as a city editor, and a year beyond that as a general—I don't know how long a period it was, during the last number of months before PM changed, I was doing some special reporting and writing editorials.

Then the ownership of the publication changed and it was named the New York Star. I worked on that publication as a reporter on general assignment from its beginning until its demise which was, I believe, at the end of January in 1948.

I free lanced a bit for the next few months; took a job with the Daily Compass, of New York, when it began publication in May of 1948, and I have been employed by the Compass continuously since.

For most of the first year I was a reporter. For about 6 weeks I

was city editor. For the last 2 years I have been managing editor of the Compass.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in Los Angeles, were you a member of the Newspaper Guild?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position in the guild?

Mr. O'CONNOR. During part of my time there, yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did you hold, and during what period of time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. For a time I was chairman of the Los Angeles Daily News—or Los Angeles News, I believe it was called—unit, that particular division of the Los Angeles chapter of the guild, and for a time—I am not sure of just when the time began—I was president of the Los Angeles local of the American Newspaper Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you president for more than one term?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have been trying to figure that out and I can't actually remember. I know I was president when I left Los Angeles in the late spring of 1940, but I have no recollection as to whether I was president for more than one term, or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you on its executive committee or board of directors? And, if so, for what period of time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I couldn't give a very precise answer to that. Under the constitution of that labor union, there were two governing bodies with different functions, an executive committee, I believe it was called, which I faintly recollect was a group of 6 or 8 people, or 10 people, and a representative assembly, which was a larger group, a very rough analogy being the Cabinet and the Congress.

The representative assembly was the larger, so to speak, legislative body of the local.

Now, I recall I was at various times a member of the representative assembly. As president of the guild, of course, I was ex officio a member of both the executive board and of the representative assembly.

I couldn't give you any precise dates as to exactly when. I think perhaps, but I am not sure, that the unit chairmen were also ex officio members of the executive committee, and if that was the case, then I would have been on the executive committee during my tenure as chairman of the guild's news unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. O'Connor, in the course of the investigation which the committee has been conducting in Los Angeles and in Hollywood, it has come to the attention of the committee that cells of the Communist Party were, as a matter of policy, formed within various professions in Hollywood and Los Angeles. There seemed at one time to have been a conflict in the Communist Party itself as to whether or not members within the professions should enjoy the privileges of being in a special group so that their identity would not be known.

But, according to the testimony of Mr. Ashe¹ before the committee, these professional groups were ultimately formed. We have found the existence of professional groups within the medical profession, within the legal profession.

Today we have heard testimony regarding the existence of cells among social workers and professions of that type.

¹ Testimony of Harold J. Ashe, September 17, 1951, in Los Angeles, Calif., is printed under title "Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion-Picture Industry—Part 4," pp. 1415-1462.

We have had considerable testimony before the committee, by Mr. Daggett and Mr. Charles Judson, of the existence of a cell within the newspaper field, and we have had testimony here by Mr. Charles Judson, who appeared before the committee on January 26, 1952, that he was a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1941, that he was employed by the Los Angeles Daily News, and was also a member of the Newspaper Guild.

Mr. Judson also testified that he was a member of the Communist Party and was assigned to a branch of the Communist Party, which was comprised of persons engaged in newspaper work.

He also testified that you were a member of this same group of the Communist Party to which he was assigned.

We desired to ascertain from you whether or not that is true, and if it is, to ask you questions regarding the purposes and the operations of the Communist Party within the newspaper field in Los Angeles.

So my first question is, Was Mr. Charles Judson correct in his statement that you were a member of the same unit of the Communist Party to which he was assigned?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am afraid I must object to that question and the whole subject, and refuse to answer, for the following reasons:

I received a subpoena from your committee last Thursday afternoon. I had no notice of the purpose of the committee in asking me to testify, nor any certainty of what matters they wished to question me about.

I was aware, from newspaper stories, that one Charles Judson has mentioned my name before the committee last January.

When subpoenaed, I immediately wrote to you, Mr. Tavenner, requesting that you forward me a transcript of Mr. Judson's testimony and the testimony of any other witnesses before the committee who might have made allegations about me.

Not until yesterday did I receive a reply from you. As you no doubt recollect, it did not contain a transcript of Mr. Judson's testimony, but merely a few sentences excerpted from it. I was unable then to learn, and still don't know, because the committee declined to make the whole record available, what Mr. Judson said that might affect me, and what context he may have said this in.

Moreover, when I requested a postponement of this hearing, it was denied me by yourself and Mr. Wheeler, of the committee staff, on the ground that I was being called as a witness on a specific day to confront another witness who would also name me.

I asked then who this witness was so that I might have some notice of the nature and character of the accuser and the accusation and have a chance to refresh my own recollection about what association I might have had with this person, if I had had any, in the dim and distant past.

Such notice was again denied me. It was not until I arrived in the room this morning that I learned the identity of this individual.

Obviously, under such circumstances, I have no choice but to proceed with extreme caution and carefully to preserve the legal safeguard to protect my rights in any eventuality which might conceivably develop.

These individuals testified concerning alleged occurrences and events of many, many years ago. I have no wish to speculate as to the reasons for their extraordinary recollection, but, for my own part, I am extremely conscious of the frailties of human memory.

And for my family's sake, as well as my own, I am unwilling to risk my liberty, if you will. I am certainly unable to afford the high cost of defending my freedom by attempting to engage in a memory contest.

MR. TAVENNER. There should not be anything difficult about your memory as to whether or not you remember such an organization. I am not asking you to rely on the memory of someone else. I am asking you to rely on your own memory.

MR. O'CONNOR. Could I, please, sir, complete the answer to the question?

MR. TAVENNER. Will you answer that question, and then proceed?

MR. O'CONNOR. I would much prefer to make a complete answer to the first question, if it could be permitted by counsel.

MR. TAVENNER. All right.

MR. O'CONNOR. In view of the nature of the allegations that have been made, I am unwilling to answer the question you have propounded lest any answer that I may give might be used against me.

In taking this stand, I invoke my constitutional privilege guaranteed by the fifth amendment, not to give any testimony which I have reasonable grounds to believe might possibly be used against me.

In asserting my constitutional privilege, I want to emphasize that it is not thereby my intention either to confirm or to deny these charges. My attorney tells me that a refusal to answer in the exercising of this constitutional privilege is not in law tantamount to an admission or denial.

MR. WOOD. Let us not get away from the question, sir. You can state your reason for not answering, if you desire. I understand you have done so, but let us not enter into a legal argument about it.

MR. O'CONNOR. And that the assertion of the privilege is completely consistent with innocence.

MR. WOOD. On that, I would like to interpose that in a public issue, if a man fails to answer a question as to an act that is criminal, he would either do that or his testimony is false, one or the other. So let us not try to inject an inference here that the facts do not justify it.

MR. VELDE. I would like to ask the witness as to whether or not he has ever heard of anyone who came before this committee and told the truth, testified to the best of his knowledge and ability, who has been incriminated?

MR. O'CONNOR. I really must beg the indulgence of the committee to finish my answer to the question that was previously asked.

MR. WOOD. I see you have a manuscript here. The committee is not going to sit here and permit you to read an argument in defense of your position. You have declined to answer the question, as I understand it. Is that true?

MR. O'CONNOR. There is very little more, sir, that I wish to say to complete my answer.

MR. WOOD. Will you please answer my question? You have declined to answer the question that has been asked of you, have you not?

MR. O'CONNOR. For the grounds that I am now relating, yes.

MR. WOOD. On the ground that it would tend to incriminate you and under the protection of the fifth amendment?

Mr. O'CONNOR. For each and all of the grounds that I am setting forth and the answer I am trying to give the committee.

Mr. WOOD. That ground is sufficient, and you have answered that beyond the justifiable grounds there are in law. I just do not want to get into an argument on the subject.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to again request permission to finish my answer to the question already originally propounded. There is not very much more.

Mr. WOOD. Have you any further questions, Mr. TAVENNER?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; I have.

Mr. WOOD. Ask them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You finished in part your refusal to answer, on the ground that you have not had fair opportunity to know just what had been said about you by other witnesses, and I do not want to appear unfair to you in that respect. I had copied for you and sent to you every reference to you in the testimony of the witness, but, of course, it did not set forth the entire testimony.

As I advised you, the testimony has not been printed as yet.

Now, if you feel that by examination of every word which the witness testified, that you might be willing to cooperate with this committee and answer questions which are of importance to this committee, I would certainly, as far as I am concerned, be perfectly willing to recommend to the committee that your testimony be adjourned and you be furnished a copy, and you can read it in 10 or 15 minutes, and you can come back this afternoon.

I think that would probably be a good solution.

Mr. WOOD. Or, if the witness prefers, I would be glad to postpone further testimony for a week for him, if that would be sufficient time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have made a decision as to the course I wish to take here under these circumstances, and I don't see that it would make any particular difference. I did request a postponement, but that was denied.

Now that I am here in Washington—

Mr. TAVENNER. It was requested because you wanted to take a vacation, was it not, beginning tomorrow?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That was certainly mentioned, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was not any question of lack of preparation for your appearance here as a witness. And now we have offered to give you every opportunity to prepare yourself, that you might want, but you come back and say now that you have already made your decision.

So, actually, you have made up your mind that you are not going to testify; is that not actually the fact?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I made up my mind as to certain answers I will give to certain questions if they are asked.

Mr. TAVENNER. And those answers will be made regardless of how long a time you have in which to read the testimony of Mr. Judson; is not that true?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I assume, in general, that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then why did you make the argument here that you did not want to testify, and would not, because you had not been given an opportunity to know what had been said against you, when you knew all along that that had nothing to do with your decision?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I make that point because I thought, and still think, it is an extremely pertinent point.

Mr. TAVENNER. But one that has absolutely nothing to do with your decision?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No, sir. I don't agree with you there.

Mr. WOOD. You say you do not agree with him there? Well, if it had nothing to do with your decision, I would be perfectly willing to adjourn this hearing until such time as would suit your convenience. I will give you whatever time you desire, if an adjournment of this case might conceivably, in your opinion, alter your attitude here with respect to giving testimony on pertinent matters that have been asked.

I will be glad to adjourn it until such time as you say.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are many other considerations which have affected my decision as to what answers I will give.

Mr. WOOD. Let me ask you this question: Would an adjournment of it for a week, or 2 weeks, in your opinion, alter your decision?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No, sir; I don't believe it would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present during the testimony of Alice Bennett this morning?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That was Alice Bennett who just testified?

Mr. TAVENNER. Who just preceded you.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; all except when she announced her name. I just came into the room shortly after that point. I wasn't sure of her identity.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear her identify you as a person known to have been a member of the Communist Party unit within the newspaper field in Los Angeles?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did so hear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she correct in so identifying you as a member?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I refuse to answer that question, on the grounds I have previously stated in part, and would like to be given an opportunity to state in full.

Mr. WOOD. It has been a uniform rule, Mr. O'Connor, of this committee not to permit prepared statements to be read, but to accept them as a part of the record. I see you have a statement in front of you. If you give it to the clerk here, it will be made a part of the record.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are a few more sentences which I wish to complete my answer to the question.

Mr. WOOD. Is that not embodied in your written statement?

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is not a statement prepared for submission to the committee as a statement. This is notes made to guide me in answering a question and to make it possible for me to give a very precise answer to a particular type of inquiry.

Mr. WOOD. I observed at the beginning of your testimony that you read approximately two typewritten pages there. How many more have you?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have——

Mr. CAMMER. Just a half page.

Mr. WOOD. Very well, you may read it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Thank you, sir.

There is just one further matter that I think it is necessary and important to make clear. That is that I object to the question asked and to this whole inquiry because I am a working newspaperman and because an inquiry into the past or present beliefs, politics, associations, or opinions of a newspaper writer or editor, it seems to me, to be a clear interference with and limitation of the free functioning of the press—a freedom which Congress and its committees, may, as I understand it, not, under the Constitution, tamper with.

My conception of the meaning of the constitutional guaranty of freedom of the press is that I am guaranteed the right to write as I please, to think as I please, to edit a newspaper as my conscience dictates, without any hinderance or pressure or interrogation as to my motives or decisions from Congress or any of its committees.

For each of these reasons that I have enumerated, and all of them, I object to and refuse to answer the question you asked and all questions related to that subject.

Mr. WOOD. By that same token, though, will you agree, sir, that the public, who is supposed to read your writings and without which you would not be valuable as a newspaperman, are entitled to know the character of the man that is doing the writing; what his past record has been with reference to his political philosophy; whether or not he has been a loyal American citizen, or whether or not he has belonged to an organization that is designed to destroy the very Government that gave him the protection and right to freedom?

Do you not think the public is entitled to know that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is my opinion, sir, that the writings speak for themselves.

Mr. VELDE. Are you still the editor of the New York Daily Compass?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Managing editor.

Mr. VELDE. I want to ask you if you are presently a member of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member a year ago?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member 5 years ago?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Ten years ago?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I object to and refuse to answer that question, on the grounds that I have previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. That is, you are claiming your privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution?

Mr. O'CONNOR. For each and all of the reasons I have stated in my previous answer.

Mr. VELDE. Personally, I can only draw one inference from the manner in which you have testified, and that is that you have in the past been a member of the Communist Party, and not only that, but you continue to be a member of the Communist Party. And in a position as managing editor of a large newspaper, I think you are extremely dangerous to this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not responsible for whatever inferences the committee might wish to draw from my testimony.

Mr. VELDE. I realize that.

Mr. WOOD. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Do you wish to have the witness in any further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered.

The committee will stand in recess until 2:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:15 p. m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., same day.)

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG PROFESSIONAL GROUPS IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—PART 2

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1952

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,

Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 2 p. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will come to order, please.

Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear the evidence you shall give to this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss DANIEL. I do.

TESTIMONY OF URCEL DANIEL

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please?

Miss DANIEL. Urcel Daniel, U-r-c-e-l D-a-n-i-e-l.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is your last name spelled with an "s"?

Miss DANIEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Miss Daniel?

Miss DANIEL. Sullivan County, Ind., October 22, 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Miss DANIEL. In Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what your educational training has been?

Miss DANIEL. Yes. I went to public schools in Indiana and graduated from Indiana University in 1932.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your record of employment up until the time you came to Washington?

Miss DANIEL. I worked on the Los Angeles Examiner for 5 years and a good part of that time in the composing room as a copyholder and different odd jobs that I could get when I was unemployed. And then I worked for the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild for 2 years as admin-

istrative officer, and for the American Newspaper Guild for 2 years as a research director and international representative.

MR. TAVENNER. Let me stop you a moment. You said you worked for 5 years for the Los Angeles Examiner. What period of time was that?

MISS DANIEL. That was about 1933 to 1938.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that followed by your 2 years of employment by the guild?

MISS DANIEL. No. Let's see; I worked for the guild in '40 and '41, the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild. In between those times I had various odd jobs. One was editing a weekly paper, Hollywood Now. That was about a year and a half.

MR. TAVENNER. Approximately what was the date?

MISS DANIEL. Sometime in '38 to sometime in '39.

MR. TAVENNER. Then your next employment was with the American Newspaper Guild?

MISS DANIEL. Then there was the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild. I worked for it for 2 years, and for the American Newspaper Guild for 2 years.

MR. TAVENNER. What were the years in which you worked for the American Newspaper Guild?

MISS DANIEL. '42 and '43.

MR. TAVENNER. When did you come to Washington?

MISS DANIEL. The last week of '43.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your first employment in Washington?

MISS DANIEL. It's the same that I have now. I have had the same job for 8½ years.

MR. TAVENNER. During the course of the testimony of a witness by the name of Charles W. Judson you were identified as a former member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. My recollection is that on the day after his testimony or very shortly after it—and he testified on January 26, 1952—you gave a statement to the press in which you acknowledged that you had been a member of the Communist Party, but that you had withdrawn from it and that you had completely severed your connection with the Communist Party.

MISS DANIEL. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. That is correct, is it not?

MISS DANIEL. Well, I think that there were two witnesses in the same week who named me and my statement was made after the first witness and that was a few days in advance of Judson, but it was within the same week in January.

MR. TAVENNER. The purpose of calling you now before the committee is to seek your cooperation in advising the committee regarding the activities of the Communists in the Newspaper Guild because we understand that it was principally during that period of time when you were connected with the guild that you were a member of the party.

MISS DANIEL. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. And also to ascertain whether or not your connection with the Communist Party has been completely severed. Had you been a member of the Young Communist League before you became a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. No, sir. I never knew anything about the Communist Party in my college days and we had no student movement of any kind on the Indiana University campus. I had no connection whatever.

Mr. TAVENNER. The newspaper that you stated you were editor of at one time, Hollywood Now, was a publication of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, was it not?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On July 19, 1940, a witness appeared before this committee in executive session and described certain activities of the Young Communist League. In the course of his testimony he stated, "Members of the Young Communist League who were active in the Young Democrats included" certain individuals and among them your name, or, rather, the name Ursula Daniels, was mentioned, "who recently held the position of circulation manager for Hollywood Now," the paper of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League.

Miss DANIEL. That's in error. I was the editor of the paper and I never belonged to the Young Communist League.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you commonly referred to by the name of Ursula, U-r-s-u-l-a?

Miss DANIEL. No, Urcel. I've always corrected people. Sometimes when they first hear my name they may call me Ursula, but when they have heard it for very long they pronounce it correctly, which is Urcel.

Mr. TAVENNER. In any event you state categorically that you were never a member of the Young Communist League?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee how you became a member of the Communist Party and the circumstances connected with it?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I will. I went to California right after I graduated from college. I actually got there by accident because I had a job in Yellowstone Park for the summer and had no job to go back to in Indiana and so I used part of my train ticket to go out to the coast, and wrote back for jobs and couldn't line one up, so I decided to stay there instead of going back and living with relatives, and I didn't get any job except very unsatisfactory mechanical sort of jobs that were not what I had trained for in college. That situation went on for a number of years and when the guild started organizing in Los Angeles I became acquainted with some Communist Party members and it seemed to me that they were the hardest-working members of unions, and at that time—I realize now they were grinding an ax—they seemed to be the only ones who were doing anything to improve the conditions of people who were suffering from the depression and who were in an underprivileged position, and I thought that I would be contributing to the general advancement of everything to work with such a group. I did join the party in about mid-1937 and all of my work in the party was taken up with activity in the Newspaper Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the party?

Miss DANIEL. Until early 1940. I joined the party and the guild just about simultaneously and, as I say, I did because from the example of people I saw they seemed to me at that time to be the best trade-unionists. I realize now if they were it was for a reason. It was not for the best interests of the union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since you broke with the party in 1940 have you been active in opposition to the Communist Party and the guild?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I have, very much so. I was working for the guild in Los Angeles when I left the party and that was, as I say, early 1940, and I worked with anti-Communists to defeat them for offices and eliminate them as the dominant faction in the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild in 1940. Then in 1941 I was still employed there and I worked with the opposition group in the American Newspaper Guild to help swing the Los Angeles local vote on the referendum so that we would also clean them out of the national leadership of the American Newspaper Guild and they were eliminated from office in the American Newspaper Guild in 1941, and I went to work for the American Newspaper Guild at the very beginning of 1942 when the new administration came in and in my work for the American Newspaper Guild I continued helping to strengthen the administration so that they could remain in office and the Communist faction could not be returned. Then, after I left the guild employment entirely in what union activity I have engaged in I have always continued to work with the anti-Communist group wherever that problem has been.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us return to the time when you first became a member of the party in 1937. Who recruited you into the party?

Miss DANIEL. I think it was probably Sid Burke. He was a member of the Newspaper Guild. I can't remember specifically because you can understand, I am sure, that in a thing of that sort you'd probably not be influenced solely by one person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. You stated in your earlier testimony that you were influenced in the course you took by several members of the Communist Party. Who were they?

Miss DANIEL. Well, the people that have been named as members of the Newspaper Guild unit in the party. I remember Dolph Winebrenner was someone I knew at that time, and I believe Judson. It's hard for me to remember the people by times. Those are the names that come readily to mind, people that were working actively in the guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those the persons to whom you referred when you said members of the Communist Party seemed to be doing something about the problems that you felt were important?

Miss DANIEL. Well, of course, in general I was thinking in reading I formed that idea and then as a matter of individuals, yes, they seemed to be among the group that was hardest working.

Mr. TAVENNER. The point I am getting at is are these the individuals you were referring to in the early part of your testimony, or were there other people that you had in mind?

Miss DANIEL. Well, I can't differentiate exactly now between being influenced generally in my reading, and so forth, by what seemed to be a group in general that was doing most and the work of particular individuals. I mean I think both influences were at work as far as that is concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the guild at the time you became a member of the party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your membership in the guild play any part in your uniting with the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, it did. When I became a member of the guild I believed in it very strongly, and I wanted to be an active and good member, and from the example I had seen I had thought that the best way of doing that was to work with other people who seemed to set that example.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position in the guild at the time you became a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Well, almost as soon as I joined the guild I was elected secretary of the unit of the guild. Both the party and the guild used the term "unit" for the smallest organized group, and I was elected secretary of my guild unit almost as soon as I joined it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you invited to become a member of the Communist Party, or did you seek membership in the party?

Miss DANIEL. No; I was invited to become. I mean I think that there were always enough people around trying to get anybody that might seem to be interested.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who invited you to become a member?

Miss DANIEL. Well, as I say, my best recollection would be that it was Sid Burke, but I can't say that he would be the only person that ever invited me to.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you became a member were any other officials of the guild members of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Well, it's difficult for me to remember. I remember who the president of the guild was at that time, and he was not a member of the party. Now, as to whether some other officer might have been I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. I assume from your testimony that you were assigned to a cell or unit of the Communist Party within the guild; is that correct?

Miss DANIEL. Well, I knew that there was such a group when I joined; that is, I was not interested in party activities as such, but only in that part of it which operated within the guild, so it wasn't so much a matter of assignment as it was that that's what I joined, was the party unit in the guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, all the members of your unit were guild members?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed that unit when you first became a member in 1937?

Miss DANIEL. I would say there weren't very many at that time. It would be hard for me to give you the total number. I would say a half dozen or so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us their names?

Miss DANIEL. Herb Klein is another whose name I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us how Herb Klein was employed at that time?

Miss DANIEL. Herb was unemployed most of the time that I knew him. I understand that he had independent income and at least he had a nice home, and so forth, so I don't know—

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how long he had been in Los Angeles before he became a member of this group?

Miss DANIEL. No; I don't know that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed with naming those that you can recall?

Miss DANIEL. Sid [Burke] and Herb Klein, Dolph [Winebrenner]—I'm trying to think from the standpoint of the time. I can't remember whether Judson was in that or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you referred to Dolph, do you mean Dolph Winebrenner?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Minna Klein, the wife of Herbert Klein?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I knew Minna.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member at that time?

Miss DANIEL. Of the party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Miss DANIEL. Yes; that's my understanding.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of the group that you were a member of?

Miss DANIEL. I've tried to remember that because I did definitely have the impression that she was a party member. I don't have a very active recollection of her at these unit meetings because there wouldn't really be much for wives to do since the time was taken up by discussions among people who were active in the guild itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Morgan Hull?

Miss DANIEL. Yes. Morgan is another one who definitely was an influence because he, I would say, certainly exemplified the idea of the active, working, effective trade-unionist, which is the capacity in which I first got to know him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he one of the original six who were members at the time you joined?

Miss DANIEL. I believe he was; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with G. H. Garrigues? That is G-a-r-r-i-g-u-e-s?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was one of the original six, or whether he united with the party later?

Miss DANIEL. I can't recall. I know that he was not in Los Angeles for nearly all the time that I was, and I don't remember whether he was there at that time or came later.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I can recall his being at a few meetings, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was testimony by Mr. Charles Daggett that he paid Communist Party dues to you, and the testimony of Mr. Judson was also of similar character. That indicates that you were probably the treasurer or dues secretary of your organization.

Miss DANIEL. I remember that in the paper and I don't have any independent recollection of being the collector, but I certainly would not want to deny it, because in every organization I get into somehow I get one of the jobs, so I am quite willing to believe that I probably got that job there. I just happen to be one of those people who always has something to work on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that you did collect dues?

Miss DANIEL. No. I do not recall it, but, as I say, I would not deny that I probably did do it. The thing is, as I have tried to reconstruct what may have happened and why I don't remember is because I assume it would be like, oh, well, a group of people attending any

function, for instance, where they have to pay. This wouldn't have been every time because dues aren't collected every time, but there is someone who is available there to take up the money and turn it over to someone, and I never had any contact with the party machinery, and so the best that I have been able to figure out is that I probably turned the money over to someone there who then turned it in; and, in any event, it doesn't loom large in my mind and I really don't have an independent recollection of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the dues of the members of your unit?

Miss DANIEL. That's something I cannot recall at all, what I paid or what anybody else paid.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how your unit was designated?

Miss DANIEL. No; that's something that I don't recall either.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the testimony of Mr. Daggett and also Mr. Judson the unit was known as No. 140. Does that refresh your recollection?

Miss DANIEL. No, it doesn't. I have been asked that before. I am sorry to not be able to remember some of these things. The only explanation I can give is that the mechanics of the thing were not very important and didn't stick in my mind, and possibly the reason for that was because of this intense preoccupation with the guild work and guild activity. I mean that was the subject of our discussions and planning, et cetera. I am not an authority on the organizational structure of the party at all, because I functioned only in this one group in connection with a trade-union job.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any other official position besides that of dues secretary, if you held that?

Miss DANIEL. No. I feel quite sure that I was never, for instance, chairman, because that would have called for presiding at meetings which I would be more likely to recall, I would think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of all those who became members of your unit or cell of the Communist Party from the time that you joined until 1940 when you left the party, as nearly as you can recall?

Miss DANIEL. There was Slim Connelly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Philip Connelly?

Miss DANIEL. Yes. Tom O'Connor. It's hard for me to remember—can you mention—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I will try to refresh your recollection, but first I would rather have you give me the names of those that you can recall without having your recollection refreshed.

Miss DANIEL. Yes. We've mentioned Garrigues. Tom Cullen, whom I can't identify much more than that, because he was unemployed most of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. C-u-l-l-e-n?

Miss DANIEL. Yes. John Cohee and his wife Alice; Morgan Hull's wife or the one who became his wife, Patricia Killoran.

Mr. TAVENNER. K-i-l-l-o-r-a-n?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she frequently referred to as Pat?

Miss DANIEL. Yes. Let's see, Andy Barrigan, B-a-r-r-i-g-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed at that time?

Miss DANIEL. At the Daily News in the circulation department. No other names come readily to mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, Charles Daggett has been mentioned in the course of your testimony.

Miss DANIEL. He wasn't in Los Angeles very much of the time that I was there and I can't recall whether he was in when I joined, and, as a matter of fact, it's hard for me to recall very much about Daggett in connection with the party because he wasn't in Los Angeles much at the time that I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already mentioned Charles Judson.

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a member of your group, was he not?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall Darr Smith?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I recall Darr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of this group?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Miss DANIEL. At the Daily News in the editorial department.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you base your statement on that he was a member of this group?

Miss DANIEL. I can visualize him at the meetings; just a recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall Dorothy Connelly?

Miss DANIEL. That was Slim Connelly's wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of your group?

Miss DANIEL. She didn't join the party—it's hard for me to remember about the wives, really, because they wouldn't have taken an active part in the discussions at all. It's my recollection that she was in the group, but I certainly have a less active recollection about her than I do about other people.

Mr. TAVENNER. I recall now that Philip Connelly was married twice and the first name of both his wives was Dorothy.

Miss DANIEL. Dorothy Connelly, the first one, that had the daughter; that's the one that I have in mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of the testimony of Charles W. Judson taken in executive session on January 26, 1952—and I have the permission of the chairman to make this public—the following question was asked by Mr. Wheeler:

Is there anyone else that you can now identify as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JUDSON. I have to identify Verne Partlow.

Were you acquainted with Verne Partlow?

Miss DANIEL. He wasn't in Los Angeles at the time I was there. He came very shortly after I left Los Angeles. I had been out of the party 2 years before I left and my recollection is that he came to work in Los Angeles shortly after I left the city, so I don't have any first-hand information about that. I have seen his name mentioned on lists and therefore I knew that he was so charged, but I didn't recall that he was in Los Angeles any of the time that I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing with the testimony of Mr. Judson, Mr. Wheeler asked this question:

What was Mr. Partlow's occupation?

Mr. JUDSON. Reporter.

Mr. WHEELER. For what paper?

Mr. JUDSON. The Daily News.

Mr. WHEELER. Did you attend more than one party meeting with Mr. Partlow?

Mr. JUDSON. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. You knew him positively as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JUDSON. Yes.

Was Mr. Partlow employed by the Daily News, to your knowledge?

Miss DANIEL. Let's see; after I left Los Angeles he was employed by the Newspaper Guild. Now, he eventually left the guild and I may have read that he was employed by the Daily News, but I can't remember. In any event, I would have no first-hand knowledge of his employment there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Leo Simon?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of your unit in the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. For a very short time.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Miss DANIEL. At the Daily News.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall in what capacity?

Miss DANIEL. I think he may have been a movie reviewer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know Lou Amster to be a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I remember Lou now.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Bill Oliver?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of your unit of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Miss DANIEL. He was a movie reviewer for the Herald-Express.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Ed Robbins?

Miss DANIEL. Yes. That's a name I should have remembered because he was in the group most of the time that I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. And by "group" are you referring to the Communist Party group?

Miss DANIEL. Communist Party unit; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Miss DANIEL. By the People's World.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what capacity?

Miss DANIEL. Their Los Angeles correspondent or Los Angeles editor, or something editorial in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Paul Cline, C-l-i-n-e?

Miss DANIEL. Only I know him by name. I can't recall that I even met him, but he was secretary of the Los Angeles County Communist Party or chairman, or whatever the chief position is. Whether it's secretary or chairman I've forgotten.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, he was a high functionary of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his association, if any, with this group of the Communist Party of which you were a member?

Miss DANIEL. None that I know of, that is, I never saw him in a meeting or anything of that sort, but he was known by name and so identified in newspaper stories at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he ever appear before your group for the purpose of giving a lecture?

Miss DANIEL. No, sir; not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Alice King Bennett, who was the wife in 1937 of Mr. Judson?

Miss DANIEL. Oh, I didn't know that was her name. Alice Judson is the only thing I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of this group, to your knowledge?

Miss DANIEL. Well, there again it's a matter of—I can't remember the wives as well. Most of them had children and wouldn't be around as much. I believe she was. I don't remember her as well as I do the people who were active in the guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a high functionary of the Communist Party by the name of Max Silver?

Miss DANIEL. No; never heard of him until his name was mentioned to me once before this year by the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of any other persons who were members or in any way affiliated with the Communist Party cell organized within the Newspaper Guild?

Miss DANIEL. No; I can't. That must make about 15 or so, which was about the size. I don't recall any others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Rena Vail?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you became acquainted with Rena Vail?

Miss DANIEL. She was a guild member on the writers' project in Los Angeles and I guess she was a member of this unit or I heard she had been. At least I know that she had testified as a former member of the Communist Party and I know at least from that, if not first hand. If she was in I don't think it lasted long after I joined, but my recollection is dim as to what I have heard about her in other respects and what I learned myself from first-hand contact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Rena Vail appeared as a witness before this committee in executive session on July 22, 1940, and in the course of her testimony she stated that the international executive board of the Newspaper Guild held its meeting in Toronto, Canada, and that a decision was reached to send you, who had taken over the duties of fraction secretary, and that you were well schooled in Communist Party procedure and that you were to be sent to this meeting in Toronto with Philip M. Connelly, then president of the Los Angeles local of the Newspaper Guild. Do you recall the circumstances of that?

Miss DANIEL. I was a delegate to the American Newspaper Guild convention in 1940. It was in Toronto. No; it was in 1938.

The guild convention in Toronto was in 1938, and, as I say, Slim Connelly also was a delegate. I can't remember whether Slim was a member of the party at that time or not, but, in any event, the idea of my being chosen by the international executive board to go—the election was right there in Los Angeles—I don't know about any angle of the international executive board and I don't want to get into any vindictiveness or recriminations, but I know that I have been the object of attacks by Rena Vail because of a situation which occurred in the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild. She and a group of

other guild members who worked on the writers' project at one time caused the guild great embarrassment because they, without authority from the guild executive board—that's the local executive board—pledged to support a strike on the writers' project and it was very much against CIO policy at that time to have strikes on these WPA projects, and was certainly contrary to guild policy and procedure. They committed the guild to this course, as I say, without any authority as a part of some maneuvering they thought the threat would accomplish, what they wanted—they never intended to strike—and so forth. I was one of the people who protested very vigorously against Rena Vail and her group for getting the guild into that situation, and it became quite a struggle within the guild over these people on the writers' project. I knew that she had given testimony about me, so I'm not surprised. I didn't know about this committee, but before the Tenney committee in California, and so on. I became one of her pet peeves, I guess, because I was most vigorous and vocal in attacking them in whatever they were doing to the guild.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether it was part of your assignment by the Communist Party to help recruit Slim Connelly into the Communist Party at that time?

MISS DANIEL. No; I do not. As a matter of fact, in my own case, I'm pretty sure that contacts with nonparty people would be made by a number of people and no one person would be assigned to do this or that, but, rather, a person would have to be acceptable to the whole group before he would be admitted, that is, at least a large majority would have to think it was proper, too.

MR. TAVENNER. Regardless of what action would be necessary to initiate such a recruitment, did you take part in any way in the recruitment of Slim Connelly?

MISS DANIEL. I can't recall particularly conversations with Slim Connelly about his joining the party. We were certainly very active together in Newspaper Guild work. We served on negotiating committees together and on organizing committees and in doing volunteer work for the guild, so it is quite possible I discussed the party with him.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you do any other recruiting work while you were a member of the Communist Party?

MISS DANIEL. Well, you say "any other." I'm not saying that I am responsible for recruiting Slim Connelly, but I think that most of the recruiting probably was done by people who worked with other people, that is, in their daily jobs, and that may be one reason why so many names appear from the Daily News. I mean most of those Daily News people were probably recruited by others on the Daily News, and I was not in that kind of a position where I worked with a number of people who were in the guild and active in it, and therefore could be approached about the party.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you recall how many of those who were members you did recruit or assist in recruiting?

MISS DANIEL. No; I don't, nor whether I recruited any of them. As I indicated, most of them were on the Daily News and I rather imagine that most of them were recruited by other people on the Daily News who worked with them every day, you see, and would be personal friends.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the total membership of the Newspaper Guild?

Miss DANIEL. Well, at the time I joined, it was just getting started in Los Angeles. Units of a few of the people were organized all at the same time I was joining. I think the guild was first organized there in 1936 and had just a handful of members, no more than, say, 25 to 50, and then there was a spurt of activity and Newspaper Guild units formed on a number of papers and the membership probably was around a few hundred, say 200-250, during the year that I joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other Communist Party cells organized within those units of the guild?

Miss DANIEL. No. Every party member in the guild would have been in the one party unit and they didn't have different units on different papers. They had guild units on different papers, but only one party unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the greatest strength of your Communist Party unit? What was the greatest strength during the time you were a member?

Miss DANIEL. Counting the wives and all, I suppose it would have been about 20.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what was the purpose, if you know, of the Communist Party in organizing a cell or group within the Newspaper Guild?

Miss DANIEL. Well, the party unit was already organized in the guild when I joined the guild and the party, so I don't know about any discussions that took place about the purpose of it. From my own observation and experience in working with it I consider our work was directed at building the guild up as a strong, actively functioning trade-union organization. For instance, we were busy all of the time in the day-to-day trade-union activity, negotiating, working, and carrying on all of the activities that any organization of that sort had to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Communist Party group functioning as a separate group from the guild, or was it endeavoring merely to control the activity of the guild?

Miss DANIEL. It met once a week or maybe once every two weeks—I've forgotten the time—and practically all of its time was taken up with discussion of guild work and guild activity. Yes, its purpose was to control the guild, that's right, and that control would be exercised, at that time at least, chiefly in the trade-union direction. In other words, first you have to build up the union, and what plans they had beyond that point I don't know. From what I have discovered since then I dare say that they accept to make use of any organization that they control in ways that they are not open and honest about even with their own members, but at the time I joined both the guild and the party the idea was to just build up the union.

Mr. TAVENNER. In their weekly meetings that you referred to did they endeavor to determine the policy that should be followed by the guild and direct its members to impart that policy to the guild?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, that's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they also endeavor to control the election of officers in the guild?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent was it successful or were they successful in that?

Miss DANIEL. I would say that up until 1940 it was successful, quite successful.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what form did that success take?

Miss DANIEL. Of having party members in positions of leadership in the guild so that nothing they opposed would be done and that things they wanted to do they at least would have the opportunity of arguing for them and trying to accomplish them.

Mr. TAVENNER. If the entire membership consisted of possibly as many as 250 at one time, that is, membership in the guild, and the membership of your cell was not more than 20, how was it that it was successful in imposing its will upon the majority?

Miss DANIEL. Well, first of all, we were the workers. We did the work. And people who do the work are usually the ones who say what is going to happen; and also there was no opposition. I mean the whole tenor of the times was along the line of what we were doing, that is, there was no opposition group that we had to fight against, you see, so it was not a case of arguing against opposition, but just of going along and conducting the affairs of the union; and, understand, there was enough of a contribution made by these people in the way of achieving things that it's understandable that their position was not questioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you regular in attendance at the Communist Party meetings?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I was. I might say—I don't know whether this has been made obvious by my testimony so far—that I also was as active as anybody else in the guild. I was busy in a volunteer capacity practically every night in the week, attending negotiations, trying to organize people, doing volunteer work of getting out organizing leaflets, the office work, and that sort of thing, and since I was very keenly interested in the guild and in that work I was also keenly interested in attending the meetings which planned and kept it going.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did the Communist Party cell meet?

Miss DANIEL. I can't recall now whether it was once every 2 weeks or once a week. I really don't recall which it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who took charge of these various meetings?

Miss DANIEL. Some person from the group was the chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was considered to be the leader of the group?

Miss DANIEL. Well, in a trade-union way Slim Connelly would have been the leader since he was the most active and effective guild member. So far as just serving as chairman, any number of people might have done that. I think Ed Robbins was chairman once. The point is that the important work was guild work and the people who were less active in that, less occupied with that, did the jobs of chairman, etc., within the party unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Communist Party literature made available to you at these meetings?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you required to purchase Communist Party literature?

Miss DANIEL. No; I can't recall that we were required to. I don't recall that we were. There may have been occasions when we were expected to take something. It doesn't stand out in my mind as a very big item.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you required to read and study the Communist Party literature that was made available for you?

Miss DANIEL. Well, as I recall, we were subject to criticism from time to time for spending so much time on the guild and trade-union work and so little time on the party, and one of the complaints would be, you know, that we never got around to discussing the literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the source of that complaint?

Miss DANIEL. The people like Ed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ed who?

Miss DANIEL. Robbins. Excuse me. And Sid Burke, and the people who were more occupied with the party work; I mean, whom I discovered were occupied with that primarily and with the guild work secondarily, or who felt that some of us, I included, were more trade-unionists than we were party members and would say that we ought to spend more time on discussing this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any reason assigned as to why you should put more time on the study of Marxism and the principles of communism?

Miss DANIEL. Oh, yes. I see now that they used the labor movement. They used unions. They weren't primarily interested in building up unions as worth while in themselves, and they were interested in making party members out of union members, and that's probably the influence, the direction which they wanted us to go, to forget this preoccupation with the union and adopt the party as our first interest and cause rather than the Newspaper Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. One high functionary of the Communist Party in testifying in executive session before our committee referred to the writers in Hollywood as being creative people, and that where you have creative people, if you influence their thinking, their product will be somewhat different. Those of you who were members of the Newspaper Guild were all employed in the newspaper field and were writing in one form or another; is that not true?

Miss DANIEL. Some were unemployed and some had various minor positions. Remember, this was during the depression, when people took about any job that they could to earn a living. They might have had newspaper experience which qualified them for membership, but they were not necessarily actively engaged in the business, all of them, at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. But they were potential writers?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; that's what they wanted them to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. In a very important field. Was there discussed in your presence this wielding of this influence which I spoke of a moment ago upon creative people which would have made their product different?

Miss DANIEL. No, there was not, Mr. Tavenner. I can honestly say I can't recall a single discussion of that kind. I think maybe understanding the circumstances of this group and of that time might help explain that, that is, in a period when you are trying to organize a union and get it functioning and that's your chief goal, you are not

going to ask people to expose themselves to the possibility of discharge by trying to color or slant what they write, so that if that purpose existed in the minds of officials of the Communist Party it wasn't translated down to us, and I really don't have any personal experience in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course most likely it would have been a complete failure if it had been so obvious as to leave you under the impression that you were to slant your stories, but if by teaching and indoctrination your thinking could be changed or influenced, then it would be accomplishing a great deal for the Communist Party, would it not?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; and that may have been a long-range objective of theirs or an objective for a later time, but at that particular time it just wouldn't have fit into the work that had to be done.

Mr. TAVENNER. But if a member of your guild or anyone engaged in the Newspaper Guild were a member of the Communist Party and subjected continuously in their meetings to the processes of the Communist Party indoctrination, do you not think that in a period of time it would be bound to influence his thinking and therefore his writing?

Miss DANIEL. Well, it certainly would influence his thinking about things in general and he might let it influence his writing or might want to let it seep into his writing, but, remember, that there is a lot of newspaper work that is just straight reporting and there isn't any opportunity for getting personal views into it, so it takes writing of a rather creative level, above that of somebody who just reports and writes, to be in a position to work in ideas. I mean there is a lot of writing that doesn't include any ideas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yet most of the editors and the greater writers began as reporters, did they not?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I imagine they did. I am just trying to answer within my own experience and not to argue one way or another about what might have been in somebody's mind as to the ultimate purpose.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the cause of your break with the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. It was about the same reasons as my joining. I came to see that they were trying to use the guild, that is, during this period, most of this period, was the united-front days when they were trying to work with everybody in support of American foreign policy and so forth, so that there was no clash between the party position and the position of the country, but then after the Hitler-Stalin pact when they started breaking up the united front and adopting a different one, they tried to translate that into action down in the unions by getting resolutions of the opposite type adopted and using the unions to promote their own position and I discovered, as I say, they were just trying to use the unions and in doing that weakening them as effective labor organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when you observed the method by which the Communist Party endeavored to control and direct the activity of your guild you realized then the possibility of harm on the part of an organization such as the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do in order to sever your connection with it?

MISS DANIEL. I had had a talk with Ed Robbins about my attitude toward the party and I was also disillusioned with the party people in that I thought that our position in the guild was something that we could discuss and agree on on the merits. I expected them to be open-minded and independent-minded about what we would do, but I found that most of them were slavish followers of the line and when they were expected to support a particular resolution they were prepared to do it without any further discussion. I mentioned that in my talk with Ed and told him that I no longer had any confidence in the people in the party, so when I decided that it would be advisable for me to make a formal withdrawal instead of leaving it in this nebulous state where I just no longer attended meetings, I wrote him a note saying that I could no longer work with the people in the party and that I therefore resigned.

MR. TAVENNER. Has any effort been made since to bring you back in the Communist Party?

MISS DANIEL. None whatever, because my position became one of opposition right away and, as a matter of fact, that's why I decided that I had better make a formal resignation because I was afraid that they might try to haul me up on charges and formally expel me, you see because I had taken a position in opposition, so they knew where I stood well enough so that nobody ever tried to draw me back.

MR. TAVENNER. Was any effort made to discipline you or any other member of this group during the time you were a member?

MISS DANIEL. No; that is, when I disagreed with them I just left and there was no opportunity to try to exercise discipline.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you give me the names of those who were members of the Communist Party and who became officials of your guild?

MISS DANIEL. Well, Tom O'Connor was the president of the guild for a while, and Slim Connelly was chairman of his guild unit, and Bill Oliver may have been chairman of his guild unit once. I just don't recall exactly.

MR. TAVENNER. Are there any others whose names you can recall?

MISS DANIEL. John Cohee was chairman of his guild unit and he may have been president of the Los Angeles local at one time. I can't recall exactly. Tom is the only one whom I can definitely recall having been president of the local.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you have anything else you desire to say about your reasons for leaving the party?

MISS DANIEL. No; that pretty well summarizes it. I lost faith in the people and in their activities and in their motives. I discovered that they were not just interested in building up a strong labor movement and in doing things for people, but were interested in using them.

MR. WOOD. Mr. Doyle, do you have any questions you would like to ask the witness?

MR. DOYLE. I think just a few, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOOD. Proceed.

MR. DOYLE. You said a few minutes ago there were enough activities by this group so their leadership was not questioned. Do you remember using that language.

MISS DANIEL. Yes; they did enough work in the guild.

MR. DOYLE. In other words, this small group of 15 or 20 did not have their activity questioned by the larger membership of the guild because they accomplished results; is that the way you put it?

MISS DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What results did you accomplish?

Miss DANIEL. We negotiated contracts. We got people organized. We did the day-to-day work.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you were members of the Communist Party and also in the guild and you maintained your leadership in the guild by reason of your accomplishing as leaders in the guild the objectives of the guild?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And were those objectives of the guild substantially the same as the objectives of the Communist Party, of which you were also members?

Miss DANIEL. Oh, no, I wouldn't say that. I don't know that I appreciated the difference between guild and party objectives at that time, but certainly in retrospect I can see that there is a decided difference, that is, I think that the party is not primarily interested in bettering the conditions of people. It is interested in taking advantage of discontent to organize them and win them for its own objectives. I think that the purpose of the guild was to get better conditions for newspaper people just because better conditions in themselves were worth getting.

Mr. DOYLE. Why was it if the objectives of the Communist Party were in many cases diametrically opposed to the objectives of the guild that you folks who were in the Communist Party and in control of the guild tried to promulgate the objectives of the guild?

Miss DANIEL. At that time, Congressman, I didn't see that the objectives of the party and the guild were any different; that is, I joined the party and worked in it because I thought that it wanted to help build up the guild.

Mr. DOYLE. As I understand, later you came to the conclusion and recognized that the objective of the Communist Party was to gain control of the guild for the purposes of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; that is, when they did not consider the best interests of the guild in making their decisions, but considered what the party wanted accomplished; for instance, adoption of resolutions which the guild membership would oppose and which would not be right for the guild to adopt because they would be injurious to the guild.

Mr. DOYLE. Is it your testimony, then—and I will put it in my own words—that at all times, even though the Communist Party leaders then in control of the guild appeared to work for the objectives of the guild, they were really working for the long-range objectives of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. I would say that that certainly seems to have been the case.

Mr. DOYLE. May I call your attention to your testimony about a man named Darr Smith. You said you knew that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. At the same time you were?

Miss DANIEL. Some of the time. I think he joined after I did. That's my recollection.

Mr. DOYLE. His name was on your list. You were secretary of the group; were you?

Miss DANIEL. I don't recall being secretary.

Mr. DOYLE. But you and he attended the Communist Party meetings?

Miss DANIEL. Yes; I can remember seeing Darr at some meetings.

Mr. DOYLE. On several occasions?

Miss DANIEL. My recollection is that Darr was not very active either in the guild or in attending the meetings.

Mr. DOYLE. But you are sure that he was known to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. At one time; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. There in the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild cell?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And that was about what year?

Miss DANIEL. 1938 or 1939.

Mr. DOYLE. You used the language "That is the reason so many employees of the Los Angeles Daily News were listed."

Miss DANIEL. Yes. I said that in reference to how people were recruited. I assume that so many were in the Daily News because they worked together; I mean on their jobs.

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed you mentioned a man named Verne Partlow.

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You said he worked for the Newspaper Guild.

Miss DANIEL. After I left; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Was he an employee of the guild?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. In Los Angeles?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. He was not known to me because he wasn't in Los Angeles at the time I left.

Mr. DOYLE. I notice you said you were attracted to the Communist Party membership because the Communist Party members in the union were the hardest workers in the union during the depression. Do you remember that?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What did they do in the union during the depression that attracted you as being the hardest working?

Miss DANIEL. Well, I think I made the generalization that not just in respect to the union, but generally at that time when conditions were very bad I didn't see any group which seemed to be doing very much to try to change conditions, and specifically in the guild the people who seemed to do the most trade-union work were party members.

Mr. DOYLE. You must have come to a realization prior to 1941.

Miss DANIEL. I left the party early in 1940.

Mr. DOYLE. You left the party in 1940 and you worked to eliminate the Communist Party leadership in the guild in 1941.

Miss DANIEL. No; the Communist Party leadership in the Los Angeles Guild in 1940 and in the American Newspaper Guild in 1941.

Mr. DOYLE. You said you came to the realization that it was not for the best interests of the majority. I understood you to so testify that the Communist Party controlled the guild. What did you see or what made you realize that made you fight the Communist Party

leadership in the guild in 1940 or 1941? Instead of fighting with them you fought against them.

MISS DANIEL. Well, for one thing I had come to distrust their motives so that I wanted to eliminate them from positions of leadership where they could do whatever they might want to, and to make them ineffective and inactive. Then, specific things which we would fight would be resolutions.

MR. DOYLE. Did you see anything in their conduct that made you feel that the Communist Party leadership was disloyal to our United States of America in your judgment?

MISS DANIEL. The only thing that I can remember specifically was a resolution that caused a great deal of controversy, a resolution, for instance, on the Selective Service Act in 1940. We had to really get out the membership to attend the meetings in order to defeat resolutions opposing the Draft Act.

MR. DOYLE. Who was opposing the Draft Act in the guild?

MISS DANIEL. The 40 people.

MR. DOYLE. What 40 people?

MISS DANIEL. The Communist Party.

MR. DOYLE. They were in control of the guild at that time, were they not?

MISS DANIEL. No; in 1940 they were defeated. They were eliminated from control of the guild. They still had numerous—I mean they could swing a large number of people, so there was the problem of getting people to meetings to defeat their resolutions to keep them from being elected to anything.

MR. DOYLE. Did that resolution against selective service emanate from the Communist Party members in the guild?

MISS DANIEL. Oh, yes.

MR. DOYLE. What was there about that resolution that would indicate that it was lack of patriotism to our Government?

MISS DANIEL. Well, I mentioned that as one thing which in retrospect I can see was—well, the party line had changed. Before that the party had been in support of practically all administration policies, for the Neutrality Act and the things for building up the strength of this country, but when the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed then they lost interest in building up the defenses of this country and, on the contrary, wanted to neutralize this country.

MR. DOYLE. Why did they want to neutralize this country?

MISS DANIEL. I suppose because—I wasn't in the party at the time. I can't tell you. I know whatever they proposed we opposed.

MR. DOYLE. Perhaps I should not have questioned you in so much detail, but I am mighty happy that you came to the realization that the line of the Communist Party did switch and that they deliberately propagandized everything that would weaken our own national security and national defense, and instead of doing that they began the line that you apparently recognized and began to support the Soviet Communist line to build up the strength of Soviet Russia in contradistinction to our own national defense. Is that a fair statement by me, in your judgment?

MISS DANIEL. It certainly is, exactly.

MR. DOYLE. I do not mean to put words in your mouth.

MISS DANIEL. I don't express myself as clearly as you do.

Mr. DOYLE. During the time you were in the guild and in the Communist Party was there anything that came to your attention through your guild membership or your Communist Party membership which seemed to emanate, in your judgment, from the American headquarters of the Communist Party? Did that come in any way to your personal attention?

Miss DANIEL. No; no, sir. I mentioned that I am not an authority on the organization of the party.

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed that. That is the reason I asked you that question, because you expressly stated to us that you had no knowledge of the Communist Party machinery or processes.

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You said, "I never had any contact with the party machinery. I functioned only in the guild." That was your exact wording or substantially so.

Miss DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You know what the functions of this committee, the House Un-American Activities Committee, are. One of our assignments under the statute is to uncover the activities of subversive people and subversive programs on un-American activity. Have you anything to suggest to us or advice to give us as to any step we should take as a committee, especially with reference to the Newspaper Guild with which you are so familiar? What should we do that we are not doing, or if you do not know exactly what we are doing have you any suggestion to make to us in view of the fact that you have switched your allegiance from the Communist Party?

Miss DANIEL. No, I don't have. I do think you have a very difficult job. This is one thing that I wanted to make clear: I do think that the true motives of the Communist Party, at that time at least—I can't speak for now; it may be the same now—the true motives of the Communist Party are not made clear to the rank-and-file members. They were not made clear to the rank-and-file members. For instance, I never heard any discussion about the use of force and violence or any plan. On the contrary, I was always told that any change would be achieved by democratic methods. They make a great effort to answer—I should put all of this in the past tense—they made a great effort to answer all charges of that sort and to try to convince the rank-and-file members that they were not true. That being the case it is difficult for anybody who was in that rank-and-file position to make a suggestion about how to get at the real operating people in the Communist Party and to find out what their true plans are, because I don't think that they take—they didn't take the risk of revealing them to people who would not have gone along or approved of them, but made a studied effort to make them seem——

Mr. DOYLE. On what sort of occasions, under what circumstances, and who in the Communist Party, as you now think of it, took pains to answer these questions or volunteer the information, if that is the way it came to you or to the membership, that they were not intending to use force and violence?

Miss DANIEL. It would be people of longer experience and indoctrination in the party in this group like—the ones I can think of off-hand would be Sid Burke and Ed Robbins. I mean there would be people who would attempt to give a defense and make any answer to charges that were current or any doubt that people might have, ques-

tions that they might bring up, "Well, what about this that is said?" And so forth.

Mr. DOYLE. Did that use of force and violence come up in those days when you were a member of the Communist Party, at which times Burke and Robbins would—

Miss DANIEL. Well, it might even have been in the literature. It probably was. I am sure that it's a charge that isn't new, but it's one that they have always had to answer and they simply had a line ready to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. And that line was what, substantially?

Miss DANIEL. That any change would be accomplished by peaceful means and that any violence that took place would be on the part of the people who tried to nullify gains that had been made democratically.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the people who tried to nullify the gains that the Communist Party might make peacefully were the ones who would be using the force and violence?

Miss DANIEL. That was the line that they used, yes; to answer any questions or doubt.

Mr. DOYLE. You used the term three or four times of discovering the true motives of the Communist Party. Was their motive and intention to use force and violence? Was that one of the true motives that you came to the conclusion about?

Miss DANIEL. No; it was not. At that time my conclusion about their motives was that they tried to get control of organizations and build up unions in order to use them. My conclusions as to whether—well, it's been testified at some of the numerous court trials that they do plan force and violence and that has brought to my mind the difference between what the leadership of the party may actually be planning and the extent to which they let the rank-and-file people in on their true purposes. I am trying to contrast what has since been brought out about the Communist Party with what I heard at that time.

Mr. DOYLE. Today you testified that you came to the point where you could not trust the leadership in your own cell?

Miss DANIEL. Oh, well, I mean that I didn't trust them as to the motives which they gave for building up unions, etc.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Miss DANIEL. I think, Congressman, maybe I could summarize this way: That a lot of the things I have learned about the Communist Party I have learned since I left, by reading what has come out at hearings and trials, and that I didn't gain any first-hand information in that field myself when I was in the party.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I must ask one more.

Putting together what you learned in the years that you were in the party from personal observation and personal contact—in other words, whatever you gained in any way during the years that you were in the party—with what you have learned since by your reading and by your reflection of what you learned while you were a member, or from any other source or in any other manner, do you have an opinion on whether or not the testimony in these law cases which you have apparently read that the Communist Party doctrine included the use of force and violence in its processes? Do you have an opinion on that point?

Miss DANIEL. My only point would be that I think they are capable of it. I mean I think there is a conspiracy at the top of the party. I don't know how far down it goes, and the reason I don't know how far down it goes is because of my own experience of its not going down to me.

Mr. DOYLE. What kind of a conspiracy?

Miss DANIEL. Oh, a conspiracy to do one thing and pretend that you are going to do another.

Mr. DOYLE. A conspiracy to do what one thing?

Miss DANIEL. Well, I never thought of it in the sense of a conspiracy to—I suppose if they could do here what they have done in some European countries that they would like to do it.

Mr. DOYLE. What have they done there that you think they would like to do here?

Miss DANIEL. I haven't even done a lot of reading on this, but, for instance, places like Czechoslovakia they infiltrate, don't they? The government, the police force, etc., and things are maneuvered around so that they take over and democratic forms are destroyed. I'm afraid that I have only very nebulous impressions and information. The thing is that now the way the Communist party is represented as acting in foreign countries I accept it as true and I think they would try to do the same thing here if they could.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, in your convictions you feel that they could in line with what you knew from your own experience be willing to use force and violence?

Miss DANIEL. Yes, I think that certainly the hardened ones would be capable of doing that.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the leadership of the party is what you refer to as the hardened ones?

Miss DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. I am sure I speak the sentiment of all the committee who are here that we are grateful to you for coming here and for your frank and forthright attitude with reference to this matter under investigation. I certainly trust that your appearance here will not endanger you or cause you any inconvenience or embarrassment.

Did you say you had some questions you wanted to ask in executive session?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Very well; we will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p. m. Tuesday, July 8, 1952, the committee proceeded in executive session.)

4

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3996

