



Williams College Library

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

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

JANUARY 24, 28, FEBRUARY 5, MARCH 20, AND APRIL 10, 30, 1952

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



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

CLYDE DOYLE, California

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*

RAPHAEL L. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

	Page
January 24, 1952, appearance of M. William Pomerance.....	2307
January 28, 1952:	
Testimony of—	
Melvin Levy.....	2309
Michael Seymour Blankfort.....	2328
George Bassman.....	2366
February 5, 1952, testimony of M. William Pomerance.....	2373
March 20, 1952, testimony of Hyman ("Hy") Solomon Kraft.....	2397
April 10, 1952, testimony of Elia Kazan.....	2409
April 30, 1952, testimony of Edward G. Robinson.....	2417

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1952

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment, at 2:28 p. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Clyde Doyle, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; Courtney E. Owens and William A. Wheeler, investigators; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order.

For the purposes of the hearing this afternoon, acting under the authority and resolution establishing this committee, I as chairman set up the subcommittee composed of the following members: Messrs. Doyle, Kearney, Potter, and Wood; and they are all present.

Who do you have for the first witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will call Mr. William Pomerance.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Pomerance, will you hold up your right hand and be sworn?

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

Mr. POMERANCE. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat, please.

TESTIMONY OF M. WILLIAM POMERANCE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DAVID REIN

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in calling the witness was merely to have him respond to the subpoena and to have the committee set a date for his appearance, as it is quite evident with the work we have planned here for today and tomorrow that we are not likely to reach him.

However, I will ask him one or two questions.

Mr. Pomerance, you were served with a subpoena to appear here today, the 24th day of January?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was the subpoena served on you?

Mr. POMERANCE. Tuesday morning.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Pomerance, owing to the schedule that we have had this week, and its taking more time than the committee contemplated, I regret very much that we are not going to be able to hear your testimony, and I am going to excuse you until Tuesday, the 5th of February.

(Whereupon the witness was excused and the committee proceeded with the witness, A. Marburg Yerkes, whose testimony is printed in a separate publication entitled "Communist Infiltration Into Professional Groups.")

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 1952

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:10 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., (appearance as noted in record), Harold H. Velde, (appearance as noted in record), Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; William A. Wheeler and Courtney E. Owens, investigators; and A. S. Poore, editor.

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

Let the record show that there are present Messrs. Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Walter.

Who is your next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will call Mr. Melvin Levy.

What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. LEVY. Melvin Levy.

Mr. WALTER. Just a moment. Will you rise please, and hold up your right hand?

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

Mr. LEVY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MELVIN LEVY

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. LEVY. Melvin Levy.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Levy?

Mr. LEVY. In Salt Lake City, on May 11, 1902.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice just a little bit?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

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

Mr. LEVY. I am a graduate with a master's degree of the University of Washington.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. It is rather difficult to hear you.

Mr. LEVY. I am sorry. I will try to raise it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you were a graduate of the University of Washington?

Mr. LEVY. The University of Washington, and I have a master's degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. A master's degree?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. LEVY. Writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are a writer?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a writer of screen plays?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I am a writer of anything.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what your record of employment or achievement has been in the field of writing?

Mr. LEVY. Well, my first novel was published when I was 21, called Matrix, M-a-t-r-i-x.

Mr. TAVENNER. Matrix?

Mr. LEVY. Matrix. And I published four novels. My first play was Gold Eagle Guy.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are having difficulty hearing you.

Mr. LEVY. I am terribly sorry. My first play was Gold Eagle Guy. It was done in New York in 1934. And I have done, I suppose, a dozen or 15 or 20 pictures, I don't know; Bandit of Sherwood Forest; Sunday Dinner for a Soldier; Renegades; She's a Soldier, Too.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the names of the last two?

Mr. LEVY. The last two that I said. Let's see, did I say "Bandit of Sherwood Forest"?

Mr. TAVENNER. Bandit of Sherwood Forest?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Sunday Dinner for a Soldier.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sunday Dinner for a Soldier?

Mr. LEVY. Hitler's Hangman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hitler's Hangman?

Mr. LEVY. She's a Soldier, Too.

Mr. TAVENNER. She's a Soldier, Too?

Mr. LEVY. That is right.

Renegades.

Mr. TAVENNER. Renegades?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. It covers a—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is sufficient.

Mr. Levy, during the course of the hearings conducted by this committee in Los Angeles in September of 1951, Mr. Martin Berkeley appeared as a witness, and identified you as having been at one time a member of the Communist Party.

(Addressing news photographers:)

May I ask that you get your pictures now?

Mr. LEVY. You can have a lot of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now that is over with.

Mr. LEVY. I am very happy.

Mr. TAVENNER. I stated that Mr. Martin Berkeley had identified you as having been at one time a member of the Communist Party. Did you then voluntarily get in touch with the committee and ask the privilege of appearing before the committee?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. To make such statement or explanation of your membership as you desired?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee did announce in Hollywood, as it has frequently announced, whenever a person has been named as a member of the Communist Party, or any testimony is given relating to him or his organization, that either he or his organization is invited to appear here for such explanation as the individual or the association desires to present.

Mr. LEVY. That is what I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it is in response to that that you have appeared?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what is it that you desire to state to the committee about it?

Mr. LEVY. Well, Mr. Berkeley's testimony was true. I was twice in my life. I was once a member of the Communist Party, and once a member of the Communist Political Association at various times.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. LEVY. I think that it is, at different times, and with no connection between, no connection between the two things.

I became a member of the Communist Party in 1933 at the request of Mr. Earl Browder.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did that take place?

Mr. LEVY. In New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occasion of Mr. Earl Browder's talking to you?

Mr. LEVY. I don't remember precisely how I met Mr. Browder. I do remember that he spoke—asked me if he could come to my house and speak, in an apartment with my wife on Fifteenth Street, and he came there, and brought other people with him, whom I didn't know. And I met him then. And as asked me over some time if I would come in the Communist Party and I said "no," because I said that I was a writer and that as a writer I wanted no obligation to anything except my writing.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would raise his voice.

Mr. LEVY. I said "no," because I told him that I was a writer and wanted to have no obligation to anything except my writing.

I had never, even in college—because I have always thought of myself as a writer, even when I was little. I didn't want to belong to anything.

And Mr. Browder then suggested I become a member at large, and that I would not be asked to go to meetings, or anything of the sort.

And I became a member at large in his office, and was given a name then, and a card. I no longer remember the name. I tried to think of it several times. It could have been Martin, but I am not sure.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. LEVY. And then, about some months later, I went—this was at a time when I was engaged in a biography of a man named Tom Mooney, and I met Mr. Mooney on the coast. I had a contract with Harcourt Brace to publish this book.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there.

Mr. LEVY. Am I saying more than I should?

Mr. TAVENNER. I want you to present it as you desire, but at times I would like to interrupt you.

Mr. LEVY. Please do.

Mr. TAVENNER. And ask you for more detailed information.

Mr. LEVY. Please do.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am interested to know why it was that Earl Browder was interested in your membership to the extent that he would suggest that you become a member at large.

Mr. LEVY. Well, I cannot answer that in any accurate way. I imagine that I was not the only person in this situation. I think he regarded me as a good writer, which I like to think of myself as being. That is it.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you became a member at the solicitation of Mr. Browder, did you engage in any particular study in company with other members of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir. This was my understanding: That I was not to be required to go to any meetings of any kind; that I was to have conversations with Mr. Browder, as I desired them.

Mr. TAVENNER. What efforts were made to indoctrinate you in the principles of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. LEVY. I was just trying to think. I talked to him a number of times, and I suppose that would be it. I don't think there was—there was no intense program. I mean, nothing that I can say "This is it."

We had a number of discussions; I suppose four or five or six.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. You may proceed. You were telling us about your work in writing the life story of Tom Mooney.

Mr. LEVY. Tom Mooney. And I went to the coast then, to San Francisco, and had met Mr. Mooney.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. LEVY. I met Mr. Mooney, and he was an extraordinary man. And I very quickly found that the book was being destroyed for my purposes, because there were things going on. The Mooney Molders Committee was fighting with other people, and the book was being molded by decisions that were made that had nothing to do with the book.

Mr. TAVENNER. These decisions that were made that seemed to alter the normal course that such a book should take were being made by whom?

Mr. LEVY. I don't know. They came to me from Mooney. They came to me from Mooney or his sister. But they were having fights with all kinds of people whom I don't know. I was not their confidante.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to find out as to what extent the Communist Party endeavored, if at all, there.

Mr. LEVY. This I cannot answer. All of my conversations were either with Mooney or with his sister, Miss Mooney. I don't remember her first name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the changes or the difficulties that you had of such a character that you could determine the source of them; that is, whether they came from problems in the Communist ideology?

Mr. LEVY. I would guess that they came from many sources. I would guess that the AFL would say something; that the molders committee would say something, probably the Communist Party would say something. There were many people interested in Mooney in a different way than I was interested in him.

I remember one of the things—it is a long time ago, and it is hard for me to remember details—one of the things that went back and forth was the attitude about the American Federation of Labor, it sometimes was for and sometimes it was against, and this man was just lost sight of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your Communist Party membership have anything to do with your selection as a person to write the life of Tom Mooney?

Mr. LEVY. No. This preceded it. No, this was Harcourt Brace and I that had this idea. It began with another firm whose name I do longer remember, which was later absorbed by Harcourt Brace who thought this was a good idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand this work commenced before you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. Yes; the contract was made before the negotiations, but just before I went to San Francisco to meet Mr. Mooney, I had these meetings with Mr. Browder.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Counsel, may I ask a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOULDER (presiding). Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. At the time you talked with Mr. Earl Browder concerning your joining the Communist Party, was Browder the leader of the Communist Party in America at that time?

Mr. LEVY. I don't know if he was a leader. He was a very important man. I don't know if he was at the top. He was an important man. I think he had a special interest in writers and artists.

Mr. KEARNEY. He had a special interest in obtaining recruits for the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I think he also had an interest in writers and artists and painters.

Mr. KEARNEY. For the Communist Party, and for recruitment into the party?

Mr. LEVY. Yes; but I think—this is judgment, personally—that he was a widely read man, and a very literate man.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason he had? That is the question I was trying to get at a moment ago. What was the reason that Earl Browder had for taking this special interest in writers? Do you think it was to influence the course of their writings?

Mr. LEVY. Yes; I think it was two things. I think that certainly it was to influence the course of writings, but I think also that this particular thing came out of his own personality—this is a matter of

judgment—he was a man who I remember had read more poets than I had read, and that was at a time when I was reading a great many poets.

He was a man who read a great deal. I think both things existed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he discuss with you at any time your assignment to write the story of Tom Mooney?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. I told him what I wanted to do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that before he asked you to become a member of the Communist Party? Did he know—

Mr. LEVY. I understand your question. I don't know the sequence of events. It was all about the same time.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. LEVY. It all happened about the same time, and I cannot say what preceded what each time. He might very well have known.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time during the course of your work in connection with that assignment feel that you were being influenced in any way by members of the Communist Party in the performance of your task that was being attempted?

Mr. LEVY. As I say, from the time I got to San Francisco until the job was finished all of my contacts were either with Mr. Mooney or his sister.

But it was obvious that these contacts were reflecting a great many—I think you have to understand what kind of a man Mooney was. This is a man, who was, I think, as interesting as any man I have ever known. He had a particular quality. But he had a tremendous egotism, and he thought of himself in all the meetings I had with him, he spoke of himself in the third person. And he thought of himself as a nation thinks of itself, or as the Congress thinks of itself.

He never thought of himself as a man named Tom Mooney. He would never say, "I think"; he would say, "Tom Mooney thinks." I never heard him use the first person singular pronoun.

Now, these were things that I wanted to have in the book. There were a great many things. To me he was a character, and a great character.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Mooney at any time make a statement to you regarding either his membership or nonmembership in the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. No; but he said to me a number of times, "Tom Mooney and the Soviet Union," as if they both occupied the same size of territory. So I would doubt that—

Mr. JACKSON. The sequence would seem to indicate that he perhaps occupied more space than the Soviet Union.

Mr. LEVY. That was always a sequence, an accidental—

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question right there:

At the time he used that phrase, "Tom Mooney and the Soviet Union," did he use it in such a way that it indicated to you that there was cooperation or functioning together by Tom Mooney and the Soviet Union?

Mr. LEVY. I would think not. I would think that it indicated that there might be a temporary alliance at one point or another, but at no time a breaking down of the borders, so to speak.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you publish your book?

Mr. LEVY. No. The book was a fiasco. Harcourt didn't want to publish it, and I didn't want to publish it, either. The book was just a hodgepodge.

Then I went to Browder and said that this was why I did not want to have anything, any organizational contacts, and asked to be released, and returned my card he had given me, I believe, and was released at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the Communist Party at that period?

Mr. LEVY. Well, it must have been right around a year, shading one way or the other, right around a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the year? I do not know that you have fixed the exact year.

Mr. LEVY. Well, it was through most of the year 1933. One of the reasons I felt most strongly about this in terms of my experience was that I was then embarking on a series of what were going to be five novels on the Pacific coast from which I come, and I was going to treat the Pacific coast in terms of industry and industrialists.

Mr. JACKSON. Could you speak a little louder, please?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I can. I say I was going to write; I had the project of writing what was going to be a series of five novels on the Pacific coast, which is my home, in terms of industries, and the protagonists in each case were to be industrialists.

And I felt that this was a field in which there could be all kinds of interference, the kind I didn't want. I took two of these. The first of these was the *The Last Pioneers*, which was a novel.

The second was *Gold Eagle Guy*, which was done as a play.

And I don't know if this is apropos, or not, but both of these were reviewed adversely in the left-wing press, generally on the basis that I had romanticized industrialists, although, I may say, that in at least one case, one who thought he was the protagonist, or his family, was just as adverse.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand you to say that you did not want to feel any restraints at the time that you prepared these, or wrote these two novels?

Mr. LEVY. I didn't want to feel any restraint about writing at all, but particularly because I knew I was going to deal with industry and industrialists.

Mr. TAVENNER. What reason did you have to believe that you would have any restraint placed upon you?

Mr. LEVY. I had just been through it with the Mooneys.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that have anything to do with your leaving the party at that particular time?

Mr. LEVY. It had everything to do with it; yes, sir. That is it.

Mr. TAVENNER. So it was because of the restraint that you felt would be imposed by the Communist Party that you withdrew?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir. I didn't want restraint from anybody. I didn't want restraint from anybody.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were of the opinion that that would interfere with your own creative work in the writing of the novels *The Last Pioneer* and so on?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, counsel, when Mr. Levy testified before he did not use the word "restraint." He said "no obligation." I am wondering if there is any difference in his mind between the terms.

You used the term "obligation"; you did not use the term "restraint," did you not?

Mr. LEVY. I don't remember, but let me say this: That I have been writing most of my life, and only once has anybody said to me, "this is what you are to write, and this is the way you are to write it." Nobody in my life has ever said to me excepting once "this is the way the thing has got to be done."

And I don't remember using the word "obligation," but I think obligation is the closer word.

Mr. DOYLE. I think the exact language was—and I wrote it down because I thought it was significant—"I wanted to have no obligation except to my writing."

Mr. LEVY. I wasn't conscious of using that word, but that is the more accurate thing. That is what I meant.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I am trying to understand is whether or not you felt that membership in the Communist Party would hinder you in carrying out your work in the preparation of the novels you spoke of.

Mr. LEVY. I felt, and do feel, that membership in any organization that has a program to which you bind yourself by being a member must give you an obligation—and thank you for giving me back that word—must give you an obligation to those things which must influence your writing.

For instance, in *Gold Eagle Guy*, the protagonist is a shipping man, a San Francisco man, who is a shipper who creates a shipping empire.

Now, as I say, the family of the man who thought that I was writing about him was very indignant that I had treated him this way, but to me he was a character. I didn't want to say, because the family may object to it, I didn't want to paint him one way, but also to me he was a very romantic and powerful, creative character, and I didn't want to be under—this was his significance to me, was that he was both things, was that he was creative, that he built, that he was essential, and also on the other side that he was amoral, that he was ruthless, and you must have both these things to make a character, to make a man.

And if you leave out either thing you are lying.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that there was only one occasion when you were told, or directed what to write. Has that any bearing upon the matters which this committee is investigating?

Mr. LEVY. I was working for the *New York Journal*.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of the problem which you mentioned, you withdrew from the Communist Party in 1933?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the year's period when you were a member at that time, did you pay dues?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir; I think I paid Mr. Browder something when he gave me the card, some small sum, but no others.

Mr. TAVENNER. But as a member at large, you did not pay dues?

Mr. LEVY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next affiliation or connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. This was either in late 1944 or early in 1945 with the Communist Political Association, and I stress the name because this was the connection.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you desire to say to the committee regarding your experience at that time?

Mr. LEVY. Well, I was asked to join, and said what had happened there before, said what had happened; said much of what I have said to you here now.

And then was told that the Communist Party no longer existed; that the Communist Political Association existed, and that it was an entirely different kind of thing; that it was part of the unity between wartime allies, et cetera, et cetera, and I joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. And because of those representations your attitude toward your work and your party was different from what it had been back in 1933?

Mr. LEVY. Well, the party no longer—there was no more party. You see, this was the thing: That there was no more party. There was no more Communist Party at this time. And that the situation that I had found unpleasant did not exist and could not exist, and that we were wartime allies with them, and we were—I cannot finish that sentence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was instrumental in bringing you into the party?

Mr. LEVY. A man named Willner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that George Willner?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he is the same George Willner who was an agent for various writers and—

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And who appeared before this committee and refused to testify on the ground that to do so might incriminate him?

Mr. LEVY. I didn't know that he had appeared before the committee, but he was an agent, he was my agent, or he worked for my agent. He was an employee of my agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just tell us a little more in detail of what Mr. Willner did to bring you into the party again in 1944.

Mr. LEVY. It was either late 1944 or 1945—I am not sure which.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Communist Political Association had its inception in 1944?

Mr. LEVY. Well, I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. And ended in 1945?

Mr. LEVY. I am not sure in my own mind, whether it was 1944 or 1945. That is why I—and I don't know how to establish it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just recite the events or the circumstances under which George Willner approached you.

Mr. LEVY. He spoke to me about this a number of times saying more or less what I have said now, in different ways, and finally I said, or finally he said, "I would like you to go to a meeting," and I said, "O. K."

Mr. JACKSON. A little louder, please.

Mr. LEVY. I am terribly sorry.

And he gave me an address, and I went to the meeting. He was not there.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney reentered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. How is that?

Mr. LEVY. He was not there. And the assumption was that—there was nothing more formal than that. I went to this meeting, and then I went to some others, not a lot.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these meetings held?

Mr. LEVY. It was in the valley; I don't know. You say whose house?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. I am not—I don't know. It was in the valley. It was on the flat part of the valley. There was a house I never went to again, and Bill¹ asked me that, and I have tried to remember that, and I have tried to remember since, and I just don't know whose house it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many meetings did you attend?

Mr. LEVY. Six or eight over a period of time; maybe five.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. LEVY. Over a period of several months. There were a half dozen, I should think.

(A note was handed to the witness.)

This note just says "Louder."

Mr. TAVENNER. I think you should read it because I would not want it to appear that we were handing you private notes.

Mr. LEVY. No. You looked so distressed.

Mr. TAVENNER. The note says "Louder"?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, try to speak a little louder.

Mr. LEVY. Over a period of several months, I think there were five or six or eight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these meetings held? If you attended about five meetings, can you tell us, or give us the names of the homes of any of the persons?

Mr. LEVY. A man named Bill Blowitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bill, is that Blowitz, B-l-o-w-i-t-z?

Mr. LEVY. Yes; it is apparently the same man, if that is the way you pronounce it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his first name?

Mr. LEVY. Bill.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in what business was he engaged?

Mr. LEVY. He is a publicity man.

(At this point, counsel for the committee interrupted the proceedings to discuss another matter.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you attended a meeting in the home of William Blowitz.

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other persons in whose homes you met?

Mr. LEVY. I am trying to do that now. At a later time, Lester Cole—I think not at this time; I'm not sure—it's hard to remember them,

because they were often in the homes of people I didn't know, and because it was so irregular, they were usually with people whom I didn't know.

I think you have something in front of you there—

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall meeting at the home of Mortimer Offner?

Mr. LEVY. I believe so.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. LEVY. I think there was one of these that was at my house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of any other members of this group?

Mr. LEVY. No; Bill¹ has the names there. Mr. Berkeley was one; Betty Wilson, who also testified that I met her at such a meeting, has testified accurately.

Mr. TAVENNER. And she testified in the Hollywood hearings?

Mr. LEVY. Yes; and this was accurate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Edward Huebsch, H-u-e-b-s-c-h?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement?

Mr. LEVY. Because he asked me if I would like—when I had left, if I would like—

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder.

Mr. LEVY. When I had left, he asked me if I wanted to be in or out.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Alfred Levitt, L-e-v-i-t-t?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. LEVY. This is something that I have been trying to remember. I have said—when I read this, I found his name there, and I cannot now say—I would say "Yes," but I cannot—I would say he is, but I keep trying to find a reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want you to say so unless you know it of your own knowledge.

Mr. LEVY. I am trying to find the reason in my mind that I would say "Yes."

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, if you have any reason, state it.

Mr. LEVY. Well, I have been trying to think if I ever was at that meeting with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me say this, that before you express any opinion you should first conclude in your own mind whether you know he was a member of the party.

Mr. LEVY. That is a difficult thing. I read it there, and when I said it I must have had a reason for saying it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean, you read it there?

¹ Bill refers to William A. Wheeler, committee investigator.

Mr. LEVY. When I read over the testimony I gave Bill, what I gave Bill earlier. And then, afterward, when I saw it there, I began to try to remember why I said it. I cannot remember now whether I was at a meeting with him or not. I was with him at a number of Screen Actors' Guild meetings and that kind of thing. And I would say that I am pretty sure the answer is "Yes," but I cannot say right now why I say "Yes." And I would like to, because this has bothered me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is that all you have to say with regard to Mr. Levitt?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, for your information, as you were not at the Hollywood hearings, Mr. Levitt was identified by witnesses there as a member of the Communist Party.

Now, were you affiliated with the Communist Party in any way between the years 1936 and 1944?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir.

(Representative Clyde Doyle returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any meetings of the Communist Party during that time?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or Marxist study groups during that period of time?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir. No, I was living on a farm in Bucks County.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. And I don't remember attending any public things except auction sales. But during that time, I certainly had no connection with anything.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go to California?

Mr. LEVY. 1941, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were in California in 1933?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were working on the Tom Mooney book?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. I was in San Francisco then. Then when Gold Eagle Guy was running, I was out to do one picture for Metro.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. LEVY. That was 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in California between 1936 and 1941?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. I had a job for Universal. I was out there for 6 weeks, in 1939. But I did not have any connection with anything.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you out there between 1936 and 1939, that is, out in California?

Mr. LEVY. No. I was there for the first time in 1933. Then I was there in 1935 at Metro. And in 1939, at Universal. Then I came out again just before Pearl Harbor in 1941, shortly before Pearl Harbor. And that time I brought my family, and I have stayed.

Mr. MOULDER. In 1944, were you issued a membership card, or was your affiliation just by attendance at meetings which you recognized or assumed to be Communist meetings?

Mr. LEVY. Which I recognized. So far as I know, the only card I ever remember was the one Mr. Browder gave me in 1933. There may have been cards made out that were not issued to me, but I do not remember seeing them.

Mr. MOULDER. Then could we assume you were a member of the Communist Party in 1941 other than attending meetings, or what was your attitude about that?

Mr. LEVY. Well, I regarded myself so. Of the political association, rather.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you said there was no more party.

Mr. LEVY. That is right. It was the political association.

Mr. DOYLE. It was your understanding that it did not exist?

Mr. LEVY. I think that was true. I think the party did not exist then, or did not exist in any form that—

Mr. MOULDER. That was the point that I referred to.

Mr. LEVY. I think Mr. Tavenner used the words interchangeably.

Mr. VELDE. Well, in your own mind, was not the Communist Political Association the same as the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. What, in your mind, was the difference between the two? Was there any difference in the personnel or the membership?

Mr. LEVY. This I don't know, because I don't know what the membership was. There was certainly a difference, because I was a difference.

Mr. VELDE. You mean there was a difference in your own mind?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, I was a difference. It was a difference in membership.

Mr. VELDE. You had belonged to the Communist Party prior to 1944?

Mr. LEVY. But I left for the specific reasons I stated, and would not have gone back, for those reasons.

Mr. VELDE. I am a little confused about this. I am sorry, Mr. Counsel.

I understood you were a member of the Communist Party prior to its change to the Communist Political Association.

Mr. LEVY. This was in 1933.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1933 he dropped out of the Communist Party. (Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. VELDE. And you did not rejoin it again—

Mr. LEVY. Until 1944.

Mr. VELDE. When you joined the Communist Political Association?

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. LEVY. Well, actually, technically, I suppose. I was a member until 1947, I think, some time in 1947. I had stopped going to meetings a long time before that. But I think technically it was in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually, the Communist Political Association went out of existence in 1945.

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, you just remained in the Communist organization, which had converted in 1945 back to its former title, that of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. What happened was that finally—I wasn't being around, and finally I was called on to say, "What do you want to do?" Finally Mr. Huebsch called and said, "What do you want to do?"

Mr. TAVENNER. Who called?

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Huebsch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please?

Mr. LEVY. You spelled it a minute ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. I know.

Mr. LEVY. H-u-e-b-s-c-h.

Mr. MOULDER. During all that time you referred to, as being associated with the Communist Party or the Political Association of the Communist Party, would you say it influenced your writings, books, or any other publications or works that you have done?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir; it did not.

Mr. MOULDER. Then the association you had with the Communist Party organization, or with the Communist Party members, did not influence in any way your publications or the work that you were doing; that is, the philosophy or the belief of those people or the party organization?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Your answer is "No"?

Mr. LEVY. My answer is "No." And I am smiling because one meeting that I remember clearly, the content of it was on literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder.

Mr. LEVY. The one meeting I remember clearly, and I don't know why I remember it, was on the question of literature. It was on the question of realism and naturalism. The announced subject was Marxist Criticism. And I think of myself as knowing something about these subjects, and I was told by a girl whom I had never seen before or since that I had no right to know about these subjects, because she, who represented the working class, understood them instinctively, and she disagreed with me, and therefore I must be in error.

Mr. MOULDER. Was there ever any attempt on the part of any of the members of the Communist Party or the organizations you mentioned in your testimony to influence you or to persuade you to write in such manner as would include the Communist philosophy or belief?

Mr. LEVY. Nothing that is overt, excepting in a kind of an almost automatic sense, that you are influenced by the people that you are with. If I spent time with you, I would be influenced by you, and you would be influenced by me, I mean, that kind of thing. But there is only one time in my life that somebody has said, "This is what you have to write."

Mr. MOULDER. Then was it your purpose, in joining the party in 1933, as well as associating yourself with the meetings that you have mentioned in 1944, to inform yourself or to broaden your information concerning the workings and the functions of the Communist Party organizations in this country?

Was it curiosity, or what?

Mr. LEVY. I am trying to find a way of saying this so that it doesn't sound kind of silly.

But my purpose both times was in the hope that I would find a way of leaving my kids a better world than I lived in.

And when I found that I was not doing that, then I didn't want to do it any more. I have lots of kids.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was this person who stated to you that you should not think as you were thinking?

Mr. LEVY. As I say, it was a girl I never saw before or since.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this in one of the Communist Party meetings?

Mr. LEVY. Oh, yes, I can't remember anything about it excepting this, that I felt such a fury. I find the kind of an automobile mechanic or somebody might feel—

Mr. TAVENNER. During this part of your experience in the Communist Party, was Communist Party literature made available to you for study?

Mr. LEVY. Yes. There was always literature, but a great variety of literature. There was both Communist literature and general literature available.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you expected to study and master the Communist Party literature?

Mr. LEVY. No. You could either buy it or not buy it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were discussion groups held on Communist matters, matters involving Communist ideology?

Mr. LEVY. I never attended one.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many meetings in all did you attend? I believe you have stated about five.

Mr. LEVY. I would say not less than five nor more than eight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you left the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I just left. I just wasn't there. And then after a long period of time Mr. Huebsch came to see me and said, "What do you want to do? Do you want to be in or out?" And I say, "Out." In my own mind, I had been gone a long time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay Communist Party dues during this period?

Mr. LEVY. I paid some dues in meetings. They were small dues.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall to whom you paid them?

Mr. LEVY. No, I think somebody would get up and say, "Give me your quarter," or something of that kind. I don't think it was more than a quarter. It may have been as much as 50 cents.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you contribute to any functions of the Communist Party by making special contributions, or such things as benefits for the New Masses?

Mr. LEVY. I bought a picture once at a New Masses sale, a very good picture. This was before I had any connection with—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time attend a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. Not at any time, knowing that I was so doing.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member, I believe, of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, were you not?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir. I have some place a note from Mr. Roosevelt thanking me for that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you engaged in any of the activities of that group after the termination of the war?

Mr. LEVY. I didn't know that it existed after the war. I was later told it had. But I was told it went out of existence during the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything of the purpose that the organization had in perpetuating itself after the period of the war?

Mr. LEVY. I didn't know it did. As I say, I was told quite recently that it had. But as far as I knew, it was a wartime thing, for civilian defense.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with John Howard Lawson?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir; very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Howard Lawson, by the testimony adduced at numerous hearings before the committee, has been shown to be the head of the Communist Party in Hollywood.

Mr. LEVY. I didn't know him as such. I met John Howard Lawson in 1925, when my first novel was published. We had the same publisher. And this was the way I knew him——

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you going to say something else?

Mr. LEVY. No, I was just hesitating as to whether it was worth while to tell the circumstances of my meeting with him. I don't think it is. They are amusing, but they are not pertinent.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active in the work of the committee for the Writers' Congress, which was held in the campus at Los Angeles October 1, 2, and 3, 1943?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir, and so were a great many people from the Army, from the State Department, from the university.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was shown by hearings before the committee that that work was done as a result of being influenced by the Communist Party. Do you know anything about that?

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

Mr. LEVY. No, sir. I was introduced to it and asked to participate in it by Phil Dunn of the OWI, who is certainly not by the farthest stretch of the imagination a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall signing a petition dated October 18, 1948, for the nomination of Lester Cole and Ring Lardner, Jr., as members of the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1948 is a period of time later than that when you said you withdrew from the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir. That had nothing to do with that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in favor in 1948 of electing to the executive board of the guild persons who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. I can only tell you that either in that year or the year before I also signed a nominating petition for a man named Fred Niblo, Jr., who is as far to the right as you can get.

Mr. TAVENNER. But was Lester Cole known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And was Ring Lardner, Jr., known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. No, sir; not known.

Mr. TAVENNER. But Lester Cole was?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir. But I signed these two petitions, the Niblo petition and this petition, on the basis that a man who had anything to say to the guild ought to have a chance to say it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not speaking of the opportunity to say what he wanted to say, what one wants to say, before the guild. This is a matter of the election of the members of the executive board.

Mr. LEVY. No, sir; this is a matter of nomination, putting a name on the ballot and letting the members decide.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't mean to say you would sign a person's petition for nomination and then vote against him?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that your view in this instance? Is that what you expected to do?

Mr. LEVY. In this case I would have voted for one of the men and against the other one. In the case of Mr. Niblo, I would, and told him I would, vote against him.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am speaking about Lester Cole, the person known to you to be a member of the party.

Mr. LEVY. I say of these two people I would have voted for one and against the other. I don't remember how I did vote.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you intend in signing the petition to support Lester Cole, who was a person then known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVY. Lester is the person I would not have voted for and did not vote for.

Mr. TAVENNER. Although you did sign his nominating petition?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir. I would and assume I did vote for Ring Lardner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any statement that you desire to make to the committee with regard to the character of your break with the Communist Party, that is, whether it was full and complete?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir. I assume that I have made that statement, that it was full and complete, I mean, that this is the content of my appearance here; that it is full and complete, that I have not heard anything nor have any desire or reason to hear anything, since this last time, about 4 years ago. I don't think there would be—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Levy, do you have legal counsel with you?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you want to identify him?

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Gang, sir. [Martin Gang.]

Mr. DOYLE. I was interested in your comment that back in 1943, as I thought you said, you thought you paid Earl Browder some dues.

Mr. LEVY. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Did he ask you for dues for the Communist Party, or how did you happen to pay him?

Mr. LEVY. Well, as I remember, he gave me this card, and I don't remember the words, but the sense of it was, "I want a quarter," or it may have been a dime. The sums were very, very small. I mean, it just seemed to me the way things were done.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Kearney? Mr. Potter? Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, there is one question I may desire to ask the witness, if you will bear with me a moment, please.

There was a witness who appeared in Los Angeles in response to a subpoena by the name of Carl Foreman. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. LEVY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement?

Mr. LEVY. Because I was invited to hear him talk to a meeting, which I have every presumption was a Communist meeting, to talk about his work.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was the meeting held, as nearly as you can recall?

Mr. LEVY. Possibly '46. It was at a time when I had not been around for a long while, and I went to this because I was very interested in hearing him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he the same person who appeared in the hearings at Hollywood and refused to answer questions on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him?

Mr. LEVY. I assume so. I don't know. I didn't hear that testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was Carl Foreman employed at that time, the one that you were speaking of?

Mr. LEVY. He was a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time he appeared?

Mr. LEVY. You mean who was he working for?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. I don't know. He is not a man that I have known well.

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

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, before concluding my testimony I should like to repeat part of the testimony I gave to Mr. Wheeler on October 22, 1951.

Mr. WALTER. Very well.

Mr. LEVY. My name was mentioned at the recent hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in Los Angeles as having formerly been a member of the Communist Party in the United States. I also heard statements made by the chairman of the committee to the effect that any person named as having been a member of the Communist Party would have the opportunity to testify before this committee as to whether the statement was true or untrue, and if true that any statements with reference to disaffiliation with the party might be given to the committee under oath.

I am taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the committee since the statement made with reference to my past affiliation with the Communist Party was a true and correct statement. I have for a considerable period of time, however, not been a member of the Communist Party. I left because I did not believe in the aims, purposes, or operation of the party. I found it had nothing to offer me and had no place in this country. I did not offer to testify before the committee since I frankly felt that I had had such a minor connection with the party that I would serve no useful purpose in volunteering. Nevertheless, my name has been mentioned and I am grateful to the committee for granting me this opportunity to get the record straight.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you. The witness may be excused.

Mr. LEVY. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a. m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 2 p. m. of the same day.)

(The following statement was inserted at this point by Representative Morgan M. Moulder:)

It is my opinion that the committee should commend and express appreciation to all witnesses who cooperate and truthfully testify and reveal all of their knowledge and information of communistic activities in our country. Therefore, I want to record to show that witness Melvin Levy voluntarily appeared and has so cooperated and testified in his assistance of this committee of its work of exposing communistic activities in this country.

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing reconvened at 2:15 p. m., Representatives Morgan Moulder, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson, being present, Mr. Walter, presiding.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Who is your first witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Michael Blankfort.

Mr. WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please?

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

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, please.

TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL SEYMOUR BLANKFORT

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name, please, sir?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Michael Seymour Blankfort.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Blankfort?

Mr. BLANKFORT. December 10, 1907, in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee, please, what your educational training and background has been?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I was educated in the public schools of New York City. I was an undergraduate at the University of Pennsylvania. I graduated with the degree of bachelor of arts in 1929.

I was an instructor of psychology at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine.

I was an instructor in psychology at Princeton University.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what years?

Mr. BLANKFORT. At Princeton it was from 1930 to 1932, where I took graduate work as well as teaching, and received my master's degree.

My educational record includes teaching at New York University in the adult education, in playwriting; a session at the University of Heidelberg in Germany, as a student of the language.

Mr. TAVENNER. What years were you teaching in New York?

Mr. BLANKFORT. 1934, I believe, or 1935. It may even have been later than that; I am not certain now. I wasn't a member of the regular faculty of New York University. This was teaching adults playwriting.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been actively engaged in the writing profession?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Since the early 1930's.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what some of the more outstanding productions have been?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I am both a novelist and a screen writer. I have particular pride in my novels, since they are the sole product of whatever ability I have, and they are not collaboration efforts as moving pictures sometimes are.

My first novel was called *I Met a Man*. It was published in 1936, I believe, or 1937.

I published a novel in 1938 called *The Brave and the Blind*; one in 1942 called *A Time To Live*; another in 1946 called *The Widow Makers*.

I published a biography of Brig. Gen. Evans Carlson in 1946.

They are my books, generally speaking. I may have left out one or two that I wrote under a pseudonym which I was not particularly proud of.

But to clear that up, they are just mystery stories, and I wrote them to earn a living.

My screen productions have been—I believe the first one was *Blind Alley*, which was about a psychologist, which is why I got the job. That was 1939.

Perhaps the best known of my screen work is *Broken Arrow*, produced by Fox; *Halls of Montezuma*, a picture, obviously, about the United States Marine Corps in 1950.

Those are the best known.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the Marine Corps. Did you at any time serve with the Marine Corps?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, though I was married and had two children, and was above draft age—and also had a contract at Columbia Pictures as a writer—I volunteered. I received my commission in the summer of 1942 as a first lieutenant, and I served for a little over 2½ years, and was honorably discharged as a captain.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blankfort, during the course of the hearings conducted here in Washington on January 15, 1952, Mr. Louis Francis Budenz was a witness.

In the course of his testimony, the following questions were asked him, and answers given by him to those questions, which I will read to you:

Mr. JACKSON. I have several questions, Mr. Chairman. If I may depart from this particular phase of the inquiry, I have some corollary questions which deal with another aspect of the committee hearings, and not knowing when we will have the pleasure of having Mr. Budenz here, I would like to ask him at this time:

During the course of the hearings in the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security dealing with the Institute of Pacific Relations, I believe you were a witness.

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to direct your attention to page 582 of the published hearings, or the testimony on those hearings when the matter of Evans F. Carlson's book *The Big Yankee* was under discussion. There was one quotation given from that book, and you were asked as to whether or not in your opinion, this quotation represented Communist propaganda, and your answer to that, as quoted in the record, was "Yes, I also would recognize the author of General Carlson's biography as a Communist, Michael Blankfort. He is well known to myself as a Communist. He had many consultations with me as such."

And then Mr. Jackson continues:

Mr. JACKSON. Inasmuch as his name has occurred a number of times during the course of the committee hearings in the Hollywood matter, I should like to ask several questions on that particular individual.

When did you first meet Mr. Michael Blankfort

Mr. BUDENZ. In 1935, at the Daily Worker.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you recall the occasion of the meeting, or what brought it about, or in what connection you met him?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes; he was then writing for the Daily Worker, that is. I wouldn't say he was a regular member of the staff although in a way he was. He wrote reviews and other articles for the Daily Worker.

Mr. JACKSON. Over how long a period of time did your association with Mr. Michael Blankfort continue?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, it continued—I cannot tell you the exact year at the moment, but until he went out to Hollywood. In the first place, when he came to me and had a 3-hour conference with me in regard to how to penetrate the ranks of the Catholics of the west coast, he told me he had received instructions from the Politburo to endeavor to look into that while he was on the west coast. He was driving through, by the way, and came to see me before he left.

Mr. JACKSON. You say effort to penetrate the Catholics? Do you mean on behalf of and for the Communist Party?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know Mr. Michael Blankfort? And I say Mr. Michael Blankfort because there is also a Henry Blankfort who testified or refused to testify before the committee during the course of the Hollywood hearings. Did you know Mr. Michael Blankfort to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, sir; he came to me as such.

Mr. JACKSON. These consultations that you had with Mr. Blankfort took place in the offices of the Daily Worker?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you ever see Mr. Michael Blankfort in the Communist Party meeting or Communist Party function where those present would have to be presumed to be Communists?

Mr. BUDENZ. Oh, yes; I have seen him, not in a branch meeting, or anything of that sort, but I have seen him in the Daily Worker.

Mr. JACKSON. Was Mr. Michael Blankfort an open member of the party, or was he a concealed member?

Mr. BUDENZ. I should say he was a concealed member, although he did not conceal it very much while he was around the party.

Mr. JACKSON. He did not conceal it to you?

Mr. BUDENZ. No; he did not.

Mr. JACKSON. What was Mr. Blankfort's profession, do you know?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, he was a writer. He wrote for the Daily Worker at that time, and was going to Hollywood also to get in some writing.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you last see Mr. Blankfort?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is the last time I saw him, when he went out to Hollywood.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know where he was going in Hollywood, or what employment he was going to undertake in Hollywood?

Mr. BUDENZ. He discussed it with me at that time, but I do not recall for the moment.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it in connection with the moving-picture industry?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, sir; in my remembrance it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mr. Louis Budenz in 1935?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir

May I comment generally on the point?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BLANKFORT. First, may I say that through my attorney, Mr. Martin Gang, I was able to read the testimony given by Mr. Budenz, and I have worked hard and searched my memory for any recollection of the testimony which he has presented before this committee.

I have made a few notes, and if you will permit me, Mr. Tavenner, may I refer to them in reply to the general testimony of Mr. Louis Budenz?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no objection.

Mr. BLANKFORT. In essence, Mr. Budenz says that he had never seen me at any Communist Party meeting, or anything of that sort, or any Communist Party function where those present would have to be presumed to be Communists. But that he knew that I was a Communist, as he says, because I came to him as such.

He states further that I had a discussion with him, and told him that the Politburo had instructed me to penetrate the ranks of the Catholics on the west coast.

This alleged discussion with Mr. Budenz said that I had with him took place between 15 and 17 years ago, although he couldn't remember the exact year.

Right now and here, and first of all, I want to categorically deny that any such discussion ever took place between me and Mr. Budenz.

Mr. TAVENNER. What discussion are you referring to specifically?

Mr. BLANKFORT. To the one about the penetration of the Catholics on the west coast, that I had told him that the Politburo had instructed me to penetrate the Catholics on the west coast.

Mr. TAVENNER. There may be a slight distinction between your statement as to the Politburo telling you to penetrate it and Mr. Budenz' statement. But Mr. Budenz' statement was that you came to him and had a 3-hour conference with him in regard to how to penetrate the ranks of the Catholic Church, and that you told him that you had received instructions from the Politburo to endeavor to look into that while he was on the west coast.

Now, that may be a different thing from directing you to penetrate. Are you making a distinction of that kind?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I am not. I am saying categorically that I never had any discussion with Mr. Budenz about any of the matters which he has described.

I am going into detail as to what discussion I may have had with Mr. Budenz, not at that time.

Now, since Mr. Budenz, in his testimony, stated that he met me for the first time in 1935, as I said, I have tried to remember when I did meet Mr. Budenz. I associate him with a group of people around a man named V. F. Calverton.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name.

Mr. BLANKFORT. C-a-l-v-e-r-t-o-n. Mr. Calverton was a member of the magazine called the Modern Quarterly, when I first met him in about 1933 or 1934.

It later became the Modern Monthly. I had just left Princeton University where, as I have already explained, I taught and was studying.

I didn't take any doctorate of philosophy, which I was supposed to do, because I then determined that I was not going to become a teacher, but a writer, and I wanted to get to writing.

Mr. Calverton was my first real major writer, the first man I met who was a major writer, and I was a disciple of his. It was he who introduced me to his—he made me a kind of junior office boy editor of the magazine, which meant that I had to correct the typed script and make sure that contributors sent their contributions in on time, and so on.

It is here, through Mr. Calverton, where I met such men, and this was part of his group, as John Chamberlin, you might remember, who was soon after, I think, literary editor of the New York Times; Henry Hazlitt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name.

Mr. BLANKFORT. H-a-z-l-i-t-t. He was, I think, writing for the New York Sun then.

Thomas Wolf, the great novelist.

There was a Professor Dewey, a Professor Hook, Max Eastman, and others of that kind. There, to the best of my recollection, was the first time I met Mr. Budenz, because he was a contributor to the magazine, came to the house, which was open house.

Of all the people of that group that I can recall now, he is the only one who became a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was not a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; he wasn't, because the distinguishing characteristic of this group was that it was anti-Communist, it was attacked frequently as a group and as individuals as anti-Communists during that period and, to the best of my recollection, I never saw Mr. Budenz after the time he left this group and became a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER. Before you proceed, you say this group was under attack. By whom?

Mr. BLANKFORT. By the New Masses and the Daily Worker. It was well known as an anti-Communist group. I don't mean to say that it was an organized group. This was a literary circle.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of Dewey. Was that John Dewey?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Hook?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that Sidney Hook?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Now, I want to add, if I might, because it is relevant and pertinent to this testimony, and I don't want to overexaggerate or overestimate, this committee has heard from countless witnesses in Hollywood, from the days in which I arrived in Hollywood, which was 1937, with positions of authority in the Communist Party. I knew some of them as a writer in my trade. I knew some of the people who have testified before this committee.

Not one of them has said that I was a member of the Communist Party.

Now I think, if you will forgive this, I am a fairly competent person. If it had been my job to go to Hollywood to penetrate or even look into the problem of how to make Communists out of the Catholics, I couldn't have been so cleverly concealed, which is the implication of the testimony, that I could have gone into the Catholic circles, tried to convert them to communism, tried to take their God away, which is a very serious matter with me, and yet no one knows it.

The fact is that there was nothing to know. The fact is that though I have been open in all my opinions, I speak about them, I have always maintained throughout my mature life an independent position, and I am sure we will go into that later.

There is one further thing, and I must take this opportunity to say it, why I particularly resent that I should be charged with antireligious activity, because I consider to make Communists out of the Catholics an antireligious activity.

Mr. MOULDER. At this point, may I interrupt, Mr. Chairman?

It has always been the procedure before that the first question asked was, "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party"?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I have not, and I am not.

I think you should know this: I was brought up in an orthodox Jewish family. Anyone who knows me can confirm that throughout all my years I have always been a deeply religious person. It is incredible to me that I should be charged with antireligious opinion or activity.

And there is this additional fact here I am telling you, that the first thing I did, when I settled in Los Angeles, was to join and become active in the B'nai B'rith, which some of you may know as a Jewish fraternal organization. I helped edit the newsletter which was fighting totalitarianism and hate groups at the time. Why would I do anything like that if I had the slightest interest in penetrating the ranks of the Catholics and making them Communists?

Mr. Budenz states that the conversation he had with me was right before I left for Hollywood. That was in the fall of 1937.

The last time, to the best of my recollection—I am pretty certain of this—that I ever wrote for the Daily Worker was around the end of 1935.

I would like to tell you about my writing for the Daily Worker. I wrote play reviews. I was a young man. I was interested in the theater. I am not ashamed to say that there was a certain amount of opportunism involved in this, because to be a play reviewer meant that I could get free tickets to all the plays.

Well, it turned out that I didn't get tickets to all the plays, because not all the managers and producers would give tickets to the Daily Worker. It wasn't that I was a daily reviewer. There was no deadline. I got my tickets chiefly by mail. I sent my copy in chiefly by mail.

There may have been a few occasions when I went there in person.

As I try to look back over the 17 years, I have a picture in my head of the offices of the Daily Worker, and that picture represents an opening in a partition where the telephone operator sat and met people coming up.

That is the picture that I have in my mind, and that is where I went, if I ever went there, to pick up the tickets in person and got them.

After 1935 I stopped writing for the Daily Worker, and I had no occasion ever to go up to the offices of the Daily Worker, nor did I go, as far as I can recall.

Now, there is one resemblance to fact, and I want to bring it to your attention, in Mr. Budenz' testimony, and that is that I did drive out west.

The only way I can explain the fact that Mr. Budenz knew that I drove out west is that I was, at that time, not well off. I looked for companions and I looked for paying companions. It was wide-

spread. I asked everybody I knew whether they knew anybody who wanted to share the expenses for the drive out. This was general knowledge, and it is the best explanation I can offer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you call upon Mr. Budenz at or about the time that you left for Hollywood?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir. No, sir, to the best of my recollection, and I know that whatever I am giving you is that, I did not. I did not see Mr. Budenz before I left for Hollywood. I had no reason to see him. I had no reason to go into the offices of the Daily Worker.

Finally, and I will conclude these notes, beyond the placing of my word, because this is, as you gentlemen well know, an important moment for me, I am placing my word against that of another man. I would like to call your attention to the fact that during the very same years during which Mr. Budenz calls me a Communist Party member, I was dropped as a writer by both the New Masses and the Daily Worker. I was dropped as a writer because, specifically, I refused to fit my play reviews into the political theory of the moment.

The Communist influence in the John Reed, at that time—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment there, please. What was the time when you state you were dropped by the New Masses?

Mr. BLANKFORT. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you dropped as a writer by the New Masses?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I would say probably in 1934.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when were you dropped as a writer of the Daily Worker?

Mr. BLANKFORT. 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you explain why the Daily Worker would accept you as a writer if the New Masses had dropped you as a writer, when both of those papers are well known organs of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, I think I can. The times were different. The New Masses, which, to anybody now, looking back on it, was clearly a Communist magazine, at that time there were many, many people who wrote for the New Masses and the Daily Worker who were not Communists, or even Communist sympathizers.

Now it has always been—I have always expressed an independent view, and I expressed it to the New Masses, when I was dropped because of a play review. The Daily Worker, I am sure, anxious to increase its circulation, perhaps I impressed people with my ability as a play reviewer, hoped that by my reviewing plays for the Daily Worker I might increase the interest in the Daily Worker. That is the only explanation I can give of that. It wasn't, Mr. Tavenner, if I may, an official hiring. I got no money for it. I never was hired.

Perhaps it was Mike Gold, whom I knew, who said, "How would you like to write reviews for the Daily Worker?" And I grabbed at it. That is how it came to pass.

Now whether the New Masses people told the Daily Worker people that I had "geed" at slanting a play review, I don't know. They may or may not have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what was this review which you said you "geed" at?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Interestingly enough, both plays were written by the same playwright. His name is Odets.

Mr. TAVENNER. Clifford Odets?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Clifford Odets. The first play was *Awake and Sing*, I believe. It was produced, I think, in January 1935. The reason I can give you that date very specifically is because I called the *New York Times* and asked them.

I did not like the play. By that I mean that I liked it, but I wasn't enthusiastic. I felt that there were many weaknesses in the play.

Apparently—now, this is assumption on my part—the Communist Party did like the play. Now I had no personal knowledge, I want to assure you at this point, that Mr. Odets was a Communist or he wasn't a Communist. But they liked *Awake and Sing*, and I didn't.

So after presenting my review I found, in both cases, that the review was being held up, it wasn't being published, and I may have called a man named Joe North who, I think, was editor of the *New Masses* at the time, or it may have been Joe Freeman, I don't recall, and said, "What about this?" And they said, "Well, we are going to publish it sometime, but are you sure that you are right about the play?"

I said, "Yes." He said, as far as I can recall now, "We think it is a fine play." I said, "Well, I don't think it is such a fine play."

The next thing I knew there were no more tickets for me, and someone else began writing play reviews, one of the editors. The same thing happened in the *Daily Worker*. The play was also by Mr. Odets. It was called *Paradise Lost*. This time I loved the play, and this time, for some reason, the play was not loved by the Communist Party.

The same thing happened. "Well, we will get another reviewer. We will try someone else out."

In this case, I can't tell you who it was specifically because it happened after the performance, the opening night performance, because I was shocked by this. Of course, there was no deadline; I didn't have to go out and write the review, and maybe 6 of us went for coffee, and I heard this thing, "Do you like it or don't you?" And I said, "I loved it."

They said, "Oh, you are wrong. It can't be so good." As a result, I didn't get any more tickets. I guess I went into too much detail on that.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, you have not. I think it is necessary for us to know these matters in our effort to ascertain the facts.

Was this first play which you mentioned, and which you were reviewing for the *New Masses*, of political implications?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Specific political implications, no; general political implications, yes. What I mean by that is that it didn't say anything about the Communist Party in the play. There was no specific reference to revolution or Marxism or communism or Russia, or anything of that kind.

It was an analysis of the middle-class attitudes. Both plays were analyses of the middle-class attitudes.

Now, for the life of me, I can't tell the difference between Mr. Odets' attitude toward his material in the first play or the second play. The material was pretty much the same. It was the crafts-

manship and the way he did it that concerned me. I had been primarily concerned with craft and not so much with what you use it for.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you know Joe North at that time to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. To my personal knowledge, no. I assumed that he was.

May I finish, I have one more remark to make?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. Just a moment, before you proceed. What was the reason you can assign as to why you were dropped as a reviewer by the *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That I didn't fit into the current party line at the moment on the plays. Now, that is the reason I assumed.

I want to finish only by adding to the fact that I had, during these various years that Mr. Budenz says I was a member of the Communist Party, this experience with the *Daily Worker* and *New Masses*.

Another experience which is way out of the past is that there was a club in New York called the John Reed Club which consisted of artists and writers.

You must understand that as a young man coming to New York, and who wanted to be a writer, he went where writers were. That is part of the job.

I applied for membership in the John Reed Club, and the Communist influence in the John Reed Club was so powerful that I was not accepted; my application was rejected, on the basis of the material which I have told you about.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I can't place it in date. I don't know, I would say it was anywhere from the time I arrived in New York, which was 1932 to 1935 or 1936. I wish I could, sir. But I do remember that I had applied and was turned down.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that before your experience with the *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*, when you were dropped by those papers, or after?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I can't honestly say what the sequence was. I can't say that.

I want further to add that during this very period I maintained a close and constant friendship with people who were well known in vocal anti-Communist groups, something no party member would be permitted to do.

I would like to add here that one of the reasons—if I could have accepted every political tenet of the Communist Party, one of the reasons which would have prevented me from becoming a Communist Party member was that it transcended personal relationship.

If you were a Communist you just were not friends with people who were anti-Communist. I maintained relationships throughout this whole period of time with well-known anti-Communists.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question at this point. Mr. Blankfort, upon what do you base your statement that Communists were not permitted to associate with anti-Communists when there is ample testimony in the record before this committee that Communists were directed to maintain entirely cordial relations both in church, in

lodges, in political registration with non-Communists for the purpose of influencing?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Mr. Jackson, I am sure that you are correct. I was referring to anti-Communists, not non-Communists. That is, the whole Calverton group were anti-Communists. These were people, as I hope will come out later, who compared me in review of my novel, who compared me with Eugene Lyons and said I am with Eugene Lyons and Max Eastman and all these people. These were not non-Communists. I knew Max Eastman, I never met Eugene Lyons, but you could not persuade Max Eastman about communism.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not ask that in the spirit of contention. I accept your distinction between anti- and non-Communists.

Mr. BLANKFORT. My first novel, by the way, which was published in 1937 and which was written long before 1937, before I left for Hollywood, was given a very cold treatment in the Communist Party press.

My second novel was criticized for treating Fascists as human beings even though wrong—that was the theme of my second novel—that Fascists were human beings, even though what they stood for was wrong.

My third novel was savagely denounced as anti-Communist in the New Masses and the Daily Worker.

In 1939 or 1940 I wrote a commemorative article in a magazine about V. F. Calverton, whose name was a curse word among Communists and the Communist circle.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me have the dates of the criticism of the Communist press of your productions?

Mr. BLANKFORT. 1937, 1939, 1942. I wrote this article in 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was all after you had left New York and had gone to Hollywood?

Mr. BLANKFORT. But, if I may say so, relevant to the statement that I had told Mr. Budenz that I was being sent to Hollywood to do obviously Communist Party machinations.

Mr. Berkeley, who is present, reminded me this morning that he had been instructed to recruit me into the Communist Party, and he tried for 2 years. This would have been—I think he referred to my first appearance in 1937 or 1938, when I first met Mr. Berkeley.

Now, if I had been this person that Mr. Budenz describes, the record, my record, subsequent to that I think is relevant.

During those years, Mr. Budenz saw and talked to thousands of people, Communists and non-Communists and anti-Communists, and I think we would all agree that events and incidents over a 20-year period tend to become confused and jumbled in one's mind. No human memory is so infallible. Mr. Budenz is clearly in error.

I repeat, I had no such conversation with him, to the best of my recollection, I never saw him after he became a Communist Party member, and, as I answered your question before, I am not nor have I been a member of the Communist Party.

I am finished commenting on Mr. Budenz.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have indicated that your subsequent action was inconsistent with your having been a member of the Communist Party prior to your leaving New York for Hollywood, and certainly inconsistent with your alleged statement to Mr. Budenz of your pur-

pose and intent to look into certain phases of the Communist Party activity in California.

I want to question you a little more fully regarding your activity in California. But before doing so, perhaps I should ask you additional questions about your activities before going to California.

You were interviewed, I believe, by a member of the committee staff in April of 1951, were you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You denied at that time having ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were asked if you had at any time come under the influence of the Communist Party and replied, as I am informed, "Yes, I think that while critical of much of it or part of it, in the early 1930's I was influenced by what I felt was not so much the Communist Party as the Communist view of Marxism."

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain further what you meant by that?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Please stop me if you think I am going on too long.

Marxism, as I understand, and I have read a lot. I don't think that I have ever been thoroughly conversant with Marxism, but I have tried—in the early thirties I tried to understand what Marxism was. I never did finish *Das Capital*, the book Marx wrote, but I read a lot of popularizations. Marxism had, for example, the Socialist Party which considered themselves Marxists. The Communists or the Stalinist group of Communists considered themselves Marxists. The Trotskyite group considered themselves Marxists.

In those days there was the Lovestone group and there, probably if I recall, perhaps six or seven groups, and each one considered itself the pure followers of Karl Marx.

Now when I speak of the Communist angle or Communist view of Marxism, I am talking specifically about the Stalinist view.

During those years what brought me first to interest was I looked for opportunities to fulfill what I considered to be the imperative for me, and that is to partake in the alleviation of human distress. Put it in its context it was the 1930's, there was a depression, this was shocking.

Now of all these groups, only the Communist Party group seemed to be active. They were the ones who, at least to my knowledge, the ones who were big, important, and did things like fight for unemployment insurance, for example.

Now, unemployment insurance was a very serious thing in those days. I don't think there had ever been unemployment insurance in this country that I knew of. I am not giving the Communist Party credit for getting unemployment insurance; I want that to be clear. But they were active. They did call for unemployment insurance. So that when I say that I came under the influence of the Communist view of Marxism, I meant that I joined organizations which subsequently I have now become convinced were Communist, pure Communist-front organizations, to put it that way.

I would be honest to say that if you, Mr. Tavenner, had told me in 1935 or 1934, around that time, that the Committee to Get Un-

employment Insurance for the Unemployed was a Communist-front I would have joined it anyway. I believed, at that time, that the Communist movement represented a progressive force in the American life. Wherever I disagreed—as I said, there were many things that I disagreed with them with—wherever they moved in this type of activity, I supported them.

Mr. WALTER. Did you not recognize the fact that those Communist-front organizations were nothing but band-wagon riders. They certainly did not take the lead in bringing about social reforms. When they saw that a social reform was about to become effective, then they adopted that as their policy because it was the popular thing.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Sir, I did not see it, and I was not sophisticated enough at the time.

Mr. WALTER. I want to say to you that those of us who have brought about social legislation have frequently been embarrassed by the support that we have received from those groups.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I can well understand that.

Mr. WALTER. So that they actually were a hindrance rather than any help in bringing about any social reforms.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I believe that, yes, sir. But in the early 1930's I didn't know as much about it. Right up beyond the 1930's, wherever there were activities, possibilities for action, I partook.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you partake in the sense of joining any groups which were studying Communist Party ideology?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this connection, you say you did become active and take part in a number of activities, which you now recognize, probably, as Communist fronts or organizations and publications sponsored by the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker was known to you at the time you worked there as an organ for the Communist Party, was it not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the same was true when you were employed and worked for the New Masses. Is that not correct?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, no, sir. In the first place, I wasn't employed, but when I wrote reviews for the New Masses I didn't believe that it was a Communist Party Magazine.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to show you a photostatic copy of a clipping taken from the Daily Worker of April 27, 1934. This article does not appear to be a review, but it appears to be an article on the problems connected with producing a play called The Stevedore.

According to the Daily Worker, the article was written by Michael Blankfort, director of The Stevedore. Do you recall the article?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I didn't recall it until I saw it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recognize it as a contribution which you made to the Daily Worker?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I am certainly sure it is, and I would like to point out that it is about a play that I had been the director of, a play. As a director of a play, I had written articles about this play, the only play I did direct, for any periodical that would have asked me. It was part of the publicity program for a play. Directors do that; actors and playwrights do that regularly. It is part of the procedure.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to point out to you several expressions used

by you in the course of this article. In the first line of the last paragraph, there appears the words, "a familiar canard of the white chauvinism." Do you see that expression?

Mr. BLANKFORT. The last line?

Mr. TAVENNER. The first line of the last paragraph.

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; wait a minute.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the last paragraph of the first column.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; I have read it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you tell the committee what meaning you intended to convey by the use of those words?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir. I must preface it by saying this took place in 1934, and to ask me what I had in mind then is difficult.

But I think I can say that up to Stevedore, up to the time in the theater in New York, it was difficult for Negro actors to get work, and the point that I was trying to make here is that people—I said, "A familiar canard of the white chauvinism is that Negro casts are unreliable," and which was a stereotyped reaction that producers and directors gave about Negro actors.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was not the language the stereotyped language of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, it may well be. It may well be. I want to remind you that I was reading Communist literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you reading it under the supervision of some leader of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir. I was reading it because I was interested. I was interested in everything that was going on around me.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the second column appears these words:

There are no stock Mammies or night club jazz babies or comic butlers, or any other of the false characters which colored actors or actresses are called on to play in the bourgeois theater.

Will you tell the committee what you meant by "bourgeois theater"?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I was a student at that time, and most of my reading was directed toward an analysis of the social content of the history of the theater, and there have been many histories of the theater written.

The whole French theater of the nineteenth century has been called, in many histories, not necessarily left wing, the theater of the bourgeoisie.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that not the stereotyped language of the Communist Party in referring to anything which was not Communist?

Mr. BLANKFORT. It may well have been at that time; yes, sir. I do not deny that the Communists had stereotypes. Believe me, I disliked them and I had an enormous distaste for them. I used them with a sheer part of my education. But the word "bourgeois" goes back long before the Communists took it as a stereotype.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. But at this particular time it was, and has since that time, used as a stereotype expression of the Communist Party to describe anything which is not of Communist art; is that not correct?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I believe—

Mr. VELDE. Do you still use that term, "bourgeoisie"?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't; no sir. I think it is too inclusive. I don't use the term. I try my best not to use any general terms of that char-

acter. My experience has been in America that to use that word to any class or any group in our country would be completely misleading. It has no sense.

Mr. VELDE. Do you recall when you stopped using it; or any of the other well-known Communist terms?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I don't recall. I was not conscious of ever saying that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, it is a term that has been used back in French history, but was it not adopted in the Communist Manifesto itself, and appears in the manifesto? Did you learn of it there?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I read the manifesto.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you find it there?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No. I read the word "bourgeois" long before I read the Communist Manifesto.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand, but you do know it was recognized as a Communist Party term in the manifesto—the Communist Manifesto?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, the Communist Manifesto preceded the Communist Party by a long number of years, and the writings of the American Socialists, Jack London, whom I remember reading, and Debs, used the word "bourgeois" very, very often. However, I think your point is about the use of the word as a Communist Party or a Communist stereotype.

On that, there is no disagreement. I am sure it was used as a Communist stereotype.

Mr. TAVENNER. But do you mean to tell the committee that at the time you were using language of that type, while working for the Communist Party organs, you were not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of the clipping from the Daily Worker of December 21, 1935. This article is entitled "Introducing the Staff." The name of Michael Blankfort appears as the theater editor. Does that refer to you?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That is me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that not indicate a connection with the publication of that paper of a more definite character than merely that of making reviews for the paper, when you would be paid for it only in theater tickets? I mean, does it not show that you had a definite position with the Daily Worker?

Mr. BLANKFORT. The fact is that I did no more for the Daily Worker than I described. I cannot be responsible for the way the Daily Worker advertised my appearance as a play reviewer in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you not the theater editor of the paper?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I never considered myself the theater editor. Now, I believe that on several issues my name did appear as the theater editor. But what does an editor do? He makes up a page, he is responsible for the theater section. As far as I know, I never was responsible for anything but my play reviews. I never attended a staff meeting. I assumed that that is what a regular member of the staff would do.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to this same article, the editors of the Daily Workers are C. A. Hathaway, Joseph North, James Allen, and

Edwin Seaver. Were you personally acquainted with each of those individuals?

Mr. BLANKFORT. The only two that I was personally acquainted with, I can remember, was Edwin Seaver and Joseph North.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already testified regarding Joseph North. Was Edwin Seaver known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a meeting held in Philadelphia in April 1936, and referred to as the National Conference of the New Theater League? Do you recall a meeting held in Philadelphia, in April 1936, referred to as the National Conference of the Theater League?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't recall it at all. I am pretty certain that I never attended it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I show you a photostatic copy of a clipping from the Daily Worker of April 23, 1936. It is an article by Ben Irwin regarding the conference. In the last column appear these words:

Greetings from John Howard Lawson, Michael Blankfort, and from a number of exiled German playwrights now in the Soviet Union received prolonged applause from the delegates.

Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Not at all, because I am pretty certain I wasn't there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you and John Howard Lawson send greetings to that meeting of the National Conference of the Theater League?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't know about Mr. Lawson. I may have sent greetings. I may have been asked to send a telegram of greetings. I have no recollection that I did. But I may have, as it says here I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall having collaborated with John Howard Lawson in regard to it?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I didn't collaborate. I have never collaborated with John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, they could have been entirely separate. This article does not necessarily mean that it was done jointly. Did you know John Howard Lawson at that time, in 1936?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Not well.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was before you had gone to California, to Hollywood?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how had you met John Howard Lawson before going to Hollywood?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I may have met him at the League of American Writers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was John Howard Lawson in New York along about that period, in 1936, or prior to that?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I think so; yes. I think I met him in two ways: One was in the League of American Writers, and the other was in the Theater Union, which produced his play.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party prior to your going to Hollywood?

MR. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Referring again to the greetings alleged to have been sent by you to the National Conference of the New Theater League, it would indicate that you were a member of the New Theater League: is that true?

MR. BLANKFORT. I wrote for a magazine called The New Theater magazine, which may have been the organ of the New Theater League. I wrote a series of three articles on the psychology of the audience—what makes an audience respond as it does to different kinds of material.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the New Theater League was, how it was created and what it advocated?

MR. BLANKFORT. I was never an active or leading member of the New Theater League, but my recollection was that it was an organization to which Little Theater groups, throughout the country, are joined. It was an organization of theaters. There was a theater in Los Angeles, which I am reminded of by this article. There were Little Theaters throughout the country doing plays like Bury the Dead, Waiting for Lefty, and others, that formed a national organization, and this was it.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney left the hearing room at this point.)

MR. TAVENNER. Did you at any time travel outside of the United States?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; many times.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you visited any countries of Europe?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; almost all of them.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you visit the Soviet Union?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. When was that?

MR. BLANKFORT. In 1929.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of your trip?

MR. BLANKFORT. I had been teaching at Bowdoin College. It was the first money I made and I wanted a trip to Europe. I found out that there was an American tour of anthropologists being sent into the remote part of the Caucasus. I remember the name of a University of Buffalo anthropologist—I think he was the head of it—a man named Leslie White.

As a psychologist, I was interested. So somehow, I can't remember who arranged it—my meeting with Leslie White—I then joined the party. I can remember two girls from Philadelphia, sisters, named Wasserman. I remember their names.

We went down to the Caucasus and spent most of our time, about 5 weeks, on horse, and went into a village of the Caucasus, in the inner Caucasus, where people spoke pure Greek.

The myth was that Jason was there for the Golden Fleece, and that is how these people spoke the Greek that they did. They had blood feuds. They lived in fortified farms with towers, and so on.

MR. TAVENNER. Let me ask you whether or not World Tourists, Inc., or Open Road—

MR. BLANKFORT. Open Road. A man named Rothschild, I think, was head of the Open Road at that time.

MR. TAVENNER. This was sponsored by Open Road?

MR. BLANKFORT. Not the tour. But I think our tickets were gotten through Open Road. There were a couple—I say a couple; I am not certain how many there were—of Russian anthropologists who joined this group and went into the Caucasus with us.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know whether you paid the regular cost of transportation or whether any assistance was given you, any financial assistance by Open Road or World Tourists, Inc.?

MR. BLANKFORT. I paid.

MR. TAVENNER. But the tickets and the arrangements for transportation were made available by Open Road?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of another article appearing in the Daily Worker, and of the date of June 6, 1936.

MR. JACKSON. It seems to me that the various exhibits which are being shown should be made a part of the record.

MR. TAVENNER. If you would like them a part.

MR. JACKSON. I request that they be received and marked as exhibits in the testimony.

MR. WALTER. Without objection, they will be marked and made a part of the record.

(The documents referred to, marked "Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3," are filed herewith.)

MR. TAVENNER. Do you have the article before you?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce it in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 4." This article is by Michael Gold and Michael Blankfort, and begins with these words:

We have been asked by the editor of the Daily Worker's feature page to comment on the matters that impelled us to write *Battle Hymn*, the drama about John Brown, the abolitionist, which is now playing at Daley's Experimental Theater of the WPA.

Do you see that?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Further along in the article you said:

There is a great and epic pathos in the fact that an abolitionist like John Brown, who was hounded by spies, cursed as a madman, beaten, and finally hung, just as our Tom Mooneys and Vanzettis are today, and for almost the same reasons, and by the same exploiters.

Will you explain to the committee what you meant by the use of those words?

MR. BLANKFORT. I can't explain to the committee because I didn't write this. I wrote a play called *Battle Hymn* with Michael Gold. Specifically, I didn't collaborate with him. He had written a play called *John Brown*, which was not right. It wasn't good enough. He brought it to me and I rewrote the play and it subsequently was produced by the Federal Theater here in San Francisco.

Michael Gold's name is on the play as coauthor. Michael Gold at this time, I suspect, was writing for the Daily Worker and wrote this article. As coauthor he credited me with coauthorship of the article. I can't explain that. I am as certain as anything that I did not write this article.

MR. TAVENNER. You were employed by the Daily Worker at that time; were you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean you were working for the Daily Worker at that time.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Not to my recollection did I work for the Daily Worker as late as June 6, 1936. I use the word "work." I don't feel like I worked for the Daily Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were making contributions during this period of time to the Daily Worker; were you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't recall any. There may have been. I have no files, Mr. Tavenner. I don't recall any.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you saw the article at the time that it appeared, or shortly thereafter; did you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I have no recollection of seeing this article before this. The likelihood was that in June I may have been away from New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Later in the article appears another statement that I want to call to your attention. It is this:

The proletarian writer who will help revivify this great tradition will find himself well rewarded.

Will you tell the committee what a proletarian writer is?

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, that phrase kind of tips it off to me that I didn't write it. I may have used the phrase "proletarian writer," but I sometimes tried to qualify it because at that time there was a great discussion as to what is a proletarian writer. Is he a man who works as a member of the proletariat—that is, the working class—or is he a man who writes about the working class?

If you ask me what I thought then about the phrase "proletarian writer," I couldn't be certain about it. It is not qualified here. The feeling then which I shared was that a writer should participate in the deep currents of his time. I don't believe that a man can be a good writer without loving people.

Now, I don't mean to say that people are limited to just a working-class people. I think we are all workers. But you had to go out and you had to love these people if you were going to be a good writer. You had to feel them. I came from a closed corporation. I was brought up in a family, and I didn't know much of the world. I certainly had never known a union man.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was another of those stereotyped expressions of the Communist Party used frequently by it in referring to writers?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Mr. Tavenner, may I comment on that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I think if you were to look through the periodicals of that time, the New York Times, and all the periodicals—right, left, and center—I think you would find that these phrases had widespread use, that many people who were not members of the Communist Party used these words.

This was the current of the time, the way Fair Deal now has become the current. One can use the word even in a sympathetic sense without indicating his connections. I mean, these were current words of the time.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you known Michael Gold?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Probably for 2 or 3 years. At the time the play was produced, which I believe was 1936, I didn't see him. I mean, I knew him but I didn't have contact with him. I didn't talk with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you collaborated in the work referred to—

Mr. BLANKFORT. We didn't collaborate in the sense of two people getting together and working. I got his script and rewrote it, and then either gave it to him or sent it to him, and I think he wrote me about it. He didn't like some of the things I had done with it, and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostat copy of an article that appeared in the Daily Worker on December 9, 1936. I ask that it be introduced in evidence and marked "Blankfort Exhibit 5."

Mr. WALTER. It will be marked and received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 5," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. It is an announcement of the twenty-fifth celebration of New Masses. At this celebration, it appears that they played Anniversary Cavalcade by Michael Blankfort. Would you tell the committee the circumstances under which you contributed to that occasion?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That is true. They dropped me as a contributor.

Mr. BLANKFORT. The Anniversary Cavalcade, as I have now recalled it to me, the New Masses was an outgrowth of a magazine called the Masses, which in turn was an outgrowth of the magazine called, I think, the Liberator, which, in turn, I believe, was an outgrowth of a magazine called or published by the Inter-Collegiate Socialist Society.

That is, it was kind of an inheritance. I believe Max Eastland was the editor of the old Masses, as was perhaps John Reed or Jack London, and so on. I would like to be able to recall with absolute accuracy who asked me, or how I came to write this. But obviously, someone asked me whether I would write a history of the New Masses. That is why it was called Anniversary Cavalcade, and I wrote one.

I went to the library, I looked up the Liberator, I looked up the old Masses, and I got material from them and I wrote the Cavalcade.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was some years after you say they had dropped you because of your attitude toward your work on reviewing plays?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That is true. They dropped me as a contributor.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then came to you again to perform this particular work?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you another photostatic copy of a page from the March 9, 1936, issue of New Masses, which I desire to offer in evidence and have marked as "Blankfort Exhibit No. 6."

Mr. WALTER. It will be marked and will be received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 6," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. It contains a review by Michael Blankfort of An Actor Prepares, by Constantine Stanislavsky. Do you recall that occasion?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes. I still have the book.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a contribution made by you to New Masses?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well now, there is confusion here. I said that I had stopped contributing as a regular contributor to the New Masses and Daily Worker at a certain time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say you had been dropped by them.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes; that is true. They stopped asking me to contribute play reviews. I don't know how long it was before they stopped sending me books. In this case, I may have begged for the book. In this case, I may have run into Joe Freeman or Joe North and said, "Will you send me a book to review?"

There are no two ways about this. Book reviews, to review books—for which, by the way, I was paid nothing—means that you got the book. That means that you owned it. This book cost \$2.50; it was a book I wanted. I begged to review for the New York Times. I begged to review for the Nation and New Republic. I wanted those books.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but the fact that you were continuing to make reviews for the New Masses, regardless of what purpose you had in mind, is inconsistent with your prior statement that they dropped you because of your attitude unless you have some explanation of it.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, they knew that I would not write play reviews to fit their design. Now, if I had said in this review that I thought that Stanislovsky was a something, that they didn't like, then they wouldn't have published this review.

I wrote a review about a theater piece. It is about acting. It is a nonpolitical piece about acting. I had no objection—I want this to be clear, I don't want to mislead you—I had no objection to contributing as a writer on nonpolitical material to the New Masses. I would say, when I would not have written for the New Masses—

Mr. TAVENNER. I know, but the point is that you have reiterated here several times that the New Masses dropped you because you would not conform your views to their wishes and their desires. Now, if that were true, it is hard to reconcile it with the appearance of other reviews several years later.

Mr. MOULDER. As I understand it, you mean to construe that they dropped you as a regular contributor to the paper?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the only explanation you have of that, that you were dropped as a regular contributor?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a pamphlet published by the National Committee Against Censorship of the Theater Arts. According to this pamphlet you were a member of that committee. Will you tell us when that committee was created, the purpose of its creation, and who solicited your support, if you were a member?

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

Mr. BLANKFORT. I can't even remember the committee. This was 1935. I was opposed to censorship, and I can't—as I look over the names, I am impressed by the number of people that I knew and didn't know, and people like Brooks Atkinson, of the New York Times,

and Bennet Cerf, and Clifton Fadiman. I don't know anything about this committee.

MR. TAVENNER. You notice there also the name of Mary Virginia Farmer?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with her?

MR. BLANKFORT. I think—I know I was, but I am trying to remember under what circumstances. I think she was an actress whom I met who may have appeared in some plays.

MR. TAVENNER. And John Howard Lawson?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know whether either of those persons were members of the Communist Party?

MR. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I didn't. I think this list characterizes the spirit of the times. There were people whom we now know as Communists there, and there are people quite unlike the others, Charles Angoff and others. I don't want to go on reading all the names, but I think an examination of this list would show at that time people who were Communist Party members, as we now know, people who were generally sympathetic, people who were liberals, people who were interested only in the theater, and that is the point about this. This was the National Committee against Censorship of the Theater Arts. These were the people interested in the fight against censorship.

Now, if this was a Communist-front organization, it was very clever, because who in the theater is not interested in fighting against censorship? This was organized by the Communist Party?

MR. TAVENNER. Of course, every Communist front is made up of persons who are not members of the Communist Party as well as those who are. If there were only Communist Party members it would not be a front; it would be a Communist group.

MR. BLANKFORT. That is right. I understand that.

MR. WALTER. What attempt was being made at that time to impose any sort of censorship?

MR. BLANKFORT. I don't remember the detail of the theater at that time, sir. What I recall, as you ask the question, is something by O'Neill, by Eugene O'Neill; it may have been some play of his that was—I don't recall the details, in fact, back in the period 1935 in the theater.

MR. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of the letterhead of the American Society for Technical Aid for Spanish Democracy.

According to information in the files of this committee, some of this technical aid was the recruiting of Americans to fight in the Loyalist Army during the Spanish Civil War. The name of Michael Blankfort appears as a member of the board.

Will you tell the committee how this organization was formed, its purposes, and how your support of it was solicited?

MR. BLANKFORT. Mr. Tavenner, there are two things about this: One is that I never attended as a member of the board, I never attended as a member of the committee, I have no recollection of anybody asking for my name, or giving it. That is one thing. And the other thing that I want to say is that if I had been asked I would have given it, so there it is.

I have no hesitancy or shame or anything but a deep feeling about my views on the Spanish war. I was for the Loyalists. This is something I believe in. I believed in the Loyalists, and I wanted them to win. I was opposed to Franco and the Spanish Fascists.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken, and upon reconvening, Representatives Francis E. Walter and Donald L. Jackson were present.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blankfort, I show you a photostatic copy of the program of the banquet given Mother Bloor on the forty-fifth anniversary of—and I quote—

your [Mother Bloor's] never-ceasing fight in the ranks of the revolutionary movement for the liberation of the American toilers.

I offer this in evidence and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 7."

Mr. WALTER. Let it be marked and received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 7," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The name of Michael Blankfort not only appears as a sponsor, but personal greetings by Michael Blankfort appear in the form of "All power to Mother Bloor." At the time when you were interviewed by Mr. Wheeler in April of 1951 you stated that you were not a sponsor of that banquet. Does this photostatic copy of the program refresh your recollection?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, it doesn't, Mr. Tavenner. I don't remember ever being asked to be a sponsor. I don't remember ever sending a message of greetings. I don't remember whether I ever met Mrs. Bloor or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever permit anyone to use your name in sending greetings to Mother Bloor?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir. But it is not unlikely that someone may have said to me, "They are having a conference, or an anniversary or a birthday party for Mother Bloor," and I might have said "That is fine, all power to her." I don't go beyond that.

Mr. TAVENNER. The date on the program is January 24, 1936, so this was prior to your going to Hollywood.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir. As I have read, Mother Bloor is an old lady.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say an old Communist lady?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I certainly would, I certainly would.

Mr. TAVENNER. The First American Writers' Congress was held in 1935, and this congress founded the League of American Writers. According to the report of that congress, you were among those submitting articles. Do you recall that?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a printed record of the First Congress of American Writers published by the International Publishers in 1935.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Among the articles submitted to this conference was one entitled "Social Trends in the Modern Drama," by Michael

Blankfort and Nathaniel Buchwald, appearing in the report beginning at page 128.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you submit that article to this Congress of American Writers?

Mr. BLANKFORT. To be precise about it, I spoke it aloud. It was a regular congress, and I read the article; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the League of American Writers at the time?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the League of American Writers still in existence?

Mr. BLANKFORT. To the best of my knowledge, it is not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know when it ceased to function?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No; I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not recall that it became nonexistent shortly after the German invasion of Russia?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I am not personally—I don't remember that. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are aware of the fact, are you not, that the publishing company, International Publishers, which published this book, has been cited as a Communist Party publishing house headed by Alexander Trachtenberg?

Mr. BLANKFORT. When was that cited?

Mr. TAVENNER. The date is September 24, 1942, that it was cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir. This is published in 1935, these proceedings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware that it was cited as a Communist Party—

Mr. BLANKFORT. I am now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know at the time that the International Publishing House was a part of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I suspected strongly that it was a Communist Party publishing house. Although sometimes it published non-Communist stuff. That was a little confusing about it.

But I certainly believed that it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you also aware that the Attorney General classified the League of American Writers as a Communist Party organization?

Mr. BLANKFORT. When was that?

Mr. TAVENNER. The League of American Writers was cited by Attorney General Tom Clark on June 1, 1948, and again on September 21, 1948, as subversive and Communist; and by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942, and again on March 29, 1944.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I think I was aware of the Attorney General's designation in 1948—was that the date?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I cannot say that I was aware of its earlier citations.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a clipping from the People's World, of May 2, 1942. According to this article, you were a

master of ceremonies of the feature presented by the school for writers of the League of American Writers. Do you recall that occasion?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, I recall it now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the school for writers?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a circular concerning the American people's meeting held at Randall's Island, N. Y., on April 5, 1941. This was a meeting of the American Peace Mobilization.

According to the circular you were a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization. Is that correct?

Mr. BLANKFORT. According to the circular, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I desire to offer the circular in evidence and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 8."

Mr. WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 8," is filed herewith.)

Mr. BLANKFORT. May I comment on this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I am going to ask you further questions.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Pardon me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state that, according to the circular, you are listed as a sponsor. Were you a sponsor?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Mr. Tavenner, I do not recall ever sending permission or greetings or anything of that kind to the American Peace Mobilization.

I want to say in this connection—and I think you have found this to be true of me so far, that of many of the activities in my past I have no apologies. If at any time I have ever been connected with the American Peace Mobilization, it is the one thing of which I am deeply ashamed. That is all I want to say. I can expand, but that is all I want to say now. I did not sponsor it, to my real recollection on the thing.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman, at that point?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. You remember that this is one of a number of organizations with which your name has been associated, and which have later been proscribed either by this committee, or by the Attorney General's Office, as being Communist-front organizations, and dominated by Communists. You have entered a vehement denial in the case of the Peace Mobilization. Does that mean that you did not effect such rejection of the other organizations upon the finding by the United States Government that they are and were Communist-dominated organizations?

Mr. BLANKFORT. On the contrary, Mr. Jackson. I respect these. I would not belong to an organization that had been called subversive.

Mr. JACKSON. That is the point I wanted to make. You emphatically reject the America Peace Mobilization?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I do, because my principle has been whenever I have joined an organization, to examine the objectives, the stated objectives.

Mr. JACKSON. You should have examined the membership lists of some of them.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I certainly should have.

Mr. JACKSON. The membership lists would have told you a great deal more about the organizations than the avowed principles.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I agree with you. However, I subsequently have been shocked to find that there have been people connected with these organizations who have been listed as Communist Party members. It had never occurred to me, honestly, that a lot of these people who have been listed, were Communist Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are aware that the Attorney General has listed the American Peace Mobilization as a Communist organization, and that it has also been cited by this committee, are you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That was in 1948 it was cited?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not think I gave you the date of the American Peace Mobilization. December 4, 1947, was the date it was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark, and also by Attorney General Francis Biddle, on September 24, 1942, and it was cited by this committee first on June 25, 1942, and later on January 2, 1943, and March 29, 1944, as one of the most seditious organizations which ever operated in the United States, and an instrument of the Communist Party prior to Hitler's attack on Russia.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I certainly would not knowingly have remained in any organization that was cited as subversive.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write the book *The Big Yankee*?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this book based on the life of Evans F. Carlson?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with Evans F. Carlson?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir. May I comment on that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANKFORT. The first time I met the then Col. Evans F. Carlson was at Camp Pendleton, when I served in the Marine Corps.

This is a man whose reputation, as it came to me, was as a Marine Corps leader who had won the adoration of every marine who had ever heard of him. My friendship with General Carlson is one of the dearest things of my memory. I cannot tell you with what outrage I responded to the accusation and allegation that General Carlson was a member of the Communist Party, for many reasons. One, I knew him well; but more than that, his public record. His public record as a God-fearing man, who made no pretenses about it, whose eulogy after his death at Guadalcanal, in which his own words were used, stated "This experience reaffirms our belief in the Supreme Being."

This is a man who fought at Guadalcanal, at Tarawa, at Makin, was wounded twice, and at Saipan. I would like to point out that his father is a Congregationalist minister, who is still alive.

When I was at General Carlson's home, grace was said before meals. His total attitude toward life is that of a very deep feeling religious man.

I would like to add further that any reference to General Carlson in relation to the Chinese Communist armies—so it is on the record—was done, as far as I know, and as far as the records are, as a member of the Naval Intelligence. He sent his reports in, and that is what he was there for. And it is a terrible blow to the American morale.

If you are going to call—I don't mean you, Mr. Tavenner—but if one calls General Carlson a Communist, this is good for the Communists; it is not good for the country.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you are acquainted with the fact that the book which you wrote was distributed by the Liberty Book Club, a new book club organized in New York to distribute Communist books, are you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I was very happy that they did. It meant an additional royalty.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, aside from the question of royalties, what special purpose would the Communist Party have in circulating your book? Do you attach any special significance to that?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Has the Liberty Book Club been cited as a Communist Party organization? I don't know that.

Mr. WALTER. Who ever charged General Carlson with being a Communist?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Mr. Budenz, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Where was that, sir?

Mr. BLANKFORT. In his testimony before the Senate Internal Affairs Committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Internal Security Committee.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Internal Security Committee.

Mr. JACKSON. On hearings referring to the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. WALTER. Are you sure that Mr. Budenz described General Carlson as being a Communist, or did he say that the author of the biography was?

Mr. JACKSON. I retract that. He did not identify him. I don't think he did. I think the question was whether this excerpt from Mr. Blankfort's book would be interpreted as Communist propaganda.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the answer was "Yes" and then he said he identified the author of the book.

Mr. WALTER. That is it.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the testimony which I read, there was no identification of Carlson.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I have it here on page 581, the date is August 1951, part II, Mr. Budenz, in answer to a question said:

Yes, sir; General Carlson was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand from your statement that your study of the document and other material which you had available to you for use in writing the life of Carlson, that you saw nothing to indicate membership on his part in the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I certainly did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have been listed in an advertisement of the Civil Rights Congress as a sponsor of the Los Angeles chapter of the Civil Rights Congress. In this advertisement it is said that:

The Civil Rights Congress is defending Gerhart Eisler, world renowned anti-Fascist fighter.

Do you recall that?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, I recall that. I got out as quickly as I could.

As soon as—let me put it like this: I am for civil liberties. I don't believe that any civil-liberties organization should devote itself to the defense of the civil liberty of the Communists, and no one else. I did not know until Mr. Wheeler brought it to my attention, that the Civil Rights Congress had been formed out of the International Labor Defense and someone else, some other organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. The National Federation of Constitutional Liberties.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes. That is what was brought to my attention. I didn't know that.

I joined the Civil Rights Congress. I got out pretty quick, and I joined the American Civil Liberties Union. I got out because I felt some—by the way, I never attended a meeting, but I felt from what I gathered in the public press—I don't believe everything I read in the newspapers, but I believe the Civil Rights Congress was not in business to defend the civil rights of everybody or of anybody. The American Civil Liberties Union, of which I became a member afterward, will defend Communists and anti-Communists and Fascists. That is what I believe the civil rights should be.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce in evidence a photostatic copy of the Daily People's World of May 2, 1947, and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 9." That is the advertisement to which I have referred.

Mr. WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 9," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This advertisement of the Civil Rights Congress, which lists you as a sponsor, also says that Eisler, Gerhart Eisler, was framed by this committee, and it calls for the abolishment of this committee.

Upon what evidence do you base the statement that Eisler was framed by this committee, if you had any part in the sponsorship of the movement which the article says you were a sponsor of?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I want to confess to something: I gave my name to an awful lot of organizations. It took me a long time—and this is no credit to me, believe me, it is no credit to me—to realize that giving one's name to an organization of any kind means one of two things: Either you have got to get into that organization actively and go over a copy like this, or you don't give your name, or you don't belong. I didn't realize that.

I say this, and it is no credit to me, I repeat again I never saw that ad. I am not in a position to say or to have said that Mr. Eisler was ever framed by anybody.

Mr. WALTER. Why did these Communists have Communist-front organizations and feel that they could use your name without consulting you?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't believe that they did, often. In this connection, I am reasonably certain they asked me. I think several places, that there were several organizations where my name is used without my recollection.

Mr. WALTER. Why is it that your name is always used when it was used, in connection with Communist-front and Communist movements?

Mr. BLANKFORT. That is a good question, and I have tried to thrash this thing out with myself.

I think I was lazy, intellectually lazy.

Sir, since I was a writer, since I was not a journalist, in which my views would have appeared in daily comment on the things that were happening around me, my only expression was verbal.

Mr. WALTER. Because of these verbal expressions, these left-wing—

Mr. BLANKFORT. On the contrary—

Mr. WALTER. Left-wing organizations thought they could use your name?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No; on the contrary; quite on the contrary. My verbal expressions; that is, in trying to describe an independent attitude which I had—ever since I was a mature person my independence was not so much in terms of organizations, although I belonged to organizations and participated in anti-Communist groups; nevertheless, my total anti-Communist expression, or critical expression, was verbal.

Mr. WALTER. Then you feel that it was because of your anti-Communist expressions that the Communist organizations used your name?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I said about that that I was intellectually lazy. Someone would ask me would I join the Civil Rights Congress, and I just didn't go and say "Well, let me see who is connected with it? What does it stand for?"

Mr. WALTER. You want us to believe, then, that you were asked to join the Civil Rights Congress because of your anti-Communist expressions?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I am sorry. I didn't say that at all. I didn't mean to say that.

Mr. WALTER. I think that is what it adds up to.

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; I didn't mean that at all. I was talking of two different things. I am not sure but what General Carlson was a member of the Civil Rights Congress, and I am not certain but what I joined just on his say-so. You have the record of the national sponsorship there; I don't. But, if it were General Carlson, I guess I would have followed him without question at all.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you not also a member of the Committee for the First Amendment? Or were you not a sponsor of it?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Whether I was a sponsor or not, I would have been a sponsor, and I certainly would have been a member. I believe that the Committee for the First Amendment had a good point. This committee was the broadest, widest committee one could possibly get in Hollywood. I don't know—were there Communist Party members on that committee?

Mr. JACKSON. There were Communist Party members on almost every committee formed at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your first examination by the committee, in April of 1951, you stated that you supported the Committee for the First Amendment. I do not know whether you meant that you were a member of the committee and took part in its activities or not.

Mr. BLANKFORT. No; I had no—I don't believe I ever attended a meeting of the Committee for the First Amendment, but I supported it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who solicited your support?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I think it was an ad put out in the Hollywood Reporter, and asking people to join and contribute money. There was going to be a national broadcast, I believe, and I sent in \$25 or whatever it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me show you a photostatic copy of the original statement of the Committee for the First Amendment, and its original signers, and that may be the advertisement you were speaking of?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Did this appear in the Hollywood Reporter?

Maybe Phil Dunn asked me. I think I was at his studio at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the photostatic copy in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 10."

Mr. WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 10," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will examine it, please, I think you will see that your name appears there as a sponsor.

(Mr. Blankfort consults document.)

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who asked you to become a sponsor?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, on this list, any one of these people could have asked me. Bob Ardrey could have asked me. It depended on what studio I was working at at the time. It may have been Ardrey. It may have been Dunn. It may have been a man named Gomberg. It may have been—I don't know. I don't know who asked me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, after looking at the exhibit, you are convinced that you did become a sponsor of it; are you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me read to you the opening statement:

We the undersigned, as American citizens who believe in constitutional democratic government, are disgusted and outraged by the continuing attempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to smear the motion-picture industry.

Do you believe that the efforts of this committee to expose the Communist infiltration into the moving-picture industry constituted a smear of that industry?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Was it this committee that this refers to, this present committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, that is dated, as you will see, 1947.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Then it wasn't this committee. I mean it had the same name, but it wasn't the committee which is presently constituted.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is the same regardless of the membership of it. A corporation doesn't go out of existence because the board of directors are changed.

Mr. BLANKFORT. This is the only committee I know. I don't have to tell you, Mr. Tavenner, what the opinion of Hollywood was about the earlier 1947 committee. I don't want to go into details as to the activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking you to make any comparisons that may be in your mind, but I do want to know whether you think it was smeared.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Whether I think Hollywood was smeared?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, in light of the evidence as you now know it.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, "smear" is a word which is a color word. Certainly it has not helped Hollywood. I don't mean that the committee has had anything to do with it, but the fact that it has come out that people in the moving-picture industry have been Communist Party members certainly is not helpful.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that is not a smear of it.

Mr. BLANKFORT. No; it is not a smear of it. It is a fact. These are the facts, and it is unfortunate for Hollywood.

Mr. WALTER. Do you not think that this committee would have been derelict in its duty if it did not expose the machinations of these Communists?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I think it would have been. I think this is the function of your committee, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you permit the use of your name as a sponsor of a committee which was organized to try to destroy the work of this committee?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, again, you force me to make the perhaps invidious comparison there are committees and there are committees. There is a way of handling interrogation, and a different way. I don't feel for myself—and I am glad to take this opportunity—that I have been under any pressure. I don't feel that I have been a victim of any kind of unfair questioning. I am not certain that that would have been true of the earlier committee. I am not an authority on that. But nevertheless that was our impression.

It was our impression, and Hollywood, as perhaps one man, was under the same impression of that earlier committee. And that is why, if we look at the list, it contains the names of the foremost people in Hollywood.

Now, we could all perhaps have been wrong about it, but that was our feeling at the time.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. In the light of what has developed in the interim, do you still feel that the Committee for the First Amendment was performing a worth-while function, or do you feel that in light of what has developed it was being largely used by Communists, some of whom came here for the express purpose of smearing the committee?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Mr. Jackson, as I said before, I was not an active member of this committee, but I did speak to some of the active members of this committee much later. And I found out, to my amazement, which I had not known before, that the active members of the committee had tried to persuade those 10 men from pleading as they did. They tried to get them to cooperate with the committee. I hadn't known this.

As I say, I didn't know this, and I think that is answer to your question. I don't think that the Committee for the First Amendment knew the total picture. I think that today if you went over that list

perhaps 95 percent of them would say that they had been misled in their efforts. I personally believe that the men who came up before the committee in 1947 were wrong.

I didn't believe that at the time, but I believe they were wrong in taking the attitude they did.

MR. WALTER. Do you not think that perhaps they were misled by those people who were afraid of an investigation, whose own guilty consciences dictated to them that they should take steps in order to prevent a disclosure of their activities?

MR. BLANKFORT. That is certainly possible.

MR. JACKSON. The activities of the previous committee, after all, was the opening gun in an investigation which was to disclose the presence of a highly organized, well-integrated group of Communists in Hollywood. I think that that is historically on the record today to the satisfaction of everyone, even those who at the time said "There is no organized Communist movement in Hollywood. There may be a few individuals running around who are doing no damage; but, as far as organized communism is concerned, there isn't any."

The activities of this committee through the years has proven quite the contrary: that there was a very effective organization. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Walter, when he says that much of the furor created by the Committee for the First Amendment was furor created in self-defense by others who had not been subpoenaed before the committee, but who had every reason to believe that as the time went by they would be subpoenaed. Many have subsequently been.

MR. TAVENNER. The committee has information that you also joined in an amicus curiae brief to the Supreme Court on behalf of Dalton Trumbo and John Howard Lawson. Is that true?

MR. BLANKFORT. Yes; it is true.

MR. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which your assistance in that matter was obtained?

MR. BLANKFORT. As I remember it, I got a letter asking for my support. It was signed, I believe, by a professor at the University of California, or Stanford. His name was Max Radin.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name, please?

MR. BLANKFORT. R-a-d-i-n. All I knew of Max Radin was that he was—in references in books and so on—a very distinguished constitutional lawyer, or a constitutional authority. I don't think he practiced law. This was a constitutional point. It was raised in the minds of people that the question of the proceedings was a constitutional and moot point, and that is why I signed it.

MR. WALTER. Do you suppose that the eminent professor wrote that letter because he knew of your anti-Communist utterances?

MR. BLANKFORT. Sir, he didn't know me, and I am sorry that I—

MR. WALTER. Why do you suppose he wrote to you asking for your support?

MR. BLANKFORT. Sir, I was under the impression that he wrote to everybody. I think he wrote to everyone.

MR. WALTER. By "everybody" you mean whom?

MR. BLANKFORT. I mean that he probably got a list of the subscribers to the Nation and the New Republic. He probably got a list of the members of the Screen Actors' Guild or Screen Directors'

Guild. I am not charging that he did. When you ask me everybody, I—

Mr. WALTER. That is what you said. That is the reason I asked you.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes. I would say that everybody in Hollywood, including those who wouldn't have signed the amicus curiae brief under any circumstances, received it. I know, I believe, that at the time I was interrogated by Mr. Wheeler that my own attorney had received a letter. I think Professor Radin got the lists, the public lists of everybody and sent it out.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you have informed the committee prior to this that as a member of the American Veterans' Committee you supported a resolution to deprive members of the Communist Party from membership in the American Veterans' Committee.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; that is true. I was an active member of the Beverly Hills Chapter of the American Veterans' Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. BLANKFORT. From its inception to its dissolution, the dates, probably from 1946 to 1948. A resolution had been submitted to instruct our delegates to the national conference as to whether they would support an anti-Communist resolution in the national organization.

I not only spoke in favor of it, in support of an anti-Communist resolution, but I think that I swung it. I spoke at great length.

The reason, you might be interested to know, why I supported an anti-Communist resolution was brought out earlier by Mr. Walter, I believe, that I believed in the objectives of the American Veterans' Committee, and therefore wanted to drive out the Communists because they would only confuse the issue. They would make it difficult for the American Veterans' Committee to fulfill its objectives, which I thought were good.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, at the same time you were a member of the Screen Writers' Guild; were you not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. But in the Screen Writers' Guild you did not take the same position with regard to Communists; did you?

Mr. BLANKFORT. The issue never came up. I will tell you what I did do in the Screen Writers' Guild. I have never been an active member of the Screen Writers' Guild. That is, I served on the board, I think, 10 or 11 years ago for 6 months. I never made a speech, as far as I can recall, on the floor of the guild.

But I was nominated recently, 2 years ago. My nomination speech, which did not win me the—I had to make it myself, not nominate myself, but I had to say what I stood for—which did not win me the election, was that when I am on that guild the board, if I am on the guild board, I would vote for those things that I considered to best represent the guild as a whole.

Now, practically everyone else right and left had a partisan view of what they would do. The issue about driving the Communists out of the Screen Writers' Guild was not sharply brought before the guild. If you ask me whether I would support such a resolution—which you haven't, but I will tell you—I would not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why would you not support such a resolution in the Screen Writers' Guild when you did support a similar resolution in the Veterans' Committee?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Because one has to do with the question of whether a man can earn a living, and the other doesn't. We have a 100-percent guild shop now; so, if you are not in the Screen Writers' Guild, you don't work.

Mr. TAVENNER. I see. Were you affiliated with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, at any time?

Let me show you a photostatic copy of a letter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I believe your name appears there as one of the signers.

Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. BLANKFORT. You mean to say if I have ever seen this letter before?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I mean whether examination of that letter refreshes your recollection to the point where you can state definitely whether you were affiliated with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I think I was, but I have no recollection of this letter.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the letter in evidence and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 11."

Mr. WALTER. Mark it and it will be received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 11," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You will notice that there appears, if you examine the article again, please, that it is directed to the Members of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it uses this language:

The Eighty-first Congress can and must abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Will you examine the document again and state what the date is?

Mr. BLANKFORT. There is no date on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee who solicited your signature to that letter?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No one. I never saw this letter before now.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not recall permitting the use of your name?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a signer?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Not to my recollection. This was sent from New York. What was the date?

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1948, December 1948.

Mr. BLANKFORT. To the best of my recollection, I never saw this letter before now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Aside from the fact that you may never have seen it, did you authorize the use of your name?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Not to my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a signatory to the letter?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir; not to my recollection; no, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Did you advocate the abolition of this committee at that time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see it again, now.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Sir? I beg your pardon?

Mr. WALTER. Did you advocate the abolition of this committee at that time?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I advocated a change in procedure. That was my chief criticism.

Mr. WALTER. Was that because you were fearful that the committee would continue its investigation of Hollywood?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No; I don't think I was fearful that the committee would continue its investigation. I was fearful that the investigation would not be fair, let us say, or reasonable.

Mr. TAVENNER. Attached to the letter which I handed you is an article, a photostatic copy of an article appearing in the Daily Worker of December 29, 1948, which says:

A group of distinguished writers, clergymen, actors, and other notables, called upon the Eighty-first Congress to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. The request was made in a statement released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Signers of the statement included—

and giving the list of names, a person by the name of Michael Blankfort.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Doesn't that come from the same list?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; the same list refers to the same incident.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But I want you to look at the article from the Daily Worker and state whether or not you saw that article.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I can answer that without looking at it. I never saw the article. I have never seen the Daily Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, as far as the use of your name in that particular article is concerned, or the article referred to, it was done without your permission?

Mr. BLANKFORT. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

Mr. WALTER. Have you ever seen the article before?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. What do you propose to do now that your name has been used without authority to find out why people had the temerity to use your name without permission?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't think these organizations are still in existence. If they were I would write them a letter and tell them, and express my view on this.

Mr. JACKSON. You can write the Hollywood Chapter of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. It is still in existence.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. They are still in existence.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I have. I cannot tell you the date, but I perhaps could find out when I did and resigned from my membership. Has that committee ever been classed subversive?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, it has been. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 26, 1950. The Hollywood chapter is an affiliate of that national organization.

Mr. BLANKFORT. You understand, Mr. Tavenner, I did not say I had not been a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't want that to—I think you understand better than I do that when you are a member of an organization, I never

understood that they would have to have special permission to use your name for any function of that organization. I don't want it——

Mr. TAVENNER. I am very much surprised to hear you state that, because I don't see how anyone could be assumed to have agreed to the use of his name in any project in which an organization may be interested without permission. I have never heard that advanced before.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I didn't think I was advancing original theory.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think a great many of the names of people were used without permission, but this is the first time I have ever heard it suggested that the mere joining of the organization was tantamount to a consent to use the individual's name in matters of this kind without specific permission.

I show you a photostatic copy of a program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York City in March 1949. Your name appears as one of the sponsors.

I desire to offer the copy in evidence and ask that it be marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 12."

Mr. WALTER. It may be marked and received.

(The document referred to, marked "Blankfort Exhibit No. 12," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee who received your sponsorship of that group, if you actually sponsored it?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes. I have a recollection about this. This took place in March 1949, I believe, that was your date, March 1949. I was in Israel. I wasn't present. The only specific recollection I have is that I received a letter asking for my permission, and I did not give it. As I remember the letter a card was enclosed, I am not certain, "Will you sponsor or give permission"—or whatever the thing is for—"this conference."

I know I got the letter before I left, or on my way to Europe, and I did not give permission for my name to be used.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Blankfort, you stated in the early part of your testimony in effect that the pattern of your conduct had been such as to show that you could not have been or were not a member of the Communist Party at the time that Mr. Budenz testified you were, and that you could not have or did not go to Hollywood for the purpose of looking into Communist activities out there.

You have testified here about your membership in many Communist-front organizations in Hollywood.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Sir, I was the front in the Communist organization, that is clear, that is very clear. Parallel with these activities, as I pointed out and as you pointed out, were other activities. I was a member of organizations which had taken decided stands against Communists: The American-Jewish Congress, the B'nai B'rith, the American Veterans' Committee.

My whole life has been one of independent radicalism. I suppose radicalism is the word for it. I am not a party joiner. It is apparent that I am an organization joiner. That is apparent. One of the things——

Mr. TAVENNER. It is pretty hard to differentiate between the two at times, is it not?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't believe, I really don't believe it is, because when one joins an organization the general purposes seem to catch you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any occasion other than the time that you said Mr. Martin Berkeley solicited, or I believe you said the two times that Mr. Martin Berkeley solicited your membership in the party, that other persons solicited you to join the party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Well, as I said before, in the early thirties—what I said before to Mr. Walter has a point here—and I was not clear before—that one of the reasons why I didn't get the solicitation that one would assume I would have was because verbally in social groups I had for so long taken an anti-Communist Party position that if there were Communist Party people there they knew where I stood.

That is the point. You probably don't—were you listening to me?

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not hear all of what you said. I was conferring with the investigator.

Mr. BLANKFORT. What I referred to in talking to Congressman Walter was that I had in circles, at social gatherings, I had always been critical and outspoken about my anti-Communist position. I had always been critical of the Communist Party. That is why people didn't come and ask me to join the Communist Party, because it was obvious where I stood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. But your activities were so closely attached to the Communist Party that it is difficult to understand how you could have been so vocal in opposing the Communist Party, and yet so close to the Communist Party in your conduct of your activities.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Mr. Tavenner, these organizations were not brought to my attention as Communist organizations and under the circumstances, one joins them. Now, one learns, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then in the final analysis you are saying that you are not now and never have been—

Mr. BLANKFORT. Never have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. A member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Exactly.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Blankfort, can you assign any possible reason for the testimony given by Mr. Budenz before this committee on January 15?

Mr. BLANKFORT. You mean do I have a theory as to why he testified this way?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Why would Mr. Budenz, in your opinion, say that? Could it have grown, perhaps, out of a personal disagreement? Have you ever had a personal disagreement with Mr. Budenz?

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

Mr. BLANKFORT. No. If the sense of your question is that this could have been a personal matter, no.

Mr. JACKSON. Because the situation with which the committee is confronted is that of a positive identification on the one hand and a positive denial on the other up to this moment.

Did you know Michael Gold to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I sure assumed that he was. I may add at this point that Michael Gold told me never to join the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. That is recruitment in reverse.

Have you ever made any public statement, or have you ever repudiated the use of your name by any of these several organizations with which you were alleged to have been associated, or to have sponsored?

Mr. BLANKFORT. You mean, did I ever call the press and—

Mr. JACKSON. Well, the press or any group, or did you, for instance, ever tell the Beverly Hills AVC that your name was used by such-and-such an organization, and that you were not a member of the organization?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I may have told personal friends.

Mr. JACKSON. But you have never made a public pronouncement to that effect?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, I cannot say that I ever did make a public announcement, if by public you meant in the public press.

Mr. JACKSON. That would be one method, yes, probably the most logical method to us.

Mr. BLANKFORT. You are talking about specific organizations.

Mr. JACKSON. The organizations which have been mentioned here today.

Did you know Gerhart Eisler?

Mr. BLANKFORT. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you feel, Mr. Blankfort, that in light of the identification made before the committee by Mr. Budenz, and in the light of the many suspect groups with which you have been associated, that the committee was doing the proper thing in asking you to appear before it to explain the situation?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I certainly do, I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. JACKSON. You used the word "smeared" in connection with the previous committees that antedated this one. Do you know anyone who has been smeared by this committee either now or in times past?

Mr. BLANKFORT. This present committee; no, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I am speaking of the committee generally. I would like to know who has been unjustly accused. If that accusation still stands, I am sure the committee would want to give him an opportunity to affirm or deny the allegations that resulted in the smear.

Mr. BLANKFORT. As I understand it, this committee has checked the names before it has called them, called the people before the committee. To call the man before the committee who has no real business being before the committee, that might be considered a smear.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, but who? I want to know the names.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't know. You are asking me the names?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I am asking you for the name of anyone who has been unjustly accused before this committee.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't think anybody has as far as I know of this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. By this committee I am also talking of its predecessors. I should like to know whether the House Committee on Un-American Activities actions has smeared anyone. I think it is a very important matter.

Mr. WALTER. It is extremely important, because we have spent a great deal of time in executive session endeavoring to put up the safe-

guards that will protect anybody from any unjust intimation, even, and that is why Mr. Jackson's question is so very important to those of us in the committee who have tried so hard for so long to protect people that are entitled to protection.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I believe you have. I don't believe this committee has smeared anybody, and Mr. Jackson asks me about preceding committees, and I am caught on the word "smear," because I cannot bring to mind the name of anybody who was brought before even the preceding committees who, in the long run—perhaps not at first—but in the long run there was justification for it.

The word "smear" is a color word again. And I guess what it has meant is that men have lost their jobs just on the announcement of the subpoena.

Mr. VELDE. I think the gentleman from California used the words "unjustly accused," too. What would you say about that?

Mr. BLANKFORT. I don't think anybody who was brought before the committee has been unjustly accused. You have had—

Mr. WALTER. We have not accused anybody of anything. When these witnesses have been subpoenaed it is because we have every reason to believe they possess information that will aid us in letting the American people see to what extent this Communist conspiracy has gone in our society.

Mr. BLANKFORT. Yes, sir; I realize that. I don't say that—

Mr. WALTER. We do not accuse anybody of anything.

Mr. BLANKFORT. I agree with you. I haven't said that you have.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, my question naturally sprung from the fact that your name was associated with a petition, or with a letter which accused the committee of having smeared individuals. And I have asked a great many witnesses, and of course the unfriendly ones snarl, and the friendly ones say, "No, I don't know of anyone that was smeared," but the word is still used.

The Daily Worker, and all of the Communist press and some people who should know better still fling the charge that the committee is smearing. To the best of my knowledge, I don't know of anyone being smeared, and I am still trying to find the name of one so he may avail himself of the opportunity to come forward and say in what manner he has been smeared.

If any name occurs to you after you leave here I wish you would let us know.

When did you disassociate yourself from the ASP, Arts, Sciences and Professions?

Mr. BLANKFORT. Probably 1948 or 1949, I don't know. It must have been 1948.

Mr. JACKSON. Was that the Hollywood council?

Mr. BLANKFORT. As far as I know. I never attended a meeting of the Hollywood group. And I think what happened was that I got a request for renewal of membership and said I wouldn't renew it.

Mr. WALTER. Do you have anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. One question, please, sir.

You stated that Michael Gold advised you not to become a member of the Communist Party. What were the circumstances of his giving you that advice?

Mr. BLANKFORD. The first time I met Michael Gold was probably when I got the manuscript of that play; and he just complained about the fact that he was a writer, and any writer who is a member of the Communist Party was just insane. That is a recollection of many, many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know Michael Gold was a member; wasn't he?

Mr. BLANKFORD. He certainly was, from all appearances; and this goes into the psychology of people. He probably felt lack of personal freedom, of one kind or another, and he just spoke against the party membership of anybody who wanted to be a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Is there any reason why the witness cannot be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. WALTER. Very well. We appreciate your cooperation, and it is only because of the willingness of people like you to come here and give us a full statement of the facts as you know them that we are able to point up to the American people the danger of this conspiracy. We are deeply appreciative of your efforts to assist us.

The witness is excused from further attendance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bassman.

Mr. WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please?

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

Mr. BASSMAN. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Be seated, please.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE BASSMAN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name?

Mr. BASSMAN. George Bassman.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BASSMAN. New York City, February 7, 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a statement of your general educational background?

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, I was brought up in Boston, and I went to Memorial High School there. I stayed in Boston until 1932 or 1933, and then I went to New York where I lived until 1936, and from there I left for Hollywood where I worked until 1948, and then returned to New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. BASSMAN. I am a musician, composer, and arranger.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bassman, in the course of the hearings in Hollywood in September you were identified as a member of the Communist Party by Mr. Martin Berkeley. I understand that very soon thereafter you indicated a desire to appear before the committee and be heard in regard to the matter.

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, sir, you are at liberty to make any explanation to the committee you desire to make.

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, I believe in 1938 I was invited to a few meetings, which I attended, which I discovered were of Communist nature. I probably attended six or seven meetings, in all, over a period of 3 or 4 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment, please. You said these meetings were, you discovered, of a Communist nature?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean that they were meetings of the Communist Party?

Mr. BASSMAN. I didn't know it at the time I went, but I subsequently found out that they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you find that out?

Mr. BASSMAN. Oh, after I went to maybe three of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you continued to attend the meetings?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. I interrupted you. You may proceed.

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, I went for a short time longer. I found that I had no interest in anything that went on there and just ceased going.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many Communist Party meetings did you attend?

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, there couldn't have been over a half dozen, perhaps seven.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were the meetings held?

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, there were a couple of them that were held at my home, there were a few that were held at the home of Mr. Berkeley, and I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a Communist Party meeting at the home of Mr. Ornitz, Sam Ornitz?

Mr. BASSMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On Martell Street in Hollywood?

Mr. BASSMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say possibly several meetings were held in your home?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes; probably two or three.

Mr. TAVENNER. Probably two or three?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you invite those who attended to come?

Mr. BASSMAN. I never invited anybody.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how did it happen that these meetings were held in your home?

Mr. BASSMAN. They were invited by my ex-wife, who had invited me.

MR. TAVENNER. You mean you only came to your home when you had Communist Party meetings?

MR. BASSMAN. No, no, no. I was invited originally by my ex-wife, who had gone to some meetings before I ever went. Because she felt, and when we talked it over we both felt that we both should be interested in the same things. I went with her to one of these meetings, and then I went to the second, and then the third might have been at my home, and that is how I attended a meeting in my own home.

MR. TAVENNER. Actually, at the end of a meeting, say, in your home, was it not agreed by all present as to where the meeting should be held the next week, or in the next 2 weeks?

MR. BASSMAN. Undoubtedly, but I really don't recall.

MR. TAVENNER. Don't you think you were present and took part in meetings at which it was determined that the next meeting would be at your home?

MR. BASSMAN. Yes, sir; but I don't recall—there is so little that I recall about these meetings now, because it is so many years later, I don't really remember now. I remember going, but I don't remember much of what happened. I remember a few things, but not much.

MR. TAVENNER. In other words, your position is that you were not active in the work of the Communist Party?

MR. BASSMAN. Not at all.

MR. TAVENNER. But you were a member of the Communist Party, do you mean that?

MR. BASSMAN. So I have been told. I never joined to my recollection, but I cannot say that I wasn't a member, because I might have been. I don't recall ever paying dues. I know that I never took money out of my pocket and gave it to anyone, according to my best recollection; but I have been told that I was in the party for a short period of time, and I cannot deny it.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you take any action to stop the Communist Party from meeting in your home?

MR. BASSMAN. When I stopped going to the meetings, I asked my wife if she would mind never having a meeting there, and we never did again.

MR. TAVENNER. What was your reason for not attending other meetings?

MR. BASSMAN. Well, I didn't understand too much of what went on. I have never been a political person. I am a musician. The kind of work that I do in my music sometimes will keep me working for 3 weeks straight with maybe 2 or 3 hours sleep a night.

I tried to study a Marx pamphlet and couldn't make heads or tails out of it; and this was why I stopped going.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, did high functionaries of the Communist Party appear at your meetings and endeavor to instruct you on the subject of Marxism and communism?

MR. BASSMAN. No, sir; I recall in 1937 attending a class where I was supposed to be studying a Marx pamphlet, and I went to two or three of those classes and stopped going to those, because I didn't understand them.

MR. TAVENNER. Who were conducting those classes?

MR. BASSMAN. As I recall, there was a man by the name of Jacobson, but I don't know his first name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Eli Jacobson?

Mr. BASSMAN. I think that is his name; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any others?

Mr. BASSMAN. I beg your pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other instructors?

Mr. BASSMAN. Not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, is it your statement that you left the Communist Party because you could not understand the Marx theory? Is that your reason for leaving?

Mr. BASSMAN. I hate to appear stupid, because I don't really feel that I am. But on political matters, I just really had no interest. I was interested in music, in playing tennis, in, well, in things that were not political.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was it that you happened to get into the Communist Party if you had no interest in matters of that kind?

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, occasionally, one follows someone that is close into some sort of a project that interests them, and that is what happened to me here.

I recall someone very close to me in—may I deviate for a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BASSMAN. I recall someone very close to me interested in psychoanalysis once who was in it for 2½ years, and they insisted that I would have to be analyzed, because they were interested in it. Well, it was the same sort of thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a very interesting thing.

Mr. WALTER. I think that is true of most of the people that are members of these Communist fronts. They should have been psychoanalyzed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't understand the sense in which you were to be psychoanalyzed in going into the party. I can understand that about coming out of the party.

Mr. BASSMAN. No; my analogy was simply this, Mr. Tavenner: I had a very unhappy marriage.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't wish to go into personal things.

Mr. BASSMAN. I am not going to be personal. I am trying to explain my analogy of entering the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about entering the party. I am not interested, particularly, in your analysis. We want to know of the exact facts about it.

Mr. BASSMAN. The fact is simply this: I went to these meetings because my wife asked me to accompany her. She went before I did and explained some of the functions to me, which were of no interest to me, but because we lived together as a family she thought that I should be involved with her in a project in which she had great interest.

Well, I went. After going to a few meetings I decided it was not for me, and I just ceased going.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any further statement you want to make to the committee about your leaving the party?

Mr. BASSMAN. Only to say that I never really felt that I left anything, because I never really felt that I belonged, but I stopped going because I had no interest and have never bothered with it since.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the others who were members of this group with you?

Mr. BASSMAN. I didn't remember until I was shown Mr. Berkeley's testimony, and there were a couple of names on there that I recall. There were a couple on there that I don't recall or remember ever seeing at a meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Give us the names of those whom you recall were members.

Mr. BASSMAN. Well, there was a girl by the name of Babb, that I recall seeing at a meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that her first name or last name?

Mr. BASSMAN. No; that is her last name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell it?

Mr. BASSMAN. B-a-b-b.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is her first name?

Mr. BASSMAN. Sonora.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you be more definite as to the first name?

Mr. BASSMAN. As far as I remember I thought it was Sonora.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could it have been Sonja?

Mr. BASSMAN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is Sonora according to your recollection?

Mr. BASSMAN. That is right. If you have the testimony I could tell you better. I really don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am advised that that is the correct name. And who were the others?

Mr. BASSMAN. Then I recall someone there who was in publicity by the name of Shapiro.

Mr. TAVENNER. Shapiro?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the first name?

Mr. BASSMAN. I don't know him well, I don't really remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Male or female?

Mr. BASSMAN. A man.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it Victor Shapiro?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say his name was Victor Shapiro?

Mr. BASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you known Victor Shapiro?

Mr. BASSMAN. I had met him there and just saw him at those few meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his activity in the meetings?

Mr. BASSMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I don't remember anyone's activities at those meetings. I just remember that I went and usually held a book in my hand and listened, and couldn't wait to get out of there, and that is the truth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there others?

Mr. BASSMAN. There were a couple of other names in the testimony, but I don't remember them being at the meetings.

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

Mr. WALTER. Does the committee have any questions?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Are you here in response to a subpoena?

Mr. BASSMAN. No, sir; I came here because I felt that it was important for my work, which is in New York City, to have it on the record that whereas I may have at one time been a member of the Communist Party, I haven't been for over 12 years, that I am no longer interested in it, and I wanted to take advantage of the fact that I knew that this committee would give me this kind of a hearing. So to prospective employers in New York City, if the question were to come up, since I had been named, as to was I or am I or am I not a member, I could truthfully state that I am not.

Mr. JACKSON. You state under oath now that you have broken all connections, physical and philosophical, with the Communist Party?

Mr. BASSMAN. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you. The witness is excused.

The committee will recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 5:15 p. m., the committee was recessed to be reconvened subject to the call of the Chair.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 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 10:45 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; John W. Carrington, clerk; Jackson Jones, investigator; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. Let the committee be in order.

Let the record show that for the purposes of this hearing the chairman has set up a subcommittee composed of three members, Mr. Walter, Mr. Jackson, and myself, who are all present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance?

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

You do solemnly swear that the evidence you give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. POMERANCE. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name, please, sir?

TESTIMONY OF M. WILLIAM POMERANCE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DAVID REIN

Mr. POMERANCE. M. William Pomerance, P-o-m-e-r-a-n-c-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. M. William Pomerance?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TANNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. REIN. David Rein, 711 Fourteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, when and where were you born?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was born in New York City on August 2, 1905.

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

Mr. POMERANCE. I went to the public schools and a private school in New York City up till the age of 17, when I went to work.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't have a profession. I am a businessman, a salesman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now live?

Mr. POMERANCE. New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly for the committee, please, what your record of employment has been, say, from 1935 until the present time?

Mr. POMERANCE. Well, actually, I did various jobs; and my first really continuous or permanent job that lasted for any time was with the NLRB. I went to work for the NLRB, I believe in December—I am not positive of the month—1937. I think it was 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you remain an employee of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think it was until August of 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what was your employment beginning with August 1941?

Mr. POMERANCE. I resigned from the Board in New York and went to work as the business agent for the Screen Cartoonists, Local 852, A. F. of L.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you assume your duties there?

Mr. POMERANCE. Immediately after I resigned from the Board.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that would have been approximately what date?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall the exact date, but it would have been in August, I think, or September, of 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was your employer?

Mr. POMERANCE. The Screen Cartoonists, Local 852, A. F. of L., Painters International.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain employed by the Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am not sure of the month, but I think it was either November or December of 1944. I can't be sure of the month.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, after that, how were you employed?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was the executive secretary of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you remain employed by the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think it was December of 1946, either November or December. Again I am not positive of the year, but it was the end of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. And after that, how were you employed?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was unemployed for about 6 months. Then I came to New York and was employed in a business that was exploiting or attempting to exploit an invention. This lasted only about—I can't recall exactly; I think it was less than a year. And then I went into another business, as salesman, and took care of sales for a company making television commercials.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your employment continue with that company?

Mr. POMERANCE. It has continued until the present except that in the past year I have been off payroll at least once for a long period because of my health.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, you stated that beginning in December 1937 and continuing until August 1941, you were employed by the National Labor Relations Board. Where were you employed, and in what capacity?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was a field examiner, and I first was employed with the Board in the Atlanta, Ga., office for about 3 months, after which I was transferred to Los Angeles, where I worked as a field examiner until, I think, either the end of 1938—December of 1938. I transferred to L. A., I think, in March of 1938, and I left the end of 1939, when I was transferred to New York, to the New York office.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your duties as a field examiner, when you took over your position in Georgia?

Mr. POMERANCE. We were enforcing the National Labor Relations Act, and that involved investigating charges of unfair labor practices and running elections.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you function, and what part were you to play in running elections?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall the exact machinery any more of the Board, but when a case was filed concerning a question of representation, if the Board either ordered it it was voluntarily agreed to, we would set up the necessary machinery for holding an election, to decide who the bargaining agents were to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't your duties as a field examiner include the taking of a vote or the receiving of petitions to hold an election?

Mr. POMERANCE. Well, after a case was filed, we would examine the situation to see if there was sufficient reason to hold the election, and also to get the parties together concerning the bargaining unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, specifically, wasn't it part of your duties to examine the cards, or the applications, of the members of a union in the preliminary step that was taken, to determine whether or not an election would be held?

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct, as I recall; against the payroll, to see if there was a sufficient reason to hold such an election. I think that was the way it was worked.

Mr. TAVENNER. And wasn't it provided by the regulations that a certain percentage of a union must make application for the holding of an election? I believe it was 20 percent, wasn't it?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall the percentage.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before an election would be held?

Mr. POMERANCE. I remember that there had to be sufficient reason to hold it, but I don't recall the percentage.

Mr. TAVENNER. And wasn't it your duty to take that petition with the names on it and check it to ascertain whether their names were legitimately used for that purpose, that is, to compare the signatures against known signatures of the individuals, for instance?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think that that was done where there was a consent to recognize the union without an election, that the Board sometimes would, by agreement between the company and the union, examine the cards and the payroll to see whether or not the union represented a majority. You are going back into machinery that I haven't been connected with in a long time.

Mr. TAVENNER. The purpose of my questioning along that line, is to ascertain from you whether or not a person employed as a field examiner, if he chose to do it, could influence the results by improperly considering these cards or applications or petitions as being bona fide, when they were not.

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall the exact machinery, but I am positive that that was impossible. At no time did I know, or has anybody ever charged, that any such thing happened. I don't remember the machinery, but I am positive no such thing could happen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if in the holding of a particular election, it was the duty of the field examiner to determine whether the names on the petition were put there in a bona fide way and were the signatures of the individuals, the true signatures, wouldn't the improper investigation of a matter of that kind have influenced the enforcement of the National Labor Relations Board matters?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am trying to recall how it operated, and it seems to me that I know that on elections, when ballots were counted, there were always present not only the Board people but also members of the company and the union; and it seems to me that whenever cards were compared for purposes of certifying a union as the bargaining agent, there were present the company and the union.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that you were transferred to Los Angeles after having served about 3 months in Georgia.

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your assignment in California?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was a field examiner.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you performed the same duties, general duties, which you have already described?

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I believe it was the end of 1939, you testified, that you were transferred from Los Angeles to New York?

Mr. POMERANCE. Correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of work were you assigned to in New York?

Mr. POMERANCE. The same; field examiner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, where? Where was your office?

Mr. POMERANCE. New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason that you were assigned from Los Angeles to New York?

Mr. POMERANCE. Well, there was a difficulty in the office, a disagreement between the field examiners for the most part and the then director of the office, which resulted in my transfer as well as some other changes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain as an employee of the National Labor Relations Board after your return to New York?

Mr. POMERANCE. I guess about a year and 8 or 9 months, something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would bring you up to August 1941?

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you left the employment of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. I resigned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your resignation, had you been in contact with the Screen Cartoonists' Guild regarding employment in an official capacity for it?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was made aware of the job just prior to my resignation.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I am getting at is this: Did you leave your employment with the National Labor Relations Board in order to accept employment with the Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any other reason that contributed to your leaving your position with the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. None.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your position with the Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was the business agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who employed you?

Mr. POMERANCE. The guild, the union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I know, but the guild had to act through its officers in making its contact. Who handled the matter for the guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was elected by the membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who was it that first conferred with you regarding acceptance of employment with the National Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I can't recall. There were several people. I don't think I would be able to say. I can't recall. I know there were a number that suggested it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you remained employed by the Screen Cartoonists' Guild until December of 1944.

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you left that employment and went to the Screen Writers' Guild? Under which you went there as its executive secretary?

Mr. POMERANCE. I resigned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the circumstances under which you were employed as secretary by the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. As far as I remember, I was interviewed by a number of the executive board members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. POMERANCE. And the officers.

Emmet Lavery was president. And I don't recall all the officers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who were those who talked to you about coming with the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall all of them. I remember having lunch with Lavery and a couple of them, but I don't recall who was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well there are others who talked to you about the matter besides Mr. Lavery?

Mr. POMERANCE. There were of the board.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us their names?

Mr. POMERANCE. If I had a list of who was on the board, I might be able to recall some of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. We may return to that later. Were you ever employed by or connected in any way with the American Communications Association?

Mr. POMERANCE. Very briefly—I don't recall, but I think for about 2 months or so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately when was that?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you relate it to your employment in these other capacities?

Mr. POMERANCE. It was before any of these employments.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was prior to your employment by the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that employment began in December 1937?

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to read to you a part of a letter directed to Mr. Mervin Rathborne, president of the American Communications Association, which is set forth in the testimony of Mr. Frey when he appeared before this committee on August 13, 1938; that is, Mr. John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor.

This letter appears at page 134, volume 1, of this committee's report, in 1938.

I may preface the reading of the letter by stating that a Mr. Richard D. Hallett, H-a-l-l-e-t-t, wrote a letter of resignation addressed to Mr. Rathborne, the president of the American Communications Association. Were you acquainted with Mr. Richard D. Hallett?

Mr. POMERANCE. I can't recall the name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly this will refresh your recollection regarding the incident I want to interrogate you about.

Mr. MERVIN RATHBORNE,

*President, American Communications Association, CIO,
New York, N. Y.*

DEAR SIR: Kindly consider this my resignation not only as chairman but also as member of the American Communications Association, effective immediately. Since I have been most active in the interests of ACA since the very beginning of its organizing campaign in Washington, D. C., and since I was the second Western Union man in the entire country to join ACA, this action calls for some explanation.

When I signed my application for membership in ACA on April 23, 1937, I bargained for unionism and unionism only. I definitely did not bargain to aid or comfort or to support in any way financially or otherwise communism or any Communistic agencies.

However, during the 14 months of my chairmanship of local 35-B, ACA, I have not only received communications from numerous pseudopatriotic organizations asking for support but have been strongly urged by numerous representatives of the national office of the ACA to support these organizations. These aforementioned representatives of ACA included—

various persons whose names appear here, including William Pomerance.

Are you the William Pomerance referred to in the letter of resignation by Richard D. Hallett?

Mr. POMERANCE. I worked for ACA, and therefore I assume that I am the one he is referring to.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your duties as an employee of ACA?

Mr. POMERANCE. I went on a sort of survey for them through the South at a time when they were attempting to organize Postal Telegraph.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Hallett says that you, as a representative, called upon him to support certain pseudopatriotic organizations, which he claims and states was a part of his reason for resigning from the ACA.

Now, what was it that you were asking him to do?

Mr. POMERANCE. May I speak to my counsel?

Mr. WOOD. You have a perfect right, sir, to consult with your counsel any time you desire.

(Mr. Pomerance confers with Mr. Rein.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have conferred with counsel. Can you answer?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I can't recall the man at all, or his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, aside from that, will you tell us whether or not you were soliciting funds or support from officials of the ACA in behalf of any organizations while employed by the ACA?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that under my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what ground?

Mr. POMERANCE. The fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean to state that you decline to answer the question on the ground that if you did answer it, it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. POMERANCE. That's correct.

Mr. JACKSON. In a criminal action? Incriminate you in a criminal action?

Mr. POMERANCE. I assume that's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to return now to a question I asked you a little while ago, regarding the persons in the Screen Writers' Guild who talked with you about your employment by the guild as its executive secretary. You stated you were unable to recall the names of the members of the executive board.

Mr. POMERANCE. And officers.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a list of the members in 1946. Mr. Emmet Lavery was at that time president. The other officials of the executive board, or the other officers and executive members at that time, were: first vice president, Lester Cole. I suggest that as I read these names out, you write down any of those whom you talked to about your employment, and then when I have completed reading the list, tell me who they are.

Second vice president, Howard Estabrook; third vice president, Oliver H. P. Garrett; secretary, Maurice Rapf; treasurer, Harold Buchman.

Executive board: Harold Buchman, George Callahan, Richard Collins, Lester Cole, Gordon Kahn, Howard Koch, Emmet Lavery, Mary McCall, Jr., Frank Partos, Maurice Rapf, Marguerite Roberts.

Alternates: John Wexley, Allen Scott, F. Hugh Herbert, Henry Myers, David Hertz, Waldo Salt; and at this time, 1946, the executive secretary was William Pomerance.

Now, which of those, if any, conferred with you about your employment with the Screen Writers' Guild, as executive secretary?

MR. POMERANCE. I am sorry, I don't recall. By listing everybody, you have more confused me. I think their records would show that they set up a committee—they usually do—to interview persons. It would be much more accurate.

MR. TAVENNER. That may be. But you should also know who conferred with you.

MR. POMERANCE. I honestly don't remember. I honestly don't remember beyond the meeting with Lavery.

MR. TAVENNER. You do remember that you met with others, but Lavery is the only name that you recall?

MR. POMERANCE. That's the way I remember it.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, I show you a photostatic copy of page 3 of the People's World, the issue of July 14, 1944, and I will ask you to look at the center of the page at a double column entitled, "Communist ban." This article has to do with the Los Angeles Central Labor Council rejecting a recommendation of the executive board to bar Communists. You will note a marked portion, where it is said that Bill Pomerance, business agent of the Screen Cartoonists' Guild, and certain other persons, led the fight against banning Communists. Do you see that?

MR. POMERANCE. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that a correct statement, that you were one of the leaders in the fight against banning Communists?

MR. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same ground.

MR. TAVENNER. I will ask you to look further in the article at the paragraph which I point out to you and ask you if you see whether or not it is stated that Pomerance said that the issue is not Communists. "We are not interested in them, but unity in the council." Do you see that statement?

MR. POMERANCE. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, do you have any explanation that you can make of the reason for that statement?

MR. POMERANCE. Can I ask counsel, please?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

(Mr. Pomerance confers with his counsel.)

MR. POMERANCE. I don't recall the statement.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, you can easily see the sense of the statement by looking at it now. Regardless of whether you recall the statement, what reason could you have had for that statement?

MR. POMERANCE. I don't see how I can discuss a statement I didn't make. I don't remember making it.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Central Labor Council at that time, July 14, 1944?

MR. POMERANCE. I believe so.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at that time on that date, July 14, 1944?

MR. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

MR. TAVENNER. And could that have been the real reason why the statement is attributed to you that you were not interested in Communists, if made?

MR. POMERANCE. I decline, for the same reason.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time that you occupied the position of executive secretary of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were employed by the Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, a witness by the name of Martin Berkeley, appeared before the committee on Un-American Activities at its hearing conducted in Los Angeles of the 19th day of September 1951, and in the course of his testimony, he had this to say in response to a question.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This question was asked:

What fraction meetings did you attend? I know you will not be able to tell us that in detail, but give us a general description of those meetings and the purposes of them.

Mr. BERKELEY. Well, we had a fraction of the Screen Writers' Guild. The guild fraction, especially in its early days, and you gentlemen are quite familiar with the struggle we had in the early days of the guild, we had the advice of Mr. Charles Katz, an attorney at law in this town, in our legal problems in the guild. Mr. Katz was a member of the body. Lester Cole, Ian McLellan Hunter, to whom I referred before, who was married to Alice Goldberg, John Wexley, W-e-x-l-e-y, the playwright, Marguerite Roberts, who is a writer at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, and the Charles Page I spoke about before who is no longer with the State Department. Fred Rinaldo, a writer, and his collaborator, Bob Lees.

Question. Do you know whether that is the same Bob Lees who appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington?

Mr. BERKELEY. It is, sir.

And then, continuing:

Albert Maltz, the writer. Now we come to the third member of the party who was also an executive secretary of my guild, William Pomerance, who had been with the NLRB and who, on the recommendation of party members on the Board, was entrusted with the job of guiding our guild through its struggle.

Question: Do you know anything about the connection of William Pomerance with the National Labor Relations Board, or any function of that Board, prior to his coming to California?

Mr. BERKELEY. Yes, sir. He was a member of the Board, I believe, in the South. It may have been New Orleans; I'm not sure. I know he worked with the NLRB down South and he worked with them back East. He was under fire constantly for the stand he took. He was suspected of having sympathies too far to the left. Either about the time he was to lose his job with the NLRB, or having lost it, the comrades out here felt that he was an ideal man to move into our guild and they promptly proceeded to move Pomerance into our guild.

Question: Was he what is known as a field examiner with the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. BERKELEY. He was.

Question: Do you know whether at the time he was a member of the Communist Party here in California that he was serving in that capacity, that is, as a field agent of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. BERKELEY. Do you mean whether I know at the time he was working for the Government he was also a party member?

Question: Yes.

Mr. BERKELEY. Sir, I cannot say to my own personal knowledge. I can only say that he was brought out here by the party to work in the guild, and was a party member when he got here because he was brought right into our fraction. I can presume from that that he was a party member before he reached California.

Now, do you have any statement that you desire to make in explanation or in denial of the testimony given by Mr. Martin Berkeley to this committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer, if that is a question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I will ask you, to be specific, whether or not Mr. Martin Berkeley's statement was true, or false?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury, Mrs. Bernice Polifka Fleury, testified before the committee in Los Angeles on September 24, 1951. Mrs. Fleury had described to the committee meetings which she had, Communist Party meetings which she attended at the homes of various persons. She was asked this question:

Will you tell us who met with you in these groups? First, I want to make certain that the persons you have mentioned were persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party, if they were. What persons who were members of the Communist Party met with you in these meetings?

Mrs. FLEURY. I believe, sir, there are only two persons—I beg your pardon?

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead. Proceed.

Mrs. FLEURY. I believe there are only two persons which it would be at all possible for me to connect with the Communist Party. One of them is Mr. William Pomerance, and one is Mr. David Hilberman.

Question: * * * What were the circumstances under which you met with them in the Communist Party matters?

Mrs. FLEURY. At the same meetings about art, same—

Question: Where were these meetings held?

Mrs. FLEURY. They were held at various houses. I remember going to meetings at Mr. Hilberman's. I remember going to meetings at Mr. Pomerance's. I remember going to meetings at other houses who, believe me, I cannot remember whose house they were or where they were. I understand, also, that my husband, in his previous testimony to this committee, mentioned that there was a meeting at our house. I do not remember that meeting at all. We have discussed it since and evidently I either was out of town or—evidently, the only thing we can think of is that I was out of town.

Question: Well, how did you learn when and where meetings were to be held?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, it was a very vague thing. Somebody would say, "Well let's meet 2 weeks from today at such and such a house." Perhaps you would get a phone call putting it over for a couple of weeks or perhaps someone would say, "Well, we are going to get together at" somebody's. There was no regular routine at any time on where we were to meet.

Question: Well, how did you go to the places of these meetings? What means of transportation did you have?

Mrs. FLEURY. When my husband was in the Army, I was very often picked up by either Mr. Hilberman or Mr. Pomerance, inasmuch as we lived in the same district of the Los Angeles area.

Is there any comment that you desire to make, either by way of denial or explanation of the testimony of Mrs. Fleury regarding your alleged Communist Party membership?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that, on the same grounds.

Mr. WOOD. Permit me to ask the witness a question at that point, Mr. Counsel.

I will ask you, Mr. Pomerance, whether or not the testimony you have just heard read by Mr. Tavenner, referring to you to have been known to her as being a member of the Communist Party and attending these meetings, is true. Is that testimony true, or false?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you were an employee for the National Labor Relations Board in New York, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you were an employee of the National Labor Relations Board in California as a field examiner, which was from an early date in 1938 until the end of 1939, were you at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party when you became employed, in December 1937, by the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, I hand you a photostatic copy of a personnel affidavit. I will ask you to examine it.

(Mr. Pomerance confers with Mr. Rein.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the personnel affidavit in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Pomerance Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. WOOD. Has he identified it?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; not yet.

Is that your signature to the affidavit, Mr. Pomerance?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the room at this point.)

Mr. WOOD. The document will be marked "Pomerance Exhibit No. 1," and received.

(The document referred to was marked "Pomerance Exhibit No. 1, and received in evidence.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you read the last paragraph, please?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir. [Reading:]

I, M. William Pomerance, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have read and understand the foregoing; that I do not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; that I am not a member of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; and that during such time as I am an employee of the Federal Government, I will not advocate nor become a member of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the date of the affidavit?

Mr. POMERANCE. June 19, 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. On June 19, 1941, the date of the giving of this affidavit, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what ground?

Mr. POMERANCE. The fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean that to answer the question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. POMERANCE. It might.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to point out that the statute of limitations has run, and that you could not be prosecuted for perjury.

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I am not aware of all the legal—of the law, on this, and I therefore have taken that position.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the room at this point.)

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand in recess until 3 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11:42 a. m., the hearing was recessed until 3 p. m., this same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

For the purposes of this hearing this afternoon, let the record show that I have set up a subcommittee composed of Messrs. Walter, Frazier, Velde, and Wood, and we are all present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, will you come back to the stand, please?

Mr. Pomerance, I hand you a photostatic copy of what appears to be a ballot for the election of officers and the executive board of the Hollywood Democratic Committee, bearing the date of July 26, 1944. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not your name appears at the bottom of the middle column as one of those standing for election to the executive board?

Mr. POMERANCE. It does.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. It does.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you elected to the board?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the previous grounds stated.

Mr. WALTER. What was the name of the organization?

Mr. WOOD. Hollywood Democratic Committee.

Mr. WALTER. Would you take the position that it might incriminate you to admit that you had been elected to a committee of the Democratic Party? Is that what I understand your position to be?

Mr. TAVENNER. That was a committee out there.

Mr. WALTER. I know that.

Mr. POMERANCE. What, sir?

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead.

Mr. POMERANCE. Would you mind repeating it? I am sorry.

Mr. WALTER. I will withdraw the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything about the circumstances of the organization of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are acquainted with the fact, are you not, that the Hollywood Democratic Committee was cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities by its report in 1948 in this form:

This Communist front grew out of a series of fronts designed to entrap Hollywood innocents in the motion-picture industry. Organized in 1942 for the announced purpose of reelecting Governor Olson, of California, it had no connection with the Democratic Party. When it faced exposure as a Communist front, it changed its name in June 1945 to "Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions."

Were you acquainted in any way with the activities of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of a group of persons who met at the time that the name was changed from the Hollywood Democratic Committee to the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions?

Mr. POMERANCE. When was that?

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of the June 11, 1945, issue of the People's World, entitled "Hollywood Democrats Choosing Name," in which a number of persons are represented as being part of the group. You will see your name appearing there underscored with a red pencil. Possibly that will refresh your recollection.

Mr. POMERANCE. My name appears on there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you become affiliated with the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, which was the new name for the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a letterhead bearing date of December 10, 1946, of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. At the bottom of a letter appear the names of those who comprised its executive council. Will you examine it and see whether or not your name appears as a member of the executive council?

Mr. POMERANCE. My name appears in the letterhead.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the executive council of the—

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me mention the name. Of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered the room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of the articles of incorporation of the Hollywood Community Radio Group, which, Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer in evidence and ask that it be marked "Pomerance Exhibit No. 2."

Mr. WOOD. It will be admitted.

(The articles of incorporation referred to were marked "Pomerance Exhibit No. 2" and filed for the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, will you examine the document and state whether or not your name appears as one of the incorporators of the Hollywood Community Radio Group?

Mr. POMERANCE. It does.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice the name of Sam Moore, among the directors or incorporators. Were you acquainted with Sam Moore?

Mr. POMERANCE. I know Sam Moore.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice also the name of Abraham L. Polonsky. Were you acquainted with Abraham L. Polonsky?

Mr. POMERANCE. I know Mr. Polonsky.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice also the name of Philip M. Connelly. Were you acquainted with Mr. Connelly?

Mr. POMERANCE. I know Mr. Connelly.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is that?

Mr. POMERANCE. I know Mr. Connelly.

Mr. TAVENNER. I see also the name of Pauline Lauber. She is also known as Pauline Lauber Finn.

Mr. POMERANCE. I know her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with her?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice also the name of John T. McTernan. Were you acquainted with Mr. McTernan?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the legal profession in Los Angeles?

Mr. POMERANCE. He is a lawyer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he the lawyer for this corporation, to your knowledge?

Mr. POMERANCE. I believe he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice also the name of Hy Kraft. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. POMERANCE. I know Hy Kraft.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of these persons whose names I have asked you about known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you connected with this corporation, the Hollywood Community Radio Group, as a member of the board of directors?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't think I said I was connected.

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh. Well, were you connected?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state what the purpose of the formation of this Hollywood Community Radio Group was?

Mr. POMERANCE. I would say it was set forth in whatever document you have there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it have any purposes other than those set forth in the provisions of its certificate of incorporation or charter?

Mr. POMERANCE. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances which led up to the establishment of this corporation?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are acquainted, are you not, with the fact that this corporation was cited also by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, as a Communist-inspired and directed organization, whose immediate objective is the establishment of a radio station in Los Angeles County?

Mr. POMERANCE. I was not aware of it; but I assume that it is correct, if it is in their hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the purpose of the corporation, or any of its directors, to your knowledge, to use it for the purpose of operating a radio station upon which the Communist Party would be given any special privileges or that the Communist Party would use it for any special programs or purposes?

Mr. POMERANCE. Can I speak to my attorney, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; at any time, you are at liberty to confer with counsel.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. POMERANCE. I claim my privilege for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, according to an article appearing in the People's World of December 16, 1943, a provisional committee was set up to organize the People's Educational Association, and, according to the article, M. William Pomerance, business agent of Screen Cartoonists, Local 852, was a member of that committee.

I hand you a photostatic copy of the article and ask you whether or not you served as a member of the committee to organize the People's Educational Association?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Referring to People's Daily World of April 19, 1946, William Pomerance, business agent of the Screen Writers' Guild was engaged in conducting a class on the Film Industry Today, at the People's Educational Center, and then also another class on "The trade-union line-up in Hollywood."

I hand you a photostatic copy of the clipping from the April 19, 1946, issue of the People's Daily World, and I will ask you to state how clearance was obtained for you in your work or in your participation in teaching at the People's Educational Center.

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I don't understand.

Mr. WALTER. Where was that?

Mr. TAVENNER. In Los Angeles.

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I don't understand the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you first if you did engage in teaching courses at the People's Educational Center?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. I referred you there to the article reciting that you did conduct a class on "The film industry today" and another class on "The trade-union line-up in Hollywood." Did you conduct either of those classes, or any other classes?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you tell the committee how teachers were selected to conduct courses in the People's Educational Center, that is, whether or not there were special groups who had to pass upon the qualifications of the teacher or any other matter relating to the teacher?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think I declined to answer any questions about my connections with that organization.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Pomerance, did you ever see this article that appeared on the 19th of April, 1946, in the Peoples Daily World?

Mr. POMERANCE. I can't recall, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Do you deny that you are the William Pomerance mentioned in this article?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't.

Mr. WALTER. You do not?

Mr. POMERANCE. It is there.

Mr. WALTER. Well, are you the same William Pomerance who is mentioned in this article?

Mr. POMERANCE. I assume so.

Mr. WALTER. Well, if you are, then you were a teacher in this school?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline, under my constitutional rights under the fifth amendment, to answer any questions about the school, because it appears as a subversive organization, both in this committee and in the Tenney committee hearings, I am told.

Mr. WALTER. You have just testified that you are the William Pomerance mentioned in this article. This article concerns a school. Now, is that the fact or isn't it?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the record should show positively that the People's Educational Center, incorporated under the name of "Los

Angeles Educational Association, Inc.," also known as People's University, People's School, and People's Educational Association, was cited as Communist and subversive by Attorney General Tom Clark in a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released on June 1 and September 21, 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of the fact that this school had been cited as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think Mr. Jackson said the date was 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I am asking you if you ever learned the fact that it was cited in 1948?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes. I don't remember whether it was in 1948, but I have learned of the fact, yes, that it was cited.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, in 1948, you were living in New York; were you not?

Mr. POMERANCE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever make a public pronouncement of any kind of disaffiliation with that school?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall that I said I was affiliated with it, or I refused to answer the question with regard to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to an article in the People's World of October 6, 1944, the American Youth for Democracy sponsored a teen-age mock congress at the Virgil High School, Los Angeles. I show you the article and call your attention to the fact that in the place underscored your name appears as the sponsor or consultant. Do you recall that?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, published by this committee on May 14, 1951, shows that the American Youth for Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark, by letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and that it was cited as the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress, according to the report of this committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944.

After the citation of this group by this committee on March 29, 1944, did you do anything to disassociate yourself from it?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't recall that I admitted that I was associated with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, you have not.

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't think you asked me the question about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you associated at any time in any manner with the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. The "win the peace" conference was held in Washington, D. C., on April 5 to 7, 1946, according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1946.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, do you have the date that the AYD succeeded the YCL? According to your statement there, the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities was in 1944.

Mr. JACKSON. It was formed in October 1943.

Mr. VELDE. The AYD?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. It succeeded the Young Communist League.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; there is another citation which shows that fact.

I was saying that, according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1946, William Pomerance of the Hollywood Citizens' Committee, attended that conference, that is, the conference in Washington from April 5 to 7, 1946. Will you examine the photostatic copy of the issue of the Daily Worker of April 3, 1946, and state whether or not it is correct in stating that you were scheduled to attend that conference?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you attend the conference in Washington, that is, the conference of April 5 to 7, 1946, a "win the peace" conference?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer the question, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of the fact that the Attorney General classified the National Committee to Win the Peace as a Communist organization, as subversive and Communist, on December 4, 1947?

Mr. POMERANCE. I suspect it was. I cannot recall specifically.

Mr. WALTER. Why do you suspect that? He described it as being a Communist organization.

Mr. POMERANCE. Because a number of people had so stated, and the press has carried that story.

Mr. WALTER. It wasn't because you knew it was a Communist organization?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer the question regarding the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an official of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization or did you hold any official position with that organization?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware that it, too, has been cited as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated with any organization devoted to the defense of Harry Bridges?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated with or did you ever aid in any way the work of the Bridges' Victory Committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the fact that the Harry Bridges Victory Committee was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, as a Communist-front organization operating in San Francisco, and that after the Communist Party became prowar, Harry Bridges, a Communist Party member and leader of the Communist Party, planned a general strike in San Francisco in 1944, was threatened with deportation, the defense against which was almost entirely in the hands of Communists? Were you acquainted with that fact, that is, the fact that it had been so cited by this committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. May I speak to counsel a minute?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Mr. POMERANCE. The answer is "Yes" to the last question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Pomerance, in my earlier questioning of you this morning I read to you the testimony of Mrs. Fleury, wherein she identified you and Mr. David Hilberman as persons known to her to be members of the Communist Party, and with whom she attended meetings of the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

Were you acquainted with Mr. David Hilberman?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was Mr. David Hilberman employed, or what was his business when you knew him in California?

Mr. POMERANCE. He was employed in one of the studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know in what capacity?

Mr. POMERANCE. I believe as a lay-out man.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us again when you left California?

Mr. POMERANCE. I left the Screen Writers' Guild, I think, in December of 1946. I actually left California a few months later, after a rest.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Hilberman known to you to be a member of the Communist Party when you knew him in California?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you seen Mr. David Hilberman since you left California in 1946?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. In New York City?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you employed by Mr. Hilberman now?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am employed by the corporation of which he is an officer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his official position in the corporation?

Mr. POMERANCE. He is president.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the name of the corporation?

Mr. POMERANCE. Tempo Productions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tempo Productions?

Mr. POMERANCE. Tempo Productions, Inc.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the word "tempo"?

Mr. POMERANCE. T-e-m-p-o.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did he leave California, to your knowledge?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think he left before I did. I think he left in—I couldn't be sure, but I think he left before I did. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you left California did you come to New York to accept employment in his company?

Mr. POMERANCE. No; I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury stated in her testimony before the committee in Los Angeles that she remembered going to meetings at Mr. Hilberman's house. Did you ever accompany Mrs. Fleury to a meeting of any kind in Mr. Hilberman's home?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a meeting of any kind in the home of Mr. Hilberman?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. Yes, excuse me, I do.

Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party when you left Los Angeles in 1946?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. And came to New York?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry, I decline to answer that, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was the subpoena served on you to appear as a witness before this committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I think Tuesday, 2 weeks ago, whatever that date was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on Tuesday, 2 weeks ago, when the subpoena was served on you?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You appeared before the committee in response to the committee, I believe, on the Thursday following your—

Mr. POMERANCE. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Following the service of the subpoena upon you?

Mr. POMERANCE. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you appeared before the committee and you were directed to return today, I mean, at which time you were directed to return today, were you then a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party when you appeared before this hearing this morning?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds?

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are not a member now? Is that what I understand you to say?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I was talking in the present, and I did not mean to divide the hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Well, how do you divide it? That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. POMERANCE. I said as of the present date I am not now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean at this precise moment? Is that what you mean? When you spoke of dividing things, I am trying to find out what your measure of division is.

Mr. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I don't know how to state it, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Perhaps we can clarify the situation in this way: Were you a Communist when we recessed this noon?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Were you one yesterday?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. WALTER. Now, what impression do you suppose that answer has made on the members of this committee?

Mr. POMERANCE. I don't know, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Will you be a Communist Party member when your presence is no longer required by this committee under the subpoena?

Mr. POMERANCE. I can answer that by saying that I have no intention at this time of joining the Communist Party, but I think any man has taken something on himself in talking about what he does in the future.

Mr. JACKSON. I hardly think so, in the matter of the Communist Party. I think it is pretty clear in your mind whether you are going to be a Communist when you walk out of the door or not.

Mr. POMERANCE. I answered that as truthfully as I can, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. You have no intention at the present time of becoming a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you trying to tell the committee that, while you are sitting here before it, that you are not a member of the Communist Party, but that when you are outside, you are?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, when did you become associated with the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that. I never said that I was.

Mr. WOOD. Were you a member of the Communist Party last night?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Were you a member of the Communist Party this morning at breakfast time?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Well, what happened during the night?

Mr. VELDE. Maybe he listened to Billy Graham.

Mr. TAVENNER. Today is Tuesday. Does that have anything to do with your membership or nonmembership?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Are there any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Are you acquainted with Harry Bridges personally?

Mr. POMERANCE. I have met Harry Bridges.

Mr. VELDE. Have you ever met Harry Bridges in a Communist Party meeting?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. VELDE. Are you acquainted with Bartley Crum?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. How well acquainted with him are you? What is the nature of that acquaintance, I believe I should ask you?

Mr. POMERANCE. Well, I have had a drink with him a couple of times.

Mr. VELDE. Did he ever act as your counsel?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Are you acquainted with Richard Gladstein?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir. I may have met him, but I don't know him.

Mr. VELDE. Is Harry Bridges a member of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

Mr. POMERANCE. I decline to answer that.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Pomerance, what were the circumstances of your employment by the National Labor Relations Board? Was it by examination or by appointment?

MR. POMERANCE. I think it was appointive, sir.

MR. JACKSON. With whom did you carry on negotiations for your employment? Who appointed you?

MR. POMERANCE. I think there was a change of Secretaries at the time I came in. I made application when Mr. Wolf was Secretary of the Board. Mr. Witt subsequently became a member, but as I understood it, the Board passed on all of the employees, as I met the Board members at that time.

MR. JACKSON. Did you receive a written appointment as a member of the NLRB?

MR. POMERANCE. As I say, I can't recall whether it was written or not.

MR. JACKSON. Do you recall who notified you that you had been accepted?

MR. POMERANCE. It is a long time ago.

MR. JACKSON. With whom did you carry on negotiations for employment as a business agent for the Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

MR. POMERANCE. I said this morning that I couldn't recall. There were a number of people that I knew on the coast who were in the Cartoonists—

MR. JACKSON. Well, who was the president or chairman of the Screen Cartoonists' Guild at the time that you took this employment?

MR. POMERANCE. I think William Littlejohn, but I wouldn't be sure of that. The record will show.

MR. JACKSON. Who was the secretary?

MR. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I don't remember.

MR. JACKSON. You were business agent for the Screen Cartoonists' Guild, were you not?

MR. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

MR. JACKSON. Well, I assume that that would bring you into frequent contact with the officers of that organization, would it not?

MR. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I thought you said when I was hired by them.

MR. JACKSON. During your tenure as business agent.

MR. POMERANCE. I am sorry. I don't remember the name of the secretary.

MR. JACKSON. How many members were there in the Screen Cartoonists' Guild?

MR. POMERANCE. I think at that time there were about 800 or possibly more, 1,000.

MR. JACKSON. You do not remember the name of the chairman of it, or the president or the secretary?

MR. POMERANCE. I said that, as I recall it, the president of the guild was William Littlejohn.

MR. JACKSON. And the secretary?

MR. POMERANCE. I can't recall the name of the secretary.

MR. JACKSON. Do you recall the name of the treasurer of the organization?

MR. POMERANCE. There is an office called secretary-treasurer, and secretary. The secretary I can't remember. I think the then secretary-treasurer was Pepe Ruyz, but I am not sure of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. POMERANCE. R-u-y-z, I think. I am a very bad speller.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the first name?

Mr. POMERANCE. P-e-p-e.

Mr. JACKSON. You were shown by counsel an affidavit that you signed in 1941 stating that you were not a member of any organization which sought the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Would you sign such an affidavit today?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you have signed one yesterday?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you have signed one a week ago?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. During the course of the past 5 years was there any time that you could not have signed such an affidavit in good faith?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that the Communist Party advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Mr. POMERANCE. I am not prepared to go into any discussion on that. I am no student of sufficient stature to discuss that question.

Mr. WOOD. By that you mean you have no opinion on the subject, sir?

Mr. POMERANCE. Well, I would never agree with anything that would go for force and violence in relation to the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. WOOD. You are asked whether or not, in your opinion, the Communist Party, as it is constituted, has as one of its objectives, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Your reply was that you feel you are not qualified to discuss that question.

My question is: Have you any opinion on the subject?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You do not have any opinion?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that this committee should recommend to the Congress legislative restrictions upon the operations of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. POMERANCE. I would not have any opinion about what this committee recommends.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, you understand that the end product of this committee is recommendation of remedial legislation, and if you don't understand it, I will read it into the record at this time.

I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Are there any further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Pomerance, you stated that at the time of your employment by the National Labor Relations Board, a person by the name of Witt, I believe, you said, was counsel; is that right?

Mr. POMERANCE. No; he was secretary, as I remember it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his first name?

Mr. POMERANCE. Nathan Witt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Nathan Witt confer with you prior to your appointment, regarding your appointment?

Mr. POMERANCE. I made application to Wolf, who was the secretary just prior to Witt, and met with him and then later I met Mr. Witt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Witt have anything to do by way of recommendation or otherwise toward bringing you into the organization of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. I assume that he did, because I got the appointment, but I know that I met with the Board members.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am speaking of in addition to his official act at the time you were employed?

Mr. POMERANCE. No; I didn't know the man.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you obtain your employment with the Board?

Mr. POMERANCE. I made application and I had several letters, I think, of recommendation. The file would show it. I am sure the Board file would show it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Do you know that Nathan Witt was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, I don't.

Mr. WOOD. Not at the time you made application, but at the time you became employed by the National Labor Relations Board, you say Witt was a member of the Board at that time?

Mr. POMERANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Do you know whether he was then a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Did you ever know that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POMERANCE. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered.

We will stand in recess until tomorrow morning at 10:30.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the room at this point.)

(Whereupon, at 4 p. m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 6, 1952.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1952

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson.

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. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show that a subcommittee consisting of Messrs. Kearney, Jackson, and Walter has been appointed to conduct this hearing, and all of the members of the subcommittee are present.

Call your witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hy Kraft.

Mr. WALTER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KRAFT. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HYMAN "HY" SOLOMON KRAFT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, SIDNEY COHN

Mr. WALTER. You are represented by counsel?

Mr. COHN. I as Sidney Cohn, 1776 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name?

Mr. KRAFT. My full name is Hyman Solomon Kraft.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Kraft?

Mr. KRAFT. I was born on April 30, 1899, in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. KRAFT. I now reside at 410 East Fifty-seventh Street.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the witness could raise his voice a little. He is hard to hear.

Mr. WALTER. Keep your voice up.

Mr. KRAFT. I will try, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you say is your present place of residence?

Mr. KRAFT. 410 East Fifty-seventh Street, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in New York City?

Mr. KRAFT. I spent 10 years, about 10 to 12 years in California. Most of my life I have spent in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you review briefly for the committee your educational training?

Mr. KRAFT. I was educated in the public and high schools of New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what has been your occupation since 1935, say?

Mr. KRAFT. My major occupation throughout my adult and professional life has been that of a Broadway playwright.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the performance of your work, have you been employed by any particular organization or group? In other words, state for the committee briefly what your employment record has been.

Mr. KRAFT. In the theater I have held various jobs. Among other things I have produced several shows. One was Gentlemen of the Press in 1928 by Ward Morehouse, and another play called Poppa by the Spewacks, they are a well-known Broadway writing team. Subsequently I wrote in collaboration with Marc Hellinger a musical called Hot Cha.

I also wrote the original story of the musical called the New Yorkers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little, please?

Mr. KRAFT. I will try to. I am trying to direct it to the stenographer.

Mr. COHN. Direct it to Mr. Tavenner, please.

Mr. KRAFT. I will, sir.

I wrote the original story for the musical called the New Yorkers.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that, approximately?

Mr. KRAFT. Some time in the thirties, sir. I then wrote the play Cafe Crown, which was produced in 1941 or 1942 in New York City.

I spent the years from about 1937 or 1938 to 1950 living in California and working sporadically in the motion-picture business. My last screen credit—

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the principal screen credits you received between 1938 and 1950 while living in Hollywood?

Mr. KRAFT. My credits are very sparse, Mr. Tavenner. I wrote several original stories for the screen, and my last credit, if I remember correctly, was in 1942 when I did the screen adaptation of a musical in Fox-Twentieth Century called Stormy Weather.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other productions have you had besides those that you received the screen credits for?

Mr. KRAFT. I worked on several originals at MGM, but these were never produced. One in particular was a story for Esther Williams, but through the mechanics of the studio the picture itself was never produced.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. KRAFT. That was in 1942. I think that was in 1942.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAFT. My last actual part in Hollywood was for Paramount Studios in 1946 or 1947, an original story which was unproduced.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where have you been employed from 1946 on?

MR. KRAFT. Mr. Tavenner, I have occupied rather ambivalent positions since my chief interest has always been the theater, and, as I say, I have worked only sporadically in Hollywood from time to time, and sold an original when the circumstances were such that I could get them.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you briefly describe what your work in the theater has been since you returned to the East from the west coast?

MR. KRAFT. For the last 2½ years or the last 3 years, I have been almost completely occupied in preparing the production of the musical *Top Banana*, which is also running in New York.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Kraft, you are aware of the fact, I suppose, that your name has been brought into the hearings before this committee at various times during its investigation of communism in the entertainment field, especially in the moving-picture industry; are you not?

MR. KRAFT. Yes, I am.

MR. TAVENNER. There have been several witnesses who have mentioned your name, and there have been several who have mentioned it in a very positive manner, and I want to ask you several questions with regard to that testimony.

On September 18, 1951, a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee heard the testimony of Martin Berkeley, who admitted former membership in the Communist Party and furnished the committee information concerning his activities and associations while in the Communist Party.

Mr. Berkeley in describing various transactions of the Communist Party furnished testimony concerning those dealing with minority groups. In describing individuals whom he knew to be members of the Communist Party in these hearings, he described a Hy, H-y, Kraft, K-r-a-f-t; and stated: "I presume that he is Hyman, H-y-m-a-n. I have also know him as Hy, H-y. His name is spelled K-r-a-f-t."

Were you acquainted with Mr. Martin Berkeley?

MR. KRAFT. Yes.

MR. KEARNEY. Was that answer yes?

MR. KRAFT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. In what work were you engaged at any time in conjunction with Martin Berkeley, if any?

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

MR. KRAFT. I was never engaged in any professional work with Mr. Martin Berkeley.

MR. TAVENNER. You limited or restricted your answer to professional work.

MR. COHN. He did not, Mr. Tavenner. You may not have heard the last. He said, "or any other kind of work."

MR. TAVENNER. Oh, I did not hear that.

Mr. Berkeley, in the course of his testimony, was talking about fraction meetings, and I should read this question and answer in order to give you the proper background of his statement. I asked him this question:

By "fraction meetings" I mean fraction meetings of the Communist Party.

That was my statement.

MR. BERKELEY. Of the Communist Party. Someone asked me where the name "fraction" came from, whether it was "faction," and I told this gentleman that

if there was a faction you were thrown out of the party: that was a faction [f-r-a-c-t-i-o-n] which was called a faction because it was part of the whole.

QUESTION. Well, will you tell us about the work of those faction meetings?

MR. BERKELEY. The faction dealing with minority groups—

which I interpolate to mean fraction of the Communist Party in the light of the questions—

and again this ran over a period of time. Jerome Chodorov, one of the authors of *My Sister Eileen*, was a party member, and Lester Koenig, K-o-e-n-i-g, who is now an associate producer; Rowland Kibbee, K-i-b-b-e-e, and Marguerite Roberts, husband John Sanford, a writer; Morton Grant and Melvin Levy, L-e-v-y, Allen Boretz, B-o-r-e-t-z, coauthor of *Room Service*, Hy Kraft—

Now, was Mr. Berkeley correct in stating that you were associated as part of this fraction meeting involving minority groups of the Communist Party?

MR. KRAFT. Mr. Tavenner, I would like to state first that I am not a member of the Communist Party, and I decline to answer this question on the grounds that it violates my privilege under the fifth amendment.

MR. KEARNEY. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

MR. KRAFT. I decline to answer, sir, on the same grounds.

MR. TAVENNER. I desire to correct the record for the sake of accuracy. The testimony of Mr. Berkeley was on the 19th instead of the 18th of September.

You state that you are not now a member of the Communist Party, is that correct?

MR. KRAFT. I stated that I am not a member of the Communist Party.

MR. TAVENNER. You mean at this time?

MR. KRAFT. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Kraft, on January 23, 1952, Mr. Max Silver, formerly a high functionary of the Communist Party in Los Angeles, a county organizer of Los Angeles County, to be exact, testified in executive session before this committee, and until the present time you have had no opportunity to know to what extent if any he might have involved you in his testimony.

The committee has permitted the release of that executive testimony to the extent that I am now going to state to you. Mr. Silver was asked the question as to whether or not you were known to him to have been a member of the Communist Party. His answer is:

I have known Hy Kraft in Hollywood in, I believe, the year 1937. He was a party member.

Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1937?

MR. KRAFT. I decline to answer, Mr. Tavenner, on the previously stated grounds.

MR. TAVENNER. Is the statement made by Mr. Silver true or false?

MR. KRAFT. I decline to answer, sir.

MR. JACKSON. Do you know Mr. Max Silver?

MR. KRAFT. Yes.

MR. JACKSON. In what connection did you know Mr. Silver?

MR. KRAFT. I decline to answer, Mr. Jackson.

MR. KEARNEY. Have you ever attended any meetings of any kind with Mr. Silver?

MR. KRAFT. I decline to answer, General, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state that you are not a member of the Communist Party now. And you refuse to answer whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party in 1937. May I ask you whether you were a member of the Communist Party in 1950 when you left Los Angeles and returned to New York City?

Mr. KRAFT. I was not a member of the Communist Party in 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Specifically when did you leave Los Angeles to return to New York?

Mr. KRAFT. I think it was in September of 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the year 1950?

Mr. KRAFT. I was not a member of the Communist Party during 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, there is a little difference in your answer from my question. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the year 1950?

Mr. KRAFT. No.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1949?

Mr. KRAFT. I was not a member of the Communist Party in 1949; no.

Mr. KEARNEY. In 1948?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed in 1948?

Mr. KRAFT. I don't remember that I had any specific employment in 1948. I think that is when I started work on Top Banana. I think that is when I started working on shows.

Mr. KEARNEY. If you were not a member of the Communist Party in 1948, would you so state to this committee?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, General.

Mr. COHN. Would you get that again? Do you mind if we consult for a moment?

Mr. KEARNEY. Not at all.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. Would you read the question back?

Mr. WALTER. Read the question, please.

(The record was read by the reporter as follows:)

If you were not a member of the Communist Party in 1948, would you so state to this committee?

Mr. KEARNEY. If you were not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KRAFT. I would have so stated, that is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. And the same question pertaining to 1947?

Mr. KRAFT. I must decline—I decline to answer. Just a minute.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. You do not mind my consulting with him?

Mr. KEARNEY. No, no; that is what you are there for.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KEARNEY. I will rephrase that question. If you were a member of the Communist Party in 1947, would you so state?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer this question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kraft, the committee is in possession of information regarding your alleged participation in various Communist-front activities prior to 1948. The committee is anxious to know the circumstances under which your affiliation, if it existed, with such organizations occurred, and any other information that you

can give us regarding the Communist Party activities within those organizations.

For instance, the committee is in possession of a pamphlet describing the Writers' Congress of 1943, which was held, as you know, in early October of that year, which indicates that this congress was held under the joint auspices of the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. This pamphlet indicates that you were on the panel for arrangements.

First of all, were you a member of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you a participant in the Writers' Congress of 1943 sponsored by the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is also in possession of a photostatic copy of a booklet published by the Actors' Laboratory, Inc., which is described as a schedule for activities for 1949 and 1950. This pamphlet indicates that you were a member of the Actors' Laboratory, Inc. Were you a member of that organization?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is his name on that photostatic copy?

Mr. COHN. After you are through with it, General, do you mind if we see it, too?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think the name appears as a member of the board.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to ask the witness if he ever repudiated the use of his name as a member of the board of Actors' Laboratory, Inc.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1949-50.

Mr. KRAFT. May I see that?

(Document handed to Mr. Kraft, and Mr. Kraft and his counsel consult document.)

Mr. KRAFT. I never saw this pamphlet before, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name does appear as a member of the board, does it not?

Mr. KRAFT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you authorize the use of your name for that purpose?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer on that question.

Mr. WALTER. This was in 1949. You say that in 1949 you were not a Communist.

Mr. KRAFT. I have said that; yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. And you decline to answer the question of whether or not you were a member of this organization, because I am assuming that you know that was a Communist organization?

Mr. KRAFT. The Actors' Laboratory has been cited.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. KRAFT. As a subversive organization.

Mr. WALTER. That is why you refuse to answer the question, because of that?

Mr. KRAFT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should also show that the citation on the Actors' Laboratory was in 1947, or fully 2 years

before the dates given on this photostat, which reflects that Mr. Kraft was a member of the executive board.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is also in possession of a letterhead bearing the date of October 1939 on which your name appears on the margin of the letterhead as a sponsor of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Were you a sponsor of that organization?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Tavenner the date of the formation of the Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. TAVENNER. My recollection is that it was in 1936.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or 1937, about that date.

Mr. WALTER. When was it captured, do you remember that?

Mr. TAVENNER. The testimony in our hearings was to the effect that V. J. Jerome played a part in it when he went to Hollywood, but as to the date, my recollection is the date was between 1936 and 1938, probably 1938.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you want the citation, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Hollywood Anti-Nazi League incorporated on June 8, 1936, as the Hollywood League Against Nazism. It became the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League in September 1936. The Stalin-Hitler pact brought this front to abrupt termination in August of 1939. The Hollywood Motion Picture Democratic Committee was its successor. That is a citation of the California State Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the witness is suggested as being a member of this Anti-Nazi League prior to the Hitler-Stalin pact, and long before this country entered the war.

Now, for my own personal information, I would like to know why does the gentleman refuse to answer whether he was a member of that organization?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline because the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League has been cited as a subversive organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Artists' Front to Win the War was organized October 16, 1942. You are listed as one of the sponsors under the heading of "Literature." Do you recall your membership in that organization?

Mr. KRAFT. Could I see that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(Document handed to Mr. Kraft, and Mr. Kraft and his counsel consult the document.)

Mr. KRAFT. I don't recall my membership in this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any explanation to give for the use of your name as a sponsor of the organization?

Mr. KRAFT. I have no explanation, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in any manner in the work of the Artists' Front to Win the War?

Mr. KRAFT. I have no knowledge of any activity in connection with the Artists' Front to Win the War. I cannot remember it specifically.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is also in possession of information that the New Masses of May 3, 1938, at page 19, contained the names

of individuals upholding the Moscow trials, and purported to understand the real facts about this situation in the Soviet Union at that time. Among the signers appears the name of H. S. Kraft.

Mr. COHN. May we take a look at that, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. It appears that it has not been brought into the hearing, and I will proceed to another question and come back to that.

Mr. COHN. Is it important to you? Can we get off the record?

Mr. TAVENNER. It may be important to the witness in answering the question. That is my only point.

Mr. COHN. We would like to look at it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely, I think you have that right.

I will proceed to another matter. The committee has possession of a photostatic copy of the articles of incorporation of the Hollywood Community Radio Group, which has been described by the California Committee on Un-American Activities as Communist-inspired and directed, and an organization whose immediate objective was the establishment of a radio station in Los Angeles County. These articles of incorporation indicate that you were a member of the first board of directors of this group.

You were a member of the first board of directors, were you not?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of the certificate of incorporation and ask you whether or not your name appears as a member of the first board of directors.

(Document handed to Mr. Kraft, and Mr. Kraft and his counsel consult the document.)

Mr. KRAFT. The document, Mr. Tavenner, speaks for itself, but I decline to answer any questions in connection with this.

Mr. TAVENNER. But your name does appear there, does it not?

Mr. KRAFT. My name does.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you have any knowledge of your name being used on that certificate of incorporation?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, General.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us the extent to which the Communists controlled the formation of that organization?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I will return to the question that I asked you a few moments ago. I hand you now a photostatic copy of page 19 of the May 3, 1938, issue of New Masses where there appears an article entitled "The Moscow Trials" and I will ask you to state whether or not you see your name in the right-hand column of that article.

(Document handed to Mr. Kraft, and Mr. Kraft consults the document with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAFT. My name does appear, Mr. Tavenner, but I have no recollection of this matter. I think this is dated—

Mr. TAVENNER. 1938.

Mr. KRAFT. 1938. I have no recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, the persons whose names appear in that article are alleged to have approved, or to have upheld the Moscow trials. Did you advocate or approve at any time the Moscow trials?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does this serve to refresh your recollection regarding this particular article:

We, the undersigned, are fully aware of the confusion that exists with regard to the Moscow trials, and the real facts about the situation in the Soviet Union.

Now, did you have any knowledge about the real facts in the Soviet Union?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, Mr. Tavenner.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAFT. I never visited the Soviet.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have never been to Russia?

Mr. KRAFT. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you answer my question?

Mr. KRAFT. I believe I did. I declined to answer the question as to whether I had the real facts. I think that was the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the letterhead of February 24, 1940, you were a sponsor of the Hollywood League for Democratic Action.

Mr. COHN. Is that one of the organizations on the list?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is. I will read the citation. The Hollywood League for Democratic Action appears in the guide to subversive organizations and publications issued by this committee. It appears in the following form:

Cited as a Communist-front organization in which Communist individuals were "pulling the strings and setting the policy." It "was a continuation of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee after the invasion of Russia by Germany precipitated an abrupt change in Soviet foreign policy." It lasted until 1942 when it reorganized as the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

You recall my question, do you?

Mr. KRAFT. I wish you would repeat it, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question? I will reframe the question to save time.

I have before me a letterhead of the Hollywood League for Democratic Action dated February 24, 1940, and on the margin appears the list of sponsors, among whom is your name, or the name H. S. Kraft. That is your name, is it not, H. S. Kraft?

Mr. KRAFT. Yes, sir; the initials of my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a sponsor of that organization? That is, as indicated by this letterhead?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Tavenner, these organizations are the ones that are listed as subversive by the Attorney General in the State of California?

Mr. TAVENNER. The citation in this particular instance was by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. KEARNEY. If this organization were not listed as a subversive organization by the State of California, would your answer be different?

Mr. COHN. Do you mind if we consult?

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead.

(Mr. Kraft consults with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAFT. It is a difficult question. The fact of the matter is that the organization has been listed, and therefore, I decline to answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let us assume that it were not listed as subversive; would your answer be different?

Mr. KRAFT. I can't answer that question. I can't tell you the answer that I would give to that question.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean you won't answer?

Mr. KRAFT. Sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean you won't answer?

Mr. COHN. Would you repeat the statement? I am sorry, we did not hear.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean the witness won't answer the question.

Mr. COHN. Won't.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you still stand on your original answer?

Mr. KRAFT. It is a hypothetical question, and I must stand—

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not see anything hypothetical about it at all.

Mr. KRAFT. I must stand on my original answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is what I assumed you would do.

Mr. TAVENNER. We find upon examination of the amicus curiae brief to the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of John Howard Lawson against the United States and Dalton Trumbo against the United States that you are listed on it. Now, this was—

Mr. COHN. It must have been some time in 1949, was it not?

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the October term, 1949, of the Supreme Court of the United States and was filed on the tenth day of September, 1949.

We would like to know the circumstances under which you became a party to that proceeding.

Mr. KRAFT. Mr. Tavenner, in all honesty, I cannot remember the circumstances under which I became a party to this proceeding. But I certainly admit being a party to this proceeding, because I think the issue involved was one that the Court should have settled.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have a perfect right, of course, and I am not attempting by innuendo to criticize you from becoming a party to the proceeding in the form in which you did. But we are interested in the means used to obtain your participation, because you have stated to us that in 1949 you were not a member of the Communist Party, and we are anxious to know to what extent any Communist Party influences were brought to bear upon you to use your name in this connection.

Mr. KRAFT. I can only repeat that I don't remember the circumstances under which my name was obtained.

Mr. WALTER. Who asked you to become a party to these proceedings?

Mr. KRAFT. I don't remember, sir.

Mr. WALTER. 1949 this was. How much money did you contribute to the legal expenses involved in that appeal?

Mr. KRAFT. As far as I can recall, sir, I contributed no money because in 1949 it was a very bad year for me.

Mr. WALTER. Don't you remember who asked you whether or not your name could be used in this brief?

Mr. KRAFT. I honestly don't, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

Mr. KRAFT. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. WALTER. Why? Why do you decline to answer the question as to whether or not you know somebody?

Mr. KRAFT. Mr. Jerome's name and Mr. Jerome himself has appeared before this committee.

Mr. WALTER. The mere fact that you knew him certainly does not mean anything. You cannot be convicted of anything because you happen to know somebody. I know a lot of Communists myself, and I admit that I know them.

(Mr. Kraft confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAFT. I stand on my rights in regard to this question.

Mr. WALTER. All right. Mr. Tavenner, is there any reason why we should go on? This witness certainly is not going to assist this committee.

Mr. Kraft, Martin Berkeley, who was a member of the Communist Party, felt that he was in error when he aided and assisted in this conspiracy and came forward and assisted this committee tremendously in its work. We had hoped that you would do the same thing, because we know that you were a member of the Communist Party, and we hoped when we subpoenaed you down here that you would assist this committee in showing the machinations of this Communist crowd that you were connected with.

In view of the fact that you are not going to assist, I do not see any reason why we should waste our time in asking questions when we know the witness is not going to answer them.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is quite obvious, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be adjourned.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I can agree with the chairman for his reasons, but personally I think the answers given by the witness have been very enlightening. But I do believe that the witness should be instructed by the chairman to hold himself in readiness for further questioning.

Mr. WALTER. I do not think that is necessary. We know where he is, and if he ever has a change of heart, and, Mr. Kraft, if you ever feel that you would like to make a slight contribution to the security of your Nation during these troubled times, we will give you every opportunity that you seek to come down here. And if we feel there is anything we want to know we will know where you are, and we will subpoena you again. I do not see any reason why the witness should not be excused.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you still believe in the philosophy of the Communist Party?

Mr. KRAFT. I do not.

Mr. WALTER. The committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a. m., the subcommittee was recessed subject to the call of the chairman.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1952¹

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

EXECUTIVE HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 4:25 p. m., in room 330, Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter, presiding.

Committee member present: Representative Francis E. Walter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; and Raphael I. Nixon, director of research.

TESTIMONY OF ELIA KAZAN

Mr. WALTER. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear the evidence you are about to give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KAZAN. I so swear.

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

Mr. KAZAN. Elia Kazan.

Mr. TAVENNER. E-l-i-a?

Mr. KAZAN. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kazan, you testified before this committee on January 14, 1952, in an executive session; did you not?

Mr. KAZAN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. In that hearing, you testified fully regarding your own membership in the Communist Party approximately 17 years ago, and your activity in the party; did you not?

Mr. KAZAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. However, you declined at that time to give the committee any information relating to the activities of others, or to identify others associated with you in your activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. KAZAN. Most of the others, yes, sir. Some I did name.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you declined at that time to name all of them?

Mr. KAZAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I understand that you have voluntarily requested the committee to reopen your hearing, and to give you an

¹ Released April 11, 1952.

opportunity to explain fully the participation of others known to you at the time to have been members of the Communist Party.

Mr. KAZAN. That is correct. I want to make a full and complete statement. I want to tell you everything I know about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in preparation for your testimony here, have you spent considerable time and effort in recalling and in reducing to writing the information which you have?

Mr. KAZAN. I spent a great deal of time; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have prepared, in written form, the full and complete statement which you say you would like to make to the committee?

Mr. KAZAN. Yes, sir; I have such a statement prepared.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you hand it to me please, sir?

(Mr. Tavenner received the statement.)

Mr. WALTER. Let the statement be made a part of the record and considered to be the sworn testimony of the witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I introduce in evidence this statement prepared and submitted by the witness and ask that it be marked "Kazan Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. WALTER. Mark it and let it be made a part of the record.

(Statement of Elia Kazan:)

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., April 9, 1952.

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to amend the testimony which I have before you on January 14 of this year, by adding to it this letter and the accompanying sworn affidavit.

In the affidavit I answer the only question which I failed to answer at the hearing, namely, what people I knew to be members of the Communist Party between the summer of 1934, when I joined it, and the late winter or early spring of 1936, when I severed all connection with it.

I have come to the conclusion that I did wrong to withhold these names before, because secrecy serves the Communists, and is exactly what they want. The American people need the facts and all the facts about all aspects of communism in order to deal with it wisely and effectively. It is my obligation as a citizen to tell everything that I know.

Although I answered all other questions which were put to me before, the naming of these people makes it possible for me to volunteer a detailed description of my own activities and of the general activity which I witnessed. I have attempted to set these down as carefully and fully as my memory allows. In doing so, I have necessarily repeated portions of my former testimony, but I believe that by so doing I have made a more complete picture than if I omitted it.

In the second section of the affidavit, I have tried to review comprehensively my very slight political activity in the 16 years since I left the party. Here again, I have of necessity repeated former testimony, but I wanted to make as complete an over-all picture as my fallible memory allows.

In the third section is a list of the motion pictures I have made and the plays I have chosen to direct. I call your attention to these for they constitute the entire history of my professional activity as a director.

Respectfully,

ELIA KAZAN.

STATE OF NEW YORK,

County of New York, ss:

I, Elia Kazan, being duly sworn, depose and say:

I repeat my testimony of January 14, 1952, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to the effect that I was a member of the Communist Party from some time in the summer of 1934 until the late winter or early spring of 1936, when I severed all connection with it permanently.

I want to reiterate that in those years, to my eyes, there was no clear opposition of national interests between the United States and Russia. It was not even clear to me that the American Communist Party was taking its orders

from the Kremlin and acting as a Russian agency in this country. On the contrary, it seemed to me at that time that the party had at heart the cause of the poor and unemployed people whom I saw on the streets about me. I felt that by joining, I was going to help them, I was going to fight Hitler, and, strange as it seems today, I felt that I was acting for the good of the American people.

For the approximately 19 months of my membership, I was assigned to a "unit" composed of those party members who were, like myself, members of the Group Theatre acting company. These were—

Lewis Leverett, co-leader of the unit.

J. Edward Bromberg, co-leader of the unit, deceased.

Phoebe Brand (later Mrs. Morris Carnovsky). I was instrumental in bringing her into the party.

Morris Carnovsky.

Tony Kraber; along with Wellman (see below), he recruited me into the party.

Paula Miller (later Mrs. Lee Strasberg): We are friends today. I believe that, as she has told me, she quit the Communists long ago. She is far too sensible and balanced a woman, and she is married to too fine and intelligent a man, to have remained among them.

Clifford Odets: He has assured me that he got out about the same time I did.

Art Smith.

These are the only members of the unit whom I recall and I believe this to be a complete list. Even at this date I do not believe it would be possible for me to forget anyone.

I believe that in my previous testimony I mentioned that there were nine members in the unit. I was including Michael Gordon, but in searching my recollection I find that I do not recall his having attended any meeting with me.

As I testified previously, two party functionaries were assigned to "hand the party line" to us new recruits. They were—

V. J. Jerome, who had some sort of official "cultural" commissar position at party headquarters; and

Andrew Overgaard, a Scandinavian, who was head, as I recall, of the Trade Union Unity League.

There was a third party official who concerned himself with us, although whether he was officially assigned or merely hung about the theater when he was in New York, I never knew. He told us that he was State organizer for the party in Tennessee. He was obviously stagestruck and he undertook to advise us. He was—

Ted Wellman, also known as Sid Benson.

Our financial contributions and dues were on a puny scale. We were small-salaried actors, frequently out of work and it was depression time.

What we were asked to do was fourfold:

- (1) To "educate" ourselves in Marxist and party doctrine;
- (2) To help the party get a foothold in the Actors Equity Association;
- (3) To support various "front" organizations of the party;
- (4) To try to capture the Group Theatre and make it a Communist mouthpiece.

The history of these efforts in my time, were as follows:

(1) In the "education" program we were sold pamphlets and books and told to read them. There were also "discussions" of these. The "discussions" were my first taste of totalitarian methods, for there was no honest discussion at all, but only an attempt to make sure that we swallowed every sentence without challenge.

(2) The attempt to gain a foothold in Actors' Equity was guided by an actor, Robert or Bob Caille (I think that was the spelling). He was also known as Bob Reed. I have been told that he died some years ago.

The tactic—and the sincere effort of many individuals—was to "raise a demand" that actors receive pay during the weeks when they rehearsed for shows. The long-range plan was, by leading a fight for a reasonable gain for the actors, to gain prestige for individual Communists and sympathizers who, the party hoped, would then run the union.

Pay for the rehearsal period was obtained, but at no time that I saw, either then or after I left, did the party come within sight of controlling the actors' union.

(3) Most of our time, however, went directly or indirectly into providing "entertainment" for the meetings and rallies of front organizations and unions. The "entertainment" was strictly propaganda.

There were two front organizations in the theater field, but off Broadway, whose purpose was to provide such propaganda entertainment and with whom I had dealings. They were the League of Workers Theatres (later the New Theatre League) and the Theatre of Action. It was into these that my time went. I acted, I trained and directed other actors and, with Art Smith, I co-authored a play called Dimitroff, which had to do with the imprisonment of the Bulgarian Communist leader by the Nazis following the Reichstag fire. It is my memory that the play enjoyed either two or three Sunday-night performances before benefit audiences and was then retired.

I taught at the school for actors and directors run by the League of Workers Theatres. This was unquestionably a Communist-controlled outfit. Its officials were never bona fide theater people and it was my impression that they had been imported by the party from other fields to regiment the political novices in the theater. To the best of my knowledge, when the league came to an end, they retired from the theater again. I do not recall any Communist meeting which I attended with them, but my impression that they were all Communists is very strong. The ones I remember were—

Harry Elion, president;

John Bonn, a German refugee;

Alice Evans (I am told she later married V. J. Jerome);

Anne Howe.

In the Theatre of Action, there was a Communist thought and behavior and control, but I did not attend their political meetings so I cannot tell which of the actors were party members and which were not. I did some acting training here and I co-directed with Al Saxe a play called *The Young Go First*, and I directed another called (I think) *The Crisis*.

About 1936, I began a connection with an outfit called Frontier Films, but the party had nothing to do with my making this connection. The organization consisted of four or five men, of whom I remember Paul Strand, Leo Hurwitz, and Ralph Steiner. From long friendship with Steiner, I believe him to be a strong anti-Communist. I do not know the party affiliations of the others. They were trying to raise money to make documentary films. They put me on their board, but I attended few meetings. I wanted to make a picture. This I did, with Ralph Steiner, in 1937. It was a two-reel documentary called *The People of the Cumberland*s.

That was my last active connection with any organization which has since been listed as subversive.

(4) I want to repeat emphatically that the Communists' attempt to take over the Group Theatre failed. There was some influence and a great deal of talk, the members of the Communist unit consumed a great deal of time at group meetings, they raised some money from the non-Communist members for Communists' causes and they sold them some Communist pamphlets; they brought the prestige of the group name to meetings where they entertained as individuals, but they never succeeded in controlling the Group Theatre.

This was because the control of the group stayed firmly in the hands of the three non-Communist directors, Harold Clurman, Lee Strasberg, and Cheryl Crawford. (In 1937 Clurman became sole director and remained so until the theater broke up in 1940.)

In a small way I played a part in blocking the Communist unit's maneuvers to get control. In the winter of 1935-36 I was a member of the actors' committee of the group. This was an advisory committee, but it was the nearest the actors ever came to having any voice in the running of the theater. I was instructed by the Communist unit to demand that the group be run "democratically." This was a characteristic Communist tactic: they were not interested in democracy; they wanted control. They had no chance of controlling the directors, but they thought that if authority went to the actors, they would have a chance to dominate through the usual tricks of behind-the-scenes caucuses, block voting, and confusion of issues.

This was the specific issue on which I quit the party. I had enough regimentation, enough of being told what to think and say and do, enough of their habitual violation of the daily practices of democracy to which I was accustomed. The last straw came when I was invited to go through a typical Communist scene of crawling and apologizing and admitting the error of my ways. The invitation came from a Communist functionary brought in for the

occasion. He was introduced as an organizer of the Auto Workers Union from Detroit. I regret that I cannot remember his name. In any case, he probably did not use his own name. I had never seen him before, nor he me.

He made a vituperative analysis of my conduct in refusing to fall in with the party line and plan for the Group Theatre, and he invited my repentance. My fellow members looked at him as if he were an oracle. I have not seen him since, either.

That was the night I quit them. I had had enough anyway. I had had a taste of police-state living and I did not like it. Instead of working honestly for the good of the American people, I had found that I was being used to put power in the hands of people for whom, individually and as a group, I felt nothing but contempt, and for whose standard of conduct I felt a genuine horror.

Since that night, I have never had the least thing to do with the party.

II

After I left the party in 1936, except for the making of the two-reel documentary film mentioned above, in 1937, I was never active in any organization since listed as subversive.

My policy in the years after 1936 was an instinctive rather than a planned one. I could usually detect a front organization when I first heard about it and I stayed away from it. I never became a member of such an organization, although I was pressed to join dozens of them.

Contradictorily, on a few of the many occasions when I was asked to sign a statement or a telegram for a specific cause, I may have allowed my name to be used, even though I suspected the sponsoring organization. They insidiously picked causes which appealed to decent, liberal, humanitarian people; against racial discrimination, against Japanese aggression, against specific miscarriages of justice. There was a piece of spurious reasoning which influenced me to let them use my name in rare instances. It went like this, "I hate the Communists but I go along with this cause because I believe the cause is right."

Today I repudiate that reasoning, but it accounts for those of the instances listed below in which I may have done what is alleged. I repudiate the reasoning because I believe that all their fights are deceitful maneuvers to gain influence.

My connections with these front organizations were so slight and so transitory that I am forced to rely on a listing of these prepared for me after research by my employer, Twentieth Century-Fox. I state with full awareness that I am under oath, that in most of the cases I do not remember any connection at all. It is possible that my name was used without my consent. It is possible that in a few instances I gave consent.

I am told that the New Masses of November 4, and the Daily Worker of November 8, 1941, list me as an entertainer at a meeting sponsored by the American Friends of the Chinese People. I remember no connection whatsoever with this organization and especially since I ceased all "entertaining" in 1936 when I left the party, I can only suppose that my name was used without my permission in this instance.

I am told that I signed an appeal put out by the Committee for a Boycott Against Japanese Aggression. I do not remember this either, but it is possible that I signed such an appeal. No date is given, but it must have been before Pearl Harbor.

I am told that the official program of the Artists Front To Win the War listed me as a sponsor in October 1942. I have no memory of this either, but it is possible that I gave my consent to the use of my name.

I am told that on July 19, 1942, I signed an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which denounced Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges. I have no recollection of this either, but again it is possible that I did so, for I remember that, in contrast to what I had heard about the New York water front, what I had heard about San Francisco suggested that Bridges had done a good job for his union. And I remember that I believed the story, current at that time, that he was being hounded for this. At that time I did not believe him to be a Communist.

I have been reminded that my name was used as a sponsor of the publication, People's Songs. I have no doubt that I gave permission for this. The date could be found by referring to the first issues of the publication. Beyond allowing my name to be used initially, I had no contact with it.

The only money contribution which I remember between 1936 and 1947 or 1948—and I remember it with regret—was one of \$200 which I gave to Arnaud D'Usseau when he asked for help in founding what he said was to be a new "liberal literary magazine." This magazine turned out to be *Mainstream* and from its first issue was a patently Communist publication altogether detestable and neither liberal nor literary.

Now I come to the only case of cause in which I got involved, even to a limited extent, in those 16 years between 1936 and 1952. It was what became known as the case of the Hollywood 10.

I would recall to this committee the opening of the first investigation into communism in Hollywood by the previous committee under the chairmanship of J. Parnell Thomas. I would recall that a large number of representative people in the creative branch of picture industry, regardless of their politics, were alarmed by the first sessions. They signed protests and they banded in organizations which certainly did not look to me like front organizations at their inception, although later the Communists plainly got control of them.

I am listed as sponsoring a committee to raise funds for the defense of the 10 and as having sent a telegram to John Huston on March 5, 1948, when he was chairman of the dinner for them. I do not remember these specific actions, but I certainly felt impelled to action of that sort at that time and did this or something like it. I also made a contribution of \$500 to a woman representative of the committee for the Hollywood 10. This was in New York. If I am able to recall her name, I will advise you of it, but I cannot recall it at the moment. I am also listed as supporting a radio program for the 10 as late as August 1950. I am surprised at the date. It is possible that I was approached and gave permission to use my name as late as this, but it seems to me more likely that my name was reused without asking me, since I had allowed its use earlier.

For by that time I was disgusted by the silence of the 10 and by their contemptuous attitude. However, I must say now that what I did earlier represented my convictions at the beginning of the case.

That is the end of the list of my front associations after 1936, insofar as I can remember them, with the assistance of the memorandum prepared for me.

I should like to point out some of the typical Communist-front and Communist-sympathizer activities which I stayed away from:

From the day I went to Hollywood to direct my first picture, in 1944, I had nothing to do with any front organization there. Neither had I anything to do with them on three earlier trips as an actor. I had nothing to do with the Actors' Lab. I never gave a penny to any front organization on the west coast.

I did not sign the Stockholm peace pledge. I saw what that was. I resented the Communist attempt to capture the word "peace."

I did not sponsor or attend the Waldorf Peace Conference. My wife's name was used as a sponsor without her permission. She protested and asked for its withdrawal in a letter to Prof. Harlow Shapley of Harvard University, who had some official post. She received no answer from him, but she did get an apology from James Proctor, who had given her name without her permission.

I had nothing to do with the Arts, Sciences, and Professions or any of its predecessors or successors.

I did not support Henry Wallace for President.

I do not want to imply that anyone who did these things was one of the Communists; I do submit that anyone who did none of them was a long way away from them.

III

There follows a list of my entire professional career as a director, all the plays I have done and the films I have made.

Casey Jones, by Robert Ardrey, 1938: The story of a railroad engineer who comes to the end of his working days.

It is thoroughly and wonderfully American in its tone, characters, and outlook.

Thunder Rock, by Robert Ardrey, 1939: This is a deeply democratic and deeply optimistic play, written at a time when there was a good deal of pessimism about democracy. It told of a group of European immigrants headed for the West about 1848, and showed how they despaired of reforms which this country has long since achieved and now takes for granted. A failure in New York, this play was a huge hit in wartime London.

Cafe Crown, by Ily Kraft, 1942: A comedy about Jewish actors on New York's East Side. No politics, but a warm and friendly feeling toward a minority of a minority.

The Strings, My Lord, Are False, by Paul Vincent Carrol, 1942: An Irishman's play about England under the bombings. Not political. It shows human courage and endurance in many kinds of people, including, prominently, a priest.

The Skin of Our Teeth, by Thornton Wilder, 1942: One of the plays I am proudest to have done. It celebrates the endurance of the human race and does so with wit and wisdom and compassion.

Harriet, by Florence Ryerson and Colin Clements, 1943: The story of Harriet Beecher Stowe, who wrote *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

One Touch of Venus, by S. J. Perelman, Ogden Nash, and Kurt Weil, 1943: Musical comedy. The goddess Venus falls in love with a barber.

Jacobowsky and the Colonel, by S. N. Behrman, 1942: Humorous-sad tale of the flight of a Jewish jack-of-all-trades and a Polish count before the oncoming Nazis. Not political, but very human.

A Tree Grows in Brooklyn (my first picture), 1944: A little girl grows up in the slum section of Brooklyn. There is pain in the story, but there is health. It is a typically American story and could only happen here, and a glorification of America not in material terms, but in spiritual ones.

Sing Out Sweet Land, by Jean and Walter Kerr, 1944: A musical built around old American songs. Nonpolitical but full of American tradition and spirit.

Deep Are the Roots, by Arnaud D'Usseau and James Gow, 1945: This was a very frank and somewhat melodramatic exploration of relations between Negroes and whites. It was shocking to some people but on the whole both audiences and critics took it with enthusiasm.

Dunnigan's Daughter, by S. N. Behrman, 1945: A comedy drama about a young wife whose husband was too absorbed in his business to love her.

Sea of Grass (picture), 1946: The conflict between cattle ranchers and farmers on the prairie.

Boomerang (picture), 1946: Based on an incident in the life of Homer Cummings, later Attorney General of the United States. It tells how an initial miscarriage of justice was righted by the persistence and integrity of a young district attorney, who risked his career to save an innocent man. This shows the exact opposite of the Communist libels on America.

All My Sons, by Arthur Miller, 1947: The story of a war veteran who came home to discover that his father, a small manufacturer, had shipped defective plane parts to the Armed Forces during the war. Some people have searched for hidden propaganda in this one, but I believe it to be a deeply moral investigation of problems of conscience and responsibility.

Gentlemen's Agreement (picture): Picture version of the best-selling novel about anti-Semitism. It won an academy award and I think it is in a healthy American tradition, for it shows Americans exploring a problem and tackling a solution. Again it is opposite to the picture which Communists present of Americans.

A Streetcar Named Desire, by Tennessee Williams, 1947: A famous play. Not political, but deeply human.

Sundown Beach, by Bessie Breuer, 1948: A group of young Army fliers and their girls at a hospital in Florida. Not political, but a warm and compassionate treatment.

Loveline, by Alan Jay Lerner and Kurt Weil, 1948: Musical comedy. Story of a married couple, covering 100 years of changing American standards and customs.

Death of a Salesman, by Arthur Miller, 1949: It shows the frustrations of the life of a salesman and contains implicit criticism of his materialistic standards.

Pinky (picture), 1949: The story of a Negro girl who passed for white in the North and returns to the South to encounter freshly the impact of prejudice. Almost everybody liked this except the Communists, who attacked it virulently. It was extremely successful throughout the country, as much so in the South as elsewhere.

Panic in the Streets (picture), 1950: A melodrama built around the subject of an incipient plague. The hero is a doctor in the United States Health Service.

A Streetcar Named Desire (picture), 1950: Picture version of the play.

Viva Zapata (picture, my most recent one), 1951: This is an anti-Communist picture. Please see my article on political aspects of this picture in the *Saturday Review* of April 5, which I forwarded to your investigator, Mr. Nixon.

Flight into Egypt, by George Tabori, 1952: Story of refugees stranded in Cairo and trying to get into the United States.

I think it is useful that certain of us had this kind of experience with the Communists, for if we had not, we should not know them so well. Anyone who has had it is not to be fooled by them again. Today, when all the world fears war and they scream peace, we know how much their professions are worth. We know tomorrow they will have a new slogan.

First-hand experience of dictatorship and thought control left me with an abiding hatred of these. It left me with an abiding hatred of Communist philosophy and methods.

It also left me with the passionate conviction that we must never let the Communists get away with the pretense that they stand for the very things which they kill in their own countries.

I am talking about free speech, a free press, the rights of labor, racial equality and, above all, individual rights. I value these things. I take them seriously. I value peace, too, when it is not bought at the price of fundamental decencies.

I believe these things must be fought for wherever they are not fully honored and protected whenever they are threatened.

The motion pictures I have made and the plays I have chosen to direct represent those convictions.

I have placed a copy of this affidavit with Mr. Spyros P. Skouras, president of Twentieth Century Fox.

ELIA KAZAN.

Sworn to before me this 10th day of April 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kazan, the staff or members of the committee may desire to recall you at some future time for the purpose of asking you to make further explanations of some of the matters contained in your sworn statement.

Mr. KAZAN. I will be glad to do anything to help—anything you consider necessary or valuable.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Kazan, we appreciate your cooperation with our committee. It is only through the assistance of people such as you that we have been able to make the progress that has been made in bringing the attention of the American people to the machinations of this Communist conspiracy for world domination. I am sure the American people are more aware today of the seriousness and gravity of the situation than they were a year ago, but certainly not as aware as they should be. It is still possible, as is attested to by some notices of phony peace movements that have come to my desk, that there are still people who are deceived by the Communist groups and fronts, and we appreciate your cooperation. I feel that you have made a considerable contribution to the work of the committee in whatever we do.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 7

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 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 recess, at 2 p. m., in room 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Hon. Francis E. Walter, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; Donald T. Appell and James A. Andrews, investigators; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Mr. ROBINSON, will you raise your right hand, please, and be sworn?

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD G. ROBINSON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. ROBINSON. Edward G. Robinson.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand, Mr. Robinson, that this morning you requested of the committee that you be permitted to appear before it?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is quite right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that privilege was granted you?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee your purpose in desiring to appear before the committee at this time?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have just finished my season with *Darkness at Noon*, Monday night in West Virginia, and I had come to Washington on a personal matter. I hoped that I would have the opportunity of appearing before your committee, so that I could give you an idea of just what my feelings and my thoughts are in this matter since the revelations that have been made during 1951 and 1952 by your committee.

I have prepared a written statement, and I should like to read it to you.

My voice is a little hoarse—I have had a very arduous part for a long time. If you will permit me to read this statement—

Mr. WALTER. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as on previous occasions, I have asked for this opportunity to appear before you so as to make unmistakably clear my feeling about communism and Communists.

As on previous occasions when I have appeared, I desire to repeat under oath a denial that I am or ever have been a Communist or knowingly a fellow traveler.

I have always been a liberal Democrat. The revelations that persons whom I thought were sincere liberals were, in fact, Communists, has shocked me more than I can tell you. That they persuaded me by lies and concealment of their real purposes to allow them to use my name for what I believed to be a worthy cause is now obvious. I was sincere. They were not. I bitterly resent their false assertions of liberalism and honesty through which they imposed upon me and exploited my sincere desire to help my fellowmen. Not one of the Communists who sought my help or requested permission to use my name ever told me that he or she was a member of the Communist Party.

My suspicions, which should have been aroused, were allayed by the fact that I had been falsely accused of Communist sympathies, and I was, therefore, willing to believe that other accused persons were also being unfairly smeared.

My conscience is clear. My loyalty to this Nation I know to be absolute. No one has ever been willing to confront me under oath free from immunity and unequivocally charge me with membership in the Communist Party or any other subversive organization. No one can honestly do so.

I now realize that some organizations which I permitted to use my name were, in fact, Communist fronts. But their ostensible purposes were good, and it was for such purposes that I allowed use of my name and even made numerous financial contributions.

The hidden purposes of the Communists, in such groups, was not known to me. Had I known the truth, I would not have associated with such persons, although I would have and intend to continue to help to the extent of my ability in worth-while causes, honestly calculated to help underprivileged or oppressed people, including those oppressed by Communist tyranny.

The committee will, I am sure, appreciate the fact that I have been active in groups opposed to the Communists.

For instance, my memory was recently refreshed concerning the support I gave the William Allen White Committee to aid the Allies at a time when Hitler and Stalin sympathizers were using the slogan "The Yanks are not coming." I was at that time urging aid for Great Britain, which was fighting the Communist-Nazi alliance. My stand was definitely contrary to the stand of the Communists. I have helped other anti-Communist causes, but this has somehow been lost sight of by those who seem intent upon trying to make me out a Communist, in spite of my repeated denials under oath of my Communist sympathies.

May I add that of the very many civic, cultural, philanthropic, and political organizations of which I have been a member and a contributor, but a small percentage I later discovered were tinged with the taint of communism.

It is a serious matter to have one's loyalty questioned. Life is less dear to me than my loyalty to democracy and the United States. I ask favors of no one. All I ask is that the record be kept straight and that I be permitted to live free of false charges.

I readily concede that I have been used, and that I have been mistaken regarding certain associations which I regret, but I have not been disloyal or dishonest.

I would like to find some way to put at rest the ever-recurring innuendoes concerning my loyalty. Surely there must be some way for a person falsely accused of disloyalty to clear his name once and for all. It is for this purpose that I come again voluntarily before this committee to testify under oath. What more can I do?

Anyone who understands the history of the political activity in Hollywood will appreciate the fact that innocent, sincere persons were used by the Communists to whom honesty and sincerity are as foreign as the Soviet Union is to America. I was duped and used. I was lied to. But, I repeat, I acted from good motives, and I have never knowingly aided Communists or any Communist cause.

I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to appear and clarify my position. I have been slow to realize that persons I thought sincere were Communists. I am glad, for the sake of myself and the Nation, that they have been exposed by your committee.

While you have been exposing Communists, I have been fighting them and their ideology in my own way. I just finished appearing in close to 250 performances of *Darkness at Noon* all over the country. It is, perhaps, the strongest indictment of communism ever presented. I am sure it had a profound and lasting effect on all who saw it.

Allow me to again thank you for permitting me to appear before this committee to frankly express my views.

MR. WALTER. Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that inasmuch as Mr. Robinson is here at this time I should ask him whether he recalls the testimony of Mr. Dmytryk regarding a meeting which took place in his home.

MR. ROBINSON. In my home?

MR. TAVENNER. At which time the witness was said not to have been present.

MR. ROBINSON. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. I think I should read that testimony and see what explanation you have of it.

MR. ROBINSON. Certainly.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Dmytryk was one of the early witnesses who appeared before the committee in the course of our investigation of communism in the field of entertainment, with particular reference to the moving-picture industry.

MR. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. This question was asked:

During the early period—I might say about the time you were subpoenaed to appear before this committee, was there any indication to you that the Com-

unist Party was endeavoring in any way to influence the course of action that you as a group should take when you appeared here before this committee? the testimony then followed:

Mr. DMYTRYK. You mean the first time?¹

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I certainly had no idea of it at the time. In looking back, of course, I can reach conclusions based on my later experiences about that, which I couldn't have had at the time. I think, in looking back on it and remembering how the 19² were organized, I would say the answer to that would probably be "Yes."

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, describe that to the committee.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, it went something like this. When we first got the subpoenas, Adrian Scott and I accepted subpoenas from the marshal at RKO studios. We had been in touch with nobody else, nor did we get in touch with anybody else at that time. We decided we wanted to get a lawyer.

So I think that Adrian Scott at that time on a story, Behind the Silken Curtain, had some contact with Bartley Crum, whom we knew as a liberal Republican from San Francisco, a man who had been very active in Wilkie's campaign. So we decided to contact Bartley Crum and ask him to serve as our counsel.

We went to San Francisco and talked to him. He agreed. We told him our experience, that we had been members of the party. We had both gotten out. We asked him to serve as our counsel.

Now, we came back to Hollywood, and we were asked to attend a very loose meeting of a group of the people who had gotten subpoenas, other people who had gotten subpoenas and who were not friendly to the committee.

This meeting was held in Edward G. Robinson's house. He was not there. As a matter of fact, he wasn't even in town at the time. The only reason it was held there—I want to make this very clear—is that Senator Pepper was visiting in Hollywood at the time, and whether he was a house guest with the Robinsons—I know he was quite friendly. They thought it would be wise if we could get together with Senator Pepper and find out from him what the situation was in Washington, what the feeling was, which we did. He spoke, extemporaneously, of course, very informally, completely harmless. He simply tried to give us a picture of people in Washington, what was going on in Washington, in a very broad sort of way. There was nothing there you could pick on in any way at all.

At the end of that meeting, however, we were approached by people like Herbert Biberman, Adrian Scott, and asked to attend a further meeting, at which we would discuss procedure for our mutual benefit.

Now, reference has been made to that meeting. Did you in advance give your approval or were you consulted about the holding of that meeting in your home?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I had never been consulted. I found that out very much later. The story that Mr. Dmytryk tells is true. Senator Pepper was a very close friend of ours, and his wife was a very close friend of my wife.

I think that they were in this particular quandary, and they knew that Senator Pepper was well versed in what was going on in Washington, and I think they wanted some advice as to what tactics to pursue and how to go about it. That is the way it has been explained to me.

May I say this, however? I say this in absolute honesty to you. Had I been there, I feel fairly certain that I would have allowed that thing to happen because it was previous to the investigations. I think that in one of my first testimonies I said that I felt that I was with these men at that particular time because, long before that, one of

¹ This refers to the hearings conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities in October 1947 regarding Communist activities in Hollywood.

² This refers to the 19 persons who were originally served with subpoenas for the 1947 Hollywood hearings. Of this group, 10 were actually called upon to testify.

the past chairmen of this committee, Parnell Thomas, had given out a story that I was going to be one of the first to be subpoenaed, and I never was subpoenaed. Consequently, that sort of allayed my suspicions that I might have regarded everybody else, and I thought at the time that the first amendment was a very important thing, and perhaps I would not have been backward and shy in allowing Senator Pepper and this group to come to my house.

There was nothing, I am sure, because my wife is the one who gave the approval.

Mrs. Robinson—may I say this—was the head of the USO of the State of California, and was on the national board. She has testimonials showing that she has done perhaps a great deal more than most women who had been associated with the USO in the country. She broke down as a result of it, and instead of taking a rest, she organized the Desert Battalion, which became rather famous.

That was made up of all sorts of working girls, which gave them a certain amount of glamour. They went out to these God-forsaken places in the desert where the Hollywood coordinating committee would not send any entertainers. They used to be put in barracks there for the week ends, and they would dance with the boys and entertain them.

She goes way back to Valley Forge, and I know, and everybody knows, what a great American she is. So there couldn't have been anything subversive in her mind in allowing this thing to happen.

So that I go beyond your question, and say that I feel fairly certain that at that time I would have given the approval myself, even though I knew nothing about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was there ever an occasion prior to that time when a Communist Party meeting was held in your home, which you recognized as a Communist Party group?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; but I would say that some of the members, that some of the people who were present at my house, who have been associated with these causes, and who have now been revealed as being Communists, and who would not answer the question which, to me, is more or less tantamount to their being Communists, have been in my home at various times.

There were tremendous activities that went on in my house during the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they ever meet there in Communist Party meetings, to your knowledge?

Mr. ROBINSON. Never.

Mr. TAVENNER. On Communist Party matters or business?

Mr. ROBINSON. Never, sir, because, if I had had any idea that any of these organizations, as I told you in my statement, that any of these men who were important cogs in these organizations were Communists, I would not have been a member of these organizations.

It was difficult for me to consent, up to these recent hearings, to say that I had been used, because, while I would still have been for these causes, I would not have done them in company with these men. I think that is the wicked and the horrible and the treacherous thing that these rascals have done in masquerading as supporters of a cause, but who at the time were just trying to encroach upon—and I suppose now I am getting wise—in trying to capture the organizations.

But, as far as my knowing them as Communists, or suspecting them as Communists, it may be naive, but I certainly didn't know that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, since you testified before the committee in October and in December of 1950, a great deal of investigative work has been done in the Hollywood area, with the result that the committee has released the testimony identifying quite a few persons in Hollywood as having been members of the Communist Party, possibly as many as 300.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; that is shocking to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have read the testimony, I suppose?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have read some of it. I was on the road. I read some of it that I got in my papers, and my wife occasionally would send me some excerpts from the Hollywood Reporter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, as a result of what you have read and what you have learned from the investigations which the committee has conducted, have you any information that would be of value to the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to God I had.

Mr. TAVENNER. With regard to its work in Hollywood?

Mr. ROBINSON. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I don't know a thing about it. This is the God's truth. I wish I could be of help to you in this way, and I would willingly volunteer any information that I had. But I was never mixed up with anything of that sort, that I knew of, or that had Communist reasons behind it. I am sure that a good many of us have been victims of that sort of thing. They have their own subtle way of working, so that you couldn't put your finger on it as being communistic.

As far as I knew, whatever activities they were concerned with were causes that I was interested in, and which I thought represented the finest American ideals.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't that virtually the same position that you took when you were before the committee previously?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, not before, because now, in retrospect, I can see where I had been used, and where a good many of the important people of these organizations, garnered and gathered a lot of decent, sincere people who were champions of a cause and cared for it, while they absolutely came in for another reason.

In other words, they were just masquerading as supporters of the cause, while the others had sincere purposes behind them.

When I found out that certain of the executive secretaries of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions¹—I cannot recall the name—were Communists, as well as some other organizations that I had been in, I realized the dirty, filthy work that they had been doing.

There was a lot of conniving going on, but at the time that it happened, I was not aware of it because, as I tell you, had I known anything like that, I would have dropped them.

All of my life I have been against tyranny, and I don't give a hang for it.

¹ Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

To me, communism is abhorrent. Certainly I supported Russia during the war, but, as an ally, and no more than as an ally. What I did for Russia was relatively negligible, compared to what I did for our other allies.

You see, you can take things out of context and build up a case against someone, but I think that if you will really look at my record and see again, as I say, the pattern of life that I have lived all of my life and the kind of American that I have been, it is rather difficult to estimate it in any other way than what a darned good American I have been, of which I am proud.

I think I told you that, Congressman Jackson, when I saw you in California.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Robinson, you stated that you were duped and used—by whom?

Mr. ROBINSON. By the sinister forces who were members, and probably in important positions in these organizations.

Mr. WALTER. Well, tell us what individuals you have reference to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, you had Albert Maltz, and you have Dalton Trumbo, and you have—what is the other fellow, the top fellow who they say is the commissar out there?

Mr. WALTER. John Howard Lawson?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, John Howard Lawson. I knew Frank Tuttle. I didn't know Dmytryk at all. There are the Buchmans, that I know, Sidney Buchman and all that sort of thing.

It never entered my mind that any of these people were Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well now, will you tell us more in detail in what manner these people, or any of them, approached you and attempted to use you in the way that you have described?

Mr. ROBINSON. I came in for a cause that appealed to me. Now, if you take the important organizations that I belonged to—the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, principally—they represented to me that they were the champions on the Rooseveltian policies, both internal and external. Consequently I was very much interested in it. I was a great admirer of Mr. Roosevelt.

I have found out now in retrospect, and since these revelations have been made, how many of the important people in that organization were Communists at the time I was a member of it. My interest really waned with the death of Mr. Roosevelt.

Well, when Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith came to California, he made some speeches. You know the kind of speeches he had been making. I was asked whether I would appear, whether I would go there and do some picketing. I thought it was a silly sort of thing to do, but I said, "Well, the others have been doing it," and after the second or third meeting that had taken place, I fell for the idea.

Now I have found that they used me. I thought that it was a funny thing for me to do. I have found that a good many of the people who more or less backed Gerald L. K. Smith were Communists.

I think these outside things that were being done, the superficial things that were done were done principally by this Communist group.

I am thinking of something that was in Counterattack or in Red Channels, that had me down for Yugoslav Relief,¹ and I find that that

¹ American Committee for Yugoslav Relief.

is a subversive organization. Now, I was not a member of Yugoslav Relief, despite what may be written in that book; but I had been solicited to come and make a speech for Yugoslav Relief.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, can you tell us the circumstances under which you were solicited, and who it was that solicited you?

MR. ROBINSON. Well, as I remember, it was Abe Burrows who solicited me. I don't know that he is a Communist. Mind you, I am just talking about the organization being set down as being communistic. I remember Abe Burrows and his wife. I don't know whether they were in Yugoslav Relief or not. They asked me whether I would appear on the steps of city hall. The mayor was to appear, and I was to introduce him and make an appeal for Yugoslav Relief. I found out now that that has been put down as a subversive organization, as a Communist front. That is as far as my association with it was concerned.

MR. TAVENNER. Were there repeated efforts made to have you contribute to the organization?

MR. ROBINSON. I don't know that I contributed anything to it. I was to just contribute my services as a speaker, and to introduce the mayor. Naturally, it appealed to me—that is, Yugoslav Relief—they were with us.

Now, what is the other item I was going to mention—yes, the Society for the Protection of the Foreign Born.¹ I was solicited there by Donald Ogden Stewart, whom I had known for many years in the theater and long before I came into pictures, and he was a very personable and likable fellow. I find now that he is a Communist.

I was asked to appear at one of their dinners and make a little talk. At the dinner at which I appeared, William Allen White made the principal address; Dorothy Thompson spoke; Grace Moore sang the Star Spangled Banner. There were other people of that kind present.

I made a funny little talk about not having been born in America. I thought that it was incumbent on me to do what I could and to appear at a function of that kind.

Now, it later turned out that these were Communist organizations. I have been seeing some of their recent literature that they have sent out, such as from the Society of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, for a number of years, now, and they certainly, I would say, are subversive and communistic and are following the Russian line in that everything that America has been doing is wrong.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, you made a fairly substantial contribution, did you not, to the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born?

MR. ROBINSON. It was very negligible—I will find that in here²—I don't think it amounted to hardly anything.

You will find that amongst the list of the organizations to which I gave between \$350,000 and \$400,000 in 10 years, that the so-called subversive organizations got hardly anything. I think it was \$10 or something, and \$10 again that they have gotten. They still send me literature, although I have asked them not to send it to me, but it still kind of filters in. They follow absolutely, for my purposes, that is, according to my ideas, the Communist line.

¹ American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.

² Testimony of Edward G. Robinson, October 27, and December 21, 1950, printed hearings of the committee, 81st Cong., pp. 3299-3344.

Mr. WALTER. Practically the entire activities of that organization today are involved in trying to prevent the deportation of known Communists.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is right. That is exactly it. And the Society of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions follows the line that the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic Treaty, and all those sorts of things are all wrong and cockeyed.

The Society for Soviet-American Friendship.¹ My heavens—I had better be careful what I say—but you will find that while I appeared at two or three meetings at the Hotel Astor, a good many of these were done at the instigation and behest of the State Department, our own State Department. They asked me to appear at various meetings, and make a little talk. They have asked me to make some recordings which were sent back on Red Army Day.

The people who appeared at these places were the most reputable and certainly unimpeachable Americans. You couldn't question their loyalty.

Now, to pick that up out of context and to forget all of the other things that I had done for the other allies, for France, for Britain, for Greece, and for Poland—I mentioned something about the William Allen White Committee. The first thing my wife and I did when we got back in 1939, which was just about a week after war had been declared and there was the Moscow-Berlin Pact, was to hold a great big garden party for the victims of Poland. You will find that in my testimony. That was also done for the Red Cross of Britain, and for all of the victims of that particular pact.

Mr. MOULDER. Following the chairman's statement, you made an expression about everything having been all wrong and not right. I take it you were quoting the belief of the organization—that was not your own belief? Don't you think that for the record you should clarify that?

Mr. ROBINSON. I don't quite understand the question.

Mr. MOULDER. Following the chairman's statement, you made some statement about that organization believing that the Marshall Plan and everything else were all wrong.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. That was the belief of the organization and not your own?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, the Society for the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I was not a member of it any longer. There was not a formal membership in many of these organizations, and there was no formal resignation. As I think you well know, there wasn't anything of that kind that went on. They continued to send me literature. They continued to use my name. I finally wrote them to stop doing that, and I found that they were still doing it and still sending me literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. In these cases where they were using your name, were they doing so without your consent?

Mr. ROBINSON. Without my consent. There is one organization, the Civil Rights Congress, which has been mentioned in Red Channels.

¹ National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Now, I know nothing about the Civil Rights Congress. As a matter of fact, I made it my business to investigate that organization. I found that there was a Civil Rights Congress office in Los Angeles.

Well, I went there against the advice of my friends, who knew a little better and said, "Don't be seen in a place like that."

I said, "Why, I have nothing to be afraid of. I am certainly not a member. I am going down there to get some information."

They had me down as an initiator of that particular organization. I went down there and found that they certainly had nothing of the kind. I tried to ask them to show me letterheads, or something, where my name was written down as a sponsor or as an initiator, or anything at all, and they had nothing of the kind.

Where they got that information, I don't know.

MR. KEARNEY. Well, they did use your name, though, Mr. Robinson. What steps did you take, if any, to prevent the use of your name by this organization?

MR. ROBINSON. I went down there and asked them to show me how they were using my name. My name was never on any letterhead that they presented to me.

MR. TAVENNER. When did you go there to make that investigation?

MR. ROBINSON. Previous to my first appearance before you.

MR. TAVENNER. I think you have testified on that.

MR. ROBINSON. Yes. It is incorporated in the brief that I presented during my first appearance.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, you have spoken about the large contributions that you have made and the relative smallness of your contributions to these organizations which you have now recognized to have been Communist-front organizations.

MR. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you endeavored to calculate the proportions of your contributions to Communist-front organizations as compared to contributions to the other organizations?

MR. ROBINSON. Yes, sir. I believe you have that in my first brief. Would you like me to read that?

MR. TAVENNER. Just as you like.

MR. ROBINSON. Well, I think it answers your question, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER. All right, sir.

MR. ROBINSON. Do you mind?

MR. TAVENNER. Go right ahead.

MR. ROBINSON (reading):

Perhaps Mr. Robinson's character, mental make-up, and spheres of interest is revealed more clearly in analysis of his financial contributions to worthy causes. In a period of 10 years from 1939 to 1949, he contributed more than a quarter of a million dollars.

The figures for this analysis were drawn from Mr. Robinson's books and income-tax reports.

The largest sum, close to \$130,000, was given to organizations whose purpose it was to build morale during the war among our soldiers at the home front. This does not include the personal services of which he gave unstintingly. Mention should be made that he financed the major portion of both his trips abroad out of his own funds.

The largest recipient of Mr. Robinson's gift was the USO. Other large contributions went to the Desert Battalion, Salute to the Wounded Chaplains Fund, Hollywood Guild Canteen, and the Masquers Servicemen's Morale Corps.

More than \$30,000 was given by Mr. Robinson to charities which, in one way or another, aided victims of World War II. Among these were contributions to foreign war relief organizations, such as the China Relief Agency, Free French, British Relief, Aid to Greece, Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and so forth.

His contributions to the people who were victims of the Berlin-Moscow Pact began at the very outset of the war, in 1939, while the Berlin-Moscow Pact was still in effect and before the United States entry into the conflict.

Charities maintained by religious groups received more than \$67,000 in the 10-year period, and in that case, too, practically every denomination was given consideration. Catholic churches and hospitals, the Salvation Army, Episcopal and Congregational churches came to Mr. Robinson for aid and received it. Of course, Jewish charities received a good share of this sum, since Mr. Robinson is of that faith.

Organizations dedicated to the promotion of better understanding among people of different race or creed received \$10,000. Among them were the United Negro College Fund, the George Washington Carver Association, National Conference of Christians and Jews. The Urban League, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, University Religious Conference, and others of that type.

Another \$10,000 went to educational and cultural groups, particularly to art associations, museums, symphony associations, artists' fellowships, universities, libraries, and so forth.

Groups aiding underprivileged, disabled, blind, aged people, etc., received over \$15,000, among them the Braille Institute, Helping Hand, National Society for Prevention of Blindness, Home of the Aged, Industrial Center for the Aged, etc. There were contributions also to the National Foundation on Infantile Paralysis, Damon Runyon Fund, Sister Kenny Foundation, and the Community Chest's crippled children's fund, Children's Aid Society, Benefit for Spastic Children, Nursery School for Handicapped Children, Prison Relief Organizations, and the motion-picture relief fund were among the beneficiaries.

Patriotic, youth and veterans' organizations received around \$2,000, among them the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, YMCA, YWCA, Eddie Cantor Camp Committee, Boy Scouts, boys clubs of various sorts, and many others.

These figures do not add up to make the donor a Communist or fellow traveler. Most of the recipients are what the Communists call either bourgeois or fascist.

Being a consistent Democrat and a follower of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Robinson contributed to the party's election campaigns.

In 1940, he contributed \$250 to F. D. R.'s campaign through the Hollywood for Roosevelt Committee. In 1944 he contributed to the Democratic candidates seeking election to the United States Congress and the California State Assembly; \$500 was given to the Hollywood Democratic Committee, and \$1,500 was given to the NCPAC to purchase radio time in Franklin Roosevelt's behalf.

HICCASP¹ received \$250 at the time of its founding, in May 1945. In addition, three contributions, amounting to \$195, were made to HICCASP in 1946 to support regular Democratic candidates.

The Los Angeles chapter of PCA² received \$200 to cover part of the expenses of its founding meeting on February 11, 1947, and two additional contributions followed in that year amounting to \$373.50, the latest of these on May 19, 1947.

The National Council for American-Soviet Friendship received during the war period a contribution of \$100 and annual dues for 2 years of \$5 each, totaling \$110.

In addition, the following amounts were given to the American Society for Russian Relief, Inc.: In 1941, \$11; in 1942, \$144.50; in 1943, \$11.50; in 1945, \$75. Mr. Robinson's books do not contain an explanation for the odd figures, but he assumes they were for purchases of tickets.

In comparison to the quarter of a million dollars, the contributions to organizations listed in Red Channels are microscopically small. The point need not be labored. The facts and figures speak for themselves.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, you have no changes that you desire to make in your statement with regard to contributions since you were before the committee?

MR. ROBINSON. I have none whatever, sir. They are all in my books, and as reported on my income-tax returns.

¹ Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

² Progressive Citizens of America.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was a period during World War II when the policy of the Army toward members of the Communist Party, who were inductees in the Army was changed. The decision was reached to commission, or to permit men who were members of the Communist Party to be commissioned as officers in the Army.

We find that you sent a telegram commending the Army for that action. What is your explanation for that?

Mr. ROBINSON. The telegram had been sent to me signed by very reputable people, and I think they solicited my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you be specific? To whom do you refer when you say "they"?

Mr. ROBINSON. I haven't the telegram with me. I submitted that telegram to the FBI when I asked them to investigate me. I wish I were prepared now as I was prepared the last time when I came to see you, but they do have a copy of that telegram. I am sure they have it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well now, what is your recollection about the circumstances under which you were asked to take part or to sign that telegram?

Mr. ROBINSON. They thought it was an un-American idea not to allow Communists to receive commissions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whom do you mean by "they"?

Mr. ROBINSON. The people—whoever they were—whose names were on that particular telegram. I do not recall them, Mr. Tavenner, at the moment; but I submitted that telegram to the FBI. I submitted everything that I thought might be damaging against me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they individuals or were they acting as members of an organization?

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, I don't recall. I believe they were individuals. Perhaps it was a committee, and perhaps they enumerated the various names of those who were backing it. I thought, being a liberal-minded man at that time, that that was the right sort of thing to do, to lend my name as well. In terms of today, I certainly would not do it, considering what I know now years later, but I thought then that since they were good enough to be in the Army they ought to be good enough to have equal privileges of becoming officers. That is the way it appeared to me at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am principally interested in how the movement was organized, and what was behind the movement, which I cannot do without knowledge of the names of the individuals or the organizations who were sponsoring it.

Mr. ROBINSON. I cannot recall whether it was an organization or whether it was a committee made up of certain people, but I do know that there were some very reputable names that sort of impressed me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you endeavor to secure that information and furnish it to the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I will try to do it, sir. I shall do that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that Dalton Trumbo was one of those who visited your home?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On a number of occasions?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. After his conviction for contempt of Congress, did you have any financial transactions with him?

Mr. ROBINSON. He had written me a letter, sir, in which he described to me the financial straits that he was in. He had been denied employment for some time, and he stated that he had consumed a lot of money in his appearances, in fighting his legal battle as to his contempt charges. He enumerated to me in his letter the various difficulties that he was in, stating that he was going to lose his farm, that something was going to happen to his home and to his family, and he asked me for the loan of some money.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you understand whether or not the money you were lending him was to be used in his defense?

Mr. ROBINSON. It had nothing to do with his defense. I have submitted letters to the FBI on the question—I voluntarily submitted them—showing the purpose of all that and also a letter that he wrote to me previous to his going to the penitentiary, telling me that he was thanking me for the loan that I had made him, how much it had helped set his economic situation straight, and that he felt it incumbent upon him when he got out of the penitentiary as one of his first obligations, to repay his debt to me.

I have found out recently, Mr. Tavenner, that he has made a settlement with his company regarding his contract, and I thought it best to send him a letter and say "What about the money you owe me?" I sent it to him, but I never received an answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know whether he is working in Hollywood at the present time?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, sir; I don't know where he is. I sent him a letter to what I think was called Hopewell Ranch, some place in California. That is where I sent the letter. It was never returned to me, although it had the return address on it, so I imagine that he received it. I don't know how he could work in Hollywood. I really don't know where he is—I have no idea at all.

They say that some of them are in Mexico. Isn't that what they say? I was told that he was in Mexico, by somebody.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member at the present time of any Communist-front organization that you recognize as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. ROBINSON. Not any.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or which has been cited, to your knowledge, by the Attorney General of the United States, or this committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not a member of any organizations except clubs, now, my country club and my actors' club—two actors' clubs. Try and get me. I can tell you that actors' clubs are very good, conservative organizations. As you know, the Screen Actors' Guild, Actors' Equity at that time, is a good, conservative organization.

Mr. WALTER. You are a little gun shy now?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes.

There ain't room for both of us in this town—one of us has got to go, and it was me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Jack Johnstone?

Mr. ROBINSON. The name doesn't mean anything to me. It doesn't strike a bell.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a copy of the Daily Worker, which has in it the photograph of Jack Johnstone, and I will ask you to look at it and state whether you can identify it.

Mr. ROBINSON. That face looks familiar to me. It vaguely looks like somebody I know, but I couldn't tell you what his name is. I don't know that this man is Jack Johnstone. The face looks familiar to me. That is all that I can tell you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Robert Reed, usually called Bob Reed?

Mr. ROBINSON. What is his business? Mr. Tavenner, you must excuse me, but all of my life—and I am telling you the truth—I have been awfully bad on names. That face looked familiar to me. I must say that. What was his business?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kazan testified that Robert Reed was an organizer within the cultural group of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROBINSON. I had nothing to do with Kazan. I just used to see him from the other side as an auditor, when I was an actor. Then when I got into pictures, I would see him in California, when he became a motion-picture director. I don't believe I know Mr. Reed. The name doesn't strike a bell with me. I don't know that man Johnstone. He looks like a man whom I know is not him at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not you ever had an engagement or an appointment with him?

Mr. ROBINSON. With Robert Reed?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; with Jack Johnstone.

Mr. ROBINSON. I don't think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or with Robert Reed?

Mr. ROBINSON. No. I don't know any Robert Reed. If I do, the name does not sort of conjure up a face before me. But I would like to know what you have in mind regarding Mr. Reed, and perhaps I can answer you that way.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is a question in our minds as to whether you ever had a conference with Jack Johnstone, or whether one had been arranged for you.

Mr. ROBINSON. I don't know of any, and I don't know any Jack Johnstone. That is the truth, and I don't know anything about a Robert Reed. What would the meeting have been about?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, it would have related to Communist Party matters, if it were held.

Mr. ROBINSON. I never had any such meeting in my life. I have never met with anyone about any such thing, never in my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have never met with anyone from the national committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBINSON. If I had, I wouldn't know about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. On Communist Party matters, to your knowledge?

Mr. ROBINSON. Never, to my absolute knowledge—I am saying this under oath. I say to my absolute knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time ever been acquainted with a person named Alpa Brown? That may not have been the man's correct name. His correct name may have been Ferruccio Marini.

Mr. ROBINSON. No, sir; not that I can recall. I don't recall any such name. I have met an awful lot of people in my days, but I don't recall any name of that kind.

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

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I have just a couple of questions.

What is your feeling, Mr. Robinson, with respect to those witnesses who have appeared before this committee in recent months, and declined to affirm or deny public identification of themselves as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROBINSON. I haven't the least sympathy with them. I think the tempo of the times have completely changed.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that those people should be reemployed in the motion-picture industry in any capacity?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not an employer, and I don't think that I should have to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. I am asking you your opinion, as one who has been closely associated with the entertainment world for a long time.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, I have no use for people of that kind. I think that wherever you find anyone who works under wraps, who does things in a clandestine fashion, and, as I said before, masquerades as something he is not, and then you find out that he has been engaged in sinister purposes, which I believe the Communist Party and Communists represent, drastic measures should be taken.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, I don't think there is any question but that Communists work under wraps.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. The reluctance of these people to associate themselves with the Communist Party is indicative of that.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions, but I should like to say this, since this is perhaps an excellent place to clear up a lot of public misunderstanding as to the functions of the committee.

The committee is an investigative body, and my understanding of it is that it does not have the power, nor is it delegated the authority to find either guilt or innocence. It marshals certain facts and certain information which is made available to it and, in turn, questions witnesses. The testimony of the witness, then, must stand on its own feet.

I am sure that no member of this committee has ever identified you as a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, but, Mr. Jackson, may I recall that—I don't know whether this is in order or not—

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that in my meeting with you I told you the same thing that I told this committee. After all, I am saying exactly what I said here before, and that is that I feel that this is the only tribunal where an American citizen can come and ask for relief from smears, false accusations, and innuendoes.

Mr. Jackson, I think that when I saw you, I said that if you found—I didn't ask for one bit of mercy—that in any way I had trespassed on

the truth, or that in any way I had perjured myself, you would go ahead and take absolute steps against me.

I have been a victim of this sort of thing for 3 or 4 years, and you must realize how much that must mean to an individual whose loyalty is questioned.

Where can I go and ask for relief?

Mr. JACKSON. That is very true, and no member of this committee, nor any Member of the Congress has the idea that he is to persecute the innocent. Hysterical witnesses to the contrary, that is the truth.

However, how could this committee relieve any witness of responsibility for prior activities and prior associations, which the committee did not lead the witness into, but which he went into of his own free will? Your previous testimony here is simply a compilation of certain information which had reached the committee. The committee cannot say that that information is incorrect because in several instances, at least, you have acknowledged that you were led into these things, and that you were to an extent a dupe.

The committee cannot say, for instance, that you were not associated with the Soviet-American Friendship Committee or HICCASP, or the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Wouldn't you say, Mr. Jackson, that some of our most illustrious—and again I say most unimpeachable—people have been members of those organizations, too?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Several unimpeachable persons testified as witnesses for Alger Hiss.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a question of weeding out those who are really sinister people and those who are really good Americans.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee has said that there is no evidence that you are or have ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am here to be investigated, but may I ask you a question?

Do you believe in your heart that I have been disloyal to my country?

Mr. JACKSON. Let me put it this way: I don't believe that you have knowingly been disloyal to your country, Mr. Robinson. I think that some of your activities have lent aid and comfort to the Communist Party, perhaps inadvertently on your part.

Mr. ROBINSON. Inadvertently and unknowingly.

Mr. JACKSON. I would be the last person in the world to call anyone a Communist unless I had irrefutable evidence to that effect.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will you say that about me?

Mr. JACKSON. What is that?

Mr. ROBINSON. Will you repeat what you told me before? I hope you will say it now.

Mr. JACKSON. I personally do not believe that you were a member of the Communist Party. Let me extend that a little further. Let me say that the activities in which you have engaged have, to some extent and in some degree in the past lent aid and comfort to the international Communist conspiracy. Perhaps that was through no volition of your own, but again, the fact of association with and activities on behalf of some of these organizations is a fact which will stand or fall of its own weight.

The point is that the committee or no member of the committee can simply say "Well, these organizations didn't really exist. Mr. Robinson wasn't actually associated with them in any way."

That is the point I make, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Robinson, the only question I have to ask is this:

You made some reference to Red Channels.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. This is just to clear up a thought in my own mind. Were you designated as a member of the Communist Party in Red Channels?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, but having my name appearing there is almost equivalent, I think. It was almost tantamount to it, considering the way, considering the way the thing was gotten up, that particular paper, magazine or book, whatever you call it, with a drawing of a red hand stabbing at the heart of something or other.

The first thing that I did was to come down and present my case as to "Red Channels." I had this brief drawn, which I incorporated in my first hearing before the committee. They never had me down as a member of the Communist Party. If they had done that, they would have had something on their hands.

You see that is what I have been a victim of Mr. Kearney. If you are a member of the Communist Party there is something positive there. What happens to a man who has never been a member of the Communist Party and who has been smeared and upon whom insinuations, innuendoes and false accusations have been heaped, so as to make people question his loyalty? Where is an American going to go and find some relief from that?

It is none of my business to say that, and I hope you will not think that I am presumptuous.

Mr. KEARNEY. Let me understand you. Do I understand from your statement just now that you have been called a Communist by certain people?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have been called subversive. What does it actually mean? It means a traitor. After all, that is the most heinous crime that a man can be guilty of. I think is the rarest sort of crime, because I think most everybody can point to the fact that he is a good citizen.

Mr. KEARNEY. Have you ever taken counsel with any of your attorneys on that particular score, wherein you have been called subversive by certain individuals, or perhaps organizations?

Mr. ROBINSON. I did, Congressman Kearney. When my name was first mentioned by Matthew Woll in a magazine article in which he mentioned some other rather good names, I took that article, which was republished in The Reporter, and showed it to my attorney in California.

He said, "Well, look, this is so cowardly worded, that if you went to court you would not get a judgment." That happened again and again, and so I abandoned it, and did nothing about it.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, your attorney probably felt the same as some of us on this committee who have been designated as Red baiters by certain people.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is exactly the same thing. One is as wicked as the other. I put them in the same category.

I made a picture called Confessions of a Nazi Spy and I was very proud to have been associated with the play that I have just finished doing and which I hope will be made into a picture, if I can persuade them out there to do so.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is your residence still in Hollywood?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; Beverly Hills.

Mr. KEARNEY. You said that you knew John Howard Lawson?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I have seen him at meetings.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is he connected with the motion-picture industry at the present time?

Mr. ROBINSON. Is he in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I don't believe so. I have been out of the motion-picture industry myself for about a year or so, and so I don't know, but I am sure he isn't however.

Mr. KEARNEY. I didn't hear that.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am sure that he is not, Congressman Kearney. I don't think he will ever be in again, for that matter.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Robinson, from the record it appears that most of the organizations to which you made contributions were meritorious, worth-while, and outstanding charitable organizations?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And as to some of them that you say you made contributions to, it later developed, without your knowledge at the time, that they may have been or later became under control of Communists.

Mr. ROBINSON. At least they were so designated by the Attorney General as subversive organizations.

Mr. MOULDER. But you had no knowledge of that whatever?

Mr. ROBINSON. I said that I did not at the time, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Jackson has made the statement that this committee is not in a position to exonerate or to vindicate any person who has been wrongfully accused of being a Communist or who has been smeared as a result of such false accusations. I will agree with him to a certain extent.

However, I believe that when, as a result of any proceedings or functions of this committee, someone has been unjustly smeared or injured, it is our duty to aid that person and give that person an opportunity to appear before the committee to explain and defend himself as you have done.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. I want further to say that I appreciate the strong and vigorous statement that you have made. It was a splendid statement—clear and convincing.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, Congressman Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. I don't believe that any member of the committee is any more anxious to reveal or expose dangers of communism and subversive activities in our America than you are. You are a great artist and I believe that you have been unjustly imposed upon and smeared. You have been generous to many worthwhile charitable organizations and on many occasions you have voluntarily contributed and performed valuable and patriotic service for our great country.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. According to the evidence presented to this committee you are a good, loyal, and intensely patriotic American citizen.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, sir. You are very kind to say that.

What I am most jealous of, after good theatrical notices, is my Americanism, and I am very happy to hear that coming from you.

Believe me, Congressman Jackson, when you said that you didn't believe that I am a Communist, it made me feel good.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I am happy that it did. I have several more questions.

Have you, Mr. Robinson, recently made application for a passport?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the outcome of that application?

Mr. ROBINSON. I am to meet with Miss Shipley.¹

Mr. JACKSON. With Miss Shipley?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. There has been no decision rendered upon the request?

Mr. ROBINSON. No. I am to meet her today. I was coming in to see her.

Mr. WALTER. Have you anything further?

Mr. JACKSON. I have nothing further.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Robinson, your testimony before this committee has been valuable in this respect: It ought to give notice to a lot of well-meaning people that they can be imposed upon through the machinations of this group who are past masters at organizing the innocent.

You certainly opened up the door to all sorts of suspicion by becoming a member of so many organizations. That is understandable because of your prominence. The fact that you would be identified with a movement would of itself attract other people.

By the same token I hope that other people in this country have learned a lesson from your unfortunate experience, and will not permit themselves to be imposed upon.

Mr. ROBINSON. I hope so.

Mr. WALTER. This morning we had a witness testify concerning the activities of this organization for the protection of the foreign-born, of which you were a member.

Well, actually, that organization does more harm to the foreign-born than does anything else in America today.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is in the hands of the wrong people.

Mr. WALTER. But still, thousands of unsuspecting, innocent people join it, just as you did, and contribute their money to it, and that money is used for the purpose of preventing the deportation of Communists or felons.

It is indeed refreshing to have somebody like you come here and make the kind of statement you did, because I am sure that people will be warned and will not want to find themselves in the position that you found yourself, with the only place to which you could appeal, was this committee.

The statement that Mr. Jackson made about the function of this committee not being to determine the guilt or innocence of anyone is quite correct. However, we have felt in the last few years that this committee is under certain obligations to give to people an opportunity, where they have been mentioned in connection with any investigation, the opportunity to come here and make a statement. I don't know of any other forum where that could be done.

¹ Individual in the Passport Division of the State Department.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I also believe that in justice to any individual who comes before this committee, it should be noted in the record whether or not the committee has any information that the individual is a Communist.

Mr. WALTER. Well, actually, this committee has never had any evidence presented to indicate that you were anything more than a very choice sucker. I think you are No. 1 on every sucker list in the country.

Mr. ROBINSON. We were in very trying and emotional times. The war was going on.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I am shocked to see my name on the list of contributors to some of these organizations myself.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, there you are.

Mr. KEARNEY. It is the same way, Mr. Robinson, with reference to the individuals who are signing the so-called peace petitions that daily come before the Congress. They are all well-meaning individuals. I do not know of anybody in this country that does not want peace.

Mr. ROBINSON. They pick on a subject on which they are all agreed, some cause on which they are all agreed.

Mr. WALTER. Is there anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. The committee stands adjourned.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 3:20 p. m., the committee recessed, to reconvene upon the call of the chairman.)

×

