

7925-41100 flat

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

(EDUCATION—PART 6)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Congress. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

JUNE 22, 24, 29, AND JULY 1, 1953

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

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

AUG 7 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

CLYDE DOYLE, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

June 22, 1953:		Page
Testimony of Harry J. Marks.....		1843
June 24, 1953:		
Testimony of George F. Markham.....		1875
June 29, 1953:		
Testimony of Louis Harap.....		1895
July 1, 1953:		
Testimony of George Beach Mayberry.....		1915
Index.....		1935

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides :

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (Education—Part 6)

MONDAY, JUNE 22, 1953

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 2:10 p. m., in room 225 of the Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy (appearance noted in transcript), and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Leslie C. Scott, research analyst.

Mr. VELDE. The subcommittee will be in order.

Will you stand and be sworn, please?

In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MARKS. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show that I have appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Doyle, of California, and myself, as chairman, for the purposes of this hearing.

Proceed Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record, please.

(Off the record.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that this hearing be in executive session.

Mr. VELDE. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the hearing be in executive session. Those in favor say "aye"; contrary. The motion is carried. The hearing will be in executive session.

TESTIMONY OF HARRY J. MARKS

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what is your name, please, sir?

Mr. MARKS. Harry J. Marks.

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

Mr. MARKS. In New York City on July 19, 1909.

¹ Released by the full committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mr. MARKS. At 35 South Eagleville Road, Storrs, Conn.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. MARKS. I teach history at the University of Connecticut.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what formal educational training you have had?

Mr. MARKS. How far back shall I begin?

Mr. TAVENNER. Beginning with college.

Mr. MARKS. I went to Harvard College in the fall of 1927. I was graduated with a degree of bachelor of arts, magna cum laude, in 1931, in June.

I then went to Germany and attended the University of Berlin for four semesters. I returned to—

Mr. TAVENNER. All right; just a moment.

Mr. MARKS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in Berlin, and during what year?

Mr. MARKS. I arrived in Berlin—well, I didn't go straight to Berlin. I arrived in Hamburg in June 1931, on the day the newspapers were carrying the report of the Hoover moratorium. I don't remember when that was—probably about the 20th or the 21st.

I went to the University of Heidelberg summer session in 1931, where a course was given on German for foreigners, and I enrolled in the University of Berlin in the fall semester of 1931. I continued at the University of Berlin until I left to return to Harvard in September 1933.

I enrolled in the graduate school at Harvard and fulfilled the requirements for a doctor of philosophy degree in history in June 1937.

I have had miscellaneous courses in education at New York University, Teachers' College at Columbia University, City College, and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, from which I received a degree of master of arts in teaching in 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the years, please, when you attended these various institutions?

Mr. MARKS. Well, Harvard College 1927 to 1931; the University of Heidelberg summer session 1931; the University of Berlin 1931 to 1933; Harvard 1931, with some interruptions, to 1937.

I think I took some summer session courses in education at Harvard in 1938.

I am not sure when I took the courses in education at NYU, and at City College. I took one course in each place, but that was to have been during a period 1939 to 1941 or 1942.

Then I took some summer-session work at Harvard I think in 1944 and 1945, and received the master of arts in teaching in 1946.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your record of employment has been since you returned from Berlin in 1933?

Mr. MARKS. Well, as best I can remember it, I was in the writers' project in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Writers' project of the WPA?

Mr. MARKS. Yes.

I think that was in 1938, perhaps, and 1939.

I was employed by the New York City Board of Education from September 1939 to the end of January or February 1943. This was intermittent at times—that is, most of the time I was a substitute and if a teacher were away on leave, I would teach for the whole semester or a year.

From March 1, I think it was, 1943, to June 1946, I was employed by the school committee of the town of Amherst, Mass.

Now, there's some miscellaneous jobs I held. I don't know whether the committee is interested in that.

I taught 1 or 2 summer sessions at the Rhodes School in New York when I was in New York.

Mr. VELDE. What type of school is that?

Mr. MARKS. It is a private secretary school, college prep.

I worked one summer—I think it must have been the summer of 1943—in a lumber yard, which was an illuminating experience.

I taught part time in what I think was called the ASTP program, at what was then called Massachusetts State College and is now called the University of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do the initials "ASTP" stand for?

Mr. MARKS. Army Specialized Training Program, I think.

I assisted in teaching—perhaps I taught one summer session and assisted in teaching another at Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what year?

Mr. MARKS. Well, this would be perhaps 1945 and 1946.

I had a peculiar experience there in 1945.

Mr. VELDE. What was the nature?

Mr. MARKS. This is just anecdotal. I was helping Prof. William H. Burton, for whom I have a stupendous regard, and he was away at lunch one day in the first week of August in 1949, and a brokerage firm, I believe, telephoned while he was away at noon, and I was the only one at the office, and said, "Would you tell Professor Burton that the first atomic bomb has been dropped?"

I didn't know the first atomic bomb had been dropped. So, I took it very calmly and said, "Yes; I'll tell him."

And it wasn't until later in the afternoon when the newspapers came out that I realized what had happened.

Mr. VELDE. Was that the bomb test?

Mr. MARKS. No; this was the first one on Hiroshima.

Mr. VELDE. Oh, the first one.

Mr. MARKS. Yes, and I was the first one there who had gotten the news.

But this is not a matter of importance to this committee.

From September 1946, to date I have been employed by the University of Connecticut, teaching for the first 3 years at the Hartford branch, and since September 1949 at the main campus at Storrs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Marks, the committee has information that there were Communist Party activities under the guise of various organizations conducted at Harvard during the period that you were or appear to have been at Harvard. Were you aware of the existence of an organized group or cell of the Communist Party on the Harvard campus, or an organized group or cell of the Young Communist League at that place?

Mr. MARKS. The answer has to be located in time. During the period of my undergraduate years, I was not aware of any such organization. I did become aware and intimately aware of such an organization after my return from Europe.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of an organization was it that you were familiar with during the period of your undergraduate study?

Mr. MARKS. May I take this opportunity to explain how I became connected with it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly.

Mr. MARKS. All right.

I had seen the first several months of the Hitler regime when I was in Germany. I had seen the beginnings of the influence of fascism on the university. I had learned of the intentions of the Hitler regime with respect to rearmament, a violation of the Versailles Treaty.

I was considerably distressed at the appearance of fascism in Germany and when I returned to this country, I felt that it was being somewhat narrowly interpreted as merely an anti-Semitic move.

(Representative Kit Clardy entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. MARKS. Consequently, I was eager to explain to anyone who would listen to me that fascism was an enemy of all democratic rights, and that it was probably in the direction of war.

Mr. VELDE. I think we will have to suspend at this point until Mr. Doyle gets back because neither Mr. Clardy nor I have answered the roll.¹

(Whereupon, at 2:25 p. m., the committee recessed, to reconvene as soon as the members answered the rollcall.)

(The committee reconvened at 2:41 p. m., the following committee members being present: Representative Clyde Doyle (presiding).)

Mr. DOYLE (presiding). The committee will be in order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed, Mr. Marks?

Mr. MARKS. I think I was saying I had been distressed at the oversimplified response to Hitler, as though it were merely anti-Semitic in character, while it was actually that and a great deal more. It was opposed to human interests everywhere and tended in the direction of war; and I think I had also said that I had come back interested in trying to warn people, and at Harvard I found some students who constituted an interested youth group to whom I could speak. These were members of the National Student League, which is generally called the NSCL. So, it was easy to accept an invitation to speak to them, and it was likewise easy to join the National Student League since apparently we saw eye to eye on the matters of fascism.

Presently I became aware that the leadership of the National Student League was composed of members of the Young Communist League.

There had been a meeting of the National Student League chapter and either before or after that meeting there had been a caucus of some of the members, and I wondered what it was all about, and presently I found out that the group which was most vigorous in the leadership of the organization consisted of members of the Young Communist League; and, consequently, some time in the winter of 1933-34 I entered the Young Communist League.

¹ Rollcall vote on floor of House of Representatives.

Mr. DOYLE. How old were you then? Just about?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I was born in 1909. I would have been 24, I should say.

Subsequently—and I am not sure how many months it took after having worked in the Young Communist League at Harvard—I was invited to join the Communist Party. I think this invitation, which was somewhat more than an invitation, was extended by the district organizer of the Young Communist League at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his name?

Mr. MARKS. His name was Mack Libby—L-i-b-b-y.

My activities as a member of the Communist Party at that time were devoted, I think, exclusively to the work of the Young Communist League among students at Harvard. This also involved promoting the recruitment of members of the National Student League.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe, please, the activities of the Young Communist League at Harvard during the period that you were a member of it?

Mr. MARKS. The Young Communist League, on the whole, conducted study groups intended to acquaint the membership with the principles of communism, with the classics of Marxism, Leninism and, in general, to indoctrinate them with the viewpoint of the Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the importance to the Communist Party of attempting to organize students as members of the Young Communist League?

Mr. MARKS. I think the objective was to reach a section of the young people who possessed ideals and who were perhaps especially vulnerable through being away from home and being concerned with intellectual pursuits and who, in subsequent years, might be expected to play roles of some conceivable importance in whatever community they went. In other words, I think that they were banking on influencing a certain number of young people, with the hope that in the course of time they would become so involved emotionally and intellectually that they would be ripe for recruitment into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated the method of indoctrination was to conduct classes in Leninism and Marxism and other subjects. Did the plan contemplate also the use of speakers who came to the meetings of the Young Communist League from higher levels of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKS. I imagine so, to some extent. The group was rather autonomous, I think, in the sense that there was some feeling, I suspect, on the part, shall we say, of Mack Libby that these students were more highly educated than he was. So, I don't think he appeared very much. I think, rather, it was perhaps a little different.

Let me illustrate this. I remember one meeting, presumably against war and fascism, that was organized at MIT and, as I recall, among the speakers we were able to get a functionary of the Communist Party to speak there along with the panel of other people.

Is that what you mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Do you remember who that functionary was?

Mr. MARKS. All I remember is that his name was—wait—Johnny Weber, I think.

Mr. VELDE. Johnny Weber—W-e-b-e-r?

Mr. MARKS. W-e-b-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other instances you can recall when functionaries of the Communist Party took part in the Young Communist League meetings?

Mr. MARKS. This was not a Young Communist League meeting. This was one of those broad attempts to introduce to the general public, as far as anyone was interested in attending a meeting of general nature, a Communist who was presumably going to make a good impression.

Now, let me mention something else, though. I have no idea whether Corliss Lamont is a Communist in the organizational sense—

Mr. VELDE. Whether who?

Mr. MARKS. Corliss Lamont. But I do recall sometime in the spring of 1943 the National Student League staged a meeting for Lamont at Harvard.

Mr. VELDE. Well, as I understand it, this meeting that Mr. Weber attended and where he spoke was not a closed meeting of the Young Communist League?

Mr. MARKS. That's right.

Mr. VELDE. It was an open meeting against war and fascism; is that correct?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe for the committee just what the activities of the Young Communist League were beside the holding of study classes and the indoctrination of its members?

Mr. MARKS. Are you referring to the Harvard students—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MARKS (continuing). In the Young Communist League?

I am not sure but what some of them were asked to distribute the Daily Worker in working-class neighborhoods in Cambridge. I rather have a feeling that was part of the work. I might add they were not particularly successful.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any particular interest shown in having the members of the Young Communist League become members of the front organizations?

Mr. MARKS. Yes. The National Student League was the obvious one on the campus.

I don't know whether any of the students became members of the American League Against War and Fascism. That would have been a likely thing, had there been an organization there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you describe the operations of the Young Communist League in its effort to control the National Student League or infiltrate it?

Mr. MARKS. The Young Communist League members would caucus before a meeting. This is standard Communist practice. They used the European term "fraction," and the fraction meeting would be held before a meeting, perhaps after a meeting, for a post mortem examination of the results; but the general objective was to make sure that the proper proposals were presented in an acceptable form and that they would be passed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Young Communist League group take part in any demonstrations of any character or carry any programs of activity designed to influence outside groups?

Mr. MARKS. I don't think the students operated very much off the campus.

I could report an episode in June of 1936 in connection with the Harvard commencement, if you would care to hear about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. MARKS. The class, I assume, of 1911 was meeting for its 25th reunion, and the most notorious member of that class was Hitler's pianoplayer, Ernst Hanfstaengel.

Mr. VELDE. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. MARKS. I remember having had something to do with arranging for two girls to attend the commencement. They had some chains or handcuffs with which they latched themselves onto something immovable during the session and emitted loud outcries against Hanfstaengel and called for freeing of the German Communist leader Thaelmann.

This episode was undoubtedly bad manners, but I'm not sure that the motive was wholly bad—the motive of protest against Hitler. I think the effect was probably the opposite of what was desired.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have described the object of the Communist Party in concentrating its effort upon the organization of students into the Communist Party. Would you say they were fairly successful in attaining that object at Harvard?

Mr. MARKS. Certainly the Young Communist League never felt it was successful in the sense of creating an enormous organization. On the other hand, I think the success can be measured qualitatively by another standard—and this is one thing which causes me a great deal of remorse. Some of the people whom I had something to do with in bringing into the Communist movement turned out to be irretrievably lost.

I'm thinking in particular of one person who was a splendid young fellow at the time, a boy of high idealistic temperament and good intellect, who is known now as a full-time Communist organizer. I am referring to Boone Schirmer—B-o-o-n-e-S-c-h-i-r-m-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. MARKS. Yes. His first name was Daniel. At that time he used only Boone Schirmer, and I knew him as Boone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where Daniel Boone Schirmer is today?

Mr. MARKS. No; I do not, but I can tell you one peculiar episode in which I saw him. In the movie Paisan—P-a-i-s-a-n—which was produced, I believe, in Italy shortly after the war and made use of non-professionals in the acting, there was one episode in which American soldiers were shown supposedly operating behind the lines during the war. The scene shows a half dozen of them getting into a boat in a marsh, and I could swear that one of those soldiers was Boone Schirmer.

Mr. VELDE. When was the last time you had heard from him or of him?

Mr. MARKS. Years and years. It goes way back.

Mr. VELDE. You said he became an organizer for the Communist Party. Can you tell us something of his activities as such an organizer, where it was at that time?

Mr. MARKS. Well, he was not at that time. I read about this in Philbrick's book. At the time he was a student, and he was working in the YCL, the Young Communist League.

After that, I would say, 2 years of my work with the Young Communist League at Harvard, I dropped out of that and it was self-operating among undergraduates, and I devoted myself to Young Communist League work in other parts of the Boston area, among different groups.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you do that in other areas in Boston at the request of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKS. Yes. My entire work in the Communist Party was localized in the youth movement.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, before proceeding to discuss that, can you tell us the names of any other individuals who were members of the Young Communist League that you have reason to believe continued in the Communist Party work for any period of time after leaving Harvard?

Mr. MARKS. I can remember the names of 2 or 3 people who were active at the time, but I didn't follow them up.

Wait—there is one, I think—Larry Levy.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the first name?

Mr. MARKS. Lawrence, I assume—Larry.

Mr. TAVENNER. What can you tell us of his activity?

Mr. MARKS. I simply recall that he was, I think, the leader of the Young Communist League in Harvard after I had gone out of that particular area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other members who were affiliated with the group of the Young Communist League with which you were affiliated?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I can remember one very clearly who is no longer alive, and 2 or 3 others who I trust are alive, but I don't know anything at all about them for the past 15 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you give us the names of those who were alive?

Mr. MARKS. I assume they are alive.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MARKS. There was one very fine young fellow by the name of Alan Philbrick. When I saw Philbrick's name attached to a book, I wondered whether there was any relationship, but there is not. He left Harvard in the middle 1930's. I have no idea what happened to him subsequently, and I sincerely trust he got out early.

Herbert Robbins I remember.

There was one student in the law school who was a very nice fellow by the name of Saul Friedburg, I think. I don't know what happened to him. I think he, too, must have dropped out. I hope so.

Mr. VELDE. At this point it is necessary for me to leave; but before I do leave I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to you, Professor Marks, for your very helpful testimony which you are giving at the present time and I am sure you will complete before the hearing is over.

Mr. MARKS. Well, I appreciate the opportunity for me to testify in executive session. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. MARKS. There are some other names, faces, to whom I can attach no names at the moment. There was one fellow whose first name I remember—Paul—but I can't remember any more.

I ought to mention Eugene Bronstein's name, who was a brilliant student of philosophy, came to Harvard to pursue graduate studies. He had been graduated from City College, probably 1934 or 1935, but actually as an undergraduate published a short article on philosophy, and I'm sorry to say I induced him to enter the Communist movement and in the long run he was one of those who volunteered in 1936 or 1937 to go to Spain, and I well remember the appalling feeling I had when a news broadcast one evening, in the summer, I imagine, 1937, reported that he had been killed there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of how young men were recruited for service in Spain?

Mr. MARKS. In a vague way. The recruitment seems to have been organized by the Communist Party. I don't know the details, but the Communist Party was interested in getting young men to volunteer.

There was another boy from the Boston area, who was not in this Harvard group, who must have gone at the same time that Gene Bronstein went, and he was killed at the same time. I don't have the same feeling of personal responsibility in his case.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you were a member of this Young Communist League group for a period of 2 years. Were you a member of the Communist Party itself during any of that period of time?

Mr. MARKS. I imagine for the bulk of that time. That is, I think the period of time during which I was only a member of the Young Communist League was probably no more than 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Young Communist League used as a recruiting ground for membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKS. It certainly was.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was that done?

Mr. MARKS. In the first place, it was important to indoctrinate young people with the idea that the Young Communists and nobody else had the right answers to all kinds of problems.

In the second place, it was desirable to test out a person's loyalty through the willingness to engage in the dull, routine activities of peddling the Daily Worker, distributing mimeographed leaflets or participating in May Day parades, and so on and so forth.

I don't think there was any great rush to move people from the YCL to the Communist Party if they were still at an early age, and I suspect that probably people had to be in their 20's before they would have been welcomed in the Communist Party; and probably in most cases even there, if they were fairly young and could work with young people, their membership in the Communist Party was used as an additional mode of discipline, so that their work remained essentially the same—that is to say, attempting to influence youth while they were more subject to direct orders than they had been in the Young Communist League.

In the Young Communist League presumably the members would be asked whether they wanted to do something, such as distributing leaflets, and in the Communist Party a member would be expected to. He would not be asked. He might be asked, but this would be a formality, like the command performance would be for a queen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, after you became a member of the Communist Party, did you meet with any particular cell or group of the Communist Party as distinguished from the Young Communist League group?

Mr. MARKS. Not that I recall. I met with the district organizer from time to time. I seem to recall that there was perhaps some sort of council, a group of people who were Communist Party members, active in youth work. I am not sure about the details. I couldn't tell you, for example, whether I paid dues separately or together.

Incidentally, might I add one minor point. This is purely semantic. I read in the newspapers of people being spoken of as card-carrying Communists. There were no cards. There was a membership book. You were not supposed to carry it.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask him a question at this time?

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. COOPER. Did you know of a book kept by the treasurer or secretary with the names in it at that time?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I assume that every—

Mr. COOPER. Did you ever see one, Professor Marks?

Mr. MARKS. Probably.

Mr. COOPER. Will you think about that a minute?

Mr. MARKS. Surely.

Mr. COOPER. Did you ever see a book with your name in it?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I—I can't answer you that on the basis of a photographic recollection. If you are suggesting that there were pseudonyms that were used, or numbers, or some sort of key, so that my name didn't appear, but a symbol was entered in some book, I can't answer you that. I don't remember. All I know is that at meetings of the unit, or whatever the name happened to be for the organization, the basic organization of the Communist movement at the time, there was always a treasurer who collected dues; and I seem to recall of some sort of record whether or not dues were being paid and kept up to date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the treasurer of the group that you remember?

Mr. MARKS. I have no recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall to whom you paid dues at any time?

Mr. MARKS. No; I can't remember that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of the work to which you were assigned in the youth movement after you ceased to become active in the Young Communist League?

Mr. MARKS. It was chiefly work that was called educational, in the sense that I generally went to the meetings of other groups in the greater Boston area. Sometimes I conducted classes in which young people read various of the pamphlets that were available on Marxism, Leninism, on the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, on the pamphlet—discussions of pamphlets dealing with contemporary American problems and international problems.

Let me add one thing: For a short time I taught a class in the school that the party ran in Boston at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of that school?

Mr. MARKS. It didn't have any name at that time, as far as I remember it. It was not dressed up with the name of some American hero, outstanding note, in order to lend it a patriotic air. It may have had some designation, but that slips my mind at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other teachers in that same school at the time you taught?

Mr. MARKS. I think the other teachers were generally party functionaries, people like this Weber that I've mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the names of others who taught in that school besides Weber?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I think the Communist district organizer at that time, whose name was Sparks, was a very effective teacher.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his first name?

Mr. MARKS. His first name was Nehemiah, but he felt that in public appearances that would be too difficult a name for people to understand and he, consequently, was often introduced at a public meeting as Ned Sparks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether that was the same person as Nemmy Sparks?

Mr. MARKS. I've heard that nickname applied to him. He was, by training, incidentally, I think, a chemist because I remember once he explained to me the meaning of octane ratings in gasoline.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us more of what you know about his activities?

Mr. MARKS. Well, the activities of a district organizer of the Communist Party are something like the appearance of an iceberg. That is to say, you see perhaps one-sixth or one-seventh of them. That was the part that I saw of them. The bulk of his activities were not invisible. Such activities consisted of intermeetings, education reports, and the like.

They had some system of couriers whereby they received directives—I believe that would be the word—from the central committee in New York. I have no idea how that was handled—whether there was a bus driver or—they were not committed to the mails—whether there was a bus driver on the New York-to-Boston route, or some trainman, or something of that sort. I doubt whether they had any money to pay somebody just to travel back and forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time were you acquainted with Mr. Sparks?

Mr. MARKS. I couldn't say for sure. He was the district organizer at the time I entered the Communist movement in 1934, and he was subsequently replaced. Now, I don't remember when.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he went from your school area?

Mr. MARKS. I think he went to the Middle West.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the address of the school at which he taught?

Mr. MARKS. I could tell you how to find the place in Boston. There was a short street, which may have been a blind alley, off Washington Street, near Essex. I don't remember the—it would be in the telephone book at that time. I don't remember the number or the name of the street. It was up one flight of long, narrow stairs, a dinky 2- or 3-room collection of offices.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, can you give us the names of any of the persons who taught at that school?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I think of the people that were active after Sparks left—Sidney Bloomfield, for example.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you spell the last name?

Mr. MARKS. B-l-o-o-m-f-i-e-l-d.

The Young Communist League organizers taught there—Mack Libby; a repulsive female by the name of Loretta Starr—S-t-a-r-r—and the last—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did both of those persons attend Young Communist League meetings at which you were present?

Mr. MARKS. Yes.

The last Young Communist League organizer that I knew was Dave Grant. I have no idea where he went.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe in general the activities of those persons who were organizers, including Loretta Starr?

Mr. MARKS. I can describe what I saw of them. They were intermediaries between the headquarters in New York on the one hand and the local Communist Party leadership on the other in transmitting directives to the Young Communist League organizations in the area.

Incidentally, a side point just occurred to me. I think at that time the Communist Party was organized into districts which corresponded to—

Is it Army districts? Is that the term that I want?

For example, Governor's Island is the headquarters of some Army district.

I think the United States has divided up into districts corresponding to that.

I can draw—

Mr. TAVENNER. They may have had areas instead of districts?

Mr. MARKS. It simply is a side point, which occurs to me, and may have no value whatever.

The activities of an organizer of the Young Communist League were on the whole, I think devoted to strengthening and extending the scope of Communist youth activities. This involved introducing members of the Young Communist League into organizations of a non-Communist nature.

Some of these organizations were, in effect, sponsored by the Communist Party or perhaps the word "instigated" or "hatched" may be better, such as the American League Against War and Fascism. In such an organization, there would always be a core, a fraction, of young Communists if this organization had anything to do with youth.

On the other hand, there were organizations that were not under Communist influence, such as the YMCA, and the YWCA, and similar organizations. Members of the Young Communist League were expected to enter these, to join in their various activities and to make friends with friends with people who were of their age and in these organizations. The object was, in the long run, to influence these

members and, if possible, these organizations, so that at national conferences, if it was possible to get a member of the Young Communist League elected as a delegate from one of these perfectly innocent organizations to attend a national gathering of an organization which, as a whole, was perfectly innocent and in the clear, it might be possible to influence the resolutions of such an organization in such a way as to lead them to conform to some immediate objectives which the Communists had in mind.

In view of the fact that in the 1930's the Soviet Union was weak—it was, therefore, in favor of peace; since they had little in the way of armament, they were in favor of disarmament—and in view of the fact that the vast majority of the American people have been in favor of peace and generally have been loath to expend vast sums of money on a permanent military organization, it was possible for them to strike an echo among young people who had no attachment to communism, who did not identify these people as Communists and who would presumably have spurned them had they known who they were.

MR. TAVENNER. Was it not also the purpose of the Communist Party to add membership to the Communist Party through such influences?

MR. MARKS. Certainly. If it was possible to find individuals in these innocent organizations who appeared to be interested in discussion, it would be possible to organize a study group which might have no overt Communist sponsorship and no overt Communist direction, yet, on the basis of study and the assiduous cultivation of personal friendships, people would be brought closer to the Communist Party, perhaps initially enlisted in one of the less obvious organizations, and in the long run induced to join the Communist Party, if they could be brought to take the full dose.

The whole procedure was particularly perfidious because it depended upon exploiting the perfectly admirable ideals which many people harbored in connection with anti-Fascist feelings, in connection with a desire to preserve the peace, in connection with a desire to provide employment, and the like; and what the Communists did was take hold of these ideas and pervert them to their own ends.

Mind you, I don't say they were opposed to peace in 1930; but this was purely coincidental and happened to match the interests of the Soviet Union at that time.

MR. TAVENNER. Did this Young Communist League group or the Communist Party itself endeavor to exert its influence over the American Youth Congress, to your knowledge?

MR. MARKS. I think so.

Let me—could you refresh my memory as to what the American Youth Congress was?

MR. COOPER. The American Youth Congress, Professor, was an organization of the students of all the schools—that is, of all the young college students. They were chartered, and one of their first presidents of it was Cavin.

MR. MARKS. Cavin?

MR. COOPER. Cavin—Joseph Cavin—and later they elected Jack McMichael.

Now, I will ask you now: Do you know Jack McMichael?

MR. MARKS. Not the name. I never heard the name, as I recall.

Mr. COOPER. When the American Youth Congress would hold their meetings or their—

Mr. MARKS. Conclaves.

Mr. COOPER. Conclaves, at different places, always there were certain ones of the Young Communist League that infiltrated into this meeting. Among those was a man by the name of Quill.

Did you know Michael Quill?

Mr. MARKS. I've read about him in the newspapers in connection with the Transport Workers' Union in New York.

Mr. COOPER. You say you have never heard the name Jack McMichael?

Mr. MARKS. No.

Mr. COOPER. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. COOPER. At every meeting they always had a representative there to speak, and I just wondered whether you had any knowledge, since you were in New York City at the time, at the time this was taking place, in 1939, 1940, 1941.

Mr. MARKS. I was in Staten Island, Mr. Cooper.

Have you ever been in Staten Island?

Mr. COOPER. No; I haven't.

Mr. MARKS. Staten Island, where I lived, was about as far from Times Square as New Haven.

Mr. COOPER. Well, I meant, though, you were in the public school there.

Mr. MARKS. Staten Island is more like a rural community than a borough of the city.

I was unaware of any of these things. I was not a member of the Communist movement at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated earlier in your testimony that while a member of the Communist Party you worked in the youth movement by attending, by lecturing at various groups throughout the Boston area. Can you tell the committee more about the nature of those groups which you addressed?

Mr. MARKS. As I recollect them, they were generally neighborhood organizations. That is to say, there would be perhaps 2 or 3 organizations in Roxbury.

One of the great griefs that the Communists had at that time was that they were unable to get a foothold among the employed youth. They would have liked to have had organizations that were among young people who were employed in important industries.

Actually, I think probably employment was a prophylactic against Communist membership.

Among the unemployed, therefore, or people who were still attending school, or young people who had paper routes, casual employment of that sort, it was necessary to organize them on a neighborhood basis; and, consequently, these people met, I think, once a week and there would be an agenda, which would usually have some item concerning recruitment, and particularly the retention of members who had dropped out. The turnover was tremendous.

Then, there would be some sort of political discussion, and possibly an outsider, like myself, an outsider in the sense of not being a member of that particular outfit, who would come along, prepared to dis-

cuss some point, politics, or some socialistic theory, or something of that sort.

Frankly, it must have been terribly dull and I can understand why the turnover was as great as it was, although at the time it seemed difficult to understand because the Communists were convinced that they had the answers to all problems. These answers were founded upon the positive achievements of the only verifiable social science that has ever existed—to wit, that founded by Marx and Engels, perfected by Lenin and carried on by Stalin.

So, those of us who were imbued with this emotional orientation were apt to be totally unaware of the actual interests of American young people.

The effect was, actually, trying to import an ideology whose terminology even was foreign—the use of the word “fraction,” as I have suggested, instead of caucus; the attempt to appeal to the toiling masses.

Can you imagine a group of American factory workers listening to anyone talking to them about the toiling masses?

Mr. DOYLE. But it appealed to you?

Mr. MARKS. Because I was not a member of the toiling masses. I was a student.

Mr. DOYLE. What was there about it that appealed to you in the emotional orientation that you speak about? Why did it get you for a time?

Mr. MARKS. That seems to me to be something where perhaps I can make a contribution to the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't mean to have interrupted your line of questioning.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; that is all right.

Mr. MARKS. No; I think perhaps that is the one thing where I can make some personal observations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you——

Mr. MARKS. It seems to me——

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask——

Mr. MARKS. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). This, to see if I am correct. You by this time were 25 or 26 years of age?

Mr. MARKS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. You were fairly mature?

Mr. MARKS. I was older.

Mr. DOYLE. You were unusually mature.

Mr. MARKS. I would say older, but mature—I wonder in retrospect.

Mr. DOYLE. But your brain had been wonderfully trained. You had been to Heidelberg. You had been to Germany.

Mr. MARKS. That's true.

Mr. DOYLE. You had gone through Harvard College.

Mr. MARKS. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. What was it that got you, with all that fine brain training, to get you to be a youth leader in the Communist Party? Why did you do it?

Mr. MARKS. That is—that's the central issue.

Mr. DOYLE. Were you paid for it?

Mr. MARKS. No; I was not paid for it.

Mr. DOYLE. You donated your time?

Mr. MARKS. Exactly.

Mr. DOYLE. And your transportation expense—

Mr. MARKS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. If you went any place.

Why did you do it?

Mr. MARKS. It seems to me one of the things we have to recognize—and I say this as a person who is in contact with college students all the time—one of the things we have to recognize is the extent to which young people are accessible to ideals.

Mr. DOYLE. What do you mean by "ideals"?

Mr. MARKS. One of the things that the Communists have done over a period of 50 years has been to take the finest ideals of western civilization, use the words that are used in the Halls of Congress, from pulpits, in the finest of books, the same words, mind you, such as "democracy", and pervert them to their own ends.

Now, I was in favor of democracy, and I still am; but I have come to understand that what the Communists mean when they say democracy, is its opposite.

I was in favor of peace. I am in favor of peace today.

The Communists have never been pacifists. The Communists were in favor of peace in the situation that developed in the 1930's when it appeared that Russia was in danger both in the east and in the west by Japan and by Germany. Therefore, they were in favor of peace. It was purely tactical, as we can see today.

They were opposed to fascism. I was opposed to fascism. Most of the American people, I assume, came to oppose fascism—and the Second World War is testimony to that effect.

I wanted answers to questions on philosophy, economics.

Remember the mid-1930's, when we had poverty in the midst of plenty. There was a great deal of unemployment, and students who were not directly, themselves, the victims of the depression tended to have, perhaps for that very reason, a sense of guilt, a sense of responsibility.

I think perhaps it might be comparable to the feelings which motivated Russian youth in the 1870's to undertake conspiracies against the Czar. They were the sheltered offspring of the beneficiaries of an autocratic system. Their minds were exposed to the ideals of the west. Consequently, they felt a feeling of guilt at enjoying the benefits which they had received.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you feel that?

Mr. MARKS. I think I must have had a similar feeling.

Mr. DOYLE. But you were not youth; you were a man.

Mr. MARKS. All the more reason, I think, for my feeling. I must do something to help my fellow man.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you said you were seeking the answers.

Mr. MARKS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. You must have then arrived at the point where you felt you had the answers.

Mr. MARKS. I certainly did.

Mr. DOYLE. So you were no longer seeking for the answers.

Mr. MARKS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. You concluded the Communist Party had the answers.

Mr. MARKS. Absolutely.

Mr. DOYLE. So you were no longer philosophizing.

Mr. MARKS. That is precisely the point. That's what makes it deplorable.

It seems to me if you overlook the appeal which the Communists have, based upon an all-inclusive philosophy, if you want to call it that, although it debases the term which has an honorable lineage, then we miss one of the points which explains the appeal of communism to intellectuals. They have a coherent and superficially plausible explanation of everything from causality in philosophy to genetics; they have their own cosmology; they have their own theories with respect to literature, with respect to music.

To people who are baffled—to people who want a coherent outlook—this is plausible precisely because they use so many of the terms that we use in a democratic society.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, is part of the reason why men like you, with the brain training you had, adopt communism because they were so inferior that you couldn't understand it and therefore you encompassed it?

Mr. MARKS. I don't think—

Mr. DOYLE. Were you looking for an escape of some sort in your own lack of comprehension?

Mr. MARKS. I don't think you're being just to the appeal which Communists have; that is to say, it is much more plausible if you shut your mind to other things. If you shut your mind to critics, if you shut your mind to objective analysis of what the Communists are doing, it is much more plausible.

Mr. DOYLE. But these younger men, much younger than you, couldn't comprehend the ultimate of communism. They were not mature enough, were they, at 18?

Mr. MARKS. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what was it about communism that attracted them, then? Why did they encompass a foreign ideology?

What was there in communism that democracy, under which they were born and raised, didn't have?

Mr. MARKS. Let me illustrate the thing by contrast: In the 1930's these students could look at the United States and see that we were in the throes of a depression. We had between 12 and perhaps 15 million unemployed. We looked at the Soviet Union and they told us that since 1931 there had been no unemployment. They had, you see, supposedly a rational organization of their economy.

Now, planned economy is something which has a certain appeal to a person who is not engaged in business life, who has no job, who sees people abstractly as students are apt to see them.

That's one reason why I said people who were employed were in part insulated against the Communist appeal and, consequently, they were not in the position to feel that unless the system were changed radically nothing could become of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Excuse me.

Mr. MARKS. The Communists argued you couldn't reform, which, of course, we have disproven.

Mr. DOYLE. Excuse me for interrupting, Counsel. That is something that just occurred to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is quite all right.

Mr. MARKS. May I go on to one further point?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MARKS. I have a course which I teach in the history of Europe since 1918, in the course of which obviously we have to discuss communism and fascism. In the last 2 or 3 lectures in the course I devote to a comparison of communism and fascism, and I point out to the students that the very things which we abhor in fascism we find exemplified in the Soviet Union—almost everything, except the lingo.

The Fascists openly damned democracy. The Communists appropriated the term, perpetrated the opposite of democracy and called it democracy; and that seems to me to be the particular perfidious character of communism—that it takes ideals of western civilization, the Judean-Christian tradition, and makes use of these to mislead people.

Mr. DOYLE. How do you define fascism, as you used the term, contrasted with communism or democracy?

Mr. MARKS. I should say fascism was the sort of social system that was set up in Italy, in Germany, beginning in 1922 in Italy and 1933 in Germany, in which a rather small group of the people, consisting generally of the military, bureaucracy, the reactionary landlords, some of the biggest representatives of big business, but not business in general, and a party membership which consists of opportunists, political gangsters, ne'er-do-wells, and the like—this coalition ruling ruthlessly over the vast bulk of the population, exploiting the middle class, exploiting the intellectuals, exploiting peasantry, exploiting business people who were not of the biggest category.

So far as the Communists were concerned, they had done away with one or two sections of the groups that were beneficiaries of fascism—that is to say big landlords of prewar Russia and the old class, the capitalists. In their place, you have the vast bulk of the population, exploited fundamentally by a new bureaucracy, which is just as ruthless, just as brutal, just as fraudulent in its ideology as the Fascists, but in the use of their language very different and, consequently, I think, able to persuade a certain number of people for a certain length of time that there is a profound difference between the two.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any Fascist movement in this country now that you would identify?

Mr. MARKS. Well, only in the region of psychosomatics, if you will permit a word, is near a crackpot fringe. I would say it does not strike me as being serious.

Mr. DOYLE. Is that movement subversive in the same manner, substantially the same, as communism is?

Mr. MARKS. I would say subversive in the sense that it is opposed to the general outlook, the bulk of America, but dangerous, I doubt.

They don't have 175 divisions behind them.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, one chief distinction that you are making between communism and fascism is that the Communists subverted many of the terms and principles used in a democracy to a purpose for which they were not designed?

Mr. MARKS. Exactly, and let me add, too, that we have the weakness of our virtues.

It seems to me one of the great virtues that we have is diversity, so that we have many possible answers to serious questions.

Now, the Communists have one answer, and to some people that is very desirable. They want to be embraced in some enfolding symbol. Stalin was an illustration of that. In a sense, he was a father image, and he was openly cultivated as such.

There is some hope now that the disappearance of that image there may bring serious dissension within the Soviet Union. They have not been able to replace that symbol by another.

MR. DOYLE. You said you were teaching in classes comparative fascism and democracy and communism. What is your appraisal or evaluation of whether or not the young people in your classes, any of them, became attracted to communism through the comparison that you taught?

MR. MARKS. I very much doubt if anyone did.

As far as I know, I have had one Communist in my classes. He thought he was a Marxist. He took this particular course, incidentally, and he did a term paper for me. I forget what it was about, but he attempted to give a Marxist analysis, or something or another, and it was very poor Marxism. He subsequently ran for some State office on some third-party ticket.

MR. DOYLE. May I ask one more question here: In your classes do you feel there is a sense of dissatisfaction on the part of the American students with democracy?

MR. MARKS. Definitely not.

I think there is another situation which some people have found more current than I. Some members of the faculty think that students, on the whole, are apathetic. I think they are not as apathetic as perhaps would be alarming, but I think we've got to appeal to their ideals.

MR. DOYLE. But you were dissatisfied, you and the rest of those people who were young Communists. Was that because of conditions at that time?

MR. MARKS. I think so.

MR. DOYLE. If those conditions recurred, would you find the same interests in a foreign ideology such as communism?

MR. MARKS. I don't think so.

Don't you think the various measures which we have adopted to, in the first place, level out the fluctuations of the business cycle and, in the second place, to cushion the impact where these fluctuations occur have given people the feeling that society is on their side?

I don't think there would be very much feeling of exclusion from society.

I think that one of the things which is important is that people know—students, young people, employed, unemployed, housewives, and the like—it's important that these people know that they are of some concern to other people, and I think that the transformation of the United States in the last 15 or 20 years has given people that feeling of belonging.

MR. DOYLE. Well, excuse me for interrupting your line of questioning.

MR. TAVENNER. We had one witness who appeared before this witness and testified as to his prior Communist Party membership, and in the course of his testimony he stated if he had been taught in college a proper course in comparative governments he probably never would have joined the Communist Party because he didn't understand the

subject in the proper light, in a comparative way. What is your judgment about that?

Mr. MARKS. I don't think there is any one course that should be required of everyone in order to inoculate them against this disease, but it does seem to me that this is one approach, which is essential. It seems to me that we have got to teach young people about communism. Now, whether it is done on a comparative basis, which is in a sense what I do in this history course, or whether it is done in another course—say a course in Russian history—or whether it is done in a course on political parties, or whether it is done in a course of music—presumably you could deal with Communist theories about music, which, I confess, I found utterly unintelligible—

Mr. DOYLE. Or art.

Mr. MARKS. Or art or literature—any one of those things I think should serve toward the same goal.

But I want to express this point: That we must not ignore this any more than we must ignore cancer.

I think that analogy was one which Mr. Conant used some years back.

We must study it and, furthermore, we must explain it.

Mr. DOYLE. Beginning at what grade in school would you suggest it be studied or begin to be taught?

Mr. MARKS. I think possibly in the high school. I don't think in the grammar school age you get very much attention at anything of that sort, but in many schools throughout the country there is a 9th or 10th grade course in civics. It seems to me a little bit could be done there, quite legitimately.

Mr. TAVENNER. That brings me to the next question of whether or not a person who is a member of the Communist Party and subject to its directives and subject to the discipline of the Communist Party should be entrusted with the teaching of that subject or any other subject?

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Tavenner, having been a Communist myself, my feelings on this question are a bit different from that of some of my colleagues who have never been Communists. Some of them think that being a Communist merely means espousing a divergent ideology, such as a different philosophy, a different outlook, a different political theory. That seems to me to be dead wrong. A Communist is a person who is expected to dedicate himself to a movement, the center of which is not in the United States.

I don't mean that every member of the Communist Party is fully aware of this, and I have merely to mention my own experience. It took me time to realize this.

Mr. DOYLE. How long did it take you? When did you wake up to the fact?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I should say that, in the first place, I became a non-Communist before I became an anti-Communist.

I don't think during the war I was anti-Communist. It would have meant opposing our ally; but the behavior of the Soviet Union after the war was not only impossible to square with any of their own statements of ideals and objectives—my own feeling about Yalta is that the difficulty has not been with the agreement, but with the execution thereof, or perhaps we should have been more sophisticated and real-

ized there wouldn't have been any possible fulfillment as the pledge of free elections.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the violation of it?

Mr. MARKS. I think so.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, what year, though, did you come to a realization that you must become a non-Communist?

Mr. MARKS. That was in 1938 or—

Mr. DOYLE. And what year—

Mr. MARKS. I became anti-Communist after the war.

Mr. DOYLE. Let's hear about it.

Mr. MARKS. Well, I would say it was a gradual process, whereby I shed one delusion after another; and the experiences which the United States had and the United Nations had with Communist incursions in Greece, in Iran; the attitude of the Communists toward the Marshall plan, the frustration of all attempts to secure the fulfillment of the Yalta pledges, the coups in the satellite countries, one after another—all of this made me aware that it was not enough to be non-Communist, but it was important to be anti-Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. I see.

Mr. MARKS. May I—

Mr. DOYLE. What year would that be?

Mr. MARKS. I would say 1947, 1948.

Mr. DOYLE. Why didn't you look up this committee before now or some other Government agency and help us in this fight of anticommunism if you have felt that feeling ever since 1947 or 1948?

Mr. MARKS. Well, to tell the truth, my initial feeling about these committees was very dubious, and I wondered whether or not the committee was proceeding in a way which was going to be effective.

I think there has been a change in attitude, particularly in the last 6 months in the academic community. I think the general—may I use the word "professional"—approach to the problem which this committee has exhibited has reassured members of the academic community, I think.

Now, as far as I, myself, am concerned, I should explain this as follows: I have had a feeling of revulsion. I have repressed all of this.

Mr. Cooper presented me in the most courteous way possible with a subpoena, and I didn't feel distressed. He was reassuring in his manner, and I had something in the neighborhood of 3 weeks to go prying around in my subconscious and, believe me, it wasn't easy. In the first place, it was quite apparent that I was not very bright in not coming to a realization as early as I should have of the actual nature of the organization to which I had belonged. In the second place, I had a feeling that this was all a rather revolting thing, which lay 15 years in the past.

I didn't remember Johnny Weber's name until you asked me the question today, but I have been turning over things in my mind; and, consequently, until I received the subpoena, I had put this so far from me that—it was disgusting to me to think about it.

May I show you these?

For a time in 1949 and 1950 I received some books to review for the Hartford Courant, and I reviewed three books concerning the Soviet Union, in which I think my point of view is quite clear.

May I show them to you?

Mr. TAVENNER. In these book reviews, do you take an anti-Communist approach to the subject?

Mr. MARKS. I think that is apparent in them; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think it may be well——

Mr. DOYLE. Can these be filed with the record, or do you have other copies?

Mr. MARKS. I don't have any other copies.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we request permission to file these reviews and to have them photostated and return the originals to the witness?

Mr. MARKS. That will be agreeable.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. MARKS. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE. All right; that will be done.

Do you figure, Professor, your going through the processes that you did could be multiplied by a majority of men in the educational field with their past experiences?

Mr. MARKS. No; I would say there was no majority that has gone through this.

Mr. DOYLE. No; no.

Mr. MARKS. You mean of those who had been implicated?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; the majority of the men who had been in the Communist Party.

Mr. MARKS. Well, you are in a position better than mine to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. But you are in the educational field, and that is the limit of my question—to men in the educational field. Would you anticipate that they——

Mr. MARKS. I would say—anticipate that, but I have no evidence.

Mr. DOYLE. No; I realize that.

Mr. MARKS. I should think so, and from the reports I have read there seems to be a fairly widespread phenomenon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record just a moment.

(Off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Marks, you were describing to the committee the change of opinion that you reached regarding the Communist Party. You have described in a general way the differences between fascism and communism and how communism subverted many of the phrases of democracy and principles of democracy to their own purposes, and then, finally, how you had concluded, as a result of subsequent events, that such subversion had taken place, with the resulting change of opinion on your own part as to the Communist Party movement.

Now, do you have anything further in regard to that?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I should probably go into the part which is personally the most difficult to deal with. In connection with my passing the examination for a teacher in training in the New York City high schools, my name must have appeared in a list published in the newspapers, I assume, in the fall of 1938, as the recipient of such license.

I have to identify my father at this point.

My father was a member of the board of examiners of the Board of Education of the City of New York, which had no bearing, of

course, upon my taking the examination, but I received a letter from him early in January 1939, in which he described how a colleague of his on the board of examiners, subsequent to the publication of the teacher-in-training list, had received an anonymous telephone call, a male voice, saying, "You have Harry Marks' name on your list of teachers in training. Do you know that Harry Marks is a Communist?"

The member of the board of examiners tried to find out who this person was who was speaking to him on the telephone. He simply hung up; said it was the press, or some such thing.

This colleague of my father's mulled the thing over for a day or two and then asked my father what truth there was to it. My father did not know, and consequently he wrote me this letter which, as I say, I received in the early part of January. I can date the thing because his birthday was January 11, and I remember it was not a very happy birthday that I could wish him.

This was the point when the roof caved in, so to speak.

Following 1936 my activities in the Communist movement had diminished somewhat. I was not as red hot as I had been 2 or 3 years, 2 years prior, and I considered what the consequences would be if I answered yes, I was a Communist. The effect upon my father would have been disastrous; the effect upon my family would have been disastrous. Consequently, I replied that I had been a Communist, but that I had dropped out in 1936. This was the jolt which effectively severed organizational ties with the Communist Party.

I went to New York, the board gave me a hearing, and eventually they granted the license, that is, teacher training. I went to New York in the summer of 1939. I never had any organizational connection with the Communist Party since.

I have thought, in considerable anguish, during the past 2 or 3 weeks about what conceivable effect there would have been had I answered otherwise, and I confess I am appalled. Either way, it looked to me like, in retrospect, disaster.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you have had no organizational connection with the Communist Party since 1938?

Mr. MARKS. That is correct, or perhaps 1939, January, there; I do not know.

I would say I have been clear and free for 14 years.

Mr. DOYLE. Have they tried to get you back in in any way?

Mr. MARKS. They tried in 1939, but, thanks very largely to the encouragement of my wife, I resisted.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, if it became to repugnant to you, why did—

Mr. MARKS. It did not become repugnant to me as much as it later became.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I hope you realize, Professor, when I ask you such a blunt question, that I am not shooting a dart at you. I am trying to get—

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Doyle, I—

Mr. DOYLE. I'm trying to get you to make an appraisal of whatever it is which will be helpful to us in our study.

Mr. MARKS. I understand that, and I think we're on the same side in this whole issue.

I think it's important to understand the difficulty of an intellectual once you are really involved in it.

Mr. DOYLE. Does that enter into the position so many of the intellectuals take before our committee, for instance, and plead the fifth amendment?

Mr. MARKS. I have tried to figure out why they do it. I think there are probably several motives. One of them is probably this feeling of nausea, which came over me, and I found it pretty desperate, so I decided the only thing to do was to tell the whole story, including this part about my father, which is not easy to tell.

I think that is one explanation.

I think another explanation lies in some sort of quixotic feeling that there is something dishonorable in mentioning other people's names, and frankly, I expect various of my colleagues who are not Communists on the campus at Storrs will think very poorly of me for talking to you this way. They have an abstract idea of what a Communist is. I know better. I think in a certain sense I probably know more about communism than I would possibly have known in any academic way. I probably am able to explain this particular point, which I mentioned before, of the way in which the Communists pervert ideals better than people who have not been through this miserable experience.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, is the reason they have this quixotic idea of what communism is because they do not know enough about it?

Mr. MARKS. I think so.

Mr. DOYLE. Therefore they condemn men like you for being friendly to this committee in giving names?

Mr. MARKS. I think they would. I think it might be a good thing if they knew more about the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. You have given two reasons there in answer to my question as to why—

Mr. MARKS. They plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, and what other reason?

Mr. MARKS. Well, the other obvious reason is that they are afraid of actually incriminating themselves because of some action which they may have done in the past. Conceivably some of them still may be Communists. I do not know.

Mr. DOYLE. When you say some action in the past, you mean the fact they joined the Communist Party is the action?

Mr. MARKS. Conceivably, or suppose I had something to do with Gene Bronstein's going to Spain, and had thereby violated some law. That would presumably be an incriminating act, would it not?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am thinking, primarily, for instance, of men of the intellectual field, the field of education. There would not be many of those deliberately violating some law with communism, would there?

Mr. MARKS. No, I do not think so. I think probably the most significant general feeling is and has been expressed by some fairly notable people, including Professor Einstein, that this committee is an inquisition, that is attempting to interfere with academic freedom.

I think Einstein is dead wrong. I think the editorial of the New York Times that day or the next day fairly well answers the point.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I would say, would you not, Counsel, if the professor were in a public session instead of this executive session, we would have asked you substantially the same question. Do you feel the way—

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Doyle—

Mr. DOYLE. Do you feel the way we have questioned you is any interference with academic freedom?

Mr. MARKS. No, but I think if it would have been in public, it would have had very serious effects.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I realize that, sir. I am only getting to the point of Einstein or any other person who thought we were trying to interfere with academic freedom. We certainly are not.

Mr. MARKS. That I can see.

Mr. DOYLE. But how are we ever going to get at our assignment by Congress to uncover the subversive programs and elements to the daylight of patriotic American citizenship unless we do question people, without thought of academic freedom? In other words—

Mr. MARKS. Well, you have acquired whatever information I can give you, but it seems to me that the university would be subjected to a certain amount of public pressure.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. MARKS. To say nothing of the effects on my family. I happen to have a 16-year-old daughter who is, at this moment, attending the Laurels Girl's State. I have told her about my implications in the Communist movement, but it seems to me it would be a shocking experience for a girl like that to have this testimony, which I have given this committee, made public. It would be distressing.

Mr. DOYLE. Have we time yet where I can, in addition to your questions, ask the professor's idea about the question I usually ask, have you any recommendation or suggestion as to our procedure?

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not think you completed your answer to a question I asked you earlier in your testimony about the advisability of a person teaching who was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MARKS. I started—

Mr. TAVENNER. And subject to its directives and the discipline of the party.

Mr. MARKS. We have had long, repeated, and serious discussion in the University of Connecticut Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, on this issue. I have, as emphatically as I could, presented the point of view that a member of the Communist Party ought not to teach.

We have diverged in the chapter on that point, and I have gone along with the endorsement of a resolution which says in effect that political affiliation alone shall not constitute grounds for dismissal, but that actions alone would constitute evidence leading to dismissal.

Now, the reason for my feeling that there is no contradiction between this point which my colleagues have been feeling strongly about and which was represented in the Chicago resolutions of the national annual meeting of the AAUP is because I think that a Communist must be active and, consequently, presumably disclose himself. This may not be easy to demonstrate.

Incidentally, I also have felt again, very emphatically, that the board of trustees of the University of Connecticut acted with wisdom in adopting a resolution 2 or 3 months ago which said very simply, if I recall its wording, something like this: "We shall not engage any Communist as a teacher nor retain any Communist as a teacher."

The university went further and set up certain kinds of procedure for dealing with issues, charges that may be raised to provide for a hearing, which seems to me to be extremely wise and well thought out.

I think you have this difficulty also in this problem. There is something to be said for the point of view that some people present when they think of English universities with people like Haldane teaching, a known Communist, and these people say, "Sure, we ought to have a Communist on the staff teaching." In a sense I think that might not be very dangerous if someone were to stand up and openly say, "I am a Communist. I am a member of the Communist Party."

Students are not fools. Students can make allowances there, but this leads me to a very Quixotic position which I cannot accept, which can be stated only this way: That you should remove all unknown Communists and permit only known Communists to teach. This is ridiculous, and yet I can see the point of enabling students to identify a Communist.

MR. TAVENNER. But the Communist Party requires its members to keep their membership secret.

MR. MARKS. I suspect on the basis of what I have read in the newspapers that the Communist Party probably dissolved memberships in the universities. Don't you think so?

MR. COOPER. No.

MR. MARKS. So there would be no direct linkage. You don't think so?

MR. COOPER. No.

MR. MARKS. All right.

MR. TAVENNER. You spoke in the early part of your testimony about the tremendous turnover in membership of the Young Communist League and the work that was being done to indoctrinate the membership in Communist ideology.

Do you feel that a question of indoctrination is a necessary part of the Communist program in order to retain individuals as members of the Communist Party?

MR. MARKS. I think so. I think it involves also an emotional indoctrination. It is not purely intellectual.

It is the sense of comradeship; the use of the term "comrade" probably has gone out of style since my day, but I came back from Europe, and it meant something for me to have friends who were that close, so that there is this emotional affiliation which is not to be lost sight of.

MR. TAVENNER. During the period that you were at Harvard University there was an organization of the Communist Party within the teaching staff, according to testimony before the committee. Were you aware of the existence of such an organization while you were at Harvard?

MR. MARKS. I do not think so. I was aware, for example, that Granville Hicks came to Harvard, but I never met him. I had no idea what he did. I had nothing to do with him. I was not teaching. I suspect that organization was rather rigidly exclusive.

MR. TAVENNER. I hand you a list of persons who have been identified as having been members of the Communist Party during the course of our investigation in this field, and I will ask you to examine them and state which of them were known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. MARKS. I knew that Wendell Furry was in the American League Against War and Fascism. I did not know he was in the Communist Party. I did not know that Louis Harap was in the Communist Party, but I understood that he was very close to it.

Granville Hicks I took for granted as a member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I suggest that you only testify as to those that you personally knew were members of the party.

Mr. MARKS. I received a copy of the testimony of Herbert Robbins from Mr. Cooper. I knew that he was a member of the Young Communist League. I could not say that I knew he was a member of the Communist Party.

Boone Schirmer likewise I would have identified with the YCL rather than with the party.

I did not know most of these people.

Harry Marks, yes, I can identify him.

Most of these names are not known to me, I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Charles Hendley?

Mr. MARKS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was formerly Cooper? He was head of the public schools in New York City.

Mr. MARKS. I have seen his name in connection with, I think, the Teachers' Union, but I never knew him, never met him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Teachers' Union?

Mr. MARKS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Paul R. Zilsel?

Mr. MARKS. Yes, sir. He is a neighbor of ours.

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

Mr. MARKS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you spoke of having appeared before various groups in the Boston area, that is, groups of the Communist Party—

Mr. MARKS. And also street corners.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify any of those groups by any further description?

Mr. MARKS. I think only the Young Communist League organization and perhaps party meetings, but I do not think I spoke at any party meetings. I did not attend meetings of the Y or similar organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify any other persons affiliated with the Young Communist League group at Harvard other than those you have already mentioned?

Mr. MARKS. I have been trying to think of names, and I think I have exhausted my memory.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were directed to appear before these various groups, did you receive the direction from persons on a higher level in the Communist Party, or did you go upon invitation of the particular group?

Mr. MARKS. I think it was probably upon the direction of the district organizer of the Young Communist League.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any fraction meetings of the organizers of the Young Communist League in the Boston area?

Mr. MARKS. I can only say probably, without being able to recall a name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of any of those who were known to you to be organizers of the Communist Party, or the Young Communist League, other than those you have already mentioned?

Mr. MARKS. I am afraid not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, your work with the Young Communist League at Harvard could be summarized by saying that you were engaged in recruiting for the Young Communist League and that you were organizing for the Young Communist League.

Mr. MARKS. I think—

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that correct?

Mr. MARKS. That would be correct, regrettedly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in the work of distributing leaflets and material at the direction of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKS. Yes; I did, if I get the tense of that correct. It would be past.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MARKS. Yes. There was one notable occasion. In the summer of 1934 or 1935, when there was a strike on the west coast among the longshoremen, perhaps seamen, or both, and a meeting was organized—under whose auspices I have no notion at this time—in Boston for the purpose of discussing a sympathy strike in the port of Boston, somebody got in touch with me from the party headquarters and asked me to take part in the distribution of leaflets going to longshoremen on their way to this particular meeting.

The leaflets asked the Boston longshoremen to come out in sympathy with their west coast brethren.

I showed up at the time, received my bundle of leaflets, rather nervously stood in the street leading to the hall where the meeting was to be held. The street was virtually deserted. I may have given out 2 or 3 of these leaflets when a Boston police cruiser with two policemen in it came along and arrested me. I was charged with having littered the streets under an antilitter municipal ordinance, and appeared in court, testified, pleading not guilty, and was convicted and sentenced. I think, to pay a \$5 fine.

On principle I appealed, and in the next highest court eventually a jury trial was held, at which time I was appalled to hear one of the policemen testify that the street was littered and was virtually white as snow with the leaflets; and on the basis of that I was again found guilty and sentenced to pay a \$10 fine, which I did, and then suffered the ironic experience of coming down into the street in front of the justice building and finding that a rally was being held in the square there—it may well have been for Curley—and there was a good deal of trash, leaflets, and the like that had been distributed and thrown on the ground. There were plenty of policemen around, and nobody interfered with the distribution of that litter, and that sort of experience suggested, it seemed to me at the time, there was no justice. Also it did not inculcate a too high respect for testimony of policemen, which was not good.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. About what year was that court experience, approximately?

Mr. MARKS. I could look it up in the files and newspapers. Either in the summer of 1934 or 1935. You may remember there was a good deal of hoopla in California.

Mr. DOYLE. Who provided your attorney on your appeal?

Mr. MARKS. I was my own attorney. This was a matter of principle.

Mr. DOYLE. And how many others distributed leaflets on that occasion?

Mr. MARKS. Oh, there may have been 4 or 5. I do not know whether any of the others were picked up.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of your statement, you were busy for the Communist Party, you were recruiting youth. At what age did you try to recruit youth? How tender were they in their ages? In other words, let me ask you this: What young age does the Communist Party first begin to try to inculcate?

Mr. MARKS. I cannot answer the question with precision but at that time they began with children of tender age and recruited them into the Young Pioneers, which was molded on the Russian scale.

I think they even tried to get children in that at the age of 8 or 9, thereabouts. I think the Young Communist League had some age requirement, such as 16 or 17.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do they go from Young Pioneers into the Young Communist League?

Mr. MARKS. That was the objective; and whether they did, I cannot—

Mr. DOYLE. There was no organization between the Young Pioneers and the Young Communists?

Mr. MARKS. Not that I recall.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what sort of activities did they carry on that would attract the—how did they function in their organization to attract children into Young Pioneers, let us say?

Mr. MARKS. I think they attempted to set up a Communist parallel or surrogate for the organizations which are comparable to Boy Scouts—which, I do not recall—and the Brownies. I know the girl side of it, having two daughters.

Mr. COOPER. Cub Scouts.

Mr. MARKS. Cub Scouts; that is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, did they—

Mr. MARKS. And I think they attempt to have some sort of equivalent activities—games and so forth.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, did they have professional workers emphasizing this work?

Mr. MARKS. I do not think so.

Mr. DOYLE. All voluntary leadership?

Mr. MARKS. I assume so.

Mr. DOYLE. What about the Young Communist League? Did they have any paid workers?

Mr. MARKS. Yes; the district organizer was paid, when he got paid.

Mr. DOYLE. And did you ever attend any national convention of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKS. I do not think so. I did go to New York on one occasion. I think that was for the National Student League, though. There was a national meeting of that.

Mr. DOYLE. I was going to ask you if you were ever invited to attend any national conference or regional conference dealing with youth work in the Communist Party.

Mr. MARKS. I cannot think of anything other than the NSL, although it is possible.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, did the Communist Party pay your expenses to go to that?

Mr. MARKS. Again I do not know, but I would assume no. There was little evidence of Moscow gold in the Communist movement.

Mr. DOYLE. I have just one more question—two questions. I notice you use the term “the emotional affiliation.”

Mr. MARKS. You want me to discuss that?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that emotional affiliation, though, is based in part, at least, on secrecy—secret names and secret meetings?

Mr. MARKS. There is a romantic sort of aspect to it there. I think you are right.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what else is there that is emotional?

Mr. MARKS. I think there is an attempt to inculcate members in the Communist movement. I use that term to cover more than just the party, a feeling of absolute loyalty to the organization, and there is a strength which people acquire by affiliation to organization, whether that be to a church or to a professional association or what not. It seems to me they tried very hard to create this feeling of belonging.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, of course your high-school fraternities and sororities, where they are secret, are an example of the attractiveness. People join something secret.

May I ask you this: You have noticed—I am sure you have—the conviction the other day in the court of Honolulu, Hawaii, of these several persons there who were charged with conspiracy, and again a jury down there found them guilty. I think the fact is every American jury in the continental United States, as well as this one in Honolulu, has found the defendants guilty as charged in the indictments which charge them with violation of the Smith Act in a Federal statute referring to conspiracy to use force and violence to overthrow our Government.

Have you any comment on that? Why is it these American juries are all finding all of these defendants guilty as indicted? Because they're charged with being willing to or advocating the use of force and violence?

Mr. MARKS. Well, my own feeling in the matter is that they are more apt to use force and violence in a negative way. I do not think there is very much danger of our being ejected from the House of Representatives Office Building by Communists taking it over within the foreseeable future, not the local boys, but I do see a good deal of danger in the possible frustration of American policy by Communist action.

I am positive, for example, as positive as I can be, that if the Communists had control over the longshoremen's unions on the west coast, they would long ago have tried to stop the shipment of supplies to Korea.

Now, that is negative. It is injurious to the United States, and they might, in the event of open war between the United States and Russia, constitute a very serious obstacle to the American prosecution of the

war, but I think they would probably only have a hope of coming into power on the coattails of the Red army.

Mr. DOYLE. One more question.

Mr. MARKS. And I hope that never happens.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any suggestion to make to this committee as to our processes and procedures? You know what our assignment is, under Public Law 601, I am sure.

Have you any suggestion to make as to our procedures, as to the methods of subpoenaing our witnesses and our interviews with alleged Communists?

Have you any suggestion of any kind to make to us?

Mr. MARKS. I have various observations which I can make which you will weigh as you see fit.

Let me start out, first of all, by saying with respect to the subpoena no one could have delivered a subpoena more painlessly and in a friendlier spirit than Mr. Cooper.

This is not an experience to be dreaded.

The second point is that it seems to me that the opportunity to discourse informally, intimately with the committee on the basis which you have afforded me is going to produce testimony which is much less inhibited than testimony given in public.

As to the third point, I think that probably the committee has already focused the attention of university administrators upon the problem and I, for one, think the statement of principals that was adopted at the last meeting of the Association of American Universities was correct.

I think the committee's objective probably is to cooperate with universities and university administrations in general.

I think the easier you make it for institutions and individuals to contribute whatever information they have, the further along the committee, the individuals, the universities, education in general will be.

As for legislation, I am not sure that I can imagine what kind of legislation would be effective in dealing with this particular problem. It seems to me that the alerting of the university administrations has already exercised a beneficial influence and it might well be that this is the limit of my picture of the possible outcomes.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

That is all the questions I have.

Mr. MARKS. Well, may I thank you for a very courteous and kind hearing of the story which I am not particularly happy to relate, and I would like to thank the chairman, Mr. Velde, in his absence.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, he regretted he was called out.

Those things happen, and we can't help it.

I think if in the future you have any suggestions or observations to make, Professor, that you feel would be worthy of consideration, in your judgment, by the committee, you should submit those to us.

Mr. MARKS. I will try.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, I think I would just make this observation to you, and I do it with the realization that you can, in your vigilant, vigorous anti-Communist approach probably do much.

Mr. MARKS. I was going to say I think on the operating level teachers, like myself, can probably help a certain amount. We do see a few hundred students every year.

Mr. DOYLE. You think, then, the universities, generally speaking, as far as you can observe, from now on can probably police their own problem with reference to possible subversive people?

Mr. MARKS. I should hope so.

Mr. DOYLE. And so should I, because we alone can't do the job, and it ought to be done.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MARKS. Thank you.

(Thereupon, at 5 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

(Education—Part 6)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1953

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

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 a. m., in the Caucus Room of the House Office Building, Hon. Donald L. Jackson (acting chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order.

Who is your witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. George F. Markham. Will you come forward, Mr. Markham?

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

Do you solemnly swear that in the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Let the record show that for the purposes of this hearing the chairman has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, and Mr. Jackson as acting chairman.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE F. MARKHAM, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, HAROLD CAMMER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. MARKHAM. George F. Markham.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel, Mr. Markham?

Mr. MARKHAM. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself?

Mr. CAMMER. Harold Cammer, 9 East 40th Street, New York 16, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. MARKHAM. Independence, Wis., August 15, 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. MARKHAM. Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

Mr. MARKHAM. I am educational director in New England for the International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal education and training has consisted of?

Mr. MARKHAM. I graduated from the public schools in Independence, Wis.; a B. A. from the University of Wisconsin with honors in 1933.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your record of employment has been since the completion of your educational studies in 1933?

Mr. MARKHAM. In the summer of 1933, in July, I believe it was, I went to work for the Wisconsin Rapids Tribune, Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., as a reporter. In April 1934 I went to work for the Standard Times in New Bedford, Mass. I worked on the copy desk as a reporter, and finally as telegraph editor.

In September 1936 I went to work for the Associated Press in the Boston bureau. I was employed there until December 1939, when I resigned and went to work for the Newspaper Guild of Boston, Local 33, of the American Newspaper Guild.

I worked for them until August of 1942 when I went into the Navy. I was also employed part time—I am a little uncertain of this date—but approximately the last year of that employment I was employed also part time as legislative agent for the Massachusetts State CIO. I divided my work between the two jobs.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you discharged from the Navy?

Mr. MARKHAM. I served in the Navy, active service, until November 1945, I believe the 15th.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment after your return from service?

Mr. MARKHAM. Immediately after leaving the service in December of 1946—no; 1945—I went to work for the Massachusetts State CIO as legislative agent. I was employed by them for 1 year. At the end of that year I resigned.

In February 1947 I took up my present occupation, present job, as educational director for the New England district, employed by the New England district, of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. That is an independent union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, just what the nature of your work was while employed by the Newspaper Guild in Boston from 1939 to 1942?

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

Mr. MARKHAM. I negotiated contracts, worked on organization of unorganized newspapers. We had an arrangement that while I was employed by the Boston guild there was a New England district which had extremely limited funds that would pay expenses, and their payment of expenses would finance my operation outside of Boston where occasionally, as in the case of the Manchester, N. H., paper, I went out and conducted an organizing campaign and organized that at the time it was owned by Colonel Knox, so some of my activities

were outside the city of Boston. I negotiated contracts in places like Lynn, Salem, and so on that were already organized.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you stationed in San Diego during a part of the time that you were a member of the United States Navy?

Mr. MARKHAM. After returning from my first tour of duty I had a refresher course at Quonset Point, and then before being assigned again—I forget the dates exactly, but it was in the fall of 1944—I was assigned to Fleet Air Wing 14, I believe it was, until in December or along in there, maybe early December or late November, somewhere in there, I shipped out again on my second tour of duty.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in San Diego were you aware of the existence of a newspaper guild in that area?

Mr. MARKHAM. I cannot truthfully say I was. I assume that there was—I know that there was in Los Angeles. I know there was a very active newspaper guild in Los Angeles, and I am unfamiliar with precisely whether the San Diego paper was organized or not. I cannot recall now. I may have been aware of it at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Morgan Hull?

Mr. MARKHAM. I think I shall decline to answer that question.

Maybe I ought to consult counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. May I have the question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you repeat the question, please?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In California.

Mr. MARKHAM. My answer is "Yes."

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what connection he had with the newspaper guild in either Los Angeles or San Diego during the period of time that you were acquainted with him?

Mr. MARKHAM. No, sir; I do not. I met Mr. Hull in Boston when I was working for the guild. He was international representative for the Newspaper Guild, and we had a major organizing campaign on at the Boston Globe, and he came in to assist—if I am not mistaken, he came in a couple of times for a period of a week or more, and to the best of my recollection, that is the first time I knew him. That is where I became acquainted with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your association with him in California?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I do not know if you call it an association. I knew him as a guild official who was one of the leaders in the California area previously. I do not know whether he had any connection with the guild at all at that point.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had Mr. Hull occupied a position as a national officer of the Newspaper Guild, to your knowledge?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I say, he was international representative. They had, I forget how many, but they had a number, and he was, I guess, sort of a troubleshooter, a person of great ability who was sent around in difficult situations as we had in Boston with the Boston Globe, a very difficult organizing situation, and that was the only reason that he came in. In ordinary circumstances in the district he never would have come around.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to confer with him at any time during your tour of duty in California?

Mr. MARKHAM. I would not say I conferred with him. I met him socially.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware of the existence in California of a cell or group of the Communist Party organized within the Newspaper Guild?

Mr. MARKHAM. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Testimony has been received by the committee that Mr. Morgan Hull was one of those who organized a cell of the Communist Party among the Newspaper Guild members in California, and he has been identified as having been a member of the Communist Party group in that area. Did you have occasion while in California to meet William Oliver?

Mr. MARKHAM. All I can say—

Mr. TAVENNER. Normally referred to as "Bill Oliver."

Mr. MARKHAM. All I can say is that to the best of my knowledge, this is the first time I have heard his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Charles Judson?

Mr. MARKHAM. I cannot say I was. That name sounds sort of familiar, but—you know, I attended national conventions of the Newspaper Guild on a number of occasions. I met people from California and all parts of the country. You know how it is at a convention, and whether I met him in that way or not, I would not want to say under oath.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Urcel Daniel?

Mr. MARKHAM. I remember meeting her at at least one guild convention. I remember she was somewhat of a figure in the California guild. My recollection is she was from San Francisco. Maybe it was Los Angeles, I do not know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Urcel Daniel and Charles Judson have both testified before the committee regarding the organization of the Communist Party composed of members of the Newspaper Guild in California and the activities of that group. Do you know anything of the activities of that group of Communist Party members within the guild, Newspaper Guild, in California?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. May I have the question again, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, the answer is "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have knowledge of the fact, while you were in California, that Morgan Hull was president of the San Diego County Communist Political Association or the head of that group?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. Mr. Tavenner, I have answered questions here regarding the fact that I have knowledge of some sort of social relationship with Morgan Hull who, as I said, was a leader in the organization that I had belonged to prior to going in the Navy, but you are now getting into a realm of investigation of political associations, and I would like to say very briefly to the committee my opinion on this sort of a question, and the statement I make regarding specifically this question will apply as well to I know not what other questions in this realm you or the members of the committee have in mind.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the witness be instructed to answer the question before he makes any statement.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; it is the general custom of the committee that the question be answered first.

Mr. MARKHAM. That is what I am going to do.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness will then be given an opportunity to elaborate or explain his answer. There is, however, a question pending at the moment. The Chair directs an answer to that question previous to any statement as to the reasons for the answer.

Mr. MARKHAM. That is what I wish to do, and while it will take only a couple of minutes, I have jotted down some rather specific wording to explain my answer.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. Let us have your answer then, if you will, please, and then proceed to explain your answer in any manner you see fit.

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer this or other questions regarding my political beliefs and associations for several reasons: First of all, I do not recognize the right of Congress to question me in this field. Under the first amendment to the Constitution I am protected in my exercise of free speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion. Committees such as this are spreading fear and distrust in this great land of ours and intimidating people in their use of their rights under the first amendment. In view of big business control of the Government, the press, radio, and television, this fear by the people to speak out can destroy democracy and reduce unions to the status of company unions.

I cannot as a patriotic American do anything to assist in this attack on the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

Secondly, I believe this committee is violating the Constitution by usurping the powers of the courts and the police. It takes over the function of a grand jury. It condemns and punishes people whose views it does not like. It punishes by smears, innuendo, and hearsay evidence. It does not confront a witness with accusers who can be cross-examined. All this is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

Finally, I decline to answer this question and others like it because it invades my rights under the fifth amendment, which says that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

I use this constitutional protection in full recognition that it is a protection for the innocent as well as the guilty. I make no apologies for anything I have done. The members of my union and my friends are well able to judge what kind of a citizen I have been and am. I am proud of my 34½ years' wartime naval record in the service of my country, and my record of service for as fine a group of union men and women as exist anywhere in the world. I am aware that we live in a period of hysteria and reaction, a happy hunting ground for paid spies and liars. Even Justices of the United States Supreme Court who express their honest opinions are threatened with impeachment.

I also know that my union is a powerful one. It has an unprecedented record of achievement. Such organizations are the ones which are first and most violently attacked. In the light of all this I must invoke my rights under the fifth amendment to prevent you from forcing me to make statements that can be used as a possible link in a chain of evidence to subject me to prosecution, even though my conscience is clear, and I feel my loyalty to this country runs as deep and strong as that of any Member of Congress.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. The understanding of the Chair is that you decline to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendment of the Constitution; is that correct?

Mr. MARKHAM. The secretary has the reasons, I believe, that I gave.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the existence of a bookstore in San Diego known as the Community Book Store at 635 E Street?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the same reason. Shall I state it over again each time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Subject to the chairman's ruling, it would be satisfactory, I think, to say on the same grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. TAVENNER. While in said San Diego did you meet a person by the name of Robert Minor?

Mr. MARKHAM. Did I know a person by the name of Robert Minor in San Diego?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. The answer is "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any meeting in which Robert Minor either presided or was the speaker, while in California?

Mr. MARKHAM. I am not aware of it, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you knew Mr.——

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, let me interrupt you. I am not sure whether that last answer means he did not attend or not. I wish you would press that a little further.

Mr. MARKHAM. It is a long time ago. I want to say just flatly "No"; and maybe I should say to the best of my recollection, no.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not at all sure?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not remember attending any meetings, public meetings, where people were giving speeches.

Mr. JACKSON. You have no personal recollection of having attended such a meeting?

Mr. MARKHAM. I certainly do not.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Robert Minor held any position with the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I do not know what position, but I have read his name frequently in connection with the Communist Party. I mean, he is a public figure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any meeting, either a public meeting or a closed meeting, at which he was a speaker?

Mr. MARKHAM. No, sir. I am relying on recollection of a long time ago, but I know how tricky questions can be, when you are talking about something a long time ago, and I would——

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever meet Robert Minor?

Mr. MARKHAM. Not to my recollection.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever have any correspondence with him?

Mr. MARKHAM. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. When did you first hear of him?

Mr. MARKHAM. There you got me. I think that the first time I heard of him was in connection with activities of some kind in the thirties. I do not know if it was unemployment compensation or what

it was. His name I remember seeing in the press. I would say roughly in the thirties sometime was the first time I heard his name.

Mr. CLARDY. Where were you at that time?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not know. I was either working for the New Bedford paper or the Associated Press. I must have seen it in news stories or something. It is conceivable that I heard his name before that, but that is just my guess that it probably was along there. I have heard his name for some time.

Mr. CLARDY. When did you first learn that he was identified with the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not know. I would not want to state that.

Mr. CLARDY. Was it the first time you heard of him or at some subsequent date?

Mr. MARKHAM. I honestly cannot say. I do not see how it is germane here, but I just—you are asking me to recall—you could ask me when did I first hear the name Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I could not tell you.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you sure it was not at a meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I think I would have to decline that just because of what it seems to imply.

Mr. CLARDY. You do not have to decline at all. Do you decline?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline.

Mr. JACKSON. You do decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. MARKHAM. And because I just don't remember where I heard his name first.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you resigned as an employee of the Associated Press in 1939?

Mr. MARKHAM. Yes, December.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of your withdrawing from employment with the Associated Press?

Mr. MARKHAM. The Newspaper Guild of Boston employed a full-time person as executive secretary. That person left. They wanted a person who could take over. I was president of the Guild, and there was discussion held among the leadership, the executive board and so on of the Guild, and they wanted to have somebody who was active in the Newspaper Guild in Boston, a newspaper man from that area. The previous executive secretary—I do not know where he came from; he came from outside of Boston. They wanted to hire somebody from Boston, so I was eventually decided upon. I forget how the reasoning went, but we finally decided I would take it over.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you read any of the testimony presented to this committee with regard to the activities of the Communist Party within the Newspaper Guild in Los Angeles?

Mr. MARKHAM. I have, but cannot recollect what it was, I remember seeing it in the New York Times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you participate in any organizational work for the Communist Party or any other activities for the Communist Party within the Newspaper Guild in Boston while you were employed by it from the period of 1939 to 1942?

Mr. MARKHAM. I think you are off on that same business again, as I stated in my statement, that I am declining to answer, and I will decline again for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you if you were aware of the existence within the Newspaper Guild in Boston of a group or cell of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I would decline.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, you mean at the time he was acting—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; at the time that he was employed by the guild.

Mr. MARKHAM. The answer is the same.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of the existence of a group or cell of the Communist Party within the Newspaper Guild in Boston at any other time, that is, any time when you were not employed by it as an organizer?

Mr. MARKHAM. I will decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any occupation since 1933 until the present time which you have not described to us?

Mr. MARKHAM. You are talking about any job?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. That does not necessarily mean a job for which you were paid compensation.

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. That has me floored. I just do not—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection. Have you taught in any capacity?

Mr. MARKHAM. I would decline for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you apparently did know of some other occupation or some other work in which you had engaged which you had not told us about if you decline to answer that question.

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, you asked me my employment record. To the best of my knowledge I gave you my employment record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but you stated that my question floored you, when all the while you had in mind a matter which you were unwilling to tell this committee about; is that not true?

Mr. MARKHAM. No; this last question you were asking whether I had done anything, any sort of work other than my employment, whether I was paid or not paid.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MARKHAM. That is a different thing. You are not asking what my—I gave you my employment record, and to the best of my recollection it was accurate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed as a teacher at any time?

Mr. MARKHAM. I would decline. I was not—well, I do not know what—

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not what?

Mr. MARKHAM. I cannot recall having any employment as such other than what I have given you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in teaching, whether for compensation or not?

Mr. MARKHAM. I think I answered that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer?

Mr. MARKHAM. You asked me whether I taught, and I said I decline.

Mr. JACKSON. For the reasons previously given?

Mr. MARKHAM. That is correct.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a trustee at one time of the Samuel Adams School?

MR. MARKHAM. I decline.

MR. CLARDY. Do you know what the Samuel Adams School is?

MR. MARKHAM. Oh, it has been quite prominently displayed in the press in Boston, at least.

MR. CLARDY. Your answer is you do know, then?

MR. MARKHAM. I know there was such a thing. It is public knowledge.

MR. CLARDY. You know all about it, as a matter of fact, do you not?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

MR. MARKHAM. I decline to answer the previous question. I think——

MR. JACKSON. Will you make your declination complete by assigning your reasons on each occasion?

MR. MARKHAM. All right.

MR. CLARDY. You are declining to answer my last question, I take it?

MR. MARKHAM. I am declining to answer the last question on the grounds previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you conduct any course of training or teaching at that school?

MR. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons stated previously.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you play any part in the preparation of the printing of the catalog for that institution or that school?

MR. MARKHAM. I decline, same reason.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know the names of other persons who taught or any person who taught in that school?

MR. MARKHAM. I think it is rather obvious that for the reasons previously stated I shall decline any questions regarding that institution.

MR. JACKSON. You so decline——

MR. MARKHAM. In that connection.

MR. JACKSON. Do you so decline to answer the last question?

MR. MARKHAM. I do.

MR. TAVENNER. There has been testimony presented to the committee that there was in existence in Boston, in Cambridge, a group or cell of the Communist Party made up from time to time of members of the teaching profession at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and at Harvard University. Did you ever attend a meeting of a group of that character?

MR. MARKHAM. May I have that question again?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

MR. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER. Was a meeting ever held in your home, composed of Communist Party members who were teachers either in Harvard or the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

MR. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated. You see, Mr. Tavenner, what I meant by "innuendo."

MR. CLARDY. This proceeding is rather amusing to you, is it not, witness? I see you sit there with a smile or a smirk on your face.

MR. MARKHAM. That is not a smirk, Senator—Representative.

MR. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. I just want him to know I do not regard this as humorous, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not regard this as humorous, either.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order. Please proceed.

Mr. MARKHAM. I did not ask to come down.

Mr. CLARDY. You volunteered—

Mr. MARKHAM. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any effort made by any party to interest you in the work of publication of a periodical or paper in behalf of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. I did not hear that.

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Jesse Prosten?

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

Mr. MARKHAM. I was.

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

Mr. MARKHAM. You are getting into that same business again. I will decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information indicating that on January 14, 1946, a Fannie Hartman, a functionary of the Communist Party, was at the Hotel Touraine in Boston. Did you meet Fannie Hartman on that occasion?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Fannie Hartman?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Otis Hood?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a meeting at any time in September or October 1946, at Communist Party headquarters in Boston?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Fannie Hartman was interested in promoting the political activities of any individual in the Boston area during a period of election?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it that you became legislative agent in the State of Massachusetts for the CIO?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I stated before what my recollection was. I really do not remember the dates, but I went to work for the Newspaper Guild in December of 1939, and it may have been a year or so later than that, at a state convention of the Massachusetts State CIO I was elected as assistant legislative agent. It was not a paid job and, as a matter of fact, the legislative agent was elected; it was not a paid job. They were not too active. Then at some time, it may have been the 1941 convention, which would have been, I think, in the fall, November or December of 1941, and this is just to the best of my recollection, I was elected as legislative agent for the State CIO and worked part time on that and part time for the Newspaper Guild. I was paid by both. My salary was split between the two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your work chiefly that of lobbying for legislation in which your organization was interested?

Mr. MARKHAM. As far as my work with the State CIO was concerned, that is true. I was the only person who was on the payroll of the State CIO, so that I was the only person available for various jobs. There may have been some jobs aside from strictly lobbying activities that I might have been assigned to, but that would have been minor. The major thing was lobbying for legislation on a State and national level.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did other labor organizations have legislative representatives charged with the same general duties that you were charged with?

Mr. MARKHAM. The A. F. of L. did, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen did; that is, regular lobbyists, not people who came up as business agents or something of that sort occasionally. Whether there were more than that, I do not recall, but there were some others. The A. F. of L. representative was the most active and the principal one at that stage.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not the International Fur and Leather Workers Union had such a representative?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not believe that they did. You are talking about this period before the war?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am talking about the period while you were legislative agent for the CIO.

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I do not recall that they did in 1946, either.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has heard testimony that legislative representatives of various organizations on national level here in Washington had fraction meetings; in other words, many of those legislative representatives were members of the Communist Party, and that as members of the Communist Party, and while acting as legislative representatives here in Washington, they caucused and met as Communist Party members here in the District of Columbia and planned their work. Were you aware of the existence of such a practice among legislative representatives in Massachusetts?

Mr. MARKHAM. I would decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you served in the Navy from 1942 to the end of 1945. What was the general nature of your position in the Navy?

Mr. MARKHAM. I was an air combat intelligence officer, and I served with aircraft squadrons aboard carriers in the Pacific. I had eight battle stars, and I have had a number of citations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of the Naval Reserve?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, on——

Mr. TAVENNER. After your discharge?

Mr. MARKHAM. Not after my discharge.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you a member of the Naval Reserve?

Mr. MARKHAM. It was in the Navy regulation, automatic business, that when an officer ceased active duty, he automatically went on the inactive list of the Naval Reserve, and that is what I did in November, I believe the 15th, of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain on the inactive list of the Naval Reserve?

Mr. MARKHAM. I forget the date, sir, but sometime in the fall of 1952. That is the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for your leaving the list of Naval Reserve officers?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, in the fall of 1952 I was given a kangaroo-court proceeding—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment—kangaroo-court proceeding? It was a Loyalty Review Board decision; was it not? That is what you refer to as the kangaroo hearing?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not know what the title was. It was a hearing by the Navy. It was not by the Loyalty Board. It was a hearing by 3 naval officers.

Mr. CLARDY. Where was that conducted?

Mr. MARKHAM. In Boston.

Mr. WALTER. Were you represented there?

Mr. MARKHAM. I was, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. What was the date of that, Counsel?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not finished.

Mr. MARKHAM. I am sorry; what was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated there was a hearing.

Mr. MARKHAM. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I was asking you the reason for your separation from the status of Reserve Corps officer, and you were telling us in 1952 this hearing took place. What was the result of the hearing?

Mr. MARKHAM. At that hearing, at which no witnesses were presented against me, a series of statements were made, generally pretty wild, and at the conclusion of the hearing I made a statement to the officers; I put myself under oath, made a statement to the officers. I am sure that this committee has or can get a copy of that statement and a copy of the proceedings of that hearing.

While I was told that it was only a hearing, not a trial, nothing of the sort, after the hearing—I forget how long—a month, 6 weeks, something like that, I received a notification from the Navy that I had been separated from the service.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean the first time you knew of the charges was at this hearing?

Mr. MARKHAM. No, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you said a number of wild statements were made; in fact you knew of the charges against you for at least 45 days prior to that hearing.

Mr. MARKHAM. At least that long. What I said was that a series of statements were made by the Navy—

Mr. WALTER. What were these wild statements?

Mr. MARKHAM. As statements of fact.

Mr. WALTER. What were they?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I will give you an illustration. I believe it was one of the first statements made in this long statement, which said that it was a known fact that I had attended as a delegate a convention of the Communist Party in Philadelphia in 1948.

Mr. WALTER. Did you?

Mr. MARKHAM. I did not.

Mr. WALTER. Did you ever attend a Communist Party convention?

Mr. MARKHAM. Let me finish the question.

Mr. WALTER. Answer my question.

Mr. JACKSON. There is a question pending. Please answer the question.

Mr. MARKHAM. I have been asked a question here, and I will answer that afterward.

The convention that they referred to, fortunately I kept my alternate delegate's credential, was a convention, nominating convention, of the Progressive Party at that time. Apparently in the eyes of the Navy activity in the Progressive Party was the same as being active in the Communist Party.

I presented this piece of evidence which, as I say, I fortunately had kept, and while they did not withdraw the charge, if you have the record of the hearing, you will see there is some hocus-pocus wording that they in effect withdrew that charge, but that was the kind of thing that I was presented with at that hearing.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you asked during the hearing if you had been a member of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not recall that—I do not have the record of that hearing, but I do not recall that that question was asked. As I say, I put myself—after they had gone through this whole business of reading off this long statement, and in the process, just automatically, practically, of withdrawing some of the things that they said, I put myself under oath and stated my position, and the recorder, which is comparable to a prosecuting attorney, asked no further questions, and that was the end of it.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you asked if you had ever attended a meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, in this statement they made a whole series of statements about Communist Party, about various organizations, and so on.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever attended a meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I would decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that all of these charges that were preferred against you by the Navy at that time dealt with communistic activities on your part; did they not?

Mr. MARKHAM. They may have dealt with what they thought were.

Mr. SCHERER. I am not asking what they thought, but the charges did deal with Communist activities, whether they were true or not. The charges dealt with that; did they not?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I do not like the wording of the question. I will just decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. All right; you decline.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you at any time before that Board, and while you were under oath, unequivocally state that you were not and never had at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Again you can get the transcript.

Mr. CLARDY. I am not referring to that. I am asking you whether as a matter of fact you did make such a statement. Please answer that.

Mr. MARKHAM. I forget just what I said, but to the best of my knowledge I did not make such a statement. I was not asked such a question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not a fact that the charges that you have referred to and have described were to the effect that you had been a member of the Communist Party?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. In general.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, had you been a member of the Communist Party prior to that date in 1952 when this hearing was had?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you want this committee to believe that you are not now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Do I want you to believe that?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not believe that it is the province of this committee to inquire into that.

Mr. CLARDY. Regardless of whether that is your belief or not, will you answer the question?

Mr. MARKHAM. I am responsible to a group of workers who see me day in and day out and know exactly the kind of work I do, and it is my desire to serve them and be highly regarded by them, and whether the committee here thinks one thing or another from responses I make to questions here—

Mr. SCHERER. Do you not think—

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me, you mean you do not care what your Government thinks about your belonging to or not belonging to the Communist Party? Is that what you mean?

Mr. MARKHAM. I do not think that was your question.

Mr. CLARDY. I am putting it that way now. Is it your position that you do not care how your Government looks upon your membership or your nonmembership, whichever it may be, in the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I have not been asked by my Government what I think, and I do not think the Government is going to ask me what I think.

Mr. CLARDY. You are being asked that by your Government right now, sir. Will you answer the question?

Mr. MARKHAM. I think that is purely, if I recall the question, purely an opinion.

Mr. CLARDY. Is that the only answer you care to give?

Mr. MARKHAM. I just do not care to discuss the opinion—

Mr. CLARDY. That is your answer. Thank you.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you not think these workers whom you represent are entitled to know whether today you are a member of the Communist Party or not? Do you not think they are entitled to know?

Mr. MARKHAM. My members know what I do. They can judge me by my acts, and they see me day in and day out.

Mr. SCHERER. That is not the answer to my question.

Mr. MARKHAM. And I would be willing to stand before them any day and defend my record before them. In fact, I do not need to do it. They will do it themselves.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that; but that was not my question. Do you not think the workers whom you represent are entitled to know whether you are a member of the Communist Party, which is a part of a Kremlin conspiracy in this country? Do you not think your workers are entitled to know that?

Mr. MARKHAM. If they want to know, they will ask me.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that the only answer you are going to give to that question?

Mr. MARKHAM. I think it is a good one.

Mr. WALTER. If they did ask you, what would your answer be?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer that on the grounds stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Do they know whether you are or are not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Again you are asking me what somebody else thinks.

Mr. CLARDY. What does a wave of the hand and a shrug of the shoulders mean? Does that mean you refuse to answer?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer. I cannot read the minds of—

Mr. CLARDY. I know; but I wish you would state it. Several times you have waved your hand rather contemptuously and shrugged your shoulders and not said anything, and I want to be sure the record correctly reflects your willingness or refusal to answer.

Now, that last shrug was intended to be a declination?

Mr. MARKHAM. And my statement. I do not think that the Congressman, who is a servant of myself and the rest of the people in the country, has any right to say that I am being contemptuous, because I am not.

Mr. CLARDY. We have heard that a great many times, and we heard it when you said it.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to a meeting—

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt? You made some charges about this committee at the opening of the hearing when you declined to answer the first question that was asked you. Do those same charges apply to that Navy Loyalty Review Board?

Mr. MARKHAM. I certainly did not regard that I was given any sort of a trial, if you want to call it that.

Mr. SCHERER. That was not my question, Mr. Witness. My question was, Do the statements that you made with reference to this committee and its activities, do those same statements relate to the Navy Loyalty Review Board hearing?

Mr. MARKHAM. No; no.

Mr. CLARDY. What was your answer?

Mr. MARKHAM. No.

Mr. CLARDY. By the way, what was the rank of the officers making up that Board, do you recall?

Mr. MARKHAM. My recollection is that 1 was a captain, and 2 were full commanders.

Mr. SCHERER. You did say that it was a kangaroo hearing.

Mr. MARKHAM. That is true.

Mr. WALTER. Did you appeal from the decision of this court?

Mr. MARKHAM. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you represented by counsel during all stages of the hearing?

Mr. MARKHAM. I was.

Mr. JACKSON. Continue, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. Was that counsel of your own selection?

Mr. MARKHAM. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Markham, you referred in your explanation of what occurred at this hearing to a meeting of the Progressive Party which you attended as a delegate. When was that meeting held?

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

Mr. MARKHAM. It was in the summer of 1948, the nominating convention in Philadelphia. Is that close enough? I forget the dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state whether or not you were aware of a decision made by the Communist Party that it would work within the framework of the Progressive Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in any planning with members of the Communist Party to influence or control the action of the Progressive Party on any level?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, in declining to answer that on the grounds previously stated, I would like to say that I do not think it is the province of this committee, in my opinion, to inquire into the operations of a political party in this country.

Mr. JACKSON. Let the Chair say in answer to that that there is adequate testimony in the record from a number of witnesses which indicates beyond any peradventure of a doubt that exactly that form of planning did take place, so it is a matter of record. The question was directed as to whether you, yourself, took part in any such planning. That is a matter quite within the jurisdiction of this committee to inquire into, as to the nature and extent of Communist infiltration into the Progressive Party, which infiltration, I think, was best testified to by Mr. Hemy Wallace himself when he left the Progressive Party.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. I have no questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. You have stated that you feel that this committee has no right to inquire into your political beliefs or whether you were a member of the Communist Party. Do you feel that the Navy Loyalty Review Board had a right to inquire as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, they were operating under a specific Executive order.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you think they had such a right? I am asking that merely because you described it as a kangaroo hearing. I want to know whether you feel that the board had a right to inquire as to your membership and activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, the Navy—if the Navy wants to say that to be a naval officer you have to agree that the world is flat, and if you do not agree with that, you are out of the Navy, I suppose they have a right to set up their standards as to that nature of who is going to be in the Navy.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that a member of the Communist Party should hold a commission in the United States Navy?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, that is again a matter of opinion I am not going to discuss.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean even today, when we are at war with the Communist-dominated countries, engaged in both a hot and cold war, you cannot tell us whether a commissioned officer of the United States Armed Forces should be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I am not running the Navy; I am not running the Army.

Mr. SCHERER. Obviously not; thank heavens.

Mr. MARKHAM. What they regard as a sound policy, all right; that is their business to set the policy and carry it out. I am not the one to do that.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say that the holding of a commission in the Armed Forces of the United States is a privilege and not a constitutional right. No one has a right to a commission. He gains it on merit, and he holds it by the nature of the work that he does and his unquestioned loyalty to the institutions of this Government.

Certainly the Navy or any other agency of the United States Government quite properly removes commissions from those in whom there is any doubt as to loyalty.

Mr. Counsel.

Mr. MARKHAM. May I say something on that? I feel that if—after I was out of the active service in the Navy and was operating as a private citizen, I believe that I had full rights to act as long as I was doing what I felt was right as a citizen, and that I did not consider that the standards for what I was going to do necessarily had to be the standards of the Navy. If they thought that a person who was in the Inactive Reserve was doing things they did not like, they had a perfect right to say, "Well, look, Markham, we do not think that a naval officer ought to be doing this or doing that," if they had any idea or any suspicion or anything else that I was doing anything they did not like.

As an illustration, in 1946 there was a strike on of the railroad workers. You remember the President seized the railroads; the Army ran the railroads, and there was talk at that moment of the same thing being done with the maritime workers. A meeting was called in Boston; the meeting was presided over by a man who ran for Vice President of the United States at one time, attorney for the railroad, and a number of people spoke at the meeting. They invited in people who had been in one branch of the armed service or another as some of the speakers who appeared, and I was one of them.

At that time I was working for the State CIO. Several months after that meeting I received a notice from the Navy, "Contrary to regulation so-and-so, you had attended this public meeting and addressed it attired in naval uniform."

So I wrote back to the Navy and said that I was well aware of regulation so-and-so, that I had not addressed this meeting attired in my naval uniform, which I never wore after the day that I left active service, and that I would appreciate knowing why any such a charge was made, and I heard nothing from them.

Now, that was the kind of information apparently the Navy was getting regarding me. I suppose you would say if I had been smart at that time I would have offered my resignation.

However, I felt I was not doing anything wrong, and I did not, and I took no action to do so.

Mr. SCHERER. Again let me call your attention that this was a hearing before a Navy Loyalty Review Board. You do not mean to say that there is a different standard of loyalty for a man in active service and one in the inactive service; do you?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, as far as I know, the standards that they set up apply whether a person is in the Active or Inactive Reserve.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, despite the fact that the whole charge against you at that hearing had to do with alleged Communist affiliations on your part, you have told me here today, by indirection, at least, that you did not deny your affiliations at any time during the course of that hearing.

Now, do you think that under those circumstances this kangaroo court you have referred to acted unfairly and unjustly in your case?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I made responses to the hearing, to the Board, on every statement that they made where they presented any evidence whatsoever. They presented no witnesses. But where they presented any evidence whatsoever—

Mr. JACKSON. I believe that counsel has another question which the witness will have an opportunity to answer. Do you want to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Markham, you have stated to the committee that you refused to answer the question as to whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Now, I think I should present to you the testimony of Mr. Herbert Philbrick on that matter.

Mr. Philbrick testified on June 17, 1953, before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate. Mr. Philbrick was asked the question by Mr. Morris¹:

Did you know a Boston couple named George and Helen D. Markham?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was George Markham?

Mr. PHILBRICK. George Markham I knew quite well as a fellow party member. He was the educational director for the Fur and Leather Workers Union. I was a member of the educational commission of the Communist Party, again working under orders from the Communist Party, and I worked with George Markham on projects to do with Communist propaganda.

¹ Robert Morris, chief counsel to named subcommittee.

Mr. MORRIS. The Fur and Leather Workers Union, to your knowledge, was virtually an open Communist union?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It was pretty well dominated and controlled by the Communist Party, although of course not all of the members of the union itself were party members.

Was Mr. Philbrick telling the truth about his association with you in Communist Party work?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, I would decline for the reasons previously stated to discuss any relationship that I might have had, real or supposed, with such a liar and perjurer.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interpose, Mr. Chairman? What was your rank when you were in the Navy?

Mr. MARKHAM. I went in as a lieutenant (junior grade), and I came out as a lieutenant commander.

Mr. SCHERER. You say Philbrick is a liar and a perjurer?

Mr. MARKHAM. I say that is the kind of person he is.

Mr. JACKSON. You have made a statement that Mr. Philbrick is a liar and a perjurer. In what respect and in what testimony that he has given did he lie?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, there is a very good political axiom that it is very wise never to get into any kind of a contest with a skunk.

Mr. JACKSON. That is not responsive to my question.

In what specific instance did Mr. Philbrick lie?

Mr. MARKHAM. Well, there is enough on the record—

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. I am only asking you to quote one instance out of the record so that we can tie it down.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that inasmuch as he has now said that Mr. Philbrick committed perjury and was a liar, he has lost the protection of the fifth amendment, and I ask that he be directed to answer the questions in all particulars.

Mr. JACKSON. My question was based upon that fact.

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair directs that you answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. In what respect did Mr. Philbrick perjure himself in any way in any of the testimony he has given?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair directs that you answer the question. In what manner and in what place did Mr. Philbrick perjure himself in his testimony.

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute. On that same line, did he lie when he said you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick testified that he worked with you on many projects to do with Communist propaganda. What projects of Communist propaganda did you work on with Mr. Philbrick?

(At this point Mr. Markham conferred with Mr. Cammer.)

Mr. MARKHAM. I would decline to answer on the grounds previously stated. I think you might inquire of Mr. Philbrick.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest that the witness be directed to answer.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question put by counsel.

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work on any Communist propaganda matters with Mr. Philbrick or any other person?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask that he be directed to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any Communist Party activities with Mr. Philbrick?

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. May he be directed to answer that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. MARKHAM. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is excused, and the subcommittee stands in adjournment.

(Whereupon, at 12:12 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

(Education—Part 6)

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1953

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 a. m., in caucus room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Donald L. Jackson (acting chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson and Kit Clardy.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; George E. Cooper, investigator; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order, please.

For the purposes of the record, let it be shown that the chairman has appointed a subcommittee of two, consisting of Mr. Clardy and Mr. Jackson for the purpose of this hearing.

Will you call your witness, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Dr. Louis Harap, will you please step forward.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Harap, will you raise your right hand, sir?

Do you solemnly swear that in the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HARAP. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS HARAP, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Mr. KUNZIG. The acoustics are very bad in this room, Dr. Harap, so will you please speak as clearly, slowly, and distinctly as you can.

Mr. CLARDY. Who is the stranger beside him?

Mr. KUNZIG. His counsel.

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your name and address for the record, please, sir?

Mr. HARAP. My name is Louis, L-o-u-i-s, Harap, H-a-r-a-p. I live at 83 Horatio, H-o-r-a-t-i-o Street, New York City.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here which I should like to read before the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. The statement will be accepted by the committee. However, you are not permitted to read the statement.

Mr. HARAP. May I ask why I am not permitted to read it since it is relevant to my testimony?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. That is the standard procedure of the committee and has been for a long time, that statements are not permitted to be read. However, having answered a question, you may then elaborate however you wish on your answer, giving your reasons for your answer, if you so desire.

The committee will receive and take under advisement any statement that you have.

Mr. HARAP. Well, I simply want to register an objection to my not being permitted to read the statement, because it is relevant to my sentiments about the committee, about the activity of the committee, and about its significance for the American people, and so on.

Mr. JACKSON. Your objection is noted in the record.

Mr. CLARDY. I think, Witness, we can pretty well anticipate what you have said. We have heard it many times before.

Mr. HARAP. It doesn't make it any less true, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. We shall be the judge of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé, sir, of your educational background?

Mr. HARAP. Yes. I graduated from Ethical Culture High School in New York City. I then went to Antioch College for a few years, transferred to Harvard College where I received my B. A. degree in 1928; I received my master's degree in 1930 and my Ph. D. in philosophy in 1932.

Mr. KUNZIG. Does that end your formal education?

Mr. HARAP. That ends my formal education.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, sir, would you give the committee a résumé of your employment background?

Mr. HARAP. That is since receiving my doctorate?

Mr. KUNZIG. Unless you had any employment prior to that time.

Mr. HARAP. No; I should not say I had any.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then since you finished your studies.

Mr. HARAP. Since receiving my degree I have worked as a writer and I have done editorial work for the entire period except for a period of just about 3 years, 1942 to 1945, when I was in the Army during the war—

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. I am sorry, I beg your pardon. Shortly after receiving my doctorate I was appointed librarian of the philosophical library at Harvard University and held the job about—I don't know exactly when I assumed it—I held it about—no; precisely until the end of the academic term of 1939, and I came to New York City after that; I resigned my position and came to New York City, and since 1939 I have worked as a writer and have done editorial work except for the period in the Army.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state where you have been a writer and where you have done editorial work, and who employed you?

Mr. HARAP. I have written for various publications, and I will state to this committee some of the publications which I wrote; some of the publications I will not state, as I will explain soon, and applies to my work, editorial work.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just state all that you can.

Mr. HARAP. Yes. I have written for a number of learned publications, such as the *Journal of Philosophy*, *Philosophical Review*, *American Quarterly*, and so on, a number of these publications.

Those are all the publications that I care to state before this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. What was your answer, all that you care to state?

Mr. HARAP. I am sorry, all the publications that I am willing to state before this committee. As for any other publications or any editorial work which I have done or the employers of—my employers in these connections, I wish to refuse to answer for the following reasons—

Mr. JACKSON. May I suggest, Mr. Harap, that you wait until the question is asked before you refuse to answer, and then give your reasons?

Mr. HARAP. I thought I was asked the question.

Mr. JACKSON. No, he was asking for clarification.

Mr. KUNZIG. I had intended to ask, Mr. Chairman, and I will now ask, Will you please state for the record all the publications which you have written for in these last years which you are just describing?

Mr. HARAP. I don't understand. I have stated a number of publications for which I have written.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is right; I am asking for all.

Mr. HARAP. Then I proceeded to say that I refuse to answer further for the remaining publications for the following reasons—

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt there just a minute, Mr. Chairman? There are additional publications than those you have listed?

Mr. HARAP. Oh, yes, yes.

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I ask, then, that the witness be directed to answer the question and list the other publications for which he has written.

Mr. HARAP. Yes. Well, I—

Mr. JACKSON. Just a minute, Mr. Harap. The Chair is of the opinion that the question is rather general in nature, and I believe that it would be better if the questions were phrased as direct questions having to do with certain publications.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, we will come to that, then, Mr. Chairman, later.

Mr. CLARDY. Let's see if I understand, Counsel.

Is it your question now that you want him to complete the listing and to include those which he seems about to tell us he will refuse to give us?

Mr. KUNZIG. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I cannot see that it is incriminating before this committee that a person list the publications for which he has written. Apparently the witness feels that certain publications may incriminate him.

I respectfully request that he be ordered to answer the question as to listing the publications for which he has written since he graduated and got his Ph. D.

Mr. JACKSON. Is this for the purpose of establishing the occupational background of the witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. The witness is directed to answer the question as to all of the publications to which he has contributed.

Mr. HARAP. For any publications which I have not stated here I refuse to answer on the following grounds:

First, I refuse to answer under the protection of the first amendment which guarantees the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and academic freedom, and I believe that this committee is infringing those freedoms and putting them in jeopardy, and I refuse to answer in the first place on that ground.

In the second place, I refuse to answer the question under the fifth amendment which gives me the privilege of refusing to answer on the ground that no person can be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. CLARDY. In a criminal proceeding.

Mr. HARAP. Mr. Clardy—I believe you are Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. HARAP. I believe that the inference which you are trying to draw by that question—

Mr. CLARDY. No; I am just giving you the language.

Mr. HARAP. The language does state, on the other hand, that judicial decisions have provided that the fifth amendment applies not only in criminal proceedings but also in such investigations as this and for a number of other circumstances.

Mr. CLARDY. You can take it for granted I am familiar with the law; I have practiced law a number of years.

Mr. HARAP. I am taking this procedure because I don't want the inference to remain that my application of the fifth amendment here implies in any sense guilt of any kind. On the contrary, the fifth amendment was designed specifically to protect the innocent, and so that I stand on the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will proceed, sir. I do think, though, that we ought to clear the record and not allow the last statement to remain unchallenged.

Of course, Mr. Clardy was absolutely correct, that this only applies—there must be a fear of involvement in a criminal prosecution, and certainly the fifth amendment may be used before this committee or any other committee in a judicial proceeding, but it must arise because of fear of involvement in a criminal proceeding.

That is the law, and the record should be straight.

Mr. HARAP. On the other hand, a criminal proceeding—if there is involvement in a criminal proceeding it does not necessarily mean the one involved is guilty, necessarily.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party at any time, sir?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds that I previously stated, and I would like to say that it is questions of this kind which are—and the activities of the committee relating to questions of this kind which are throwing the country into a hysteria and miasma of fear that is very, very dangerous for this country and threatens our democratic freedoms. Only this morning—

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I request that the witness—

Mr. JACKSON. The question has been answered and the reasons for refusal to answer given.

Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Harap, there has been testimony given by Robert G. Davis before this committee on February 25, 1953. I shall read briefly the important parts of this testimony as it involves you, and then ask you what your comment is on this testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER, counsel for the committee, asked:

Were both of the persons that you have in mind persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I will ask you to give the names of both of them.

Mr. DAVIS. Louis Harap.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you spell the last name, please?

Mr. DAVIS. H-a-r-a-p.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I think you should spell the first name.

Mr. DAVIS. L-o-u-i-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you know what his subsequent connection was with the Communist Party I think you should tell us. That is, if you know of your own knowledge whether he has remained in the Communist Party for any definite period of time or whether he withdrew from the party at any time, I would like you to so state.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no firsthand knowledge. I have read writing by him in recent years which would suggest that his tendency had remained the same.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is he a professor at Harvard?

Mr. DAVIS. No; he was not. He was employed in a very minor capacity as librarian, I believe, of the philosophy library.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is he still connected in that position?

Mr. DAVIS. No. He left Harvard many years ago.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know what he is doing now?

Mr. DAVIS. I believe he is editor of a magazine.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know the name of the magazine?

Mr. DAVIS. It is the Jewish Affairs, I believe—some such magazine.

Mr. VELDE. Will you spell that, please?

Mr. DAVIS. The name of the magazine?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. J-e-w-i-s-h A-f-f-a-i-r-s.

Mr. KEARNEY. He is the editor, you think?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I think he is editor.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know where that is published?

Mr. DAVIS. In New York.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe you said, Professor, that the group, party, at that time opposed anti-Semitism?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Today, of course, you know it is as anti-Semitic as the Nazi Party?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. That's why I was particularly interested in the position of Louis Harap.

Mr. CLARDY. I don't follow you there.

Mr. DAVIS. Because, as editor of the magazine, whatever it may be called, Jewish Affairs, I believe, he is now defending the Prague trials, contending that they are not anti-Semitic.

Do you have any comment on that identification of you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HARAP. I am at a loss, sir, Mr. Kunzig, to understand why you should read that because I have already answered that I refuse to answer that question, and your reading that lengthy excerpt is merely a restatement of the same question. I still stand on my refusal for the same reasons that I gave before.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right, Dr. Harap; many people who take the viewpoint that you take may come before this committee and say that they have no opportunity to answer. They prattle about the United States of America, that they have no opportunity to answer what is

said about them. You are here today being given that opportunity to answer what three separate witnesses under oath swearing to God have testified about you.

Now, you have refused to answer as to the first. I shall now ask you as to the second. Here is testimony from Granville Hicks of February 26, 1953:

Question, by Mr. Tavenner:

Do you recall an individual by name of Louis Harap—H-a-r-a-p?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What connection, if any, did he have with this Communist Party group?

Mr. HICKS. He was a member of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell how the directives or instructions from the Communist Party were transmitted to your group?

Mr. HICKS. My recollection is that they came in various ways. As a matter of fact, I have often carried them myself, since I had—I was carrying on a rather wide range of Communist propaganda activities and, therefore, was likely to go into Phil Frankfeld's office, and he would tell me things he wished our group would discuss or would do. I think Harap also acted as a kind of go-between, and there may have been others. It was pretty informal in that particular year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were all the members of this group fairly active in the work of the party?

Mr. HICKS. I would say there was a good deal of variation. Some were more active than others.

Do you have any comment on the testimony of Hicks that you were a member of this Communist Party group?

Mr. HARAP. Well, again, Mr. Kunzig, the same applies, that is to say, you are merely asking the same question which I have several times already refused to answer, and I may say that my refusal to answer is based upon the fact, also, that as a Jew I believe that it is my obligation as a Jew and as an American, but speaking for the moment of my being a Jew, it is my obligation not to cooperate with this committee because, in my view, the activities of this committee are tending to bring this country into the same condition under which 6 million Jews were murdered and, for that reason, it seems to me I must refuse to answer and refuse to cooperate with this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you shrink with the same horror from the things that the Russian Government is doing to the Jewish people?

Mr. HARAP. Well, Mr. Clardy, I will be very glad—

Mr. CLARDY. Answer my question.

Mr. HARAP. I am answering it, Mr. Clardy. I will be very glad to discuss this matter with you because I think that the implication, "Do you shrink from what they are doing to the Jewish people" is based on ignorance of what the status of the Jewish people is in the Soviet Union, and ignorance of the way in which in the Soviet Union anti-Semitism has been virtually obliterated.

I know that in the Soviet Union, Jews—there is no discrimination against Jews in employment or in any activity, vocational activity. There is genuinely a free avenue to Jews in every activity of Soviet life, and there—

Mr. KUNZIG. They just have their heads chopped off if they disagree; that is the only discrimination.

Mr. HARAP. There is no such matter. There is disagreement on a number of things in the Soviet Union, but there is no chopping of heads. The fact of the matter is that in the Soviet Union the Jews

have a higher degree of freedom and equality than they have, I think, in any other part of the world, and this is a matter of recorded fact, Mr. Clardy; this is a matter of statistical fact, and with respect, for instance, to—I suppose you refer to the recent events. Now, I would like to point out, Mr. Clardy, that when it was discovered in the Soviet Union that there was an attempt to frame up Jewish doctors, that the Soviet Union did an unprecedented thing, namely, it publicly announced to the world that this attempt existed, and, further, it went even further than that; it punished those who made the attempt.

Now, I submit, Mr. Clardy, that this is evidence of a determination that there shall be no anti-Semitism; it should not be tolerated for a moment and, furthermore, this is associated, also, with the policy of the Soviet Union with regard to all nationalities, nationality antagonism. No nationality antagonism is permitted, and if it is perceived or detected in any way it is summarily dealt with——

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JACKSON. This is largely extraneous matter.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask one more question?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. You admire Russia a great deal; don't you? Now, what is the source of the knowledge you have on that subject?

Mr. HARAP. Mr. Clardy, I am a serious person. The world is—many serious problems are facing the world, and I have, therefore, assumed the obligation of informing myself about these things, and that is the source of my knowledge.

Mr. CLARDY. You don't disagree with me when I say you have a great admiration for Russia, though, do you?

Mr. HARAP. I think there are many things about the Soviet Union which register an advance in human relations and in social relations; yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair would like to point out that this kindness to Jews, of course, in the Soviet Union and elsewhere resulted in the bombing by Jews of the Soviet Embassy in Israel and also the rupture of relationships between Israel and the Soviet Union.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. HARAP. Mr. Jackson, may I comment?

Mr. KUNZIG. There is no question.

Mr. JACKSON. No; I think the entire point has been labored far enough by all concerned.

Mr. HARAP. But I would like to indicate——

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that there is no question pending.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Proceed in regular order.

Mr. CLARDY. May I be excused? The bell just rang three times, There is a call—I don't want to miss the rollcall.¹

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now I will go into the third identification, involving the testimony of Herbert E. Robbins in executive session on March 25, 1953. He was asked:

Was Louis Harap at the time you were a member of the Young Communist League a student at Harvard?

¹ Call to the floor of the House of Representatives for a rollcall vote.

Mr. ROBBINS. I believe he was.

Question. At a later period of time did you know him to be a librarian in one of the buildings? I don't recall which.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; he was a part-time librarian in Emerson Hall, which is the philosophy department.

That is the total testimony involving you at that point.

Do you have any comment to make about Mr. Robbins' testimony?

Mr. HARAP. No; I have no comment. I don't think there is anything very—

Mr. KUNZIG. I have asked you whether you were ever at any time a member of the Communist Party. I now ask you, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HARAP. That is the same question—

Mr. KUNZIG. No; it is not the same question.

Mr. HARAP. And my answer is the same, but I would like to say one thing, Mr. Jackson, about your remark before, because—

Mr. KUNZIG. I ask that the witness not be permitted to speak further.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you now decline to answer the question?

Mr. HARAP. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. And for the reasons—

Mr. HARAP. For the reasons previously stated; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you at any time been the managing editor of Jewish Life, a publication issued monthly by the Morning Freiheit Association?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that I have previously stated, and I think that in any case such questions are indicative of respect for freedom of the press.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well—

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Chairman, since Jewish Life is a publication as such?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that he be directed to answer it because, obviously, in my opinion, at least he will be in contempt of the subcommittee, or in contempt of Congress if he refuses to answer something that is of public record.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. HARAP. Mr. Chairman, what question am I directed to answer?

Mr. JACKSON. As to whether or not you are the editor—I believe it was in the present tense—whether you are the editor of a magazine known as Jewish Life.

Mr. HARAP. I have answered that question under the privilege of the first amendment and the fifth amendment, as I previously stated.

The JACKSON. The Chair has directed you to answer it.

Mr. HARAP. I stand on my privilege.

Mr. JACKSON. You continue to refuse to answer on grounds previously stated?

Mr. HARAP. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sorry; there is a call on the floor and the members of the subcommittee must go to the floor briefly.

The hearing is recessed until 11:45.

(Whereupon, at 11:10, the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 11:45 a. m.)

Mr. KUNZIG. I have just been advised that the House will be in session on a rollcall vote and, therefore, the hearing will be adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 11:46 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m., same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At 2 p. m., same day, the proceedings were resumed, the following committee members being present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman) (appearance noted in transcript), Donald L. Jackson (presiding), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, and Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript).)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that the members of the appointed subcommittee are present and, in addition, Mr. Scherer is here.

I am sorry for any inconvenience that may have been caused by virtue of the call to the floor.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS HARAP, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
JOSEPH FORER—Resumed

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Harap, since there was a slight break here in the testimony due to the necessity of going over to the floor of Congress, I would like to ask again, so that the record is clear. I am asking you whether you have ever been a managing editor of a publication called Jewish Life, issued monthly by the Morning Freiheit Association?

Mr. HARAP. I answered that question; that is to say, that question was put before the recess and I said then, and I say now, that I refuse to answer that question on all the grounds which I stated before.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Chairman, since the Jewish Life is a publication which anyone may purchase and is issued monthly, as it states on its own masthead, by the Morning Freiheit Association, and since it is published right on that masthead that the editor is Louis Harap, I cannot see how an answer can incriminate this witness, and I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I believe that before the recess the witness was requested to answer the question and declined. However, I will again direct that the witness answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question as I stated before, on the grounds, on several grounds which I before indicated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Chairman, for the record, I want to state that I have here copies of several issues of Jewish Life issued monthly by the Morning Freiheit Association—May 1949, April 1950; here is a November 1949, November 1948—all of which state directly on the page listing the editorial board the name Louis Harap, managing editor.

I also wish to state for the record—

Mr. CLARDY. Will you pause right there, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. I would like to have you ask one question concerning that. Perhaps I can ask it.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right.

Mr. CLARDY. You have heard the dates read by counsel, Witness. Were you in fact, as the masthead indicates, the managing editor of that magazine during the period covered by the editions identified?

Mr. HARAP. The answer is the same, Mr. Clardy. I refuse to answer on the grounds stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here, also, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the Daily Peoples World of Tuesday, January 29, 1952, which refers to an article by Louis Harap in the same Jewish Life, and also one Monday, December 1, 1952, a copy of the Daily People's World, which again refers to an article by the same Louis Harap in the December issue of the progressive monthly, Jewish Life.

Now, also, for the record, the Morning Freiheit has been cited, one, a Communist Yiddish daily by Attorney General Francis Biddle, in the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942; the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, said "The Freiheit has been one of the rankest organs of Communist propaganda in this country for almost a quarter of a century." It has also been cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities and the Massachusetts Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Daily People's World has been cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, as the official organ of the Communist Party on the West Coast; also cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. HARAP. I would like to say that—

Mr. KUNZIG. There is no question before the witness.

Now, I have here in front of me a copy of the Daily Worker, New York, Thursday, February 5, 1953, and I ask you if you were the Louis Harap who wrote an article therein entitled—

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

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). "The Evidence Against Zionist Leaders. the Truth About the Prague Trial"?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds as I stated before, and I might say I think this—

Mr. KUNZIG. He refuses to answer the question. I don't think there is any necessity to have further comments.

Mr. VELDE. No. If you answer the question, I think, certainly, it has been the rule of the acting chairman that you would be allowed to explain and make further statements, but upon refusing to answer the question I see no reason to be bothered with further harangue.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have a copy of the Daily Worker, Monday, February 16, 1953, in which there is an article entitled "The Truth About the Prague Trial, Number Ten," and the heading is "United States Intelligence Used Nazi Gestapo List to Recruit Spies in East Europe," an article written by Louis Harap.

Are you the Louis Harap that wrote that article?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend the Prague trials on which you base this knowledge?

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where did you get the story on which basis the article is written?

Mr. HARAP. I have read everything; I am very much interested in that, as we explained this morning, and I read whatever I could get my hands on relating to the Prague trial.

Mr. KUNZIG. So you did write the article?

Mr. HARAP. I didn't say I wrote the article, Mr. Kunzig. I said I was interested in these articles, as I expressed this morning, and did in fact study the Prague trial.

Mr. KUNZIG. In the Daily Worker, February 12, 1953, there is an article called "The Truth About the Prague Trial, Number Nine," entitled "The Defendants and Their Crimes," written by Louis Harap, and it lists here that Dr. Louis Harap is managing editor of Jewish Life, as stated in each of the articles.

Are you the person who wrote that article in the February 12 issue, 1953?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. There is an advertisement in the February 5, 1953, issues as follows:

PAMPHLET TELLS TRUTH ABOUT PRAGUE TRIAL

An examination of the charge of anti-Semitism and the Zionist involvement in the recent Prague trial of the Slansky group, as well as details of the trial itself are contained in a comprehensive pamphlet, the truth about the trial, issued by Jewish Life, progressive monthly. Author of the pamphlet is Louis Harap, managing editor of the magazine; pamphlet sells for 10 cents. Bundle orders—

and so forth—

can be obtained.

Are you the Dr. Louis Harap who wrote the Truth About the Prague Trial?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer on the grounds stated before, and I think this is an inquisition into the press, and I don't see what the committee is inquisiting the press for.

Mr. KUNZIG. At this stage we usually put the citation of the organization we are discussing. I think there is no need to quote the citation of the Daily Worker.

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Mr. CLARDY. I move that he be directed to answer the question because, again, it is the same problem presented by refusal to answer prior questions concerning this Jewish Life.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the direction is probably redundant, but I will direct that the witness answer the question.

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer, as I have before, on the same grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Harap, did you ever write for a publication entitled "Soviet Russia Today," specifically, in the 1937 November edition?

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. FORER. Do you have the edition there so we can check?

Mr. KUNZIG. November 27; certainly. I will be glad to point it out to you so you can see exactly what you wrote.

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. Yes; I wrote that article.

Mr. CLARDY. What article is this again?

Mr. KUNZIG. An article entitled "Where Philosophy Counts." It is discussing philosophy in the Soviet Union, and so forth.

The purpose of presenting this, Mr. Chairman, is that Soviet Russia Today, the magazine in which this was printed—this article—has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944; also in 1942. That is, of course, several years after the time this article appeared, but it was because of the articles and such articles that appeared in that publication that the publication, of course, was cited.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair would like to ask a question at that point.

Upon whose solicitation was that article written?

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. Well, I tell you, it was really a long time ago. My memory is very hazy about this. I don't remember a great deal.

Mr. CLARDY. What year was it?

Mr. KUNZIG. 1937, Mr. Clardy.

Mr. JACKSON. You don't recall whether or not the article was solicited or whether you offered it to the publication for—

Mr. HARAP. I don't recall; it is all very hazy in my mind.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you the Louis Harap who wrote an article in Science and Society, fall of 1950?

Mr. FORER. Could we check that?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds as I have previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Science and Society, for the record, has been cited as a Communist publication by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944; it has also been cited by the California and the Massachusetts Committees on Un-American Activities.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask, Dr. Harap, did you write any other articles for Soviet Russia Today?

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. Yes; I don't recall any other articles that I wrote for that publication.

Mr. JACKSON. That is the only one that you recall?

Mr. HARAP. So far as I can remember, that is the only one.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt a minute, Mr. Counsel and Chairman?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I have before me this issue of Jewish Life dated May 1949, to which Mr. Kunzig, the counsel, referred just a few minutes ago in which the witness appears as the managing editor.

It does not say who wrote the following article which I am going to quote from, but I am going to ask whether or not you wrote this yourself or if you know who wrote it.

It says:

TRAGI-COMEDY ON FOLEY SQUARE

While Judge Harold Medina smugly presides over the case of the 11 Communist leaders on trial in Foley Square, the structure of American liberties disintegrates rapidly. Every day brings news of the violation of traditional democratic rights in this city, in that college, in that State, North, South, East, West. In Maryland, a hysterical legislature outlaws the Communist Party in the most Fascist-like legislative act since hysteria first struck this country.

Did you write that article?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you approve of that statement now as I read it? (At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Foley.)

Mr. HARAP. Yes; I think that is fairly accurate. I would say that there are many people now, more people than at the time that article was written, who agree that this disintegration of our civil liberties has extended pretty far, and I think that that is a true statement.

Mr. SCHERER. With reference to Judge Medina presiding over the trial of 11 Communists; do you think that is a true statement?

Mr. HARAP. Yes; I think it is a true statement.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know Albert Maltz, M-a-l-t-z?

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Albert Maltz, Mr. Chairman, for the record, was one of the Hollywood Ten who refused to answer questions of this committee in 1947 and who subsequently were cited for contempt, indicted by a grand jury on December 5, 1947, and sentenced to 1 year and \$1,000 fine.

Were you, Dr. Harap, associated together with this Albert Maltz in the management of the Jewish Survey, a magazine of which I have a copy, December 1942, in my hand at this moment?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you take part in a meeting on Wednesday, April 16, 1952, entitled "A Tribute to the Warsaw Ghetto Fighters," presented by Jewish Life, the same publication already mentioned as coming from the Morning Freiheit, together with Morris Carnovsky and Morris Schappes, S-c-h-a-p-p-e-s?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds already stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know Morris Carnovsky, who is listed in this handbill as having appeared in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Diplomat together with you on Wednesday, April 16, 1952?

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HARAP. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. For the record, Morris Carnovsky has been identified as a Communist before this committee by Marc Lawrence, April 24, 1951; Leo Townsend, September 18, 1951; Charles Daggett, January 21, 1952, and also by others in executive session.

Morris Schappes has been identified as a Communist by Harvey Matusow, former member of the Communist Party, New York, principally in youth groups, and identified by Schappes in public session, February 6, 1952.

Did you write in the Worker of May 21, 1950, a review of a book by A. B. Magil, entitled "Israel in Crisis"?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds already stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. This is a review of Israel in Crisis, a book written by A. B. Magil, who has been identified as a Communist by Granville Hicks, June 16, 1952, before this committee, and the review is written in the Worker, and I believe there is no necessity to go into citations of that publication.

Did you, Dr. Harap, ever teach or give any lectures at the School of Jewish Studies, 575 Sixth Avenue, Jefferson School Building, Room 301, New York?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you lecture there with Mike Gold, Howard Fast, Morris Schappes, and others?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. The School of Jewish Studies has been cited as an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947.

This school and lecture series listing the name of Louis Harap is in the Daily Worker of Tuesday, April 18, 1950.

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever write any articles for the New Masses, Dr. Harap?

Mr. HARAP. This strikes me as the kind of inquisition—

Mr. KUNZIG. Just answer the question.

Mr. HARAP. About publications—

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you or did you not ever write any articles for the publication New Masses?

Mr. JACKSON. The charge laid upon the committee is to investigate the nature and extent of Communist and other propaganda activity. Obviously, the written word is one of the chief weapons of the Communist Party. Therefore, the questions which relate to your articles or articles which you are alleged to have written are certainly relevant and material as far as this interrogation is concerned.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a copy of the New Masses, October 7, 1947, in which there is an article by one Louis Harap. New Masses has been cited as a Communist periodical by Attorney General Francis Biddle, Congressional Record, September 24, 1942. It is cited as—

A nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service—

by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944. It has also been cited by the California and Massachusetts Committees on Un-American Activities.

Did you ever write an article, Dr. Harap, for a publication entitled, "Masses and Mainstream"?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds and, Mr. Chairman, you said before that—it seems to me that my understanding was that the function of this committee is to investigate un-American activities. Now, there are many, many un-American activities, genuine un-American activities, in the sense that they are against the welfare and the civil liberties of the United States, like anti-Semitism and Fascist activities, and so on, which this committee apparently is not interested in.

Mr. JACKSON. Dr. Harap, I will remind you that you are here today because you have been identified on several occasions as a member of the Communist Party. That is the only reason you are called. That is the only phase we are investigating at this time.

Mr. HARAP. Have there been any other matters the committee has investigated?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; we have investigated thoroughly into the German-American Bund.

Mr. HARAP. That was many years ago.

Mr. JACKSON. The finding of the highest court in the land is that the clear and present danger is the Communist Party. For that reason we are presently engaged in an investigation of the Communist Party. It may very well be that other activities will be investigated by this committee. The questions being asked you regarding Communist Party activities are directly related to articles written by you and having to do with Communist propaganda. That is the phase we are investigating today.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have a copy in my hands of Masses and Mainstream of April 1950, in which there is an article signed by Louis Harap, one Louis Harap, and Masses and Mainstream is listed as a Marxist quarterly launched by the Communist Party in January 1947 for the avowed purpose of stimulating Marxist thinking in literature and the creative arts. It later merged with New Masses, the weekly journalistic voice of the Communist Party, and it was so cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Masses and Mainstream has also been cited by this committee as a successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine, on April 26, 1950.

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. FORER. It wasn't a question.

Mr. HARAP. I am sorry.

Mr. KUNZIG. It was not a question, but I realize it is virtually automatic.

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question pending at the moment.

Mr. CLARDY. No answer, either, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KUNZIG. Turning back for the moment to the trial of 11 Communists, otherwise known as the Medina famous trial conducted by Judge Medina, were you a member of a delegation which is listed here as Louis Harap, member of a delegation to Judge Medina to protest the handling of the trial?

Mr. HARAP. I refuse to answer that on the same grounds, and I might say that Mr. Jackson's statement that the Communist Party is a clear and present danger is, of course, a decision of the majority, but there is a decision of the minority which dissented, and I think it is the privilege of the chairman to stress that majority decision, but it has been proved in the past that many of the most crucial ones became the majority opinion.

Mr. SCHERER. Aren't we fighting Communists on the hills of Korea? Aren't they shooting Americans at this very moment? So you say communism isn't a present danger. How can we be so dumb?

Mr. HARAP. There is shooting going on on both sides, and what we want now is to stop shooting.

Mr. SCHERER. I say, a Communist in this country is considered to be more dangerous than a thousand of them shooting boys openly on the battlefields of Korea.

Mr. JACKSON. Let the Chair say this is no question of a right to dissent. You have by your answers today, or, more properly speaking, failure to answer, dissented in many instances. That hasn't been brought into question. Your constitutional right to dissent hasn't

been questioned, nor has your refusal to answer been questioned by any member of the committee. The matter of your right to dissent is quite well protected, I think, by the committee.

Mr. HARAP. I think the activities of the committee—

Mr. CLARDY. May I make an observation?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. May I point out to the witness that until the minority opinion of the Supreme Court becomes the majority it is the duty of good, law-abiding citizens to abide by the decision of the majority of the court, and what you are suggesting and proposing, sir, is that you disregard the law as established by the majority because you wish your will to triumph.

That is all I wish to say.

Mr. HARAP. I don't wish to triumph at all.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Counsel, proceed.

(At this point Mr. Harap conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. KUNZIG. To finish that statement on which I had just started asking questions, I have a copy of the Daily Worker, New York, Friday, August 5, 1949, which has a lengthy article about delegates to Judge Medina protesting, and so forth, against the judge's action in jailing leaders of the Communist Party, and one of those in attendance, according to the Daily Worker, is Louis Harap.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't like to comment too much, Mr. Chairman, but the witness has objected to the procedures of this committee, objected to the Medina trial, and here in his publication he also says this about another trial:

The death house at the State prison at Trenton, N. J., seals off from the world six men to die in the electric chair for the crime of being Negroes. Six thousand pages of their trial record reveal one of the most startling cases of legal lynching on the books.

So I don't know what trial in American courts he agrees with.

Mr. JACKSON. That is what is generally known as freedom of speech.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that, but I think we have a right to point out what a man does say and what a man does say and what a man does believe in view of his statement about this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Harap, did you speak at an open forum on chauvinism and culture, Friday evening, August 13, 1948, before the student section of the Communist Party itself as listed in the Daily Worker of Wednesday, August 11, 1948?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you speak before the Communist Party of Brownsville on Thursday, April 28, 1949, as listed in the Daily Worker of that day, listing Louis Harap, managing editor of Jewish Life?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, perhaps of more current interest, Dr. Harap, did you write an article in the Worker of January 20, 1952, entitled "Anti-Semitism and the Rosenbergs," the effect of which article was to make it clear, or suggest very strongly, that the only reason for the death sentence of the Rosenbergs was because of anti-Semitism?

Are you the Louis Harap who wrote that article in the January 20 issue, 1952, of the Worker?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you on Thursday, June 26, 1952, in the Daily Worker, write an article entitled "The Ominous Aspect of the Rosenberg Death Sentence," by Louis Harap? Are you the Louis Harap?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you, in the Daily People's World of Friday, March 21, 1952, write another article entitled "Anti-Semitism in the Rosenberg Spy Case," by Louis Harap? Are you the Louis Harap who wrote that article?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, there is much other material here indicating articles written from the Marxist viewpoint of art, articles in the Daily Worker, articles in various other publications here. I think it is rather apparent that the witness is going to take the fifth amendment as to any and all of these articles and, therefore, I respectfully suggest that there is perhaps no further reason in citing them in addition.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair has one question. The science pamphlet—may I see that?

Is it my understanding that this pamphlet has been cited and appears in the Guide to Subversive Organizations?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; I think we listed that; if not—

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask, Dr. Harap, what distinction you make between answering to a question having to do with an article in Soviet Russia Today, and refusing to answer the same question having to do with an article appearing in Science and Society—

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

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Both of which publications have been cited by the committee or by the Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. HARAP. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know that Science and Society had been cited?

Mr. HARAP. I wasn't sure; no.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know Soviet Russia Today had been cited?

Mr. HARAP. Well, so many publications are cited that one can't keep up with it. I wouldn't be able to say for certain about any of these things.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have any questions, Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. The subcommittee stands in adjournment.

(Whereupon, at 2:35 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION
(Education—Part 6)

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1953

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:42 a. m., in the Caucus Room, 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; George E. Cooper and James Andrews, investigators.

Mr. VELDE. The meeting will come to order.

Let the record show that present are Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, and Mr. Velde as chairman. There is a quorum of the full committee.

Before proceeding with the next witness, Mr. Counsel, I want to read into the record a letter and two resolutions which refute some of the statements made by the witness we had yesterday, Dr. Louis Harap.

The letter is on the stationery of the American Jewish Committee, and reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

New York 16, N. Y.

(Washington Counsel, Marcus Cohn, Washington 6, D. C.)

JUNE 30, 1953.

Hon. HAROLD H. VELDE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VELDE: The false statements made yesterday (June 29) to an open session of your committee by Louis Harap prompts us to place before you our views exposing the Communist propaganda employed by him.

The American Jewish Committee, as a nationwide organization which has pioneered in fighting anti-Semitism the world over and in advancing human rights, believes that through this statement to you it can express some measure of the outrage which American Jews, like so many of their fellow citizens of all faiths, must feel at Harap's attempt to exploit your committee's platform to impugn American democracy and its treatment of the diverse groups constituting our population.

Louis Harap speaks for himself and for Communists. He is no more a spokesman for the religious group he seeks to exploit than for the democracy he professes to support, for Judaism and communism are utterly incompatible. His injection of the false charge of anti-Semitism into your committee's investigation of Communists is a studied Communist maneuver in the long-standing attempt to

besmirch American treatment of its religious and racial groups while praising the Soviet Union. As such this maneuver should be exposed as a brazen design to hide from the world communism's long standing campaign against minority groups, their religions and culture.

We share what must be a common concern among your fellow Congressmen and among all thoughtful Americans about Harap's use of your committee as a platform for the worldwide circulation of Communist propaganda. To help defeat these distortions we shall be glad to place at your disposal all our published findings on the treatment of minorities behind the Iron Curtain including advance galleys of our forthcoming book, the Jews in the Soviet Satellite. Compiled by experts and based upon personal documents and eye-witness accounts, it exposes Communist treatment of Jews in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. This companion volume to the Jews in the Soviet Union (the latter was published in 1951 and is being transmitted to you under separate cover) is but the latest carefully documented study in a series which the American Jewish Committee has published since 1948 on Communist assaults on Jewish life abroad.

For the benefit of the American people and to help maintain America's rightful place as a leader in the promotion of human rights and better interfaith understanding we ask that you (1) include this statement and the attached resolutions in your committee's record and (2) make this statement exposing Harap's slanders available to the American public.

With appreciation,

IRVING M. ENGEL,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

The resolution entitled "Declaration of Communist Anti-Semitism Adopted at the 46th Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee, January 30, February 1, 1953," is as follows:

Anti-Semitism has long been present in the internal policies of Moscow and its subjugated countries. The injection of anti-Semitism into the trial of renegade Jews, who had espoused communism, is renewed evidence that the anti-Semitism of Stalin is similar to the anti-Semitism of Hitler.

The Jews are not the first to suffer. The doctrine of group guilt and group annihilation has long been ruthlessly applied by the Soviet masters to social classes, ethnic minorities, and religious groups. Members of all religious groups have been persecuted and their churches destroyed. The Catholic Church has been the object of special persecution, culminating in the recent infamous imprisonment and execution of Catholic priests.

Communism has long done its utmost to destroy the spiritual life of all groups, like the Jews, who by reason of their religious belief or cultural heritage do not yield to its total domination. Now, the Jews, like others, face the threat of imprisonment, starvation, exposure, and execution.

Anti-Semitism is for the Communist rulers not an end in itself, but a tactic. It is not the Jews only they seek to destroy. Stalin's attack upon the Jews is a bid for support from all Fascist forces in Germany, in Western Europe, in the Near East, and in Latin America, looking ultimately to the conquest of America and the entire free world. As with Hitler, anti-Semitism is again being used to unite the enemies of democracy.

The American Jewish Committee appeals to free men the world over to denounce this new threat to humanity.

The second resolution issued by the American Jewish Committee is on the subject of anti-Semitism and religious persecution, adopted by the executive committee May 3, 1953, and reads as follows:

In an open confession of guilt the new regime in the U. S. S. R. has quashed the patently fabricated case against the Moscow doctors and has acknowledged that it was designed to promote anti-Semitism.

This case has produced a profound revulsion in world public opinion since the world has learned from the Nazis what an official program of anti-Semitism portends to all religious and ethnic minorities.

The American Jewish Committee points out that although the fantastic case against the doctors has been dropped, there is no evidence of the abandonment of the discriminatory and repressive policies pursued for many years by the Soviet Union and its satellites against Jews and other religious and ethnic groups.

In Poland, Hungary, and other satellite countries, purges of the few remaining Jewish institutions continues. Absurd charges against Jews and Jewish organizations continue to be hurled by the Soviet bloc representatives in the United Nations and in the Soviet and satellite press. The policy of suppressing Jewish communal and cultural organizations initiated a number of years ago remains in effect. Immigration from satellite countries has been completely stopped. In short, the fundamental policies and attitudes of the Soviet Union and the satellite countries towards Jews and Judaism have not changed.

Recent reports from some of the satellite countries, particularly East Germany, indicate that the equally abhorrent persecution of the Protestant and Catholic religious leadership is actually being intensified.

Until all groups under the Soviet Union and its satellites are given religious freedom and full protection of their individual human rights, the American Jewish Committee will continue unabated its efforts to expose the striking variance between the Soviet Union's professed opposition to racial and religious discrimination and its actual practices.

I believe that these resolutions and the letter express, of course, an opinion, but a great majority of the people who adhere to the Jewish faith here in the United States and Americans, if called to testify, if we were able to call all the members of this committee and other organizations of the Jewish faith, we would be able to definitely prove the statement I have just made.

Mr. WALTER. You might be interested in knowing that several weeks ago we were having some hearings on an immigration matter and the spokesman for various Jewish groups was asked the question by me because of the charge that the immigration act is anti-Semitic and the question was asked wherein it was anti-Semitic. He said it wasn't, but these charges are made by the same kind of people, the same Jews.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure that the gentleman is correct in his interpretation of the Jewish opinion regarding the McCarran-Walter bill.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have as a witness this morning, Mr. George Mayberry.

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you swear that it will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE BEACH MAYBERRY

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

Mr. MAYBERRY. George Beach Mayberry. I have dropped the Beach in the last 20 years because it confused my father and myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel, Mr. Mayberry?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the practice of the committee to explain to every witness that he has the right to counsel at any time during the course of the hearing and if there should be an occasion when you desire to consult counsel, an opportunity will be given you to do so.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Surely. I hope no opportunity will arise.

Mr. CLARDY. May I make a slight correction?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. He has the privilege of having counsel not as a matter of constitutional right.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

When and where were you born, Mr. Mayberry?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I was born in East Orange, N. J., on July 29, 1913.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. MAYBERRY. At 369 North Grove Street, East Orange, N. J.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I am a free lance editor and writer.

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

Mr. MAYBERRY. The East Orange high schools; at Williams College from 1930 to 1932; Princeton University, 1932 to 1934, and Harvard University from 1935 to, I think it was 1942. You can check on that in the record, when I got my doctor's degree from Harvard, because I am not sure myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin your graduate studies at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. In 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your record of employment has been?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, let me see, starting in the year 1936 or 1937, I became an instructor at Harvard, not on the faculty. That is a different system. They have part-time instructors who are not on the faculty, and as a matter of fact, in all my career at Harvard I was never on the faculty, but I was a part-time instructor at Harvard.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what field?

Mr. MAYBERRY. In English literature. But the following year, which was 1938—and you will have to correct me on that—in 1938 I became a tutor at Harvard, tutor and assistant. I assisted in various departments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a new plan just put into effect at Harvard at that time known as the tutor system?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Oh, no; the tutor system had been there for a long time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there some phase or branch of that work which was put into effect for the first time in 1938?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Oh, no. It had been there for a long time. I think it started when Charles W. Eliot was president, and he was dead long before I got there.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you engage in work as tutor and assistant at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Either 1941 or 1942, and you can look up the dates to get them right, because I am very bad on dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed after 1942?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, in 1942 I was unemployed, either late in 1942 or early in 1943, and again you can check to find out, I went to work in New York for the New Republic magazine. I remained there until, I think, about 1948. As I said before, since then I have been a free-lance editor and writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been the general nature of your work as a free-lance writer?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Mainly book reviews for the New York Times and also editing those 25-cent pocket books. I have done four of them and am working on one now.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you engaged in making book reviews for the New York Times? Over what years?

Mr. MAYBERRY. The last 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Mayberry, during the period of time that you were at Harvard University either as an undergraduate—

Mr. MAYBERRY. I was not an undergraduate.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. While at Harvard University between 1935 and 1942, were you aware of the existence of a Communist Party group or cell located either within the student body or within the graduate group or the faculty of Harvard University?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Now you have given me three choices there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; three choices.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I will say "yes" to all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes to all three?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Let me get this straight. In what capacity were you serving during those years from 1935 to 1942?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I was a part-time graduate student and at the same time teaching, not on the faculty but as an assistant to members of the faculty. I think that is as clear as I can make it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you told us that you were an instructor in 1936 and then in 1938 became a tutor and assistant?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I think you have those dates wrong there. Maybe I stated them wrong. I became a tutor in 1936. I may have given you the wrong information.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us just what you consider to be correct?

Mr. MAYBERRY. As nearly as I can remember, let me see, there was a year completely out of my life where I was unemployed and went to Europe for a while, and that was in 1935, and in the fall of 1936 I went to Harvard, and at first I was a graduate assistant in English, so it was in the fall of 1936 that I was given an assistantship and also made a tutor at the Leverett House.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the nature of your awareness of the existence of a Communist Party group at Harvard, your first awareness of that matter?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I knew very well it existed, because of my left-wing activity in the Teachers' Union. I was approached by the Communist Party to join the group, which I did, as far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that, please?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I would say that was 1936, but I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you were approached by the Communist Party to become a member, did you hold any official position in the Teachers' Union?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Not that I know of. At one time or another I was a member of the executive board of the Teachers' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. But not at the time that you were requested to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't know. I frankly don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who approached you and asked you to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I hate to say it, but it was a guy named Louis Harap.

Mr. SCHERER. What was that name?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Harap.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed to describe how you became a member?

Mr. MAYBERRY. As nearly as I can remember, and as I say this is 16 or 17 years ago, Harap and I were walking back from an afternoon party at somebody's place, whose name I cannot remember at all, and Louis said, "You seem to vote within the Teachers' Union the way we vote, and I understand that you have very strong leftwing sympathies. How about coming around to a meeting?"

And that is all there was to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend the meeting?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I attended the meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was the meeting held?

Mr. MAYBERRY. At the apartment of Robert Gorham Davis. The address I cannot remember right now, but you can check that too.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of that group of the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Until the spring of 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, during that period of time what was the main objective of this group of the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, without going into a long historical background of radicalism in Cambridge, Mass., I will try to narrow it down to this simple thing; we were to work in mass organization and our immediate mass organization was the Harvard Teachers' Union which had different names at different times. At one time it was the Cambridge Teachers' Union, and we were to get our point across as well as we could.

Outside of that the one thing we did and did effectively, and I am very proud of it still, we published a pamphlet on anti-Semitism. Anyone reading it today would never detect that that was a Communist document, but it was. We did that. Of course, I am talking in the frame of reference as a popular front, and that was why I left the Communist Party. When the Communist Party dropped out of the People's Front I dropped out too.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you presently about your reasons for leaving the Communist Party.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. At this point I want to find out just what it was that the Communist Party was interested in achieving at Harvard University and the method they used to achieve their objectives.

Mr. MAYBERRY. It was all working within the Teachers' Union. There were other things, but very peripheral. There was a bookshop, the Holyoke Book Shop, and I don't know where the money came from, but it was obviously a Communist bookshop.

Then I voluntarily taught one semester at the Boston Central Labor School, which I understand has also since then gone under various names. I taught a very innocuous course on modern American literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Returning now to the American Federation of Teachers, did you continue to be active in this organization after you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; I must have, yes; the year I left Harvard was 1941 and I think I must have paid my dues up to that time, although I think it ceased to be the A. F. of L.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe to the committee, please, just how the Communist Party functioned in its effort to infiltrate the Teachers' Union and to influence its action?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Let me narrow it down to one case and if you want more I can give you more, and I think this kind of thing is what you are interested in and what I am interested in.

In the late fall of 1939 I had ceased going to Communist meetings and dropped out of it, but in 1939 there was a token bid by the Communists to pledge \$5 to the Harvard undergraduate fight against arms to England. And at that Teachers' Union meeting I know a few people by that time left, and there must have been very few who were in favor of giving the undergraduates \$5 to continue their campaign against arms to Britain.

I went to that meeting and of course naturally by that time I was through with the Communists and also, I hate to say this as an Irishman, but I was also in favor of arms to Britain as I had always been ever since that campaign started.

The remnants of the Communist Party in Cambridge obviously were working there. They probably had a caucus beforehand and they had gotten out everybody they could get for whatever reasons to try to get this \$5 committed to the students. That was the way they worked on any number of issues.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the Communist Party group within the American Federation of Labor through various advance caucuses, they endeavored to control the action of the Teachers' Union?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Exactly. That is standard practice in American politics, union politics. I am not defending it, but as a historian I am trying to explain that that is standard practice. That is what they did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party, by the same method, endeavor to control the election of officers of the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Of course. All the other groups at the union did, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they successful to any material extent in the decision as to who should be elected?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I think they lost every time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they caucus in the same manner and for the purpose of determining who should be delegates to the State and national conventions?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a national or a State convention at any time?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No. I think in fairness let us get this clear. I was a known Communist and everybody who knew me knew I was a Communist during these 2½ years and the Communists are not so stupid that they would send me to a national convention. But so far as I know they never got anyone they really wanted to go to get elected to the convention.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other mass organizations did the Communist Party become active in at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Now, let me see, there was an organization—and you will have to check on this, too, because I never can remember those things—it may have been called Friends of the Spanish Republic.

I know I worked for that quite hard. It was not quite Friends of the Spanish Republic, but you will have to check on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the nature of the work that the Harvard Communist group did?

Mr. MAYBERRY. To raise money for ambulances for the Spanish Republic.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any effort made to recruit members for the war in Spain?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee about that, please?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I was asked, for example, if I would go to Spain, and I said "No," because I had family obligations, and I was excused on those grounds by the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us more in detail how the decisions were made to endeavor to recruit you for the war in Spain?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I guess either Bob Davis or Louis Harap, and I don't know which, and maybe it was another person asked me, "How do you feel about it?"

I said I would be willing to go, but I would have to have clearance from my own family, because my family comes first before the party. Beyond that I cannot remember the details, if there were any details. That just dropped. And when I was asked I said temporarily no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, of any other work that this Communist Party cell was engaged in that you can recall?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I told you about the Boston Labor School at which I taught.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the connection of the Communist Party group in Harvard with the Boston Labor School?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, there was one year there when Philip Frankfeld was the head of the Communist Party in New England or maybe just Massachusetts, I don't know, and it was suggested that they have a course in modern American literature, and I don't know who asked me, probably Davis because Davis did not want to appear publicly because he was not known to be a Communist on the campus, whereas I was known to be a Communist to everybody. It was no skin off my behind to go over to Boston and teach.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other names has that school had, to your knowledge?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I think later it was called the Samuel Adams School.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of any other persons who taught there while you were teaching?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No, I cannot; but you could very easily find out because they had a printed prospectus with the names of the teachers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether George Markham taught there at that time?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't recall the name at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet any Communist Party groups at the school?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I just went there and gave my lecture and a one-half hour talk afterward, but I wouldn't know any names at all. That is the honest to God's truth there, as elsewhere in my whole testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the bookshop in Cambridge. Do you recall who operated the bookshop?

Mr. MAYBERRY. There was a little girl, there; you probably have her name there somewhere.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it Margot Clark?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; Margot Clark, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What knowledge did you have of the connection of the Communist Party with that bookshop?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I knew the Communists were very much interested in it and, well, do you want me to skip ahead of my testimony, because this is very important as to why I left the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is a good place to develop that point, so just proceed.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't know whether Margot Clark was a Communist or not, but I knew very well it was a left-wing bookshop, Communist or otherwise, and I hope to make clear in my testimony that there are many brands of left-wing Americanisms which are not Communist.

Margot Clark seemed to run the bookshop and I never saw her at any Communist meeting or activities, but I more or less assumed that she probably belonged either completely or as a fellow traveler within the Communist group.

I was asked to help out and select the books to sell at the bookshop.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were asked by whom?

Mr. MAYBERRY. By Robert Davis and Louis Harap, if I would kind of drop by and tell Margot what books to buy and what books to push, which I thought was very stupid and no reason to it at all because it was an open bookshop.

But one day a very good friend of mine dropped by and tried to get a copy of a book which he had seen the day before in the front window of the bookshop. Margot or one of the girls at the bookshop told him they were out of the book. So I went up to the bookstore and I got hold of Margot and I said "Margot, why isn't that book in the window?" She said "He is now an anti-Communist. We won't sell the book."

Mr. TAVENNER. That the author of the book was an anti-Communist?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; the author of the book was Ignazio Silone, and the title of the book is Fontmara.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. You mentioned Louis Harap's name as one of the two that you had consulted with, or one of the two who asked you to operate in the selection of the books. In doing that, in what capacity was he acting? What gave him any authority to put you on that job, so to speak?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I was a frequenter of the bookstore even before I knew that it was a Communist or fellow traveler bookstore and I was friendly with the people in the bookstore. It was either Harap or Davis, and I am talking about things that happened 16 years ago.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes. They must have had some Communist Party position of some sort that would have given them the necessary authority to delegate this unofficial job to you.

What I am trying to get at is, What position did Harap occupy that would give him that authority?

MR. MAYBERRY. Well, if I were an American businessman running an organization I would certainly have to condemn the Communist Party as it acted at Cambridge as being thoroughly ineffective. We never had any chairman at the meetings. It was just like a college bull session.

MR. CLARDY. Everybody was sort of like a committee of one, more or less.

MR. MAYBERRY. Yes; and usually the more dominant person would take charge and at the time that I was there and the one year that Granville Hicks was there, Granville more or less, by seniority, took over. Otherwise Davis who was I think probably the oldest of us and had a very keen, quick mind, and the rest of the fellows were like myself, sloppy, casual individuals.

MR. CLARDY. Harap was apparently pretty high up on the chain of command and when the others were not there he took over the responsibility of dominating the group?

MR. MAYBERRY. He is that kind of a fellow, a little fellow who quite often reacts in that way because of his size.

MR. CLARDY. We have heard him, and I know what you mean.

He was active in the Communist Party and could assert himself and could delegate this job to you?

MR. MAYBERRY. He could ask me to do it.

MR. CLARDY. That is what I meant. He had the authority, whether he seized it or not.

MR. MAYBERRY. He asked me. It was either he or Davis, but it was probably Harap.

MR. CLARDY. Thank you.

MR. TAVENNER. As a result of those instructions you became aware of this incident which you have just described when Margot Clark refused to sell a book because the author had become anti-Communist?

MR. MAYBERRY. That is right. She did not refuse. She just took the book or books and put them in the back room of the bookshop.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know of any other efforts of the Communist group to censor books and publications in this bookshop?

MR. MAYBERRY. Yes; I had a very hard time to persuade either Margot or the girl who worked with her, whose name I cannot remember, to get me any—because I wanted them to get the profit of the sale—a copy of Charles Beard's *The Rise of American Civilization*. It took them about a day to find they had a copy in the backroom.

MR. CLARDY. You mean they did not want to sell that?

MR. MAYBERRY. They put it in the backroom.

MR. CLARDY. Why?

MR. MAYBERRY. Because Charles Beard was a violent anti-Communist.

MR. TAVENNER. Did Margot Clark advise you as to the source of her directions about the sale of anti-Communist literature and books?

MR. MAYBERRY. No. I don't know where that came from.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you have any conferences with Louis Harap on the subject?

MR. MAYBERRY. No. He talked to me about one matter which I hope we will get to later.

Mr. CLARDY. Were there any other incidents of that kind in which they would snatch a book off the shelf as soon as they discovered the author had become anti-Communist?

Mr. MAYBERRY. There was a book by André Malraux. I have forgotten which of his books it was, but it was at the time that Malraux ceased being a Communist in France. He just became nothing. He became anti-Communist.

Mr. CLARDY. And as soon as that happened they automatically crossed him off the list?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. They have a little bit of a blacklist of their own.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Evidently.

Mr. CLARDY. And they use it.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; in their own stores. I am saying that that was one of the first steps of why I left the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. You finally began to tumble to the fact that this thing called academic freedom did not exist in the Communist world?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the attitude of this particular Communist Party group with regard to recruiting new members?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, we always tried our best.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of your membership in it, did you acquire information as to when it was first organized at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I never knew. It was in existence in a very small way. Of course it was always a very small organization. It was a very small minority group.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was the same group of which Robert Gorham Davis, Granville Hicks, Daniel J. Boorstin, and Wendell Furry were members?

Mr. MAYBERRY. That is right, and myself, of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the latest knowledge that you had of the existence of that group at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I would say somewhere in 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the time that you severed your connections with it?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes. When I stopped going to meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know, however, whether it went out of existence at that time or whether it continued for a longer period of time?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I would guess it kept going, but I could only guess because I was not there and didn't see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any connection between this group and the student body?

Mr. MAYBERRY. During my time only indirectly. That incident I described to you when the Teachers' Union was asked to give a token sum of \$5 to the American Student Union which then had been captured, as far as I could find out, by the American Communist Party because they get there first and stay longer, as you know, and they work hard. I would guess then that the impulse to try to get the \$5 for the student group came from whatever was left of the Communist core within the Teachers' Union. As I say, I don't know because I believe that time I was out and I spoke long and violently against giving that \$5.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had the Communist Party at that time secured a foothold in the student union at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. That I would guess to be correct, but I don't know because I had lost contact completely. When I got disillusioned with communism I did not have anything to do with them any more except for Davis who was a personal friend of mine and also a colleague.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether this group of the Communist Party was visited from time to time by functionaries on a higher level in the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, now, I don't know whether Granville Hicks would have been considered a functionary or not, but when he came to Cambridge that one year he taught as a guest lecturer. He came and in fact took over the small unit. We were visited once, at our request, by Philip Frankfeld who had just been appointed the general—whatever title they have—of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occasion for inviting him before your group?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Just for a chat and to make ourselves acquainted with the great Phil Frankfeld. There were no directives handed down as far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are Communist Party directives transmitted to your group?

Mr. MAYBERRY. This is very complicated. We were regarded as a kind of an elite group of scholars and intelligent men and we made our own decisions. I cannot recall of any directive coming down, with one exception, and I would like to reserve that for later—or do you want me to tell you now?

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe it would be better to tell us at this time.

Mr. MAYBERRY. We were asked, and by whom I don't know, that we should all buy and read a copy of the history of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever asked to read any historical works on the United States?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; we did that as a matter of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you were asked to buy and to read—

Mr. MAYBERRY. A copy of the history of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, and when I read it I was—it was the most distorted version of what happened in Russia between the years 1917 and 1935 that I have ever read.

Mr. CLARDY. Who authored that?

Mr. MAYBERRY. It was edited by a man named Joseph Stalin. Who wrote it, I don't know. It was edited by Stalin.

Mr. SCHERER. Should I save my time in reading it?

Mr. MAYBERRY. You will not learn any history.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it a fact that the Communist Party put much stress on the study in their study courses of the history of the Soviet Union, much more so than any other publication or any other part of the Communist Party literature?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Actually in my time the stress was on American history.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Studying American history, and of course, drawing the Marxist-Lenin lessons from American history, which I could not

draw because they do not apply. I found that out as a historian and if I can expand just for a minute on that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBERRY. There is a great deal of Marxism, a great deal to it when it applies itself to facts. It brings out facts that the ordinary historians do not see; but when it sets itself on theory to be applied back to the facts, then as a historian I had to reject it, and that is one of the reasons why I had to quit the party because their reading of history didn't make any sense.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you were telling us you were directed to buy and to read this particular document.

Mr. MAYBERRY. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. The History of the Soviet Union.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was that directive handed down to you in your group?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I arrived at Bob Davis' apartment one afternoon, and about 6 or 7 copies of the book were there; and, now, whether Harap or someone else brought them beforehand I don't know. At any rate, the books were there, and we were told to take them and read them, and also to try to persuade friends of ours to read them. Of course, I read the book. It is not a very long book. I read it maybe in an evening, and I was ashamed to show it to any friend of mine.

Mr. SCHIERER. I didn't hear that last statement.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I said I was afraid to show it to any friend of mine. (Representative Kit Clardy left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other instances that you can recall when directives were handed down from higher levels of the Communist Party to your group—

Mr. MAYBERRY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or higher functionaries appeared before your group?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you asked at any time to visit other groups of the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any Communist Party group meetings among the undergraduates at Harvard?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No. That was something that was strictly forbidden.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom?

Mr. TAVENNER. By ourselves—not to get mixed up with undergraduates.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for that?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Probably—well, again I have to guess—probably it was better to leave the undergraduates alone and not let them know that certain members in the faculty group were members of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was, then, principally a security matter?

Mr. MAYBERRY. As far as I know; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee where your meetings were held?

Mr. MAYBERRY. At the apartment of Robert Gorham Davis. The street number I wouldn't know, and the street address.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of the meetings held in your apartment?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; there was a meeting in my apartment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who attended the meeting in your apartment?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Davis, Boorstin, and Harap may have been there, but I can't remember. This was on a very special thing. It was a pamphlet that we wrote and distributed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of others?

Mr. MAYBERRY. At that meeting?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I think that is all.

I think maybe Harap was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed the group while you were there—approximately?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Oh, between 7 and 9.

I am trying to think of the size of Davis' apartment. It was a very small one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of others who were members of this group, whose names you can recall?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes, I can; but some of them you have to put a question mark alongside of because, as I say, this was more or less in the nature of a college bull session.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, we don't want you to give us the names of any that there should be a question mark beside.

Mr. MAYBERRY. We had no membership cards. Dues were just paid cash out of hand.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right; let me ask you this: To whom did you pay dues?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't know who picked the money up. I think probably either Harap or Davis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you collect dues at any time?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Not that I can remember. I may have but if I did I would have turned it over at the end of the meeting to either Bob or Harap.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what led to your severance of your Communist Party connections?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I think most of that information you have already, but to go over it again: One was the interference with the bookshop. Another was when Harap—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, just a moment.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the seriousness in your mind of the Communist Party interference with the operation of the bookshop?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't like any form of thought control, never have, and I hope I never will.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't hear that answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. He does not approve of any form of thought control.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Whether by Communists or other groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you considered that the Communist Party was endeavoring—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Some of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. To restrict—

Mr. MAYBERRY. I can't say it was the Communist Party, but someone was trying to influence the policy of that bookshop, and I felt it should be a free and open bookshop.

And shortly after that Harap came to me and he asked me to use my influence with my literary friends not to write—pardon my syntax—not to write for a magazine called Partisan Review, which had been started back, oh, about 1932 by the then Communists and had been captured in about 1936 by the non-Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, what was the seriousness in your mind of that situation?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I was asked to go and talk to 3 or 4 of my friends who were willing to write for the new Partisan Review, the new non-Communist Partisan Review, and I was supposed to go and explain, according to Louis Harap—I was supposed to go and explain to them they would be betraying the working class, and all that rubbish, by writing for this publication.

Mr. TAVENNER. Betraying the working class.

In other words, this was a form of boycotting—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or blacklisting—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. A publication which had ceased to be a Communist publication?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Exactly.

And again I can't use the language that I told Louis when he asked me that, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you refuse to comply with his request?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I certainly did.

At that time I was already not going to meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any other occurrence take place which influenced you in your decision?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, not within this country, but in Russia the evidence of the purge trials in 1937.

Mr. SCHERER. The evidence of what trials?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Of the purge trials in Russia in 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you at that point—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Naturally, at that time I couldn't believe them, but, as I mulled them over, it became obvious they were pretty damnably true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you at this point—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Surely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been to Russia at any time?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes; I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee when that trip occurred?

Mr. MAYBERRY. In 1937—the summer of 1937—I would say early in—either late in July or early in August.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you obtain any information in Russia regarding the purge trials?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I didn't. The purge took—the major part of the purge took place after I left Russia. I was in Russia completely as a tourist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Completely as a tourist.

How long were you in Russia?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Two weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party have anything to do with your engaging in that travel?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; and—keep this on the record or off, but this is my joke for the day: When I was leaving Cambridge in June of that year, I ran into Harap on the street and he said, "George, what are you doing this summer?"

I said, "Well, I'm going to Europe."

He said, "Did you tell the party?"

I said, "No. My vacation time is my own, isn't it?"

He said, "Oh, but you ought to tell the party when you're on vacation so they can keep in touch with you all the time."

As I said, by that time I was practically out of it, and that kind of attitude is something I can't stand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go alone on this trip—

Mr. MAYBERRY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or were you accompanied by—

Mr. MAYBERRY. My brother was with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any other members or any members of the Communist Party other than yourself in the party or group?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; no; no. John and I were completely alone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Edwin Blaisdell?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't know the name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I interrupted you in your description of the occurrences that took place in Russia which had a bearing on your decision—

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; no; no.

Mr. TAVENNER. To leave—

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; no.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Communist Party.

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; from what I read.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I understand.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

I didn't see a thing in Russia that would bear on my attitude at all, except for the subway. It looked like the backside of Brooklyn.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not certain whether you have completed your testimony as to the occurrences that took place in Russia—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, what happened—

Mr. TAVENNER. Which affected your decision.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Oh, yes; sure. I would be glad to expand on that.

The Russian revolution, the Bolshevik revolution, as with all revolutions, amalgamated many different people, and some of them were the greatest and finest minds who had been fighting the Czarist government for years. I think the two outstanding ones were Maxim Gorky and Lunacharsky, and the younger disciples—men like Karl Radek and Nicholai Bukharin. The old men—they died off, and the young men—at least some comparatively young—were purged in 1937 and 1938, and finally the real tough boys like Stalin came in.

Mr. SCHERER. Finally what?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Finally the real tough boys like Stalin had a free hand, because men like Lunacharsky, one of the greatest educators,

and men like Gorky, one of the greatest novelists of our time—they were dead, and they got rid of Radek and those with a flexible, sensitive mind. They got rid of them, and Stalin and his goose-stepping boys were in complete power—and that was not the Communist Party I joined, and I was glad to get out of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what the date of your last association with the Communist Party was?

Mr. MAYBERRY. It would be somewhere in 1938; when, exactly, I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any effort made by members of the Communist Party to get you back into the party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I think they were so fed up with me, because in their minds I had never been a real Communist. I was more or less a showpiece.

Mr. SCHERER. A what?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I was more or less a showpiece, and I was very effective moving on the campus as—

Mr. SCHERER. You indicated by your testimony that you felt Communist philosophy in some respects was rather attractive; did you not?

Mr. MAYBERRY. That's roughly fair; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I don't say I disagree with you on that, but isn't it a fact that this philosophy was only used to attract people to the Soviet cause?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, now, I would say that you're young enough to have been in the depression.

Mr. SCHERER. What?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I would say you are young enough to have been in the depression, and you saw what it was like.

Mr. VELDE. Old enough, you mean, to have been in the depression?

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, yes; I started to practice law a week before the depression.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't know what more to say on that point.

Mr. VELDE. Well, do you make a distinction between communism in theory, or Marxism in theory, and Marxism and communism in practice?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I certainly do.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I mean, I regard myself as being still—it would be hard to figure out the percentage, but say 75 percent a Marxist, as a historian, because it still makes a great deal of sense, as you study history and as you study economics. The practice, though, of the American Communist Party—

Mr. SCHERER. What?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I object to openly and violently.

Mr. VELDE. But don't you agree, Doctor, that this idea of sharing the wealth is a good propaganda piece to get—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Sure.

Mr. SCHERER. Converts?

Mr. VELDE. Converts—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Sure; it is.

Mr. VELDE. To Marxism or communism?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Sure.

Mr. SCHERER. The present leaders of the Kremlin are using this somewhat attractive philosophy, are they not, to ensnare the masses to their cause?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I suppose they are. All I know is what I read in the newspapers. I am completely out of the situation.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I understand that; but you certainly—

Mr. MAYBERRY. It is a very powerful appeal, and I'm sure that—well, I'm here to answer questions, not to make speeches, but—

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you to speak on that question.

Mr. MAYBERRY. We have lost our cause in Asia and probably most of Africa by not getting in there first and fighting the terrific appeal the Communists have. After all, the Russian Revolution was run by Lenin on the simple slogan of bread and land. That's all he offered them—bread and land. I don't know whether they ever got it or not.

Mr. SCHERER. I say the present leaders of the Kremlin are using this—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Sure; they are.

Mr. SCHERER. Philosophy which you talk about—

Mr. MAYBERRY. I assume they are.

Mr. SCHERER. To attract people in the cause?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I assume so.

Mr. SCHERER. They actually don't believe in it, as you indicated, do they? They don't believe in the idealism that they teach?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I think, as I say, the idealism died—probably the tail end of it was in 1937 when they finally got rid of Radek and Bukharin. They were the last ones left who were really old-fashioned revolutionaries, as I was an old-fashioned revolutionary.

Mr. SCHERER. The thing that motivates the leaders of the Kremlin today is the thing that motivated all conquerors and dictators—and that is power and dominations—isn't it—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Power.

Mr. SCHERER. And they will use any means, even this so-called attractive philosophy of communism, to gain converts?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I think that is absolutely right.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you agree with the contents of the letter you heard read from the American Jewish Committee here this morning?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Almost entirely. I'd have some reservations about some of the adjectives.

Mr. SCHERER. Some of the what?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Some of the adjectives there. It was getting a little purjorative.

Mr. SCHERER. Getting what?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Getting a little purjorative. It was pushing.

But the gist of the statement I would agree with entirely, and the only time I have read the Daily Worker in the last 5 years was because someone told me about these articles by Harap—and for a mild, in-offensive, little fellow, Louis Harap—the utter nonsense that he was spouting—

Mr. SCHERER. You do agree with the conclusion they reached—that the Soviet Party today in Russia is as anti-Semitic as Hitler ever was?

Mr. MAYBERRY. That I don't know. I don't know. I mean, I haven't been——

Mr. SCHERER. That is the conclusion——

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. That is reached by the committee, as indicated by the letter.

Mr. MAYBERRY. From reading the concrete reports of the New York Times and the Herald-Tribune, the evidence is pretty much to that effect.

Mr. SCHERER. Is what?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Is pretty much to that effect—that the practice of the Kremlin is anti-Semitic—but until I was there, I mean, I wouldn't know.

Mr. SCHERER. We have had any number of highly educated individuals say under oath that the Communist Party today in Russia is anti-Semitic.

Mr. MAYBERRY. But I don't know of any gluten bowls in Russia, because I haven't been there in recent years.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, all any of us know——

Mr. MAYBERRY. All I can do is tell you what I read in the New York Times.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you read other papers?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Oh, sure. My job—I read five papers a day.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with any other functionaries in the Communist Party in addition to Philip Frankfeld?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I met Earl Browder once at a cocktail party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Otis A. Hood?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Not acquainted. I went to meetings at which he spoke when he was running, as he always runs, every year, for Governor of Massachusetts, or whenever the year occurs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what you know of his connection with the Communist Party or his activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, he was an undergraduate of Harvard when I first was teaching there, and he was in the American Student Union, and I gathered from the violence of his speeches that he was in the Communist wing. See, the American Student Union at that time—I don't know what ever happened to it—was not a Communist organization, but had a very powerful minority of Communists in it, and from the way that—at that time he was known just as Boone Schirmer—Boone always followed whatever the party line was at the time, and then later he came back to Harvard when he was running for Governor of either Vermont or New Hampshire. I would have to check on that, because I am not sure. My geography is very feeble.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he is today?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I haven't the faintest idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Jack Rackliffe?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I have known Jack Rackliffe from—for at least 15 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of this group of the Communist Party of which you were a member?

Mr. MAYBERRY. He came to meetings. Now, whether he was a member or not, I don't know. I'm not saying that in a legal way, but I just don't know, because we had no records of membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time did he attend meetings?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Well, I think he came to the last meeting I attended, and I never went to any more meetings; but I knew Jack for the next 2 years that I was in Cambridge and I have known Jack on and off.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had he attended meetings prior to the last meeting you attended?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I think he attended the last meeting I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but for how many meetings prior to that had he been attending meetings?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't know. I don't think he was there. I think I just saw him once at a meeting at Davis' house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how he is employed today?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I don't. I know he's doing free-lance work, the same as I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Abe Gelbart—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Who?

Mr. TAVENNER. G-e-l-b-a-r-t?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I don't know the name.

What is the first name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Abe.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Doctor, I just have 1 or 2 questions.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Sure.

Mr. VELDE. At the present time I understand you are a free-lance writer and you do some book reviews for the New York Times?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. There has been, as you have probably read in the papers, quite a controversy as to the use of Communist publications in our American libraries, as well as our overseas libraries. I think as a writer and as a former Communist you should have an opinion regarding the placing of Communist publications, books, authored by Communists or former Communists, in our American libraries, both here in the United States and overseas. Would you care to express an opinion regarding that?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I'll be glad to, since one of my books is in the State Department libraries both in this country and overseas. This is a plug for my book.

Mr. VELDE. Well, give us the name, then, too.

Mr. MAYBERRY. A Little Treasury of American Prose, published by Charles Scribner & Sons, and it was edited entirely during the time that I was a non-Communist.

On the general point, though, I would say wouldn't it be wiser to set up a panel of about 10 American publishers, editors, and critics and let them decide the books to go over?

Someone said the other day—maybe Mrs. Roosevelt—there's no point in taking Communist books off the shelf because the Communists will get them in, in their way. I mean, let us—we're not afraid of Communist ideas. I hope to heaven I am a living example of a person who got a good strong smell of communism and couldn't stand it, and I think almost any intelligent American would have the same reaction.

Now, for example, a very minor point: Taking Howard Fast's books off the shelf—and Howard Fast's books are not Communist. He is a Communist, but his books very carefully skirt the question of communism. I'd take them off the shelf because they're so badly written. They're clumsy.

Mr. SCHERER. They are what?

Mr. MAYBERRY. They are clumsy and stupid—the Howard Fast books.

I think we make ourselves look very silly when we take Dashiell Hammett's books off the shelf. There's no communism at all in the Sam Spade stories.

Mr. VELDE. I have always had the feeling that Communist books—that is, books or any literature written by members of the Communist Party—should be read by American students and American citizens, but I also feel they should know what they are reading; and, therefore, if there were some way we could show on the cover of the book, or otherwise, that it was authored by a Communist Party member, give his history as a Communist Party member—

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. As developed by this committee and other committees—

Mr. MAYBERRY. If there is any way of doing that, I would agree with you—it would be a very good thing.

Mr. VELDE. That is a difficult proposition, of course.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, wouldn't it be somewhat of a threat to academic freedom even if we took books off the shelf, as you said, by Fast, which were clumsy and poorly written?

Mr. MAYBERRY. Yes. I mean, I don't know where you would stop. I mean, let the people read them all. The good judgment of the people I think in the long run works out.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you asking him about the books in our Information Service?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Do you have anything further to add to that, Doctor?

Mr. MAYBERRY. No; I haven't.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have any other questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Any more I can add—I would like to, but I can't think of anything I haven't said.

Mr. VELDE. The committee appreciates the information you have given here this morning, Doctor, and if there is nothing further this witness is dismissed with the committee's thanks.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Thank you.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. VELDE. The hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:06 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Beard, Charles	1922
Blaisdell, Edwin	1928
Bloomfield, Sidney	1854
Boorstin, Daniel J.	1923, 1926
Bronstein, Eugene (Gene)	1851, 1866
Browder, Earl	1931
Burton, William H.	1845
Cammer, Harold	1875-1894
Carnovsky, Morris	1907
Cavin, Joseph	1855
Clark, Margot	1921, 1922
Clark, Tom	1908
Cohn, Marcus	1913
Conant, Mr.	1862
Cooper, Charles (Hendley)	1869
Daggett, Charles	1907
Daniel, Urcel	1878
Davis, Robert Gorham	1890, 1918, 1920-1926, 1932
Einstein, Albert	1866
Eliot, Charles W.	1916
Fast, Howard	1908, 1933
Forer, Joseph	1895-1911
Frankfeld, Philip	1900, 1920, 1924, 1931
Friedburg, Saul	1850
Furry, Wendell	1869, 1923
Gelbart, Abe	1932
Gold, Mike	1908
Haldane, Mr.	1868
Hammett, Dashiell	1933
Hanfstaengel, Ernst	1849
Harap, Louis	1869, 1895-1911 (testimony), 1913, 1914, 1917, 1918, 1920-1922, 1925-1928, 1930
Hartman, Fannie	1884
Hendley, Charles	1869
Hicks, Granville	1868, 1869, 1900, 1907, 1922-1924
Hood, Otis A.	1884, 1931
Hull, Morgan	1877, 1878
Judson, Charles	1878
Lamont, Corliss	1848
Lawrence, Marc	1907
Levy, Larry	1850
Libby, Mack	1847, 1854
Magil, A. B.	1907
Malraux, André	1923
Maltz, Albert	1907
Markham, George F.	1875-1894 (testimony), 1920
Markham, Helen D.	1892
Marks, Harry J.	1843-1874 (testimony)
Matusow, Harvey	1907
Mayberry, George Beach	1915-1933 (testimony)
Mayberry, John	1928
McMichael, Jack	1855, 1856

	Page
Minor, Robert.....	1880
Oliver, William (Bill).....	1878
Philbrick, Alan.....	1850
Philbrick, Herbert.....	1850, 1892-1894
Prosten, Jesse.....	1884
Quill, Michael.....	1856
Rackliffe, Jack.....	1931, 1932
Robbins, Herbert E.....	1850, 1869, 1901, 1902
Rosenberg, Ethel.....	1910
Rosenberg, Julius.....	1910
Schappes, Morris.....	1907, 1908
Schirmer, Daniel Boone.....	1849, 1869, 1931
Silone, Ignazio.....	1921
Sparks, Nehemiah (Nemmy; Ned).....	1853, 1854
Starr, Loretta.....	1854
Townsend, Leo.....	1907
Wallace, Henry.....	1890
Weber, Johnny.....	1848, 1853, 1863
Zinsel, Paul R.....	1869

ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of University Professors.....	1867
American Federation of Labor.....	1885, 1918, 1919
American Federation of Teachers.....	1918, 1919
American Fund for Public Service.....	1908
American Jewish Committee.....	1913, 1914, 1930
American League Against War and Fascism.....	1848, 1854, 1869
American Newspaper Guild.....	1876-1878
American Student Union.....	1923, 1931
American Youth Congress.....	1855, 1856
Antioch College.....	1876
Associated Press, Boston.....	1876
Association of American Universities.....	1873
Boston Central Labor School.....	1918
Boston Labor School.....	1920
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.....	1885
Cambridge Teachers' Union.....	1918
City College of New York.....	1844, 1851
Columbia University Teachers' College.....	1844
Community Book Store, San Diego.....	1880
Congress of Industrial Organizations.....	1885
German-American Bund.....	1909
Harvard College.....	1844, 1857, 1896
Harvard Graduate School of Education.....	1844, 1845
Harvard Teachers' Union.....	1918
Harvard University.....	1845-1851, 1868-1870, 1883, 1896, 1899, 1901, 1916-1920, 1923-1925, 1931
Holyoke Book Shop.....	1918
International Fur and Leather Workers Union.....	1876, 1885, 1892, 1893
Jefferson School of Social Science.....	1908
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.....	1847, 1883
Massachusetts State CIO.....	1876, 1884, 1885, 1892
Massachusetts State College.....	1845
Morning Freiheit Association.....	1902-1904, 1907
National Student League.....	1846-1848, 1871, 1872
Newspaper Guild, Boston.....	1881, 1882
Newspaper Guild, Los Angeles.....	1881
New York City Board of Education.....	1845, 1864
New York University.....	1844
Progressive Party.....	1887, 1890
Rhodes School.....	1845
Samuel Adams School.....	1883, 1920
School of Jewish Studies.....	1908
Teachers' Union.....	1869, 1917-1919, 1923
Transport Workers' Union.....	1856

	Page
University of Berlin.....	1844
University of Connecticut.....	1867
University of Heidelberg.....	1844
University of Massachusetts.....	1845
University of Wisconsin.....	1876
Williams College.....	1916
Works Progress Administration.....	1844
Young Communist League.....	1854, 1869, 1871
Young Pioneers.....	1871

PUBLICATIONS

American Quarterly.....	1897
Daily Peoples World.....	1904, 1911
Daily Worker.....	1848, 1851, 1904, 1905, 1907, 1908, 1910, 1911, 1930
Hartford Courant.....	1863
Jewish Affairs.....	1899
Jewish Life.....	1902, 1903-1907, 1910
Jewish Survey.....	1907
Journal of Philosophy.....	1897
Masses and Mainstream.....	1908, 1909
New Masses.....	1908, 1909
New Republic.....	1916
New York Herald-Tribune.....	1931
New York Times.....	1866, 1881, 1916, 1931, 1932
Partisan Review.....	1927
Philosophical Review.....	1897
Science and Society.....	1906, 1911
Soviet Russia Today.....	1905, 1906, 1911

×



