





COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION  
(EDUCATION—PART 8)

---

---

HEARINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS  
FIRST AND SECOND SESSIONS

APRIL 21; JUNE 8, 1953; AND APRIL 12, 1954

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

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1954

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*

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

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
April 21, 1953: Testimony of Lawrence Baker Arguimbau-----	4013
June 8, 1953: Testimony of Francis X. T. Crowley-----	4037
April 12, 1954: Testimony of Bernhard Deutch-----	4043
Index -----	4053



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, the following standing committees:

\* \* \* \* \*

(a) 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 propoganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propoganda 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 8)

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*  
EXECUTIVE SESSION <sup>1</sup>

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:41 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. Donald L. Jackson presiding.

Committee member present: Representative Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

Mr. JACKSON. Let the record show that for the purposes of this hearing and under the authority vested in the chairman by the provisions of Public Law 601, Congressman Donald L. Jackson has been appointed a subcommittee for the purpose of taking testimony.

Will you stand and be sworn, sir? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FRANKEL. My name is Osmond K. Frankel, 120 Broadway, New York.

Mr. JACKSON. If at any time during the course of this interrogation you desire to confer with your counsel privately, please feel at liberty to leave the hearing room and do so if you care to do so.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Will you proceed, Mr. Kunzig?

### TESTIMONY OF LAWRENCE BAKER ARGUIMBAU, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, OSMOND K. FRANKEL

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Arguimbau, when and where were you born?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Brooklyn, N. Y., March 25, 1906.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline for the subcommittee your educational background?

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes; I started out—going back to the beginning?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I started out in the Brooklyn, N. Y., schools and went there for about 3 years to Public School No. 92, and then I shifted to Westfield, N. J., and went through the high school there. Then for 3 years I was in the Bell Laboratories working as a student assistant. During that time I had 1 hour a week of instruction in engineering work. I think I got some kind of a paper for it.

Then at the end of that time I went to Harvard for 4 years and graduated from Harvard College in 1930 with a S. B. in physics.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline your occupational background through the years?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Let us say starting from the end of high school, I was at Bell Laboratories for 3 years, and then as I told you, I went to Harvard and during the period that I was at Harvard I was also working at General Radio Co. on about a half-time basis while a student. At my graduation I continued and until 1939, at which time I went to work for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and I am there at present.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present situation at MIT?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Associate professor of electrical communications.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you go to MIT?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. In 1939, the fall term, September.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Arguimbau, have you ever been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, now, in an informal group like this, if you don't mind, may I take 3 or 4 minutes to outline my position on this general situation?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. It is roughly that I feel personally that I have never engaged in un-American or improper activities, but at the same time, I feel that many of the things that I have been doing could be open to misinterpretation, and I think that a situation of that sort is appropriately handled by the use of the fifth amendment.

Now I think that has two defects, really. One is it doesn't give you the information that you would like, really. It doesn't give the public the information that would be useful to them; and in the second place it does leave a misinterpretation on why I have used the fifth amendment. Now for that reason I have decided that the thing I should do is to talk about what I have been doing and at the same time, however, you recognize that a thing of that sort puts a person under strain. I have lost 6 pounds and may lose my job and it is a difficult situation. I do not feel justified morally, not that I feel that it would serve any real interests, to tell other people that have been in this situation. I feel also that to talk about other people's connections with me would be in a sense a thing that is warded against by the use of the first amendment in the business of association, that is freedom of association and freedom of speech.

I should like to take the position that I can give all the information that is pertinent without talking about other people and subjecting them to the same difficulties that I have been subjected to. I realize that doesn't give you fully what you would like and I realize it puts me in jeopardy, but I am doing what I can for you and what I feel I morally can do.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee cannot accept any conditions to the extent that the witness has indicated, that he will not give the names of those with whom he may have been associated in the Communist Party. That appears to me to be conditioning to a certain extent his testimony. We are hopeful that you will see fit to cooperate with the committee to the fullest possible extent. I would also hope that inasmuch as the conspiracy is in essence the people who comprise it, that you would see fit to be fully frank with the committee as to the names of those with whom you were associated in the party if you were in the party. I recognize and I think the committee recognizes the difficult problem which is imposed in this connection, but we cannot leave it to the discretion of the witness as to whether or not the people he might name have left the party or are still in the party. Certainly if the witness sees fit to give the committee full cooperation, including the names of those with whom he was associated in the party, if he was in the party, we certainly hope that where there is knowledge that an individual had left the party, that that would be included. However, the full and frank cooperation of the witness must be precisely that and that in the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee would necessitate being fully frank with respect to those with whom the witness was associated.

So I say we cannot condition the taking of the testimony in any way upon what is entirely natural reluctance on the part of the witness to disclose it.

Mr. FRANKEL. We are not suggesting any conditioning, but are merely stating his position. We are not taking the position that has been taken by some others that unless the committee accepts it we will not testify at all.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am not discussing this for the purpose of withholding any knowledge of what I consider and what I feel the general public if they knew all the facts would consider essential acts or wrong-doing.

Mr. JACKSON. I think we will proceed.

Mr. FRANKEL. The original question has been answered.

Mr. KUNZIG. There is a question pending which has not yet been answered, which is whether you have at any time ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, I have.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state the times that you were a member?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes. From 1937 to 1950.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you say member, I presume you mean a full-fledged, card-carrying member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, this is technical in some ways. I did at times carry a card and at other times I didn't.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you pay dues to the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. At times I think I stopped somewhat at the beginning or slightly before 1950. But I haven't a record of that. You do not keep precise records of things like that, usually. But previous to that I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. How did you originally become a member of the Communist Party? Would you describe the events and the situation at that time?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes. However, would you like me to go back previous to that, that is, previous to the actual time?

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, the specific events perhaps in the year or so prior to that that led to your becoming a member of the party.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I suppose it goes back to the period of 1933 or 1934 when I had been reading generalized history in order to get some understanding of the nature of the difficulties that were facing us, the depression, and I was struggling in my own mind to try to find out what was the cause of it, as a theoretical matter, historically, and also practically, because of the reaction on my friends and myself of the depression. So I began to be forced more or less into a position that was parallel to that of, let us say, the whole Socialist movement, not just the Communist movement, the Socialist movement as a whole, of government ownership and planning as opposed to the other, merely in the sense that planning might enable us to avoid the instability and crisis situation that faced us in the early 1930's. In doing so, I sought out groups that had these objectives in mind in trying to study what they were doing.

I noticed that there was a large disagreement between all of them. Each had its own sectarian points of view and I hold no brief for that or for any one of those points of view, and my only reason for seeking out the Communist group rather than any of the others was that I thought there was one source of unity and most of us or many of us at that time viewed the experiment in Russia and the attempt at socialism, and it seemed to me that there was no possibility of unison in all these groups, outside of cooperating, and for that reason I sought out the Communist Party. I had some difficulty in finding it. It took me a year or two to find it.

I was asked to join by people in 1936 and refused at that time and felt I was not ready to. In 1937 I decided to do so.

Mr. KUNZIG. What unit in the sense of terms of the groups or units did you first become affiliated with?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. In this sense I realize the subcommittee will be a little bit critical of me, perhaps appropriately so, but I should like to keep to the general philosophy that I outlined in my statement initially, to be a little vague in spotting places where individuals might be brought in and I would say it was a group in a small industrial town that I joined near where I was living.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sorry but the question is a specific one and we must have a more specific answer than that.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I don't mind naming the town. It was the town of Norwood.

Mr. KUNZIG. What State?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Massachusetts.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the group or cell have any specific name?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I cannot remember. I believe it did, English Speaking Group, something of that sort.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. And it was in Norwood, Mass.?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. In roughly 1937?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. In 1937, that is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you transfer to any other group and, if so, when and where?

Mr. ARGUMBAU. Yes; I transferred to a group in a very small town and I think that was a very short time after my being in Norwood.

Mr. KUNZIG. What town did you transfer to?

Mr. ARGUMBAU. That I am sorry but I must reserve naming. I realize you cannot accept that but you will not be able to accept my position right through, but I would like to give you in principal what happened as closely as possible, but without spotlighting individuals and to name the small town would do so.

Mr. JACKSON. I feel I should point out to the witness that in acknowledging his membership in the Communist Party he has, in effect, waived the provisions of immunity with respect to the names of the groups and the names of the individuals concerned.

Mr. ARGUMBAU. I realize that.

Mr. JACKSON. And I feel I should indicate at this time so that there will be no misunderstanding of the possible consequences of that action.

Mr. ARGUMBAU. I realize that I have had to weigh these problems back and forth and I have taken the course that I feel, although it is the more dangerous one to me, will enable me in conformity with my feeling of principles and my feeling against bearing tales, if you like, and also with my moral principles involved, I feel that I am taking the course that is the best one to do under all circumstances, weighing the difficulties and the differences, and I realize your problem.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee is not in any manner impugning your motive nor your convictions. However, we have a legislative job to do which has been assigned to us by the Congress and I want to point out the waiver of immunity which has occurred by virtue of your admission of membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. ARGUMBAU. I did it understanding that.

Mr. JACKSON. I am quite sure that is the case.

Mr. ARGUMBAU. By the way, I want to say that I feel I can substantially give you the information that is needed for legislative purposes. But this is my feeling and not necessarily yours, still keeping within the principles that I have outlined.

Mr. JACKSON. That has not been the position nor the experience of the committee in the past. We have felt that identifications, matters having to do with the location of the branches, the means and methods of recruitment and methods of financing were all pertinent, looking to the ultimate end of legislation.

Mr. ARGUMBAU. Yes, most of these matters I would be perfectly willing to discuss. The only one I am reserving, and I am not legally reserving, is the one of spotting or spotlighting individuals that I think in my opinion would be unjustified to put under public and private pressure.

Mr. FRANKEL. Might I inject one thought off the record?

Mr. JACKSON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record.

Mr. KUNZIG. Coming back just a moment to the first group that you said you were affiliated with in Norwood, Mass., would you tell the

committee the names of the officers of that group at the time you were affiliated with it?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, I must persist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you now at this time name the group to which you moved or the town to which you moved and the second group with which you were affiliated?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to do that also on the same ground.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to give the committee the name of the town in which the branch is located.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to do that on the same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you name the officers or any member whose name you still recall of that second group to which you went?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, I must persist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell the subcommittee the functions and activities of both of these 2 groups that we have talked about here this morning?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes; I would say that in both of those cases it was largely a matter, a combination of discussing community activities, the economic and other conditions in the community, and in those two cases to a lesser extent discussing broader issues, both international and national, I think with little in this case of an international aspect but more of a national aspect and fitting in the community problems with the national problems.

In addition to that there was the ordinary discussion of running a small organization of the sort you would meet in any small town organization. I don't know whether you would like me to name anyone, but let us say the Parent-Teachers Association and things of that sort, questions of finances and questions of financing the central groups in addition to the local group.

Mr. JACKSON. How many were members of the first group to which you belonged?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My guess, and this is only a guess because it was back in 1937, my guess is that there were about 7 or 8, but I am not sure of that.

Mr. JACKSON. From what economic walk of life were they, what occupations?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. It was a mixture. I would say they were mainly people working in small shops and wives of those people.

Mr. JACKSON. In the second group, how many were members?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Again I cannot remember very precisely, but I would say 5 or 6.

Mr. JACKSON. And their occupations?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Mainly small-town people, handymen, and their wives.

Mr. KUNZIG. We were up to the second group. What period of time and dates and years did you leave that and transfer to another one, if you did?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I transferred, I believe, in 1938 when I moved to Cambridge, Mass., and I transferred to a group there which I am not sure again of the exact name, but I would think it was the Cambridge Street group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there a cell at that time or a group or whatever name you want to give it at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. At that time I would have no knowledge because I was not teaching there.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there at Harvard?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I have no knowledge of that as of 1938. Excuse me a moment. I say I have no knowledge of it. I had no knowledge from personal contacts, but my belief is that there was at that time, merely from hearsay.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there a Philip Frankfeld under whom you worked in connection with the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I wouldn't say that I worked under him directly. I met him for the first time in 1936.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was his connection with the party at that time?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I believe he was district organizer of the New England district.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he the one who asked you to become a member of the party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. He did ask me in 1936 and I refused at that time. I said I didn't feel I knew enough about it to wish to join. He asked me because someone else brought me to him and suggested that it would be useful to have a discussion.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain to the subcommittee as far as you know the full activities of Philip Frankfeld in the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My knowledge of it is roughly that he was running the group as a whole, with 2 or 3 assistants. That is, running the group for New England as a whole, with 2 or 3 assistants. I think most of the activity was centered in Boston rather than in other parts. By the way, when I say New England, I mean the region broadly of Massachusetts and north.

Mr. KUNZIG. Excluding Connecticut?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am not certain about that. Excluding Rhode Island.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1938, we are up to group No. 3, and that was the Cambridge Street group, roughly the name you gave.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. May I speak off the record for a moment?

Mr. KUNZIG. That is up to the chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. If it is a matter which is pertinent.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I will put it on the record.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well; off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Arguimbau, we are up to group No. 3. So far as you recall, who were the officers of that group at the time that you were a member?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer that one on the same basis.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. And again I persist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give us the name of any members who were fellow members with you at that time of that group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No; I feel I should not on the same basis.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I persist.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long were you a member of the group there and when did you transfer to the next group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I was a member of that group for a relatively short time since I went to teach at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1939 and at that time switched to a group at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. KUNZIG. What month did you become professor of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and switch in 1939?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am not sure of the month in which I switched. I went to MIT in September because that is the beginning of the fall term. I am not sure whether I joined the group immediately. I think there were some transitional provisions.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was the year of the Hitler-Stalin pact, and I wonder if you could explain to the subcommittee your feeling at that time and how you could continue to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My feeling about that was that I disagreed with the general position at Munich and, unlike many others, I did not take the action of the Soviet Union seriously in lining up with Hitler. I felt that the situation would change as time went on, and I was confirmed in my point of view about that when, as I recall it, and I am not certain of the details, but as I recall it the Soviet Union made a nonaggression pact with Yugoslavia at the time Hitler was threatening them but before the Soviet Union was invaded, and I said, "Ha, ha, I thought there was something funny going on here." I felt the pact was a matter of expediency rather than a matter of principle. I was, throughout that time, very strongly opposed to the Hitler point of view. I like to read as much as I can and I read Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in that period of time, and I also read Mussolini's autobiography and I was thoroughly disgusted with both.

Mr. KUNZIG. At that time the Communist Party was calling our President a warmonger and was completely following the Hitler line. Did you follow the Hitler line? You must have.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I think not. I took the point of view that I didn't like Hitler any more than anyone else did and probably much less because I had read his book and I had listened occasionally by short-wave to his Sports Palace talks, and I felt very strongly on this matter and I felt that this was something that I could not condone at all, and I was completely opposed to the Hitler regime in all that.

Mr. KUNZIG. But you remained a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let us move on to the next cell or group that you belonged to. That would be No. 4. What year was this move effected?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. This becomes more difficult to answer with precision and I will do the best I can for you, but my dates are very hazy. My



recollection is that some time during the war and it may have been at the beginning of the war or it may have been a little later on in the Second World War, there was a feeling that it wasn't sensible for our group at MIT to continue holding meetings and largely wasting time when there were many things to be done, and we ceased holding meetings during that period and I was not sure whether the other members of the group had continued or not. I did not discuss it with them but I was at that time what is spoken of as a member at large in the sense that I met with no group but rather passively continued membership in the party, but took part in no actual activities.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question at this point. How many members were there in the MIT group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. As nearly as I can remember, six, and as I remember there might have been an occasional additional one that met with us, but I am not certain of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean by that there were six faculty members?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No, there were six total members, not all of whom were on the faculty.

Mr. JACKSON. Some of the members were members of the faculty of MIT?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. This period was the war period. What was the period of your membership in what counsel has called group No. 4, to the best of your recollection?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. To the best of my recollection it did start in 1939. To the best of my recollection, if I were to make a guess, and it is only a guess here, it would be 1943 for that group.

Mr. JACKSON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record. What do you mean by faculty members?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. As a technicality in the way that we do business at MIT, faculty member means assistant professor and higher, in some specific cases, but there are perhaps 1 percent of the total there who might be instructors with special privileges or a research associate with special privileges.

Mr. JACKSON. I have one more question on that score. During the period of your membership in the MIT branch, did MIT have Government contracts of a classified nature, or were faculty members at MIT engaged on work of a classified nature for the United States Government?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes; although, to the best of my knowledge, none of us who were members of the group were working on such projects. I am not sure of that.

Mr. JACKSON. You are not prepared to say that none of the members of this group were engaged on classified work?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I have no knowledge of their working on classified work.

Mr. KUNZIG. But they may have been engaged upon classified work and you did not know that?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I see you for a moment in the next room, Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Jackson and Mr. Kunzig left the hearing room and returned.)

Mr. JACKSON. Let the record show that the interrogation at this point was taken over by Mr. Appell, due to Mr. Kunzig's leaving.

Mr. APPELL. We were talking about this fourth section of the Communist Party in which you had been assigned and you had testified that you had remained in that for an indefinite period of time and then had ceased your activity and gone to a status which you described as member at large.

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. That is right.

Mr. APPELL. How long did you remain in a member-at-large status?

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. That again is a very difficult question for me to be sure of at this time. My guess is that it lasted until about 1945, but I am not sure about that either.

Mr. APPELL. Could we establish it with the creation of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. No; I think not. I remember the formation of that but I cannot establish the date relative to that.

May I add a little perhaps to a previous answer? You asked me about classified work at MIT and my knowledge of members of our group taking part in it. My recollection is that I have never heard of anyone mentioning taking part in such work.

Mr. JACKSON. Would such information have been divulged voluntarily if the work was of a highly classified nature in any event?

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. I would doubt it because people don't ordinarily speak of working on classified work unless it is to a very closely allied colleague they might say they are working on something in such a field.

Mr. JACKSON. I think in light of this particular situation that I am going to ask you to give the committee the names of those who were associated with you in the fourth branch of the Communist Party at MIT.

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. I must again refuse to do so.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair directs and I ask you to answer that question again.

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. I again persist for the previous reasons.

Mr. APPELL. Up to this period of time, were you acquainted with a unit of the Communist Party, and we will call it branch, group, or section, known by the name of the Henry Thoreau Group?

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. The name is familiar but I never attended a meeting of that group. I have heard of it being spoken of. It is my impression it was at Harvard, but I am not sure of that.

Mr. APPELL. Does your recollection of the group encompass a period of time that the Henry Thoreau section was known and used by the group at all?

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. I am sorry, I didn't get that.

Mr. APPELL. Can you recall what period of time the Henry Thoreau section, which you understood to have been at Harvard, operated?

Mr. ARGUMENTBAU. No; I have merely casually heard it, heard the name used and I don't think that the name was sufficiently in regular circulation to designate the group that I would have heard of it particularly.

Mr. APPELL. Your affiliation when with an active group, you placed it some time in 1945, and was that in the days of the Communist Political Association or in the fall of 1945 when the Communist Political Association was dissolved and reverted to the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I think I can perhaps answer that question best by saying that I continued membership until the vicinity of 1950. The group went through those transitions during that period and I was a member continuously during that period. It would be difficult for me to remember the dates. There was no significance in my joining one particular group or another when that transition occurred so that I think perhaps the best way to answer that would be for you to take the dates that are the best estimate that I can make at this time and then use your knowledge of when that change took place and I do not have the date.

Mr. APPELL. Was the group to which you were assigned in approximately 1945 a broader group than you had been in prior to that time, the group that comprised the staff of MIT?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, that is my recollection, and my recollection is that the major portion, at least, of the staff at MIT, at least did not attend meetings of the new group and I did not know from personal knowledge whether they had dropped out. I didn't know. I didn't ask them. They may have dropped out of the party at that time. I think it likely, but I don't know that.

Mr. APPELL. What percentage of the people with whom you previously met in the MIT group ceased, so far as your knowledge is concerned, an active affiliation with the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Really I have no accurate knowledge of them ceasing. I would merely say that there were at least 3 of the 6 that I cannot recall having any contact with later in the sense of talking with them about Communist Party affairs. Whether they had ceased or not is something that I just don't know. They were not working in my department and so I did not come in daily contact with them and I did not discuss the matter.

Mr. APPELL. Were they working in the mathematics department?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That question again I must refuse to answer in the sense that I don't think it would help the committee except to pinpoint the individuals.

Mr. APPELL. Was William Ted Martin one of the individuals of the group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer the question.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. And I persist for the previous reason.

Mr. APPELL. Was Norman Levinson one of the individuals of the group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer that for the previously given reason.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. And I persist.

Mr. APPELL. Was Isadore Amdur one of the individuals of the group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer for the previously given reason.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. And I persist.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know Granville Hicks, who, I might say, has appeared before the committee and admitted his membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I have never met him personally. I heard him talk on one occasion at a Harvard function. I also heard him debate once in Boston.

Mr. APPELL. Returning to the group that you affiliated with in 1945, did you continue in that group until 1950, or were there additional transfers?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. There were additional transfers and it is very difficult to sketch the exact thing that took place. I would say that the party at that time was pretty badly disorganized and it did not have the sort of stability that it had in the period of 1939, let us say.

Mr. JACKSON. Are we dealing with group No. 4 now, or is this branch 4 or branch 5?

Mr. APPELL. Branch 5.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. APPELL. In order to get unity back into the party was there again another shift of people within groups and were you again assigned to a group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, my best recollection is that I was reassigned 3 or 4 times.

Mr. APPELL. Between 1945 and 1950?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is correct.

Mr. APPELL. Without trying to remember specific transfers, can you recall the common interest which the members of the group had?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes.

Mr. APPELL. We will now take No. 6.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would say, if I may go back to No. 5, that that was a group largely with academic interests, perhaps wives of people with academic backgrounds and just an academic atmosphere about the group. The other groups were varied. One was a group of I would say mainly housewives working on nonacademic problems. Another group was a group whose members were in the Progressive Party in 1948 or 1947, I think. As a convenience, they met together partly to discuss their activities in the Progressive Party and partly it seemed to be a natural grouping. I don't know whether I have given you sufficient on that. Why don't you ask me some questions on that?

Mr. APPELL. With the wane of the Progressive Party, was there still another shift or did you remain in that so-called Progressive Party group until you left in 1950?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My best recollection, and here I could be wrong, was that there was one more shift only. I did have 1 more shift but perhaps only 1 more shift.

Mr. APPELL. What was the common interest of this last shift?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. There it is very difficult for me to answer because we didn't know the detailed professional work of the people involved, but it was largely a group of people, some with academic interests and some with other interests.

Mr. APPELL. During your entire membership in the Communist Party, were you ever registered in an alias?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Not to the best of my knowledge there. But this would be a very difficult question to answer. I did not of my intention.

Mr. APPELL. During the time that you were issued a Communist Party membership card or a book, depending upon the history of the party we are talking about, were these cards ever in a name other than your given name?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My recollection is that it was my own name and my recollection is that I again physically carried it in my wallet for some years previous to going to MIT and I cannot recall after that time having a card.

Mr. JACKSON. Was your membership in the Communist Party generally known at any time while you were a member?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Not generally known; no.

Mr. JACKSON. To, let us say, the institute authorities or other faculty members who were not themselves Communists?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. JACKSON. Was a considered effort made to keep this information from becoming public?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. On my part?

Mr. JACKSON. On your part.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the purpose in taking that action?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, I think this last 2 weeks has been a pleasant time to try to review such questions as that and think them over again, and I am of the opinion now that from all points concerned, and even from the point of view of the Communist Party, this may have been a mistake. I can see no logical reason for having done so except perhaps the purpose of being subjected to public pressure because the point of view was an unpopular one.

Mr. APPELL. Would you agree that another reason for that might be, and I put this on the point of view of the Communist Party rather than your own, that by keeping your membership secret that you could be used by them, or you yourself could operate in other organizations and in other circles without people knowing that you were putting forth the views of the Communist Party with which they might have disagreed.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I think that some have done that but I would say that, in general, that aspect has been overemphasized, at least in the circles in which I have been. I couldn't say that was true in all circles, but those circles of which I have public knowledge I would say that aspect was overemphasized.

I was interested, for example, to see that we were to meet in the caucus room because these things were like a caucus of groups of people with similar points of view who would like to discuss these things rather than having a point of view that is normally taken on this matter. Perhaps a more specific question on this would help.

Mr. APPELL. I bring that up because the Daily Worker of March 1, 1949, contains a story that has the headline, "150 Educators Assail Washington University Firings," and if you will recall at that time the president of the university fired 3 professors, 2 of them for Communist Party membership.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I do not recall it.

Mr. APPELL. The Daily Worker reprints the names of several of the people whom they claim protested this action, and there is listed as one of the signers "Louis B. Arguimbau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, that is a misspelling of my name. I am not "Louis B."

Mr. APPELL. It is just "L. B." I am sorry. I show you that illustration.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes. Well, my attitude on these things was that I would occasionally sign statements of that sort that came up if I felt they were sensible ones. I at times used my address at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as an identification, not implying to include the institute in my remarks, but I also felt later that this was not a desirable thing to do and I later made the practice when I signed these statements of this general sort of leaving off the institute's name.

Mr. JACKSON. Did this in fact represent your feelings with respect to the firing of the professors?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, I wouldn't have signed it without reading it, and I do not recall the incident at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. What is your feeling today, if I may ask, with respect to the employment of members of the Communist Party as faculty members?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I cannot give a considered judgment as of the present moment. I can only give it as of the time that I left. I would say that my judgment on those things is that, well in the first place, that the membership in the Communist Party did not imply that there was any influence in my particular surroundings and in my particular knowledge, no influence from the Communist Party as to what I should teach. I have never been aware of anyone recommending to me what I should teach or make any suggestion along that line.

In my own field of engineering I have not had any logical reason for talking about political matters and I have not done so. I have felt that it was perhaps desirable not to talk to the students about political matters, a least in a serious way, and my contact with the students has been purely a matter of a professional one. I suspect tomorrow morning, if they read about these matters in the paper, they will be very much surprised.

Mr. JACKSON. That, I imagine, covers your professional capacity in the classroom. You mean you had no political discussions with regard to communism outside of the classroom?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. If I may go back a moment, up until the year 1939, the time I went to MIT, I did very forcibly discuss such things, just as I suspect Democrats and Republicans discuss it around the Capitol steps with anyone who cares to discuss it. When I went to Tech I felt this is a controversial point of view, and I am going to teach technical things and, whenever possible, I will avoid such discussions. Over a lunch table you cannot very well refuse or wish to refuse to discuss events of the day. But I did not try to convince people that my little diffident point of view was a desirable one. I did not do this in a concealment way but I felt it was undesirable for me to take a stand of urging anything of this sort and I did not do so.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you have any sense of being responsible for the carrying out of Communist policy or, more specifically, of broad Communist directives?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Insofar as teaching is concerned?

Mr. JACKSON. Insofar as either teaching is concerned or insofar as your personal and off-campus activities were concerned?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would say insofar as they coincided with my personal beliefs.

Mr. JACKSON. And your personal beliefs at that time, as I understand it, largely paralleled those of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Largely, but not completely, in particular the Soviet-Nazi pact, and I outlined my position there.

Mr. JACKSON. On the point of the Nazi-Soviet nonaggression pact, if I remember your statement, you felt this was a matter of expediency on the part of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. How did you rationalize the view, if you did, that included as one of the principal parts of the pact was the transfer of war material for war potential from the Soviet Union to Hitler's forces, which were in turn being used against the nations in Central Europe?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I think perhaps you may have more data on that than I have. I have not consistently read all the fine print of the New York Times although I have tried to do so and I am not sure of the situation in that respect. I feel that the whole thing was a matter of expediency and they may have taken some steps cooperating with an unwilling partner in a way that I would then think was undesirable and which nations at times do, but I did not have a conviction that they were cooperating with Hitler in the sense that they would like to see him successful.

Mr. JACKSON. I think Von Ribbentrop went to Moscow to negotiate for these materials and they were delivered in substantial quantities until such time as it became obvious that Hitler was not going to reciprocate with the things that he was supposed to send to Moscow.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am a technical person engaged in research and I do not like to come to conclusions hastily. It was a guess that it was a matter of expediency rather than of fundamental policy and I still am of that opinion, but it is just an opinion that I cannot document.

Mr. JACKSON. Although the basic concept of Marx and those who were to implement the policies was to deviate at any time, is that not the case, from the established line, if it was in the interest of the Soviet Union to do so? I ask that, not in a contentious spirit.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I should like to cooperate as best as I can. I am an engineer and on theoretical matters I did not study that as much as I should have. I will say that this kind of action that has taken place is rather a hard-boiled problem of what do you do under given circumstances. It could be related to old theories, but my feeling is that it was a matter of expediency.

Mr. JACKSON. When you left the party in 1950, was your break a full and complete one?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. And you have not been associated with the Communist Party or any of its activities since that time?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is right, and in particular I was asked at that time to continue contributions and refused to do so.

Mr. JACKSON. What, if I may ask, brought about your final break with the party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My final break came roughly, well, I would rather go back if I may.

Mr. JACKSON. Please do.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would say that I began to be less enthusiastic, let us say, about these matters, fairly early in the sense that my original purpose of joining was one to think of the economic business cycle rather than of world affairs, even though those are inter-related and when the thing shifted from one of an economic problem to one of world affairs, I had less conviction in the whole thing than I had previously.

I would say that the period in which I was most active in party activities corresponds roughly to the early years when it was something new, let us say from 1937 to 1939 or 1940 or 1941, perhaps in that early period, the first few years.

Then again in the period of 1947 I would not say that I was very active in party activities. In fact, I never held any leadership position whatsoever, even in a group of 5. I was very active politically in a sense that I was very disturbed about the world situation and I became emphatic about the Wallace campaign, thinking that it had an opportunity of bringing a peaceful solution to these things. I am not sure that I was right or wrong. So I devoted more energy to this and this was not Communist Party energy but more personal energy than I had at any previous time. When Wallace was defeated I was badly discouraged about the whole thing. I felt that the possibilities of obtaining a friendlier world all around, let us say a Willkie kind of dream, that this thing had diminished and I felt quite unhappy about the whole thing and I think that was reflected in a rather diminished enthusiasm about anything that the party was doing. I attended meetings less frequently than I had previously and less regularly, as I recall it, and I stopped paying dues in early 1950 or perhaps 1949, the latter part.

Mr. JACKSON. This was following the Korean attack?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am not sure of that.

Mr. JACKSON. That was June 26 and you had left the party by that time?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I wouldn't say I had left the party. I am not sure of the exact termination date. I stopped paying dues and was not active in the sense that I attended meetings regularly. I attended some meetings but not regularly.

Mr. APPELL. So when did the final break come?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I do not have the final date for that. It became quite obvious that the force of public opinion was against the party and that it reacted on me personally in the sense I recognized that it was becoming that I was connected with the party and I felt that there was nothing to be accomplished by continued membership. It was now a matter of international affairs rather than of economics and as a matter of expediency and as a matter of principal both, I felt there was no point in continuing past that point.

Mr. APPELL. Was there any disagreement at that time with the program and the policy?



Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would say that there was neither disagreement or agreement.

Mr. APPELL. You approved of the Communist Party with respect to America, with respect to Korea, and with respect to those other issues?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No. It might be helpful for me to tell what happened at that time to me personally as far as the Korean situation is concerned.

As a research person I am anxious to get the sources about things like that rather than editorials, and I tried to find out what happened. My reason for that was that I some way did not feel that it made sense for either side to attack each other. It just didn't make military sense. So I felt I would like to try as nearly as I could to get the source material to find out in a scholarly way that had happened, and so I read very diligently all the fine print of the New York Times, the Boston Globe, and others to get not the editorial or the reporter's comments, but to find the actual events that had taken place in the sense of the background. I would like to call the committee's attention—well, not the committee necessarily, but the Congress' attention to the fact that this documentation left a good deal to be desired. I could not make up my mind what had occurred. I did what any citizen should do in a case like that, but about 2 or 3 months later I wrote to Trygve Lie and said I had just heard a discussion by General Eisenhower that truth was a great weapon and would like to find out what was happening and I had not been able to get enough source material on the Korean war and I would appreciate any pamphlets or material that might be available. I was unhappy when it came back because it was a large envelope of mimeographed material, but none of it having to do with the actual outbreak of the hostilities, but having to do with the conditions that had happened 2 or 3 months previous to the outbreak. If you can do so it would be helpful to me to have documented evidence of that sort, that is, any source material on that, because it would help to clear up my mind on that. I have not any scholarly understanding of what happened.

Mr. APPELL. During the time that you were a member of the Communist Party, did you participate in discussions of works of the Communist Party, such as the History of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union and State and Revolution?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, from time to time I read documents of that sort and participated in discussions about them.

Mr. APPELL. Can you explain your acceptance of the argument which is advanced both in the Communist Party history about the necessity throughout the world of overthrowing imperialist governments, and in light of your answer to see if you cannot recall that at this same period of time that the Communist Party throughout the world, including America, was calling America exactly what these words were advocating, the overthrow?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I should like to go back a little and then I would like to repeat the question if I have not answered it just to your satisfaction.

I would say that there are many works, starting in 1800 with Robert Owen, previous to the starting of the Communist group, and the works of Marx, and Engels, of which I have read very little, and later

works of Lenin and Stalin, and these should be taken, I think, in historical perspective, and I have felt that referring to situations in other countries at other times than our own, I felt that was interesting in giving the views of people at that time. I would say, if I may be permitted to do so without disrespect, I would say that there are groups in the Christian church, some of which take a more emphatic view than others do. I never like dogmatic statements, and I would take these older writings as being an interesting thing to see how people were talking and thinking at the time, but not necessarily the statement of what my policy would be or what I think any group policy should be at the present time in this country. That is my personal feeling.

Mr. APPELL. But the History of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union was something that every Communist had to study over the past 10 or 15 years, the same as it was studied today. It was the document, it was the bible with the party. It is not ancient when they are using it today.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I hope the committee will permit me to say this, because there is no disrespect in it. This was true of Christian groups, because they studied Christian doctrines of long ago, and they are interpreted to mean one thing and another from the way they are written, and I would feel, as I assert, that documents of that sort are interesting and I think should be studied. I think, for example, at one time in the early 1930's I understand most of these documents were required study at Harvard in government courses and studied without comment for or against, merely as the thinking of the people at one time. I feel that is a good thing and I always have viewed them in that light.

Mr. JACKSON. You believe though they should be taught by a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. In a college, you mean?

Mr. JACKSON. In a college.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I don't know of that having happened.

Mr. JACKSON. I daresay there are members of the Communist Party in the political sciences, in the political science departments of colleges.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I have not been connected with the political sciences, but if it were taught by a member of the Communist Party, it should be taught as a matter of fundamental documentation and should be discussed to try to interpret to the students what was in them, but not necessarily with application to the present time, merely as anyone else would.

Mr. JACKSON. I touched upon this and I don't know that we arrived at the conclusion. What is your feeling with respect to the desirability or the nondesirability of employing members of the Communist Party as teachers of the professions in light of the existing world conditions?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, I would rather not answer that as of later than my own membership, because I really don't know what is happening at the present time in the Communist Party. I might guess, but that is only a guess, much as anyone else would make.

Mr. JACKSON. As of the time you left the party, what was your feeling?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. At the time I left the party it was my feeling that there was no reason certainly why in the sciences or in any other

technical field that one should not be so employed because it was not my experience that there was any organized effort other than if an individual might differ from an individual to indoctrinate anybody in anything.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee is in possession of sworn testimony entirely to the contrary with reference to the sciences, where we had a witness who declined on the basis of the fifth amendment to answer whether he had unauthorized material belonging to the armed services. That is a serious matter, whether he had ever transferred confidential material to an agent of a foreign power.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. This is a different matter from teaching.

Mr. JACKSON. He is presently a teacher.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. This is a function of his other than a teaching function, and I was talking about the teaching function purely and simply.

I would say it is my feeling that it would be an undesirable thing from the point of view of the individual concerned to have anything to do with classified material if he can avoid it, and in my case I have always avoided and have not taken access to classified material even in cases where it might have been granted.

Mr. JACKSON. So many schools and universities are working on projects for the United States Government. I think it is a very important facet of this entire investigation where teachers do on occasion come into possession of classified information, in the field of science particularly.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. We are being very careful at MIT to compartmentalize in that field as I understand it. We have a particular problem there that we have a large number of foreign students at the institute and it would certainly be very important that they should not have access to material of that sort and we have had, for that reason, to be very careful to compartmentalize and I have been emphatic that under no circumstances should any classified material come into my laboratory, and I think this is desirable.

Mr. JACKSON. But classified projects are undertaken at MIT; is that not right?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes. There is an effort there to keep them in separate buildings and to have guards at the doors and it is in such a way to keep it compartmentalized so that they are not merged with the general teaching activities. I think that is all, I believe.

Mr. JACKSON. It is a very worthwhile precaution.

Mr. APPELL. Since you have been at MIT have you heard of the group of students who belonged to the Young Communist League?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Not in the sense of meeting them or discussing anything with them, but in the first year I was there I guess everyone at MIT had various pieces of literature pushed under his door from time to time about the world events. It was distinctly the sort of thing that a Young Communist Leaguer would push under people's doors, but I have not had any impression of that sort of thing happening in later years and I am not aware whether or not there are any student groups at MIT.

Mr. APPELL. Do you know of a student group of American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I knew there was such a group but I never met with them as a group. I have met, I may have met one of them from time to time, but it was not intentional.

Mr. JACKSON. Are there presently employed on the faculty at MIT individuals who are known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, I mentioned that previously in the testimony about the group at MIT.

Mr. JACKSON. I am speaking now of the present time.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am sorry. I misunderstood the question. I have of course no way of—

Mr. FRANKEL. May I interrupt and go off the record for a moment?

Mr. JACKSON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. We will go back on the record.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would say that all but one are still employed at MIT.

Mr. APPELL. All but one who were in the original group?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, as of 1939.

Mr. APPELL. But your position in your declination to give us the names of these individuals—

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. That is correct.

Mr. FRANKEL. May I confer with the witness a moment?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Arguimbau conferred with Mr. Frankel.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record.

Mr. APPELL. In 1947 the American Youth for Democracy held a rather large rally on the campus of Harvard and addressing that gathering sponsored by the American Youth for Democracy were 3 or 4 members of, let us say, college staffs. I am not certain that they were all faculty, who were known by the committee to be members of the Communist Party.

Isn't that staff member exercising an influence over a student to accept a program of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would say that as a matter of principal, other than as a matter of principal that personally I felt I should not do that, but that there have been, for example, some discussions at MIT about letters that have gone through the faculty mailing system urging the candidacy of Mr. Eisenhower or Mr. Stevenson, and there has been a difference of opinion as to whether this sort of thing is an appropriate thing, and I am not sure that I will take a stand on that for principal.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us make a distinction between the Republican and Democratic political parties and what has been found to be, in the Supreme Court of the United States, an international conspiracy. I think there is a valid distinction between any given American becoming President of the United States and propagandizing on behalf of a foreign-directed movement which has been found by law to seek the overthrow of law by force and violence. Do you recognize the distinction, professor?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Well, let us say in 1939 the head of the Communist Party of the United States, Earl Browder, addressed student groups and I would say that is an appropriate thing for the students to know

what is going on. I would say that it would be an inappropriate thing for a person on the staff of an institution to address a group as part of an international conspiracy if I knew it to be such. On the other hand, for a person who did not have such feeling about the movement as a whole, but regarded it rather as a local principal, and by local principal I mean a principal applying with local interest to the United States, and of course with international implications too, but not one directed from abroad, I would say it would be appropriate to give his views and I would hope that as many people as could would give their views.

Mr. JACKSON. Do I understand you correctly, then, that in the context of today and in the light of what has developed historically in the past two decades that you feel it would not be inappropriate for a faculty member or an instructor to address a group which had been found by duly constituted authority to be such, and this is a very complex question and perhaps I should start all over again.

Do you think it would be appropriate for a college professor today, or a member of the faculty or of the staff, to address a group and to set forth Communist doctrine?

Mr. ARGUMBAU. It depends on the doctrine, what the Communist doctrine was, if he is discussing it in a scholarly way and not urging anything that is inappropriate, that is one thing. Then if he is urging inappropriate action, that is another. I think I am not in a position to make a real opinion about that. I haven't done that kind of thing myself and I would rather urge others not to. But I wouldn't, for a matter of principal, and I wouldn't feel that I have enough real knowledge about whether people should talk to students in this way or not. I have not done it and I think it is undesirable. I don't know whether that answers your question.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; I think that answers it satisfactorily.

Mr. ARGUMBAU. I remember at one time President Roosevelt addressed a group and told them in rather straight terms what he thought.

Mr. JACKSON. There have been changes.

Mr. APPELL. Do you draw a distinction between Earl Browder speaking to a group of students as a Communist and a staff member of a college speaking to them as a liberal who, by his very concealment of Communist Party membership, denies to everyone that he is a Communist?

Mr. ARGUMBAU. There are very subtle questions involved here and I would say that, in the first place, I think it is entirely appropriate that any national figure that is known to be advocating a certain thing, no matter what it is, it would be desirable for a student to know what is going on, and so I think the case of Earl Browder addressing them in the period when he did was not an inappropriate thing. It was known what his connections were, and I think it is a desirable one. It is debatable. Assuming again that similar leaders from other groups also addressed them so that it wasn't one-sided.

When it comes to the other matter, I would say that I believe general public opinion is that a member of the Communist Party in addressing a group would try very closely to conform to a certain point of view in which he might not necessarily have faith in talking to students. I have not had evidence of that personally, and I would

say that if he did then it would be very wrong for him to address students. If he was telling his views and he believed them, then I cannot see any impropriety in it as of the time that I was a member.

Now, let us say again that I feel that the whole business of secrecy has been an undesirable one and I would feel that it would be much more desirable if he had announced the fact that he was a Communist and that this might influence his point of view somewhat, but discuss his point of view anyway. This is done by Mexicans and people like that where the problems are not too tense.

Mr. APPELL. Do you know the American Youth for Democracy to be a successor organization of the Young Communist League?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I believe I have heard of it. I don't recall having any contact with it as a group.

Mr. APPELL. Within the party, you did not learn as a member of the Communist Party that the Young Communist League caucus in their respective districts had voted to make the change and went to New York and the same delegation from the Young Communist League in fact became the organization of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Not except that incidentally I might have read in the Communist Party press that is available to you. I have no private knowledge of that matter and I do not recall having read about it in detail at this time. It was not to me a matter of real professional or politically important interest. I did not pay much attention to what the students were doing in this sense.

Mr. JACKSON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record.

Will you rephrase the question?

Mr. APPELL. I was trying to reconstruct a set of facts which would help the committee to clearly find out whether you draw a distinction from Earl Browder and hidden Communists. That is the thing I am trying to arrive at.

Mr. FRANKEL. I think the witness has answered that as well as he could.

Mr. APPELL. Returning to the Daily Worker article which set forth the protest which you made to the University of Washington over the firing of the 3 professors, was your signature as a member of the Communist Party who was interested in protecting another member of the Communist Party who had been fired from the faculty, is that the reason why you signed?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I would think that the signature, as I recall it and I do not recall the details, but as I recall it I would say the signatures were not obtained through Communist Party circles but rather from others who asked me to sign it and I looked at it as a matter of principle and I would feel that the same principle should be applicable to me personally in the activities that were going on in that period of time, and I would say for that reason I was completely sincere in doing it. It was not partisan.

Mr. APPELL. This was sponsored by the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Were you a member of that organization?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am not sure that I paid dues to it. I was a member for a while.

Mr. APPELL. Can you recall who solicited your signature in this matter?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No; I cannot.

Mr. JACKSON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record.

Mr. APPELL. Do you know Prof. Bart Jan Bok?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes.

Mr. APPELL. Did you ever know Prof. Bart Jan Bok to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds as given previously.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I persist.

Mr. APPELL. May I ask here, Professor, if you did not know a person to be a member of the Communist Party, would you tell us? I know that is a hard question, but you can understand that we do not want to do harm to any individual.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. The difficulty of course there is a technical one that if you were to present me with a list of 1,000 names and I answered "No" on each one and "Yes" on a few, or refused to answer on a few, it would be the same thing as saying that I would answer on every one. You would have that implication and I don't want to give that implication to you.

Mr. APPELL. Mr. Chairman, may we go off the record?

Mr. JACKSON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JACKSON. Back on the record.

Mr. APPELL. Professor Arguimbau, according to a 1949 advertisement in Consumers' Union you were listed as an officer and director of Consumers' Union.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes, sir; as a member of the board of directors.

Mr. APPELL. Are you still a member of the board of directors?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No.

Mr. APPELL. When did you leave the board of directors of Consumers' Union?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I think you can get that more readily than I have by looking over that file on them. My recollection is that I was on for approximately a year.

Mr. APPELL. Did your membership in the Communist Party have anything to do with your association with Consumers' Union?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Not at all, except in the sense that I was interested in broad social things, and so I was interested in anything that would contribute to, let us say, general prosperity and social movements of the sort that were of the New Deal era, and so I took an interest in Consumers' Union.

Mr. APPELL. Did the Consumers' Union inquire of you whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No, sir.

Mr. APPELL. Did you deny to them or indicate that you were not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No.

Mr. APPELL. At the same time, you never denied to them?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. No; I was not asked.

Mr. APPELL. I think for this time that is all the questions I have to ask, and I would suggest that the witness be excused to return tentatively at 2 o'clock.

Mr. JACKSON. The subcommittee will adjourn shortly, and we request that the witness return to the committee offices with his counsel at 2 p. m. this afternoon.

Are you here in answer to a subpoena, Professor Arguimbau?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. When was the subpoena served upon you, if you recall?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. It was on a Thursday, and I know that other subpoenas were served for approximately the same period. My recollection is that mine was delivered about a week later than others.

Mr. JACKSON. It would be approximately how long ago?

Mr. APPELL. Thursday, March 19.

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. My recollection is that it was April 2.

Mr. JACKSON. April 2?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I am not sure of that.

Mr. JACKSON. You were personally served?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. I was personally served.

Mr. JACKSON. By a United States marshal?

Mr. ARGUIMBAU. Yes; by a United States marshal.

Mr. JACKSON. The subcommittee is adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 12:25 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)



# COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

## (Education—Part 8)

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1953

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION <sup>1</sup>

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:43 a. m., in room 226 of the Old House Office Building, Hon. Bernard W. Kearney presiding.

Committee member present: Representative Bernard W. Kearney (presiding).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; and Raphael I. Nixon, director of research.

Mr. KEARNEY. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that, for the purpose of the hearing this morning, a subcommittee has been set up composed of Mr. Kearney from New York. The hearing will be conducted under the authority granted for subcommittee by the chairman of the committee, Mr. Velde.

Will you stand and be sworn?

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF FRANCIS XAVIER THOMAS CROWLEY

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Crowley, are you accompanied by counsel here this morning?

Mr. CROWLEY. No; I am by myself.

Mr. KUNZIG. You understand, of course, your right to be accompanied by counsel if you so desire?

Mr. CROWLEY. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. And it is your wish to be here present at this hearing today without counsel?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your full name, please?

Mr. CROWLEY. Francis Xavier Thomas Crowley. The Thomas is a confirmation.

Mr. KUNZIG. And your present address, Mr. Crowley?

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. 226 Second Avenue, New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. And what is your age at the present time?

Mr. CROWLEY. Twenty-seven.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you give the subcommittee here this morning a brief résumé of your educational background?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes.

Well, I went to grade school in Long Island, Queens, and I went to Brooklyn Technical High School; then to Columbia College for about a year and a half. Then I went to the University of Michigan. I graduated there with a bachelor of arts.

Mr. KUNZIG. When?

Mr. CROWLEY. 1950.

Then I came back to New York and took some graduate work at Columbia at night, and then I dropped that, lost interest in school.

Mr. KUNZIG. Roughly, when did you drop that?

Mr. CROWLEY. The last course I took was—I think it was last spring. I took a course—I think last spring I took a course at night.

Mr. KUNZIG. And that completed—

Mr. CROWLEY. No; no—wait—it was this fall. This fall I took a course at night—this past fall.

Mr. KUNZIG. And that completed up to the present your formal schooling education?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you give the committee a résumé of your occupational or employment background?

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, through high school I worked summers at odd jobs, and then from high school I went to the Army. I enlisted when I was in high school, when I was 18.

When I got out of the Army in 1945, I worked a few weeks in Wallach's as a clothing salesman—Wallach's store in New York. That was a haberdashery.

Then that was the only job I had before I started to school at Columbia. I went to Columbia for a little over a year—almost a year and a half. I quit in the middle of a term.

Then I left the city and moved to Boston, and I didn't have work there, and I got unemployment insurance for quite a while.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was this?

Mr. CROWLEY. I don't think that I had any job there.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was this?

Mr. CROWLEY. Nineteen—let's see—wait a minute—1947, I believe.

Mr. KUNZIG. It was before you went to Michigan?

Mr. CROWLEY. Before I went to Michigan; yeah.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were in Boston at that time?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yeah; I lived there.

Then I went to Michigan, and I picked up school again there. I think it was about January 1948.

Then I had 1 or 2 odd jobs in drug stores, working part time, and I worked summers—one summer for a builder; another summer for a man out there who was building his own home. I helped him build it.

Then, when I graduated, I came east and I worked at—the first job I had—Boston—it was a Boston shop.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where was that?

Mr. CROWLEY. Third Avenue on 50th Street, New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know the name of it?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yeah; the Art Exchange.

Mr. KUNZIG. What type of work did you do there?

Mr. CROWLEY. Sold antique porcelain and pottery.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was the next job you had?

Mr. CROWLEY. Then I worked there about 9 months.

Then I worked one summer at Camp Unity as a ground hand—ground crew.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where is Camp Unity?

Mr. CROWLEY. Wingdale, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell it?

Mr. CROWLEY. Wingdale, W-i-n-g-d-a-l-e.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any other employment since the time you left Michigan?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes; I worked at—then I went to work for a steamfitter when I came back from there.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you came back from Camp Unity?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes; that summer. That was 1951.

Mr. KUNZIG. What did you do as a steamfitter?

Mr. CROWLEY. I was learning to be a pipefitter.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who was the steamfitter?

Mr. CROWLEY. William Behringer.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell that?

Mr. CROWLEY. B-e-h-r-i-n-g-e-r—New York City.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have the address?

Mr. CROWLEY. 220-something Lafayette Street, New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long did you work for Behringer?

Mr. CROWLEY. It wasn't more than 2 months.

Then I went to work for the man I am working for now—Angelilli.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell that?

Mr. CROWLEY. Angelilli—A-n-g-e-l-i-l-l-i—Brothers, 226 Lafayette Street.

Mr. KUNZIG. What business are they in?

Mr. CROWLEY. They're builders, contractors.

Mr. KUNZIG. And what type of work do you do for them?

Mr. CROWLEY. I'm a laborer.

Mr. KUNZIG. That brings you up to the present?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yeah.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Crowley, when you were in Boston, Mass., that period of time prior to going to the University of Michigan that you have just told us about, were you a member of the West End Club of the Communist Party?

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, I can't answer that.

Mr. KEARNEY. What do you mean—you can't answer it?

Mr. CROWLEY. I won't answer it.

Mr. KEARNEY. On what grounds?

Mr. CROWLEY. It goes against my conscience to speak about it. I don't believe I should be in a position where I have to speak about anyone except my priest, and I have spoken to him about it.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, do I take it to mean your conscience bothered you because you were a member of the party?

Mr. CROWLEY. No; not in this instance.

Mr. KEARNEY. Has your conscience ever bothered you because you were a member of the party?

Mr. CROWLEY. My conscience bothers me that I might some way harm or hurt someone else by telling you what I know, that you want to know.

Mr. KEARNEY. How could it harm or hurt someone else by stating whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CROWLEY. Because if I answered that question, I imagine you will ask me, "Well, who else was?" or things of that sort.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, if we did ask you that question, you could decline to answer it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, I would be in the same position then about answering. I guess I would be in the same jeopardy.

Mr. KUNZIG explained to me what I can do and what I can't do legally. I know—

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I am quite curious. What jeopardy would you be in if you stated to this committee that you had been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CROWLEY. What jeopardy would I be in? None that I know of.

Mr. KEARNEY. Then why can't you answer that question?

Mr. CROWLEY. Because I believe it would be cowardice to answer any question about my past life to anyone that I didn't want to—and there's one thing I cannot do, is be a coward. I'd sooner—you know—take anything I have coming to me rather than have to live with something on my mind, something I felt was wrong that I did. It would be wrong for me to tell you anything about my past life or my acquaintances, my activities with other people.

Mr. KEARNEY. When you say you refuse to answer as to whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party or not, if you never had been a member of the Communist Party, would you so answer?

Mr. CROWLEY. If I never had been—I don't know; probably not. Probably not.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am quite curious to know your reasons as to why you would refuse to state why you had never been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, it is not all reasoning, I guess. It is just a feeling I have, and I haven't reasoned it out. I can't give you a logical reason why.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, Mr. Chairman, the question, of course, whether the witness was a member of the West End Club of the Communist Party in Boston. I respectfully request he be directed to answer that question.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I was coming to that, and I am going to direct the witness to answer that question unless he can show sufficient reasons as to why he shouldn't answer it.

Mr. CROWLEY. I can't give you any reasonable reasons, any legal reasons, or otherwise.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, you were advised by counsel here that you had the right to counsel—

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). At this hearing, and you decline counsel to represent you. Now, you are being asked the question as to whether you are now or ever have been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. The question—the specific question—I believe at this moment, sir, is whether the witness was a member of the West End Club of the Communist Party in Boston, Mass., when he was in Boston. That is the question at the moment.

Mr. KEARNEY. And your answer to that is——

Mr. CROWLEY. I won't answer it.

Mr. KEARNEY. You won't answer it.

As the chairman, I direct you to answer that question.

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, I don't know what you mean.

Mr. KEARNEY. What?

Mr. CROWLEY. I don't know what you mean.

Mr. KEARNEY. I direct you to answer the question that Counsel just propounded to you.

Mr. CROWLEY. No; I can't answer that.

Mr. KEARNEY. You can't answer or you won't answer it?

Mr. CROWLEY. I won't answer it.

Mr. KEARNEY. You won't answer it?

Mr. KUNZIG. May I state for the record, Mr. Chairman, prior to the hearing, I discussed this matter with the witness and he stated he had spoken to attorneys and had had the advice of counsel on this matter. I advised him, of course, of his right to come here today with counsel and have counsel present with him in the hearing to advise him as the course of the hearing progressed.

Mr. CROWLEY. I explained why I didn't bring a lawyer with me. I said I didn't think it was a matter of my citing the fifth amendment or not. I am not looking at it in a legal sense. I'm just going by my own feelings. That is the way it is. That is the way——

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, Mr. Crowley, you are an educated man. You are a graduate of a university. You have the degree of——

Mr. CROWLEY. Bachelor of arts.

Mr. KEARNEY. Bachelor of arts.

Have you ever been associated with any members of the West End Club of Boston?

Mr. CROWLEY. That comes to the same thing. I won't answer that either.

Mr. KEARNEY. You won't answer it?

Mr. CROWLEY. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I speak to you for a moment?

(At this point Mr. Kunzig conferred with Mr. Kearney.)

Mr. KEARNEY. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. KEARNEY. As I understand your testimony, you just refuse to answer any questions concerning your activities with communism?

Mr. CROWLEY. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. No.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you have any other questions?

Mr. KUNZIG. I think we better follow it up by asking: Have you ever at any time been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CROWLEY. I refuse to answer that.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think that is all.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is the witness still under subpoena?

Mr. KEARNEY. I think we better continue him under subpoena, subject to further call by the committee.

Mr. KUNZIG. The chairman has continued you under subpoena, subject to further call by this committee of Congress.

(Whereupon at 11:13 a. m., the hearing was adjourned.)



# COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION

## (Education—Part 8)

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1954

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION<sup>1</sup>

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in room 225, Old House Office Building, the Honorable Donald L. Jackson, acting chairman, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Donald L. Jackson, Gordon H. Scherer (appearance noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle, and Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., and Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; Earl Fuoss, investigator; Dolores Anderson, reporter.

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

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

Mr. DEUTCH. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF BERNHARD DEUTCH, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, HENRY W. SAWYER III

Mr. JACKSON. You may sit down, please.

Let the record show that for the purpose of taking this testimony this morning, and pursuant to the rules of this committee, the chairman has appointed a subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Scherer, Doyle, and Jackson, with Jackson as acting chairman.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Will you state your name, please?

Mr. DEUTCH. Bernhard Deutch, B-e-r-n-h-a-r-d D-e-u-t-c-h, not D-e-u-t-s-c-h.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself?

Mr. SAWYER. Henry W. Sawyer, the 3d, 117 South 17th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. I was born September 29, 1929, in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. DEUTCH. In Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation or employment, or how are you now engaged?

Mr. DEUTCH. I am a student at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee, please, what your educational training to this point has been?

Mr. DEUTCH. I went to public school 225. Should I mention the years, too?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DEUTCH. I guess I graduated in 1943, so 8 from 43 leaves—I started in 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. We don't need for you to go into that much detail. Just tell us briefly what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. DEUTCH. Public school. I went to high school in Brooklyn Technical High School. I went to Cornell University as an undergraduate, and spent 2 years on graduate study at Cornell and got a master's degree, and am now at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter Cornell University?

Mr. DEUTCH. In 1947, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when did you complete your master's degree at Cornell?

Mr. DEUTCH. In 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Deutch, during hearings at Albany last week, the committee heard testimony regarding the existence of a Communist Party group or cell operating among undergraduates at Cornell University, among certain graduates at Cornell and in the city of Ithaca.

In connection with that testimony, the committee was informed that you were a member of one or more of those groups. If so, I would like to ask you certain matters relating to your activity there.

Were you a member of a group of the Communist Party at Cornell?

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. I will answer that question, but only under protest.

I wish to register a challenge as to the jurisdiction of this committee under Public Law 601, which is the committee's enabling legislation. This question, or any similar questions involving my associations, past or future, I am answering, but only under protest as to its constitutionality. But, under your jurisdiction as stated, I answer yes, I was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee was advised that a witness by the name of ROSS Richardson has stated that you acted as liaison between a Communist Party group on the campus and a member of the faculty at Cornell, and that you knew the name of the member of that faculty, who was a member of the Communist Party.

Will you tell us who that member of the faculty was?

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Sir, I am perfectly willing to tell about my own activities, but do you feel I should trade my moral scruples by informing on someone else?



Mr. JACKSON. Let the Chair say that moral scruples on your part do not constitute a legal reason for declining to answer the question, and you are directed to answer the question.

Mr. DEUTCH. At this time I do think so, sir, because I had certain ideas and people I came in contact with had certain ideas. I didn't believe in force or violence, or anything like that.

Mr. JACKSON. That is entirely beside the point. You have been asked a question and we must insist that you answer the question or decline to answer it, and your declination must consist of something more than your moral scruples.

Mr. DEUTCH. As to the details of that, I think the whole question has been magnified more than it should have.

Mr. JACKSON. There is a question pending and the Chair must insist that you answer the question that has been asked.

(At this point Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room.)

(Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. I can only say that whereas I do not want to be in contempt of the committee, I do not believe I can answer questions about other people, but only about myself.

Mr. JACKSON. You therefore refuse to answer the question that is pending, is that correct?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes, sir, but I could amplify that point. I do not mean the point of contempt. I think—I happen to have been a graduate student—the only one there, and the organization is completely defunct, and the individual you are interested in wasn't even a professor. The magnitude of this is really beyond reason.

Mr. JACKSON. That decision does not rest with you as to whether or not the scope of this inquiry—as to whether or not certain individuals are important now or not. That is the responsibility of we Representatives to determine. That determination cannot rest with you. It may be very true that the individual to whom you have referred is no longer a member of the Communist Party. However, that is a supposition on your part—and a supposition which the committee cannot accept.

Again I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. DEUTCH. The committee knows through Ross Richardson's statement that this gentleman had quit the Communist Party—who you are referring to—and it just happens I was the only contact because I was the only graduate student, so it was an inevitable thing.

Mr. JACKSON. So you still decline to answer the question asked by counsel?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes .

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you—

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. The young man read a statement in which he referred to Public Law 601. He no doubt read point 1 in that law in which it states our duty in Congress is to inquire into the extent—that is the language—"the extent." Now manifestly our counsel, in asking you the name, etc., goes into the extent of the existence of the Communist cell, don't you see? All Communist activities. I wanted to empha-

size that to you because you were referring to Public Law 601 and relying on that in your statement which you read. So I can come right back to you and ask, or call to your attention the fact that under our Congress we have the duty or we are charged with looking into the extent, you see, which the Communist Party has acted. Therefore, you see, I am calling your attention to the fact that this question goes into the extent. I just wanted to call that to your attention, just in case you didn't realize the kind of question that was.

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes, I see. The only thing I am saying, sir, my challenge is, is it constitutional under Public Law 601?

Mr. JACKSON. Very well, Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you aware of the existence of a membership in the Communist Party of more than one member of the faculty at Cornell University?

Mr. DEUTCH. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee received testimony from Ross Richardson to the effect that you collected certain donations for the benefit of the Communist Party, and that on one occasion you delivered to him the sum of \$100, without designating to him the source of it. Will you tell the committee, please, the source of that \$100 contribution, if it was made?

Mr. DEUTCH. No; this contribution was made—I believe I gave you the reason why I decline to answer regarding names, and this was from a personal friend.

Mr. JACKSON. Let the Chair make a statement at this time. I think that it is only fair to advise the witness—again advise the witness—that any scruples he may have due to a desire to protect friends and acquaintances, is not a legal reason for declining to answer the questions which are now being put to you, and which will be put to you by counsel. It is most important that you be fully aware of the possible consequences of your declination to answer—and I am confident that your able counsel has so advised you.

I want the record to show the succession of questions from the Chair, so that there can be no possible misunderstanding at any subsequent date, but will show that you were fully advised by the Chair, in the most friendly spirit. I assure you that your reasons, however laudable they may be, do not constitute a legal reason for declining to answer.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. JACKSON. I have not issued a directive on the last question.

The witness is directed to answer the question as to the source of the contribution which he received and about which he has just been asked a question by the counsel.

Mr. DEUTCH. Is this last question about—

Mr. JACKSON. The question that was asked by counsel relative to the \$100.

Mr. DEUTCH. That does not refer to your last statement.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, everything that is being done—my statement refers to the entire proceeding, generally. Specifically, at this moment I am directing that you answer the question asked by counsel.

Mr. DEUTCH. I feel like I can't answer that question. I realize there are many problems facing me, and it wasn't an easy decision to make.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair directs again that you answer.

Mr. DEUTCH. I am unable to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the contribution of \$100 referred to a moment ago made by a member of the faculty at Cornell University?

Mr. DEUTCH. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that in response to the question that preceded this last one that you said you were unable to answer the question. I want to know if you refuse to answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question: Was it made by a teaching fellow of any sort at the university, less than the rank of a professor—a person that was instructor in some place?

Mr. DEUTCH. To the best of my recollection, I do not believe it was made by any member of Cornell University.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you get by my question what I meant? Was it made by someone who was instructor in the classes there?

Mr. DEUTCH. I believe I answered that question.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't hear you.

Mr. DEUTCH. I do not believe it was made by anyone at Cornell University.

Mr. DOYLE. Of any university?

Mr. DEUTCH. To the best of my recollection—

Mr. JACKSON. Did you personally know this individual from whom you received the money?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you personally at this moment know his name?

Mr. DEUTCH. That is right, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of the Downtown Club of the Communist Party in Ithaca?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend meetings of that group?

Mr. DEUTCH. No. That is, I don't believe so. The reason I wonder is because that organization became defunct so that there was really no organization. Downtown was Uptown, and there were so few people that I just want to qualify that statement.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you withdraw from the Communist Party?

Mr. DEUTCH. The conviction of mine was gradual and for many years as probably—Mr. Richardson knows what my feelings were—but I haven't attended any Communist function at all, nor do I intend to for at least the last 8 months. I have had no contact or given money to—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the last—I didn't mean to cut you off.

Mr. DEUTCH. Or given any money or anything like that and I don't regard myself as a person under discipline of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were the last meetings of the Communist Party which were attended by you?

Mr. DEUTCH. My memory isn't too good. It was with Mr. Richardson, so his guess is as good as mine. It was either the end of the term

of 1953 or maybe one time in the summer—I don't remember too exactly.

Mr. SCHERER. It was within the last year, however; right?

Mr. DEUTCH. Just about.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of the central committee of the Communist Party at Ithaca?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't know what that means—that is, I was told I was a sort of a head of a graduate group, but since there was only one graduate student—that was me—Mr. Richardson had me go around to meetings, but that was again by nature of the fact that I was the only person in the group.

Mr. JACKSON. How many people were in attendance at the meetings?

Mr. DEUTCH. During what time?

Mr. JACKSON. During the period immediately before you separated from the party.

Mr. DEUTCH. Very few. Maybe a maximum of 4 or 5, that I can recall.

Mr. JACKSON. Where were these meetings held?

Mr. DEUTCH. I believe this is the type of question I can't answer.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean this is the type of question you won't answer; is that correct?

Mr. DEUTCH. Well, whichever way you want to say it; yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask you this question. You knew where the meetings were held?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't believe I know exactly where they were. This is because—since Mr. Richardson drove me there.

[Witness laughs.]

Mr. SCHERER. Of course this is not a funny matter.

Mr. DEUTCH. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you think it was a private residence?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't think it would be considered a private residence.

Mr. DOYLE. At an apartment house or flat?

Mr. DEUTCH. Private house, I would say.

Mr. SCHERER. You know the names of the owners of the home or apartment where these meetings were held?

Mr. DEUTCH. I probably did. At this moment I can't recall. I didn't know them by their last names.

Mr. SCHERER. What were their first names?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't believe I can say. It is very—

Mr. SCHERER. When you say you don't believe you can say, are you referring to your answer for the reason heretofore advanced?

Mr. DEUTCH. I do refuse to answer, but on this particular question I don't believe I remember. Just for the record, I will say, even if urged and if I knew, I would say the same thing.

Mr. SCHERER. You are refusing to answer then, even if you knew the names of the people?

Mr. DEUTCH. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. Was this place at the last meeting—this private home—the same place at which you attended other meetings with Mr. Richardson?

Mr. DEUTCH. The last meeting may have been with Mr. Richardson.

Mr. DOYLE. Just you and he alone?

Mr. DEUTCH. Possibly.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now think—was there some other person there besides you and Mr. Richardson?

Mr. DEUTCH. I believe it was Mr. Richardson, and if he is positive about this other point, it would be this other meeting.

Mr. DOYLE. May I say that my point is—had you gone to the same meetings before?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes; with Mr. Richardson.

Mr. DOYLE. How many times—about?

Mr. DEUTCH. Maybe 4 or 5 times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Homer Owen?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't think I should discuss any people from now on because some people I am acquainted with and some I am not, so I don't think I want to discuss the people's names.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. My refusal about this or any other names does not mean anything incriminating about the gentleman.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest the witness be directed to answer.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to answer.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. I will have to refuse on the same grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. No, you don't have to. You are under no compulsion. Do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes, I decline to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a Communist Party member?

Mr. DEUTCH. Well, this was many years ago. Not that I became a Communist Party member, but from the age of 13 or 14 I had read many books on Marxism and at that time was very much impressed with trying to solve certain of the injustices we have nowadays. I believe in high school I became, or joined the A. Y. D. [American Youth for Democracy] for a period of time. I was very much influenced at this time by the ideas in—

Mr. TAVENNER. What high school was this?

Mr. DEUTCH. I wasn't in a high school branch. There wasn't any high school branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you joined while at high school. What high school?

Mr. DEUTCH. The Brooklyn Technical High School.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. The A. Y. D. wasn't connected with a high school.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Deutch, it seems to me it is more important that you answer these questions than most people who have been before this committee, because you were in the party during the last few years. We have abundant evidence before this committee that anybody who remained in the party up to a year ago was a potential agent of the Kremlin—there is no question about it. There is some excuse for those who were in the party in the late thirties or forties, but not after 1951 or 1952. Therefore it is more important that you answer these questions than most people.

Mr. DEUTCH. I stated previously that I am not a member of the Communist Party now.

Mr. SCHERER. But you have information concerning the activities of the Communist Party within the last year.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. When I was in the Communist Party about all that happened were bull sessions on Marxism, and some activities like giving out a leaflet or two. The people I met didn't advocate the overthrowing of the Government by force and violence, and if they had, I wouldn't have allowed it.

Mr. JACKSON. How do you know whether or not the people with whom you associated did not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

Mr. DEUTCH. This is in my experience.

Mr. JACKSON. That is to say, you were never approached about it, nevertheless—

Mr. DEUTCH. I was never approached about any criminal act, nor were any theories they—

Mr. SCHERER. But you do know the ultimate objectives of the people who were perhaps the leadership in the party?

Mr. DEUTCH. I am describing the people I knew.

Mr. SCHERER. But you haven't told us the people you knew.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Counsel, do you have any further inquiry of this witness? I can see no useful purpose in continuing this questioning.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I have a few. You stated, Mr. Deutch, that while at high school you became a member of the AYD. For the record, what organization do you refer to when you say that?

Mr. DEUTCH. That was the American Youth for Democracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were proceeding to tell us the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party. Will you proceed on that?

Mr. DEUTCH. Well, at that time I had certain views or ideas, but I didn't act on these views. At that time I believed in marxism. To a great extent it is only fair to say I am a Marxist today—I don't want to deny that. I felt if I had ideas I shouldn't be half pregnant about them, so when I came to college I was approached and joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you approached?

Mr. DEUTCH. I was approached by a student. I don't wish to give his name.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness is directed to give the name of the person by whom he was approached.

Mr. DEUTCH. I decline to give the name.

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have anything further, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, a bit more.

Were you referred to Cornell University, Mr. Deutch?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the witness here as a result of a subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; the witness was subpoenaed to appear at Albany on Friday of last week, which was April 9. The counsel for the witness called me on the 8th and asked that, as a matter of convenience to him, the appearance of his witness be postponed for a few days because of the shortness of time for his appearance after the service of the subpoena. This was agreed to by the subcommittee and counsel was directed to have his client here this morning. That is correct, isn't it?

Mr. DEUTCH. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I notice you said you became interested in marxism when you were about 13 years old. You used this language—

It seemed my conviction of mind was I believed it for many years. My conviction of mind was, I believe, for many years.

You are only 25 years old now. You have been a member of the Communist Party in the last year?

Mr. DEUTCH. I am 24 years old.

Mr. DOYLE. 24 years. Why did you stay in the Communist Party for so long? Up to within the year? Why didn't you get out before?

Mr. DEUTCH. I suppose that is of my own inertia. I did nothing for long time. I was trying to act upon my conviction and yet when I tried to I was somewhat rebuffed and it was extreme inertia actually.

Mr. DOYLE. By other people?

Mr. DEUTCH. There were certain disagreements. I just felt I wasn't doing very much.

Mr. DOYLE. You said there was some activity like giving out leaflets. What leaflets did you give out, up to a year ago? What leaflets? Where did you get the leaflets? What did the leaflets advocate?

Mr. DEUTCH. Well, I think they discussed problems in a shoe factory in upstate New York.

Mr. DOYLE. In connection with a strike?

Mr. DEUTCH. Correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Who published the leaflets?

Mr. DEUTCH. I believe the Communist Party published them.

Mr. DOYLE. What Communist Party? Where did you get the leaflets? From the national headquarters?

Mr. DEUTCH. I don't believe so. It was a local branch.

Mr. DOYLE. Where was the office of the local branch from which you got these leaflets?

Mr. DEUTCH. I didn't know where it was. I was just asked to distribute them.

Mr. DOYLE. What?

Mr. DEUTCH. I was asked to distribute them.

Mr. DOYLE. Who asked you to?

Mr. DEUTCH. Those people I was connected with. I don't remember in detail.

Mr. DOYLE. How many of these people who were connected with you do you now refer to? About how many?

Mr. DEUTCH. Those people who were members of the student branch at Cornell.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many people was that?

Mr. DEUTCH. You mean over the course of years?

(At this point Mr. Deutch conferred with Mr. Sawyer.)

Mr. DEUTCH. How many were giving out leaflets? Oh, 5 to 10.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No, no questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 a. m., Monday, April 12, the executive hearing adjourned, subject to a call of the Chair.)



# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Amdur, Isadore.....	4023
Angelilli .....	4039
Arguimbau, Lawrence Baker.....	4013-4036 (testimony)
Behringer, William.....	4039
Bok, Bart Jan.....	4035
Browder, Earl.....	4032, 4033
Crowley, Francis Xavier Thomas.....	4037-4041 (testimony)
Deutch, Bernhard.....	4043-4052 (testimony)
Eisenhower, General.....	4029, 4032
Frankel, Osmand K.....	4013-4036
Frankfeld, Philip.....	4019
Hicks, Granville.....	4024
Levinson, Norman.....	4023
Lie, Trygve.....	4029
Martin, William Ted.....	4023
Owen, Homer.....	4049
Owen, Robert.....	4029
Richardson, Ross.....	4045-4049
Roosevelt, President.....	4033
Sawyer, Henry W. III.....	4043-4052
Stevenson, Adlai.....	4032
Wallace, Henry A.....	4028
Willkie, Wendell.....	4028

## ORGANIZATIONS

American Youth for Democracy.....	4031, 4032, 4034, 4049, 4050
Bell Laboratories.....	4014
Brooklyn Technical High School.....	4044, 4049
Camp Unity.....	4039
Columbia College.....	4038
Communist Party.....	4014-4017, 4019, 4020, 4022-4026, 4028-4030, 4032-4034, 4040, 4044-4051
Communist Political Association.....	4022, 4023
Consumers' Union.....	4035
Cornell University.....	4044, 4046, 4047, 4050
Downtown Club of the Communist Party, Ithaca.....	4047
General Radio Co.....	4014
Harvard College.....	4014, 4019, 4022, 4024, 4030, 4032
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.....	4014, 4019, 4023, 4025, 4026, 4031, 4032
National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions.....	4034
Parent-Teachers Association.....	4018
Progressive Party.....	4024
University of Michigan.....	4038, 4039
University of Pennsylvania.....	4044
University of Washington.....	4025, 4034
West End Club of the Communist Party (Boston).....	4039-4041
Young Communist League.....	4031, 4034

## PUBLICATIONS

Boston Globe.....	4029
Daily Worker.....	4025, 4026, 4034
New York Times.....	4029

