



9335.1/a 172



GIVEN BY

see list

EXPOSE OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

(BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 23 AND 24, OCTOBER 10 AND 11, 1951

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



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1951

193: HM72

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

CLYDE DOYLE, California

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword.....	v
July 23, 1951, testimony of Herbert A. Philbrick.....	1257
July 24, 1951, testimony of—	
Harry Eugene Winner.....	1307
Prof. Dirk J. Struik.....	1321
October 10, 1951, testimony of Donald C. Bollen.....	1353
October 11, 1951, testimony of—	
Donald Tormey.....	1371
Nathaniel Mills.....	1390
Robert Goodwin.....	1397
Appendix.....	1401

FOREWORD

The Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, in the course of its investigation to ascertain the scope of infiltration and influence of communism in areas containing industries of vital defense to the national welfare of this country, has heard the following testimony relating to the New England area.

Also subpoenaed to appear before the committee was Joseph Figueiredo who is referred to on several occasions in this testimony. The committee has acceded to the request of Figueiredo's physician to postpone his appearance before the committee until such time as Mr. Figueiredo's health will permit such an appearance. It is expected that Mr. Figueiredo and such other individuals whose investigation would appear to be warranted will be heard some time early in 1952. From the nature of the testimony concerning him, it is believed that if Mr. Figueiredo so desires he can furnish testimony that will be of great assistance to the committee relative to determining the extent of Communist infiltration and influence in the New England area.

EXPOSE OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF
MASSACHUSETTS
(BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK)

MONDAY, JULY 23, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10:55 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Clyde Doyle (appearance as noted in transcript), James B. Frazier, Jr., and Donald L. Jackson.

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

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that for the purposes of this hearing I, as chairman, have set up a subcommittee composed of the following members: Messrs. Frazier, Jackson, and Wood. We are all present.

Whom do you have, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the investigation this morning is shifting from the Baltimore area to the New England area, with special emphasis upon the Communist Party activities in the State of Massachusetts. The witness this morning is Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick, who occupies the witness chair.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Philbrick, will you stand and be sworn, please. Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF HERBERT ARTHUR PHILBRICK

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. My full name is Herbert Arthur Philbrick.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was born in Boston, Mass., May 11, 1915.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I reside in Melrose Highlands, Mass., a suburb of Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state for the committee in a general way what your education has been?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I am a graduate of a school of civil engineering, and also a graduate of several courses in advertising, salesmanship, public relations, and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your trade or profession?

Mr. PHILBRICK. My profession is that of advertising. I am now advertising and sales-promotion manager of the Maintain Store Engineering Service in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe briefly for the committee what your record of employment has been since the completion of your education?

Mr. PHILBRICK. My first employment was with the Dickie Raymond Co. of Boston, a direct-mail advertising firm. From there I went to Cambridge, Mass., where I worked with the Holmes Direct Mail Service, H-o-l-m-e-s.

Then I became assistant advertising director for the Paramount chain of theaters, working for Harry Browning, advertising director.

Following that I worked for a short time for American Theatres Corp., again as assistant advertising director; and from there as advertising director for the Maintain Store Engineering Service, my present employer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, the committee records reflect that in the trial of the 11 Communist leaders, in the United States district court in New York City, you appeared as a witness for the Government in the course of that trial. Is that correct?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of that testimony it was indicated that you had operated in an undercover capacity for the Government in connection with various Communist Party activities, and in connection with the Young Communist League, American Youth for Democracy, and possibly other organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you became a member of the Cambridge Youth Council, which I understand you joined, you were not working for a Government agency; were you?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to tell the committee in your own words all the circumstances relating to your joining the Cambridge Youth Council, and how your experience in that organization led to your connection with the Federal Government.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, in the spring of 1940, in the course of canvassing for business for my firm, which at that time was the Holmes Co. in Cambridge, I walked into an office at 7 Water Street, Boston. I had no previous knowledge of this particular office or of any of the individuals connected with it.

Upon opening the door I found I was in the office of an organization called the Massachusetts Youth Council, and it was through that visit that I became acquainted with Alice Mills, who was in charge of the office at that time. Also, through her, I became known to Nathaniel Mills, or Nat Mills, her husband, who was the head of the Massachusetts Youth Council.

Through them I also met a girl in Cambridge by the name of Toni Grosse, who I found later was the head of the Harvard Student Union, which was a branch of the American Student Union, in Cambridge.

I had always been in young people's work myself. I had been very active as a youth leader in our Baptist church in Somerville, Mass. I was very much interested in youth organizations and youth activities. When I learned of the possibility of a Cambridge Youth Council which would include the participation of many youth organizations, such as the YWCA, YMCA, and all the various church youth groups in Cambridge, I was very much interested in it. So I became affiliated with the group in that fashion.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you have any official position in the group that was established; that is, the Cambridge Youth Council?

MR. PHILBRICK. I became the chairman of the initial committee to form the provisional Cambridge Youth Council, and subsequently became chairman of the Cambridge Youth Council itself.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date of the formation of the Cambridge Youth Council?

MR. PHILBRICK. I believe it was formally organized in the fall of 1940.

MR. TAVENNER. What were the purposes of that group?

MR. PHILBRICK. Well, the purposes of the group, so far as the great majority of the young people participating in it, were perfectly legitimate and honest. Our main objectives at that time—and by that I mean of the majority of the young people in the group—were, first, to try to maintain peace for the United States, to try to keep the United States out of the World War which was growing at that time; also, to work on job-training projects for the young people, because at that time unemployment was widespread among the youth. So, we worked on NYA projects, I believe they were called, and other worthwhile functions.

MR. TAVENNER. What part did the two persons by the name of Mills—I believe you said Nat Mills and Alice Mills—and Toni Grosse, have in the original formation of this organization?

MR. PHILBRICK. Nat Mills, as chairman of the Massachusetts Youth Council, which included similar organizations in many cities and towns throughout the State, offered all help and aid and advice in forming this group. He supplied me and other members in the initial organization the names of various people to contact and see, names of people he said would be interested in participating in the youth group.

Toni Grosse: I have no recollection that she ever belonged to the Cambridge Youth Council itself, but she did offer her office in Cambridge, which I believe was at 1384 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge. She offered us her office for the time being until we were able to get offices for ourselves.

MR. TAVENNER. Was the Cambridge Youth Council affiliated with the Massachusetts Youth Council or the American Youth Congress?

MR. PHILBRICK. We were affiliated with the Massachusetts Youth Council and the American Youth Congress through delegates that we sent to these various organizations.

MR. TAVENNER. How long did you serve as chairman of the Cambridge Youth Council?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I served as chairman right through until the time it folded, which was during the summer of 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did this group have an executive secretary?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the executive secretary?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The person in the position of executive secretary was a fellow by the name of Arthur Solomon of Cambridge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Arthur Solomon?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-o-l-o-m-o-n?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you known him prior to your association with him in this group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state whether the policies of the organization and the programs which it adopted were those dictated and chosen by the membership at large, or whether there were any other influences brought to bear which decided the policy and was influential in the selection of the projects?

Mr. PHILBRICK. To lead up to the question, very shortly after I became involved in this youth movement I began to realize that there was something wrong. Perhaps the major conviction that things were not right centered around the fact that we had an executive board consisting of five people. One of the persons was myself, as chairman; another one was a girl by the name of Alice Solomont, S-o-l-o-m-o-n-t, who was the recording secretary of the group; and the other three members were Arthur Solomon; Sidney Solomon, his brother; and another fellow by the name of Stanley Beecher, B-e-e-c-h-e-r.

Alice Solomont and I soon found that in every matter having to do with policy we were continually overruled by the other three. We also discovered that at no time did the stand taken by those three vary in any way from the position of the Massachusetts Youth Council or of the American Youth Congress.

I might go on to say that all of the positions taken by the American Youth Congress were not in accordance with the majority of the membership of the Cambridge Youth Council, and yet, in spite of that, we were most effectively controlled, so that we could not overrule the policies of the American Youth Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the general membership in the group aware of that influence?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; they were not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or control?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, as far as the youth groups which were represented in the Cambridge Youth Council were concerned, they were totally unaware of the fact that outside influences were controlling the policy of their organization?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that your experience aroused your suspicions about those matters. What did you do about it?

Mr. PHILBRICK. As soon as I became convinced that I had run into a Communist-front activity, I reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before taking that action, had you decided to resign from the position of chairman of the organization?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir; I had.

Mr. TAVENNER. After talking to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you continue with your plan to resign?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I stayed in the group for the purpose of reporting to the Government the activities of the Communists and their attempts to control the Cambridge Youth Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were of the opinion then, I assume, that the activities in connection with your youth organization were such that the Government should be made aware of what was going on.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was your reason for reporting?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you continue in the organization, then, at the behest of the Government?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I believe you told us that you remained as chairman of the organization until it disbanded in the summer of 1941?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. June 22, 1941, was the date of the invasion of Russia by Germany, I believe, and that was the date, I believe, your organization disbanded?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Of course, as I have already said, the prime objective of the majority of the members of the Cambridge Youth Council was to keep America on this side of the ocean as long as possible, and of course as of June 22, 1941, the comrades lost all interest in that objective, so the Cambridge Youth Council, to all effects and purposes, dissolved.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you acquire information as to other organizations of which Arthur Solomon was a member at the same time he was executive secretary of the Cambridge Youth Council?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I found out later that Arthur Solomon was the head of the Young Communist League in Cambridge at the same time he had been executive secretary of our organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you obtain that information?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He told me so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee very briefly what functions the Cambridge Youth Council performed during its existence, what it did, what work it engaged in, in addition to the general sponsoring of the policies which you have already mentioned?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, of course, there were two factions at work, one the group I would call the legitimate group, and the other the Young Communist group. It is rather difficult at times to separate the two. But in addition to working for job training, working for peace, and so forth, we also, through the Communist influence, worked on other matters. One of them was to participate in a group called the American Peace Mobilization, I believe, and through the YCLers we were provided with, I believe, many petitions to be signed, and so forth. So there was a great deal of activity, much of which I do not

recall at the present time, which had to do with matters that were not of prime interest to the majority of the members of the Cambridge Youth Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were the financial affairs of the organization handled?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Very loosely, I would say. We raised money through friends and contacts we made, most of them believing in the honest objectives of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any contributions made by any other organizations to the work of your organization?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall of any.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any occasions when the Cambridge Youth Council performed any particular service for other organizations in the way of furnishing materials, newsprint, or paper of any kind for use in circularizing the public?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Another one of the difficulties we ran into—this was at a very late date of the organization—was the fact that since, as it turned out, a great deal of our mimeograph work was being done at YCL headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say YCL you mean Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. Since a great deal of our mimeograph work was being done at Young Communist League headquarters, this, also, without the knowledge of the majority of the membership, much of our supplies, mimeograph paper and so forth, which we bought, were actually delivered to YCL headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether any of the Cambridge Youth Council materials were used by organizations other than your own and, of course, the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. After the termination of your organization in the summer of 1941, did you continue your relationship with Arthur Solomon and his brother, Sidney Solomon, and others of the group which you have indicated were exercising influence and control over your organization?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was your purpose in doing that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. My purpose was still to obtain information for the Government concerning the activities of these individuals.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of that relationship, were you urged to join another organization known as the Cambridge Committee for Equal Opportunities?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us a little more of the circumstances regarding the establishment of that organization.

Mr. PHILBRICK. The Cambridge Committee for Equal Opportunities was another group which included a great many very fine people from Cambridge who were honestly interested in obtaining some benefits from the group. The purposes of it were—well, there were two purposes. First, of course, the purpose of the Communist Party was to establish this front to reach the Negro people of Cambridge. The stated purposes, the legitimate purposes, were to try to end race discrimination in jobs, and to obtain better housing and other opportunities for the Negro people of Cambridge.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of that organization, do you recall?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Only a short time. My initial capacity was as a member of the sponsoring committee of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was a group organized at the behest and under the influence of Arthur Solomon and his associates?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Very largely; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of your membership in the Cambridge Committee for Equal Opportunities, were you approached regarding a desire to have you unite with any additional organizations?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In the spring of 1942 I was invited to join the Young Communist League.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom was the invitation extended?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The invitation was by Arthur Solomon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you accept the invitation?

Mr. PHILBRICK. After consultation with the Government, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to a group or cell of the Young Communist League.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances of your becoming a member, and the associations you had as a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, my recollections are very vague for that period of time. I recall that the first meetings of this new group—which I understood was a group of people like myself, newly recruited in to the Young Communist League—the first meetings were held in my apartment at Cambridge, and it was then that I, together with the others, was given the first indoctrination by the Communist Party leaders who were in charge of the educational work.

I have very little recollection of the people who belonged to that particular cell. It was a small group of 8, 9, or 10 people, perhaps.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Arthur Solomon a member of the same group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; he wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was his brother Sidney Solomon a member of that group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He attended one or two meetings, but it was my understanding he belonged to another cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have spoken of the indoctrinational phase of the work while you were in the Young Communist League. Who conducted or took the lead in the indoctrinational work?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There was a girl comrade who conducted the sessions, but I do not recall her name at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your membership in the Young Communist League of an open nature, or were you advised that your membership would be kept secret?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was advised that my membership would be kept secret, and I was also instructed to keep my membership in the group secret.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you were unable to recall at this time the names of the 8 or 9 persons who were associated in this group with you at that time, but can you give us any description or any opinion of the particular field of employment or profession represented by those who associated with you at that time?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The group was composed of young people living either in the community or attending one of the colleges in the vicinity. We had, for example, some Harvard students, some Radcliffe students, also some young people who were employed and living in Cambridge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were their last names given to you?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Only their first names were given in these YCL meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any instructions after you became a member?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall any instructions specifically, except that I was given various jobs as a new member. For example, I was asked to help out in the free Earl Browder campaign. I was instructed to contact my friends and so forth as a non-Communist, and to obtain their signatures for the free Earl Browder campaign.

Also, we worked on the Russian War Relief, as I recall, and in that connection we canvassed various people, looking for money and so forth. I guess those are the two most prominent ones I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any reason assigned as to why your membership in the Young Communist League was to be kept secret?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was told that it was quite common for people in executive or semiexecutive classifications, or for people working in Government jobs, and for other various reasons, not to have their party membership known publicly.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have previously mentioned certain individuals, Nathaniel Mills, Alice Mills, and Toni Grosse. Did it come to your attention during the period you were a member of the Young Communist League that any of these people were also members?

Mr. PHILBRICK. After I became a member of the Young Communist League, I found that my comrades included Nat Mills, Alice Mills, and Toni Grosse.

Mr. TAVENNER. Though they were not, I assume, members of your particular cell?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they times when you felt you were under investigation yourself regarding the sincerity of your purposes in joining the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. During the time we were discussing the possibility of my membership—you see, I stalled Arthur Solomon until I had time to contact the Government—during that time or immediately thereafter I was contacted by Toni Grosse, who up to that time I had not known as a member of the Communist Party or the Young Communist League, and she proceeded to examine me quite thoroughly regarding my background, and to question me closely as to my reasons for joining, and what I hoped to get out of the organization, and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom did you pay your dues while a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall. It was to one of the members of our group who served as treasurer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I remained a member of the Young Communist League right up until the time of its dissolution, which I believe was in the fall of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of your joining the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I joined the Young Communist League in the spring of 1942 and remained a member until the fall of 1943, when the organization was dissolved in New York City and an organization called American Youth for Democracy was formed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to the dissolution of the Young Communist League, was there any occasion at which you were present where there was a discussion concerning the formation of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that, please?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There were two or three discussions. One or two of them were held in our own cell meetings. These centered around an article which I believe was written by Max Weiss, and which appeared in a magazine known at the time either as the Communist or Political Affairs. We had some discussion regarding this new organization to be formed.

Then I had luncheon with Alice Gordon at which we discussed not only the formation of the organization, but the question of my becoming State treasurer of the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us at this point who Alice Gordon was?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She was the head of the Young Communist League movement in district 1 of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the area or territory of district 1?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That includes all the New England States with the exception of Connecticut, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us of various conversations relating to the formation of an organization of youth. Had the name of that organization been discussed prior to the time of the dissolution of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it correct to state that the American Youth for Democracy was a continuation of the Young Communist League, or an extension of it?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Substantially so, although the policies and programs of the American Youth for Democracy were considerably less Marxist than those of the original Young Communist League.

For example, in the Young Communist League we, together with the Communist Party, taught and believed in a revolutionary overthrow of the Government. In the American Youth for Democracy this question was never brought up. It was strictly a win-the-war organization. But all members of the Young Communist League were actually interested in the American Youth for Democracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present at the convention in New York at which the Young Communist League was dissolved?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was. I was a delegate to that convention.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us the circumstances of the formation of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The details are very vague now. We met for 3 or 4 days in New York City. Mecca Temple was one of the spots we met, and Manhattan Center. We met first, I believe, on a Friday night. I don't recall exactly. But we first met very briefly to go through the formality of dissolving the Young Communist League. Committees were set up then to form this new group, American Youth for Democracy. The delegates were in almost every case the same delegates as we had for the AYD the next day.

Mr. TAVENNER. So it was the same group which dissolved the Young Communist League who organized the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold a State office in the new organization, the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did. I became, as we had discussed in Massachusetts even before the organization was formed, State treasurer for the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "we" discussed, to whom do you refer?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Alice Gordon and other members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the Communist Party formed a slate of the officers to be elected in the Massachusetts chapter of the American Youth for Democracy; is that what you mean?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that slate elected?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It was; completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the officers, other than yourself?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall the full slate of officers we had. Don Bollen was chairman. I met him for the first time at the Young Communist League convention in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you able at that time or sometime later to identify him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time or later?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I assumed, since he was at the Young Communist League convention, that he was a member. As Young Communist League members we all understood that to all effects and purposes we were members of the Communist Party. I assumed he was, and at a later date I met him at Communist Party meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the names of other officers whose names appeared on this slate formed by the Communist Party members?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The only other name I recall right now was Bernice Rogers. I believe she became secretary of the organization. Then there were several others who also were on that list, but I am not entirely sure which of those became members or officers at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Bernice Rogers a member of the Communist Party to your knowledge?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, she was.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have partially answered this question, but I would like to have it restated, probably a little more fully.

What, in your opinion, was the purpose of the formation of the American Youth for Democracy at that time?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The purpose was to organize a large, mass youth organization which would back the policies of winning the war, of getting aid to Russia, and so forth. It was to be a non-Communist organization, insofar as we did not advocate overthrow of the Government, and of course we watered down several other Marxist tenets and beliefs in accordance with that period, which was the time known as Browderism.

The purpose was to organize a large mass movement of young people, the great majority of them being non-Communists, and to organize them in a win-the-war youth movement.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I remained State treasurer of AYD from the time of its organization in the fall of 1943 up until the summer of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the largest membership of the American Youth for Democracy in the State of Massachusetts, if you know?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The peak of membership in Massachusetts was around 1,000 members.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of time when you were active in the American Youth for Democracy, did you have occasion to come in contact with members of the Communist Party, or persons known at that time, or even at a later date, by you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occasion for your meeting those individuals?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, there were two groups with whom I came in contact. One was the group affiliated nationally with AYD, and of course as State treasurer of AYD in Massachusetts, I met with these people many times in working on the business of the AYD of Massachusetts.

One of these was Bob McCarthy, originally from Massachusetts, a member of the furniture workers union, who became an officer in the national group.

I also met people such as Robert Thompson; Carl Ross——

Mr. TAVENNER. Are these people all known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Leo Cooper, I recall working with him from time to time.

Max Weiss, of course, I met in New York, and he is an open member of the Communist Party.

Claudia Jones, I believe, is known as an open member of the Communist Party, and I met with her.

Mr. WOOD. What is her first name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Claudia.

Mr. TAVENNER. C-l-a-u-d-i-a?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. She is one of the 21 persons now under indictment as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is the same person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether there are also deportation proceedings pending against her?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is the same individual; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you in the listing of names of members of the Communist Party with whom you came in contact during this period.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, I believe I mentioned Max Weiss.

Marcella Sloane, from the national office of the Communist Party; I became acquainted with her.

Those people I became acquainted with on a national level.

On the local level I met at regular intervals with the leaders of the Communist Party in Massachusetts, most of these meetings taking place in Communist Party headquarters in the Little Building in Boston. At these meetings I received my instructions and orders as to my activities as a Communist in the American Youth for Democracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify the names at this time of any of the Communist Party leaders on the State level who were active at that time?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, Fanny Hartman was the person from whom I received most of my instructions and orders, although I also worked with Jack Green, Anne Burlack, Boone Schirmer—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. B-o-o-n-e S-c-h-i-r-m-e-r, I believe. His first name was Daniel, so he was known to us as Dan as well as Boone.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke first of Fanny Hartman. Can you give us further identifying information concerning her?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She was in charge of and was running the district 1 office of the Communist Party at that time. She is the former wife of Phil Frankfeld, who was also in Massachusetts for a period of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he the same Phil Frankfeld who came later to Baltimore and became the district chairman of district 4 of the Communist Party, consisting of the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir; that is the same person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Frankfeld yourself in connection with your work?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, I did not. He had moved out of Massachusetts just prior to the time that I had gone in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us of your association and connection with these members of the Communist Party, both on a National and State level. Were you an actual dues-paying member of the Communist Party at that particular time?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I became a dues-paying member of the Communist Party in March of 1944, which was also, of course, during this same period of time when I was serving as State treasurer for AYD.

Mr. TAVENNER. The contacts that you have mentioned with these various individuals occurred prior or subsequent to the time you actually became a member?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Some before and some later.

Mr. TAVENNER. What explanation do you have for a Communist Party member having contact with you in this work prior to your becoming a member yourself?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, as I say, during that period, though we were only official members of the Young Communist League, it was pretty well understood that I was under the discipline of the Communist Party and taking orders from the Communist Party, and serving as treasurer of AYD as a Communist.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. In the spring of 1944 I became a member of a cell on Beacon Hill which was headed up by Alice Gordon. She was the head of that particular cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. And at whose solicitation?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall just who it was who actually arranged for my formal joining of the Communist Party, except I know it was worked out in consultation with Alice Gordon and Fanny Hartman, but who made the first move, I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. After arrangements were made for you to become a dues-paying member of the Communist Party, did you consult an agency of Government before taking the actual step?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Returning now to the question of your activities in connection with the American Youth for Democracy organization, will you tell the committee how funds were raised by that organization for the purpose of carrying on its work?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, we raised funds largely, of course, by the dues from the various members. The dues were very small, however, running only about a dollar or so a year, so in addition to that we had to obtain money from other sources, mainly from various sponsors of AYD.

In addition to that, we ran Saturday night dances and raised money that way. And we had direct contributions from party members and friends.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by party members?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I recall one of the ways we used to raise money was to get sponsors who would give a prearranged monthly donation toward the maintenance of the organization, and some of these I later learned were members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. So funds were contributed directly by Communist Party members?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any occasion during the operation of the American Youth for Democracy when that organization's policies or programs were at variance with those of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Never at any time were the policies and programs of the American Youth for Democracy at variance with the policies and aims of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. With reference to your joining the Communist Party in the spring of 1944, what reasons, if any, were given you for inviting you to become a member of the Communist Party, if you recall?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall that any specific reasons were given to me, except, of course, that it was time now that I should become a full-fledged party member.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have testified that when you became a member of the Young Communist League you were told that the fact of your

membership would be kept secret. Was the same statement made to you with reference to the keeping of your membership secret upon your joining the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir. Instructions were given to me at that time, and I might say also earlier, at the time of AYD, that if at any time anyone should charge I was a member of the party, or ask if I was a member of the party, I was to state that I was not a member of the Communist Party and had never been a member of the Communist Party. These same instructions were given to me again in the spring of 1944 when I actually obtained for the first time a Communist Party card.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you always serve in the Communist Party as a secret member?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was never known publicly as a Communist Party member, and I was not known to many other Communist Party members as a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first time you were disclosed publicly as a member of the Communist Party was when you testified in the course of the trial of the 11 Communists in the United States district court in New York?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have testified that you were active in various youth organizations in your church fork. Did you continue to be active in your church work after joining the Young Communist League?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did. First of all, of course, I wanted to continue because I wanted to maintain my contacts with some healthy minded individuals; but beyond that, and to my good fortune, I was instructed by the party to continue my contacts and to continue my affiliations in all my normal groups.

These instructions were also given to other members in my cell. We were told not to separate ourselves from any mass organizations, because we were taught that as good Marxists we could lead the people only if we maintained contact with the people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who gave you those instructions?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe the first instructions came early in my Young Communist League career. I recall that in a discussion at the apartment of Dave Bennett we were given those instructions. I was also given those same instructions by Fanny Hartman and by Alice Gordon.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. He was known to me long before I actually became a formal member myself. I had already attended, on Dana Street in Cambridge, training sessions, Communist courses, given by Dave Bennett to a group of comrades there.

Mr. TAVENNER. From the instructions which you received from the Communist Party, did it appear, or were you led to believe, that in the field of religious activity the Communist Party was incompatible with any religious belief?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Absolutely. We were taught that the socialistic theories of Marx had nothing to do with the idealistic superstitions of religious organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you became a member of the Communist Party, did you register, or were you given a Communist membership card?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was given a membership card, but the members of our group at the apartment of Alice Gordon were instructed to destroy the cards, but to keep the card number in mind for purposes of identification, which we supposedly did; however, instead of destroying my card, I turned it in to the Government.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of having been assigned to a cell or unit of the Communist Party. Did that unit or cell have a name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Not that I know of, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many individuals were in that group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It was a rather small group. There were perhaps seven or eight in the small group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of those who were members with you of that particular cell?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall now who the people were who belonged to that particular cell. My recollection is very vague, except that Alice Gordon was the head of it.

Otis Hood used to drop around occasionally at our meetings, but he was not a member of our cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whose name did you just mention?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Otis Hood.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. He is publicly known in Massachusetts as a member of the Communist Party. He is pretty much the figurehead for the party in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you became a member of this Communist Party cell, were you known by your full name or just by your first name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Only by my first name officially, although of course one or two of the members knew who I was from my affiliation in AYD. But only first names were used or were placed on the Communist membership cards.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any instructions at the time you became officially a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It was just after I had joined that we were given instructions that the Communist Party was to be dissolved and the Communist Political Association was to be formed.

Also, of course, in keeping with the regular routine of membership in those groups, we were given a course of instructions, though I do not recall what the course was at that time. The major issue was changing over from the Communist Party to the Communist Political Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. When the Communist Political Association was formed, were you kept in the same cell or group, or were you assigned to a different group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was kept in the same cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period of time were you still a member of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any change in the policy of the American Youth for Democracy following the dissolution of the Communist Party and the formation of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I would say that rather than the youth organization following the policy of the party, the party was leading and we followed the policy of AYD. In AYD we had been cooperating with so-called progressive capitalists and so forth, and now the new group was going to do the same thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other groups and organizations in Massachusetts at that time—that is, during the days of the Communist Political Association—which became Communist-front organizations and largely influenced and controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, there were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee about each of them?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, I don't know if I can recall all of them. There was a tremendous number of them. But in connection with the youth movement we had various youth organizations which were, again, infiltrated by Communist Party members and largely controlled by them.

One of them was the Sweethearts of Servicemen. Sweethearts of Servicemen was pretty much of a subsidiary of American Youth for Democracy, and completely controlled and dominated by the Communist element.

Another group that we set up in Boston was known as Youth for Victory. Youth for Victory was set up quite early in the war, and there were many comrades, including myself, assigned to that group. In Youth for Victory I was playing a part, upon instructions of the party, as a non-Communist. The party ordered me to serve in various organizations as a liberal non-Communist. In such capacity I served as sponsor for an organization known as Youth for Unity. And I believe there were a few others, too, that I do not recall at this time, that were dominated and controlled by the party.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of the Communist Party, if you know, in infiltrating and controlling the policies of these groups?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The reason it was possible to get the support of a large number of patriotic young people was to win the war. In that connection, we wrapped bandages, carried on war-bond and war-stamp sales campaigns, and so forth. For that reason we had the support of very many fine citizens in Boston.

However, the objectives of the Communist Party were as follows:

We were told and instructed that, first of all, we were not only to work for winning the war; we were also to work very strenuously for aid to Russia as a great ally of the United States, and we were to work to get people to see Russia in a favorable and friendly light, and we were to win support for the Soviet Socialist system of government.

Mr. TAVENNER. In carrying out that program, did members of the armed services of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics appear at any of your meetings?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. We had a group of comrades from Russia come to Boston, and we had a reception for them and so forth, sponsored by these youth groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position in any of these groups which you had been directed by the Communist Party to sponsor as a non-Communist?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was one of the organizers of Youth for Victory, and I was on the sponsoring committee of Youth for Unity; and because of my profession in the advertising field I was instructed by the party to work in the promotional activities of these organizations. I did prepare many of the folders and propaganda material for them.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of your experience in Massachusetts, did you learn of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it have a chapter in Boston?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee who were connected with it, known to you to be members of the Communist Party, in that particular chapter?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I do not recall at this time. I did know at that time, and that information has gone to the Government, but I have no recollection of it now. I know we worked with them closely.

The Youth for Unity was pretty much of a foreign language group. We would sponsor, for example, folk dances, to which the young people would come dressed in native costumes, and so forth, and in that capacity this youth organization was very close to us.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned earlier in your testimony the name of Marcella Sloane, I believe.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us more identifying information relating to her?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Marcella Sloane, I believe I have testified before. I had already become acquainted with as attached to the national office of the Communist Party. In the latter part of 1945 she was assigned to Boston to organize and to direct a recruiting class for the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, for the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. For the Communist Party or Communist Political Association: they were pretty much the same in membership.

So we set up a training class sponsored by AYD. Various comrades in the organization were assigned to the task of recruiting likely looking prospects for the party, and of having them come to these classes. These classes were conducted by Marcella Sloane for a period of several weeks, during which time her salary was paid by the national office.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What organizations were used as the recruiting fields for these groups?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Mainly AYD, but also some of the contacts we had through Boston Youth for Unity and Boston Youth for Victory.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what success Marcella Sloane had in recruiting members into the party as a result of the procedure you have described?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I know they were successful in getting some of the young people to actually join the CPA. Just how many, I don't know, but I know there were a few.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar, of course, with the dissolution of the Communist Political Association and the reorganization of the Communist Party in 1945, are you not?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly about that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, in early 1945 a French Communist leader, Jacques Duclos, had written an article or a thesis criticizing the American [Communist] Party for the so-called taint of Browderism. That, of course, started the chain of reaction which ultimately, in July or August of the same year, resulted in the reformation of the Communist Party and the return to Marxism-Leninism.

Mr. TAVENNER. And also resulted in the ouster of Browder?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend either the State or national convention at which the Communist Political Association was dissolved and the Communist Party revived?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. I attended the convention in the State of Massachusetts as a delegate. In the meantime, in the course of these activities I had become a member of the Communist Party while in Malden, Mass. So in 1945 I attended the State convention as an alternate delegate from the Malden Club.

I also attended upon personal invitation of Dave Bennett, who was then, I believe, secretary of the Communist Party in Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of the other delegates from the Malden Club in addition to yourself?

Mr. PHILBRICK. My old friend Alice Mills was a delegate, and she was a full delegate.

Gus Johnson was a delegate or alternate.

Frank Collier was a delegate.

And a girl named Grace was a delegate, not known by her last name.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were all delegates from your club or cell in Malden, Mass.?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe three were delegates and the rest of us were alternate delegates.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you notice any change in the attitude of the Communist Party as a result of its revival after the ouster of Browder?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There was a very drastic change, which was to be brought forward very forcibly in the course of these conventions and later events.

The change, of course, was a revocation of the line that communism could cooperate with any part of capitalism in any way, respect, or manner. We were told specifically that the forces of imperialism had been greatly strengthened by the war, and the newly formed Communist Party must combat imperialism, and especially American imperialism, in every way possible.

That, of course, was the major change, although there was a great deal of other material that went along with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then the revival of the Communist Party in 1945 marked a return to the old Marx-Lenin principles of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand at recess until 2:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:10 p. m., a recess was taken until 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:30 p. m., Representatives Wood, Doyle, and Jackson being present.)

Mr. WOOD. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF HERBERT ARTHUR PHILBRICK—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, you described for us this morning the formation of the Communist Political Association and also its dissolution. Did you take part in any of the convention activities which led up to the formation of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I attended the conventions of the CPA—that is, the formation of the CPA—but only as a visitor, not as a delegate. In fact, I had attended Communist Party conventions as far back as 1943, I believe, as a visitor, but it was not until 1945 that I attended as an actual delegate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time voice opposition to the formation of the Communist Political Association and the adoption of the less stringent views or activity by that organization?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I did. It so happened that in 1944, just prior to the acceptance of Browderism, I had been attending some classes over at Dave Bennett's apartment which were very strictly Marxist classes, advocacy of violent revolution, and so forth.

So when the discussion came up at Alice Gordon's apartment regarding the dissolution of the Communist Party and the formation of the Communist Political Association, more to heckle the comrades than anything else, I voiced strenuous opposition to the change. I said I thought capitalism was still fighting for its own selfish ends, and we were making a great mistake in overthrowing the great revolutionary traditions of the party.

We had quite a time. The comrades were rather hard put for a while to explain all the changes. But of course in the end I did give in, as a good comrade, and admit that perhaps Comrade Browder was correct.

To advance the story now to 1945, when the Communist Party leaders again changed their minds and it was decided they had to get rid of this very vile creature, Mr. Browder, it was remembered on the State convention floor that Philbrick was the one who had held out the longest against this great evil; and for that reason I became somewhat of a great hero in 1945, and that was one of the reasons why I was assigned to educational work in the party, to teach Marxism to other comrades.

I might add I had no success at all in convincing my comrades in 1944 that they were wrong.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, as a result of that action, you finally became the head of the State Educational Commission of the Communist

Party at the dissolution of the Communist Political Association; is that correct?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No. I became a member of the education commission in charge of the propaganda work, in charge of the leaflet production. I was in charge of the printed material that the party produced from that time on. The first chairman was Justine O'Connor, then we had various chairmen throughout the years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall now the names of the various chairmen of that commission?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The members of the commission at the time I became a member of it in 1945 were: Justine O'Connor; Otis Hood; Boone Schirmer, who later became a chairman—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. B-o-o-n-e S-c-h-i-r-m-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Daniel Boone Schirmer.

Max Weitzman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I can't recall the spelling. It was something like W-h-i-t-e-s-m-a-n or W-e-i-t-z-m-a-n; but Max was our chairman for quite a period of time. He was normally known only as Max.

And Manny Blum was a member of the commission and a leader of the group for a period of time.

Of course the group was headed up nationally by Jack Stachel of the national office.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your commission receive its directions from Jack Stachel?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, we did.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what your functions were as a member of that commission?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The purpose of the commission as a whole in the first instance was to set up Marxist training classes to get the party back to its revolutionary thinking of Marxism-Leninism, and to cleanse the party of every element of Browderism, which, of course, was quite prevalent, especially among the newer members who had joined during the CPA period.

So our immediate task was to train every single Communist Party member in the traditional Marxist-Leninist theory.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe briefly the traditional Marxist-Leninist theory to which you have referred?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It was a long, involved course. I attended a course at 3 Hancock Street in Boston, given to only a select number of comrades in whom the party had absolute trust and confidence.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK (continuing). And we were trained in turn to become instructors in Marxism.

I then became educational director for the Eighth Congressional District in Massachusetts. The Eighth Congressional District included Malden, Melrose, Everett, a part of Somerville, Wakefield, and a part of Stoneham. As such I went from cell to cell and branch to branch, either leading educational discussions myself, or many times arranging for State functionaries, functionaries from the State office, to come out to the branches and speak.

The great difference between our teachings in this period as against our teachings before was that now the party taught that capitalism had to be destroyed absolutely in order to establish communism; that it could not be done by peaceful means or by legislation, but it could be done and accomplished only through a violent revolution; and we were taught quite specifically that there was no other way to establish communism in this country.

And of course in order to teach that we used all of the usual Marxist textbooks and manuals, starting right in with the book *Value, Price, and Profit*, which was usually the beginner, then *The Theory of Leninism*, by Stalin; *Capitalism* by Karl Marx; and *History of the C. P. S. U. (B)*; that was used as a textbook in my course.

Then, of course, the two most important books so far as teaching the absolute necessity of revolution, were, first, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, and *State and Revolution*. Those two were the most important textbooks used to teach why it was impossible for communism to be established in any other way except through a violent revolution against the existing state government.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of having attended a special school, a secret school, designed only for those in whom the Communist Party reposed great trust. Who were the instructors in that school?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Fanny Hartman—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Fanny Hartman, H-a-r-t-m-a-n. She was more or less the coordinator for the school. She taught the first session, I remember, and she taught some of the subsequent sessions.

A man named Sam, not identified by any other name, was another one of the instructors.

And a woman party member by the name of Hulda, H-u-l-d-a, was the third of our instructors. I was later able to identify her as Hulda McGarvey, who was affiliated with the Samuel Adams School.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe it is M-e-G-a-r-v-e-y, Hulda McGarvey.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say she was affiliated with the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; at a later date she also taught a class at the Sam Adams School.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she also on the faculty of some college?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. With some teaching staff?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I did know. I don't recall at the moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been able to identify the last name of the person referred to as Sam?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to the Sam Adams School. Do you have any knowledge of the method of operation of that school?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, since I was on the educational commission of the party, I became acquainted with the Sam Adams School quite well. Of course the Sam Adams School was one of the big projects of the Communist Party Educational Commission, and most, if not all, of the courses used at the school were planned directly by the Communist Party. There were a few teachers on the staff of the Sam

Adams School who were not Communist Party members, but not many, and of course even the courses taught by the non-Communists were selected ahead of time.

There were many things we did at Communist Party headquarters for the Sam Adams School. First, since I was in charge of leaflet productions, I helped to prepare the folders and fliers and pamphlets for the Sam Adams School. This was done at the Communist Party headquarters of Massachusetts, and the material went out to the public supposedly as non-Communist material.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were non-Communists invited to attend the school?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was the school located?

Mr. PHILBRICK. On Province Street in Boston, between School and Bromfield Streets.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of members of the teaching staff at the Sam Adams School who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Let's see if I can recall a few of them now.

Hulda McGarvey, of course, was one who was a member of the Communist Party and a teacher at the Sam Adams School.

Another Communist Party member who was a teacher at the school was Arthur Timpson.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. T-i-m-p-s-o-n. Arthur Timpson was the husband of Anne Burlack, so her married name was Anne Timpson, although she used the name of Anne Burlack.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have mentioned Anne Burlack previously in your testimony?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you have identified her as a member of the Communist Party also, have you not?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She was a member of the Communist Party who worked directly at Communist Party headquarters on many occasions with me.

Another member of the Communist Party teaching at the Sam Adams School was Mrs. Otis Archer Hood. She was the wife of Otis Hood whom we have already mentioned, who has been at many times the figurehead of the Communist Party in Massachusetts.

Mr. WOOD. We still can't hear you.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I am sorry.

Another member of the teaching staff was Edwin Garfield, a member of the Communist Party. I believe he was editor for quite a while of the Morning Freiheit in Boston. He was also associated with the Jewish People's Fraternal Order and with the IWO.

I believe that Saul Vail, V-a-i-l, taught a course at the Sam Adams School, and he was known to me as a Communist Party member and a member of IWO and JPFO. He was an undercover party agent, because I know occasionally, instead of delivering material to his office, I delivered it to his home on Parkdale Avenue in Boston.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. You have mentioned aboveground and underground members of the Communist Party. How much of a distinction was there between the two?

Mr. PHILBRICK. You mean as to their aims and objectives?

Mr. JACKSON. No; their mode of operation.

Mr. PHILBRICK. They were almost the same except that underground members were to behave in other organizations as non-Communists, and were not to preach out-and-out Marxism, but they were to go as far as they felt it was safe, depending on the individual with whom they were dealing.

We were taught in that connection very thoroughly that always, in our dealings with other people, we were to frame our conversations in such a way as to be on the level of thinking of our listener. We were taught to deal with Republicans; we were taught to deal with church people; we were taught to deal with liberals, and so on, of different shades, and in all cases we were to push the Marxist line only as far as we felt the person could be dealt with diplomatically.

Mr. JACKSON. Was there a distinct separation in activities as between the so-called underground members and those who were in cell organizations? Where was the chain of command to join the two together?

As I see it, they had parallel activities, with the same philosophy and same aims and objectives, but there was no common contact as between the two; is that true?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true. The underground party members were organized in a separate group, and this group had no contact with the neighborhood cells or branches of the party.

Mr. JACKSON. That is the point I wanted to bring out.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. The only point at which they would converge would be in a district chairman or a district functionary, and there would be no connection in their parallel lines as they went about their separate activities?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true. Some of the people in the secret or pro group were kept so secret that even the party functionaries at the State headquarters did not know their identities.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing with the list of teachers, was Mr. William Harrison a trustee and teacher in the school during your period in the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. I became quite well acquainted with William Harrison, who was a Negro fellow, and a vice president for many years. He had a course having to do with analyzing the news. Of course his analyses were very good.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Barbara Bennett on the teaching staff?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I remember she was affiliated with the school, but I have no recollection at this time of a particular course she taught.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is she the wife of David Bennett?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She is, or was, the wife of Dave Bennett.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a person by the name of Harrison Harley affiliated with the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Dr. Harrison Harley was the director of the school, I believe, and I met with him many times, at luncheon and so forth, on matters pertaining to the school. However, I did not get to know

Dr. Harley as a Communist Party member, and to my knowledge he did not know me as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the Boston School for Marxist Studies, sometimes referred to as the Boston Labor School for Marxist Studies?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Shortly before the trial of the 11 in New York, or before my participation in it, I had worked with the State education commission in preparing the material for that school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you perform the same type of services for that school as you did for the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I did. I prepared a leaflet advertising the courses to be taught at the school, and I believe I prepared an outline for one of the courses.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that school Communist-controlled and conducted?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The Boston School for Marxist Studies was completely a Communist Party school. While non-Communists not only attended but were urged to attend the Sam Adams School, the Boston School for Marxist Studies was limited to Communist Party members. Every person who attended the Boston School for Marxist Studies had to be cleared by the State office and approved by the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was necessary to have Communist Party approval before a person could enroll in that school?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of having Communist Party approval?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The man in charge was Manny Blum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He was known to us as Manny, M-a-n-n-y. I believe his full name, which I never heard used, was Emanuel.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how do you spell his last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The last name was Blum, B-l-u-m.

I recall my own experience, which I believe indicates quite clearly the subversive tactics used by the party, the means used to keep their activities secret and underground.

In this case, although I had worked on the material myself, I had no knowledge of where the classes were going to be held. There was some delay, because I was busy at my regular job in addition to working for the Communist Party, and finally, on the day one of the classes was to open, I stopped at the Communist bookshop, the Progressive Bookshop, on Beech Street, and inquired of Frank Collier, who was in charge of the bookshop, as to where the course was going to be held.

He said he couldn't tell me, that I would have to contact the State office.

Bear in mind at that time I was a member of the pro group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean the professional group of the Communist Party of the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

I was advised not to call from the bookshop. I called from a pay station and asked if they could direct me to where the course was going to be held that night, and they said they could not, that they would have to speak to Manny about it.

They came back and said, "We can't give it to you right now. Can you come to headquarters?"

This was the first time I had been to headquarters. They told me to use caution that I was not followed coming down.

So I went down and saw Manny Blum. We engaged in conversation. Manny told me not to talk about some subjects because the walls had ears, he claimed; so there were many things we could not discuss.

I asked again where the class was to be held, and rather than saying it aloud he tore off a piece of paper on his desk and wrote the address, 15 Fayston Street.

I knew that to be the address of Otis Archer Hood, so, sure enough, I turned up at the home of Otis Archer Hood that night and one of the classes was being held there.

I think that illustrates the great caution exercised in everything we did in the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give me the names of any other persons connected with the teaching staff at that school? You have given the name of Hood as the person conducting the class the night you attended.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I can't recall now. There were two other classes in addition to the one taught by Mr. Hood.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Boston Traveler of January 4, 1949, contains a news item to the effect that the Boston School for Marxist Studies will open and that Emanuel Blum, Otis A. Hood, and Mrs. Frances Olrich would be instructors.

You have already testified that Hood was a member of the Communist Party to your knowledge?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And also Emanuel Blum?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Frances Olrich was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She was a member of the Communist Party, but I met her in the party by the name of Smith.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the first name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She used the same first name, Frances: Frances Smith. In fact, Frances Smith and I worked on a training manual together, something to the effect of Crises in Capitalist Economy. It was a longer title than that. We worked on it strenuously.

Mr. TAVENNER. And she is the same person as Frances Olrich?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of January 21, 1949, contains an article to the effect that Israel Epstein and A. B. Magill were instructors at that school. Did you know them, and do you know if they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I did not meet either of them: no.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of December 26, 1948, contains an article to the effect that Samuel Sillen and Howard Fast were instructors at that school. Do you know either of those persons, and do you know if they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't remember meeting either of those two gentlemen in a Communist Party meeting, but I had understood from other comrades that Howard Fast was a Communist Party member,

and I believe the same is true as to Sam Sillen, who was connected with the magazine Political Affairs, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Political Affairs one of the magazines you were required to study in your indoctrination course?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. Political Affairs was on the required reading list and study list for the courses.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the State education commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I remained a member of the State education commission right up until the time I was expelled from the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when was that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. According to the party, that was 2 weeks after I appeared on the stand.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a witness in the trial of the 11 Communists in New York City?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, we have reviewed at considerable length your activities in the Communist Party, in order to demonstrate the fullness of your knowledge of its operations, for the principal purpose of determining what position you are in to testify as to the objectives of the Communist Party in New England, and in Massachusetts, in particular, with relation to basic industries.

As a result of your experience and your contacts within the Communist Party, did you become aware of the policies and plans of the Communist Party with reference to basic industries after the revival of the Communist Party in 1945?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what that was?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In 1946 and 1947, as an executive of the Communist Party, I attended what were known as district executive conferences, held in Boston. I believe these were titled "party building conferences," and each of them, I found, was for the purpose of infiltrating heavy industries, or key industries, in our area and in the United States.

I remember specifically at one of the party building conferences the comrades were instructed to take positions as colonizers; that is, to take upon themselves the duty of being colonizers in the key industries.

That meant if you had a job in a small business or nonessential industry, you should leave it and take a job in one of the key industries. These key industries were listed by the party leaders. We were told they were industries important to the war effort.

We were instructed that the imperialist aims of the United States, the war-promoting purposes of the United States, were to carry on a war against the Soviet Union, and a war against the free peoples of the world, that is, peoples under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Union.

We were told that the chief means at the disposal of the American imperialists was the productive capacity of this country, which they said was owned directly by the capitalists of the United States.

We were taught that since this was the key weapon, it was the weapon we had to attack and destroy as Communists.

We were told in New England one of the key industries consisted of the General Electric plant in Lynn. We were told one reason why colonizers were needed there was because it was involved in the development of defense materials, including jet airplane engines. I

might point out that at that time no one outside of the party had any knowledge that jet airplane engines were being developed at the General Electric plant in Lynn, but they knew that.

Another key industry was the communications industry; another was the leather industry, boots and shoes; and another was the clothes industry, service clothes, and so forth.

We were told that the steel industry and lines of transportation were very important centers for Communist Party infiltration and colonization, so various comrades were ordered at this time to take up jobs at these spots.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have outlined industries considered key industries in New England. Was any distinction drawn between the key industries in New England and nationally?

Mr. PHILBRICK. We were told in certain sections of the country the steel industry would be the main point of concentration, whereas in New England the steel industry was not as important. We had seven or eight comrades assigned to the General Electric plant in Lynn, and only one assigned to the steel industry, to my knowledge, to set up the colonization program.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed with your discussion of the colonization program.

Mr. PHILBRICK. As a part of the colonization program, but carried out very secretly, a survey was conducted of certain plants. This was a very complete survey. That program in New England was under the direction of Daniel Boone Schirmer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that on a national level or local level?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was told it was on a national level, but my only information concerning it came from this local level.

I came upon it more or less by accident. I was working at Communist Party headquarters on leaflet production at that time. One of the means of preparing the survey was a mimeographed form which I happened to prepare for Daniel Boone Schirmer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what information that form requested?

Mr. PHILBRICK. This had to do completely with industrial plants, although I understand they made investigations along other lines too. These particular forms that I worked on had to do with a complete survey of the plants—what they were producing; how many they were producing; the labor unions; the number of employees; also the number of comrades in these plants and exactly what influence the comrades had in the unions. They also included a review of the training and qualifications of the various comrades working in these plants.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the forms request any information relating to the facilities of the plants?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they go to the extent of requesting blueprint information as to the layout of the plants?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; at least not on these particular forms.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. PHILBRICK. As I say, I came upon it somewhat by accident, and therefore did not know how much information Daniel Boone Schirmer was getting from the comrades in the plants, but I know

he was calling on them for very specific information, including blueprints, but I had no knowledge of any particular blueprints.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have spoken of persons being assigned to conduct the campaign for the colonization of these various basic industries. Can you tell the committee the names of any individuals who were assigned to particular tasks of that character?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, I had a very complete list at the time. Of course my recollection now has failed me so that I cannot recall all of them. I know that at least 8, possibly more, Communist Party members were assigned to the General Electric plant in Lynn. The ones I recall now are:

One was a fellow by the name of Nat Goodwin.

Mr. TAVENNER. In mentioning the names of these individuals, will you please tell the committee whether they are employed at the Lynn plant at the present time, and, if not, where they are employed, if you know.

I believe you mentioned the first name as Nat Goodwin?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned earlier the name of Nat Mills. I am wondering if you have the names confused?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No. These are two different people. Nat Goodwin was assigned to the plant at Lynn, and Nat Mills also was assigned to the General Electric plant at Lynn. The last I heard, all these people were still working at the Lynn plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say the last you have heard—

Mr. PHILBRICK. That was in the spring of 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have received no information that their employment at Lynn has been terminated?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Now if you will give us their names, please.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Nat Goodwin.

Don Bollen.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you one other thing: Do you know the character of the work that each of these persons was assigned to do?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, sir, I don't, except, here again, to say that most of these people are fairly skilled in union organizing, and of course that was part of their task too. These were not single individuals who were to go in there and remain isolated. Their task was to endeavor to draw in as many other Communists as well as non-Communists in those unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how each of these persons was employed prior to going into this colonization work?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Now if you will proceed.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Don Tormey, T-o-r-m-e-y, was another one assigned to Lynn.

I believe that is all I can recall at the moment. There were some others, and I did know them well at the time.

Dave Bennett was named to head up the colonization of the steel industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before we go to steel, was there a Robert Goodwin assigned to Lynn?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he one of the persons in the group that you have described? I mean, was he assigned for colonization purposes?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And he was a person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Lynn engaged in the manufacture of jet propulsion engines at the time this action was taken?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir. According to the party, they were engaged not only in the production but in the development of bigger and better jet engines.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything about the results of their efforts in colonization at Lynn?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No. I did understand, in contact with Don Bollen at a later date, that he was quite happy with the results up to that time; but specific information, I have none.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether any of these persons sent to colonize UE at Lynn became officials in the UE union at a later date?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Some of them did; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the names of those who did become union officials?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now if you will proceed to the steel industry.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Dave Bennett, who for a time was a Communist Party functionary, that is, he was on the Communist Party payroll, was assigned to direct the colonizing of the steel industry.

Joe Fieguerito, F-i-e-g-u-e-r-i-t-o, [Figueiredo] I believe his name is spelled, was ordered to take charge of the colonizing of the Fall River and New Bedford district, and he in turn was to obtain other comrades in that district to assist him in this project.¹

Mr. TAVENNER. What particular defense industries were located at Fall River?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe they call it the needle trade, was quite heavy in that area; and also the shipyard in that area.

In addition to that, at least two comrades were assigned to organize the Boston & Maine Railroad. One of those I recall was a fellow by the name of Gus Johnson. The other member was known in the party simply as "Whitey." I did discover his real name, but that slips me at the moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you whether those last three named persons are still employed in the same industry, that is, Bennett, Figueiredo, and Gus Johnson; and also a fourth I believe you stated was known as Whitey.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Dave Bennett, I believe, was transferred shortly before I appeared in the trial of the 11.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that date was when?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In the spring of 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he was transferred to?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall.

Gus Johnson has since been deported as an undesirable alien.

(Representative Clyde Doyle left the hearing room.)

Whitey, the last time I heard, was still with the Boston & Maine Railroad.

¹ See foreword. The correct spelling of this name is Figueiredo.

And Joe Figueiredo, up until the spring of 1949, to my last direct knowledge, was still in the Fall River-New Bedford area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not any of those four individuals were elected to positions of leadership in their respective unions?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't believe that Gus Johnson or Whitey was elected to any position of importance.

Dave Bennett, I understand, did manage to be elected to a minor position in the steel industry.

And Joe Figueiredo became—I can't recall now; it is my best recollection—that Joe Figueiredo did also reach some position of importance in his union activities in the Fall River-New Bedford area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with any other assignments of this character, that is, in the basic industries?

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe that is all I can recall at the moment, with one exception—and there, again, with no specific names but simply of the group. One group which was given the same instructions and carried on a similar program of colonization was an organization called the United Office and Professional Workers Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I will come to that in just a moment.

The group who were to take the leadership in the colonization of the basic industries to which you have referred must have received instructions from the Communist Party in connection with their work as time went on. Were you familiar with instructions or meetings of any character that took place between those individuals and the leadership of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I know that such meetings did take place, but I did not attend them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not officials of the Communist Party met with leaders of the UE, either on a national or local level, in connection with the Communist Party plans and purposes to infiltrate basic industries?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I know that such meetings did take place. One such meeting, I know, took place at the rear of the Communist Party book shop in Boston. They had a small room set up at the back of the store. Most people didn't know it was there. But at least one meeting between UE people and Communist Party people took place quite secretly in that location.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the location?

Mr. PHILBRICK. At the Progressive Book Shop on Beach Street in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the UE officials who took part in that meeting, members of the national or local organization?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe they were members of the local organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the names of any of them?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the results of the meeting, or the purposes of it?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There, again, I recall sending a report in concerning it, but I have no recollection of the details of the information.

Mr. Wood. At this point I am asking Mr. Frazier to take over, and Mr. Doyle will be back in a few minutes, he has just gone upstairs, so that you will still have a quorum of the subcommittee.

(Representative John S. Wood left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, you referred to the work done through the United Office and Professional Workers Union. What were you about to tell us in connection with that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In common with the industrial workers, this organization, too, received instructions concerning the necessity for colonization in key industries.

Mr. TAVENNER. What plan was used to infiltrate organizations through that group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, they conducted somewhat their own program, a bit separated from the industrial workers, and their chief aim, I learned, I was told, and chief points of concentration, were in the communications industry and in finance.

Most of these people, I will explain, were white-collar workers and clerical workers, so that they would take up positions as private secretaries and other jobs in the nature of white-collar work.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say there were two principal areas in which they desired to function, in finance and—

Mr. PHILBRICK. And in communications.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in communications. Will you tell us what was done in the area of finance, if you know?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Here, again, we will have to go back to Marxism for a moment.

We were told in Boston that one of the great centers of finance for capitalism was that of insurance companies, especially in Boston, rather than banks. So a program was started to infiltrate and to build up strength within the large insurance companies in our area. I was assigned directly to assist in one of the campaigns; this happened to be the campaign to organize the John Hancock Insurance Co. in Boston, which is perhaps the largest, if not the largest, in the country.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say to organize, what do you mean?

Mr. PHILBRICK. To organize all the workers in the John Hancock Co. as members of the UOPWA.

Mr. TAVENNER. You received instructions from the Communist Party to engage in that work?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right, and so I did, and in my usual capacity I worked on the advertising and sales promotion for that campaign. So for the party and for the UOPWA I prepared a great many of their leaflets. On some I looked up the statistics and gathered the material as well as printing it in printed form.

The comrade assigned as my contact person—you see, I was still an underground party member so I had to conduct myself in an undercover capacity—my contact was Helen Johnson, already a member of UOPWA.

To establish a better cover for myself, the party ordered me to join the UOPWA, and that I did. I went down to the UOPWA office and applied for membership and paid my membership fees and so forth.

I was ordered not to go near the State headquarters of the Communist Party, being a member of the pro group—

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by the pro group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The professional group in Boston, all the members of which were underground.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Helen Johnson to whom you referred known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; she was.

Since I could not go near State headquarters, we had to conduct our communications with State headquarters by courier. The courier in this instance was Carole Levy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. L-e-v-y, also known to me to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any other person engaged in that activity with you who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There were one or two people in the pro group who worked with me. Let's see if I can recall who they were.

One person who assisted on gathering statistics for me was a Comrade Mike, not known by his last name, a member of the pro group, and the husband of a Comrade Norma, also not known by her full name.

I am trying to recall; it seems to me that Frances Smith, or Frances Olrich, also helped provide some of the material. But most of it came from Helen Johnson and from Carole Levy.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to this purpose of the Communist Party to infiltrate areas dealing with finance, you said they also desired to infiltrate the communications industry?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee information of a concrete character regarding their work in that direction?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I never obtained direct information as to how much success they had in that field. I know they were to seek positions in the communications industry, that would be wire or telephone, and also in the advertising field, the book-publishing field, and in the newspaper and radio fields.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us about the Communist Party plan and program to colonize the basic industries, and then, through the UOPWA, the various areas in finance and communications. Can you tell the committee of any instances in which people did actually change from their employment and take up work within these various industries, pursuant to the directions of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I know that some of them did, upon orders of the party, change their positions, but I have no recollection now of the details or of the persons involved.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have spoken several times of the professional group of the Communist Party. Were you a member of that group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I became a member of the professional group in the fall of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us the circumstances under which that occurred.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I joined the pro group upon orders of Fanny Hartman, and was instructed at that time that I was to separate myself from the Eighth Congressional District work and from affiliation with

groups in that section, and join an underground Communist group known only as Pro-4, or sometimes known as MO.

I was instructed at the time that I was to drop all contact with all members of the Communist Party with whom I had been previously affiliated. I was to drop out of sight and no longer affiliate with them or fraternize with them on an official or a social basis. So far as the comrades with whom I had been previously affiliated, I had apparently dropped out of the Communist Party.

I was told that in the pro group I was to affiliate only with members in my own cell, and that I was to keep the identities of known people in my cell a secret; that is, I was not to mention their names to any other individuals, either that I knew them as Communists or as non-Communists.

And so in either September or October 1947 I did separate myself from the Eighth Congressional District and joined the pro group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was this group located?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There, again, as part of the system for staying underground, the party had devious means and methods of keeping this location secret.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which locality?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In Boston, or Cambridge.

From 1947 until I appeared in the trial of the 11, we met sometimes in the Beacon Hill area of Boston and sometimes in Cambridge. On one or two occasions I was brought to the place of meeting without even knowing the address. In other words, I was given the address without any names of the individuals living there.

Sometimes we would meet in restaurants rather than at homes, in order, again, to keep the identities of the members secret. No meeting, for example, of the pro group ever took place in my home, and no meetings took place in the homes of some of the other members of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee what the general purposes of this group were?

Mr. PHILBRICK. First of all, all of these people were professional people. They were engaged in the law profession, or the teaching profession, or advertising, or as doctors, or in some other line of work of a professional nature.

Their chief objectives were twofold. Number one, of course, was to serve as Communist Party agents in Communist-front organizations. By Communist-front organizations I mean those such as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. At least two members of my own cell were assigned to work in that group.

Then we were also instructed to participate in non-Communist organizations. At that time, for example, the Progressive Citizens of America might be considered as a non-Communist organization to some extent. I believe members of the professional group worked in the forerunner of the Progressive Citizens of America, known as the Citizens PAC, was it not, Citizens Political Action Committee?

And of course we were asked to influence people in our normal surroundings. For example, I was listed as a Republican in Melrose, and listed as a Baptist, and I was to influence these people as best I could in Marxism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you directed by the Communist Party to become a member of the Republican Party, or were you a member of the

Republican Party and used your membership at the instance of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was requested to be a member of the Republican Party by the Communists. From my history, which they had a very good record of, they knew that my parents were both Republicans, so they said, "We think it is a good idea for you to be listed as a Republican too, especially since the Democrats are very weak in your town and the Republicans are the only ones that have any force there."

Mr. JACKSON. Did you make converts among the Republicans?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I am afraid not.

Mr. JACKSON. I am delighted to know that.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I was instructed by the party to be a liberal Republican.

Mr. JACKSON. Did they give you any model in the party whose actions you might follow? Did they name any liberal Republican after whom you could pattern your activities?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; they didn't.

Mr. JACKSON. They might, though.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons were in this professional cell with you?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There were between 70 and 80 members in the professional group in the Boston area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they all in one group, or were they broken up into smaller units or cells?

Mr. PHILBRICK. We were broken into smaller units or cells. If it so happened that we knew a member in another cell, we were ordered not to have anything to do with that member. We were to work only with people in our cell. The last knowledge I had, there were 14 or 15 cells in the pro group.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you arrive at the conclusion there were 70 to 80 members in the professional cell of the Communist Party? Was that in Boston?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That was just in Boston, in a fund-raising campaign in 1948, as the party always does have fund-raising campaigns. This particular fund-raising campaign was for a general fund to strengthen the party. All comrades in all sections of the party are asked to give a certain amount of money to this particular fund. We in the professional group were asked to donate likewise.

I was told by one member of our cell at the end of the drive that we, the pro group, had contributed over \$3,500 to that particular campaign, which, I was told, was "pretty good in view of the fact that we have only 70 or 80 members." I thought it was pretty good myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the arrangement about the payment of dues?

Mr. PHILBRICK. We paid dues once a month. Our dues were, according to the Communist Party's routine, in line with the regular dues of party members. In our cell our dues ran \$2 a month automatically, since we were in a little better bracket than the other groups. I think that \$2 was for those who made \$75 or more a week. In addition, we had to pay a sustaining fee. That ran from \$5 a month to \$50 a month per person. At least one person was contributing \$100 a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are getting in the Hollywood class now.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is not bad for Boston, which is very conservative.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were these funds collected?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They were turned over to the member of the cell designated as treasurer, and the money was then given to the courier for the party member in the next higher level, who passed it on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you carry a Communist Party card as a member of the professional group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In the pro group we were not even issued a Communist Party card. I was told that under no circumstances should a member of the professional group carry a Communist Party card.

Mr. TAVENNER. There were 14 cells that made up the professional group. You were a member of one of them. What was the name of the group with which you were affiliated?

Mr. PHILBRICK. MO.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did those initials have any significance?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. They stood for mass organizations. Each member of our cell was assigned to mass-organization work. That would be work in Communist-front organizations such as the Progressive Citizens of America, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and I can't recall the others.

Mr. TAVENNER. The other 13 cells were assigned to what general type of work? Was it the same or a different type of work?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They would be assigned to various types of work according to their normal occupations. For example, the doctors would belong to a group comprised of physicians and so forth, and they were to work in their usual trade organizations or trade groups and infiltrate non-Communist groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Identify as many of the different types of assignments as you can recall. You have the group in the field of advertising, of which you were a member. You have the doctors. What other organizations were there?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There was a teachers' group.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many belonged to the teachers' group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. A very small number, I understand; perhaps five or six.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the names of any of them?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; I don't. Max Weitzman may have been one of them.

(Representative Clyde Doyle returned to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What other groups?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There were at least two groups of college professors, one at Harvard and one at MIT; and I know there were others in the area, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the names of any of those who were in the college-professor group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Not directly; no.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Also, at least one and possibly two groups of people working in Government organizations, that is, they went on the jobs from civil service, for example, jobs in the Post Office Department and other governmental positions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any information as to the membership of the so-called governmental groups?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No. I was never affiliated with those particular comrades as Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the names of any persons who were members of the governmental group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; I don't believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other groups? Were there any in the field of religion?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; that is right. A very important group had to do with the field of religious activity. That was one of the most active groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Describe to the committee the method of operation of that group.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I came very close to being well known to that group just before appearing on the stand, and it was a pity I could not remain in Cambridge two more months, because I am sure I would have become well acquainted with that group. I would say these people were at least posing as ministers of the gospel and playing the part of ministers and religious leaders while in fact they were Communist Party members using the cloak as a cover-up for their true motives and intents.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how many were in that group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. My best guess is that in the Boston area there were perhaps between 6 and 12 people in that particular cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify any of the individuals in that group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; I can't, not by direct legal evidence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, if you will return to the group of which you were a member, who was the leader of that group, and how many composed your own unit or cell?

Mr. PHILBRICK. When I first joined the group in the fall of 1947 there were 12 members in my group. At the time I joined, the leader was a man named Dick.

Incidentally, let me explain that in this group we used either first names or nicknames or false names, which made it difficult at times to learn the true identity of those you were closely associated with.

At the time I joined, the chairman was a person named Dick.

Immediately thereafter, Comrade Martha became leader of the cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first person named was Dick, and the second Martha?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. Others in the group were known as Butch, Peg, Helen—

Mr. TAVENNER. Quite familiar names.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Too familiar. That is the trouble. If a person's first name or his nickname was uncommon, they would change it to a common one.

Mr. DOYLE. What was your name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They used the name of Herb.

Comrade Jackie, who happened to be a girl.

Comrade Norma.

Teddy, who was also a girl.

Faith.

And Henry.

Those were the names used by comrades in that first pro cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of time, did you become familiar enough with those individuals whose first names you gave to learn where they worked and what the last names of some of them were?

Mr. PHILBRICK. With some I did. For instance, Comrade Martha, I had already known her to be Martha Fletcher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she single or married?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She was married. Her married name was Mrs. Harold Fletcher, Jr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Harold A. Fletcher, Jr.?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Harold A. Fletcher, Jr. At that time he was a student at Harvard College. They have since gone to Europe.

I had known Martha previously because of her association with Steve Fritchman and the Unitarian Youth movement.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her association with that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. She worked as secretary with Steve Fritchman for 1 or 2 years, I believe she told me, and also she was head of the Unitarian Youth movement, which work she obtained through Steve Fritchman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any further description of Martha Fletcher or her activities?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall much more about her. I did, of course, at the time, have a very complete record of her activities. She lived at 15 Grove Street, G-r-o-v-e, in Boston, which was in the Beacon Hill area, and we had many meetings at her apartment at 15 Grove Street. We used a back room in the apartment.

I think most of her activities were centered around the Unitarian Youth movement. At a much earlier date she had been selected by the AYD as one of the youth to be honored, and I had met her at that time, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. This position of leadership which she obtained in the Unitarian Youth group, you stated, was obtained through the assistance of Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did she obtain that position of leadership, if you know?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I am sure she obtained that position because she was a Communist Party member and it was known she would carry out Communist Party tactics in her position there.

I never ran across Steve Fritchman inside a Communist Party meeting, but I had many conversations with Martha about him, and she left no doubt in my mind but that he was a Communist Party member.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know where Reverend Fritchman is at the present time?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. He is in California at the present time, and one of the Communist Party members in my group has gone out to join him there.

Mr. JACKSON. Is he the same Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman who is connected with the arts, sciences and professions organization in Hollywood?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; that is the same man.

Mr. JACKSON. With Miss Sondergaard and Mr. DaSilva and a few others?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the name of the other associate of yours to whom you referred when you said an associate had joined Reverend Fritchman in California?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I understand that Comrade Margo Clark, M-a-r-g-o C-l-a-r-k, with whom I was closely associated as a Communist Party member, as comrades over the entire period of 9 years that I worked for the Government, I understand Margo Clark has joined Steve Fritchman on the west coast.

Mr. JACKSON. In Los Angeles?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does Margo Clark have a sister?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. She had two sisters, I believe. Joy Clark was another sister. At the time I first ran into Margo Clark she belonged to a cell in Cambridge; that was in 1940 or 1941. The cell in Cambridge also included, I believe it was, Professor Bridgeman. I am a little uncertain about it. I could identify him further that he was a professor who came to Cambridge from a TVA cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are a little uncertain here. We are going to look it up and see in a few minutes.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe he was studying at Harvard at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. He attended Dartmouth?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He attended Dartmouth and later went to Tufts College.

Mr. TAVENNER. Howard Allen Bridgeman?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. He testified before this committee in the Remington case. Is that the same individual you are referring to?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe it probably is.

Mr. TAVENNER. He attended Harvard University in 1940, according to his reply to a question I asked him.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you identify Dr. Bridgeman as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Not directly. Of course, at that time I was just a fellow traveler, you might say, on the way to becoming a young Communist, as I did not attend the meetings of that cell in Cambridge, but I heard Margo Clark was attending the meetings of this cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any Communist Party meetings at the home of Margo Clark?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain to the committee all you know about the activities of Margo Clark in the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I worked with Margo Clark over the period of 9 years, and I believe for a time we belonged to the same cell, for a short period of time, but as comrades we worked independently on many projects.

I know that in addition to her regular Communist Party work locally with our groups in Boston, Margo Clark also had a rather wide network arrangement with Communists not only here in this country, but overseas as well; and so it was my deduction, although she had never told me so in so many words, I gathered from what she told me that she was pretty closely hooked up with an international system of espionage.

One of the persons she knew was Herman Field in New York City, an architect. At that time the name didn't mean much to me except that he was an architect in New York. There were others, also, whose names slip me at the moment.

MR. TAVENNER. Is the Herman Field to whom you refer the brother of Noel Field, the person who disappeared without explanation behind the so-called iron curtain?

MR. PHILBRICK. Yes; that is the same person.

MR. TAVENNER. You were identifying the names of those who were members of your own group. Will you please proceed with that?

MR. PHILBRICK. Comrade Jackie was a girl, a stenographer or a private secretary. Her assignment by the party for quite a while was that of working with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

In common with all the other members of our group, she was known publicly as a non-Communist, as all of us were, so she worked in the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a non-Communist.

She also worked either for or in the company of Mr. Angus Cameron at Little, Brown & Co. in Cambridge. She lived in Cambridge on Massachusetts Avenue, I believe. I believe she was a single girl. The last I saw of her, which was about 2 weeks before I appeared on the stand in New York, she was telling me about her work at Little, Brown & Co.

Comrade Peg lived on Foster Street in Cambridge. We had meetings at her house on Foster Street in Cambridge. Her husband was also a member of the Communist Party, but a member of another group, an industrial group. At a later date they moved to an industrial city, I believe Detroit, to serve as colonizers there.

Comrade Henry was a writer, and I believe he wrote some articles for the New Republic magazine, among others.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you identify his last name?

MR. PHILBRICK. No. A great many of these people were never known to me by their last names.

Comrade Butch was an artist. I did learn his name. I don't remember it now. He had a brother Pete who worked as a courier between our cell and Communist Party headquarters if there were important messages from Communist Party headquarters from time to time.

Comrade Helen, I learned her last name was something like Dugochet. I don't know how that was spelled. The phonetic spelling would be D-u-g-o-c-h-e-t. I believe she was a British citizen and served as courier for the party, making many trips between here and Great Britain.

Comrade Norma was also assigned to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Comrade Teddy was assigned to the Progressive Party. I don't recall her name at the moment, but she played an important part in the Progressive Party work in Massachusetts.

I believe I mentioned Comrade Faith. I have no recollection at all about what she did.

MR. TAVENNER. Did any other members come into this group after you first became affiliated with it?

MR. PHILBRICK. Well, there were three or four changes made during my membership in the group.

At the time that Peg and her husband moved out, we had a couple of new members come in. These turned out to be Comrade Harry and Comrade Eileen.¹ I knew these two people. At least, I knew Comrade Harry to be Harry Winner, W-i-n-n-e-r. Comrade Winner had been very active in the Sam Adams School. He had also taught classes for us in the AYD. He was very active in a great many Communist-front organizations, so I came to know him quite well, although up to that time I had never had any legal proof, or direct proof, that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the procedure in having him assigned to your group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. These assignments were made from some place above our echelon. That was decided by somebody higher than we were.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He was employed, I believe, as the personnel director of a rubber company in Malden, Mass., the Converse Rubber Co., in Malden, Mass. I had also known him as far back as 1946 in Malden, Mass., in connection with political campaigns in Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Comrade Eileen¹ his wife?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there others who became affiliated with your group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Shortly after the first of the year, beginning around January 1948, I was told to report to a Communist Party pro-group cell meeting on Beacon Street, Boston, at 534 Beacon Street, Boston, and I was given the apartment number, but no name. This turned out to be a hotel, I believe the Hotel Fensgate, 534 Beacon Street, Boston. This was in apartment 48, I discovered this apartment was the apartment of one Sara Gordon, S-a-r-a G-o-r-d-o-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Any relation to Alice Gordon, previously referred to in your testimony?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Not to my knowledge, no. We had meetings in this apartment, which was a very, very beautiful swank hotel apartment overlooking the Charles River. It was Sara, I learned, who was making the monthly contribution of \$100 sustaining fund to the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether any special contributions were made by her or Alice Gordon to the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. It was Sara Gordon. At a much earlier date, I was told at a cell meeting that Comrade Sara had been making contributions of \$100 and upwards per month to the Sam Adams School. At that time she was identified only as Comrade Sara. Later I learned she had been one of the leading angels of the Sam Adams School in Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any further information relating to her? Was she employed?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No. She was independently wealthy, and she was not employed in a wage-earning job that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other individuals with whom you became acquainted, members of the Communist Party to your knowledge, who took any part in the leadership in the educational field?

¹ Subsequently in hearings before the committee, on July 24, 1951, it was established that Mrs. Harry Winner is named Irene.

Mr. PHILBRICK. In the latter part of 1947 and beginning of 1948 in our pro group, we had been studying one of these revolutionary books. I believe at that time it was State and Revolution. By the time we had finished the course we had a new member join our group. He had apparently been informed as to the nature of our studies, so he—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there. Do you mean joined your professional cell?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The same cell that we have been talking about?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, my particular cell. And so this new member was brought in. He was a new member to our own little cell, not a new member of the party. He was called in to conduct a summary of the entire book, State and Revolution. This member, it turned out, was Comrade Dirk Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of the Sam Adams School.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell both the first and last names, please?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe it is D-i-r-k, Dirk, S-t-r-u-i-k, Dirk J. Struik, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he is presently employed in the teaching profession?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. He is still with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a teacher of mathematics. He was one of the sponsors of the Sam Adams School in Boston, and one of the sponsors of the Thomas Jefferson School in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he also teach or lecture in the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, he did, and as a Communist Party member I attended his classes, or the classes he gave, at the Sam Adams School.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe a little more definitely this meeting which you state he attended of your group and summarized the book, State and Revolution?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, the nature of the course had been that we had studied the nature of the state, the capitalist state, and the need for violent revolution to overthrow that state.

Comrade Struik brought in a world-wide summary of the status of capitalism in various parts of the world. He particularly dwelt on the state of capitalism and imperialism in the Pacific, and at that time instructed us that there we saw imperialism at its worst, such as in the Dutch East Indies, and that we must back the Indonesian revolt and the revolt of all colonial peoples throughout the Pacific area against the inroads of capitalism, and the absolute necessity of overthrowing capitalist control in those sections. It was a long discourse, running about 2 hours in length.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did Dr. Struik attend the meetings of your group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He attended meetings every other week, as that was the custom of our group, to meet every other week. He attended our meetings from that period right up through, I believe, the latter part of May or first part of June.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you have been in many, many Communist Party meetings with him?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those meetings closed meetings, that is, secret Communist Party meetings?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They were very secret Communist Party meetings, and it was impossible, absolutely impossible, for any person or any individual to ever get into these meetings unless he was not only a bona fide party member, but one who was very well trusted and who had been passed upon by someone in the higher ranks as a party member of sufficient trustworthiness to be permitted to belong to the pro cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any further information you can give the committee regarding the Communist Party membership or activity of Dr. Struik?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There were many instances over the years. I don't know which are the most important. So far as the Communist Party was concerned, and so far as the educational commission was concerned, of which I was a member, Professor Struik was very influential in teaching Marxism at the Sam Adams School. This was a required course for Communist Party members.

As a member of the educational commission, I was given instructions to prepare leaflets promoting the classes of Professor Struik at the Sam Adams School, and all Communist Party members were urged to attend that particular course. I attended it myself.

I might say that perhaps to pin it down a little further, in one year we had two such courses for party members to attend. One of these was to be given by Professor Struik, and the other was to be given by Clive Knowles. At the last moment, Clive Knowles could not teach the course, and someone else would have to teach his course.

I had already prepared the leaflets advertising both courses. I was called to Communist Party headquarters and told that all comrades who had registered for the class of Clive Knowles were to shift their registration to Professor Struik's class. The reason given was because the new teacher taking the place of Clive Knowles was not a Communist Party member, and it was felt that members of the Communist Party should not be learning Marxism from a nonparty member.

As a result, Professor Struik's course became so large he had to teach them in two sections, one at 6 o'clock and one at 7.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the early part of your testimony you were asked a question about the American-Soviet Friendship in Massachusetts.

I hand you a letterhead of the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, on which there is a letter dated February 5, 1946, signed by Dirk J. Struik, executive director. Is he the Dr. Struik to whom you have been referring?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is the same man.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you look at the names of the officers and sponsors appearing on the letterhead, and state whether or not any of the persons shown to be connected with that organization were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. This is quite a list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just take your time.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Edwin B. Goodell, Jr., I came to know as a Communist Party member myself, but I never found him inside a Communist Party meeting. However, he always cooperated very fully

and very completely with us in various Communist Party activities from the early days of 1940 and 1941. For example, in June 1941, when the Communist Party switched from peace to open-the-second-front, Mr. Goodell, who had worked with us on peace activities prior to that date, went along with us to open-the-second-front.

Professor Struik is listed as executive director.

I am wondering if Eugene Blum, who is listed, is the same as Manny Blum. I don't know.

Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, I have already testified to. He is listed as a member of the board of directors.

William Harrison I knew to be a Communist Party member.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is also listed as a member of the board of directors?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He is also listed as a member of the board of directors, and I knew him to be a Communist Party member.

Sol Vail I knew to be a Communist Party member.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is listed as a member of the board of directors?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He is listed as a member of the board of directors.

In the list of sponsors, Leslie Arnold heads the list. I knew that individual to be a member of the Communist Party.

Richard Linsley I find in the list of sponsors. He was affiliated with us in Communist Party activities.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he affiliated with the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, and with many other activities. I am trying to remember if he attended one of our Communist Party meetings, and I don't recall now.

I believe that is all of these people I can positively identify as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Elba Chase Nelson?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you know about her?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I knew her to be the head of the Communist Party branch located in New Hampshire, and I met her several times in Boston and worked with her on several matters having to do with Communist Party work.

She was chairman of one of the sessions in 1945 to reestablish the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, can you give the committee any further information that might be pertinent to the infiltration of communism into the defense areas, particularly into basic industries, particularly into the fields of finance and communications?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't believe we included that this John Hancock organizing campaign was successful for the party, and that they were able to set up the UOPWA union at the John Hancock Insurance Co. at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what the over-all results in the UE were?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall any specific information except I believe I said before the comrades, generally speaking, according to

Don Bollen, were quite happy with the results they were able to achieve in the UE.

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

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Jackson, any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. Is Rev. Stephen Fritchman, to your knowledge, an ordained minister of the gospel?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe he is.

Mr. JACKSON. In what faith, do you know?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe in the Unitarian organization. I know that the comrades really were quite successful in infiltrating the Unitarian movement in Massachusetts, and I guess on an international scale too, from information I gained from Margo Clark.

Mr. JACKSON. You stated you were more or less in charge of the preparation and distribution of party pamphlets, literature, and things of that sort. What was the principal outlet in Boston for the Communist Party publications?

Mr. PHILBRICK. First of all, we had the Progressive Bookshop on Beech Street. That was the Communist Party center for all Marxist material and Marxist training material.

As literature director I would always go to Frank Collier or one of the other persons in charge of the Progressive Bookshop and obtain copies of the Daily Worker, copies of Political Affairs, and copies of the international publication, For a Lasting Peace, which we used quite heavily in our educational work.

All that material I obtained at the Progressive Bookshop and in turn sold to Communist Party members.

The material we prepared in the educational division was distributed by various means. Some we distributed just to Communist Party members. The document Crises in Capitalism, consisting of 20 or 30 pages, was distributed to Communist Party members only.

However, the largest amount of material I prepared was for public consumption, and this was distributed at shop gates. In the John Hancock campaign it was distributed around the building to the employees as they would come and go from their place of employment.

Mr. JACKSON. Was there a student cell on the Harvard campus?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, there was.

Mr. JACKSON. One or more?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Before they were broken up into small groups, there was just one student cell, but in early 1948, in common with all other cells, they were broken into smaller units, and there became several cells instead of one.

Mr. JACKSON. How about MIT?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They had a student group at MIT.

Mr. JACKSON. And Radcliffe?

Mr. PHILBRICK. A very small one at Radcliffe, off and on. Boston University had a student cell off and on. Some years they would be successful and some years very unsuccessful.

Mr. JACKSON. How was literature channeled into the cells?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Through literature directors who would bring it back to the cells.

Mr. JACKSON. You mentioned several organizations. The Youth League for Unity was one, I think?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Sweethearts of Servicemen, and other groups. Was there a coordinating body or coordinating council for projects which were undertaken in common?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Whenever we had a common project, that was usually worked out at the AYD headquarters, but these groups in themselves were supposed to be coordinating groups. The Youth for Victory group was a coordinating group. Many legitimate groups, YMCA, Young Men's Hebrew Association, settlement houses, and so forth, were brought into Youth for Victory.

Mr. JACKSON. What can you tell the committee about the work of the Civil Rights Congress in Boston?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I became a member of the Civil Rights Congress. I was ordered to join that body by the party, I believe in 1948. The comrade assigned to head up this particular work at that time was Comrade Hank Cooperstock, C-o-o-p-e-r-s-t-o-c-k. He was sent from New York City to take over the AYD after Don Bollen and myself had dropped out and gone into other work. From there he went into various other work, and at the time this group was set up in Boston, he was assigned to that.

Mr. JACKSON. To what extent was the Communist Party instrumental in the activities or in directing the policy of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Completely. It is my recollection that the very first meeting I attended, I was able to give to the Government information that almost everybody in charge there were members of the Communist Party.

One of the persons who attended that very first meeting—I don't recall if he was a speaker, but he attended in some capacity—was Harry Winner. He was mentioned in another part of my testimony.

Mr. JACKSON. Was the Cooperstock you mentioned an attorney?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall.

Mr. JACKSON. I think you stated that two members of your pro group were assigned to the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Who were those two?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Comrade Jackie for a time played a leading part in that organization; and Comrade Norma was assigned to the group at one period of time. Those two.

Mr. JACKSON. You mentioned that Fletcher and his wife had gone to Europe. Do you know in what capacity?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe Harold Fletcher went to Paris to study there—at a university in Paris.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know if he was a veteran or not?

Mr. PHILBRICK. My recollection is vague. It seems to me he might have been, but I can't recall right now.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no further questions. I want to thank you for your testimony.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. JACKSON. Just one more question: Is the Progressive Bookshop still in operation?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No. That was closed within the last few weeks.

Mr. JACKSON. That is all.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Philbrick, I was not privileged to hear your testimony this morning. I was in an executive session of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am also a member, so I could not be here.

If I ask you a question you have already answered in the record, tell me frankly it is already in the record, and don't take the time of the committee to answer it again.

I am particularly interested in the youth angle. I noticed you said repeatedly, "I was instructed by the party; I was instructed by the party; I was told."

Who told you? When you say, "I was instructed by the party," who above you told you what to do?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That would depend on the area of activity. For a time it was Alice Gordon who was head of the YCL. She was the top boss in the Young Communist League.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know where she would get her instructions?

Mr. PHILBRICK. From State headquarters. Many times I would meet with her at State headquarters and would get my instructions there.

Then at other times it would be Fanny Hartman who would give me instructions. Manny Blum, who replaced Fanny Hartman at a later date, was one of those from whom I received instructions. These were all Communist Party functionaries.

Mr. DOYLE. You stated the objective was to get the party back to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. Was that objective taught to young people in the youth groups? Do you understand my question?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Not exactly.

Mr. DOYLE. You said the objective was to get the party back to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. Did you try to instruct the young people that revolution by force was necessary to get rid of the capitalist state?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right; young people from 1948 on, remnants of AYD, remnants of YCL.

Mr. DOYLE. What form of force were they to use?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Physical force.

Mr. DOYLE. What do you mean by that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Whatever force they had at hand. At one of the meetings of the progrouop at a later date I recall it was Martha Fletcher who was in charge of instructions for a period of time, and she advocated and urged, at one of the meetings, the necessity for the gathering of arms. She said, "We must arm the workers for this fight against capitalism, and we must do it soon."

Mr. DOYLE. When was that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. 1948. But as early as 1945 we were teaching young people that force and violence were absolutely necessary to overthrow the Government.

Mr. DOYLE. Were these young people children of parents who were already Communists?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Some of them, yes; but others, no.

Mr. DOYLE. Did these young people generally come from homes where the parents were American-born, or were they foreign-born?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is hard to say. They were both. We had some young people who boasted parents who had practically come over on the Mayflower. Otis Archer Hood, for instance, boasted that his family was from a long New England lineage of Americans.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you telling me, from your 9 years' experience as a member of the Communist Party, that young people of teen age and

older in our country were being taught by the Communist Party, through you and others, that it would be necessary to gather arms—that means military arms?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. And use them in a revolution?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. And did any number of these American young people fall for that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Not very many; not very many. For instance, I mentioned this morning the Cambridge Committee for Equal Opportunities, a large group of Negro youth. As I worked among them, went into their homes—this was, of course, in the early days of the war and before there was a large defense effort—I went through their homes and met many of these Negro young people, many without jobs, many with very poor living conditions, houses without toilets, houses with flush bowls in the basement, very bad; parents who were ill and had been unable to get proper medical care; as I went through that area I thought, "By George! I can't blame many of those people if they do join the Communist Party."

And, of course, that was the object of the Communist Party, to stir these people against the capitalist state of government; to tell them the reason they were so badly off was capitalism, Jim-crowism, and so forth.

We worked in that Committee for Equal Opportunities for a whole year, and very diligently, and to my knowledge only one member was gained from that activity. Others, such as Alice Solomon, a Negro girl secretary, quite the Cambridge Youth Council when she found it was Communist; a very fine girl.

Mr. DOYLE. Then would you say that the propaganda of the necessity to use force of arms, during your 9 years of experience, was proving successful or unsuccessful among the young people of America?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Let's put it this way: The party would not teach that to new members of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. But they would still be the American young people. Within the group of American youngsters who were in the party, am I to understand that they became convinced that they should use force of arms?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. You understand my question; do you?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. In the Boston School for Marxist Studies, for example, in a course I attended at Otis Hood's home on Fayston Street, we had young people in that course. The course started with the evils of capitalism and so forth, but this particular course occurred just about the time when an Italian Communist leader stated that in a fracas with Russia Italian Communists would fight on the side of Russia and not on the side of Italy.

The question came up in one of our sessions, and a member in the class asked the question directly of Otis Hood, "If we have a war between the United States and Soviet Russia, whose side are we fighting on?"

Mr. Hood was quite put out that the comrade should not understand quite simply and quite naturally that, since we were fighting against American imperialism, naturally we would fight on the side of the people's movement, which meant the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOYLE. I will ask you just one or two more questions, and, again, if you have answered any of these already, do not answer them again. The propaganda you have just related about the use of force of arms if need be, is that a Nation-wide program of the Communist Party in America?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Since 1945 this has been a very strenuous part of their program; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And among the young people also?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Does that come from a foreign country, or does it originate among the American Communists, if you know?

Mr. PHILBRICK. In our area these were largely American Communists who were teaching this.

Mr. DOYLE. Where did they get their instructions?

Mr. PHILBRICK. We took instructions directly from Jack Stachel of the Communist Party in New York.

Mr. DOYLE. I heard you say that, but I know Margo Clark well. I deduced she was a member of an international espionage ring. Do you know of any Americans who went to foreign countries and came back and tried to propagandize the American youth that forceful revolution was justifiable?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall, Mr. Frazier—

Mr. DOYLE. I am Mr. Doyle. You owe Mr. Frazier an apology.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Mr. Doyle. Arthur Timpson, the husband of Anne Burlack, may have been one who had been to Russia and who had studied there, and who had come back and was teaching courses in that.

Mr. DOYLE. I think this will be my last question, due to the lateness of the hour. Do you feel, as a result of your 9 years of experience in the Communist Party, there is real cause for alarm in our country because of the extent of Communist teachings in our country that forceful revolution is justifiable?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I think you would have to answer that question in two ways.

First, I am sure we do not need to be alarmed that a great number of American citizens will fall for the line. I would say the Communist Party in this country has been very, very unsuccessful in converting members of labor unions and youth to the Communist Party. I know they have been reprimanded severely many times because of that. So far as the average American citizen, I think he takes care of himself very, very well, and that includes labor unions. I think they have been doing a wonderful job. I am convinced the American citizen can be depended upon to beat that kind of thing.

But, I think also we have to realize that it is a menace, in that small numbers of disciplined, fanatic Communist Party members—which they have to be, especially today, to stay in the party—these small numbers can be doggone dangerous, particularly because of the surveys they have made of our defense plants, and so forth. They have been taught they can work in small groups, three to five, in sabotage, and I believe we have a problem on our hands if we should get into war with the Soviet Union. I know we have been successful in the past in preventing sabotage. I am not sure whether we can now.

MR. DOYLE. Didn't you say there was a meeting at which it was said it might be necessary to gather arms?

MR. PHILBRICK. That is right.

MR. DOYLE. Was that a part of the revolutionary intent against our Government?

MR. PHILBRICK. Yes.

MR. DOYLE. I ask you this question because of your long experience as a member of the Communist Party.

The public law under which you are favoring this committee with your testimony, Public Law 601, charges this committee with the duty of studying the subject with reference to any necessary remedial legislation. If you have given some of that to the committee already, don't take the time to do it now; but, if you haven't, I would like you to take a minute and state to the committee any remedial legislation you think would be helpful and constructive.

MR. PHILBRICK. I don't believe I have any suggestion, sir, without some thought on the matter. I would hesitate to give any cuff opinion.

The Communist Party claims you can't legislate it out of existence. I think this is partly right. No matter how many laws we have against murder, some murders are going to take place. And no matter how many laws we have against stealing, some thefts are going to take place, and so forth. And that is true of the Communist Party. No matter how many laws we have against the Communist Party, some people still, in spite of everything, are going to be in it. And some will be in it almost because of the laws against it. They have what you might call a will to die. The psychologists tell us there is a will to live, with which we are familiar, and that there is also a will to die. I had the feeling many times, as I sat in their meetings, that they were plunging headlong to destruction and that they were looking forward to this great world cataclysm. It was a very odd feeling to hear them teaching it and almost wishing that it would take place.

MR. DOYLE. Let me call your attention to the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950—Public Law 831, Eighty-first Congress, second session. In section 2 of that law this declaration was made:

As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Congress hereby finds that—

(1) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.

From your 9 years of experience as a member of the Communist Party, do you feel you have enough legal evidence—the reason I ask “legal evidence” is that I noticed you used that term yourself—do you feel you have enough legal evidence to believe that declaration by the Congress is well founded?

MR. PHILBRICK. It is, sir, completely.

MR. DOYLE. That is all. Thank you.

MR. FRAZIER. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER. No, sir.

MR. FRAZIER. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish to thank you, on behalf of the committee, for the very valuable testimony you have given us.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. FRAZIER. The committee stands adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 5:15 p. m. on Monday, July 23, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, July 24, 1951, at 11 a. m.)

EXPOSÉ OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE OF
MASSACHUSETTS
(BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK)

TUESDAY, JULY 24, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 11 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Clyde Doyle, and Donald L. Jackson.

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

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that for the purposes of the hearing this morning I, as chairman, have set up the following subcommittee, composed of Messrs. Doyle, Jackson, and Wood. They are all present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harry Winner, please.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Winner, will you hold up your right hand, please, and be sworn. You do solemnly swear the evidence you give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WINNER. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF HARRY EUGENE WINNER, ACCOMPANIED BY
HIS COUNSEL, H. CLIFFORD ALLDER

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

Mr. WINNER. Harry Eugene Winner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Winner, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. WINNER. I am represented by counsel.

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

Mr. ALLDER. H. Clifford Alder.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give your office address, please?

Mr. ALLDER. Columbia Building, 416 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Winner, when and where were you born?

Mr. WINNER. Brockton, Mass., October 22, 1901.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you presently reside?

Mr. WINNER. 82 Hancock Street, Malden, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee briefly your educational background?

Mr. WINNER. Very briefly, because I am merely a product of the Brockton public-school system.

Mr. WOOD. Will you elevate your voice, please, sir? We can't hear you up here.

Mr. WINNER. I am very sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where are you now employed?

Mr. WINNER. I am employed at the Converse Rubber Co., at Malden, Mass. I have charge of two departments: the cafeteria and the retail store.

Can you hear me now?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been employed by that company?

Mr. WINNER. Since 1933.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been employed constantly by that company since 1933?

Mr. WINNER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1933, how were you employed?

Mr. WINNER. In Hackensack, N. J., where I lived for a brief period, by the Citizens' Finance Corp., a defunct banking, automobile-financing corporation. It so happened that the person who owned and was in charge of that became one of the principal owners of the Converse Rubber Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other types of work have you done for your employer besides the two types of employment you have just mentioned?

Mr. WINNER. Actually, when I first went there, I worked in the receiving room, where one tugs 250-pound bales of rubber. Then I was in the shipping room; then I operated the retail store for several years; and now the retail store and the cafeteria. However, I do not work in either one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time held a position in which you employed people, or interviewed prospective employees in the plant?

Mr. WINNER. No, sir. In the interest of expedition, what is in the paper—that I am personnel manager—is incorrect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in charge of the employment of individuals at any time while an employee of that plant?

Mr. WINNER. The small number who would work in those two establishments I mentioned: the retail store and the cafeteria.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the total number of employees in the store and restaurant?

Mr. WINNER. In the store there were two, and in the cafeteria at various times there were five or four.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Winner, the committee is making a study and an investigation of Communist Party activities in the general defense area of Boston, and I would like to call upon you to furnish the committee such information as you may have regarding Communist Party activities and membership in that area which may be known to you.

During the course of his testimony here yesterday, Mr. Philbrick referred to the fact that you had been connected or affiliated at one time with the Sam Adams School in Boston. If that be correct, will you please tell us the nature of your affiliation with that school?

Mr. WINNER. I regret that I must respectfully refuse to answer the question. My refusal is based upon the fact that my answer might tend to incriminate me, and my refusal is by reason of the rights granted me under the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that you are taking the position that an answer to the question as to your affiliation with the Sam Adams School might subject you to criminal prosecution if you answer the question truthfully?

Mr. WINNER. I reaffirm what I said before.

Mr. WOOD. I am not sure, Mr. Counsel, that your initial question which the witness declined to answer for the reasons he has stated, was in fact a question or a statement. Will you ask him the question in another form?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any manner with the Sam Adams School or its operation?

Mr. WINNER. I regret, again, that I must respectfully decline to answer on the grounds that my answer might tend to incriminate me, and I stand on my rights under the fifth amendment, as before stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. From information furnished the committee yesterday, among the teachers at the Sam Adams School from time to time were William Harrison, Dr. Dirk J. Struik, Stephen Fritchman, and Barbara Bennett. Were you acquainted with any of these four individuals?

Mr. WINNER. I must again—must I repeat the formula each time?

Mr. WOOD. It will be sufficient, sir, of course I can't anticipate what your answer will be, but if you are going to decline to answer there will be no necessity for you to repeat your reason for refusing if you state it is for the same reason previously given.

Mr. WINNER. Precisely. That is my answer to the question just asked me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick?

Mr. WINNER. I must refuse to answer that on the same basis, that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Winner, I will read you a question propounded to Mr. Philbrick yesterday in the course of the hearing and his answer. The question:¹

You were identifying the names of those who were members of your own group. * * * Did any other members come into this group after you first became affiliated with it?

That question related to the professional group of the Communist Party and was referred to as the MO section, meaning mass organization section. Mr. Philbrick's reply was this:

Well, there were three or four changes made during my membership in the group. At the time that Peg and her husband moved out, we had a couple of new members come in. These turned out to be Comrade Harry and Comrade Eileen. I knew these two people. At least, I knew Comrade Harry to be Harry Winner, W-i-n-n-e-r. Comrade Winner had been very active in the Sam Adams School. He had also taught classes for us in the AYD. He was very active in a great many Communist-front organizations, so I came to know him quite well, although up to that time I had never had any legal proof, or direct proof, that he was a member of the Communist Party.

¹ See pp. 1295 and 1296.

Do you desire to deny or affirm or explain that statement?

Mr. ALLDER. I object to the form of that question, Mr. Chairman. There are so many things involved in that question.

Mr. WOOD. I grant you the question is composed of several ingredients, but he is asked if he desires to deny, affirm, or explain any of it.

Mr. ALLDER. I don't see how any person could remember all that was read.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will read it again and ask the witness to state if there is any part of it that is untrue, to his knowledge. This is Mr. Philbrick's reply:

Well, there were three or four changes made during my membership in the group. At the time that Peg and her husband moved out, we had a couple of new members come in. These turned out to be Comrade Harry and Comrade Eileen. I knew these two people. At least, I knew Comrade Harry to be Harry Winner, W-i-n-n-e-r. Comrade Winner had been very active in the Sam Adams School. He had also taught classes for us in the AYD. He was very active in a great many Communist-front organizations, so I came to know him quite well, although up to that time I had never had any legal proof, or direct proof, that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WINNER. May I correct one inaccuracy in there, at least?

Mr. TAVENNER. Any inaccuracies, I would like for you to correct.

Mr. WINNER. May I consult my counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. WOOD. The question you are asked now is: In the statement that has just been read to you, having been a statement by Mr. Philbrick, is there any statement in there that is untrue?

Mr. WINNER. I fear I must refuse to answer that on the basis previously given.

Mr. WOOD. You say you fear you must do it. Do you do it?

Mr. WINNER. I do it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the inaccuracy to which you referred when you first started to answer the question?

Mr. WINNER. I think I shall continue to not answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your wife's name?

Mr. WINNER. Irene.

Mr. TAVENNER. Irene. I notice in reading the statement that her name appears as Eileen, E-i-l-e-e-n. Is that the inaccuracy to which you referred?

Mr. WINNER. That is an inaccuracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the professional group of the Communist Party?

Mr. WINNER. I must decline to answer that also.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your reason for declining to answer?

Mr. WINNER. On the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you teach at the AYD or classes for the AYD?

Mr. WINNER. May I consult with counsel for a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. You may confer with counsel at any time you desire. I would suggest that counsel, for the benefit of the record, explain what the letters AYD stand for.

Mr. TAVENNER. American Youth for Democracy.

Mr. WOOD. Now you may confer with counsel.

Mr. WINNER (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer that also on the same grounds, on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Martha Haven Fletcher, also known as Mrs. Harold A. Fletcher, Jr.?

Mr. WINNER. I shall decline to answer that on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of any organizations known to you to be Communist-front organizations, as stated by Mr. Philbrick in his testimony? When I say member, I mean affiliated in any way with a Communist-front organization.

Mr. WINNER. I shall decline to answer that also.

Mr. WOOD. On the same grounds?

Mr. WINNER. On the same grounds, and also because of the elasticity with which that term is used today.

Mr. TAVENNER. The records of this committee reflect that the Second National Negro Congress was held October 15, 16, and 17, 1937, at the Metropolitan Opera House in Philadelphia, Pa. A program of this congress includes a list of individuals under the caption, "Boston sends greetings to the Second National Negro Congress." I hand you the program and refer you to the page carrying the heading, "Boston sends greetings to the Second National Negro Congress," and ask if you see listed there your own name and that of your wife?

Mr. WINNER. Yes, sir; of course, I see it.

Mr. TAVENNER. That organization was declared by the Attorney General of the United States to be a Communist-front organization, was it not?

Mr. WINNER. A long, long time later.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1948.

Mr. WINNER. Yes. I had been a long time disaffiliated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are the individual mentioned in the greetings that were sent to that organization, are you not?

Mr. WINNER. Yes; I am this person.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state you became disaffiliated with the organization?

Mr. WINNER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. WINNER. As a matter of fact, very shortly thereafter. I can't even tell you when. I don't remember any serious activity in connection with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean shortly after sending the greetings?

Mr. WINNER. Sometime thereafter; perhaps a year or 2 years. I can't tell you. I have practically no recollection of it, actually.

Mr. TAVENNER. I also see listed, along with your name, the name of Mr. William E. Harrison. Is he the Mr. William E. Harrison who was connected with the Sam Adams School?

Mr. WINNER. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Winner, you say you must decline to answer. There is no compulsion on you to refuse to answer.

Mr. WINNER. I am sorry. It is just an unfortunate use of language. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mr. William E. Harrison in 1937 when you signed this greeting?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that also, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee, please, the circumstances under which you joined in extending this greeting to the Second National Negro Congress?

Mr. WINNER. I have no recollection of it whatsoever. I remember when the organization was founded. I thought at the time that it was a good thing, and I probably expressed that feeling. I have no recollection of this, not the slightest; but it is my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee records also disclose that in the New York Daily Worker for Wednesday, February 15, 1950, at page 3, there is an article captioned, "Boston notables protest CIO expulsion plan." This article states that 26 educators, clergymen, and so forth, sent an open letter to CIO President Murray protesting the plan to expel CIO unions described as progressive. Among the names of those signing this open letter is the name of Harry Winner.

I hand you the February 15, 1950, edition of the Daily Worker, and ask you if your name appears there as a signer of that open letter?

Mr. WINNER. Yes; it appears there.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you sign the letter?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain the circumstances under which your name was used in connection with that open letter?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that also, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the article refers to the expulsion of certain CIO unions described as progressive. As a matter of fact you know, do you not, that the expulsion of the unions by the CIO was because of their Communist Party infiltration and control?

Mr. WINNER. I know it was so alleged. I don't know if it was so or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you protest the expulsion of the so-called progressive unions from the CIO?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that, also, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted from the same article that another signer of this letter, along with you, was Prof. Dirk Struik. Was he also opposed, to your knowledge, to the expulsion of the so-called progressive unions from the CIO?

Mr. WINNER. You say his name appears there as one of those opposed. That is all I would know about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you talk to him about it?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was your assistance obtained in connection with this protest?

Mr. WINNER (after consultation with his counsel). Is there a date on that letter?

Mr. NIXON. February 15, 1950.

Mr. ALLDER. The date on the letter. That is the date of the publication.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is no date. The date line of the article is February 14, appearing in the issue of February 15, 1950.

Mr. WINNER. And your question, again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question, please.

(The question referred to was read, as follows: "How was your assistance obtained in connection with this protest?")

Mr. WINNER. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Professor Struik in February 1950?

Mr. WINNER. I refuse to answer on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with him in 1947?

Mr. WINNER. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Jackie, a woman, who was employed in the office of Little, Brown, Inc.?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer to the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an individual by the name of Henry, who contributed articles to the New Republic, if you know of such contributions?

Mr. WINNER. Can you give me the approximate date of that?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1947 and 1948.

Mr. WINNER. And he wrote for the New Republic?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WINNER. The New Republic is no less respectable this morning that it was yesterday. Henry. Is there any more to the name?

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the testimony of Mr. Philbrick there was an individual in his particular professional cell or group of the Communist Party by the name of Henry who wrote articles for the New Republic.

Mr. WINNER. I know nothing about him. I don't believe I know anybody who ever wrote for the New Republic. If I did, I have forgotten. Certainly no one named Henry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Sara Gordon?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any of the meetings of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. WINNER. You are asking am I?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you cease to be a member?

Mr. ALDER. I object to that.

Mr. BEALE. Wait a minute. Let the witness respond.

Mr. WOOD. The two answers he has given certainly indicate to me there was a time when he was a member. He said he was not now a member, and declined to answer whether he ever was or not. The question now is, if he ever was, when did he cease to be a member.

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that.

Mr. WOOD. You decline to answer that?

Mr. WINNER. Yes, sir, on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Civil Rights Congress in 1947?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member on January 1, 1950?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member yesterday?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are not a member today?

Mr. WINNER. I am not a member today.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the International Workers' Order in Boston, Mass.?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you affiliated in any way with it today?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with it in any way yesterday?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any way with it in 1950?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1947?

Mr. WINNER. No. I can't tell you the exact date, but it is several years. I will have to decline to hazard giving the exact date, because I might get into difficulties, but it is several years.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period of time were you affiliated with it?

Mr. WINNER. I am not certain. It is several years, however; a few years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you instrumental in organizing the International Workers' Order in Massachusetts?

Mr. WINNER. No. I will ask you to clarify that, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you play any part in the organization of the International Workers' Order in Massachusetts?

Mr. WINNER. You are asking me if I was one of the founders of it?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of the founders?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. WINNER. No; I was not. It is much older. I don't know when it was founded, but I was certainly not one of the founders.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the time when it was organized in the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. WINNER. No. I know nothing about it. Specifically, I know nothing about the time it was organized in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you perform organizational services for it in the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you solicit members for it?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any Communist Party meetings in the State of Massachusetts in the years 1948 and 1949?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WINNER. That is two questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. I will separate them. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WINNER. No.

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

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you sever your relationship with the Communist Party?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on January 1, 1950?

Mr. WINNER (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on January 1, 1951?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you severed your connection with the Communist Party since January 1, 1951?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Witness, you have answered you are not a member of the Communist Party as of today. This is July 24, 1951. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

Mr. WINNER (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle, any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you a few questions, please.

Mr. WINNER. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE. How large a plant is the Converse Rubber Co. with reference to the number of employees it has?

Mr. WINNER. 1,100 employees.

Mr. DOYLE. Does it have any defense contracts with the United States Government?

Mr. WINNER. I am not associated with the management of that, so that I actually do not know. We did during the war.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know what the general thought is in the plant, is it generally understood among the employees they do Government work?

Mr. WINNER. We did a great deal during the war, at least 50 per cent during the war, and I am sure there was bidding.

Mr. DOYLE. You are sure there was bidding in the last year or two?

Mr. WINNER. I am sure of that.

Mr. DOYLE. What was the Sam Adams School? I don't know. You said you didn't teach there, but what was the school?

Mr. WOOD. He didn't say he didn't teach there.

Mr. DOYLE. I live in California and I don't know what the Sam Adams School was.

Mr. WINNER. You live in California?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. I was born there. You were born in Massachusetts.

Mr. WINNER. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. What was the Sam Adams School? Does it exist now?

Mr. WINNER. It does not exist.

May I speak to my learned counsel?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WINNER (after consultation with his counsel). It was a private school known as the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies,

and it was put on the Attorney General's list, and shortly thereafter the people who ran it closed it.

Mr. DOYLE. How long did it operate? You say it was a private school?

Mr. WINNER. I mean it was not a public school.

Mr. DOYLE. How long did it operate?

Mr. WINNER. My guess it maybe 3 years. I am not certain of that.

Mr. DOYLE. Was there a large attendance, and was it for children, adults, or what?

Mr. WINNER. Adults.

Mr. DOYLE. Evening classes?

Mr. WINNER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Any day classes?

Mr. WINNER. Very few, if any. I think evening classes almost exclusively.

Mr. DOYLE. How large a faculty or teaching staff did it have?

Mr. WINNER. I would have to guess at that.

Mr. DOYLE. Guess, if you can, and help me get that information.

Mr. WINNER. Anything for California. About 15, 17, 18.

Mr. DOYLE. Then it was a social study group?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson, a member of the committee, left the hearing room.)

Mr. WINNER. Yes, if we are using the word "social" in the same sense.

Mr. DOYLE. I am using it in the sense it was a group of adult folk studying economic problems and social problems.

Mr. WINNER. There were art classes, dancing classes, handicraft; they were the largely attended classes.

Mr. DOYLE. Dancing classes are always well attended.

Mr. WINNER. Yes, even in New England.

Mr. DOYLE. Anything that amuses the public is generally well attended.

Mr. WINNER. I think as a nation we like to be amused.

Mr. DOYLE. Was the teaching staff paid, or were they volunteer teachers?

Mr. WINNER. They were paid.

Mr. DOYLE. Were they full-time instructors? Were they paid on the basis of full-time instruction, or part-time?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson, a member of the committee, returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. WINNER. I don't know exactly what you mean.

Mr. DOYLE. Were the instructors a group of men and women busily occupied in the day hours at some other work, or who might have been teachers at some other school in the day hours, and then taught 2 or 3 hours at night at the Sam Adams School?

Mr. WINNER. Yes. I think if that was not the case the amount they were paid, as I remember it, would not have permitted survival, even in those days.

Mr. DOYLE. I understood you to indicate that when the school was declared subversive, or was named by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive, it was closed shortly thereafter. Was that the reason given for the closing of the school? I thought you volunteered that statement.

Mr. WINNER. Yes, I did. I would decline to be put on record that that is a certainty. That is my belief. That is what we are discussing—our mutual beliefs.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. If you have the knowledge, I would like to have it. If you don't, I don't want you to guess at it. Were you one of the instructors at that school?

Mr. WINNER. I have declined already to answer that question.

Mr. WOOD. Do you here adhere to that answer?

Mr. WINNER. I here adhere to that answer, and for the same reason.

Mr. DOYLE. Were there any students of college age at the Sam Adams School?

Mr. WINNER. It is my understanding they ranged from young adults to old adults.

Mr. DOYLE. Indicating yourself and me?

Mr. WINNER. Indicating, sir, only myself. California is noted for its products, including perennial youth.

Mr. DOYLE. Including oranges.

Mr. WINNER. Including oranges which are the best in the world.

Mr. DOYLE. I agree with you.

Did the students pay tuition?

Mr. WINNER. Moderate.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they buy their books, or were they furnished textbooks?

Mr. WINNER. I never heard of a private school that furnished textbooks.

Mr. DOYLE. When our counsel asked if you were a member of any Communist-front organization as testified to by Mr. Philbrick—I think he said he was a resident of your geographical area in Massachusetts—you said you declined to answer on the ground of elasticity of the question.

Mr. WINNER. No. I declined to answer on the ground I have previously stated. I added it was an elastic term.

Mr. DOYLE. If I take out the elastic, would you decline to answer it?

Mr. WINNER. You are doing a snappy job. I think my reason for refusing to answer would hold even if you took the rubber out.

Mr. DOYLE. I won't waste your time, then.

Mr. WINNER. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. I did note, however, that you felt you should add that in addition to your constitutional privilege, which we all recognize.

Mr. WINNER. You are a very observing young man.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there a labor union at the Converse Rubber Co?

Mr. WINNER. There is a labor union at the Converse Rubber Co. It is an A. F. of L. union.

Mr. DOYLE. Has there been throughout your employment there?

Mr. WINNER. No. It was organized about 1939 or 1940. There has never been a strike since then. We have excellent relations.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you now or were you ever a member of the union?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. I just want to call your attention, Mr. Winner, to some of the text of the law under which this committee operates, as passed by the United States Congress. At the conclusion of reading a paragraph or two, I will ask you whether you feel this committee should

follow its assignment under the law and undertake to locate any persons or groups who are subversive in their intent. (Reading:)

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution. * * *

Do you feel that is a worthy objective for Congress to assign a group of its Members to do?

Mr. WINNER. I didn't follow you as well as I might, because you are guilty of what I was guilty of and the chairman called my attention to it, but I gathered the general purport of it. I think it is the duty—

Mr. DOYLE. You refer to not speaking up loudly enough?

Mr. WINNER. You are a man of remarkable apprehension. That is what I meant. I should have made it clearer.

I am not a lawyer. I can't make an interpretation of that. It seems to me it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to safeguard the United States in every way.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any suggestions or advice to give the committee of ways we can help uncover subversive activities in this country?

Mr. WINNER. Wouldn't that be somewhat presumptuous of me?

Mr. DOYLE. I don't think so. I feel you have information that would be very valuable to this committee. To be very frank with you, I am very sure you know some things that would be helpful to protect your Nation and mine against subversive influences. I am not asking you to waive your constitutional rights, but as man to man I am talking frankly to you, and as man to man I have a hunch that you could help us if you would.

One reason I have the hunch is that you have stated you disassociated yourself from a certain organization, and you have stated you are not now a member of the Communist Party. The form of the questions and answers indicates to me, as a fellow American, that there was a time you were a member of the Communist Party. I am not condemning you at this time. We find some American citizens who were Communists and backed away from it when they discovered the hellish designs of the Communist Party. They backed away and came forward and helped us, and did not stand behind their constitutional privilege.

Again, I am not urging you to waive your constitutional privilege. I am asking you help us as Members of your Congress, to protect our Nation against subversive influences. I give you that invitation very energetically. I sort of feel that in your testimony there has been a reservation. I have felt that you sort of wished you could come forward and tell us a thing or two, and then you backed away from it. Am I wrong? You said I was a very observing young man.

Mr. WINNER. Correct.

Mr. DOYLE. I observed that in your testimony, and I want to leave that thought with you. I think I observed something about you, that right now you have a regret. So have I. I don't mean to lecture you in public.

Mr. WINNER. It may be the only time we ever meet will be in public, so—thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. WINNER. I didn't understand that to be a question.

Mr. DOYLE. No further questions.

Mr. WINNER. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson, another member from California.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you go to Boston? I think you have stated that previously.

Mr. WINNER. When did I go to Boston?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, or to Malden.

Mr. WINNER. In 1933. That was in connection with my employment.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe you stated you left that defunct loaning agency and went to the Boston company with another individual. Did you both go to the Converse Rubber Co.?

Mr. WINNER. Let me explain that. What I said—or never mind what I said, the facts are these: The owner and manager of the People's Finance—you will have to forgive me if I do not recall the exact name—the finance company in Hackensack, N. J., this family became the owners of the Converse Rubber Co. somewhat later.

Mr. JACKSON. Are they still in ownership?

Mr. WINNER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe you refused to state whether or not you know Dr. Dirk Struik?

Mr. WINNER. Yes. I declined to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. But in answer to a question by counsel, "Did you talk to Dr. Struik in connection with the letter protesting the expulsion of CIO unions," you said "No," which indicates you probably did know him.

Mr. WINNER. I don't think that is a logical inference.

Mr. JACKSON. It is the inference I draw. I ask again, did you know him?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have any knowledge of the Boston School for Marxist Studies?

Mr. WINNER. None whatever.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know anything about the Boston Labor School for Marxist Studies?

Mr. WINNER. Is there such an outfit now?

Mr. JACKSON. There was such an outfit during the period of time you have been in the vicinity of Boston.

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Mr. Otis Hood?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Rev. Stephen Fritchman?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Herbert A. Philbrick?

Mr. WINNER. I decline to answer that on the ground it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the nature of the work done by the Converse Rubber Co. during the last war? I believe you said 50 percent of your production was devoted to war contracts. What did the company make?

Mr. WINNER. We make rubber footwear.

Mr. JACKSON. Tires?

Mr. WINNER. No. We make no tires and no rubber novelties; exclusively rubber footwear.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you consider that the Communist Party seeks the overthrow of this Government by force and violence?

Mr. WINNER. Do I consider that they do?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. WINNER. Actually, I do not consider that they do.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you report an act of sabotage in the plant that you observed taking place?

Mr. WINNER. I most certainly would.

Mr. JACKSON. Whether that act of sabotage was being performed by a member or functionary of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. WINNER. I would report an act of sabotage—I would prevent an act of sabotage, no matter by whom performed or threatened to be performed.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you bear arms for this country in the event of a conflict with the Soviet Union?

Mr. WINNER. I would bear arms for this country if attacked by anyone.

Mr. JACKSON. Assuming it was not physically attacked so far as the continental limits of the United States are concerned, would you bear arms for this country?

Mr. WINNER. Would you mind expanding that?

Mr. JACKSON. Assuming Boston or Jersey City or **San Francisco** were not physically attacked, but for the security of this country it was considered necessary to fight away from its shores.

Mr. WINNER. I would fight to defend this country.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you served in the Armed Forces?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you registered for the last war?

Mr. WINNER. I was registered.

Mr. JACKSON. What was your classification?

Mr. WINNER. I don't know. I may have it. [After searching for paper] I don't find it. I was over age, whatever that classification was.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the date of your birth?

Mr. WINNER. 1901.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you decline to state whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WINNER. I have so declined to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever been a member of any organization that seeks the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

Mr. WINNER. I have never been a member of any organization that sought to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you consider that the Communist Party seeks to overthrow the Government by force and violence?

Mr. WINNER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Then it is entirely possible, in your mind, to be a member of the Communist Party and still not belong to an organization which seeks to overthrow the Government by force and violence?

Mr. WINNER. I think so.

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

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered.

Mr. WINNER. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. WOOD. In view of the fact I personally, along with counsel, have an appointment at 1 o'clock, we will take a recess here until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 12:10 p. m., a recess was taken until 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:30 p. m., Representatives John S. Wood, Clyde Doyle, and Donald L. Jackson being present, and Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.)

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record disclose that for the purposes of the hearing this afternoon I, as chairman, have set up a subcommittee composed of Messrs. Doyle, Jackson, and Wood, and they are all present.

Who is the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Dirk Struik.

Mr. WOOD. Will you come around, please, Doctor. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please.

You do solemnly swear—

Dr. STRUIK. I do solemnly swear—

Mr. WOOD. That the evidence you give this subcommittee—

Dr. STRUIK. That the evidence I give this subcommittee—

Mr. WOOD. Shall be the truth—

Dr. STRUIK. Shall be the truth—

Mr. WOOD. The whole truth—

Dr. STRUIK. The whole truth—

Mr. WOOD. And nothing but the truth—

Dr. STRUIK. And nothing but the truth—

Mr. WOOD. So help you God.

Dr. STRUIK. So help me God.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF DR. DIRK JUNG STRUIK, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, OLIVER S. ALLEN

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name for the record, please, Doctor?

Dr. STRUIK. My full name is Dirk Jung Struik.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Dr. STRUIK. I am represented by counsel.

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

Mr. ALLEN. My name is Oliver S. Allen of the bar of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with offices in the city of Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address in Boston?

Mr. ALLEN. 100 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Dr. Struik?

Dr. STRUIK. I was born on the 13th of September 1894, in Rotterdam, in the Netherlands.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you an American citizen?

Dr. STRUIK. I am an American citizen.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you naturalized?

Dr. STRUIK. I was naturalized in 1934.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to the United States?

Dr. STRUIK. I came to the United States in December 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you naturalized?

Dr. STRUIK. In Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly what your educational training has been?

Dr. STRUIK. Gladly. I was educated in the public schools of the Netherlands in Rotterdam, elementary and the equivalent of high school; then I got my Ph. D. at the University of Leyden in 1922. I subsequently had an international fellowship and traveled and studied mainly in Germany and in Rome, Italy.

That ended my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was the approximate date of the ending of your formal education?

Dr. STRUIK. Well, I came back to Holland in 1926, I believe, before I came to the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you came to the United States, did you take up your residence in Boston?

Dr. STRUIK. Strictly speaking, in Cambridge.

Mr. TAVENNER. And have you lived there since that time?

Dr. STRUIK. First in Cambridge, then I went to Holland and several other countries for a year, and came back to Massachusetts, and since that time, 1935, I have resided in Belmont, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. You reside where?

Dr. STRUIK. Belmont, B-e-l-m-o-n-t.

Mr. TAVENNER. What countries did you visit when you returned to Holland from the United States?

Dr. STRUIK. Mexico; the Netherlands; very shortly, Germany and Poland, and the U. S. S. R.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in the U. S. S. R.?

Dr. STRUIK. Three weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did you visit?

Dr. STRUIK. Moscow.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in going to Moscow?

Dr. STRUIK. To be in attendance on a mathematics congress; to be exact, a seminar for the study of vectors and tensor analysis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you invited to attend this particular conference?

Dr. STRUIK. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom?

Dr. STRUIK. By Professor Kagan of the University of Moscow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you been employed in the United States prior to your taking this trip?

Dr. STRUIK. Which trip do you mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. The trip to Moscow?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes. I was out from 1934 to 1935, but I came to the United States in 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed from 1926 to 1934?

Dr. STRUIK. I was employed at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what capacity?

Dr. STRUIK. First as a lecturer, then as assistant professor. I think that was up to 1934 I was assistant professor.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what field?

Dr. STRUIK. Mathematics.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you teach any other subjects besides mathematics?

Dr. STRUIK. I am not quite sure if it was before 1934 or after 1934, but I believe it was before 1934 that I also gave a course in the history of science.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you returned in 1935 from your trip abroad, where were you employed?

Dr. STRUIK. At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have been employed there constantly from that time until the present?

Dr. STRUIK. Constantly, that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you are employed there now?

Dr. STRUIK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Struik, the committee, in investigating Communist Party activities in New England, with special reference to Massachusetts, is desirous of knowing what action the Communist Party took with reference to the colonization of key industries by the Communist Party. Do you have any knowledge on that subject?

Dr. STRUIK. Sir, at this stage I have to decline respectfully to answer that question on the ground that an answer to that question might tend to incriminate me, and my refusal is based on the rights guaranteed to me under the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee also, in the course of its investigation into the subject of Communist colonization of key industries, desires to know what part the Communist Party played in the education of youth in the Massachusetts area, and the committee had information that you would have some knowledge on that subject.

Dr. STRUIK. But I must respectfully decline to answer that question, again upon the same grounds; namely, that an answer to that question might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick?

Dr. STRUIK. I must again decline to answer that question upon the same grounds.

Mr. WOOD. Doctor, permit me to point out to you, sir, that in this committee you are not under any compulsion to decline to answer anything. The question is not what you must do; it is a question of whether you do it or not.

Dr. STRUIK. I stand corrected.

Mr. WOOD. Do you decline to answer?

Dr. STRUIK. I do decline to answer.

Mr. WOOD. For the reasons stated?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. And may it be understood that it is upon that ground that he declines to answer further questions?

Mr. WOOD. Unless he indicates differently, his declination to answer further questions, if he does so decline, may be assumed to be on the grounds stated.

Dr. STRUIK. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Struik, Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick appeared as a witness before this committee yesterday, and in the course of his testimony he told the committee that he had occupied a position on the educational commission of the Communist Party of the State of Massachusetts for a considerable period of time during the middle forties.

He also testified that beginning around 1947 he was transferred to what was termed the professional group of the Communist Party, and that that group had been divided into 14 units or cells, and he had been assigned to one of those known as the MO group, meaning—or do you know what it means, the MO group?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question. That is sufficient, is it?

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., a member of the committee, entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; quite sufficient. Mr. Philbrick testified that the initials MO indicated, or stood for, the words mass organization.

Dr. STRUIK. Is that a question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I am just telling you what he testified to, as the basis for a question I am going to ask you.

After having so testified, I asked Mr. Philbrick this question. First, I should say that Mr. Philbrick testified as to the membership of the particular cell to which he was assigned in the professional group, and after having given the names of those who were originally in that cell with him, I asked him this question: ¹

Were there any other individuals with whom you became acquainted, members of the Communist Party to your knowledge, who took any part in the leadership in the educational field?

Mr. Philbrick's reply was:

In the latter part of 1947 and beginning of 1948 in our pro group—meaning professional group—

we had been studying one of these revolutionary books. I believe at that time it was State and Revolution. By the time we had finished the course we had a new member join our group. He had apparently been informed as to the nature of our studies, so he—

At that moment I interrupted him and asked him this question:

Let me interrupt you there. Do you mean joined your professional cell?

Mr. Philbrick replied:

Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The same cell that we have been talking about?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, my particular cell. And so this new member was brought in. He was a new member to our own little cell, not a new member of the party. He was called in to conduct a summary of the entire book, State and Revolution. This member, it turned out, was Comrade Dirk Struik, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of the Sam Adams School.

Is there any statement contained in Mr. Philbrick's testimony which I have read to you that is untrue?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

¹ See pp. 1296 and 1297.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you join a cell of the professional group of the Communist Party in the latter part of 1947 or the beginning of 1948?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you conduct a class or lecture before a cell of the professional group of the Communist Party on the book, *State and Revolution*?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you lecture to such a group on any book or any subject?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the book, *State and Revolution*?

Dr. STRUIK (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then the testimony continued as follows:

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell both the first and last names, please?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe it is D-i-r-k, Dirk, S-t-r-u-i-k, Dirk J. Struik, I believe.

Your name is Dirk J. Struik, is it not?

Dr. STRUIK (after consultation with his counsel). Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you, sir. [Continuing reading:]

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he is presently employed in the teaching profession?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. He is still with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

You are still with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, are you not?

Dr. STRUIK. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing reading from answer by Mr. Philbrick):

He is a teacher of mathematics.

You are a teacher of mathematics?

Dr. STRUIK. I am a teacher of mathematics.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing reading from answer by Mr. Philbrick):

He was one of the sponsors of the Sam Adams School in Boston—

You were one of the sponsors of the Sam Adams School in Boston?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing reading from answer by Mr. Philbrick):

and one of the sponsors of the Thomas Jefferson School in New York City.

You were one of the sponsors of the Thomas Jefferson School in New York City?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing reading):

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he also teach or lecture in the Sam Adams School?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, he did, and as a Communist Party member I attended his classes, or the classes he gave, at the Sam Adams School.

Mr. ALLEN. Is that a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am about to ask the question.

Did you teach at the Sam Adams School?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Philbrick attend classes given by you at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

MR. ALLEN. Will you repeat that question?

MR. TAVENNER. Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter, as follows: "Did Mr. Philbrick attend classes given by you at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?")

DR. STRUIK. I can only say this, that I do not know. I have no recollection of a student called Philbrick in my mathematics classes, but so many students pass through the institute each year that I really cannot truthfully say that there was a student called Philbrick in one of my mathematics classes.

MR. TAVENNER. Did a student named Philbrick attend classes conducted by you at the Sam Adams School?

DR. STRUIK. I have to decline to answer that question, sir.

MR. WOOD. Do you so decline?

DR. STRUIK. I do decline, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the size of the classes at the Sam Adams School as compared to your classes at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. Did a Mr. Philbrick attend lectures or classes of yours at any place?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing with the testimony on the previous day of Mr. Philbrick):¹

MR. TAVENNER. Will you describe a little more definitely this meeting which you state he attended of your group and summarized the book *State and Revolution*?

MR. PHILBRICK. Well, the nature of the course had been that we had studied the nature of the state, the capitalist state, and the need for violent revolution to overthrow that state. Comrade Struik brought in a world-wide summary of the status of capitalism in various parts of the world. He particularly dwelt on the state of capitalism and imperialism in the Pacific, and at that time instructed us that there we saw imperialism at its worst, such as in the Dutch East Indies, and that we must back the Indonesian revolt and the revolt of all colonial peoples throughout the Pacific area against the inroads of capitalism, and the absolute necessity of overthrowing capitalist control in those sections. It was a long discourse, running about 2 hours in length.

Does that refresh your recollection as to the summary or lecture which Mr. Philbrick stated you delivered to his group?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. You were at that time rather vocal on the subject of government in the Dutch East Indies, were you not, in 1947 and 1948?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. According to the *Daily Worker* of August 20, 1947, at page 9, Dr. Dirk Struik, professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was designated as the chairman of the American Committee for Indonesian Independence.

You were chairman of such an organization, were you not?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. I hand you the August 20, 1947, issue of the *Daily Worker*, and ask you to examine the article appearing in the left-hand top corner of page 9 and state whether or not your name ap-

¹ See p. 1297.

pears therein, and whether or not you were designated as chairman of the American Committee for Indonesian Independence?

Dr. STRUIK. The name of Dr. Dirk Struik, professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, appears in this article.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does it appear as chairman of the American Committee for Indonesian Independence?

Dr. STRUIK. I read on: "And chairman of the American Committee for Indonesian Independence." Shall I read on?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is enough, unless you desire to read further. Are you the individual referred to in that article?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any other individual by the name of Struik at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

Dr. STRUIK. To the best of my knowledge, no.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing with the testimony of Mr. Philbrick of the previous day):¹

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did Dr. Struik attend the meetings of your group?

At this point the question refers to the cell of the professional group of the Communist Party of which Mr. Philbrick was a member, and it was referred to by him as a highly secret group. [Continuing reading:]

Mr. PHILBRICK. He attended meetings every other week, as that was the custom of our group, to meet every other week. He attended our meetings from that period right up through, I believe, the latter part of May or first part of June.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you have been in many, many Communist Party meetings with him?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those meetings closed meetings, that is, secret Communist Party meetings?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They were very secret Communist Party meetings, and it was impossible, absolutely impossible, for any person or any individual to ever get into these meetings unless he was not only a bona fide party member, but one who was very well trusted and who had been passed upon by someone in the higher ranks as a party member of sufficient trustworthiness to be permitted to belong to the pro cell.

After reading that portion of the testimony of Mr. Philbrick to you, will you state to the committee whether or not you attended such a closed meeting as that described by Mr. Philbrick?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing with the testimony of the preceding day of Mr. Philbrick):

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any further information you can give the committee regarding the Communist Party membership or activity of Dr. Struik?

Mr. PHILBRICK. There were many instances over the years. I don't know which are the most important. So far as the Communist Party was concerned, and so far as the educational commission was concerned, of which I was a member, Professor Struik was very influential in teaching Marxism at the Sam Adams School. This was a required course for Communist Party members.

As a member of the educational commission, I was given instructions to prepare leaflets promoting the classes of Professor Struik at the Sam Adams School, and all Communist Party members were urged to attend that particular course. I attended it myself.

I might say that perhaps to pin it down a little further, in 1 year we had two such course for party members to attend. One of these was to be given by Professor Struik, and the other was to be given by Clive Knowles.

¹ See pp. 1297 and 1298.

Are you acquainted with Clive Knowles?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing reading from answer by Mr. Philbrick):

At the last moment, Clive Knowles could not teach the course, and someone else would have to teach his course.

I had already prepared the leaflets advertising both courses. I was called to Communist Party headquarters and told that all comrades who had registered for the class of Clive Knowles were to shift their registration to Professor Struik's class. The reason given was because the new teacher taking the place of Clive Knowles was not a Communist Party member, and it was felt that members of the Communist Party should not be learning Marxism from a non-party member.

As a result, Professor Struik's course became so large he had to teach them in two sections, one at 6 o'clock and one at 7.

Does that refresh your recollection regarding your experience at the Sam Adams School?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you teach a class in Marxism at the Sam Adams School?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Philbrick prepare the literature and the material advertising your course in Marxism at the Sam Adams School, to your knowledge?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Struik, were you at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member today?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time denied that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that during the course of the trial of the 11 Communists in the United States District Court in New York in the spring of 1949, Mr. Philbrick, who was a witness for the Government in that trial, mentioned you as a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that?

Dr. STRUIK. I recall that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make a public statement after that with regard to Mr. Philbrick's testimony relating to you?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of the April 9, 1949, issue of the Boston Post, which contains an article headed, "No action by M. I. T. on 'Red'—Professor not to be curbed or censured, says Killian—Struik denies being Communist," accompanied by a photograph appearing over your name.

Will you look at that, please, and state whether or not that is your photograph? Do you recognize your likeness?

Dr. STRUIK. That is a very difficult question, sir. However, I can say this, that behind—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you just answer the question. Is that your photograph?

Dr. STRUIK. It looks like it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't doubt it, do you?

Dr. STRUIK. No; I don't doubt it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You recall the incident perfectly well, and you know perfectly well that is your photograph?

Mr. ALLEN. What incident?

Mr. TAVENNER. The publication of this article.

Dr. STRUIK. I recall the publication of this article very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in that article is it stated you denied membership in the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. Let's see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that?

Mr. ALLEN. One question at a time.

Dr. STRUIK. May I read what it says, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will just answer my question.

Dr. STRUIK. And your question is what?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter, as follows: "And in that article is it stated you denied membership in the Communist Party?")

Dr. STRUIK. I must look at this article to see if I said that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Look as much as you like. If you will—

Dr. STRUIK. I am not finished reading it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, there is a question pending.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the counsel be instructed he is here to confer with and advise the witness.

Mr. ALLEN. But questions should not be asked to confuse the witness.

Mr. WOOD. Do you withdraw the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir. I wanted to point out where the language I am inquiring about appears in the article.

Dr. STRUIK. I read the following:

Professor Struik said he has never advised anyone to join the Communist Party and when anyone asked him such a question he would give that person the advice to find out for himself.

Professor Struik said he readily agrees that Marxism and communism have many things in common. At one time he likened the two isms to the relationship of Christianity to some Christian church.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you read the caption of the article?

Dr. STRUIK (reading):

No Action by M. I. T. on "Red."

Mr. TAVENNER. And the rest of it?

Dr. STRUIK (reading):

Professor Not To Be Curbed or Censured, Says Killian—Struik Denies Being Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you deny being a Communist?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer the question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you also look in the center of the page and see in black type in the center of the column, "Says Philbrick Lies."

Dr. STRUIK. I see it, sure, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Philbrick lie in referring to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you were correctly quoted in the caption to this article, "Struik Denies Being Communist," was that a truthful statement?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer in evidence pages 1 and 2 of the April 9, 1949, issue of the Boston Post, and ask that they be marked "Struik Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. WOOD. Let them be admitted.

(The photostats above referred to, marked "Struik Exhibit No. 1," are filed herewith.¹)

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Struik, you have refused to answer questions which might throw some light on your knowledge of Communist Party activities in the Boston area relating to education of youth, the organization of the Communist Party, the secret units or cells of the party, and the colonization of key industries by the Communist Party, but there is information in the files of the committee which shows, or tends to show, your affiliation with a number of Communist-front organizations which, unexplained, would indicate that you had such knowledge even beyond the testimony of Mr. Philbrick on yesterday.

Dr. STRUIK. Is that a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I will ask you a question.

So I feel I should ask you about a number of such affiliations with Communist-front organizations, but before doing so, possibly you have an explanation to make of your affiliation with such groups. Do you?

Dr. STRUIK. That is a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Do you have an explanation that you would like to make?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I shall be compelled to ask you a number of specific questions relating to such organizations.

Were you affiliated in any manner with the Conference on Pan American Democracy?

Dr. STRUIK (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did not this conference set up the Council for Pan American Democracy?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it not the founding meeting for the formation of the Council for Pan American Democracy?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy and ask whether or not your name appears as one of the sponsors of that organization?

Dr. STRUIK. I see the name "Professor D. J. Struik."

Mr. TAVENNER. As a sponsor?

Dr. STRUIK. As a sponsor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a sponsor of the organization?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir. Excuse me. May I see this thing once more?

¹ See appendix, pp. 1401-1405.

MR. TAVENNER. Yes. I believe the date is November 16, 1938; is it not?

DR. STRUIK. That is right.

MR. TAVENNER. I hand you another letterhead, dated September 22, 1939, on which your name appears as a member of the National Committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. Will you identify your name as a member of the national committee?

DR. STRUIK. I see the name "Professor D. J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

MR. TAVENNER. As a member of the national committee of the organization?

DR. STRUIK. As a member of the national committee.

MR. TAVENNER. Is that you?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. The New Masses of April 2, 1940, published a letter to the President of the United States to the effect that a recent raid on the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an indictment returned by a Federal grand jury in Detroit against persons accused of recruiting Americans to fight in the Spanish civil war, and the work of the Dies committee, was evidence of a tendency to pervert the spirit of the Bill of Rights. The name of D. J. Struik, associate professor of mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, appears as one having signed the letter.

Will you examine it and state whether or not you signed such a letter?

DR. STRUIK. I see my name, Dirk J. Struik, professor of mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you sign the letter?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. I now hand you a letterhead dated August 10, 1940, which reflects your name, D. J. Struik, as a sponsor of the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War. I will ask you to verify that and state whether or not you were a sponsor of that organization.

DR. STRUIK. There are two questions, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you verify the fact that your name appears there?

DR. STRUIK. I see "Dr. D. J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

MR. TAVENNER. And were you a sponsor of that organization?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know that this organization, the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War, was a mere paper organization created for the purpose of raising funds to finance the setting up of the Emergency Peace Mobilization held in Chicago, August 31 and September 1 and 2, 1940?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. I show you a copy of the Daily Worker for March 5, 1941. Across the front page appears the headline, "450 educators, ministers, writers call on F. D. R. to defend constitutional rights of Communists." On page 2 of the paper, the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears in the article as one of the signers. Will you verify that to see if your name does so appear?

Dr. STRUIK. I see the name Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your name was used in connection with that letter?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a program of the third biennial conference of the International Labor Defense, held in New York City April 4 to 6, 1941. On the back page appears the following statement over the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik:

My sympathy is with you in your fight against all attempts to treat the Constitution of the United States with contempt.

Do you see the quotation which I read you, over your signature?

Dr. STRUIK. I see the quotation, and I recognize my name, "Professor Dirk J. Struik, MIT."

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign that message to the International Labor Defense?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a pamphlet published by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. It contains a letter addressed to President Roosevelt, dated July 11, 1942, urging reconsideration of the order of the Attorney General for the deportation of Harry Bridges. On page 30, the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears. Will you verify the appearance of your name on that page?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your name was used in connection with this letter, and how your name was solicited?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline, sir, to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest you look again, at page 15. I call your attention there to this language:

It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded.

What findings did the Attorney General make regarding the Communist Party with which you disagreed?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the findings of the Attorney General that in your opinion were ill-advised, arbitrary and unwarranted?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar with the findings of the Attorney General in the Bridges case, are you not?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know it to be a fact, do you not, that the findings of the Attorney General in the Bridges case relative to the Communist Party were practically identical to the findings in the case of the 11 Communist leaders convicted in New York.

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a page from the New York Times of April 1, 1946. It contains an advertisement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, with a statement opposing the use of injunctions in labor disputes. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of the signers. Do you identify your name there?

Dr. STRUIK. I identify my name, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you signed this statement, and who solicited your signature?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Committee for Citizenship Rights. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as an endorser. Will you identify your name, please?

Dr. STRUIK. Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not correct that this Committee for Citizenship Rights was a committee for the defense of William Schneiderman, secretary of the Communist Party in California?

Dr. STRUIK. I can only read what I see here, that it was a committee organized to defend William Schneiderman.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you did endorse that committee, did you not?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with William Schneiderman?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you contribute or participate in any way in his defense, through contributions or otherwise?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a copy of *New Masses* of July 8, 1947. Beginning on page 12 appears an article entitled "Man Over Myth." Without going into the details regarding the content of this article, it appears to be an explanation or analysis of the Communist manifesto. Is that correct?

Dr. STRUIK. Let me read it. I see I signed it. It says:

Marxism and the scientific tradition. How the founders of modern socialism transformed the nationalist outlook into a science.

Then it begins:

The Communist manifesto was written at the end of 1847—almost a century ago; it appeared in February of the next year, on the eve of the revolution of 1848.

Shall I read more, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. You may read more if it is necessary for you to answer my question.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Dr. STRUIK. Yes, I think it is an analysis mainly of the philosophical implications of the Communist manifesto and its impact upon science and philosophy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write the article?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the article in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Struik Exhibit No. 2."

Mr. WOOD. Let it be admitted.

(The article above referred to, marked "Struik Exhibit No. 2," is filed herewith.¹)

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever lectured upon the same subject?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

¹ See appendix, pp. 1406-1411.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a school schedule for the spring term of 1947 of the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York City. Will you examine it, please?

Dr. STRUIK. I see the name Dirk J. Struik on the board of trustees.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it correct that you were on the board of trustees?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you turn to page 73 and tell us what you find there?

Dr. STRUIK (reading) :

Struik, Dirk J.—Instructor, "What is Science?" (150); "Mathematics for the Citizen" (155).

Shall I read on, on my qualifications?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, that is sufficient. We understand your qualifications. Those numbers represented the numbers of the courses in the school, did they?

Dr. STRUIK. I see "What is Science?" (150)."

Mr. TAVENNER. What does 150 represent?

Dr. STRUIK. I suppose it is a number.

Mr. TAVENNER. Obviously it is a number, but what does it represent?

Dr. STRUIK. I suppose the course.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you conduct the course 150?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are aware of the fact that the Attorney General has cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as a Communist organization?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you another folder, advertising the summer session of 1944 of this same school. It still reflects your name as a member of the board of trustees, I believe?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name, Dirk J. Struik, listed on the board of trustees.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you on the board of trustees of this school?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On October 16, 1944, a dinner was given at the Hotel Commodore in honor of the first anniversary of the American Youth for Democracy. A program reflects the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik as a sponsor. Will you examine the program and state whether or not it so appears?

Dr. STRUIK. I see, "Salute to Young America Dinner, Hotel Commodore." and on the last page I see, under the heading "Sponsors," "Prof. Dirk J. Struik."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a sponsor of that dinner?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a sponsor of that dinner?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any way with the American Youth for Democracy?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a program relating to a testimonial dinner on October 12, 1947, at the Pennsylvania Hotel, a dinner given

by the American Slav Congress. According to this program your name appears as one of the sponsors. Is that true?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name in the list of sponsors, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your name was used as a sponsor of that organization?

Dr. STRUIK. Of this testimonial dinner in honor of Senator Claude Pepper?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You decline to answer?

Dr. STRUIK. I see this is a testimonial dinner in honor of Senator Claude Pepper, by—

Mr. TAVENNER. By the American Slav Congress?

Dr. STRUIK. By the American Slav Congress.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please tell us the circumstances under which your name was used in that connection?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. An undated letterhead reflects the name of Dirk J. Struik as a sponsor of a National Conference for Protection of Foreign Born, a meeting sponsored by the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. Do you identify your name?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name, Prof. Dirk J. Struik.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you sponsored this organization and who solicited your sponsorship?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to an article in the Daily Worker of April 4, 1941, you were a sponsor of this organization for the coming year. Is that correct?

Dr. STRUIK. I can only tell you what I see. I see that "73 Notables Sponsor Foreign-Born Group," and I see the name "Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.," on that list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a sponsor at the present time of the organization, and, if so, will you state the circumstances under which you became a sponsor?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a letterhead of the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and I will ask you to examine it and state whether or not your name appears as executive director of that organization?

Dr. STRUIK. I see "Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc." and "Executive director, Prof. Dirk J. Struik."

Mr. TAVENNER. On the letterhead there also appears a letter over your signature.

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name, Dirk J. Struik, one in handwriting and another in typewriting.

Mr. TAVENNER. The one that is in handwriting is your signature, is it not?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I offer that letterhead in evidence and ask that it be marked "Struik Exhibit No. 3."

Mr. WOOD. Let it be admitted, and I would like to see it.

(The letterhead above referred to, marked "Struik Exhibit No. 3," is filed herewith.¹)

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of November 10, 1948, the National Council of American Soviet Friendship—of which your name appeared on "Struik Exhibit No. 3" as the executive director of the Massachusetts chapter—sent greetings to the Soviet Union on the thirty-first anniversary of the Russian revolution. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of those who joined in sending greetings.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Examiner, it doesn't appear from what you have given the witness that this comes from a publication, the Daily Worker. You assure me that is the fact?

Mr. TAVENNER. I can only say it is clipped from the Daily Worker.

Dr. STRUIK. And the question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. I pointed out to you from that article that the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of those who joined in sending greetings from the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship to the Soviet Union on the thirty-first anniversary of the Russian revolution. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you joined in sending greetings to the Soviet Union, if you did?

Dr. STRUIK. It was a message of friendship to the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Any explanation you have to make of it, we will be glad to have. Your distinction, then, is that you were sending a greeting to the people of the Soviet Union?

Dr. STRUIK. According to this article, these people have sent a message of friendship to the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the anniversary of the Russian revolution?

Dr. STRUIK. It was the fifteenth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and the thirty-first anniversary of the Russian revolution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you joined in sending those greetings, if you did?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you the Daily Worker of March 19, 1942, and point out to you an article headed, "38 noted educators join Browder appeal." On page 2 the name of Dirk J. Struik appears as one of those who signed the appeal. Will you identify that as being correct according to the article?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name, Dirk J. Struik, professor of mathematics.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee who interviewed you with relation to your joining in on this appeal, if you did so join?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the Schappes Defense Committee, which reflects the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik as one of the sponsors. Do you see your name?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Morris U. Schappes?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

¹ See appendix, p. 1412.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar with the charges made against him at the school at which he was teaching?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a page of the New York Times of December 22, 1943, which contains an advertisement of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, of which Paul Robeson was the chairman. This was in honor of George Dimitrov, one of the defendants in the Reichstag Fire Trial. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of the signers. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a signer, if you did so?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name. I decline to answer that particular question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a letter dated July 11, 1947, wherein the name of Dirk J. Struik appears as one of the sponsors of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you sponsored this organization and who solicited your sponsorship?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name, sir. I decline to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are aware of the fact, are you not, that the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited by the Attorney General as a Communist organization?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In January 1948 the Committee For a Democratic Far Eastern Policy sponsored a meeting called the National Conference on American Policy on China and the Far East. Did you attend that conference?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you prepare a document for that conference on the subject of American policy in the Far East?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you the February 1948 issue of Spotlight. Are you acquainted with it?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spotlight was the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. On page 9 appears an article entitled "Duplicity Charged to United States Policy in Indonesia; Truce a Fake."

In this article it is said that "duplicity of American policy, which has prolonged war in Indonesia at great expense to the American people, was documented by Dr. Dirk Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

Mr. ALLEN. You are not quoting that correctly. It is "great expense to Americans."

Mr. TAVENNER. Great expense to Americans.

Mr. ALLEN. You have not quoted all of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. From the standpoint of this question, that is enough: "Duplicity of American policy, which has prolonged war in Indonesia at great expense to the American people"—

Dr. STRUIK. To Americans.

Mr. TAVENNER. "To Americans, was documented by Dr. Dirk Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

Did you document such an article?

Dr. STRUIK. I can only say what I read. It says it was "documented by Dr. Dirk Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

Mr. TAVENNER. You only know what you see in the papers; is that right?

Dr. STRUIK. Not always.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any independent recollection of it aside from the paper that is before you?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever write any articles for Spotlight, the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a copy of the June 1948 issue of the Far East Spotlight, and refer you to page 7, where there appears an article entitled "Who Fights the Indonesians?", by Dirk J. Struik, professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Does your name appear there as the author?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name there as the author.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall if you were the author of such an article?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

May I make a remark, sir? The picture of Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson is on the front of this Far East Spotlight.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a printed invitation, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee sponsored a reception for Mme. Irène Joliot-Curie. On this invitation, Dr. Dirk J. Struik was listed as a member of the national reception committee. Will you state whether or not you were a member of such a committee, or first, whether it appears on the paper that you were?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name, Dr. Dirk J. Struik.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that refresh your recollection, or do you need to refresh your recollection as to whether you served on such a committee?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of November 22, 1948, at page 4, carries an article entitled "Civic Leaders in New England Rap Frame-Up of 12." That refers, of course, to the 12 Communist leaders who were indicted in the Federal court in New York in 1949. The gist of the article was that the Attorney General abandon the prosecution of the 12 Communist leaders. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of those who signed the letter. Does your name appear?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you advocate that the Attorney General abandon the prosecution of the 12 Communist leaders in New York City?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign the letter referred to there, or did you permit your name to be used in connection with it?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I offer that article in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Struik Exhibit No. 4."

Mr. WOOD. Let it be admitted.

(The article above referred to, marked "Struik Exhibit No. 4," is filed herewith.¹)

MR. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of October 15, 1948, page 3, contains a news item to the effect that, on the evening before, a dinner forum was held at the Iceland Restaurant in honor of the 12 indicted Communist leaders. This dinner was sponsored by the New York State Civil Rights Congress, so the article says, and Prof. Dirk Struik was one of the scheduled speakers.

Are you referred to there is one of the scheduled speakers?

DR. STRUIK. Yes; scheduled speakers include Dr. Dirk Struik of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you speak at this meeting or dinner in honor of the 12 indicted Communist leaders?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of November 23, 1942, at page 3, Prof. D. J. Struik is named as an editor of Science and Society. Will you refer to the article indicated and state whether or not your name appears in that article?

DR. STRUIK. I see an article entitled "War Problems Are Main Theme of Science and Society Institute," and it says, "Opening remarks of welcome will be made by Prof. D. J. Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and an editor of Science and Society."

MR. TAVENNER. Did you ever contribute or write articles for this publication Science and Society, of which the article says you were an editor?

DR. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. I hand you the winter 1948 issue of Science and Society, in which you are listed as one of the editors, and I ask you to look at page 181, where you will find an article entitled "Marx and Mathematics," by Dirk J. Struik. Do you see an article entitled "Marx and Mathematics" by Dirk J. Struik?

DR. STRUIK. I see that.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you explain to the committee what the affinity is between Marx and mathematics?

DR. STRUIK. Marx left certain mathematical papers, and it is of great interest to the mathematicians to see what they contain. They have a bearing on the foundations of mathematics, and I will be very glad to explain to the committee the bearing of Marx on mathematics.

MR. TAVENNER. You made quite a study of the Marxist philosophy in connection with mathematics?

DR. STRUIK. I have always been interested in the bearing of Marx on science in general and mathematics in particular.

MR. TAVENNER. And you have followed that study by participating in the teaching of Marxism in certain institutions; have you not?

DR. STRUIK. This I decline to answer.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you write the article entitled "Marx and Mathematics" appearing in the issue which I handed you?

DR. STRUIK. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. What other contributions did you make to this magazine?

DR. STRUIK. I write for this magazine occasionally book reviews, and have occasionally contributed articles dealing with the philosophy

¹ Filed with the records of this hearing by the committee.

and history of science. In the last number of *Science and Society* you will find a review of a book by Herman Weyl of Princeton on the foundations of mathematics. I have recently written a review of a book by Professor Butterfield on the origin of mathematics. I try to review mainly the contributions that deal with the social implications of mathematics and science.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you have made contributions of that nature to this magazine *Science and Society*?

Dr. STRUIK. Not only to this magazine but others, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you contribute frequently to the magazine *Science and Society*?

Dr. STRUIK. Not frequently.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were an editor of it. Didn't you make your principal literary contributions to the magazine of which you were an editor?

Dr. STRUIK. I write occasionally an article for *Science and Society* on these scientific subjects, but not often, because I have other things to do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been an editor of *Science and Society*?

Dr. STRUIK. Since its existence.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Dr. STRUIK. You can see for yourself, sir. It is on there somewhere.

Mr. TAVENNER. This issue in 1948 says volume 12, No. 1. Does that mean that it is 12 years of age?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you still an editor of that magazine?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes; I am an editor of that magazine.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the connection, if any, between the Communist Party and this magazine entitled "*Science and Society*"?

Dr. STRUIK. (after consultation with his counsel). I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated you helped to organize it, or publish it?

Dr. STRUCK. No. I said I was asked to join the editorial board.

Mr. TAVENNER. At its inception?

Dr. STRUIK. I joined, and from that time until the present I have occasionally contributed an article to this magazine.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who extended the invitation to you to join the editorial board?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who controlled the editorial policy of this magazine at the time you first became an editor?

Dr. STRUIK. The editorial board.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who composed it?

Dr. STRUIK. I don't recall. You can easily find that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who composes the board at this time?

Dr. STRUIK. You will find that. Living in Boston, I have very little to do with editorial policy. My contribution was an occasional book review or sometimes a manuscript.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is there about the formation of this magazine that makes you reluctant to tell us about its inception and who was responsible for its inception?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Exclusive of yourself, is there any member on the present editorial board who is known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, Dr. Struik, is not this magazine entitled "Science and Society" a Marxian quarterly of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. The name "Marxian quarterly of the Communist Party" was never on the cover.

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh, I am not asking you if it was on the cover. Neither did this Communist Party cell advertise the place of its meetings. But I am asking you if it is not a fact that it is an organ of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of the sponsors. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you sponsored this conference, if you did sponsor it?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name on it, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you sponsored that conference?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you written and contributed articles to any other organ of the Communist Party besides the magazine Science and Society?

Dr. STRUIK. I object to the question, sir, because you said that Science and Society is a Communist organ, or words to that effect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in effect, you have not denied it.

Dr. STRUIK. I have not denied it, but I do not want to make the impression by answering this question in that form.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already done that by your previous answer.

Dr. STRUIK. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read the question.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter, as follows: "Have you written and contributed articles to any other organ of the Communist Party besides the magazine Science and Society?")

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer the question. It is not well formulated.

Mr. TAVENNER. If your objection is to the form, I will make it more specific. Have you written or contributed articles to the publication Masses and Mainstream?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the December 1948 issue, at page 58, is an article entitled "Public and Private Morals" by Dirk J. Struik. Will you examine it and see if you can identify it?

Dr. STRUIK. I see "Public and Private Morals" by Dirk J. Struik.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the fact that Masses and Mainstream has been cited as an official organ of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write the article that appears in that publication over your name?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a pamphlet, the Civil Rights Congress sponsored a National Civil Rights Legislative Conference in Washington, D. C., on January 17 and 18, 1949. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of the sponsors. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your name was used there, if it was so used?

Dr. STRUIK. I see the name "Prof. Dirk F. Struik," but that is all right, MIT. Then you ask me——

Mr. TAVENNER. To tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a sponsor of that conference.

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Civil Rights Congress also sponsored a Bill of Rights Conference held in New York City July 16 and 17, 1949. The name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of the sponsors of this conference. Will you examine it?

Dr. STRUIK. I see the call to the Bill of Rights Conference, and my name appears on page 6.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you sponsored this conference of the Civil Rights Congress and who solicited your sponsorship?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of January 3, 1949, at page 3, the Committee of One Thousand made public an open letter to Congress urging that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished. Among the signers on page 7 of the Daily Worker appears the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik. Will you examine it?

Dr. STRUIK. I see an article entitled "Signers of Open Letter to End House Un-American Activities Committee," and among the signers I see my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not intimate you do not have the right freely to criticize this committee, but I am interested in the circumstances under which you signed the letter, who obtained your cooperation and support in the criticism of this committee?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of June 20, 1950, at page 2, the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of those who signed the World Peace Appeal, according to an announcement by the Peace Information Center. Does your name so appear?

Dr. STRUIK. My name appears.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you signed this appeal, who solicited your signature?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact on December 4, 1949, at page 10, the name of Prof. Dirk J. Struik appears as one of those signing a statement calling for an international agreement to ban the use of atomic weapons. Did you sign that statement?

Dr. STRUIK. I see my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your name used with your permission?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question. I see that among the initiators of the statement were two Nobel-prize winners and a great number of clergymen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know who solicited those Nobel-prize winners for permission to use their names?

Dr. STRUIK. I don't know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How about you? Who solicited you?

Dr. STRUIK. That I decline to answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Martha H. Fletcher, also known as Mrs. Harold A. Fletcher, Jr.?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Harry Winner?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with his wife, Irene Winner?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Sara Gordon?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Otis Hood?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Struik, I have asked you many questions relating to the committee's record of alleged affiliations by you with Communist-front organizations, which you have declined to answer. Do you desire to make any explanation of your alleged affiliations with such organizations that the committee may have in mind in considering the weight of your testimony?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Professor, as to any of these communications which have been offered in which your name appears as a sponsor or in some other capacity, is there any case in which your name was used without your permission on any of those papers?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any case, in any of these papers offered to you for identification today, in which your name was used without your authority?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sure I noticed you and your worthy counsel here this morning in the committee hearing room; didn't I?

Dr. STRUIK. I was here, sure.

Mr. DOYLE. I thought I observed you two gentlemen in the front row, and I especially observed you when Mr. Winner was in the chair this morning. You recall Mr. Winner was in the chair where you are now sitting?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. When I was questioning him, I was anxious to know about the Samuel Adams School, and he related, in substance, that there were men and women in other occupations who taught at night at the Sam Adams School. Were you one of the gentlemen who was teaching at the Sam Adams School at night?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever visit the Sam Adams School?

Dr. STRUIK (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you know where it was located?

Dr. STRUIK. In Boston.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever see it?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. How do you know it was in Boston?

Dr. STRUIK. I knew it was in Boston because there were advertisements of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Where did you see advertisements of it?

Dr. STRUIK. In the papers.

Mr. DOYLE. What papers?

Dr. STRUIK. I don't know. Perhaps some of the gentlemen behind me can tell you, from the Post or Globe.

Mr. DOYLE. What advertisements did you ever see about the Sam Adams School?

Dr. STRUIK. That I couldn't tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. You said you remembered seeing them.

Dr. STRUIK. Oh, yes, several years ago.

Mr. DOYLE. What did the advertisements have to say?

Dr. STRUIK. I cannot tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. That impressed you, on your mind, after several years?

Dr. STRUIK. They said there was a Sam Adams School in Boston. That is all I remember.

Mr. DOYLE. Where was it located in Boston? Do you remember that, too, after several years, the street number?

Dr. STRUIK. I couldn't tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. How many ads did you see of the Sam Adams School that you remember after several years?

Dr. STRUIK. I couldn't tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. More than one?

Dr. STRUIK. I couldn't tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. Were they advertising night classes or day classes or both?

Dr. STRUIK. I suppose so. I really couldn't tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. What do you remember about it except that you saw it?

Dr. STRUIK. Really nothing more.

Mr. DOYLE. Really nothing. I thought so. You want me, now, as one man to another, to understand that the reason you know anything about the Sam Adams School is that you saw an ad in the paper several years ago? Is that correct?

Dr. STRUIK. I don't understand the question.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you want me, as one American to another, to understand that the only reason you knew the Sam Adams School was located in Boston was because you saw an ad in the paper several years ago with that name to it? Is that correct? I am deliberately reading my question.

Dr. STRUIK. Yes. It is not so easy to answer, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I realize it isn't. Your answers aren't easy to understand, either.

Dr. STRUIK. You asked if there were other reasons to remember that the Sam Adams School was located in Boston?

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. You see, another reason why I asked you that question was, Mr. Philbrick testified yesterday that you were one of the instructors at the Sam Adams School. You have refused to answer that question on the grounds it might incriminate you.

Dr. STRUIK. Right.

Mr. DOYLE. Why would the fact you were an instructor at the Sam Adams School tend to incriminate you?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Why would it incriminate you, in your judgment, to be an instructor at the Sam Adams School any more than it would incriminate you to be an instructor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You said you knew that Mr. Philbrick had testified in the trial of the 11 Communists in New York that you were a Communist. I believe that is what you said you heard he had done. Were you present at the trial and heard him testify?

Dr. STRUIK. No. I was at MIT at the time.

Mr. DOYLE. I beg your pardon. I misunderstood.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., a member of the committee, left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). How old were you when you came to the United States?

Dr. STRUIK. Thirty-one.

Mr. DOYLE. Why did you come?

Dr. STRUIK. I was invited by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to lecture on subjects of mathematics.

Mr. DOYLE. You were naturalized. I take it, therefore, that you realize that we gentlemen here whom you are favoring with your testimony today are Representatives of the United States Congress?

Dr. STRUIK. I recognize it, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. This is your adopted country.

Dr. STRUIK. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. And, therefore, I assume that your obligations to this country are not less than mine. You will agree with that?

Dr. STRUIK. Absolutely.

Mr. DOYLE. You heard me state this morning, very proudly, that I was born in the State of California; and I am sure you were in the committee room when I emphasized to Mr. Wimmer that it was part of the duties of this committee to uncover subversive conduct in this country. You nod your head "Yes"?

Dr. STRUIK. I heard you say that.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, the nod of your head can't go in the record.

Dr. STRUIK. I heard you say that.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your definition of "subversive"?

Dr. STRUIK. I really can't define it.

Mr. DOYLE. You can't define "subversive"?

Dr. STRUIK. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you try, for the benefit of the committee? What does subversive mean in your judgment? You are a highly educated gentleman. We can see that from the number of articles you have written.

Dr. STRUIK. Subversive comes from the Latin word "subvertere," which means to turn over.

Mr. DOYLE. It means to destroy?

Dr. STRUIK. No. I would say "change rather radically." But I am a professor of mathematics.

Mr. DOYLE. Would you accept the definition by Mr. Webster of the word "subversive"?

Dr. STRUIK. I think I could.

Mr. DOYLE. I suggest you read his definition, and you will find it means to destroy. Assuming it does mean to destroy, don't you think we, as a committee of Congress, should go the limit within our constitutional prerogative and jurisdiction to find out people or organizations that are subversive? What is your answer?—not counsel's, please. I am a lawyer, too, Counsel, and I happen to see and hear. Please give me your answer, Professor.

Dr. STRUIK. Sure, it is your duty to find out subversive currents in this country. It is a little difficult, I think, to find out what "subversive" means. You say it means to destroy. There may be many people in this room who will disagree with you on what is destructive. There may even be a difference between members of your committee on that.

Mr. DOYLE. You would agree with me—wouldn't you?—if we had evidence, from Mr. Philbrick, for instance—and you heard it stated you were a Communist—assuming we had his testimony, which we did yesterday, that the Communist Party advocated forceful overthrow of this Government by force and violence if necessary?

Dr. STRUIK. If Mr. Philbrick's statement of the aims of the Communist Party is correct, that would be highly subversive.

Mr. DOYLE. What do you know about the aims of the Communist Party and Marxism? Are they similar?

Dr. STRUIK. The question concerns the relation between the teachings of the Communist Party and Marxism. The Communist Party claims it is based on the teachings of Marx as brought up to date by Lenin. The teachings of Marx are far more than the teachings of the Communist Party. There are several parties that are not called Communist Parties that are based on the teachings of Marx.

Mr. DOYLE. What parties?

Dr. STRUIK. Socialist Labor Party.

Mr. DOYLE. That is one. You said several.

Dr. STRUIK. I didn't say in this country. I think the Socialist Party of Italy is based on the principles of Karl Marx. But Marxism is more than this. Marxism is a philosophy of the world. The Catholic creed is also underlying the behavior of Catholic Parties in Europe, such as in Holland. So Marxism, which is an all-sided philosophy, underlies the political philosophy of many parties.

Mr. DOYLE. I wanted your understanding of the principles of communism and Marxism. Did you ever give this lecture in substance, or in part, at the Sam Adams School?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any suggestions as to what steps we might take to uncover subversive conduct? Have you any suggestions and advice to give this committee, with whom you are meeting today, as an American citizen, as to steps we might take to uncover subversive conduct?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., returned to hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. What is it?

Dr. STRUIK. At present there is a terrible struggle going on in Cicero, Ill. Negroes are being attacked, and the stories in the papers, at any rate, suggest that it needs police protection, not of the Negroes, but of the assailants. I don't know if it is true. I think that is a

place where a Committee on Un-American Activities would be very interested in going.

Mr. DOYLE. As you said, you don't know if it is true or not, but you volunteered that that is a place where we might go.

Mr. STRUIK. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Based on this hearsay?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you have any knowledge of your own of any Communist cells in this country? This committee believes that we have knowledge that communism in this country is subversive. Believe me, sir, I will say to you that we believe that very thoroughly. I am asking you now to tell us. And you are an American citizen charged with the responsibilities of an American citizen, and evidently you have prospered in this country?

Dr. STRUIK. I am proud of it.

Mr. DOYLE. So are we.

Dr. STRUIK. I have had my greatest chances in America, sir, and I will never forget it.

Mr. DOYLE. On that basis, then, do you have any knowledge of any Communist cells in this country? We are telling you that we believe communism is subversive in this country. I am inviting you to tell us whether or not you have any personal knowledge of any Communist cells in the country. Will you answer that, or will you claim the fifth amendment?

Dr. STRUCK. I have to decline——

Mr. DOYLE. No; as our chairman has told you, you don't have to decline. You don't have to do anything here.

Dr. STRUIK. May I offer you another suggestion for activity of this committee?

Mr. DOYLE. I think I have taken up my time. I just wish to say this to you, sir: I have two grandchildren who arrived in Washington last night to visit us a month, and I hope they don't grow up to my age and come face to face with so many men who have been blessed and have prospered in this country and then refuse to cooperate with the United States Congress in trying to uncover subversive conduct.

Dr. STRUIK. I agree with you wholeheartedly in the sense I hope my own daughters will never come in contact with people who, like the hoodlums in Cicero, try to undermine the Constitution by force and violence.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't tell me that the only thing you know about the Sam Adams School is that you saw an ad in the paper several years ago.

Dr. STRUIK. I didn't say that.

Mr. DOYLE. I practiced law some 25 years, and I make some of my own conclusions, and I have a right to make them, when a witness answers as you do. I am not happy over it, and I want you to know I am not happy over such an answer to a frank question by me.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Dr. Struik, I believe you stated you were naturalized in 1936?

Dr. STRUIK. I was naturalized in 1934.

Mr. FRAZIER. Since that time, have you traveled in foreign countries?

Dr. STRUIK. I was abroad in 1934 and 1935, and I gave counsel—is that your title?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Dr. STRUIK. A short report on that.

Mr. FRAZIER. At the time you took the oath as an American citizen, did you have any reservations?

Dr. STRUIK. None whatever. On the contrary, I was proud to take the oath of allegiance.

Mr. FRAZIER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Dr. STRUIK. I have to decline——

Mr. WOOD. Let's not use the word "have." Do you decline?

Dr. STRUIK. I am sorry. I decline.

Mr. FRAZIER. At that time you also swore that you would bear arms in defense of this country?

Dr. STRUIK. I am not quite sure if that was in the oath, but if it was, I certainly took it, and I fully agree with the sentiment expressed by it.

Mr. FRAZIER. You have taught since what date at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology?

Dr. STRUIK. In 1926 I began to teach.

Mr. WOOD. Did you say 1936?

Dr. STRUIK. No; 1926.

Mr. FRAZIER. Have you engaged in any other work than teaching?

Dr. STRUIK. At MIT?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Dr. STRUIK. That is a long stretch of time. Give me a moment to think. I have done some administrative work on committees, and I have done an enormous amount of mathematical research.

Mr. FRAZIER. How many lectures did you deliver a week out there?

Dr. STRUIK. During the war we went up to 15. Now it is summer school, and I have only one course of one and a half hours, but I expect to teach in the fall 9 hours a week.

Mr. FRAZIER. You seem to have had a great many other activities away from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. STRUIK. Well, spread over the years it seems like a good deal, but most of that is science only; but I have always tried to give my time and support to such causes as I think are in the best interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. FRAZIER. No further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Dr. Struik, my distinguished colleague on the committee, Mr. Doyle, of California, said something about your favoring us with testimony, and with all due deference to Mr. Doyle, I must have missed some of the testimony, because I don't recall that we have had any testimony from you aside from your educational background.

I must say I am in full agreement with you so far as Cicero, Ill., is concerned. Certainly an investigation is in order in Cicero.

Would you sign an oath of loyalty to this country as a condition of employment or as a condition of travel abroad?

Dr. STRUIK. Would I sign what?

Mr. JACKSON. A loyalty oath.

Dr. STRUK. I am unalterably opposed to so-called loyalty oaths.

Mr. JACKSON. Suppose, as a condition to travel abroad, you would be required to sign the loyalty oath, would you so sign?

Dr. STRUK. It would depend on the wording of such loyalty oath. Certain loyalty oaths that have been proposed are objectionable.

Mr. JACKSON. Suppose the loyalty oath said you were not a member of any group or organization that advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Dr. STRUK (after consultation with his counsel). May I ask a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Answer my question. Suppose that the oath you were required to take as a condition to obtaining a passport required the statement from you that you were not a member of any group or organization that advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence; would you sign such oath?

Dr. STRUK. In principle I would not object.

Mr. JACKSON. You would sign such an oath?

Dr. STRUK. I believe I would.

Mr. JACKSON. Could you take such an oath in good conscience?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ALLEN. Might the question be repeated?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Could the witness sign such an oath in good conscience?

Mr. ALLEN. In the future?

Mr. JACKSON. At the present time.

Dr. STRUK. I decline to answer that question because it would tend to incriminate me.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you traveled abroad during the past 10 years?

Dr. STRUK. Last 10 years? No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You traveled abroad when?

Dr. STRUK. 1934 and 1935.

Mr. JACKSON. Not since then?

Dr. STRUK. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Where did your visit take you at that time? Is that the same journey you referred to in your early testimony?

Dr. STRUK. Yes. And I was once in Canada on a short trip.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you ever a member of the German-American Bund?

Dr. STRUK (after consultation with his counsel). I decline to answer the question, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you ever subscribe to the Chicago Tribune?

Dr. STRUK. I bought it occasionally when I was in Chicago.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you buy the Daily Worker occasionally when you were in New York?

Dr. STRUK. Sure.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you subscribe to the Daily Worker?

Dr. STRUK. I am a subscriber to the Daily Worker.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you subscribe to the New Masses?

Dr. STRUK. What is that?

Mr. JACKSON. Masses and Mainstream?

Dr. STRUK. Yes, I am a subscriber.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever known personally a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. STRUK. Now, let's see. I decline to answer the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever known a member of the Republican Party?

Dr. STRUIK. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever known a member of the Democratic Party?

Dr. STRUIK. As a matter of fact, I am a Democrat in the primary.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever advocated or endorsed the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. In this connection, I call your attention again to the article in the Boston Post of Saturday, April 9, 1949, in which it is stated, in part:¹

Professor Struik, however, said he "believes in many of the Communist principles" but considers himself a Marxist and said "a Marxist does not believe in the violent overthrow of the Government,"

Is that a correct quotation?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer the question, sir. May I, however, add something to this if you permit?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; briefly.

Dr. STRUIK. Being a Marxist, I joined in the last war in the attack to overthrow the Governments of Italy and Germany.

Mr. JACKSON. So did every Communist in the country. It became a matter of fanatical ambition.

Dr. STRUIK. Sir, the Communists in Germany, from all I know, were opposed to the Hitler regime from the beginning.

Mr. JACKSON. How did you feel about the entry of the United Nations in Korea?

Dr. STRUIK. I was sorry to see it, sir. I have always, from the beginning, stood for an honorable, peaceful solution to that unfortunate conflict. I am glad to say that there is a good chance that something like this may happen in the near future.

Mr. JACKSON. Again quoting from the article in the Boston Post, there is a direct quotation from you in which you describe Mr. Philbrick as "a stool pigeon of no intellectual standing." Is that a correct statement?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that the 12 Communists who were indicted in New York were victims of a frame-up, as you are quoted again as saying in this article?

Dr. STRUIK. A word like "frame-up" is an emotional word, but I would like to say I think it was unfortunate that the Communist leaders were found guilty in the Foley Square trial. It was a miscarriage of justice.

Mr. JACKSON. In conclusion, I desire to make a very brief statement for the record.

If you are not a member of the Communist Party and have never been a member of the Communist Party, you have compiled a record of affiliations with Communist-front organizations that would throw most of the witnesses who have appeared before us in a blue funk, or turn them green with envy. It is one of the most startling records that has been presented since I have been a member of this committee. In fact, some of the front organizations I had never heard of before counsel mentioned them today.

¹ See p. 1402.

It seems to me you have, in effect, advertently or inadvertently, offered every aid and comfort to the Communist Party by your activities in Communist fronts.

You have refused to cooperate with the committee to any extent in answering questions put to you in regard to your activities, and your claims of possible self-incrimination have passed the conceivable realm where you could in any way be held responsible for answering.

You have been identified by the previous witness as a member of the Communist Party, and in that connection you have refused to confirm or deny that alleged membership or public statements which have been attributed to you, in the public press in some instances.

Your entire testimony must leave this committee—I cannot speak for the committee—must leave me in the position of believing that you have been a member of the Communist Party, that you have lent aid and comfort to the Communist Party, that you have lectured at the Sam Adams School, and I think, based on the record, that any assumption that might be drawn by the American people after you leave the stand is as a result of your own failure to cooperate with this committee.

Do you feel that your constitutional rights have been observed during this hearing?

Dr. STRUIK (after consultation with his counsel). I can say this, sir—

Mr. JACKSON. I would like you to answer my question.

Dr. STRUIK. It is difficult for me to answer that question, because I am not a lawyer.

Mr. JACKSON. You have been permitted counsel?

Dr. STRUIK. I have been permitted counsel.

Mr. JACKSON. No duress has been placed on you to answer questions when you chose not to answer on grounds of self-incrimination?

Dr. STRUIK. Correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you feel that any of your constitutional or civil rights have been overlooked by this committee?

Dr. STRUIK. I may say this, that a listing of perfectly good, idealistic, patriotic organizations as Communist-front organizations has been highly prejudicial, not only to me but to others.

Mr. JACKSON. Idealistic, patriotic organizations that have been found secretly transferring papers of this Government to other governments, planting their agents in various organizations, and doing other things in such a manner that they would have assumed more gentility if performed in some other manner.

That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Tavenner, did you have additional questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. The catalog of the Sam Adams School for the summer session, 1947, reflects you were a member of the board of trustees at that time, as well as an instructor.

Is it correct that you were a member of the board of trustees and an instructor at the Sam Adams School in 1947?

Dr. STRUIK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire the right to produce a copy of that catalog and include it as a part of this record as Struik exhibit No. 5.

Mr. WOOD. So ordered.

(The catalog above referred to, marked "Struik Exhibit No. 5," is filed herewith.¹)

Mr. WOOD. Is that the only question you have?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused from further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. So ordered.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson, did you have a statement you desired to make?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

In today's Washington Star there appears an article headed, "Shub, Wertheimer keep Reserve commissions."

I call to the committee's attention the fact that on July 12 last Louis Julius Shub and Gunther Wertheimer appeared before this committee and refused to answer questions put to them by counsel of the committee.

Both Shub and Wertheimer hold Reserve commissions, in the Army and Navy respectively.

The Defense Department has announced that under present policy there will be no revocation of commissions in the armed services of witnesses who appear before this committee and refuse to testify.

It is my feeling in the matter that the holding of a Reserve commission in the armed services of the United States is a privilege and not an obligation, and witnesses who refuse to testify concerning their Communist affiliations and Communist activities should not be retained in positions of trust and responsibility in the armed services, where they are in a position to create considerable havoc and do considerable harm in the event of trouble.

It is my intention to introduce legislation in the House within the next several days for the purpose of relieving such individuals of commissions in the Armed Forces in the event of their refusal to answer the legitimate questions put to them when they appear before this committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand in recess subject to call.

(Thereupon, at 5:05 p. m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

¹ Filed with the records of this hearing by the committee.

**EXPOSÉ OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
(BASED ON THE TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK)**

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 11:45 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, and Charles E. Potter.

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

Mr. Wood. Let us come to order, please.

Let the record show that, acting under the authority vested in me as chairman of this committee, I have set up a subcommittee for the purpose of holding this hearing, consisting of Mr. Doyle, Mr. Velde, and Mr. Potter. The members are all present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Donald Bollen.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BOLLEN. I do.

Mr. FORER. We object to the absence of a quorum of the full committee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented here by counsel, Mr. Bollen?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will the counsel identify himself for the record, please?

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

We are proceeding under protest, Mr. Chairman.

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

**TESTIMONY OF DONALD C. BOLLEN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
JOSEPH FORER**

Mr. BOLLEN. Donald C. Bollen.

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

Mr. BOLLEN. On July 11, 1920, in Quincy, Mass.

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

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, I went to grammar school, finished junior high school, which was the ninth grade, and went perhaps a few months in the tenth grade. That is, the first year of my senior high school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you begin with that date—or rather, what was the date of your completion of the tenth grade?

Mr. BOLLEN. As I recall it, it was 1935, the winter of 1935 and 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment since that period of time?

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, I don't remember every particular job that I have had since then, because I have had so many short-time jobs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, leaving out the short-time jobs, what has been your main source of employment since 1935?

Mr. BOLLEN. My main source, or the job that I had during most of that period, was field organizer for the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin in that work?

Mr. BOLLEN. Oh, about the fall of 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you continue in that position?

Mr. BOLLEN. I was a field organizer from then until about December 1943, or at least around the end of 1943, possibly November. Then I was a field organizer again for the United Electrical Workers from about the middle of 1944, possibly July or August, until the end of 1950 or the first of 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1942, how were you employed?

Mr. BOLLEN. I had several jobs, as I said before. I have worked on a farm. I was an usher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let us take, say, from 1940 to 1942.

Mr. BOLLEN. I worked in the shipyards at Fall River and Quincy, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the entire period from 1940 to 1942?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom did you work?

Mr. BOLLEN. The name of the company I think was the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the name of the yard at that time was the Fall River Shipyard.

Mr. TAVENNER. And where was this located, this work?

Mr. BOLLEN. In Quincy, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, between 1943 and 1944, how were you employed?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question, because my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, when you ceased to be an organizer for the UE, in 1950, what employment did you take?

Mr. BOLLEN. I became a leather worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. BOLLEN. At the Bay State Belting Co. in Salem, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside, Mr. Bollen?

Mr. BOLLEN. I now reside at 177 Essex Street, Lynn, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you still employed in the leather work that you just mentioned?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bollen, a witness by the name of Mr. Herbert Arthur Philbrick testified before this committee on July 23, 1951. In the course of his testimony he revealed the fact that he had been a member of the Young Communist League, and that an organization known as the American Youth for Democracy was formed, which was the outgrowth and successor to the Young Communist League.

In the course of his testimony, he stated that there was a slate of officers for the newly formed organization, known as the American Youth for Democracy, and that this slate of officers, the first officers elected, was actually set up and formed by the Communist Party. He referred to the fact that he was one of the officers on that slate, I think State treasurer of the organization. He testified that you were its chairman and that you were one of the members of this slate.

I would like to ask you to tell the committee how this slate was organized and what information you have regarding the method by which you were elected as chairman of this new organization, the American Youth for Democracy, if it is true that you were so elected.

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons that I gave before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you chairman of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you were an organizer for the UE. In what district did you perform your work as organizer?

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, in the State of Massachusetts, which is called district 2 of the UE. It is a part of district 2.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever an employee of the General Electric Co. in Lynn, Mass.?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I was never employed by the General Electric Co. in my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. But there was a local of the UE union in General Electric; was there not?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; there was and is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your work as organizer included the performance of your duties as organizer in the union located at Lynn, Mass., with the General Electric; did it not?

Mr. BOLLEN. To the best of my recollection I have never actually had any official assignment, so to speak, with that local union, with the exception of perhaps someone calling me up a couple of times to distribute a leaflet or something like that. But, actually, my main assignment with the union was never to work with that local union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that excepted from your general assignment; and, if so, why?

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, I don't know the reason why, but I was just given certain assignments, and I carried them out, and that happened to be one of several local unions that I wasn't assigned to.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was within the area in which you performed your duties as an organizer for the UE; was it not?

Mr. BOLLEN. I have performed some duties as a UE organizer within the general area of North Shore.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which would include the General Electric plant?

Mr. BOLLEN. The General Electric plant is in the North Shore area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, during the course of the testimony of Mr. Philbrick it developed from his testimony that he was a member of the State education committee of the Communist Party. We developed through Mr. Philbrick at quite considerable length his activity within the Communist Party. In fact, the testimony showed that he had acted in an undercover capacity within the Communist Party for a Government agency from 1940 or 1941 until the time that his identity as connected with the Communist Party was disclosed in his testimony in the trial of the 11 Communists in New York in the spring of 1949.

Now, considerable details were developed in the course of his testimony regarding his activities and his connection with the Communist Party, in order to ascertain to what extent he was acquainted with the Communist Party decisions and policy with reference to infiltration by the Communist Party into heavy industry in the Massachusetts area. And that is the general subject of this investigation, and that is why we have called you here to ascertain from you what information you may have upon that subject and to call upon you to fully and frankly give the committee the benefit of your knowledge.

In the course of Mr. Philbrick's testimony, he said this. And I will omit questions which I asked him and will read directly from his testimony, which will give you a background and a thorough understanding of his testimony.

May I ask you at this point: Have you read his testimony?

Mr. BOLLEN. I have read some of it in the newspapers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I think I should read to you from his testimony, as follows: This was a question. I will read one question.¹

As a result of your experience and your contacts within the Communist Party, did you become aware of the policies and plans of the Communist Party with reference to basic industries after the revival of the Communist Party in 1945?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question—

Mr. TAVENNER. I haven't asked you a question. I am reading the question that was asked Mr. Philbrick.

And then he gave this answer: that he was familiar with it. Then I asked him:

Will you tell the committee of these matters?

And Mr. Philbrick answered:

In 1946 and 1947, as an executive of the Communist Party, I attended what were known as district executive conferences held in Boston. I believe these were entitled "party-building conferences," and each of them I found was for the purpose of infiltrating heavy industry or key industries in our area and the United States.

I remember specifically at one of the party-building conferences the parties were instructed to take positions as colonizers; that is, to take upon themselves the duty of being colonizers in the key industries. That meant if you had a job in a small business or nonessential industry you should leave it and take a job in one of the key industries. These key industries were listed by the party leaders. We were told they were industries important to the war effort. We were instructed that the imperialist aims of the United States, the war-promoting purposes of the United States, were to carry on a war against the Soviet Union and a war against the free peoples of the world; that is, peoples under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Union. We were told that the chief means at the disposal of the American imperialists was the productive capacity of this country, which they said was owned directly by the capitalists of the United States. We were taught that since that was the key weapon it was the weapon we had to attack and destroy as Communists.

¹ See pp. 1282 and 1283.

We were told in New England one of the key industries consisted of the General Electric plant in Lynn. We were told one reason why colonizers were needed there was because it was involved in the development of defense industries, including jet airplane engines.

I might point out that at that time no one outside the party had any knowledge that jet airplane engines were being developed in the airplane plant in Lynn, but they knew that.

Another key industry was the communications industry. Another was the leather industry, boots and shoes. And another was the clothes industry, service clothes, and so forth. We were told that the steel industry and lines of transportation were very important centers for Communist Party infiltration and colonization. So, various comrades were ordered at this time to take up jobs at these spots.

We were told in certain sections of the country the steel industry would be the main point of concentration, whereas in New England the steel industry was not as important. We had seven or eight comrades assigned to the General Electric plant in Lynn and only one assigned to the steel industry, to my knowledge, to set up the colonization program.

As a part of the colonization program but carried out very secretly, a survey was conducted of certain plants. This was a very complete survey. That program in New England was under the direction of Daniel Boone Schirmer. I was told it was on a national level, but my only information concerning it came from this local level. I came upon it more or less by accident. I was working at Communist Party headquarters on leaflet production at that time. One of the means of preparing the survey was a mimeographed form which I happened to prepare for Daniel Boone Schirmer. This had to do completely with industrial plants, although I understand they made investigations along other lines, too. These particular forms I worked on had to do with a complete survey of the plants, what they were producing, how many they were producing, the labor unions, the number of employees, also the number of comrades in these plants, and exactly what influence the comrades had in the unions. They also included a review of the training and qualifications of the various comrades working in these plants.

As I say, I came upon it somewhat by accident and, therefore, did not know how much information Daniel Boone Schirmer was getting from the comrades in the plants, but I know he was calling on them for very specific information, including blueprints, but I had no knowledge of any particular blueprints.

I know that at least eight, possibly more, Communist Party members were assigned to the General Electric plant in Lynn.

Then he names a number of people, including the name "Don Bollen." Were you known as Don Bollen among your friends?

MR. BOLLEN. Either Don Bollen or Donald Bollen.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to perform any function for the Communist Party at the General Electric plant at Lynn, as indicated by Mr. Philbrick's testimony?

MR. BOLLEN. Would you ask that question again, please?

MR. TAVENNER. Would you read the question, please Mr. Reporter.

(The reporter read the question referred to.)

MR. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds as before.

MR. TAVENNER. Referring to that part of Mr. Philbrick's testimony where he said that he was instructed that the imperialist aims of the United States, the war-promoting purposes of the United States, were to carry on a war against the Soviet Union, and that the productive capacity of this country was the weapon which had to be attacked and destroyed by the Communists, did you receive any instructions, or were you present at any conference or gathering where that thought was expressed?

MR. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that for the same reasons as before.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick said that it was not generally known by the public that jet airplane engines were being manufactured at the

General Electric plant, but that members of the Communist Party knew it. Were you personally acquainted with the fact that jet engines were being manufactured at the General Electric plant in 1945?

MR. BOLLEN. I am not exactly sure of the dates, as to when I learned of it, but for a few years I have known of it. I have read it in the newspapers.

MR. TAVENNER. You obtained your information from the newspapers?

MR. BOLLEN. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you obtain it from any other source?

MR. BOLLEN. I may have heard workers talking about it in Lynn. Perhaps I did.

MR. TAVENNER. When did you first learn of it through workers?

MR. BOLLEN. I don't know the exact date.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, you stated you did not know exactly. Can you give the committee a reasonable idea as to what year you did ascertain that information?

MR. BOLLEN. I just can't remember when I first heard it.

MR. TAVENNER. When you state you heard it from workers, do you know whether any one of the persons who told you of the jet engine work being done at General Electric at Lynn was a member of the Communist Party?

MR. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons given before.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, in his testimony, as you will recall, from my having read it, referred to a survey that was being conducted at these various plants by the Communist Party. As a union organizer, did you give instructions to any person within your union as to the furnishing of information to you from which a report or a survey could be prepared regarding the various matters which I read to you, namely, what the plants were producing, how many they were producing, the number of employees, the number of comrades—meaning Communist Party members—in the plants, and what influence the Communist Party members had in the unions?

MR. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons given before.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you also give directions to any person to furnish you with information regarding the lay-out of plants to be furnished by you to that other person?

MR. BOLLEN. I refuse, for the same reasons given before, to answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you report the lay-out of any plants within your district or any of these other matters which I have just mentioned such as the number of Communist Party members in a particular union or the nature of the work, to or for the benefit of the Communist Party?

MR. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Nat Goodman, Nathaniel Goodman—or Robert Goodman?

MR. BOLLEN. The question is, Am I acquainted with Robert Goodman?

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know where he worked?

MR. BOLLEN. The General Electric plant in Lynn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Nathaniel Mills?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, I have been acquainted with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he worked?

Mr. BOLLEN. The General Electric Co. in Lynn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Joseph Figueiredo?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were either Mr. Robert Goodman or Mr. Nathaniel Mills members of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Donald Tormey?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, I am.

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

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mr. BOLLEN. I believe his title was international representative of the UE.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what district?

Mr. BOLLEN. In district 2, Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that include the General Electric plant at Lynn?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I referred in reading Mr. Philbrick's testimony to a person by the name of Daniel Boone Schirmer. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Philbrick, in the course of his testimony, designated you as one of the persons who was directed by the Communist Party to engage in the colonization of the General Electric plant at Lynn for the Communist Party. Was Mr. Philbrick truthful in that statement?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question, because it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of Mr. Philbrick's testimony he was asked if he knew what success had been achieved by the Communist Party in its efforts to colonize the General Electric plant in Lynn, Mass., and to that question Mr. Philbrick replied:¹

I did understand in contact with Donald Bollen at a latter date that he was quite happy with the results up to that time, but specific information I have none.

Do you recall having made that statement to Mr. Philbrick?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question, because it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask the question—it is rather a double question; I probably should have asked you it in separate form. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

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

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

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

¹ See p. 1285.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle, any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Bollen, I see you were born in the month of July. That month, according to people who believe in those things, has produced people who are generally very patriotic, very unselfish, very generous, and have other motives that human beings ought to have.

I was also born in that month.

Mr. FORER. We were waiting for that.

Mr. DOYLE. With that premise, may I say: How old were you when you were a field organizer the first time for the United Electrical Workers? That was in 1942?

Mr. BOLLEN. To the best of my recollection, I was 22 years old.

Mr. DOYLE. Only 22?

Mr. BOLLEN. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. How did you come by experience enough prior to 1942 to be chosen as an organizer for a union of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers? What was your experience before 1942?

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, I was in the machinists department in the shipyard and became acquainted with the union there and decided I wanted to be an organizer.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you work from 1942 full time, at a full salary?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Had you been an organizer in that shipyard union of the United Electrical Workers prior to 1942?

Mr. BOLLEN. I was a steward, and I don't remember exactly whether I was an executive board member or not, but I believe I was at that time.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, were there as many men as young as you, at 22, say, who were leaders of the UE in those days in your area?

Mr. BOLLEN. You say of the UE union?

Mr. DOYLE. I mean were there many men of such young age as you who were stewards and organizers, and so forth, at 22 or 23 years of age in that union in those days?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't know whether there was or not.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your impression? I am not trying to catch you. I am just interested to know generally what the leadership was in that area in those days among those union workers.

Mr. BOLLEN. My impression is that there probably weren't very many at that young in age.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, I have a right to assume that you had unusual ability.

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. FORER. I think he should have refused to answer that.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask, Were you married at that time?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I was not.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you married now?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. DOYLE. I suppose you have some children?

Mr. BOLLEN. Two.

Mr. DOYLE. How old are they, approximately?

Mr. BOLLEN. I have a son 4 years old and a daughter approximately 10 or 11 months old.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you will agree with me again when I say you are a lucky man. I am sure you do. Those children were both born in Massachusetts?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. During your first term of 1942-43 as organizer for the UE workers, was there any controversy within that union—I mean your local union, the shipyard union—as between what you would generally term now and what you know I generally term, it being a commonly accepted term, the Communists and anti-Communists? Had that developed yet in the Massachusetts area?

Mr. BOLLEN. I would like to ask you to clarify that statement, because, you have mentioned both unions, and one of the unions you mentioned I had no affiliation with during that period.

Mr. DOYLE. I am glad you did ask me to clarify it. I realize it wasn't clear. I refer now to the time you were steward in the union, before you became an organizer in the shipyard union. Was there any controversy in that local union of which you were steward, as between the Communist group and those who were not?

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, there are all kinds of controversies. I would like to know just what kind of controversies you mean.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, in other words, you know what a Communist is. You have heard of them. Possibly you have met some of them, maybe in your own union. That is true, isn't it? You know what a Communist is? I am merely laying the basis now to see if I can clarify my question for you. I meant to ask you very clearly and very specifically, if you please, whether or not in your local union of which you were steward prior to the time you became organizer the first time for the UE there was any controversy between those known to be Communists, if there were such in your union at that time, and those who opposed the Communists, any controversy for positions of officers or positions of leadership in the union, for instance?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question on the same basis that I gave before, for the same reasons.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean that I am to understand that just telling me the fact as to whether or not there was a controversy might incriminate you? How would that possibly incriminate you? I am not asking you whether or not you were a Communist.

Mr. BOLLEN. I have already given my answer, and I still refuse for the same reasons I gave before.

Mr. DOYLE. Now I will ask you this, then. During the time you were the organizer for the UEW, from '42 to '43, the first time, was there any controversy in the UEW in the Lynn or Boston areas between the Communists and anti-Communists, to your knowledge?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. DOYLE. May I preface this next question and all the rest of these questions by making the frank statement to you: I am acquainted with some members of the UEW in my own State, and I am not entirely uninformed as to some of these questions I am asking here. So I am well aware of some of the controversies. But I am wondering whether you wouldn't cooperate with us, as a congressional committee, and help us to know what the problem was in organized labor. You see, I am one of the Members of Congress that believes rather strongly in the rights of the American workmen to

organize and to bargain collectively. I believe in it very vigorously, sir. And you apparently did when you were organizer.

Are you an organizer now in any way for any union?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I am not.

Mr. DOYLE. Since when did that end?

Mr. BOLLEN. As I answered before, around the end of 1950 or the beginning of 1951.

Mr. DOYLE. And that was your second assignment as an organizer, then, that ended in '50?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And during your second assignment, were you a full-time employee of the UEW as organizer?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, I was.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever see this man, Philbrick, that we questioned you about?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that for the same reasons.

Mr. DOYLE. I did not ask you if you knew him, sir. Would it possibly incriminate you in your judgment if you answered whether you ever saw the man?

Mr. BOLLEN. That was my answer. I repeat: I refuse to answer for the same reasons I gave before.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of any lodge now or any union now of any kind?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, I am.

Mr. DOYLE. What union?

Mr. BOLLEN. The International Fur and Leather Workers' Union.

Mr. DOYLE. What was the name of that union, again?

Mr. WOOD. The International Fur and Leather Workers' Union.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you an officer in it?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I am not.

Mr. DOYLE. Were you ever an officer in it?

Mr. BOLLEN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a committee man in it?

Mr. BOLLEN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever been?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I have not.

Mr. DOYLE. Has there been any controversy in that union between the Communists and non-Communists?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason I gave before.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you serve in the Armed Forces in the last war?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I didn't.

Mr. DOYLE. Why?

Mr. BOLLEN. I was put in 4-F because of a physical problem that I have.

Mr. DOYLE. If you were called by the United States Government to serve in the Armed Forces in this Korean conflict or any other conflict in which the United States Government was at arms with a foreign nation, would you willingly, gladly, serve?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I would go.

Mr. DOYLE. And in that connection, are you aware of what the job of this committee is? Has your counsel told you or has any one else told you what the function of this committee is?

Mr. BOLLEN. I believe so.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you read it?

Mr. BOLLEN. I have read it in the newspapers.

Mr. DOYLE. What newspaper?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't know exactly what newspaper.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't know. What newspaper did you read the testimony of Mr. Philbrick in, that you said you read? And when did you read it?

Mr. BOLLEN. Well, I can't remember all of the newspapers that I may have read any of the testimony in, but I did read it in the Boston Globe, the Boston Record, and very likely the Lynn papers, the Lynn Item—

Mr. DOYLE. Did you read it in any other paper, a weekly paper, for instance, published by any organization? Do you take any paper, besides reading the daily papers?

Mr. BOLLEN. What papers do you mean?

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, published by any organization, by your own union, for instance.

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, sir; I take the union paper.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you read about the Philbrick hearings in that?

Mr. BOLLEN. No, I didn't.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you read about the Philbrick hearings at the time they occurred?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I believe I did.

Mr. DOYLE. From day to day?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't remember if I read them from day to day. I just remember reading them.

Mr. DOYLE. And did you read in the paper where he mentioned you in this testimony?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I did.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever denied what he said about you in any way?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I have denied some of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Where?

Mr. BOLLEN. I denied something in a newspaper, I believe, the Lynn Telegram-News.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you a copy of it?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I haven't.

Mr. DOYLE. Where can we have a copy of it? Will you furnish the committee a copy of it? Was it a statement prepared by you?

Mr. BOLLEN. I issued a statement; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any part of the testimony of Mr. Philbrick which Mr. Tavenner has asked you about that you want to deny now? You have heard what Mr. Tavenner read, that he testified to.

Mr. BOLLEN. No; there isn't.

Mr. DOYLE. If you deny any part of it in the newspaper, what is that part, so that you might repeat here a denial of anything he said?

Mr. FORER. Would you make a little clearer just what you are asking?

Mr. DOYLE. My point is this, Mr. Counsel, and Mr. Bollen: What part of Mr. Philbrick's testimony was it that you denied in your newspaper statement? Will you tell us?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't remember from recollection all of the statement, but I would be glad to get a copy of it and send it to the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I am asking you what your statement was to the paper in substance. Do you not remember that?

Mr. BOLLEN. Rather than attempting to describe the actual article and what was in it, I would rather have the committee see it completely.

Mr. DOYLE. We would rather, too, but you are here now, and you are under oath. What was it that you said through the newspaper release about Mr. Philbrick's statement that you denied? Why do you not deny the same things now?

Mr. FORER. One question at a time.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, just to help the witness—I do not mean to interrupt him while he is conferring with counsel.

Mr. FORER. No, the problem was that I don't know which question you asked, Mr. Doyle, because you asked two.

Mr. DOYLE. When I asked the second it was to give him, and you as his counsel, my thinking. If he denied it, then why will he not deny it now? That is what I am asking.

Will you now deny what you denied through the newspaper and tell us what it was?

Mr. FORER. Our problem is that there are still two questions there.

Mr. DOYLE. I will make it one question. What statement did you make to the newspaper in denial or claim of denial as to Mr. Philbrick's testimony involving you?

Mr. BOLLEN. To the best of my recollection, I said that I never worked at the General Electric Co. and I am not a member of the Communist Party. And I remember ending up with something about: I don't intend to be intimidated by such charges—or something like that.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all you remember of your own prepared statement, after reading Mr. Philbrick's testimony involving you?

Mr. BOLLEN. That is all I can remember right now.

Mr. DOYLE. How long ago was that, approximately?

Mr. BOLLEN. It was either a week or 2 weeks. I can't remember.

Mr. DOYLE. It was along in the middle of July of this year, was it not, that he testified? Now, when did your denial come out in the papers, that you prepared? I have not seen it, you see. That is why I am asking.

Mr. BOLLEN. It was between a week and 2 weeks ago. Just when, I don't remember.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean 2 weeks previous to this date today, October 10?

Mr. BOLLEN. I would say it was between that period and a week ago.

Mr. WOOD. You say in that statement you denied that you are a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I did.

Mr. WOOD. Do you deny it now, under oath?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that for the same reasons I gave before.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, let me see if I understand, young man. Because I do not want to ask you two questions in one and have you confused

at all. You read Mr. Philbrick's statement involving you, and then you issued a press release, you say, between 2 and 3 weeks ago. In that you made the denials such as you chose to of Mr. Philbrick's statement involving you. I take it, therefore, and you tell me if I am in error, please, that in that newspaper release you denied everything that you believed was untrue in Mr. Philbrick's statement. Is that true?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't understand your question.

Mr. DOYLE. I thought it was very simple. In that press release which you issued between 2 and 3 weeks ago, did you deny every charge or statement which Mr. Philbrick made against you which you felt was untrue?

Mr. BOLLEN. Even to this day I haven't read all the charges that he has made. I am not familiar with all of them.

Mr. WOOD. Would you yield to me again?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; indeed.

Mr. WOOD. You stated a while ago, as I understood it, that you were willing to submit to this committee a copy of the statement that you did make to the press. Is that true?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Are you willing to submit that to the committee?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. WOOD. Are you willing to come before the committee with that statement and state under oath what you state in the statement?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I am not willing.

Mr. DOYLE. If you say you did not read all Mr. Philbrick's statement involving you, but you read some of it, how do you know he said anything about you that you did not read?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't know, if I haven't read it.

Mr. DOYLE. You are sure no one has told you that he said anything else about you which you did not read?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't know.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't know. I notice when our counsel asked you or told you that Mr. Philbrick testified before this committee that you were chairman of the American Youth for Democracy, you said, "I refuse to answer that for the reason that the answer might incriminate me." Do you remember your answer to that question?

Mr. BOLLEN. What was the question?

Mr. DOYLE. Here a few minutes ago our legal counsel asked you whether or not Mr. Philbrick's testimony, under oath by the way, that you were chairman of the American Youth for Democracy was true, was a fact. And you said, "I refuse to answer on the grounds that the answer might incriminate me."

Mr. BOLLEN. I remember saying that.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, you read in the paper, did you not, that Mr. Philbrick had said that you had been at one time chairman of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, I did.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you deny that in the paper?

Mr. BOLLEN. No, I didn't.

Mr. DOYLE. Why, if it was untrue?

Mr. BOLLEN. That didn't occur to me. That wasn't the main question that I wanted to answer.

MR. DOYLE. What were the main questions you answered other than the two you have given us? I mean, other than the two statements which you say you put in the paper, and which you denied through the newspaper statement, what other statements were there in that newspaper article which you read which you did not answer which you now want to deny under oath? Three weeks ago, young man, you made a statement through a newspaper. It was not under oath then. I have not had the benefit of reading that article. But I would suggest to you, as one American to another, that here would be a pretty good opportunity for you to clean up this matter under oath and tell this committee, as a committee of your Congressmen, if there is anything else that appeared in the Philbrick statement that you want to deny. Why do you not come in good faith before us, instead of hiding behind the first and fifth amendments? What keeps you from coming clean, as a father of two American children, in coming before a committee of Congress? What are you afraid of? Is that too blunt?

MR. BOLLEN. No, I don't think that question is too blunt.

MR. DOYLE. Then why do you not come forward, as a father of two children, born and raised in this good country that gave you birth? We are not trying to catch anyone, Mr. Bollen, believe me. We are not trying to trap anyone. We are asking your cooperation as a person that we have information was a former Communist, if you are not now. And I am especially taking the time of this committee, and I hope the committee will not be aggravated with me in asking one more question of this young man.

I am especially interested in you, sir, because you were so young when you went into organized labor work, 22 years of age. You are the father of two fine kids. You have a great future ahead of you if you use it right. And we are trying to prevent a world conflagration that may put your boy in arms like mine was; where he may not come through, as mine did not. I am saying to you that you had better wake up. Here is your chance, in good faith, clean, without any duress or without any pressure, to come forward as a young American and help the American Congress to discover where there are subversive influences and subversive programs. And if it is true that you were a leader of the Young Communist League or a Young Communist Committee of any kind at one time in this country—suppose you were. You might have been misled and misguided like a lot of other folks were. For God's sake, man, have you not waked up to the fact that the Communist Party in our country is subversive and its main objective is to help destroy our form of government if possible? You know that, and I know darn well that you do.

You will pardon me for speaking that bluntly, Mr. Chairman, to him.

But I want to urge you. I am a lawyer, too, and I know your lawyer's duty is to advise you of your legal rights. But if you were what Philbrick said you were—and you have not denied it this morning under oath; I do not know why—if you were what Philbrick said, I am saying to you, "Come on across and come clean." And you can follow your lawyer's advice in some ways. And I want to say to this lawyer: Sure. Advise your client of his rights. But I think it is time some of you American lawyers also saw to it that some of these

boys that want to come clean and have been misinformed about what would happen if they told the truth are able to come clean.

I think it is time some of the members of the American bar became aware of their full constitutional obligation and saw to it that these former Communists who want to get out of it and come clean and stay out of it and get more of a chance than they are getting can do so. And I am not directing this particularly to you, Mr. Counsel. I am directing it to all the members of the American bar, of which I am a member.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have just one or two questions.

When did you join the International Fur and Leather Workers?

Mr. BOLLEN. It was some time in January of this year, 1951.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, that was after they had become disassociated from the CIO; is that right?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, that is right.

Mr. VELDE. Now, as to your statement to the press, do I understand correctly that this was a prepared written statement issued by you?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, that is right.

Mr. VELDE. In that statement you said that you were not a Communist, about 2 or 3 weeks ago; is that right?

Mr. BOLLEN. I said 1 or 2 weeks ago.

Mr. VELDE. One or 2 weeks ago. Did you also in that statement deny that you had ever been a Communist?

Mr. BOLLEN. No, I didn't.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Bollen, the charges made against you by Mr. Philbrick are serious charges. He stated that you were one of the group that was charged with the responsibility of conducting a so-called survey, industrial survey, to obtain blueprints, and so forth, from the plant for the Communist Party.

The courts have determined that the Communist Party of the United States is an international conspiracy, and that members of the Communist Party are subservient to directions which originate in the Soviet Union. Now, secret information that you might have had a part in obtaining, according to the charges of Mr. Philbrick, could involve something very serious. Here you have an opportunity to deny those charges. And by your refusal to deny them, the only implication that this committee and the American people have is that the charges made by Mr. Philbrick are true.

I would like to ask this one question. If you saw an act of sabotage or espionage, would you impart that act to the proper governmental officials?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes, I would.

Mr. POTTER. Even though the acts were committed by members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. Now, you claim you would impart that information. Here is a man who has testified under oath and made charges against you. If those charges are not true, that man has committed perjury. If the charges are true, you have been a very disloyal person.

I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Bollen, I understood you to say a while ago that you were willing to furnish this committee with a copy of the statement which you released to the press some week or 2 weeks ago. Is that true?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. When can you let the committee have that copy? How early can you get it to us?

Mr. BOLLEN. Oh, I believe I could get a copy by this week end and put it in the mail immediately.

Mr. WOOD. Would you, then, if you were brought back here under subpoena before this committee, testify to the truthfulness of it? I am going to ask you to furnish it to us in any event. As soon as you can get it, I am going to ask you if you will mail it to the clerk of this committee. Would you then come back under oath and verify the truthfulness of that statement?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't think I would.

Mr. WOOD. That is not exactly an answer. Would you, or would you not? Because if you will, we want you back here.

Mr. BOLLEN. No, I wouldn't.

Mr. FORER. He doesn't mean that he would disobey a subpoena.

Mr. WOOD. I understand that. I do not want to put the taxpayers to the expense of bringing him back here if he still will not verify the truthfulness of his statement. That is the reason I was asking at this time. I did not want to take any advantage of it.

Mr. FORER. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. WOOD. In any event, please send that to the clerk of the committee.

I understood you to say that while you were working in the General Electric Co. you did get information from some of the workers of that organization, information to the effect that they were producing jet engines.

Mr. BOLLEN. I never worked for the General Electric Co.

Mr. WOOD. While you were engaged in activities as an organizer, did you not say that you got information that they were producing jet engines there?

Mr. BOLLEN. I believe I said that I have read it in the papers and I perhaps have heard workers mention something about it.

Mr. WOOD. So you did get that information from workers?

Mr. BOLLEN. I have heard that from them. I think.

Mr. WOOD. I want to ask you this question, and I do not know whether I have asked you the question before. If it is repetitious, let it be so. Were any of the workers from whom you received such information members of the Communist Party, to your knowledge?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. WOOD. Were you ever employed by the United States Government?

Mr. BOLLEN. Yes; I believe I was.

Mr. WOOD. In what capacity, and when?

Mr. BOLLEN. I was in the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC's, and the exact dates I am not sure of, but to the best of my recollection, I was in the CCC's in 1937 and 1939, that is, parts of those years, and possibly part of 1938.

Mr. WOOD. Was your connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps that of an enrollee, or an official capacity?

Mr. BOLLEN. Just an enrollee.

Mr. WOOD. Aside from being an enrollee in the Civilian Conservation Corps, which did a magnificent work for the youth of our country in many instances, in most instances, have you held any other position with the Government?

Mr. BOLLEN. Not that I can recall.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a few more questions?

In view of your answer, young man, just now, to the chairman, when you said "Not that I recall," I will ask you to think for a minute and I will ask you to be pretty specific as to whether or not you ever have worked for the United States Government. Just think for a minute. I want your positive answer as to whether you have been.

Mr. BOLLEN. I still can't recall working for the United States Government, with the exception of the CCC's.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever traveled abroad?

Mr. BOLLEN. No; I haven't.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask this question. Do I understand, Mr. Bollen, that when our distinguished chairman asked you if you would swear under oath before this committee that your statements in the newspaper, at least, which you gave, were all true—did I understand you to say you would not swear under oath that they were true?

Mr. BOLLEN. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand, then, that you put some things in a newspaper statement that you now know not to be true?

Mr. BOLLEN. I didn't say that.

Mr. DOYLE. I know you didn't. I am just saying to you that that is my impression pretty definitely. My impression is that that is where you find yourself in this instance.

Mr. WOOD. There is one more question I wanted to ask him.

When you obtained information from any of the employees of the General Electric Co. as to the type of material that was being produced, particularly jet engines, did you get that information from such employee or employees voluntarily by them, or did you request it?

Mr. BOLLEN. What information, again, please?

Mr. WOOD. That they were making jet engines. Did you request such information from them?

Mr. BOLLEN. No, I haven't.

Mr. WOOD. Did you ever request any information from any employee of the General Electric Co. as to what was being produced in that plant?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't remember ever doing that. I would like to say that as far as producing jet engines in the community, it was common knowledge. That is, it was in the newspapers. People were discussing it.

Mr. WOOD. I mean, before it became common knowledge, when it was classified information, did you get the information before it became common knowledge?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't believe so.

Mr. WOOD. Did you ever seek it?

Mr. BOLLEN. No.

Mr. WOOD. Did you ever seek any information from people in that plant as to what was being produced?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't recall that.

Mr. WOOD. Did you ever pass any information that you received of that kind along for use by anybody else?

Mr. BOLLEN. I don't know. Maybe I did, and maybe I didn't.

Mr. WOOD. I will make it a little more specific. Did you ever pass it along to any official or functionary of the Communist Party?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons stated before.

Mr. WOOD. I am sorry that you do so refuse.

Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. POTTER. I have just one more question.

What would the Communist Party do with that information that was secured in connection with the plant?

Mr. BOLLEN. I refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Do you think the witness can be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think he ought to be continued under the subpoena. In other words, the subpoena, I think, should be continued for a period of 2 weeks.

Mr. WOOD. Subject to notification of his return.

Mr. DOYLE. I feel the same way about it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to set a specific day.

Mr. WOOD. I will continue the subpoena in force until the 24th of this month. That would be 2 weeks from this day, at 10 o'clock, subject to notification in the event you are not to appear. If you do not get a further notification from this committee, you will appear here at 10 o'clock on the 24th of this month.

And I understood that in the meantime you are to mail to the clerk of this committee, Mr. Carrington, a copy of the statement that you released to the press.

Mr. FORER. Can we do it the other way around?

Mr. WOOD. No, because there might be some question. I would rather leave it like I have left it. Unless he gets a notification that he does not need to attend, let him come back here on the 24th. We are leaving it that way. As it stands now, he is to appear here at 10 o'clock on the 24th.

Mr. FORER. The only question I ask is that as soon as the committee makes up its mind definitely, will they notify him as quickly as possible?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will notify you.

Mr. WOOD. Until that time, the 24th of this month, the witness is excused.

Mr. FORER. I assume the reason is that you want to examine the statement before you make up your mind?

Mr. DOYLE. It might not be that that is the only reason. I would not want you and the witness to conclude that that is the only reason.

Mr. WOOD. The witness is under subpoena to return here on the 24th unless he is notified prior to that time.

(Thereupon, at 1:05 p. m., an adjournment was taken, subject to the call of the Chair.)

EXPOSÉ OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
(BASED ON TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 11:37 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, and Charles E. Potter.

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

Mr. WOOD. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show that for the purposes of the hearing today, and acting under the authority that is vested in me as chairman of the committee, I have set up a subcommittee composed of Mr. Doyle, Mr. Velde, and Mr. Wood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Donald Tormey?

Mr. FORER. Mr. Chairman, we object to proceeding in the absence of a quorum of the full committee.

Mr. WOOD. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn, please?

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

Mr. TORMEY. I do.

Mr. FORER. For the record, we are proceeding under protest, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. The record so shows.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, sir?

TESTIMONY OF DONALD TORMEY, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
JOSEPH FORER

Mr. TORMEY. Donald Tormey.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. TORMEY. I am.

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

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

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

Mr. TORMEY. In 1918, in South Ashburnham, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now live?

Mr. TORMEY. Beverly, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline for the committee briefly your educational background?

Mr. TORMEY. I attended the public grammar schools and high schools in Massachusetts and graduated in 1928; graduated from a Boston accounting school in 1931.

Mr. VELDE. Will you speak up just a little louder, if you will, please?

Mr. TORMEY. I attended and graduated from the public schools of Massachusetts, grammar and high school, and graduated from an accounting school in Boston in 1931.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

Mr. TORMEY. I am international representative for the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America—UE.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what district do you hold that position?

Mr. TORMEY. District 2.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that includes what area?

Mr. TORMEY. That includes all of New England, but most of my work is in Massachusetts.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your record of employment since, say, 1935?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, for 5½ or 6 years I worked in the accounting section of the WPA in the Boston headquarters. In 1941 I came to work for the UE.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date? 1941?

Mr. TORMEY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you worked for the UE constantly since 1941?

Mr. TORMEY. With the exception of about a year in the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. TORMEY. That was from the fall of 1942 until the fall of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been an international representative of the UE?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, although my duties haven't changed much, there are a couple of titles that staff people have with unions. One is "organizer"; the other is "international representative." Actually, there is not too much difference between what they do, but you get \$10 more for being an international representative, and I have had that title for about a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a minute. Ten dollars more for what period of time?

Mr. TORMEY. A week.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. When did you become international representative?

Mr. TORMEY. About a year ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. And prior to that time you were organizer for the same district?

Mr. TORMEY. In that district; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or in that district. When did you become organizer?

Mr. TORMEY. 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were organizer constantly from 1941 until about a year ago?

Mr. TORMEY. That is the title. I am still an organizer; different title.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an organizer in the same locality during all that period of time, or were you transferred from one area to another within your district?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, most of that time I have worked out of either Boston or the office in the North Shore, but working out of that office I go all the way from New Bedford to the south and Springfield, Vt., in the north.

Mr. TAVENNER. Specifically what area did you cover? Or I would rather put the question this way: What was the area embraced within your district over which you were organizer at the time that you became an international representative?

Mr. TORMEY. A year ago?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TORMEY. Well, for the last couple of years, most of my time has been spent at Lynn.

Mr. TAVENNER. At Lynn?

Mr. TORMEY. With some side trips for either negotiations or arbitrations or walking picket line.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when did your duties begin at Lynn? I mean, when was that particular area assigned to you?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, I was assigned to Lynn for about 30 or 40 days in the late winter of 1949, February probably. And then I received an assignment to go to Lynn in May of 1949 and have been there since.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, had you worked any as organizer in the area of Lynn, Mass.?

Mr. TORMEY. What does the area mean? Surrounding communities?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the area within which Lynn is located.

Mr. TORMEY. Well, Lynn is part of district 2 of the UE.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, but you have told us that your duties were not coexistent with the entire district.

Mr. TORMEY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was only part of it. So I am trying now merely to ascertain what sections of district 2 have come under your jurisdiction as organizer.

Mr. TORMEY. Well, almost any section where the district president wanted to send me. But I spent a lot of time in and around Boston and up on the North Shore. That would cover Lynn, Beverly, Salem, Ipswich—most of the towns up through there.

Mr. TAVENNER. And over what period of time was that true?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, that was true in 19—.

Although I was on a special assignment in 1941 and 1942, when I worked out of the Boston office up until the early part of 1949, I would go up to the North Shore whenever I was called by a local union. We never used to go to local unions unless we were called in.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. You have told us you were assigned to specific duties in the area north of Boston, as I understood it.

Mr. TORMEY. Sometimes, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which would include Lynn and the various other places you mentioned?

Mr. TORMEY. You mean some of our locals would be located there?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TORMEY. Sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, my question was: Over how long a period of that time were you given assignments of that character?

Mr. TORMEY. To plants of our union that would be located up in that area?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, including Lynn, Mass.

Mr. TORMEY. Oh, that has been going on for years. Whenever there is an assignment up on the North Shore. Although sometimes when we had organizational campaigns up there, there would be more than one organizer around. But if some local called for either negotiation or arbitration or taking grievances through some step in the grievance procedure, or if we had an organizational problem on the North Shore, I would go over there, the same as I would go to either Fitchburg or New Bedford.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you perform your first duty?

Mr. TORMEY. On the North Shore?

Mr. TAVENNER. At Lynn, Mass.

Mr. TORMEY. Are you talking about any particular company?

Mr. TAVENNER. As an organizer, for UE.

Mr. TORMEY. Are you talking about any particular company?

Mr. TAVENNER. Any company.

Mr. TORMEY. Any company in Lynn?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TORMEY. Why, in 1942 we had an organizational drive in the Boston Machine Works. We won an election there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the first time that you went to Lynn?

Mr. TORMEY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was the first time you performed your duties as an organizer in the General Electric plant at Lynn?

Mr. TORMEY. As an organizer?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TORMEY. The first time I ever went to our local union that had had bargaining rights with General Electric Co. was during the strike in 1946. We had a Nation-wide strike against General Electric Co. at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. Had you finished?

Mr. TORMEY. No, I was going to tell you what it was about.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. TORMEY. You see, GE had a plant up in Lowell that was in another union and wasn't on strike. So I went down to Lynn, and I talked to the executive board of our local down there. And we set a picket line up in Lowell, closed it down for a couple of weeks just to show the company we could do it. That is, the leadership of local 201 did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that was in the performance of your duties as an organizer?

Mr. TORMEY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other work did you do at the General Electric plant other than as an organizer?

Mr. TORMEY. I never did any work in the plant of any kind, type, or description.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what work did you do in connection with your union at the General Electric plant other than as an organizer?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, the next time I went to the local union was to speak to the veterans committee at the local union following the close of the war. I was a member of the veterans committee of the district, and there was a confusion about this GI bill of rights—who had seniority and who didn't—and we had a meeting of the veterans committee down there, and I spoke there. That was the second time.

Mr. FORER. Can we have the date of that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, if you would like.

Mr. TORMEY. That was later in 1946, as I recall it.

(Representative Charles E. Potter entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, if I understand you correctly, beginning in 1946 and intermittently after that, on up until the time you became international representative, you engaged in the performance of your duties as an organizer of UE at the General Electric plant?

Mr. TORMEY. No. Just twice.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just twice.

Mr. TORMEY. And I have already related those two times.

Mr. TAVENNER. There were no other times?

Mr. TORMEY. There were no other times, to my knowledge, that I recall, sir, up until 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what has been your connection with the work at the plant since 1949?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, in the winter of 1949, the district president of our union received a call from the local officers of our union, which holds bargaining rights, or did at that time, in GE. A rival union was trying to organize one of the departments into a craft and had filed a petition with the Labor Board for an election, and the petition had been granted. The rival union had organized and signed up about 80 percent of the members of this union in their rival union. We at that time had not complied with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law as a union, either the local or the international. Consequently we were not on the ballot. The vote would either be for this rival union or no union at all. And we had reason to believe that if we could convince the membership to vote "no," the company would continue to recognize our local as the bargaining agent for that department.

So I must have spent about 30 days on that job. And the majority voted "No." and they stayed in the union.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. TORMEY. That was in the late winter, probably February and maybe part of March, in 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to the times you have already mentioned, when you performed your duties as an organizer of UE at Lynn, Mass., whether in the General Electric or some other organization, will you tell us the number of occasions when you performed the duties of your office at Lynn, Mass.? You see, you have named, I think, about three occasions—twice for UE and once for the Boston Machine.

Mr. TORMEY. That was an organizational job; Boston Machine Co., back in 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TORMEY. I negotiated several contracts for the union with that company, spent some time in a couple of strikes at a lamp plant in

that town, helped negotiate contracts at a lamp plant in that town, and we had another local in there with a few small shops which I occasionally worked on negotiations with and a couple of strikes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time did that take place?

Mr. TORMEY. UE is always engaging in either negotiations or organization or trouble with the companies, one way or another, and that took place whenever it happened, although I wasn't always assigned. Sometimes I might be in Springfield, Vt., or New Bedford, and the president would have to send somebody else.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is quite obvious that you would not do that if you were not there, but I am trying to find out the dates or the period.

Possibly it was intermittently during the entire period. I am just trying to ascertain the facts.

Mr. TORMEY. We must have 40 shops organized between Boston and Ipswich. That is a lot of shops to take care of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Well, at Lynn, Mass., over what period of time were you engaged in performing your duties as an organizer?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, I imagine the small shops in Lynn probably took maybe anywhere from 10 to 15 percent of my time over a period of, oh—of course we had a lot of strikes in Lynn in 1946. Everybody did. And it took longer than that. But over a period of time prior to 1946 and some time in 1945, especially in negotiations, it would take from 10 to 15 percent of the time, because we had a business agent in one of the locals.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say over what period of time it took 10 to 15 percent of your time?

Mr. TORMEY. I would say every year, from the time I came back from the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. Up until 1949, when you ceased to function as an organizer?

Mr. TORMEY. I didn't really cease to function as an organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, until the present time?

Mr. TORMEY. We don't have quite as many locals there as we used to have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, would you say it would be correct to state that it took about 15 percent of your time in Lynn from the time you began your work as an organizer up until the present time?

Mr. TORMEY. No, it is probably less than that. I wouldn't put it at above 10 percent. There might be weeks when I would have to spend 2 or 3 days if it was tough negotiations. But, then, there would be months running, and I wouldn't stop in at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tormey, there appeared before the committee on July 23, 1951, pursuant to a subpoena served upon him, Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick. Mr. Philbrick, in testifying before the committee, stated in some detail what his connection had been with various organizations in Massachusetts, including the Young Communist League and the Communist Party. He told us how he became a member of the State educational commission of the Communist Party. He also told us that as a member, as an executive, of the Communist Party, he met with various groups and received from them knowledge of the plans and the purposes of the Communist Party in infiltrating certain types of industry in Massachusetts.

Now, inasmuch as he has mentioned you in connection with this, I want to read you his testimony relating to it. In order to save

needless repetition. I will read his answers, which make a rather connected story, rather than to read my questions each time they were asked.

Mr. Philbrick testified as follows:¹

In 1946 and 1947, as an executive of the Communist Party, I attended what were known as district executive conferences held in Boston. I believe these were titled party building conferences, and each of them I found was for the purpose of infiltrating heavy industries or key industries in our area and in the United States.

I remember specifically at one of the party building conferences the comrades were instructed to take positions as colonizers; that is, to take upon themselves the duty of being colonizers in the key industries.

MR. TORMEY. Do you mind if I have a smoke?

MR. TAVENNER. Not at all.

MR. WOOD. Help yourself.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing to read):

That meant if you had a job in a small business or non-essential industry you should leave it and take a job in one of the key industries.

These key industries were listed by the party leaders. We were told that they were industries important to the war effort. We were instructed that the imperialist aims of the United States, the war-promoting purposes of the United States, were to carry on a war against the Soviet Union and a war against the free peoples of the world, that is, peoples under the jurisdiction of the Soviet Union.

We were told that the chief means at the disposal of the American imperialists was the productive capacity of this country, which they said was owned directly by the capitalists of the United States. We were taught that since this was the key weapon it was the weapon we had to attack and destroy as Communists.

We were told in New England one of the key industries consisted of the General Electric plant in Lynn. We were told one reason why colonizers were needed there was because it was involved in the development of defense materials including jet airplane engines. I might point out that at that time no one outside of the party had any knowledge that jet airplane engines were being developed in the jet airplane plant in Lynn, but they knew that.

Another key industry was the communications industry, another was the leather industry, boots and shoes, and another was the clothes industry, service clothes, and so forth.

We were told that the steel industry and lines of transportation were very important centers for Communist infiltration and colonization, so various comrades were ordered at this time to take up jobs at these spots.

We were told in certain sections of the country the steel industry would be the main point of concentration, whereas in New England the steel industry was not as important. We had seven or eight comrades assigned to the General Electric plant at Lynn and only one assigned to the steel industry to my knowledge to set up the colonization program.

As a part of the colonization program, but carried out very secretly, a survey was conducted of certain plants. This was a very complete survey. That program in New England was under the direction of Daniel Boone Schirmer. I was told it was on a national level, but my only information concerning it came from this local level. I came upon it more or less by accident. I was working at Communist Party headquarters on leaflet production at that time. One of the means of preparing the survey was a mimeographed form which I happened to prepare for Daniel Boone Schirmer. This had to do completely with industrial plants, although I understand they made investigations along other lines, too. The particular forms that I worked on had to do with a complete survey of the plants, what they were producing, how many they were producing, the labor unions, the number of employees, also the number of comrades in these plants, and exactly what influence the comrades had in the unions. They also included a review of the training and qualifications of the various comrades working in these plants.

As I say, I came upon it somewhat by accident and therefore did not know how much information Daniel Boone Schirmer was getting from the comrades in the plant, but I know he was calling on them for very specific information, including blueprints, but I had no knowledge of any particular blueprints.

¹ See pp. 1282 and 1283.

I had a very complete list at the time. Of course, my recollection now has failed me, so that I cannot recall all of them. I know that at least eight, possibly more, Communist Party members were assigned to the General Electric plant at Lynn. The ones I recall. * * *

And he proceeds to name them. And after having named four or five, I asked him this question.

I stand corrected on that. He names Don Tormey, in this language:

* * * Don Tormey was another one assigned to Lynn. I believe that is all I can recall at the moment.

after having named several others.

When asked if he knew the character of the work these various people were doing, Mr. Philbrick answered:

No, sir, I don't, except here again to say that most of these people are fairly skilled in union organizing. And, of course, that was part of their task, too. These were not single individuals who were to go in there and remain isolated. Their task was to endeavor to draw in as many other Communists as well as non-Communists in those unions.

Now, Mr. Tormey, because of your peculiar position as an organizer of UE in the very plant concerned with this testimony of Mr. Philbrick—

MR. TORMEY. What was the time and date of the testimony?

MR. TAVENNER. 1946 and 1947. And due to the fact that he named you as one of those connected with this work at Lynn, I want to ask you several questions about the details, which I hope you will cooperate with me on, and I hope you will cooperate in giving the committee the benefit of such knowledge and information as you may have on the subject.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, what was the question just asked? What was the date of the testimony?

MR. TORMEY. The date he was referring to in the testimony.

MR. TAVENNER. He asked me the date as to when this began. Mr. Philbrick said it was in 1946 and 1947.

So Mr. Philbrick stated in his testimony that he attended as an executive of the Communist Party, these party building conferences in 1946 and 1947. Did you attend any party building conference of the Communist Party where these matters were discussed?

MR. TORMEY. Mr. Tavenner, in answering that question, it is necessary to say that Philbrick is, No. 1, a liar, and should be prosecuted for perjury by this committee, certainly by this committee; and that group of people in the leadership of the State CIO of Massachusetts who helped him to conspire to present this perjury should also be prosecuted by the Government for helping him do it. And what I call a conspiracy leads all the way to the Secretary of Labor, and he should also be prosecuted for being part of this conspiracy.

MR. TAVENNER. Yes; I understand you have said that before. But will you answer my question?

MR. TORMEY. What is that?

MR. TAVENNER. As to whether or not you attended a party building conference of the Communist Party at any time when this matter of infiltration or colonization of any industry was discussed?

MR. TORMEY. You see, Mr. Tavenner, in Massachusetts this fellow is a big hero.

MR. WOOD. Just answer that question, please.

Mr. TORMEY. May I explain the answer to the question beforehand?

Mr. WOOD. He asked if you were at such a meeting. That can be answered and then if you want to explain it, go ahead, after you have answered.

Mr. TORMEY. In view of this kind of a question, I am not going to answer any question anywhere in this proceedings—and this is what I call such a question—

Mr. WOOD. I cannot hear you, sir.

Mr. TORMEY. I am not going to answer any question anywhere in this proceedings that has to do with the Communist Party or my alleged, suspected, presumed, assumed membership in that party or attendance at their meetings, on the basis of my rights under the fifth amendment.

I don't have to build up a case and testify against myself, and I am not going to do it.

Mr. WOOD. What is your answer, then?

Mr. TORMEY. I just did answer.

Mr. WOOD. There has been no answer.

Mr. TORMEY. I am not going to answer the question, on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WOOD. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you ever advised, counseled, or encouraged to take part in a program at Lynn, Mass., which would facilitate the infiltration of Communist Party members in the UE union or in that plant at Lynn?

Mr. TORMEY. That is the same question as the other one.

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. TORMEY. It is the same answer.

Mr. WOOD. You give the same answer?

Mr. TORMEY. Certainly.

Mr. WOOD. Well, not "certainly," to me. The question was not "certainly" to you. Now, do you give the same answer?

Mr. TORMEY. Of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is the answer?

Mr. TORMEY. The answer is the same as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. That you refuse to answer on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate you? Is that what you intend to say?

Mr. TORMEY. I won't answer this question.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. On what ground?

Mr. TORMEY. On the basis of my privilege not to say anything that may be used. I am not going to testify against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick has testified that at the party building conferences it was determined to ask people, members of the Communist Party, to leave their jobs where they may have been employed in nonessential industry, and to take up positions in key industries. Do you have any knowledge on your own part of that having been done in any instance?

Now, I am not asking you if you were a member of the Communist Party. I am just asking you if you have any knowledge.

Mr. TORMEY. You mean as a union organizer do I have any knowledge of people who may have left one shop and went to work in another shop?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I am asking you, regardless of whether you were serving in the capacity of an organizer or not, whether—in other words, I am asking you whether you personally had any information. I don't care whether it was in an individual capacity or in an official capacity. I am asking you whether you personally had any information of any instance in which a person left his job in a minor industry or unessential industry and became employed in a key industry in response to this colonizing movement of the Communist Party.

Mr. TORMEY. I certainly don't recall anybody.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't recall anybody?

Mr. TORMEY. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised at any time that the Communist Party considered that the productive capacity of the United States was the key weapon which the Communists had to attack and destroy?

Mr. TORMEY. I never heard of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time hear of the plan of the Communist Party to colonize either your union or the General Electric plant at Lynn?

By colonizing, I mean for the Communist Party.

Mr. TORMEY. Hear of it where? From any source whatever?

Mr. TAVENNER. From any source.

Mr. TORMEY. I am not going to answer that question, on the basis of the same privilege as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted, either individually or in your official capacity, with a plan by which surveys were to be made of various key industry plants, including that of General Electric at Lynn, for the purpose of passing the results of the survey on to the Communist Party?

Mr. TORMEY. Mr. Tavenner, I was never a spy for anybody. I don't know anything about any surveys. I never participated in any surveys. And I don't intend to participate in any surveys of any such nature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. TORMEY. I refuse to answer, on the same basis as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not, as a matter of fact, know that Daniel Boone Schirmer was at the head of a group to obtain a survey from the key industries in Massachusetts and possibly other places?

Mr. TORMEY. I know of no such thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not know that?

Mr. TORMEY. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever see one of the forms which was prepared for use by Daniel Boone Schirmer in collecting this survey material?

Mr. TORMEY. What was that question, again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read the question, please, Mr. Reporter.

(The reporter read the question referred to.)

Mr. TORMEY. Of course, I never saw any such form.

Mr. WOOD. What is that? I cannot hear.

Mr. TORMEY. No; I never saw any such form.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not, or have you learned from any source that such forms were used, or that forms were used for such purposes?

Mr. TORMEY. You just told me that there was testimony to that effect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I mean prior to your appearance here.

Mr. TORMEY. What he testified here was in contradiction to what he testified at Foley Square.

Mr. WOOD. That was not the question that was asked you.

The question that was asked you was: Did you have any information as to the existence of certain forms for making these surveys prior to the time you came here as a witness today?

Mr. TORMEY. No such knowledge, except what he just read off. Of course, I have read that testimony before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you receive instructions of any character from Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. TORMEY. Me receive instructions from Schirmer? No. In relation to working in the union?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TORMEY. Organizational negotiations?

Mr. TAVENNER. Or any kind of work.

Mr. TORMEY. Certainly not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Any kind of work?

Mr. WOOD. The reporter cannot get the shake of your head.

Mr. TORMEY. The answer is "no."

Mr. FORER. Excuse me, Mr. Tavenner, but the witness has been trying to give a comment on the testimony that was given by Mr. Philbrick, a factual comment.

I think before you leave that——

Mr. TAVENNER. I haven't asked him any question to which that would be responsive.

Mr. FORER. I think it is something which the committee should be interested in, Mr. Tavenner. It is a question of evidence and of Philbrick having committed perjury before this committee, and I think the committee should want to hear that.

Mr. TAVENNER. If it is a matter of record, as you indicate, the committee certainly would have possession of it.

Mr. FORER. I don't know whether the committee has or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Joe Figueiredo?

Mr. TORMEY. That is the fellow that Philbrick testified at Foley Square was the one person in charge of colonizing the electrical union, GE.

Mr. WOOD. The question is: Do you know him?

Mr. TORMEY. I won't answer that question, on the same basis of privilege as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having attended a meeting that was entitled "The People and the Press" at the Horticultural Hall at Boston, November 28, 1944?

Mr. TORMEY. Will you tell me what happened at the meeting? I have been to a lot of meetings in my time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. In order to refresh your recollection, I hand you a photograph and will ask you if you can identify a picture of yourself in that photograph, which I will ask be marked for identification only as "Tormey Exhibit No. 1."¹

Mr. WOOD. It may be so marked.

(The photograph above referred to was marked "Tormey Exhibit No. 1" for identification only.)

Mr. FORER. There is no question yet.

¹ See appendix, p. 1413.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the photograph and state whether or not your picture is included?

Mr. TORMEY. I won't answer that question on the basis of my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is not the photograph appearing in the bottom row to the left your photograph?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the gentleman sitting next to you, next to the one that I just mentioned on the first row, the lower row?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Louis Budenz?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that a photograph of Louis Budenz?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the photograph again and state the name of the person appearing at the left in the second row, the standing row, to your left, the first one?

Mr. TORMEY. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't that Joseph Figueiredo?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the person standing in the middle in the rear row; will you identify his picture?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is his name William Harrison?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were Louis Budenz, Joseph Figueiredo, or William Harrison members of the Communist Party in 1944, when that photograph was taken? In November 1944, to your knowledge?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time between 1946 and the spring of 1949?

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

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

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me, Mr. Tormey, a leaflet or a pamphlet entitled "Who Are the Un-Americans?" by Donald Tormey.

Are you the writer of that document?

Mr. TORMEY. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that released, that document? When was it published?

Mr. TORMEY. About 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. I read to you this statement from your article:

I am not a member of the Communist Party. Nevertheless Herbert Philbrick gave sworn testimony that I am a member of the Communist Party and that I was ordered to get a job with GE in 1947 to spy out defense work and that I was still working there in 1949. Every word of that is a lie.

Was that a truthful statement, when you said that every word of that is a lie?

Mr. TORMEY. It is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then do you state that you are not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TORMEY. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. At this time?

Mr. TORMEY. Of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TORMEY. Not even now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1949?

Mr. TORMEY. I have already said that I am not going to answer questions, based on my privilege under the fifth amendment, about any past, assumed, presumed, or suspected membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

Mr. TORMEY. I have already answered that question. Same answer as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are not a member of the Communist Party today?

Mr. TORMEY. I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is membership in the Communist Party a cloak that you can put on and take off just when you appear before this committee?

Mr. TORMEY. I haven't the faintest idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. You haven't any idea. Well, what will it be tomorrow? Will you be a member of the Communist Party tomorrow?

Mr. TORMEY. Certainly not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean you have severed your connections with the Communist Party?

Mr. TORMEY. That is a pretty tricky question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, that is a very plain question. There is nothing tricky about that.

Mr. TORMEY. Same answer as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party 2 weeks ago, when you published this?

Mr. TORMEY. No; I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not 2 weeks ago. Were you 3 weeks ago?

Mr. TORMEY. Now, you see, I am just not going to answer the question, based on this privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on July the 23d, when Mr. Philbrick testified, July 23, 1951?

Mr. TORMEY. No, I wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not.

Mr. TORMEY. I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member on the 22d of July 1951?

Mr. TORMEY. Mr. Examiner, you can take me all the way back to when I was selling newspapers.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; back to 1946 is quite far enough.

Mr. TORMEY. And I have already characterized this fellow as a liar.

Mr. WOOD. Well, what we are trying to find out now is, Who is the liar?

Mr. TORMEY. I was not a member of the Communist Party at the time he testified, although all the papers said I was. If he didn't say it, he was misquoted in all the newspapers that got themselves mixed up in our election campaign, with the help of this committee. And

I am not going to answer questions back to that point, based on that privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. You won't go back to the time when he testified?

Mr. TORMEY. I just did. Sure, I will go back to that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, Mr. Philbrick testified about your conduct and your activity back in the period of 1946 and 1947.

Mr. TORMEY. He didn't do any such thing, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I just read it to you.

Mr. TORMEY. All you testified, all you read to me, was that he said Donald Tormey was one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you a member of the Communist Party in 1946 and 1947?

Mr. TORMEY. I have already answered that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is your answer?

Mr. TORMEY. The same as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is that?

Mr. TORMEY. That answer is that I am not going to answer those questions, on the basis of my privilege not to testify against myself, under the fifth amendment.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Tormey?

Mr. TORMEY. I have already answered that, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I did not hear you. I would appreciate it if you would answer it.

Mr. TORMEY. I am not going to answer the question, Mr. Doyle, based on the privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. But you did answer that you were not on July 23, 1951, a member of it.

Mr. TORMEY. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Why would that answer not incriminate you, if you think answering whether you were ever a member would incriminate you? What is the difference?

Mr. TORMEY. The difference really, Mr. Doyle, is a difference in the methods now being used to destroy, disrupt, and divide this union.

Mr. DOYLE. I assure you that I am not interested in disrupting any union.

Mr. TORMEY. Why, this committee was the most potent weapon our opponents had in our most recent elections, the one they used the most. They subpoenaed other witnesses that were mentioned by Doyle on July 20.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean mentioned by Philbrick?

Mr. TORMEY. Mentioned by Philbrick. They waited until 36 hours before a very important election at GE to subpoena me. The opposing union knew all about it and announced it to their members and told them to keep it quiet until the subpoena was served, at 4 o'clock. It was served promptly at 4 o'clock, which they knew it would be.

They dashed into the streets with an already prepared printed leaflet telling how the Government had grabbed Tormey, hoping to take the election with that little trick.

Mr. DOYLE. What provision of the Constitution, what section, did you tell us you rely on?

Mr. TORMEY. The Bill of Rights, the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any other portion of the Constitution on which you rely?

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. I see you are asking your lawyer. I am not asking about your lawyer's view.

Mr. FORER. I am sure you are not objecting to his consulting his lawyer.

Mr. DOYLE. Not as to his rights, but now I am simply asking if there is any other section of the Constitution that he relies upon.

Mr. FORER. That is just what lawyers generally tell people.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, all lawyers do not have to do that.

Mr. FORER. I am sure you did that when you were a lawyer.

Mr. DOYLE. I just assume that your witness knows what sections of the Constitution he relies on. If he does not, he can ask his lawyer.

Mr. TORMEY. I relied on the fifth amendment, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. And no other?

Mr. TORMEY. Not that I know of. I don't know if the others cover.

Mr. DOYLE. You said in your testimony, "I am not going to build up a case against myself."

Mr. TORMEY. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. "I am not going to testify against myself."

Do you feel that stating frankly as one American citizen to another whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party would be testifying against yourself?

Is that what I understand?

Mr. TORMEY. With what is going on these days, Mr. Doyle?

Of course.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, I know something of what is going on. I do not know what is going on in your mind.

Mr. TORMEY. Well, you were not involved in that election.

Mr. DOYLE. May I state this, Mr. Tormey. I am one of the Members of Congress that always has and I expect always will believe in the right of collective bargaining and the worth-whileness of organized labor.

And I wish to assure you as the son of a blacksmith, which I am, and proud of it, that I am not interested in fighting organized labor.

Mr. TORMEY. Well, then, you should not allow the committee to be used by these people in the CIO the way they are doing it.

Mr. DOYLE. We have not done that, to my knowledge.

Mr. TORMEY. Why, Mr. Doyle, you even subpoenaed the election cards with the names of six of our members in an effort to intimidate them.

Mr. DOYLE. I gave you that statement to let you understand that in my questioning I am not trying to hurt organized labor. Now, if that is clear to you, I hope it is clear that I am not interested in questioning you just because you are an organizer for organized labor.

The assignment of this committee, Mr. Tormey, is given to us by the United States Congress, which is your Congress, by the way, because you were born in this country.

This is a committee of which I am a member, and I did not ask to come on this committee. I was asked to take the assignment. I did

not seek it. It is one of those very unpleasant tasks, and yet we are assigned to find out, if we can, where there are subversive influences in this country any place.

Mr. TORMEY. Does that require issuing subpoenas during our elections in order to influence the results?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, it requires issuing subpoenas when we can catch people.

Mr. TORMEY. But he testified on July 23. Everybody else was subpoenaed on the 20th. Why did they wait until just before the election to do it to me?

Mr. DOYLE. Will you let me finish my statement?

Mr. TORMEY. I am very sorry.

Mr. DOYLE. You have already told me about that subpoena three times.

Mr. TORMEY. There were two subpoenas.

Mr. DOYLE. You have got that in the record now; so let us forget it. Let me ask my question.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. I want to state for the benefit of the record that when any subpoena was issued by the chairman of this committee to be served on any witness the chairman of this committee had no knowledge of any election being held anywhere at any time by anybody.

Mr. TORMEY. Why, the election cards themselves—

Mr. WOOD. Will you wait until I get through?

Mr. TORMEY. I am sorry.

Mr. WOOD. Since these subpoenas have been served, we have had before this committee under subpoena many other officers of the UE who have taken advantage of their privilege under the Constitution of the United States to refuse to answer whether they were members of the Communist Party.

Now, if by any act of mine—and I speak for myself only, as chairman of this committee, but individually—if by any act of mine I have been able to bring before this committee officials of an organization who cloak themselves with the fifth amendment to refuse to answer as to whether they are members of an organization that is conspiring to overthrow this Government, and if by doing that I have caused them to lose a labor-union election in this country, I would be very happy about it myself.

Mr. DOYLE. May I proceed, then, to ask you this question. Mr. Tormey: I noticed you answered our counsel in some such language as this, referring to Mr. Philbrick's testimony, "Of course, I have read that testimony before."

About when did you read Mr. Philbrick's testimony?

Mr. TORMEY. A couple of weeks ago.

Mr. DOYLE. Not until then? You did not even read it in the Boston newspapers?

Mr. TORMEY. That is where I got the idea that he said that I was actually working in the plant as a spy and had been there since 1937. That is what they reported.

Mr. DOYLE. But he testified on July 23d.

Mr. TORMEY. I just discovered today that one of the reporters instead of being an impartial reporter is an undercover agent of this committee. I tried him out today just to find out.

Mr. DOYLE. Tried out who?

Mr. TORMEY. One of the reporters from Boston. I gave him a copy of this pamphlet. The first thing he did was to rush to the committee to show it to them.

Mr. WOOD. Wait just a moment. I am not going to let that statement go unchallenged. You mean to say there is an undercover agent of this committee who is a reporter for a Boston paper? If so, I want his name. You said an "undercover agent."

Mr. TORMEY. A reporter who claims to be an impartial reporter for the Boston Traveler—his name is Dalton—received a copy of this statement a few hours ago and went to the members of the staff of this committee to give it to them.

Mr. WOOD. Is that the only information you have upon which you base the charge that he is an undercover agent of this committee?

Mr. TORMEY. Certainly.

Mr. WOOD. That statement is just as rash and irresponsible as a lot of others you are making here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in the light of this discussion, I think I should make a statement for the record that we have had a copy of this statement by the witness in our possession for fully a week.

Mr. FORER. Mr. Dalton didn't know that.

Mr. TORMEY. Mr. Dalton didn't know that.

Mr. DOYLE. May I then proceed with this, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. I am sorry I interrupted.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all right. Do it any time. You always make a contribution.

Mr. Tormey, have you ever read the law of the United States Congress under which this committee functions; I mean, what our job is?

Mr. TORMEY. The actual wording of the law? No. A lot of its activities seem to be to try to break up the UE. They are not succeeding very well.

Mr. DOYLE. No, no. I assure you, sir, there is no reference to unions, labor unions, in the law.

Mr. TORMEY. I know there isn't. I know that.

Mr. DOYLE. Then I assume you have never read it. Is that correct? I ask you that question not to embarrass you, but I can see you feel that you are well informed on what this committee does, and therefore I am asking you whether or not you have ever read the law under which we function. Now, I do not believe you have. I believe you are misinformed.

The law under which we operate, Mr. Tormey, does not mention labor unions. We are not assigned under the law to investigate labor unions. We are assigned to investigate subversive influences wherever they come from, whether they come from the United States or from any place else, anything that would destroy our American form of government, anything that is determined to be directed toward uprooting or overthrowing it. Mr. Webster, if you look at his dictionary, which most of us follow, says that the term "subversive" relates to overthrowing. Now, I have told you what our job is. I assure you we are not interested in any labor-union activity unless it happens to be the case that we know there are some members in

that labor union that are devoted to the foreign ideology of aggressive communism, which is interested in overthrowing our form of government.

Now, I have never met you, never heard you before, but you are rated as a very able UE organizer, and I am informed by Mr. Philbrick and others that you are rated as a very able member of the Communist Party.

And we are asking your cooperation to help us understand whether or not in the Communist Party to your personal knowledge there is any subversive program which would tend to overthrow our form of government.

I have not done that to preach to you, sir. I have made that statement to you. And I notice whenever you get to anything about the Communist Party, you claim your privilege. That is all right. We want you to always claim your privilege, when it is in good faith.

Mr. TORMEY. Do you want to listen to the evidence of perjury by this Philbrick?

Mr. DOYLE. No, we are interested in questioning you. We have his testimony under oath. We have that in writing, the same as we will have yours. But I am asking you if you have any knowledge within the Communist Party of any effort or program to overthrow the American form of government. Is that a fair question?

Mr. TORMEY. Well, now, let's see what happened in the last couple of years, and maybe that will answer the question.

Since—

Mr. DOYLE. Now, just a minute. Because we do not have time to permit too long statements on both sides.

Mr. TORMEY. I think I can give you a real insight on what is being overthrown.

Mr. DOYLE. No, no. I know you came prepared to make a speech I understand that.

Mr. TORMEY. No, I am not making any speeches.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you a simple question. Do you know of any plan of the Communist Party, of your own personal knowledge, to in any way overthrow this form of government, the American form of government?

Mr. TORMEY. What does it mean? Does it mean, for instance, that I am opposed to the present administration?

Mr. DOYLE. No, no.

Mr. WOOD. He is talking about the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not talking about Democrats or Republicans or any parties in the matter. We are talking about what we believe to be and have evidence to be the fact, that the Communist Party of America is dedicated to the proposition of overthrowing our form of government as it exists under the American Constitution.

Do you know whether or not the Communist Party is interested in that?

Speaking frankly, I ask you that because I believe that until fairly recently you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TORMEY. I just don't know any such thing, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. As a Communist, now, are you speaking?

I asked you this as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TORMEY. If I speak before this committee or any other body of Government, I speak as a citizen of the United States. The fifth

amendment, which is described here as a cloak, is no cloak. That is a sword to be used by the people when somebody tries to take their rights away.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask you this. Do you know Mr. Don Bollen?

Mr. TORMEY. Yes, certainly.

Mr. DOYLE. Where did you know him, sir?

Mr. TORMEY. He was an organizer for our union. He acted as a business agent while an organizer for our union.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever sit in any meeting of the Communist Party or committee of the Communist Party with him?

Mr. TORMEY. I won't answer that, on the same basis as before.

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed you eliminated the years 1942 and 1943, years when, as I understood, you were not an organizer or in the employ of the UEW.

Mr. TORMEY. Well, it is not the whole year. I was gone for about a year in the Army.

Mr. DOYLE. To Miami?

Mr. TORMEY. No, in the Army. No, I didn't get to Miami.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever travel abroad?

Mr. TORMEY. No. Oh, when I was about 7 years old, I think I made a trip into Canada and back with my uncle one day.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Any further questions?

Do you have any reason why the witness should not be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Nathaniel Mills?

Mr. WOOD. Are you Mr. Mills?

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

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

Mr. MILLS. I do, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Mills, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. MILLS. I am, sir.

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

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Gabriel Kantrovitz, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. WOOD. During the progress of your interrogation, you may confer with your counsel as often as you see fit and seek such information or advice as you think you may need.

Your counsel is at liberty to confer with you as often as he may desire and give you such information as he thinks you may be in need of.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is my first appearance before this committee. I wonder if I may make a routine objection. As I understand, the subpoena was issued in the name of the committee. I understand a quorum of that committee is five. May I note the absence of a quorum and object to the questioning under the subpoena?

Mr. WOOD. I will say for the benefit of counsel that the resolution of the Congress establishing the committee gives to the chairman the

authority to take testimony himself and to establish subcommittees to take testimony, and acting under that authority the chairman has established a subcommittee for the purpose of this hearing consisting of Mr. Doyle, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, who are present.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. But the record will show that just Mr. Doyle, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, the chairman, are present.

Mr. WOOD. That is right.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

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

TESTIMONY OF NATHANIEL MILLS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, GABRIEL KANTROVITZ

Mr. MILLS. Nathaniel Mills.

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

Mr. MILLS. I was born in 1917 in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your education?

Mr. MILLS. I graduated from the public schools, high school, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; went to Amherst College; graduated A. B. in 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment since graduation in 1939?

Mr. MILLS. Well, my first employment in private industry was in 1941, June, when I went to work for the General Electric Co. on referral from the USES.

I took tests and they informed me that they could use me at GE.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed in 1940?

Mr. MILLS. No; I wasn't in industry. I wasn't employed by a private concern.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the indication is that you were employed in some capacity, though not in industry.

What were you doing in 1940?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, because my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us how you were employed in 1941. Now will you bring us up to the present time, please?

Mr. MILLS. I was employed steadily in GE from June of 1949 up to the present except for 15 months from December 1944 until March—well, I came back from the service in March of 1946, and I think it was in late April I went to work there, under my job rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Mills, Mr. Philbrick, Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick, testified before this committee on July 23, 1951. In the course of his testimony, he described the circumstances under which he met you in 1940 and then proceeded to describe his work in the organization of the Cambridge Youth Council. He stated that you supplied him with the names of the persons whom he should interview in establishing that kind of an organization; that is, for the initial members of the organization. Do you recall the circumstances of that?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that my answer may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at that time chairman of the Massachusetts Youth Council?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, because my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick has testified here that during the course of his work with the Cambridge Youth Council, he first learned of the influence of the Communist Party on organizations of that type. He stated that other members of the executive committee along with him were Arthur Solomon, Sidney Solomon, and a third person, whose name I do not at the moment recall, and that he realized that all the decisions made were the decisions made by those three, and that the policy of his organization was controlled by those three persons, who he later learned to be members of the Communist Party.

Were you acquainted with Arthur Solomon?

Mr. MILLS. May I consult counsel?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The name of the third person was Stanley Beecher, the one I could not recall at the moment.

Mr. WOOD. But the name you are now asking about is what?

Mr. TAVENNER. Arthur Solomon.

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, because my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Sidney Solomon?

Mr. MILLS. May I say the same answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. And for the same reason?

Mr. MILLS. The same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Stanley Beecher? Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. MILLS. Same answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick also testified that the policy of the Cambridge Youth Council, of which he was the president, being controlled by these three persons, Arthur and Sidney Solomon and Stanley Beecher, never deviated from the policy of the Massachusetts Youth Council, of which you were chairman, and the American Youth Congress.

Will you tell the committee what you know, if anything, regarding the efforts to control and guide the policies of the Cambridge Youth Council by your organization, or at least the organization of which you are alleged to be the chairman, the Massachusetts Youth Council?

Mr. MILLS. The same answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick also testified about a convention held, a State convention of the Communist Political Association in the State of Massachusetts in 1945. Did you attend that convention?

May I change my question?

My question was based on a wrong assumption of facts. I withdraw the question.

Did you attend any State convention, or did you attend a convention in New York in 1943 of the Young Communist League?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, because my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever live at Malden, Mass.?

Mr. MILLS. I have lived at Malden, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time?

Mr. MILLS. I moved there shortly before I went into the service, and my wife lived there while I was in the service, and I considered it my residence, until we moved to Lynn in 1946, I guess it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you moved from Malden, Mass., to Lynn, Mass.?

Mr. MILLS. I was working in the Lynn GE for that period, and I wanted to be close to my work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Mills, you were present, were you not, during the questioning of the previous witness, Mr. Torney?

Mr. MILLS. No.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I was here.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not want to read again the testimony of Mr. Philbrick if you were present and heard it. Mr. Philbrick has testified in general about the plan in the Communist Party to have persons transferred to the General Electric plant in Lynn for the purpose of colonizing that plant for the Communist Party, due to the fact that it was an important defense industry.

In the course of his testimony, Mr. Philbrick stated that you were assigned to the General Electric plant. Now, prior to your moving over to Lynn, Mass., you say you were living at Malden. Were you a member of the Malden Club of the Communist Party at the time you left there?

Mr. MILLS. Same answer; same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will have to speak a little louder.

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you counseled or advised by any member of the Communist Party regarding activities on your part at the General Electric plant at Lynn, as to what you should do in behalf of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

(Representative Charles E. Potter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You will recall Mr. Philbrick's testimony, in which he said that you and others were assigned to the General Electric plant at Lynn for colonization purposes. Is that true, or is it false?

Mr. MILLS. It isn't true, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. You took no part in any such plan?

Mr. MILLS. No, none whatsoever, I was working in the Lynn GE from 1941. In 1941 I went to work in the GE plant in Lynn.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you continued to work straight on through until when?

Mr. MILLS. I work there today.

Mr. TAVENNER. To the present time?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Except when you were in the Army?

Mr. MILLS. Except when in service.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, during that period of time, particularly from 1946 on, were you given any advice or counsel or direction regarding any duty that you were to perform for the Communist Party in Lynn, Mass.?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Alice Gordon?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Fanny Hartman?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

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

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you want to confer with your counsel?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. That is my answer. I refuse to answer, for the same reason.

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

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I take it, Mr. Mills, from your interest in young people that probably you became interested while you had the splendid opportunity of attending Amherst College.

Am I wrong?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I learned a lot there about the problems of the country economically.

Mr. DOYLE. Along with the other young American citizens who were there with you. I think we men who were college men have perhaps more responsibility than people who have not had the chance of having a college education. You would agree with me on that, at least?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I think every young person should have the opportunity.

Mr. DOYLE. During the time you were at Amherst, were you a member of any young people's study group or organized group?

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to testify, on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean while you were at Amherst?

I am not asking you about the Communist Party, sir. I have not mentioned the Communist Party.

I want to call your attention to that.

Mr. MILLS. How can I put this? My counsel indicates that studies in college were of an academic nature, but I understood the question to refer to voluntary groups, a study group.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct, Mr. Mills. Your worthy counsel probably did not understand my question, or I did not make it clear.

Let me direct my question to you again. In other words, I am a college man, too, and I know that during college years if men are active and virile at all, interested in their Government and their Nation, especially men that graduate with an A. B. like you did, during your college years you take some time to belong to groups of students studying economic problems or social problems.

Now, I am asking you if, while you were in Amherst, you were a member of such a group. That is all. If so, what group?

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. I refuse to answer, for the same reason.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to say this. You are at perfect liberty, naturally, to confer with your counsel as to your rights under the Constitution,

but you and he were not at college together, and you ought to know whether you were a member of any such group as I asked about.

Mr. MILLS. I also understand from studying political science and from the time I was able to read that there is a freedom of association, a freedom of speech, and so on, but I am forced to refuse to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand that you claim the privilege of the Constitution, of refusing to tell a committee of Congress, merely of citizens who are interested in studying economic and social problems, as we are, because it is part of our job, with reference to the preservation of our Union, our constitutional form of Government—do I understand that you fear that you might be incriminated if you tell what group, if any, you were a member of, such as I have asked about? I have not asked anything about the Communist Party.

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. My counsel advises me that by invoking the privilege I do not need to explain my reasons for it, but that above all it is not a question of the college or of anything of such a nature, that I am inferring; it is that there is no limit, evidently, in these days, to the extent to which stool pigeons will go, and stories will be invented.

Mr. DOYLE. I understand that you would like to make a speech, but I do recognize that you are apparently a very clear thinker and a very able man, and I am just interested to see if we can get help from you in understanding your interest in young people, and how early you became interested in young people and the directions it took:

Were you a leader of young people in Amherst College while you were there?

You know what I mean by a leader, do you not? Of any group? Is that a fair question?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I was quite active. I was head of the Amherst Press and an officer in my fraternity and was in a variety of activities. I didn't keep quiet.

Mr. DOYLE. I just assumed, sir, that you were a leader in Amherst. Now, may I ask you again, Were you a leader in Amherst in studying economic and social problems in any group? Is that not a fair question?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLS. I again say that I refuse to answer for the same reason. I do not need to give my reason.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you volunteer the information that you were a member of the Amherst Press. That is the college paper. And you were a leader in your fraternity. But if you were a leader in the study of social or economic problems, you claim the privilege?

Mr. KANTROVITZ. I think he is on the horn of a dilemma. He wants no reflection on the college. You are directing your questioning, are you not, Congressman Doyle, to extracurricular activities or something of that kind?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct. Let me be perfectly frank with you, Mr. Mills. I am not trying to trap you. But you are a college graduate, and I know enough about your work up in the area to know you have been a leader of young people. I know enough about your work, whether you think I do or not.

And you may assume, perhaps, that I may know one or more of the groups that you were a leader in. But I am not trying to trap you

into that, sir. I am interested to know how young you became a leader in the study of social and economic problems at Amherst College. That is all. I am not asking you whether you were a leader in the Communist study group at Amherst or any other Communist group at Amherst.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I considered myself a citizen while I was there, and I was a voter before I graduated, and in justice to any other citizen or voter, I consider my political activities as a citizen to be privileged.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking you whether you were a Communist while you were there or what party you were a member of. But if you claim your privilege, and you are afraid it will incriminate you if you answer it, I understand, inferentially at least, that there was something while you were at Amherst College that you were a member of, the statement of which might incriminate you.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. That isn't the necessary inference.

Mr. DOYLE. He is claiming his privilege, counsel. It is his privilege. I do not question his right. I am a lawyer too, counsel, and I want him to stand up on his counsel's advice. But let me be perfectly frank with counsel, because it is your first service with us.

In my service with this committee, I have come to realize, not directing this to you, sir, but I have come to realize, from facts I know, that when a person claims privilege under the first or fifth amendments, even though the Communist Party has not been mentioned in the question, the witness has some connection or has had some connection with Communist activities and he is afraid to come out and be square enough to tell the truth. That is what I have learned as a member of the committee, and I am giving the young man the benefit of the conclusion I have come to, even though he has not asked for it.

I wish to call Mr. Mills' attention again to the fact that I did not mention the Communist Party in the question I asked. I, too, was active at USC, where I graduated, and was proud of it. If I was put on the stand and was asked what my extracurricular activities were, I certainly would have no reason to claim the first or fifth amendments, and I am surprised that you did, sir, as to your college years.

I am not suggesting—no, I will not say that, either.

Mr. MILLS. Well, you subpoenaed me, the committee did, because a man called me a spy infiltrating the GE in 1947, and now you ask me what my political and economic interests were when I was in college.

Mr. DOYLE. I did not mention political interests, sir. I asked you about social and economic problems.

Mr. MILLS. Well, groups that I associated with. I say I won't answer, and I don't feel I should give the reason.

I think you should know it from a study of the Constitution, as I do.

Mr. DOYLE. I think perhaps I, too, know a little of the Constitution. Well, now, let me say this to you, Mr. Mills, as you go home, please. Have you read the bill under which this committee functions?

Mr. MILLS. I am sorry. I haven't. I would be glad to.

Have you a copy I can read?

MR. DOYLE. Yes. We will give you a copy, from our reception room. I invite you to read that. Substantially, that law charges us with looking into the field of subversive conduct in this country, whether it generates from this country or from any other country.

Now, you certainly have no objection to cooperating with a committee that has that assignment from the United States Congress, do you?

Just one further statement, Mr. Chairman.

I only make it for your benefit, because you are much younger than I am, and you have had a college training that should put you in a position to be a great factor in this country against subversive conduct. That bill charges us, as I have said, with looking into that subject.

(Representative Charles E. Potter returned to the hearing room at this point.)

MR. DOYLE. I just want you to realize that when we subpoena people, even though we know they are Communists when we subpoena them, as generally we do—I will say to the gentleman that we generally know that in advance—we do hope that sometimes men of your age, sir, will between the time you are subpoenaed and come in go to counsel, at least, and we always like to have citizens go to counsel, but we do hope that, generally speaking, when they tell their counsel that they have been Communists, that they realize, possibly, that it was a mistake. And if they tell their counsel that, many times their counsel will say to our counsel, "My client wants to help clean up this bad situation." Many times, witnesses' counsel make dates with our counsel or with committee members. But sometimes we fail in that objective. I want to invite you, sir, as a young man, to think it over. And if there is any measure of cooperation you can give the United States Congress, why don't you give it?

MR. MILLS. I will continue to strive to be the best citizen that I know how and serve my country in the best way I know how.

MR. DOYLE. I am inviting you to think in terms of cooperating in the job this committee has, this particular job.

We may never see you again, but I hope you do it.

Thank you very much.

MR. WOOD. Mr. Potter, any questions?

Has counsel any further questions?

MR. TAVENNER. No, sir.

MR. WOOD. Do you know of any reason why the witness should not be excused?

MR. TAVENNER. No, sir.

MR. WOOD. It is so ordered.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Robert Goodwin.

MR. WOOD. Mr. Goodwin, will you stand and be sworn, please?

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

MR. GOODWIN. I do.

MR. WOOD. For the purposes of hearing this witness, I will, as chairman, appoint the same subcommittee, Messrs. Doyle, Potter, and Wood.

MR. KANTROVITZ. Same counsel, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Will you please identify yourself for the record, Mr. Counsel, again?

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Gabriel Kantrovitz, Boston, Mass.

Once again, I want to state my objections to the lack of a quorum.

Mr. WOOD. The record will note that you object to the hearing on the ground that a quorum of the full committee is not present.

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

**TESTIMONY OF ROBERT GOODWIN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, GABRIEL KANTROVITZ**

Mr. GOODWIN. Robert Goodwin.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. GOODWIN. April 1914, South Boston, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. GOODWIN. LYNN.

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

Mr. GOODWIN. Through high school; high-school graduate, South Boston High.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment record has been? That is, how you have been employed?

Mr. GOODWIN. Since school?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN. Oh, many jobs, until I went to work in GE.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go to work in GE?

Mr. GOODWIN. 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, prior to 1941, how were you employed? Say, in 1940?

Mr. GOODWIN. In 1940, I worked at the McAllen Co. in South Boston. I worked in hotels for quite a period. Or not "quite a period," but off and on for a couple of years. I was in the CCC's for a period.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your work in GE, General Electric, in Lynn?

Mr. GOODWIN. The nature?

Mr. TAVENNER. The nature of your work.

Mr. GOODWIN. Oh, several jobs.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were they?

Mr. GOODWIN. One time I was a lathe hand. I was an assembler, a winder, a dipper. Oh, there have been at least half a dozen jobs in the whole period.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Herbert A. Philbrick?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer that question, on the grounds that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, Mr. Philbrick, who for 8 or 9 years served in an undercover capacity for a Government agency, testified before this committee on July 23, 1951. He stated that you were one of the persons instructed by the Communist Party to take employment at the General Electric plant for the purpose of colonizing that plant for the Communist Party. Was that true, or false?

Mr. GOODWIN. Well, under the circumstances of today and the circumstances of the present hysteria in the country, I feel that I have to refuse to answer that question on the basis that the answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WOOD. It is not so much a question, sir, of how you feel, but what you do.

Do you answer, or not?

Mr. GOODWIN. No. I refuse to answer, on the basis that the answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you perform any duty or function for the Communist Party at Lynn, Mass., as an employee at General Electric? I should not say "as an employee," while you were employed at General Electric.

Mr. GOODWIN. The same answer, for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information that the Communist Political Association met in convention in Boston, July 21 to 22, 1945, and that the invitation to this convention was issued by Dave Bennett. Were you acquainted with Dave Bennett?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Along with the receipt of the notice for the holding of that convention, there was a statement, we are informed, which was sent out to various clubs, including the Malden Club of the Communist Party, signed by Anne Burlack, James J. Green, Otis A. Hood, Boone Schirmer, William Harrison, Justine O'Connor, and Robert Goodwin.

Do you recall having signed or helped prepare a statement with reference to that convention?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mentioned the name of Boone Schirmer. Are you acquainted with Boone Schirmer?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mentioned the name of William Harrison. I ask you to look at this photograph which I now hand you and which I desire to introduce in evidence and request that it be marked "Goodwin Exhibit No. 1," and state whether or not you can identify William Harrison's picture in that photograph.

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you if you can identify the picture of Louis Budenz in that photograph.

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a Donald Tormey?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you see his photograph in that picture?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons as given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Joseph Figueiredo?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons as given before.

Mr. WOOD. You asked that that be received in evidence?

It will be received.

(The photograph above referred to, marked "Goodwin Exhibit No. 1," is filed herewith.)¹

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Joseph Figueiredo and see if he is present in the room.

Mr. WOOD. Joseph Figueiredo?

(No response.)

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

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons as given before.

¹ See appendix, p. 1413.

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

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the same reasons as given before.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. When you first heard about the testimony of Mr. Philbrick, did you issue a statement denying these charges that he made against you?

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Will you repeat that question, please, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. POTTER. Will you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

(The reporter read the question referred to.)

Mr. GOODWIN. Not that I recall.

Mr. POTTER. Did you make any public statement, statement to the press, denying the charges?

Mr. GOODWIN. No. I made one statement to the press on the question of postponement by the committee, where I felt that the spy charges and the rest of it, if it was true, was so serious that the postponements—I think there were three postponements by the committee. That is the point I made.

Mr. POTTER. You say if they were true. Are you denying the charges now, the charges made by Philbrick in his testimony?

Mr. GOODWIN. The question I raised in the press statement you asked about was the question of postponement.

Mr. POTTER. And I believe you stated in that statement to the press that if they were true they would not have postponed the hearings.

Is that not true?

Now, are you denying the charges made by Mr. Philbrick?

Mr. GOODWIN. Under the circumstances of today, I am——

Mr. POTTER. Well, the circumstances here today are that you are here before the committee and you are under oath to tell the truth.

Mr. GOODWIN. In my opinion, under the circumstances today, I desire to refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. POTTER. No further questions.

Mr. WOOD. It is not so much what you desire. It is what you do.

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse.

Mr. WOOD. For the reason given?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman:

Will you furnish this committee with a copy of that statement that you released to the newspapers, that you referred to?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GOODWIN. Would you frame the question again?

Mr. DOYLE. Your testimony was that you furnished a statement to the newspapers. Will you furnish a copy of that newspaper release which was authorized and given by you, say, within 10 days? Will you mail it in to us?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Has counsel further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

In reply to Congressman Potter's question regarding the making of this newspaper statement, I understood you to say, "We made a statement." Whom were you referring to by "we"?

Mr. GOODWIN. Myself and Mr. Mills.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Mr. Mills.

Who prepared the statement?

Mr. GOODWIN. I refuse to answer, for the reasons given before.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

I think, Mr. Chairman, in light of this development, he should be continued under the subpoena until the 24th of October.

Mr. WOOD. Until the 24th?

Mr. TAVENNER. To the 24th.

Mr. WOOD. The 24th of this month at 10:30.

You may be excused, and if between now and then it should develop that the committee will not require your presence back here, you or your counsel will be informed of that.

The committee will go into executive session now, gentlemen.

(Thereupon, at 3:23 p. m., the committee proceeded in executive session.)

APPENDIX

The following exhibits were introduced during the course of hearings in this volume and are filed with the committee:

Struik Exhibit No. 1.—Article appearing in the Boston Post, Saturday, April 9, 1949, pages 1 and 2, with headline, "No Action by M. I. T. on 'Red'—Professor Not To Be Curbed or Censured, Says Killian—Struik Denies Being Communist." (See pp. 1330, and 1401-1405.)

Struik Exhibit No. 2.—Article appearing in New Masses, July 8, 1947, pages 12-15, entitled "Man Over Myth, Marxism and the Scientific Tradition. How the Founders of Modern Socialism Transformed the Rationalist Outlook Into a Science," by Dirk J. Struik. (See pp. 1333, and 1406-1411.)

Struik Exhibit No. 3.—Letter dated February 5, 1946, signed Dirk J. Struik, executive director of the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., on letterhead of that organization. (See pp. 1335 and 1412.)

Struik Exhibit No. 4.—Article appearing in the Daily Worker, Monday, November 22, 1948, page 4, with headline, "Civic Leaders in New England Rap Frame-up of 12". (See p. 1338; retained in committee files.)

Struik Exhibit No. 5.—Catalog of the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies, 37 Province Street, Boston 8, Mass., spring term, 1947, showing Dirk J. Struik, chairman, American Committee for Indonesian Independence, as being among the lecturers on the subject The World Today; as instructor of a course The Science of Society; and as a member of the board of trustees. (See p. 1351; retained in committee files.)

Torney Exhibit No. 1.—Photograph of four individuals. (See pp. 1381 and 1413.)

Goodwin Exhibit No. 1.—Same as Torney Exhibit No. 1. (See pp. 1398 and 1413.)

STRUIK EXHIBIT No. 1

[The Boston Post, Saturday, April 9, 1949, pp. 1 and 2]

NO ACTION BY M. I. T. ON "RED"

PROFESSOR NOT TO BE CURBED OR CENSURED, SAYS KILLIAN—
STRUIK DENIES BEING COMMUNIST

President James R. Killian, Jr., of M. I. T., made it clear last night he will not censure nor curb Mathematics Prof. Dirk J. Struik, 54, self-proclaimed "Marxist" lecturer, who was accused at the New York Communist trial of being a teacher of Red philosophies at gatherings in Greater Boston homes.

A short time later Professor Struik completed a mathematics lecture to M. I. T. students and denounced the trial as "one against ideas and not facts" and declared the American people for their own good should protest against its continuing.

Herbert A. Philbrick, 33, the Melrose advertising man who served as an FBI counterspy inside the Communist Party ranks for 9 years and who accused the professor from the witness stand, was branded as a "stool pigeon of no intellectual standing," by Professor Struik.

The sensational accusation by FBI counterspy Philbrick against the M. I. T. professor came as a startling surprise to M. I. T. and gave President Killian his first public decision since his inauguration last Saturday.

TO BE INDEPENDENT

When asked what he planned to do about the testimony of Mr. Philbrick, President Killian declared his thoughts were included in four paragraphs of his inaugural address, which read:

"Another obligation to be independent lies on all of our institutions of higher learning. In a period of armed truce, the fundamental principle of academic freedom is subject to stresses which we have not met before. One of the

gravest dangers of the armed truce is the danger that it will force America to relinquish or distort or weaken some of its basic civil rights. I hope that this does not happen either in our country or in our colleges.

"The university more than any other institution, resolves the dichotomy (a cutting in two) between the individual and the institutionalized aspects of modern life. It is an environment where the dignity of man is more important than the pomp of organization. It is the sanctuary of the free mind and the mind which is not free profanes it.

SPIRIT OF SCIENCE

"We must hope that the cold war may not diminish the opportunity to be free, either on the part of the educational institution or on the part of the scholar himself.

"To curtail freedom in our institutes of technology would be to run counter to the spirit of science, which thrives best in an atmosphere of freedom practiced with responsibility—the responsibility of a company of scholars governing themselves."

Previously President Killian had talked with Professor Struik, and Professor Struik revealed he had told his new university head he was a Marxist believer but did not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

In an hour-long interview with a Post reporter, Professor Struik said he does "not know this man Philbrick, but it's clear he was at some private home where I spoke."

SAYS PHILBRICK LIES

The professor, who came to M. I. T. from Holland in 1926 and who has been a citizen since 1934, heatedly denied, however, that Philbrick quoted him correctly. "I have spoken at several private homes. What he says about what I said is a lie. I have never advocated the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. I'm not crazy."

Professor Struik, however, said he "believes in many of the Communist principles" but considers himself a Marxist and said "a Marxist does not believe in the violent overthrow of the government."

Although he is not a dues-paying member of the Communist Party and says he does not hold a Communist membership card, Professor Struik declared that "as a Marxist I have seen many Communists and have read Communist literature and as a Marxist I have much in common with the Communists."

He said he has never participated in any Communist activities and "stayed aloof" from joining the party. During the war, he revealed, he decided to join the Communist Party because of their great work in the war effort, but later changed his mind.

MUCH IN COMMON

"I found it better not to join them as a party member. I join them in particular action if that action is right. A true Marxist is one who realizes Marxism is a general and serious authority on world philosophy," he said.

Professor Struik said he has never advised anyone to join the Communist Party and when anyone asked him such a question he would give that person the advice to find out for himself.

Professor Struik said he readily agrees that Marxism and communism have many things in common. At one time he likened the two isms to the relationship of Christianity to some Christian church.

The professor refused to name the private homes in Greater Boston where he gave talks on Marxist theory. "The people will be persecuted," he said. He revealed, however, he spoke "in many homes and in other places."

He said public speeches on Marxist theory were given by him at the John Lee Club at Harvard, the Mattapan Forum, and at meetings of the Progressive Party. "I am a member of the Progressive Party," he stated.

ENEMY OF FASCISM

He said in the speeches, "I have not ridiculed the law of God or man. I have done my duty as an American to speak out on subjects to which I have given some thought. I am an outspoken enemy of fascism," he said.

Condemning the New York trial, Professor Struik said, "I think this whole attack on the Communist Party, carried on as it is with a stool pigeon of no intellectual standing, is very dangerous to the United States.

"It increases the war danger. I believe it is the duty of all American citizens to protest what is going on in the United States, especially this trial. It is a trial against ideas and not facts. It is like the monkey trial in Dayton, Ohio. The men on trial in New York are not accused of anything except ideas. Some I share and some I don't share.

FEARS "TRADE MOVEMENT NEXT"

"If I did not share any of their views I would still believe in a Nation-wide protest to stop their trial. I believe in the power of ideas so long as they are within the limits of the law. The Communist Party is a legal party and, as far as the evidence goes, the men on trial in New York stayed within the limits of the law," Professor Struik declared.

The M. I. T. mathematician said he fears "if the trial of the Communists is won by the Government it will not be beneficial to the trade-union movement, for they will be next."

Professor Struik said he will not ask that he be allowed to take the witness stand at the New York trial to refute the accusations made by Mr. Philbrick. If he is called, however, "that would be another thing," he said.

Professor Struik said his activities as a Marxist are purely in the "interests of peace." He said he firmly believes the United States and Soviet Russia should have better relations and subscribes to the suggestion President Truman and Stalin should meet to discuss their nations' differences.

MOTHER-IN-LAW "PROUD"

While Mr. Philbrick continued to "pour it on" the Communists and their activities in this section of the country, in his testimony at the New York trial, his friends and relatives continued to express amazement at his being an FBI counterspy.

Mrs. Bessie Luscombe, of 17 Wesley St., Somerville, his mother-in-law, declared she was not only surprised but amazed when she learned of his patriotic work.

Sunday night, 2 days before he took the stand, Mrs. Luscombe said she was in the Philbricks' Melrose home at a family party. Philbrick said nothing about his going to testify.

Mrs. Luscombe said she has not heard from either her daughter or son-in-law since the testimony started in New York. She revealed if she had known what her son-in-law had been doing, she would have advised him to "get out of it." She said, however, she is proud of him now.

PLEASANT SURPRISE

Mr. Philbrick's relatives at Rye Beach, N. H., were pleasantly surprised yesterday when they heard from both Mr. and Mrs. Philbrick.

Mrs. Oris Hadley, his sister, received a telephone call from Mrs. Eva Philbrick during the day. The call was arranged by the FBI when Philbrick's uncle, Manning Remick, appealed to them for news about the safety of Philbrick's wife and three children.

Mrs. Hadley said, "I was pleasantly surprised when Eva telephoned me. She said she has talked two or three times with my brother on the telephone and told me not to worry. She said she and the children are being guarded by the FBI and will be guarded for a long time. I told her we were worried about her and she told us not to worry at all for she was all right and had plenty of protection."

Many Greater Boston people listening to a radio broadcast last night, heard a discussion of the Communist trial in New York during which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of the former President, expressed the belief the FBI should be given more power to ferret out Communists.

SAVANT ACCUSED

FBI COUNTER-SPY BRINGS IN NAME OF TECH PROFESSOR IN TESTIMONY AT NEW YORK RED TRIAL—SAYS HE LED DISCUSSION AT PARTY MEETING

NEW YORK, April 8 (AP).—A "voluntary worker" for the FBI in the Communist Party today named a Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor as a discussion leader in a party professional group.

The witness, Herbert A. Philbrick, 33-year-old advertising man, said Struik attended meetings of the professional group in the Boston area and summed up its studies of Lenin's State and Revolution.

He was testifying at the Federal court conspiracy trial of 11 leaders of the American Communist Party. They are accused of conspiring to advocate violent overthrow of the United States Government.

Philbrick said the professional group was taught it was essential to overthrow the United States Government by force and set up a dictatorship of the workers.

RECEIVED NO PAY

The advertising man, who lives at Melrose, Mass., also told the jury about clandestine contacts with Government agents to tip them off to party moves and the web of precautions spun to hide his role from party officials and members.

He said the FBI paid all his expenses, including his party dues and rental charges on a dictating machine used for his reports. But he asserted he received no pay and did his undercover job voluntarily.

Details about Philbrick's FBI connections came out on cross-examination. He named Struik as a party figure before finishing his direct testimony for the Government.

Philbrick, surprise Government witness who is closely guarded by FBI men as he enters and leaves the Federal courthouse, testified that special agents Lawrence Healy and Dick Dow were his contacts in the Bureau during the 9 years he belonged to the Communist Party or its affiliates.

Throughout this period, he said, he made typewritten, dictated, or oral reports to the United States Security Agency.

SMALL GROUPS

He told of sidling up to Healy at a main intersection in Cambridge to give him one of the reports.

Philbrick said the party professional group of which he was a member met at the Cambridge home of a party member known to him only as Peg. He had testified earlier that those in the group used only their first names and split into small units for security reasons.

At these meetings, certain passages from Lenin's book, which told of the necessity for smashing the present Government, were stressed, the witness said.

One such passage, he testified, stated the "working class cannot simply lay hold of the state machinery and wield it for its own use, but must shatter, break up, blow up, the whole state machinery."

VIOLENT REVOLUTION

The witness said teachers at the sessions included a group leader named "Martha," "a girl named Helen," "Jackie," "Dick," "Henry," and "Butch."

Philbrick said the doctrines of violent revolution were taught at meetings of party clubs in Malden, Wakefield, and Melrose, three communities in the Boston area, as well as the professional group.

WRITES TO MOTHER

PHILBRICK GLAD TO END LIFE OF DUPLICITY THAT ENABLED HIM TO KEEP FBI INFORMED ON RED ACTIVITIES IN NEW ENGLAND

RYE, N. H., April 8.—Free of the 9-year veil of secrecy which has shrouded his triple life, Herbert A. Philbrick, 34-year-old Boston theater advertising executive, has written his mother that he is once more able to breathe free air and to emerge from the duplicity which enabled him to keep the FBI informed of Communist activity in the Boston area.

So careful has the shy and studious spy hunter been that the brief note to his mother telling her of his freedom was relayed from Newton via a greater Boston minister, who placed it in the mail for the Rye Beach address.

When his mother, Mrs. Guy A. Philbrick, wife of a Boston & Maine Railroad conductor, learned her son was testifying for the FBI against 11 alleged Com-

munists in New York, she said she was the most surprised person in the world. She had no inkling that her son had any connection with the FBI and was shocked to tears when she learned her son had been an active Communist student in Cambridge for the purpose of supplying Federal officials with party information.

SPECIAL COURSE

Mrs. Philbrick stated her son had taken a special course at Harvard in psychology in 1941 and it was about that time that he became associated with a supposedly non-Communist group. He was also active at the same time in YMCA and church organization work.

Philbrick had charge of all the advertising for the M. and P. Theater chain, with headquarters in Scollay Square, and during the war promoted the very successful war-bond drives which the theaters sponsored and for which he was commended. All during this time he was attending the Communist school and learning of the plot to infiltrate into American industry, at the same time supplying the FBI with latest developments.

An aunt of the undercover agent, Mrs. A. Manning Remick, wife of the Rye police chief, said she believed her nephew had taken such an active part in the undercover activities for the Federal authorities because of his inability to enter the armed services because of an eye injury received several years ago while at work on an engineering job in Hampton, creosote from a piling had damaged the sight of one eye.

Philbrick assured his mother that he was well guarded and that he felt as if a terrific weight had been lifted from his shoulders. His wife, mother of his four blonde daughters, was not at his Rye Beach summer home as had been reported. She called her mother-in-law from an unannounced location in New England, assuring her that she and the children were in good hands and under constant survey by Federal agents.

STRUIK EXHIBIT No. 2



Justice Takes a Holiday

by VIRGINIA GARDNER

Marx Against Myth

by DIRK J. STRUIK

15¢ • in canada 20¢ july 8, 1947

STRIJK EXHIBIT No. 2

(New Masses, July 8, 1947, pp. 12-15.)

MAN OVER MYTH

MARXISM AND THE SCIENTIFIC TRADITION—HOW THE FOUNDERS OF MODERN SOCIALISM TRANSFORMED THE RATIONALIST OUTLOOK INTO A SCIENCE

(By Dirk J. Struik)

The Communist Manifesto was written at the end of 1847—almost a century ago: it appeared in February of the next year, on the eve of the revolution of 1848. It was a manifesto, a political document, published as the platform of a small and rather obscure group, the Communist League. The temper of the pamphlet was polemical, defiant, passionate. Yet it was at the same time a scientific document, a presentation of a philosophy of history and of society in general. It established social science not only as a means of understanding the social structure, but also as a means of changing and controlling it. It marked the birth of Marxism, which now guides the lives, or helps to guide the lives, of millions of men and women throughout the world.

The fundamental proposition, the core of the manifesto, belongs to Marx. This we know from Engels himself, coauthor of the manifesto and lifelong friend of Marx. That proposition is that in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, as well as the resulting social structure, form the basis from which the political and intellectual history of that epoch can be derived. Consequently the whole history of mankind after the disappearance of primitive tribal society has been a history of class struggles, of contests between exploiting and exploited, between ruling and oppressed classes. The history of these class struggles forms an evolutionary series in which nowadays the main oppressed class, the working class, can only emancipate itself from the ruling class, the bourgeoisie, by emancipating the whole of society from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions, and class struggles. The philosophy of the manifesto made it possible not only to explain the past of society, but also to understand the direction in which present society is going. By analyzing the past it helps to guide the future. Socialism was seen as a conscious act of delivery from the contradictions of capitalism, the possibility of full control of society was deduced from the direction in which the primitive controls of present and past society are necessarily developing.

Engels has remarked that this fundamental Marxian proposition is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology. There, out of haphazard actions of living beings—of which Darwin only recognized natural and sexual selection—general patterns of life evolve which, if properly understood, will eventually allow conscious interference by man in shaping living creatures. Engels also pointed out how the fundamental ideas which Marx applied to the study of society have already been successfully applied to natural science, to the theories of gravitation and light, to electricity, inorganic and organic chemistry. The great contribution of the Communist Manifesto was its method of viewing *all* human activity, with respect to nature as well as society, in the light of science. From now on not only nature but also the social structure could be understood and its behavior forecast and even controlled. The Communist Manifesto sketched for the first time, with inimitable clarity, not only the rationalistic but also the scientific approach to the problems of society.

Two hundred and ten years before the publication of the Communist Manifesto another document had appeared which had sketched, for the first time, the rationalistic approach to nature. In 1637 there was published the Discourse on Method, written by the French philosopher and mathematician Rene Descartes. It is instructive to compare the two revolutionary documents, one of which stands at the beginning of modern natural science and the other at the beginning of modern social science: one of which showed how to control nature, and the other how to control society.

The Communist Manifesto makes the impression of a highly emotional appeal, addressing itself to the "proletarians of all countries." The Discourse is academic

in style, seems to attack nobody in particular, and explains the process by which one man, the author, has tried to establish "the method of rightly conducting the reason, and seeking the truth in the sciences." But a closer inspection reveals the fact that the Communist Manifesto seeks also to establish a method of rightly conducting the reason and seeking truth. And Descartes' discourse on reason was in reality a powerful battle cry, addressing itself to a revolutionary class, the emerging bourgeoisie, in an appeal to conquer the world by the use of science and invention. Cartesianism of the seventeenth century, like Marxism of today, was a highly controversial philosophy. Adherence to Cartesian principles brought many a good man in the time of Louis XIV into serious political, religious, and personal difficulties.

Descartes rejected established authority and tried to set down rational rules for research. The real criterion for truth, he proclaimed, lies in evidence and reason. And thus he established his rule "never to accept anything for true which I did not clearly know to be such; that is to say, carefully to avoid precipitancy and prejudice, and to comprise nothing more in my judgment than was presented to my mind so clearly and distinctly as to exclude all ground of doubt." By using such purely rationalistic—we can say materialistic—methods, he saw enormous perspectives ahead:

"I perceived it to be possible to arrive at knowledge highly useful in life; and in place of the speculative philosophy usually taught in the schools, to discover a practical one, by means of which, knowing the force and action of fire, water, air, the stars, the heavens, and all the other bodies that surround us, as distinctly as we know the various crafts of our artisans, we might also apply them in the same way to all the uses to which they are adapted, and thus render ourselves the lords and possessors of nature." Descartes himself tried to contribute to the execution of his program by research and discoveries in optics, astronomy, medicine, and mathematics.

It was a bold scheme, this program of Descartes, not only because research in natural science was only in its beginnings, but also because most people still had to be convinced of the rationality of a method which proclaimed that the only way of obtaining truth in the sciences is through experiment and reason. Medieval belief in authority was all-powerful. Classical, biblical, and ecclesiastical statements were considered absolutely binding; to break preconceived notions through the combination of reason and experiment was considered heretical. Catch-all words were used to denounce Cartesianism; it was condemned as "atheistic," just as now Marxism is condemned as "totalitarian." Both Calvinists and Jesuits opposed Cartesianism. Descartes' books were placed on the Index in 1664. Three years later the interment of Descartes' ashes in a Paris church was forbidden. This persecution could not frighten philosophers and scientists; even Catholic priests turned to Cartesianism. In Descartes' steps followed the great thinkers of the later seventeenth century, a Spinoza, a Huygens, a Newton, and a Leibniz. In the early eighteenth century Cartesianism even became quite fashionable in France. The triumph of natural science became the triumph of Cartesianism.

Descartes has now won his battle; reason and experiment are universally accepted as the basis for truth in natural science. Much of his specific teachings, on substance, on vortices, on the relation of body and soul, are forgotten. His method remains. There exists at present no reasonable scepticism concerning the truth value of natural science; few people doubt that logical and experimental evidence are able to solve those problems on which there is uncertainty. Not only academic teaching but grammar-school education is impregnated with Cartesian thinking. Every teacher of science, whether in Ohio or in Shansi, is in his own way a disciple of Descartes.

We might also speak of a Marxian rationalism, since Marxism believes in man's ability to obtain objective information concerning the universe, and rejects supernaturalism. However, it differs from Cartesian rationalism in at least two important respects. In the first place, it extends its domain to the field of social relations. At the very beginning of his exposition Descartes made sure that he kept religion outside of his argumentation. He established a dualism of body and soul, of materialism and idealism. Marx subjects not only religion to his materialistic criticism, but the whole of man's social relations. With Marx all human activity, in nature as well as society, can be subjected to the Cartesian test of truth. Descartes made man and his powers of reasoning and of acting supreme in matters pertaining to substance, to natural science. Marx showed that man can become master of his destiny.

A second point of difference exists. Cartesianism is entirely unhistorical. The very idea that history, or human relations in general, can be subjected to scientific analysis, and that such analysis may show that society is in a state of development—this very idea is alien to Descartes. Marxism, on the contrary, is based on the understanding that society is in constant change, and points to the fundamental cause of this change in class society—namely, the existence of the class struggle. Cartesianism, as compared to Marxism, is static, it knows no evolution; its dynamics is restricted to dynamics in the sense of mechanics, and even this in a primitive way. The emphasis on social change in Marxism is combined with an equally strong emphasis on the interrelation of the sciences and the historical character even of natural science—all elements which are missing in Descartes.

These differences are so vital that it is better not to speak of Marxian rationalism at all, but to use another term and to speak of Marxian dialectics. There is also a dialectical element in Cartesianism—for instance in its relation of algebra to geometry, of numbers to points on a line—but it is rather primitive. We might call it an early seventeenth century form of dialectics. Common to both modes of thought is the materialist rejection of supernaturalism; with Descartes in the domain of natural science, with Marx in the domain of all human thought and activity.

The differences between Descartes and Marx are between a revolutionary thinker living at the beginning of the capitalist period and a revolutionary thinker living at a time when the industrial revolution was well on its way. Descartes, consequently, was an individualist, while Marx was socially conscious. Descartes' Discourse opened with a remark on the common sense of man and lets him doubt about the problems of his existence. Then, with the discovery "I think, hence I am," man starts out on his philosophy of certainty. The opening lines of the Communist Manifesto are equally characteristic; they introduce man as a social being: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle." These examples are typical. The Meditations of Descartes open with the author's own desire "to establish a firm and abiding superstructure in the sciences."

Marx's Capital starts by introducing a commodity-producing form of society.

Both Descartes' Discourse and the Communist Manifesto derive their primary importance from their method. Now, more than 300 years after the publication of Descartes' work, almost all of Descartes' specific contributions to science are antiquated. Several specific proposals contained in the Communist Manifesto for immediate political action have also lost their importance for today, though its basic analysis and major predictions have stood the test of time. In both Descartes and Marx the method of thinking has retained its full value, and Marx's, being the modern method, has a far wider appeal. Philosophy, in Marx's words, becomes material power when it directs the action of the masses.

The most striking thing about the Communist Manifesto is its uncanny timelessness; but for some details the pamphlet could have been written today. How many political or sociological documents written a hundred years ago have this same immediate appeal? There are not many scientific papers of the years before 1850 which possess this timeless aspect: the only documents I can think of are some books by the mathematicians Gauss or Laplace. Helmholtz' historic presentation of the principle of conservation of energy was also published in 1847—a worthy companion to the Communist Manifesto in the sweeping grandeur of its ideas. Yet the full text of Helmholtz' pamphlet has definitely lost its actuality. Natural science has moved fast in the past century, while social science has moved much slower, despite the enormous increase in specialized information. Marx and Engels are as timely today as they were in 1847.

What are the main contributions to social science laid down in the Communist Manifesto? The core of the argumentation is the principle of historical materialism, which we have already given in Engels' formulation. Moreover we find, in few but meaningful words:

1. The statement that every form of society is in a state of evolution, each form passing into another one.

2. An analysis of the origin of the two principal classes of capitalist society, the employers and the workers ("bourgeoisie" and "proletarians").

3. A description of the revolutionary role which the employing class has played, and of the way in which the laws of capitalist society itself force workers into organizations of their own choosing.

4. An account of the causes which make the bourgeoisie more and more unable to remain the ruling class.

5. The conclusion that socialism will emerge as the result of the historical evolution of capitalist society itself.

6. A materialistic analysis of the content of different ethical norms and sociological structures existing in present-day society, such as the forms of property, the instability of family life, the content of culture and so-called eternal truths like freedom and justice.

7. A critical description of all previous attempts to change society into socialism.

The manifesto gives an astonishing forecast of some of the most important social phenomena of the past century: The growth of trade unions, the concentration of capital, the political organization of the working class, the conflict between the private ownership of the principal means of production and the public interest, the formation of a socialist society. This is the more remarkable since in 1847 many of these phenomena were hardly, or not at all, in existence. It is easy now to see some weaknesses; the most interesting, perhaps, is its failure to mention the national movements for self-determination. Marx and Engels, in their later work, corrected some of these weaknesses themselves.

The great struggle of Cartesianism was waged against authority and obscurantism in the field of the natural sciences. This struggle had to be conducted against elements so benighted that we find it hard to believe that they were a reality. The fear of earthquakes and comets as tokens of a wrathful Deity is only one example. Another example was the belief in witchcraft. It is instructive to recall that some of the most ardent fighters against this miserable belief came from the school of Descartes, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly through intermediate interpreters. We think, for instance, of the Reverend Balthasar Bekker, who lived from 1634 to 1698 as a minister in the Netherlands, a good patriot and a highly cultured man, who tried to convince his fellow citizens to adopt a tolerant attitude to Cartesianism. He met with sharp opposition, which turned into violent hostility when he attacked the ancient fear of comets and the equally ancient belief in witches. His four-volume *Bewitched World* (1693) was a systematic, relentless, and ingenious attack on devils and demons; with keen wit he unraveled story after story about ghosts and witches, and "exiled the devil into hell." It was one of the strongest pleas against obscurantism ever written. Bekker's book was received with outcries of horror, especially from the pu pit; he became involved in a long trial, and lost his position as a minister in Amsterdam. However, already during Bekker's lifetime his ideas gained acceptance, and his book was able to save the lives of several wretched persons who otherwise would have perished on the scaffold.

The struggle against obscurantism in the field of natural sciences is not yet won, not even in America; but the Cartesian approach is at any rate accepted by most people with a rudiment of education. This is not the case with the acceptance of rationalist ideas in the field of social relations. A new edition of the *Bewitched World* could be written today, and four volumes would hardly be sufficient to deal with the material. From all sides, in newspapers and magazines, on the radio, in schools and from the pulpits, not to speak of the Halls of Congress, obscurantism is propagated with the greatest ardor. This, by itself, is not new. Fascism made obscurantist propaganda a fundamental part of its struggle for power. It was the propaganda of the myth, the legend, the lie, and the big lie. There exists a book called *No Compromise*, written by Melvin Rader (1941), which gives an analysis of this bewildering mass of conscious misinformation. But the destruction of the Axis has not been the end of obscurantist propaganda; its geographical center has only moved to the United States.

The present wave of misinformation has created new demons, devils, and witches, who are now collectively labeled "Reds" or "Communists," or "totalitarians." No rational analysis is given of the meaning of these words, which are only used to frighten. The simplest rules of semantics are discarded; authoritarian regimes are called democratic; liberal clergymen are called Communist; conceptions such as "freedom of the press," "religious freedom," "dictatorship" are used without any reference to their actual content. The result is that the average American of these days, if he believes what he reads and hears, must be living in a world of his own so fantastic, so utterly different from reality that Bekker would have no trouble in recognizing a new bewitched world.

An understanding of Marxism and its main ideas becomes under such circumstances extremely difficult. In sharp contrast to the widespread interest which other peoples take in Marxism stands the aloofness of many Americans. It is still a test of the liberalism of a college whether the Communist Manifesto can be freely discussed in the classroom. Even liberal instructors identify historical

materialism with economic determinism, ignoring the fact that Marxism stresses that man makes his own history. This ignorance of Marxism is fatal, since the theory first expounded in the Communist Manifesto is now guiding the destiny of millions of people with whom we have entered into the solemn covenant of the United Nations. How can we understand the Russians if we ignore their philosophy? They understand ours well, too well.

It is sometimes amazing to see how scholars and scientists who would not write a sentence in their professional publications without exact documentation are willing to accept the wildest hearsay evidence about so-called Communists and totalitarians. They may well ponder the case of a contemporary of Balthasar Bekker, also a minister, the Reverend Cotton Mather of Boston. Mather was an admirer of Newton, advocated the Copernican system when it was still heretical to do so, was the first to propose variolous inoculation in America, and was a botanist of no mean accomplishment. Yet he believed in demons and witches, and is now mainly remembered because of the disgraceful role he played in the Salem witch trials. His error stemmed from his inability to apply the rationalistic doctrine, which guided him in so many other cases, to the question of witchcraft, despite the fact that in his day the correct position was possible. There are too many Cotton Mathers in our schools and pulpits today. Let them remember, if not the words of Marx, then at least those of Descartes and comprise nothing more in their judgment than has been presented so clearly and distinctly as to exclude all ground of doubt.

(NOTE.—The following is printed in a box on same page with beginning of the foregoing article by Dirk J. Struik:)

Marxism was born in struggle. 1947-48 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the Communist Manifesto, the document which introduced scientific socialism to mankind.

A specter which has haunted the oppressors of man, Marxism for that reason has been ceaselessly attacked since its inception by the ruling class and its agents. It has been denied and denounced, "refuted" and "revised," from pulpit, press, and lectern. In our time it has been exorcised by Franco's firing squads, burned in the square of Nuremberg—and in the ovens of Maidanek. In our own country it has been harried from high and low, by philosophers and finks, by sages and stooges, by Clara Boothe Luce and Al Capone—and hounded by J. Edgar Hoover and John Rankin.

Embodying man's age-old dream for freedom, it has for that reason become rooted in the minds and loved in the hearts of millions. Its victories are imposing—and increasing; its adherents legion throughout the world; its greatest monument, the socialist society of the U. S. S. R., a greater power than ever. From the chaos and wreckage of the capitalist world Marxism emerges ever stronger, invincible.

To celebrate this anniversary New Masses will publish a series of articles by outstanding authorities on the meaning of Marxism in American life, its effects on science, culture, and politics. There will also be articles by leading Marxists of other countries. This essay by Dr. Struik, distinguished American scholar and professor of mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is the first of this series.

THE EDITORS.

STRIK EXHIBIT No. 3

MASSACHUSETTS COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.

35 newbury street • boston 16, massachusetts • kenmore 7188

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. Chairman
Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

Acting Chairman
Edwin B. Goodell, Jr.

Executive Director
Prof. Dirk J. Struk

Vice-Chairmen
Alexander Brin
Mrs. Harold H. Given

Treasurer
Dr. Samuel G. Pavlo

Executive Secretary
Ethel Machanic

Katrina B. Anderson
Prof. Hugh W. Bobb
Eugene Blum
Anna Cort

H. W. L. Dana
Dr. Albert C. Dieffenbach
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman

William Harrison
Basil Kacedon
Nancy Cox Premo
Eric Starbuck
Joseph Suk
Sol Vail

SPONSORS:

- Leslie Arnold
- Mrs. Edwin F. Atkins
- Prof. J. A. C. Fagginger Auer
- Mrs. Alice Stone Blackwell
- Mrs. W. L. Boyden
- Prof. Edgar S. Brightman
- Lawrence G. Briss
- Dr. Hugh Cabot
- Prof. Walter B. Cannon
- William H. Cary, Jr.
- Pres. Karl T. Compton
- Mrs. Charles A. Coledge
- Rev. Frederick M. Eliot
- Joseph Ford
- Deon Lucy Franklin
- Serge Goposchkin
- Dr. Bernard I. Goldberg
- Mrs. J. B. Gordon
- Sidney Grant
- Rev. Dana McLeon Greeley
- Prof. Harrison Harley
- Bishop L. O. Hartman
- Prof. William E. Hocking
- Prof. Howard Mumford Jones
- Mrs. Fannie Bowditch Katz
- Dr. Serge Koussevitzky
- Richard Linsley
- Prof. Kirtley F. Mather
- Prof. F. O. Matthiessen
- Alexander Meyersoff
- Prof. George R. Minot
- Alma R. Morse
- Mrs. John B. Nichols
- Rose Harwood
- Julia Swift Orvis
- Prof. Ralph Barton Perry
- Mrs. William Z. Ripley
- Joseph Salerno
- Dr. George Sarton
- Rev. Henry K. Sherrill
- Robert Joseph S. Shaw
- Mrs. Arthur A. Shurcliff
- Joseph I. Seibert
- Nicholas Stanimsky
- Elhu D. Stone
- Warren S. Sturgis
- Nicholas Vakar
- Howard Wilson
- Mrs. Andrew N. Winslow
- Dr. Mary E. Wooley

February 5, 1946

Mr. Ernie Adamson
Committee on Un-American Activities
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

The address of Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam
is 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York.

Bishop Oxnam is the head of the Federa-
tion of Churches of Christ of America.

Yours very truly,

Dirk J. Struk
Dirk J. Struk,
Executive Director

DJS/hc

2

TORMEY EXHIBIT No. 1

GOODWIN EXHIBIT No. 1



Lower row, left to right, Donald Tormey and Louis Budenz; at top, Joseph Figueredo and William Harrison.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3822

