

9335  
H<sup>o</sup>134

No. 9335. No 134



GIVEN BY

---





HEARINGS REGARDING COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES  
AMONG FARM GROUPS

---

---

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

—————  
FEBRUARY 28 AND MARCH 9, 1951  
—————

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



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1951

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*

# HEARINGS REGARDING COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG FARM GROUPS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1951

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

## PUBLIC HEARING

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 2:15 p. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; Donald T. Appell and Courtney E. Owens, investigators; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record disclose, please, that there are present Messrs. Moulder, Doyle, Velde, Kearney, Potter, and Wood.

Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call Mr. Lem Harris.

Mr. WOOD. Is Mr. Harris present?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Will you stand, please, Mr. Harris, and be sworn.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat. Mr. Harris, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. HARRIS. I am.

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

Mr. FREEDMAN. Yes. David M. Freedman, F-r-e-e-d-m-a-n.

Mr. WOOD. Your office address?

Mr. FREEDMAN. 11 Park Place, New York City.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Harris, I notice there are photographers present. Do you object to your picture being taken before this committee?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection.

Mr. WOOD. I will ask the photographer to do it with as little interference as possible with the proceedings.

Mr. FREEDMAN. Mr. Chairman, before you proceed I would like to request, if possible, that a statement be made on the record by yourself or counsel as to the general nature of the inquiry which you propose to make of Mr. Harris. I think that would help him in his answers,

for one thing, and it would at least help us understand what the committee wants to examine him about.

Mr. WOOD. That should be made obvious in the course of the examination. Proceed.

**TESTIMONY OF LEMENT U. HARRIS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS  
COUNSEL, DAVID M. FREEDMAN**

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

Mr. HARRIS. Lement U. Harris.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. HARRIS. I was born March 1, 1904, in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you briefly outline your educational background?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I am a graduate of Harvard College.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what year did you graduate?

Mr. HARRIS. In the year 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. I neglected to ask you your present address.

Mr. HARRIS. 2865 Faber Terrace, Far Rockaway, Long Island, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline to the committee briefly your occupational background?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, my lifelong interest has been agriculture, and my occupation is best summarized as research in the field of agriculture. I have farmed some, and have been interested in agriculture ever since I left college.

Mr. TAVENNER. But how have you been employed? What means of engaging in an occupation have you followed since you left college? What occupations have you followed for profit or for compensation?

Mr. HARRIS. Not much profit or compensation. I have farmed and engaged in research in the field of agriculture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you engaged in farming?

Mr. HARRIS. I farmed in Pennsylvania, Bucks County.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period of time?

Mr. HARRIS. 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Beginning and ending when?

Mr. HARRIS. Beginning in 1926 and ending in 1929.

Mr. TAVENNER. And since 1929 how have you been employed or engaged in work?

Mr. HARRIS. I haven't been employed since that period, and my work has been of the character I have just named.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe it further? It is of such a general character that I don't understand just how you have been employed since 1929.

Mr. HARRIS. There is little more that I can say, other than that I have followed closely various phases of agriculture, emphasis on agricultural economics, income, how farmers make their livelihood, some of the difficulties that farmers encountered, particularly during the thirties. That has been my focus of attention during that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom have you worked during this period?

Mr. HARRIS. I have been a free-lance person. I have not been employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been employed by the Federal Government?

Mr. HARRIS. I have not.



Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been employed by a State government?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. All of this work to which you refer was done, you say, as free-lance work?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any compensation of any character for the work that you did, or any fees?

Mr. HARRIS. No. For strict accuracy I will mention articles in Current History magazine a good many years ago, for which I received their normal fee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, we have ascertained that on November 21, 1927, you were issued a United States passport for travel to Europe. Will you tell the committee in what countries you traveled on that passport?

Mr. HARRIS. Will you repeat the date, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. November 21, 1927.

Mr. HARRIS. I traveled in France and Italy at that time.

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

Mr. HARRIS. My grandmother, who was residing in Rome at the time, became very ill. My mother requested that I accompany her, and I did, and we visited in Rome.

Mr. TAVENNER. On April 30, 1929, you were issued a passport for travel to Italy and the Soviet Union. What was the purpose of that trip?

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to engage in agriculture in the Soviet Union at that time, and did so.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you engage in agriculture in the Soviet Union?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I was there approximately a year and a half.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what area of the Soviet Union were you located?

Mr. HARRIS. In a number. To begin with, in a region called the North Caucasus, where there was a state farm where I worked. After that I was employed in two Soviet factories.

For accuracy, I said I was employed. If you want to correct my earlier testimony on compensation, when I worked on this state farm and in these factories I received the modest wages that were received at that time. That is what I lived on.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much was that?

Mr. HARRIS. I went to work for 90 rubles a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did that mean in American currency at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. I thought I was rather rich, because all the necessities of life were very cheap and I could live on that. It is hard to make a comparison. To give you a notion, rent per month was 4 rubles for me.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much did your wages amount to per month in American currency at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. The currency exchange at that time was in the neighborhood of 50 cents a ruble, so that if you want to make that arbitrary comparison you can.

Mr. MOULDER. When was that, Mr. Tavenner? I didn't understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1929.

How long were you in Russia on that occasion?

Mr. HARRIS. About a year and a half.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other persons from the United States engaged in that work with you?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, where I first worked there were a number of Americans, including, I think he was the chief salesman of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., Fletcher, and half a dozen other Americans sent there by their respective companies. At that time they were selling farm implements to the Soviet Union. I worked with these people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Harold Ware one of the persons there at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, he was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he there during the entire period you were there?

Mr. HARRIS. I judge not. If I remember rightly he left the country before I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the character of work he was doing?

Mr. HARRIS. He was engaged in being of assistance to the Soviet Government in modern forms of agriculture, in particular, power farming in the wheat belt.

Mr. TAVENNER. On June 5, 1935, you were issued an additional passport for travel to England, France, and Germany. Will you please state to the committee the purpose of that trip?

Mr. HARRIS. In 1935?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; June 5, 1935.

Mr. HARRIS. The purpose of that trip was to make an agricultural survey in the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you designate the Soviet Union as your destination in your application for a passport?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of the application for passport, which was obtained by subpoena duces tecum from the Passport Division of the State Department, and I will ask you if you can identify it. Do you recognize the photograph on the second page as being a photograph of you?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And is that your signature at the end of the application?

Mr. HARRIS. There is a signature at the top.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where the oath is taken?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your signature?

Mr. HARRIS. It appears to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce the photostat in evidence and ask that it be marked "Harris Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. WOOD. It will be admitted.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you note on the first page that the statement is made, "I am about to go abroad temporarily and and return to the United States within 1 year" and in the place for names of countries to be visited, "England, France, and Germany." Why did you omit any reference to the Soviet Union?

Mr. HARRIS. I really don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could it have been for the purpose of misleading the State Department as to the real object of your trip, or your real destination?

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure not.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was the trip in 1935 financed?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. On this question I think it leads me into an area of personal jeopardy and might possibly be used to incriminate me, and I will have to refer to the fifth amendment and decline to answer on that basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to answer as to the source of the funds which paid for your trip to Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. On the grounds that I named.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the source of the funds for the first and second trips, those in 1927 and 1929?

Mr. HARRIS. They were my personal funds.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the third trip, that in 1935, was not from your personal funds?

Mr. HARRIS. I have to decline to answer that on the same grounds, as part of the same question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, I show you a photostatic copy of World Tourists' records relating to your travel in 1935, and I will ask you to examine it and state the meaning of the letter "B" appearing in the receipt after your name, and the name "Blake" appearing immediately after your name in the manifest.

Mr. HARRIS. I know nothing about this. I can't explain the questions that you ask.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you book passage on the *Britannic*?

Mr. HARRIS. I sailed on that boat.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you leave from New York as your port of embarkation?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who obtained your passage for you?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. That question is similar to the other and places me in an area where I might possibly incriminate myself, so on those grounds I will have to decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive a total of \$127.60 for your passage from New York to Moscow?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you look at the manifest and receipt and state whether or not it refreshes your recollection?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I don't recall any of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer this photostatic copy of record of World Tourists in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Harris Exhibit No. 2."

Mr. WOOD. Let it be admitted.

Mr. TAVENNER. The receipt states:

Received from L. Harris, address B, the sum of \$127.60.

Did you pay that sum to World Tourists, Inc.?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. The manifest is made out in the name of L. Harris (Blake). Can you identify for me the name Blake?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that this leads into the same area and could be incriminating.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it the true name of any individual?

Mr. HARRIS. I will have to give you the same answer to that question, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it not used to designate the name of William Weiner?

Mr. HARRIS. I have to give you the same answer, decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Other persons who have testified before this committee whose travel was paid through World Tourists, Inc., included William Hinckley. Did you know William Hinckley? Were you acquainted with William Hinckley?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know anyone by that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Robert Whisner, W-h-i-s-n-e-r?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gerhart Eisler?

Mr. HARRIS. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. I stated that persons who had testified before this committee—and I should have said or who appeared before this committee—were shown to have been furnished funds through World Tourists, Inc., and I have given you the names of three persons to whom that applies, and am asking you if you knew any of the three.

Mr. WOOD. He has answered as to two of them.

Mr. HARRIS. You are now asking as to the third name?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. With respect to the third name there is again, I think, obviously, danger of self-incrimination to answer that question, so I will not answer it on those grounds.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Harris, the question was simply, do you know the person he is asking you about? Do you think it would incriminate you to answer that question?

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think, Mr. Wood—

Mr. WOOD. You may confer with the witness, but let him answer.

Mr. HARRIS. I think under present circumstances it could lead to a situation in which I might be incriminated.

Mr. WOOD. And for that reason you decline to answer whether you were acquainted with him or not?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. The investigation made by this committee shows that Jacob Golos was the president or head of World Tourists, Inc. Were you acquainted with him?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. I think that falls in the same category, which means that I can't reply on the same grounds—it might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Investigation by this committee also discloses that the name "Blake" was used to designate an account which had been placed by the Communist Party for use by World Tourists, Inc., in the payment of passage from the United States to foreign ports. Do you know whether that is true or not?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't know whether there was such an account?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you explain the connection of that account with your name?

Mr. HARRIS. I can't explain it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have no idea as to the meaning of the word "Blake" which followed your name in the manifest?

Mr. HARRIS. As a reader of the press I could hazard a guess, but I can't say that I have any positive knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any knowledge at any time as to the source of the money which was being used to defray the expense of your passage to Moscow?

Mr. HARRIS. I will have to decline to answer that. It could be used to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, the issues of the Daily Worker of December 23, 1932, November 16, 1933, January 8, 1936, and February 13, 1936, reflect that you were secretary of the Farmers' National Committee. Is it correct that you were secretary of that organization?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. I think that question, too, enters the area of leading towards matters that could be called incriminating, so I will decline to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the purposes for which the Farmers' National Committee was organized?

Mr. HARRIS. That question has the same answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. MOULDER. You mean you refuse to answer for the same reasons?

Mr. HARRIS. For the same reasons, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you spent the period of time from 1929 in a free-lance capacity working in the interest of agriculture. Define for the committee just how you worked and with whom you worked. Did you work with any organization of any kind?

Mr. HARRIS. There is not much I can say in answer to that question. As to whom I worked with and the organizations, I think in each instance they lead towards the same area of self-incrimination, so I will have to decline to answer certainly that part of the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the Farmers' Emergency Relief Conference which was held in Washington in 1932?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend it?

Mr. HARRIS. I am familiar with that conference.

Mr. WOOD. You were asked if you attended it, Mr. Harris. Did you attend it?

Mr. HARRIS. I attended it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In a speech made by Ella Reeve Bloor in which she recounted the activities of her son, Harold Ware, in the farm movement of the United States, she referred to a Farmers' Emergency Relief Conference held in Washington in December 1932. In connection with this conference she said: "My son Hal was asked to help call such a conference. Working with Hal on the conference preparations were Lem Harris, Rob Hall, and other active and intelligent young men."

Are you the Lem Harris that was referred to by Mother Bloor on that occasion?

Mr. HARRIS. I think clearly there, too, we get into the area of possible self-incrimination, so I won't answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you attended that conference. Did you take any part in the calling of the conference or arranging for it to be called?

Mr. HARRIS. I will have to give you the same answer. We are now, in my judgment, in the area of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the Rob Hall to which Mother Bloor referred in that statement has having worked with her son Hal and you the same person known as Robert Hall, now Washington correspondent for the Daily Worker?

Mr. HARRIS. That also is in the area that may lead to self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. And do you decline to answer for that reason?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you known Robert Hall, or do you know him?

Mr. HARRIS. I must give the same answer as to the previous question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall at this conference which you state you attended, that the conference voted to organize the Farmers' National Committee for Action?

Mr. HARRIS. There, too, I must give you the same answer, that that conceivably is a link in a chain of connected circumstances that could incriminate me.

Mr. WOOD. Then what is your pleasure about answering the question?

Mr. HARRIS. Therefore I must decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any of the meetings, or executive committee meetings, of the Farmers' National Committee for Action?

Mr. HARRIS. I must give you the same answer and decline to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period from 1929 on to the present time, when you say you were interested in agriculture, were you interested in Farm Research, Inc., and its work?

Mr. HARRIS. Will you repeat the period of time you were referring to?

Mr. TAVENNER. Any time from 1929 to the present time.

Mr. HARRIS. My interest in Farm Research existed in the earlier date you named.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1929?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't believe it existed prior to 1929.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that.

Mr. HARRIS. I was mistaken in my answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you have been interested in Farm Research, Inc., since 1929?

Mr. HARRIS. I am trying to indicate that 1931 is approximately the period when I had an interest in Farm Research.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your interest in it?

Mr. HARRIS. I thought it was a convenient and effective means of conducting studies and research for agriculture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of its officials?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall any officials.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of what purports to be the minutes of a meeting of the Board of Farm Research, Inc., on May 2, 1933, which purports to have been signed by you. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not that is your signature?

Mr. HARRIS. What is the question?

Mr. WOOD. The question is: Is that your signature on that document?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have read it, I assume?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. It shows as follows:

The resignations of Lement Harris, Lillian Gales, and Jerry Ingersoll from the offices of president, secretary, and treasurer, respectively, were presented for acceptance.

After due deliberation the resignations of the present officers were unanimously accepted by the board which proceeded to the election of new officers. Webster Powell was elected president of the corporation and Charles Garland was elected secretary and treasurer.

The board empowered Mr. Garland as secretary-treasurer to handle the financial affairs of the corporation and draw checks in the name of the corporation and exercise all other powers normally incident to the office.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

The foregoing minutes are correct.

To which all of those individuals appear to have signed their names.

I offer that photostat in evidence and ask that it be marked "Harris Exhibit No. 3."

Mr. WOOD. Let it be admitted.

Mr. TAVENNER. After reading those minutes, you realize you were president of that organization as late as 1933, do you not?

Mr. HARRIS. Let us emphasize this is 1933 we are speaking of, some 18 years ago, and I did not recall holding an office, and I presume from this that it was the type of designation sometimes done in legal matters, somebody has to be president and apparently somebody was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually, you were one of the founders of the organization, weren't you?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I don't recall clearly.

Mr. TAVENNER. This wasn't something you were just casually connected with?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were one of the prime movers in its organization and in the functioning or work of that organization, weren't you?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know whether "prime mover" is an accurate statement, but, as I have stated, I was participating in its work.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was in the field of agriculture, in which you have been interested to the extent that you have not done any other work since 1929 except write articles for several magazines?

Mr. HARRIS. That was and is my primary interest, that field.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the magazine Facts for Farmers a publication of Farm Research, Inc.?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the committee should know that the Farm Research, Inc., referred to in this exhibit that you have just shown me and marked is apparently a legally different entity from subsequent such corporations with a similar name. What I am stating is that my leaving the picture of Farm Research, I assume at approximately the date of that exhibit, severed my official connections at that

time, which have not been resumed, and that the publication issued since then is not of the same corporation as the one referred to here.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is a fact, is it not, that this corporation was chartered here in the city of Washington around 1931?

Mr. HARRIS. I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. And isn't it a fact that the charter has never been revoked or canceled?

Mr. HARRIS. It probably has. For your clarification, all I mean is that the corporation, considerably after I left it, I understand was dissolved and was reincorporated a number of times in my absence and without my participation.

Mr. TAVENNER. It lost its charter and then was revived? Is that what I understand you to mean?

Mr. HARRIS. That is my understanding of what happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was the same corporation, although there were periods when its charter had lapsed, possibly? Is that what you mean?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know if it was the same or not. I am informing you there were those lapses and reincorporations.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it is essentially the same corporation now as it was at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know if "essentially" is the correct word or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of this organization?

Mr. HARRIS. You are referring now to the period when I was associated with it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. As I stated, its purpose was to be a center of information, gathering point of economic and other information of agricultural character.

Mr. TAVENNER. What use was made of that information?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, there was a mimeographed sheet at that time that utilized this information.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was done with that sheet?

Mr. HARRIS. It was mailed.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom?

Mr. HARRIS. To interested parties who paid a subscription fee and received it, I presume.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they farmers generally over the country?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were making your appeal to the farmers of the country?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Through that leaflet. Was the name of it Facts for Farmers?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the same paper or magazine of which Mr. Charles J. Coe is now the editor?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think you can call it the same, the difference being both in format and appearance and so on; it was a mimeographed affair at that time, and then the corporation went through various legal changes and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the editor of Facts for Farmers at the time you were connected with this organization? Were you?



Mr. HARRIS. I am not sure it had a formal editor. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you edit it, or prepare it for publication?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I did write material which appeared in it. My memory isn't clear enough to be able to give you an exact answer as to whether I was the editor. I rather gather I wasn't, though I really don't have any clear memory on it. I do know that I wrote some of the material in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, the Washington City Directory for 1935 lists Harold Ware as an agricultural engineer with Farm Research, Inc. What were his functions in connection with that organization?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I don't know. In 1935?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I presume I was living in the West at that time. I don't have that information.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living in 1935?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, subject to correction, because I was moving around a good deal at that time, I think it was Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your business there?

Mr. HARRIS. I was pursuing the same interest. That was the period, as you know, of widespread and considerable hardship to farmers, the depression period, when there were mortgage foreclosures and other things generally referred to as the farm revolt, and when the small farmers made some good American history, I believe. I was happy to be in the same neighborhood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you just in the neighborhood, or did you take part in the activities of that period?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, don't know what "taking part" specifically means, but I was in farm homes, I was moving about the farm area, and in that sense took part.

Mr. TAVENNER. What farmers' groups or associations were you associated with and affiliated with at that time in that movement in the West that you have spoken of?

Mr. HARRIS. I can recall the Farm Holiday Association which existed then.

Mr. TAVENNER. United Farmers' League?

Mr. HARRIS. I recall that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected with it, or affiliated with it?

Mr. HARRIS. I think I was a member. This is close to 20 years ago, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you active in the work of that organization, United Farmers' League?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think so. I presume you mean in some official sense. If you mean in the sense of a member of an organization as active, I was a member, I presume: I don't feel sure on that point.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at the same time a member of the Farmers' National Committee for Action?

Mr. HARRIS. That is in the area of other questions that you have asked that I think does establish the link that might lead eventually to something that might tend to incriminate me, so I will decline to answer the question on those grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did United Farmers' League support the program of the Farmers' National Committee for Action?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no memory on that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your connection with the Farm Holiday Association to which you referred?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I recall having a membership card in the Nebraska Farm Holiday Association, and spending some time in that State. I don't remember any other formal connection at the moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you editor of Holiday's News, a publication put out by that organization?

Mr. HARRIS. No. I was never editor of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected with its publication or preparation for publication?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you on the editorial staff of that publication?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think so. I am quite sure, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any connection with it?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. I perhaps can give you the information that I think you are desiring at this point. It wasn't me. My wife was assistant to the editor of this paper, the Farm Holiday News, during perhaps a couple of years of its existence.

Mr. WOOD. Did you make contributions to it?

Mr. HARRIS. I was trying to recall. I don't remember any contributions of my own.

Mr. WOOD. Write anything for it?

Mr. HARRIS. I can't remember if I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that the United Farmers' League merged with several other farm organizations?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I don't think I do recall that. Could you name them?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. The Farmers' Union was one, and the National Farm Holiday Association was another.

Mr. HARRIS. You may have refreshed yourself recently. I would be very surprised if your information was accurate that the United Farmers' League merged with the Farmers' Union. I never heard of such a merger.

Mr. TAVENNER. Am I correct in stating that it did merge with the National Farm Holiday Association?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall that merger.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of which you were a member?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. That is, I was a member of one of the State branches. I wasn't involved in policies or its leadership, and I don't recall the merger you refer to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any salary, fee, or compensation of any kind from the National Farm Holiday Association?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall any fee or salary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive compensation of any kind from it?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think so.

Mr. WOOD. An expense account?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you work with that association, and just what was the nature of your duties?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the assumption in your question may be a trifle erroneous. I didn't work with them in the sense that I was either their employee or represented them officially. I recall no time

when I played that role, so I never did work with them in the sense I think you mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your connection with that association?

Mr. HARRIS. Merely that I had a membership as referred to. That is about all. The fact that my wife was editing their paper at that time is a form of association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the branch there known as the Minnesota Farm Holiday Association?

Mr. HARRIS. There was a Minnesota Farm Holiday Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with it at any time?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall. The likelihood is that I was, but I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected at any time with the South Dakota Farm Holiday Association?

Mr. HARRIS. I was in South Dakota from time to time, but I don't recall ever holding any official connection with the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you there to promote its interests in any manner?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall being there for that specific purpose.

Mr. TAVENNER. But did you do that while you were there?

Mr. HARRIS. I presume so. As I mentioned—

Mr. TAVENNER. The same thing is true in Minnesota?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, the same thing is true in the sense—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the character of the work that you were doing to promote the interests of those associations?

Mr. HARRIS. In an advisory character, in the sense that I was widely acquainted in many rural communities in that part of the country and met with farmers, and they had plenty to discuss in those days, and they thought I could be helpful from the standpoint of policy, finance, and related matters that were disturbing them greatly.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was your full-time occupation at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. As I recall; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And prior to that you were doing virtually the same thing in connection with your duties with Farm Research, Inc., here in Washington?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You also contributed in the same manner to the United Farmers' League, did you not?

Mr. HARRIS. If you mean in the same advisory fashion?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. And also as to the Farmers' Union?

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney leaves hearing room.)

Mr. HARRIS. Well, if you are referring to the period of the Farm Holiday movement, I don't recall any connections with the Farmers' Union then. I joined the Farmers' Union as a member as early as I could, but I think that came subsequent to the period you are inquiring about.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, 1936 or 1937.

Mr. HARRIS. Possibly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then after the formation of the Farmers' Union you continued in the same general character or work as that which you had performed in connection with these other organizations?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me make this clear to the committee. The advisory character of the work that I referred to does not mean that the officers or national leaders of the organization were requesting such advice, because they didn't. My connections were with various localities where I was acquainted with the farm members, and it was with them that I performed this function.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't quite understand your contribution of advice to these organizations without their asking for it or requesting it.

Mr. HARRIS. I merely mean that my connections were with the memberships in many spots, the locals, they are called, and not of a character of the national officers requesting that I do something for them. That was not the nature of the work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who paid your expenses in all these undertakings?

Mr. HARRIS. Nobody; by which I mean I was financing myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Without any income of any character from these various enterprises?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right. I want to be specific about that. If you are referring, by "these various enterprises," to Farm Holiday, Farmers' Union, and United Farmers' League—

Mr. TAVENNER. And Farm Research, Inc.

Mr. HARRIS. And Farm Research, Inc., I don't recall ever receiving any compensation from them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive compensation from any other source for that work which you did for these various organizations you have just named?

Mr. HARRIS. Compensation is a broad term.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean money or reimbursement of any character for your travel, your time, and your efforts.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, that, once more, brings us to the area which could be self-incriminating, and so I won't answer that question on those grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you were paid, however, for these services that you were rendering to the farmers without their request?

Mr. HARRIS. I didn't say that I was.

Mr. WOOD. Let me ask you if you were?

Mr. HARRIS. Pardon?

Mr. WOOD. Were you paid for the services you rendered or the expenses you incurred in connection with the organizations that you just outlined? Were you paid at all?

Mr. HARRIS. My income, the money on which I lived and so on during this activity, was primarily my own money.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't ask you that. I asked if you received compensation for services you rendered or for any part of the expenses you incurred from any source?

Mr. HARRIS. From any source?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. That is similar to the previous question. It does possibly bring me into an area of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. And for that reason you decline to answer?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, and for that reason I can't answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the source of income was of Farm Research, Inc.? How did it operate and function? What was the source of its income?

Mr. HARRIS. You are referring to the period when I had an association with it, are you not?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, we are now dealing with the 1931-33 period. All that I can remember is that my own funds were utilized for the rather modest expenses.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you reimbursed in any manner for the funds that you expended in organizing and promoting Farm Research, Inc.?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't remember any such reimbursement.

Mr. TAVENNER. As pointed out, Harold Ware was an agricultural engineer associated with that organization in 1935. How were his expenses paid?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know. I don't have that information.

Mr. TAVENNER. You confined your testimony a moment ago to the period 1931-33.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What contribution was made to the financing of Farm Research, Inc., after 1933, to your knowledge?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't have that knowledge. I don't know. I don't think I supplied any further funds after I left.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many people were connected with this organization at the time you were its president, Farm Research, Inc.?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall any names other than the ones your assistant is pointing out to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those names in the minutes I read to you?

Mr. HARRIS. And not even all of those. I think, as I remember that exhibit, there are four or five names, and I don't think over three of them were associated with me during the course of my work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the list of names again and tell me which three were associated with you in the work?

Mr. HARRIS. The names of Lillian Gales, my own, and Jerry Ingersoll.

Mr. MOULDER. At any time during your activities in connection with the work you have mentioned, have you received any money from any Soviet-sponsored organization?

Mr. HARRIS. You mean any time during my life?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. That is a question I think could in some way be used to incriminate me, so I shall have to decline to answer that.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. What do you mean by "could be used to incriminate you"? How could anything you have done incriminate you, and in what? In what?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, it is my impression, Mr. Doyle, that the area of possible incrimination has widened very greatly in the past few years, a thing I have personally regretted to see very much. I think the statement on Monday of Justice Black, that people's constitutional rights have been encroached upon seriously from time to time recently, is a justifiable statement. So I regret the necessity of declining to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. How could your telling Members of the American Congress who paid you, if anyone did, for your work, incriminate

you? How could that incriminate you in the sense that you might be criminally liable, I take it you refer to? How could your telling the American Congress who paid you possibly incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. As an example, the question was asked a moment ago as to whether any Soviet-sponsored organization—I don't know of any such, but if there were—whether any Soviet-sponsored organization in this country had contributed to my income.

Mr. DOYLE. That is it exactly. You don't know of any that contributed to your income, I take it, so—

Mr. WOOD. Just a moment. He hasn't said that. Suppose you ask him.

Mr. DOYLE. He just said he didn't know of such. If you don't know of any Soviet or Communist organization having paid you any compensation, salary, or traveling expenses, how could your telling us who paid you possibly incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. Some of the Members of Congress have apparently been convinced and have taken the position that Soviet-sponsored and Communist-sponsored are identical. Your statement you made just now would indicate you hold that view.

Mr. DOYLE. May I interrupt you to say I come to no conclusion until I know the facts, and I don't know the facts in your case, so my mind is wide open, and I hope yours is to believe that every member of this committee is after the facts, and I, as one, have come to no conclusion, although I am beginning to conclude that you are not giving us the facts you know exist. I am of the impression you are sort of covering up for some reason, for fear you will incriminate yourself. What is it you are fearful of being incriminated in?

Mr. HARRIS. It may be my opinion versus other opinions, but it does seem very clear to me, it is my opinion, that association with others, opinions, have been brought into question, a thing that I thought would never happen in America, but they have been brought into question, and there have been people convicted who, as far as one can see, were convicted for opinions and associations. I had hoped that would never happen in my country. That is why I am being careful in my answers.

Mr. DOYLE. I am being frank with you. I am not trying to trap you into making answers you do not want to make, contrary to the advice of your counsel, because I am a lawyer, too. But do I understand from your answer that you are conscious of certain associations you have had which, if you admit them at this time, would incriminate you in some violation of law or statute, or you believe would lead you into that sort of situation? Is that what I understand from your answer?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is not a question that I can answer without placing myself in jeopardy. Both "yes" and "no" to that question places me in jeopardy.

Mr. DOYLE. As one American to another I am asking you the question in public.

Mr. HARRIS. The difference is the circumstances under which the question is asked.

Mr. MOULDER. How do you use the term "convicted"? Do you mean conviction in public opinion or in a criminal case?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall using the word "convicted."

MR. FREEDMAN. I think he referred to the fact others had been convicted.

MR. DOYLE. Excuse me, Mr. Counsel.

MR. TAVENNER. That is all right.

MR. HARRIS, did Lillian Gales make any financial contribution to the activities of Farm Research, Inc.?

MR. HARRIS. No. She was a typist. She did not make any financial contribution.

MR. TAVENNER. Did Jerry Ingersoll make any financial contribution?

MR. HARRIS. I don't recall any. I think not.

MR. TAVENNER. Did Webster Powell make any financial contribution?

MR. HARRIS. I don't know. He arrived about the time I was leaving. I only recall that from your exhibit.

MR. TAVENNER. Did Charles Garland make any financial contribution, directly or indirectly?

MR. HARRIS. Well, this is something of a memory test.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

MR. HARRIS. I really don't have a clear memory.

MR. TAVENNER. How long had you known Charles Garland?

MR. HARRIS. I think a short time.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you at Harvard with him?

MR. HARRIS. No.

MR. TAVENNER. Is he the son of James A. Garland?

MR. HARRIS. I don't know his father's name.

MR. TAVENNER. You know James A. Garland, do you not?

MR. HARRIS. No.

MR. TAVENNER. You know who he was?

MR. HARRIS. I am sorry.

MR. TAVENNER. You stated that you did not know who James A. Garland was?

MR. HARRIS. That is right.

MR. TAVENNER. I will read you from a hearing before this committee as follows:

The American Fund for Public Service was established by Charles Garland, son of the wealthy James A. Garland. Young Garland, conditioned against wealth through radical acquaintances at Harvard, declined to accept his inheritance for his own personal use. Instead he established in 1922 the American Fund for Public Service with the sum of \$900,000, which consisted largely of conservative securities. During the lush twenties, the fund grew to some \$2,000,000.

Does that help you in any way to identify the Charles Garland who became secretary-treasurer of Farm Research, Inc.?

MR. HARRIS. My difficulty was with the name that you say is his father. That is the information I did not have.

MR. TAVENNER. But you recall that the father of Charles Garland was a very wealthy person?

MR. HARRIS. I had heard that said.

MR. TAVENNER. And that he left this estate which Charles Garland refused to accept personally?

MR. HARRIS. Yes, I had heard that.

MR. TAVENNER. Were the funds of that estate used in any manner in connection with the defraying of expenses of operation or any other type of expenses of Farm Research, Inc.?

Mr. HARRIS. I am quite sure they were not during the period when I had an association with Farm Research.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about the period after 1933, after your association? Weren't you yourself instrumental in soliciting funds from that source for use in these various enterprises in which you were interested?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall soliciting funds from that committee established by Garland for Farm Research. I don't recall that, if that is what you are asking.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you solicit funds from that source for the Farm Holiday Association or any one of those groups in South Dakota, Wisconsin, or Minnesota?

Mr. HARRIS. I have a memory of requesting the support of that committee for, I would say specifically, to the best of my memory, the Farm Holiday News.

Mr. TAVENNER. And for which of the other purposes or organizations did you also solicit funds from that committee?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I have no memory of other solicitations than the one I have mentioned. I am not perfectly sure, but it is probably accurate. We are talking about the period 1935, approximately, 15 years ago or so.

Mr. WOOD. Did you solicit funds from that committee for any purpose or organization other than Farm Holiday News?

Mr. HARRIS. I did solicit funds. When, I don't know. I can't pin it down.

Mr. WOOD. For what?

Mr. HARRIS. The most likely is the Farm Holiday News, because the financing of that paper, I recall, was a problem.

Mr. DOYLE. Is that the paper your wife was assistant to the editor for?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much money was solicited from the Garland Fund?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't remember that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time was it furnished?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I don't have a clear recollection of the length of time.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Harris, was it considerable?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I am not sure what is considerable. To the best of my recollection, a couple years.

Mr. WOOD. I am not talking about time. I am talking about amount.

Mr. HARRIS. Oh! I thought you meant time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What amount? You surely know how much you asked for?

Mr. HARRIS. No, I don't. My answer would be a guess. I could only give the general range.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the general range?

Mr. HARRIS. The likelihood is that I asked for something in the range of—well, I may have asked for \$5,000. I can recall that the amount made available was considerably less than I asked for, so if I asked for something in the range of \$5,000, probably it was something in the nature of \$2,000 or \$3,000.

Mr. WOOD. Would you say it did not exceed \$5,000?



Mr. HARRIS. I would say so, to the best of my memory.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much was contributed by the Garland Fund to the operation of the Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. I never heard of any contribution by that fund to the Farmers' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the money contributed from the Marshall Fund for that purpose, if not the Garland Fund?

Mr. HARRIS. I think yours was a double question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me change it. I didn't mean it to be a double question. I asked you first what the contribution was from the Garland Fund to the Farmers' Union, and you said there was no contribution from that fund. My question now is, was a contribution made from the Marshall Fund to the operation of the Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. It was general knowledge in Farmers' Union circles that the Marshall fund made a contribution. To the best of my memory it appeared on the statement which would be passed out by the proper authorities at the Farmers' Union conventions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your knowledge of it purely from that source, general information on the subject, or did you have some connection with obtaining the funds from the Marshall Fund?

Mr. HARRIS. On the latter part of your question, the obtaining of the funds, I think that brings us again into an area that could involve jeopardy to me and self-incrimination, so I won't answer that question. I would like to give it some thought.

Mr. POTTER. Was your question the solicitation of funds for the Farmers' Union?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, from the Marshall Foundation.

Mr. POTTER. Do you believe it would be self-incriminating to answer that question?

Mr. HARRIS. No. I think you are closer to right than I was, Mr. Potter. I think what you want to know is did I solicit funds for the Farmers' Union?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What connection did you have with the procurement of those funds for the Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. I had no connection insofar as the procurement of those funds for the Farmers' Union was concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you interview any official of the Marshall Foundation with regard to the furnishing of funds to the Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. I want to be sure I understand your question. Are you asking whether I urged a policy or made financial requests in behalf of the Farmers' Union from the Marshall Fund?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. Did you discuss the matter of furnishing money to the Farmers' Union with anyone connected with the Marshall Foundation?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. I had no official connection with the Farmers' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't ask you that.

Mr. HARRIS. I know. I had no official connection with the Farmers' Union, and my connection with the Marshall Fund was of a personal nature.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by a connection of a personal nature?

Mr. HARRIS. I mean an acquaintanceship of a personal nature with that fund.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not with the fund; you mean with the individuals controlling the fund?

Mr. HARRIS. With individuals.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which individuals?

Mr. HARRIS. I was acquainted with Gardner Jackson on that committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. And who were the others?

Mr. HARRIS. I was acquainted with George Marshall on that committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss the matter in a personal way with either or both of them, that is, the matter of the extension of credit or funds to the Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. My memory on this is not very clear. I may have discussed it. I know I heard about it. I heard of the action taken. I don't know if I saw them before or after the action was taken with respect to the Farmers' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were interested in the Farmers' Union receiving funds with which to operate, were you not?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I was not interested. It didn't seem important to me whether the Farmers' Union did or did not get funds from that source. I was interested as a person in the field, but I personally didn't care which way it went.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you care enough to talk to members of the foundation about it?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't clearly recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you state that your recollection is not clear; is that right?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Harris, what amounts did the Marshall Foundation contribute to the Farmers' Union, to your knowledge?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, the amount was big enough to have made an impression on my mind; I do recall that.

Mr. WOOD. Tell us how much it was.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to emphasize that it was not my concern or my doing.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't ask you that. What was the figure?

Mr. HARRIS. The figure, I was told, I believe, was \$30,000.

Mr. WOOD. Is that all?

Mr. HARRIS. I think it was repeated.

Mr. WOOD. Several times, wasn't it?

Mr. HARRIS. I think so; I think twice.

Mr. WOOD. Do you know what that was used for?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. WOOD. Did you know of its use in the establishment of any periodical or paper?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. WOOD. Do you know a man by the name of Aubrey Williams?

Mr. HARRIS. I know that name.

Mr. WOOD. Did you know that the so-called Farm Journal that he edits in Alabama is financed by the Marshall Field Foundation?

Mr. HARRIS. I never heard that before. I don't believe it personally.

Mr. MOULDER. Is the reference to the Marshall Foundation to the Marshall Field Foundation throughout the testimony?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. It is the Robert Marshall Foundation.

Mr. WOOD. Robert Marshall Foundation.

You have no knowledge of any funds from the Robert Marshall Foundation being used to finance any publication?

Mr. HARRIS. I have no knowledge. I assume the Farmers' Union publication, with which I have no connection of any sort other than being a member of the association, got some benefit.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't mean the Marshall Field Foundation, but the Robert Marshall Foundation.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. You indicated your conferences were of a casual character with reference to soliciting funds for these organizations. As a matter of fact, weren't you interested in raising funds for the Communist Party?

Mr. HARRIS. That question does, I believe, bring us in the area of self-incrimination, that possibility, so I won't answer the question for that reason.

Mr. WOOD. Well, if it is true, your assumption might be accurate, but if it is not true, I don't see how it could incriminate you. Do you still decline to answer?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is a loaded remark, Mr. Chairman, but I do have to decline for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. WOOD. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you register at the Pickwick Hotel in San Francisco, Calif., February 25, 1945, or about that date?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in San Francisco at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know if I was there on that date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet William Schneiderman in the year 1945 in California?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know William Schneiderman?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. That brings us to the same problem of possible self-incrimination, so I won't answer it for that reason.

Mr. DOYLE. What is there about these men like William Schneiderman? Why would stating whether or not you have met him incriminate you? Is he a criminal of some kind? I don't know the man; I don't know who he is; but why should your stating whether you met William Schneiderman incriminate you? That is what I don't understand.

Mr. FREEDMAN. If I might explain, Mr. Doyle—

Mr. WOOD. He is asking the witness.

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think the witness has explained, Mr. Wood—

Mr. WOOD. The rule of this committee is that counsel may confer with his client.

Mr. FREEDMAN. I understand that. I thought I might be helpful.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand the witness declines to answer on the advice of counsel, on the grounds stated?

Mr. HARRIS. I have lost the thread of your question.

Mr. DOYLE. Why should your answering whether or not you met William Schneiderman in California in 1945 incriminate you? Who is William Schneiderman that the fact you might have met him places you in some personal jeopardy? You evidently know the man and you are afraid for some reason to tell a bunch of American Congressmen whether or not you met him on the ground it might incriminate you. Is he some criminal? Is he some fellow evading police or something? That is what I don't understand.

Mr. HARRIS. He was generally known as a person whom the Supreme Court ruled upon, and was in jeopardy.

Mr. DOYLE. At that time?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know the dates involved, but I do have the impression that association and belief are under question these days, and I have pretty strong reasons for having that opinion, and so I must protect myself on just such questions as that.

Mr. DOYLE. Thanks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to learn that Louise Bransten had reduced a debt of the Daily People's World, which is a paper in California, by the payment of a sizable sum, namely, \$50,000?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I think that question also leads into the area of possible self-incrimination, so I will decline to answer it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I am endeavoring to do is to ascertain the sources of income of Communist organizations or Communist groups, and therefore I am asking you what you know about alleged contributions by Louise Bransten to or for the benefit of the Communist Party or Communist organizations.

Mr. HARRIS. It does seem to me that knowledge or lack of knowledge of the sources of finance of the Communist Party can be used to incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask: Do you have such knowledge?

Mr. HARRIS. I was just explaining I couldn't answer that question because it could be used to incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have knowledge of such contributions?

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think he has a right to refuse to answer that, Mr. Moulder; which he has done.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss with anyone at any time a plan for setting up a trust for Louise Bransten, which would operate as a saving in income tax to her?

Mr. HARRIS. I will have to decline to answer that question on the same ground, that such knowledge, if I possessed it, might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ask Louise Bransten to advance \$10,000 to the magazine known as Salute?

Mr. HARRIS. On that question I will say that the press carried the statement you have just made in some previous hearing of the committee, and that was the first I ever heard of it.

Mr. WOOD. Then your answer is "No"?

Mr. HARRIS. To the best of my knowledge, "No."

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar with the magazine Salute: are you not?

Mr. HARRIS. I knew of it when it existed.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Harris, do you mean to say it is possible you made a request for this sum of money and it slipped your mind? You said to the best of your knowledge the answer was "No."

Mr. HARRIS. The reason I said "to the best of my knowledge," someone under oath before this committee made that statement. I have no vestige of memory of having made such solicitation.

Mr. WOOD. Do you have any memory at all?

Mr. HARRIS. "No vestige of memory" means I have no memory at all of having made such solicitation as that.

Mr. VELDE. Could you have made such solicitation in 1945 and have no memory of it at this time?

Mr. HARRIS. Is that the accurate date?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I think it was in December 1945, in New York City. Did you meet Louise Bransten in New York City in December 1945?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. With respect to when I may have met with Louise Bransten, I think that any such association could be used to incriminate me, and I won't answer the question for that reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were asking for the date. I gave you the date and the place. Does that help refresh your recollection about the solicitation of \$10,000?

Mr. HARRIS. My request for the date was because Mr. Kearney asked if I could have forgotten.

Mr. WOOD. That is Mr. Velde. He is sitting in Mr. Kearney's seat.

Mr. VELDE. Will you answer my question now? Could you have solicited that large a fund in December 1945 and not remember it at the present time?

Mr. WOOD. That is Mr. Velde asking the question.

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think I would have forgotten that if it had happened.

Mr. VELDE. Then you are absolutely certain that you did not solicit such a sum?

Mr. HARRIS. I will repeat, since someone swore I did, there is certainty of error somewhere, but I don't think it is mine.

Mr. VELDE. You are not certain it is not your error; is that right?

Mr. HARRIS. There is always a possibility of error.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you advise Louise Bransten that the Communist Party had succeeded in raising \$100,000 for the purpose of starting the magazine Yank?

Mr. HARRIS. Whether I so informed her or not, the answer to such question would tend to incriminate me, or possibly would tend to incriminate me, by which I mean to say, any such type of association with this woman might have that end result, so I will decline to answer.

Mr. WOOD. Let me ask you this question: Do you contend that if the answer to that question were "No," that that answer would tend to incriminate you, that any answer you might make would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't quite understand the question.

Mr. WOOD. This committee is entitled to an answer unless your answer tends to incriminate you. Would an answer of "No" tend to incriminate you? Do you contend that?

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think, Congressman, there is an implied statement in that question which might tend to incriminate him, and for that reason he must refuse to answer.

Mr. WOOD. Would a negative answer tend to incriminate you?

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think it is only fair to say that there is an implication in that question that he knew and associated with this person referred to, and a "No" answer assumes it as well as a "Yes" answer.

Mr. WOOD. I don't think a "No" answer assumes it at all. Do you think an answer of "No," that you did not make the request of her, would incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. My conception of the area of discrimination includes association, and this association—

Mr. WOOD. Haven't you already answered that you knew this person?

Mr. FREEDMAN. He did not.

Mr. HARRIS. I think not. I know I haven't.

Mr. WOOD. Do you know her? Will you answer that question?

Mr. HARRIS. That does place me in the area of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. So you say you won't answer whether you know her or not?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right; for those reasons.

Mr. WOOD. And therefore you won't tell us if you made this request?

Mr. HARRIS. For the same reasons.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Harris, I refer you to exhibit 1 offered in evidence. Going back to your testimony on this exhibit, your application for passport, did you intend to visit Soviet Russia at the time of making application for passport in 1935? At the time you made this application, did you have in mind going to Soviet Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall what was in my mind at the time of application in 1935. The fact is I did go there.

Mr. MOULDER. When did you make up your mind to go to Soviet Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know. I know that I went.

Mr. MOULDER. You don't know what changed your plans to travel to England, France, and Germany, and caused you to go to Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I did go to Russia.

Mr. MOULDER. I understood you to say you were employed in Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. Isn't that application dated 1935?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I was not employed in Russia at that time.

Mr. MOULDER. What were you doing in Russia at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. Making a farm survey.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you now testify that at the time you made that application you did not intend to go to Soviet Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I can't be clear in my answer because I don't know the small circumstances at the time of making of the application. That was 15 years ago and I don't know what was in my mind then.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were you when you decided to go to Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know at what point I decided to go to Russia.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you don't know what caused you to go to Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I do know I studied agriculture there when I was there. At some point I decided to do that. I am just unable, at this distance of time, to tell you when that point was.

Mr. MOULDER. What induced you to make that decision?

Mr. HARRIS. My interest in agriculture.

Mr. MOULDER. I asked that question for the reason the fact you received \$127.60 for passage from New York to Moscow indicated at the time you made application you intended going to Russia, but did not mention it in your application.

Mr. HARRIS. I have not been able to identify that receipt, and so forth.

Mr. WOOD. You embarked from New York on that trip?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Where did you land?

Mr. HARRIS. Southampton, England.

Mr. WOOD. Where did you go from there?

Mr. HARRIS. London.

Mr. WOOD. Then where?

Mr. HARRIS. Port of Hull.

Mr. WOOD. And from there where?

Mr. HARRIS. Copenhagen.

Mr. WOOD. And from there where?

Mr. HARRIS. The port that serves the Capital of Finland, Helsinki.

Mr. WOOD. And from there?

Mr. HARRIS. To Leningrad.

Mr. WOOD. You didn't go to Germany at all or to France?

Mr. HARRIS. On the return trip I was in France. I didn't go to Germany.

Mr. WOOD. How did you get into Russia on this passport when it doesn't mention Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I never thought of it at all. I encountered no difficulty.

Mr. WOOD. No difficulty at all?

Mr. HARRIS. I had been there before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. HARRIS, were you a delegate to the National Convention of the Communist Party in the year 1948, a convention which was held in August of that year in the city of New York, from the State of Minnesota?

Mr. HARRIS. That brings us into the area of possible self-incrimination, so I won't answer that question.

Mr. WOOD. I think, Mr. Counsel, we will have to recess at this point.

I would like to know if Thursday of next week or Friday of next week would suit you better to resume your testimony? I will give you the choice of those two dates.

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think Friday would be a little easier for us.

Mr. WOOD. Friday at 10 o'clock in the forenoon. Until that time we will withhold further questions. The committee will meet again Thursday, but you will come back on Friday, March 9.

(Thereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)





# HEARINGS REGARDING COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG FARM GROUPS

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 11:25 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order. Let the record show that there are present Messrs. Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Velde, Potter, and Wood, a quorum.

The committee has just selected Mr. Thomas Beale, of Lexington, Ky., presently connected with the Civil Service Commission, to act as assistant counsel to this committee.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FREEDMAN (David M., attorney for the witness). May I make an observation before we start this morning?

When we appeared last week, we had noted in the Congressional Record of February 27, the day before, a statement that this committee would examine Mr. Harris regarding his knowledge of Communist Party activities, and I asked you at the opening of the hearing what the subject would be, because I wanted to know whether that was a correct statement.

I think that the questions during the examination indicated that that would be more or less the nature of the questioning as it proceeded, and the answer that Mr. Harris made to some of the questions, in which he refused to answer because it might incriminate him to do so, was made by him in view of the fact that at the present time some of the laws are being construed in such a way and applied in such a way that certain affiliations and connections are made subject to criminal prosecution.

My request to you this morning, based upon that, is simply this: As I read the fifth amendment, to which Mr. Harris had recourse as a basis for his refusal to answer, that amendment says that no person

shall be required to answer questions which may incriminate him; and it seems to me that since Mr. Harris has indicated by his refusal to answer certain questions that he would be obliged to refuse to answer other questions that come in the same area, for the same reason, that this committee, in deference to the prohibition in that amendment, should refrain from asking questions which you know would require him, in order to avoid jeopardy, to refuse to answer.

Mr. WOOD. We can't anticipate what is in the witness' mind. The only thing we can do to ascertain that is to ask questions.

Mr. FREEDMAN. I think it has already been established that certain matters he cannot answer without jeopardy.

Mr. WOOD. If so, we respect his constitutional rights. All he has to do is state it, if it is true. The only restriction the witness has is to tell the truth under oath.

Mr. FREEDMAN. I appreciate that. The point I am making is, it seems to me unfair to require him to continue to make the statement that he refuses to answer when you should not be asking him these questions, since you already have established that they involve him in jeopardy.

Mr. WOOD. It would be a travesty if this committee would first have to find out from the witness what he wants the committee to ask him.

Mr. FREEDMAN. I don't say that. But once you have established that there is an area in which he cannot testify, you should refrain from asking questions in that area which would require him to continue to make the statement that he refuses to answer.

Mr. WOOD. I will undertake to see to it that he is not asked the same questions that he has claimed privilege on before.

It is not necessary to administer an oath to you again, Mr. Harris. You are still under the same oath administered when you were here last week.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

### TESTIMONY OF LEMENT U. HARRIS (Resumed), ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID M. FREEDMAN, COUNSEL

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, when being questioned on February 28, Representative Moulder asked you this question: "Then you don't know what caused you to go to Russia?" to which you replied in part: "I do know I studied agriculture there when I was there."

At what institution or institutions did you study agriculture while in Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I did not study agriculture in any institutions. I did, however, make a study of Russian agriculture. The study consisted of visiting quite a number of farms, visiting different types of agricultural institutions, and interviewing people who had knowledge of agriculture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any educational institution while in Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you did not attend the Lenin Institute?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I did not attend the Lenin Institute.

Mr. TAVENNER. You testified that the purpose of your trip to Russia was to make an agricultural survey. Was this the purpose of both of your trips to Russia, or just one of them?

Mr. HARRIS. I would say that was not a proper description of my first trip. My first trip had as its purpose to work in agriculture there, which I did. The second trip had as its purpose an agricultural survey. I think, in an effort to meet this question in all its possible implications, I should say that I am not trying to make you think that my entire time was spent on the activities of the agricultural survey. I mean, I did look up old friends whom I had known 5 years previously, I did a fair amount of sightseeing, and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. At whose instance did you undertake this work of preparing an agricultural survey?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't remember any particular person's request or instance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you undertake that work at the behest of any organization or group of individuals?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, that is a question that might come within the area of incriminating me, so I won't answer it on the grounds I have named before.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that do you mean that to name the individuals or organizations at whose behest you undertook this work would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. The answering of that question could contain within it the elements of possibility of incriminating me, and that is the reason for my refusal.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have testified that Harold Ware was in Russia as an adviser to the Russian Government on agriculture during most of the period you were there on your second trip to Russia.

Mr. HARRIS. That is not correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then will you correct the statement?

Mr. HARRIS. The statement would be correct on the first trip.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the first trip?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he there while you were in Russia on your second trip?

Mr. HARRIS. No; he was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first meet Harold Ware?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I met him—I can place it nearly exactly—a few months before I left to go to the Soviet Union the first time, which would be approximately in the late spring of 1929.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you meet him, and what were the circumstances under which you met him?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I was introduced to him by Roger Baldwin, Civil Liberties Union, who informed Mr. Ware that he knew I had been farming and knew something of farming, and suggested that if Ware saw fit, that I could be a useful worker on the farm where he was involved in the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what business was Harold Ware engaged at that particular time?

Mr. HARRIS. At that time, I would think the correct answer is that he was an adviser to the Russian Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Harold Ware responsible in any manner for your visit to Russia on either of the trips that you made there?

Mr. HARRIS. The answer is "No." I will qualify it only that he did accede to my request that he help me find employment on the farm where he was the assistant director.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you stated that he returned to the United States while you were still in Russia on your trip?

Mr. HARRIS. I believe so.

Mr. VELDE. May I ask a question there?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. You stated that you were studying farming or agriculture in Soviet Russia. Were you on a farm?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. VELDE. Did you actually work on a farm?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I think you are confusing my two trips. The first trip I worked both on several farms and in farm-implement factories, two of them, in the Soviet Union. On the second trip is the trip when I did not work, but did conduct a study.

Mr. VELDE. On your second trip I understand you did continue your study of farming and agriculture in the Soviet Union?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right. The first trip I went to work there, and the second trip I went to study the conditions of agriculture.

Mr. VELDE. Was this farm on which you worked on your first trip a collective farm?

Mr. HARRIS. No. It was a state farm. Its name was the Verblud farm.

Mr. VELDE. And it was owned by—

Mr. HARRIS. It was operated by the Russian Government.

Mr. VELDE. Did you become acquainted with Anna Louise Strong?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Did she ever visit you on the farm that you worked on?

Mr. HARRIS. No; she did not.

Mr. VELDE. Where did you meet her? Did you meet her in Soviet Russia?

Mr. HARRIS. I met her in Moscow.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know her husband?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I met her husband.

Mr. VELDE. Have you recently met with Mrs. Strong?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I have not.

Mr. VELDE. When was the last time that you saw her?

Mr. HARRIS. I saw her when she arrived in this country at the end of her last trip, a year ago or something like that.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Will you let the record disclose that Mr. Moulder has absented himself from the committee at this point.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you next see Harold Ware after your return to this country?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't recall exactly. I will say shortly after I returned.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you returned about what date?

Mr. HARRIS. I returned in 1930. I am having difficulty placing what part of the year it was. It seems to me it was toward the end of the year; I think in the fall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you were engaged in the work of Farm Research, Inc., from 1931 to 1933, according to your testimony?

Mr. HARRIS. Those are approximately correct dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time, did you frequently see Harold Ware?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, we will have to revise our Farm Research dates slightly, I think; 1931, I think the whole year, I spent in his company making an agricultural survey of this country. I think we visited nearly every State of the Union, drove in a car from one agricultural section to another, and from one farm that had something of interest on it to another, through the South, West, and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then did you return after that trip to the city of Washington?

Mr. HARRIS. It was roughly after that trip that I started residing for a period of time in Washington.

Mr. TAVENNER. From that time on was Harold Ware a resident of Washington?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not sure as to that. I don't think he was in Washington for any long period of time at once. He was moving about a good deal. My recollection is that he was in Washington but a small part of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you see him frequently during that period—1931-33?

Mr. HARRIS. I saw him much less during that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are probably aware of the testimony of Lee Pressman before this committee that while he was employed in the Department of Agriculture he was one of those who united in a cell of the Communist Party under the tutelage and leadership of Harold Ware, are you not?

Mr. HARRIS. I saw that in the press. I had no means of knowing whether it was accurate or not, no knowledge of my own.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time connected with a cell of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia within the Department of Agriculture composed of Lee Pressman and others?

Mr. HARRIS. Naturally, that is a question that I am unable to answer any portion of it, because any portion that I might try to answer would lead me into that field where there would be possible self-incrimination. By that answer I do not mean to say that I affirm any of the facts that you suggest, because I am not intending to do so.

Mr. WOOD. You recognize, of course, that if the facts suggested are not true a negative answer to the question would not tend to incriminate you, would it?

Mr. HARRIS. Again, that is asking me to develop my reasons for saying "No," and that I can't do for obvious constitutional reasons, I think.

Mr. WOOD. Do you mean that to divulge your conception of the protection afforded you by the Constitution would in itself incriminate you?

Mr. FREEDMAN. Will you repeat that question? I don't think it is clear.

Mr. WOOD. I want to find out, if the truthful answer to the question of counsel should be "No," whether he thinks such an answer would incriminate him. It is an abstract question as to his knowledge of the application of the constitutional provision he is undertaking to invoke in his behalf at this time.

Mr. FREEDMAN. If I may say—

Mr. WOOD. I want the witness to answer. You may confer with him.

(Witness and counsel confer.)

Mr. WOOD. In declining to answer the question of counsel, the witness has stated that he doesn't want his declination to answer to be construed as an admission that the implications, as he calls them, in the question are true. If he wants to leave it that way, he is leaving a strong inference that the answer could be "No," and be a truthful answer.

I am trying to find out from you, Mr. Witness, if a truthful answer to the question is "No," how would that answer incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. Would you ask the reporter to repeat Mr. Tavenner's original question, because that is where it started.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; the reporter will read that question and your answer.

(The question and answer above referred to were read by the reporter, as follows:)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time connected with a cell of the Communist Party in the District of Columbia within the Department of Agriculture composed of Lee Pressman and others?

Mr. HARRIS. Naturally that is a question that I am unable to answer any portion of it, because any portion that I might try to answer would lead me into that field where there would be possible self-incrimination. By that answer I do not mean to say that I affirm any of the facts that you suggest, because I am not intending to do so.

Mr. WOOD. You leave the impression in the air that the truthful answer would be "No." What I am asking you is: Do you feel, if the truthful answer is "No," that a "no" answer would incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. Please remember the question started, did I belong in a cell of the Communist Party, and then other things were added. Naturally I can't answer that question, for the reasons already cited.

Mr. WOOD. If you stop your answer there, and say you do not want to answer the question because it might tend to incriminate you, that is a perfectly good answer as far as I am concerned. But when you go further and leave a strong inference that the truthful answer is "No," and still hide behind the fifth amendment, I want to know if you feel a no answer could incriminate you.

Mr. HARRIS. A "yes" answer or "no" answer has implications that lead you in this same field, and therefore I am unable to give you a "yes" or a "no" answer for the same reason.

Mr. WOOD. You contend that a simple negative answer, if true, would lead you into the field of self-incrimination?

Mr. HARRIS. I am contending that if I exclude the possible "yes" answer or the possible "no" answer, that I am then leading myself into the field of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. If the truth would tend to incriminate you, why don't you say so? Why do you want to leave the inference that a "no" answer is correct when a "no" answer would not incriminate you? I am getting weary of witnesses who try to hide behind the fifth amendment and leave the impression that a "no" answer is correct. You know that if you never belonged to such a cell as described by counsel, that an answer that you didn't belong to it wouldn't incriminate you.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I was interested, in your first appearance the other day and this morning, in the number of times you claimed protection under the fifth amendment. Under what clause of the fifth amendment do you stand this morning when you say that to answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. HARRIS. The wording, as I understand it, is that no man shall be required to testify against himself.

Mr. DOYLE. No; that isn't the wording. To refresh your recollection, the wording is: "\* \* \* nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Would you like to refresh yourself? Here is the Constitution.

Mr. FREEDMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. This is not a criminal case, is it?

Mr. FREEDMAN. Counsel—

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute.

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think I know the answer to that question.

Mr. WOOD. You may confer with your counsel any time you desire.

(Witness and his counsel confer.)

Mr. HARRIS. I am advised that though this is obviously not a criminal proceeding, the constitutional protection has been held to apply in just such a proceeding as this.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand, then, that when you answer as you do and claim the protection of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, you are doing so on the advice of counsel each time?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Just as you have answered now?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Then it is clear to you, is it, that this is not a criminal proceeding this morning?

(Witness and his counsel confer.)

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is clear.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you visited Central American or South American countries since your return from Russia in 1930?

Mr. HARRIS. No. If you want to make this trifling exception, I think Central America includes Mexico, and I made one of these brief 2 or 3 hour crossings of the border when I was in Brownsville, Tex., in the year 1931.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Robert Handschin have any connection with the work of Farm Research, Inc.?

Mr. HARRIS. I know that he was there and appeared subsequent to the time I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what work he was engaged in in connection with that organization?

Mr. HARRIS. Not specifically, other than the general work of the organization of following farm economics and farm legislation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the officers of the United Farmers League, do you recall?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any of them?

Mr. HARRIS. I can't think of them now.

MR. TAVENNER. If the names of any of those officers occur to you before you complete your testimony, I would like you to state so.

You have testified that you were a member of the Farmers' Union. By the use of the name Farmers' Union, I have meant throughout this hearing to refer to the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, which is frequently referred to as the National Farmers' Union. Is that the organization to which you have referred as being a member?

MR. HARRIS. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you attended any of the annual meetings or conventions of the National Farmers' Union, or the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, as it is called?

MR. HARRIS. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. How many conventions of that organization have you attended? Have you attended all of them since the beginning of your membership?

MR. HARRIS. No; I have not. I may have attended something like a half dozen of them.

MR. TAVENNER. Where were these conventions held?

MR. HARRIS. Well, I can think of Denver; Oklahoma City; Madison, Wis.—

MR. WOOD. Will you pause at this time, Mr. Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

MR. WOOD. The record will show that Mr. Velde has been called away from the committee, which reduces the committee below a quorum. Under the authority vested in me by the resolution creating this committee, I now designate a subcommittee to continue this hearing, composed of Messrs. Doyle, Frazier, Potter, and Wood.

MR. TAVENNER. You have named Denver, Oklahoma City, and Madison. What others?

MR. HARRIS. Des Moines.

MR. TAVENNER. What others?

MR. HARRIS. Topeka, Kans.

MR. TAVENNER. When was that convention held?

MR. HARRIS. It is a little hard to recall.

MR. TAVENNER. I mean, what year?

MR. HARRIS. I am trying to recall what year. Well subject to error, my guess would be approximately 1946.

MR. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in attending these conventions?

MR. HARRIS. Well, I think a major purpose was that to these conventions come farmers and farm people from many of the States of the Union, all of whom are generally pretty well informed people active in the farm cooperative movement, and from whom I can learn many things of use and value in my work.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you take a part in advising officers and delegates regarding their convention work?

MR. HARRIS. I don't think so. Do you want me to enlarge on "I don't think so"?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes.

MR. HARRIS. I naturally held conversations with people I was introduced to or whom I knew. I can't recall advising any officer. For that matter, I don't recall advising any member, although, as in any human contact, there would naturally be a mutual expression of views.



Mr. TAVENNER. Did you seek in any manner to influence the action of the conventions on resolutions, or any of its business?

Mr. HARRIS. I would say there was an occasional resolution which I hoped would go one way or the other, and I no doubt expressed my opinion on it. I don't know if anybody paid attention to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work to put over that opinion?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think so; not in the sense that would imply.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have previously referred in your testimony to your acquaintanceship with Gardner Jackson, one of the trustees of the Marshall Foundation. Was Gardner Jackson an official of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, otherwise known as the National Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. My understanding is that for a time I believe he was employed by the president.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general character of the work he was employed to do?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know. Because of his long years in Washington, my assumption was that it had to do with legislation in which the Farmers' Union was interested.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gardner Jackson is alleged to have written a letter on August 3, 1946, to James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, in which he says in effect that he was discharged from the National Farmers' Union because of his "insistent, uncagey, and un-silenceable opposition to Communist infiltration to official positions of power of the National Farmers' Union." In a postscript to this letter, it is stated that he probably will be sending copies to some of the people mentioned in it. Did you receive a copy?

Mr. HARRIS. He didn't send me a copy. At least, I received no copy.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you saw a copy?

Mr. HARRIS. Copies of his letter were made, I believe by President Patton. I recall the letter as being a sharp attack on President Patton's organization. Apparently his answer was to make copies of it and send it to every State organization, and my home State organization is where I believe I saw it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this letter attributed to Gardner Jackson, mention is made of a person by the name of Phil Reno in connection with your name and the Marshall Foundation. What position did Phil Reno have with the National Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reference I mentioned in the letter attributed to Gardner G. Jackson is as follows:

I don't have to tell you that many of us understand your appointment of the pathetic Communist or pro-Communist boy, Phil Reno, to your headquarters staff in Denver as political and labor relations official was at the behest of George Marshall and Lem Harris, the Communist Party's avowed agricultural policy fellow, in order to insure a continuing flow of money from the Marshall Foundation to the NFU.

Does that statement in the letter correctly reflect your part in the appointment of Phil Reno to the staff of the National Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. There are many inaccuracies in that statement. Not referring now to the title that he confers upon me, but referring to his reference to Reno, I think the facts are that I never met or heard of Reno until he was given some appointment by President Patton.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether you had met him or knew him or not, did you play any part whatever in advising or counseling Patton regarding his employment?

Mr. HARRIS. The flat answer is no, and I couldn't have. I want to say that I was not consulted on such matters. There was no reason for consulting me. I was never in the role of adviser to the leadership of the Farmers' Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the appointment of Phil Reno was a condition under which financial aid from the Garland fund would be continued?

Mr. HARRIS. Did you mean to say Garland fund?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I meant to say Marshall Foundation.

Mr. HARRIS. I consider the conclusion to that effect by Mr. Jackson as utterly fantastic, and with no truth in connection with it that I know anything about.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. To your knowledge, did the Farmers' Union ever receive funds from the Marshall Foundation?

Mr. HARRIS. In our previous hearing I testified that I had knowledge that the Farmers' Union did receive funds from that foundation.

Mr. POTTER. Do you know over what length of time?

Mr. HARRIS. Didn't we cover that, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. That question was asked.

Mr. HARRIS. My answer was somewhat vague, because I am vague as to the length of time. I really don't know for sure. It was a number of years.

Mr. POTTER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this same letter attributed to Gardner Jackson, it is also stated:

I do not have to recall to your mind—  
meaning Mr. Patton's mind—

Lem Harris' visit to you in Denver a few years ago to tell you that of the total amount of money remaining in the Marshall Foundation, the NFU would be allowed so much, and to ask you as president of the NFU how you wanted that sum spread over the ensuing few years—Lem Harris, not a trustee of the fund.

Is that statement correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That statement is just about as fantastic as the previous statements. Let me say I never made any request or exerted any pressure of this character or any character on a high official of the Farmers' Union. It was not my position or right to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't mean to infer that you put any pressure on anybody, and I don't think the text of the letter implies it. But did you have a conversation with James G. Patton regarding the remaining funds of the Marshall Foundation?

Mr. HARRIS. I have met Mr. Patton a few times. Never had any long conversations with him. The nearest to this that I can recall

in rather a vague way is that at some time Mr. Patton expressed his warm feeling toward Mr. Marshall. He probably said, "He is a fine person," with which I believe I agreed. That, to the best of my knowledge, is as close as our conversation at any point ever came to anything that Mr. Jackson apparently refers to in what you are quoting.

Mr. WOOD. That is not responsive to the question.

Mr. HARRIS. Maybe I don't understand the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether or not you had a conversation with Mr. James G. Patton regarding the Marshall Foundation.

Mr. HARRIS. The responsive answer to your question is just what I have said. The closest to any conversation I ever had with Mr. Patton was of the character I have just described.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then except for what you have related, you had no conversation with James G. Patton regarding the Marshall Foundation?

Mr. HARRIS. I think my memory is correct in saying that that is an accurate statement of the extent to which we even touched on the subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain to the committee how the transactions were made between the Marshall Foundation and the National Farmers' Union, bearing in mind you told us in your testimony before that you had talked in a personal way with both Gardner Jackson and George Marshall regarding contributions to the Farmers' Union.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no specific knowledge of precisely how the applications were made and how they were acted upon, and so forth, because I wasn't involved in any of them. It is a reasonable assumption that Farmers' Union made written application, and that the board met on it and passed on it, but it naturally did not involve me.

Mr. TAVENNER. State just what transpired between you and Mr. George Marshall and Mr. Gardner Jackson relating to the making of the contributions to the Farmers' Union.

Mr. HARRIS. It is particularly accurate when I say "nothing." When I say accurate, I mean I can recall one instance in which Mr. Jackson, after an appropriation had been made, said to me, "Well, we through my influence hired a splendid person," naming Mr. Ben Stong. That is about all the conversation I may have had with Mr. Jackson.

As far as Mr. Marshall is concerned, I recall no specific conversation, but I do think that I was told as to the action that had been taken after it was taken.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the letter attributed to Gardner Jackson, reference is made to a fight on the floor in the 1946 annual convention of the National Farmers' Union regarding a resolution sponsored by Gardner Jackson which was somewhat critical in tone of the Soviet Union. After the adoption of this resolution, it is alleged in this letter that a conversation took place between you and Gardner Jackson, in which you made this statement:

Well, Pat, we didn't have enough troops to take you this time, but we will by the time the next convention rolls around.

Did you have such a conversation with Mr. Jackson at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. I have some memory because I read the statement you have read here not too long after it happened. I don't think

the resolution Gardner Jackson sponsored had too much to do with the Soviet Union. My recollection is it had to do with some change in the United Nations Charter involving the veto power. I recall I didn't agree with his arguments, and this alleged conversation is, I think, very far from what actually took place. I am quite sure that I made no reference to troops or such verbiage as that. I think that is his imagination.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you did state, in substance, that although he was successful in his resolution on that occasion you would defeat him the next time?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think I said I would defeat him, because I wasn't thinking in those terms.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let us use the word "we."

Mr. HARRIS. What I believe I had in mind, the position he was advocating—I don't know if it was affirmed or not at that convention—I thought would not be a popular one in the long run with the membership of the Farmers' Union.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Harris, at that time did you oppose the proposed change in the United Nations Charter which would do away with the veto power? Did you oppose his viewpoint?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. He advocated doing away with the veto power and you advocated keeping the veto power?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you speak on the floor of the convention in regard to that subject?

Mr. HARRIS. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with delegates and others in opposition to the resolution?

Mr. HARRIS. I really doubt that. My interest was to see what the genuine reaction of the delegates there was to this. I wasn't conducting a lobby or trying to be a power in the convention. In other words, I had considerable respect for the good sense of the delegates there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Isaac Folkoff, of California?

(Witness and his counsel confer.)

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think I know anybody by that name.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Harris, why was it necessary for you to confer with counsel in order to arrive at that conclusion?

(Witness and his counsel confer.)

Mr. FREEDMAN. May I explain that?

Mr. WOOD. I would rather the witness explain that.

Mr. HARRIS. My reason for the lengthy conference with counsel was that the way that name is read, I think I have never heard of it. You can identify the person more positively, if you wish.

Mr. WOOD. Did you arrive at that conclusion that you don't think you heard of it before, after you conferred with counsel or before?

Mr. HARRIS. All the time.

Mr. WOOD. Then why did you confer with counsel?

Mr. FREEDMAN. Let me explain that.

Mr. WOOD. I want the witness to answer.

(Witness and his counsel confer.)

Mr. HARRIS. I had thought that the subject matter of conference with my counsel was privileged.

Mr. WOOD. It is if you want to claim it. I am just curious myself. You were asked if you know an individual by a certain name. After a 10-minute conference with counsel you said you didn't know anybody by that name. Did you know that before you conferred with counsel?

Mr. HARRIS. I was asking counsel—

Mr. WOOD. I am not interested in what you were asking counsel. I am interested in the reason for your having to confer with counsel at all.

Mr. HARRIS. I can tell you what I was discussing with counsel.

Mr. WOOD. Did you know before you conferred with counsel that you didn't know this person?

Mr. HARRIS. From the moment the name was mentioned, I was quite unsure about knowing such person; quite unsure.

Mr. WOOD. Are you sure now?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I am unsure now.

Mr. DOYLE. Is the name that our counsel has asked you about similar to some name you have in mind? Did it put you in mind of some person, even though it is not the same name as that of the person you have in mind?

Mr. HARRIS. It is sufficiently similar to a name I have heard that it was the cause of the hesitation.

Mr. DOYLE. Can you give the name you heard, of which this name refreshes your memory?

Mr. HARRIS. The name I had in mind was a name that could conceivably incriminate me.

Mr. DOYLE. What is that name?

Mr. HARRIS. And therefore I cannot testify concerning that name, because it conceivably could lead to self-incrimination.

Mr. DOYLE. The fifth amendment to the Constitution refers to a criminal case within certain latitudes defined by our courts. How possibly could your answer identifying the person that you have in mind as being possibly the person counsel has asked you about, using a different name but a name which nevertheless refreshes you as to who it is, how could your telling us who that person is lead you into the area of a criminal association, or into the area where you might be involved in testimony against yourself? In other words, as I understand it, the Communist Party is not outlawed. Even if he were a Communist, how would his name involve you in an area of possible testimony against yourself in some criminal matter? That is what I don't understand, why you folks don't come out frankly and help this committee in its desire to be accurate and fair, and why you won't even give us the name of a person, even before your claim to stand on your constitutional rights. I am trying to understand, as a fellow American, how you are thinking and why you are acting in this way in a frank and open hearing in your own country. As representatives of the American people we are trying to solve that problem.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, sir, I am concerned and fearful of criminal action.

Mr. DOYLE. Against you?

Mr. HARRIS. Against me.

Mr. DOYLE. If you give that name?

Mr. HARRIS. I am trying to answer your question. Laws have been passed—the Smith Act, McCarran Act—that jeopardize quite a range of thought and association, ranging from Progressives, Socialists, and

Communists. Many of them feel they are placed in jeopardy, and some people actually are in confinement now as a result of the Smith Act. This state of affairs presents a very grave problem to persons who hold certain convictions. So when confronted with a situation that places in jeopardy a person with convictions that are honestly held and involve no violence or force by anyone, he is going to protect himself, and he is put in the position of not answering questions, which is the fault of those who passed the legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't mean you believe this committee is interested in having men prosecuted for their honest convictions when those honest convictions don't mean the endangering of our own constitutional liberties, do you?

Mr. HARRIS. I feel that in a few instances of our history, of which today is one, there has developed mass hysteria. That happened in the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts, and a man like Jefferson arose. I think there are days like this day when honest men are in jeopardy.

Mr. DOYLE. You feel that you are in jeopardy if you give a truthful answer?

Mr. HARRIS. On the subjects that deal—

Mr. DOYLE. With communism, socialism?

Mr. HARRIS. With any subject that it seems to me comes within the purview of the type of legislation I have named.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, you asked me to further identify the individual Isaac Folkoff as an aid to your possible identification of him, so I will say to you that he is alleged to be the financial counsellor of the Communist Party of the State of California. Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't know that the—

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HARRIS. I realize now that that question again leads into the area of possible personal jeopardy, and I must refuse to answer because it could possibly incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then do I understand your answer is that you refuse to state whether or not you are acquainted with this particular individual?

Mr. HARRIS. I don't think that was the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you that now.

Mr. HARRIS. As an additional question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. You haven't identified the individual to my mind so that I can answer the question. I can't answer the question because, as described, I know of no such individual.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you stated you had the name of another person in mind which was a somewhat similar name, was that name Anatole Vollcov?

Mr. HARRIS. I haven't heard that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know a person by the name of Vollcov, V-o-l-l-c-o-v?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Dr. Inez Decker of Los Angeles?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Archie Wright?

Mr. HARRIS. My acquaintance or lack of acquaintance with Mr. Wright leads me again into the same area of possible personal jeopardy, and I shall have to refuse to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not F. W. Stover is officially connected with the Iowa Farmers' Union, a branch of the National Farmers' Union?

Mr. HARRIS. I know that a Fred Stover is officially connected.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Fred Stover?

Mr. HARRIS. I know Fred Stover.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he a member of the Communist Party to your knowledge or from information that has been made available to you?

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the best of my knowledge or any information that I have never heard anything that would indicate to me that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harris, the letterhead of the Peoples Congress for Democracy and Peace, dated November 3, 1937, shows you as a member of the national executive committee. Will you explain to the committee the purposes of that organization of which you were a member of the national executive committee, if that is true?

Let me change the question. Were you a member of the national executive committee of that organization?

Mr. HARRIS. Will you name the organization again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Peoples Congress for Democracy and Peace.

Mr. FREEDMAN. What was the year, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1937.

Mr. HARRIS. If you can give me more data. I don't remember that specific name or being on any executive committee of such a group.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may have asked you this question in another form: Have you been connected in any way with the task of raising funds for use in the support of the Communist Party?

Mr. HARRIS. I believe that question was asked, and I believe I answered, as I do now, that that places me in the realm of possible personal jeopardy. I might incriminate myself by answering it, so I won't answer it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, there are questions which I would like to ask this witness which I think, because of their nature, should be asked in closed session.

Mr. WOOD. You mean they involve the names of individuals?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Are you through with all other questions of this witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Let me ask if any members of the subcommittee have questions?

(No response.)

Mr. WOOD. I will ask that the committee resolve itself into an executive session.

(Thereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the committee went into executive session.)







BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 2485

**Boston Public Library**  
**Central Library, Copley Square**

**Division of**  
**Reference and Research Services**

**Social Sciences**  
**Department**

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.



