"INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM"—RED CHINA STYLE

(TESTIMONY OF CHI-CHOU HUANG)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MAY 24 AND 25, 1962

INCLUDING INDEX

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

86095 WASHINGTON : 1962

CONTENTS

	Page
Synopsis	1165
May 24, 1962: Testimony of:	
Chi-chou Huang	1169
Afternoon session:	
Chi-chou Huang (resumed)	1175
May 25, 1962: Testimony of:	
Chi-chou Huang (resumed)	1197
Index	i

Public Law 601, 79th Congress

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946]; 60 Stat. 812, which provides:

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

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Rule X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

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

Rule XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

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

(A) Un-American activities.

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

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

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

* * * * * * *

Rule XII

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 87TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 8, January 3, 1961

* * * * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

* * * * * * *

(r) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

* * * * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

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

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

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

* * * * * * *

27. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

SYNOPSIS

This is the account of a Chinese student who, at the end of World War II, came to study in the United States where he was so influenced by Communist propaganda that he returned prematurely to the Communist-occupied section of his homeland to join forces with the Chinese Reds.

In September 1945, Chi-chou Huang entered Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore as a premedical student on a scholarship from the Yunnan Provincial Government. After one semester he transferred to the University of Maryland, located only a few miles from Washington, D.C.

Before long, Huang's interest in his studies was surpassed by his concern—and confusion—over the civil war between the Communists and Nationalists in China.

Huang had had no knowledge of communism before he came to this country. In order to learn what the fighting was all about, he began reading everything he could get his hands on pertaining to social problems, communism, and China. He visited the Library of Congress, sought out books on these subjects—and was impressed by what he read.

As he testified before the committee:

> My ideas were very vague and sketchy; but according to those sketchy few books I read, under socialism there would be equality and prosperity and freedom for every individual. So I thought, well, that is the kind of society the Chinese people should have and one I would enjoy living under, for I would not have to worry about my personal future, occupation, or job, and that kind of thing.

Huang's conclusions were bolstered by articles about China contained in Communist newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets sold in a "progressive" bookshop in Washington; the pro-Communist views of another Chinese student at the University of Maryland; and theories expounded by a campus group of the Young Progressives of America which was set up to support Henry Wallace, the Progressive Party candidate for President in the 1948 election.

A lecture on socialism by Scott Nearing in Washington in late 1947 or early 1948 also had a marked influence on Huang, as did the fact that, on this same occasion, he was befriended by Dr. Frederick A. Blossom, manager of Nearing's lecture series and then a Library of Congress employee.

In the latter part of 1948, Huang decided to return to China to join the Communist forces which then controlled the northern part of the country. He went to Dr. Blossom, who introduced him to Maud Russell. She suggested that he go to Hong Kong and contact a certain Chinese newspaper which strongly supported the Chinese "democratic" movement.

In the spring of 1949, 5 months after arriving in Hong Kong—and after visiting the newspaper office to which he had been referred—

Huang was directed to a small, crowded boat manned by a Chinese crew. The boat took its Communist and pro-Communist passengers to the north China port of Tientsin, where they were given a royal welcome by Red officials. The new arrivals were fed the finest food and lodged in the most luxurious quarters in the city.

After several days in Tientsin, they were sent to Peking. Here they were given civilian "uniforms" and pocket money and treated to entertainment, films, feasts, sightseeing excursions, operas, etc. Huang became bored and annoyed with this treatment and asked to be assigned work that would contribute to the revolution. He was told to be patient, that he needed to readjust to being in China again.

After a month in Peking, he was sent to the North China University of the Peoples Revolution where, for about 6 months, he was "re-educated" away from the "old society" he had known and toward what was to exist in the "new society."

Huang was somewhat disappointed when he found that his teachers would not permit him to dissent from anything they said, even when he knew they were lying in their teachings about the United States, a subject about which he had recent and personal knowledge. Nevertheless, he conceded that it might be necessary to prohibit any debate among students until they were better indoctrinated in, and adjusted to, what was expected under the new Communist regime.

In February 1950, Huang was sent back to Peking to teach English at the Foreign Language Institute. In 1953 he married a teacher at the institute, who was an avid Communist.

The Communist Party conducted widespread "rectification" campaigns among its members on several occasions during Huang's first few years under the Red Chinese rule. These were initiated because, in periods of relaxed discipline, Communist bureaucrats furnished their offices lavishly, worked little at their jobs, and became complacent about the future course of the revolution. The rectification campaigns always produced much self-criticism by party members which, in turn, led to temporary reforms.

Huang was still enthusiastic about the possibilities of communism until the mid-1950's—although he had never been able to accept fully its limitations on personal freedom. At this time the Red Chinese Government launched a 12-year plan that was supposed to raise Red China's standard of living to that achieved in the United States. The Communist leaders decided that, in order to fulfill this plan, greater freedom would have to be given to the intellectuals. It was with this thought that Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Communist Party of China, made his now famous speech which contained the exhortation:

> Let one hundred flowers bloom. Let one hundred different schools of thought contend.

At the Foreign Language Institute, which had branched out into many other fields since Huang first arrived there, much new research was undertaken and broader studies were introduced. At Peking University some professors even incorporated certain capitalist theories in their courses of instruction. The intellectuals were pleased, not only with their new freedom, but because mandatory political activity was reduced to a fraction of what it had been.

Somewhat later, however, the Communist Party launched another "rectification" campaign, and this time the usual confessions and self-criticisms of party members did not satisfy the Red hierarchy. The party also called upon non-Communists to join in the criticism of the party and its members. At first the non-Communist intellectuals were reluctant to say anything because they did not trust the party or its motives. But the party pleaded for their cooperation "for the country's good." Communist leaders promised that there would be no reprisals for criticisms made.

A few non-Communists cautiously pointed out party shortcomings and, when no retaliation came, others among the intellectuals followed suit. Then more and more joined in. Newspapers overflowed with accusations against Communists. Some persons went so far as to declare that they did not like communism and would like to see Communists dead. Still there was no retaliation.

At Huang's institute, new and bigger bulletin boards were built because existing ones could not hold all the complaints about the party offered by the intellectuals.

Suddenly all this was brought to an end. The Communist Party announced that "rightist," "anti-party" elements had used the increased freedom to cause trouble for the party and the government. They had diverted the rectification campaign from its proper course, and this would have to be corrected. The party, therefore, organized a bitter "anti-rightist" struggle to smash all open anti-communism.

At the same time the party stepped up its "rectification" campaign, and all intellectuals—Communist and non-Communist—were forced to participate fully. Huang described to the committee how it was carried out at the institute:

> In this struggle, everybody—I mean, every intellectual in every organization—had to go through the process of criticism and self-criticism. Some in small groups, some in larger groups—a few were conducted with the participation of the entire school * * *. At these meetings, each person, each participant, had to re-examine his own thoughts. In other words, they had to go through a great process of thought remolding, by exposing their own views and thoughts. You read your own thoughts in written form, aloud to the group; and the group would criticize you, point out what was wrong and what was right, in addition to your own criticism. * * *
>
> They made everybody go through a stage, a fairly long period of criticism and self-criticism, and finally, in 1957, late 1957, the party decided to take measures to send intellectuals to the countryside to go through a period of manual labor.

Huang and others from the institute were sent to a collective farm. They worked as many as 16 hours a day, for this was part of Red China's attempt to make the "Great Leap Forward." After a year they were transferred to work iron mines and blast furnances for 3 months. Huang characterized this period as "silly." The intellectuals at first did not know anything about farming and, just at the time they were beginning to learn something from the peasants, were shifted to the mines and the blast furnaces. Again, knowing nothing, they produced little.

In 1959, Huang was sent back to the Foreign Language Institute. He was now a candidate for the Communist Party but did not become a member. Soon afterwards he was sent to Iraq to teach the Chinese language under a cultural exchange agreement. He had to leave his wife and two children in China.

In Iraq he became the head of the Chinese Section at the Institute of Languages of Baghdad University. After his 2-year contract had been fulfilled, he was ordered to return to Red China for a "vacation." As Huang told the committee, the Chinese Communists knew that "if you lived abroad too long, all kinds of influences would have affected your thoughts and action * * *."

On June 8, 1961, Huang and a fellow Chinese teacher boarded an airplane for their return trip to Red China by way of Damascus, Athens, and Prague. Huang was now determined to try to defect somewhere enroute.

When the plane landed at Athens for a short stopover, Huang was amazed to find that he could just pick up his suitcase and walk away from the airport, which he did. He obtained official protection from Greek authorities.

From Greece, he proceeded to West Germany where he stayed for 10 months before coming back to the United States.

When Huang was asked by the committee why he had defected, he said:

> In my experience during the past 10 years' life, including the life lived in Iraq, I found the regimentation, the limitation of personal liberty, unbearable. You cannot do this, you cannot do that, you have to think in this way, you have to in that way, and that way is the only correct way of thinking; so it made me in many cases feel that I was not honest.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> That kind of mental pressure. They do not beat you. You are not beaten by roughnecks or hoodlums. They do not have such practice * * * but a sort of abstract pressure that I felt very strongly.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> If you said something against the party line, then you have something to worry about: I have said something wrong, I have acted in the wrong way, now I must start preparing self-criticism, and you don't know how long that will take.
>
> Sometimes you write again and again to criticize yourself. Sometimes I felt rather sick of it, because I felt I have no more to say along this line. But they say it is still not good enough; you should study more and analyze your thoughts * * *.

Huang had learned the difference between Communist propaganda and Communist practice.

"INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM"—RED CHINA STYLE

(Testimony of Chi-Chou Huang)

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1962

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION [1]

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 11:30 a.m. in Room 225, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Francis E. Walter, chairman, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri; Clyde Doyle, of California; William M. Tuck, of Virginia; August E. Johansen, of Michigan; Donald C. Bruce, of Indiana; and Henry C. Schadeberg, of Wisconsin.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Huang, we welcome you and hope that you can assist the committee in developing the type information the American people ought to have about certain events in your life and about a regime of great importance to our country.

Will you raise your right hand, please.

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

Mr. HUANG. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF CHI-CHOU HUANG

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name for the record, please?

Mr. HUANG. My present name is Chi-chou Huang.

Mr. NITTLE. How old are you, Mr. Huang?

Mr. HUANG. I am 39 years old.

Mr. NITTLE. Where were you born?

Mr. HUANG. In Yunnan Province, China.

Mr. NITTLE. In what year?

Mr. HUANG. 1923.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the name of your father?

Mr. HUANG. My father died very young. I never had a chance to know him. As I recall, he was called by various names. The one I remember most often whenever he was mentioned is Yu-ho.

Mr. NITTLE. What year did your father die?

[1] Released by the committee and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUANG. I don't know exactly, but when I was a very small baby.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you continue to reside at the place of your birth in Yunnan Province, China?

Mr. HUANG. Until 1945 when I left to study in United States.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the extent of your education in China prior to your leaving in 1945 to come to the United States?

Mr. HUANG. After graduation from high school, senior school, I went to study in Yunnan University. Then the Yunnan Provincial Government set up this special class for sending students abroad—to America—for further studies, and I passed the examination and was enrolled in that special class. There I studied for one full year and graduated about 1942 perhaps. But then the exit visas were not immediately granted and our departure for the United States was delayed. We were sent to study in Southwest Consolidated University.

Mr. NITTLE. Under whose auspices did you come to the United States to study?

Mr. HUANG. The Yunnan Provincial Government.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you financed by the Yunnan Province?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you sent here to make any particular study?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. Everyone had a special field.

Mr. NITTLE. What was your field?

Mr. HUANG. I was supposed to study public health.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any choice of university that you would attend here?

Mr. HUANG. Everything was arranged by the Provincial government. I was recommended to, and accepted by, Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the date of your arrival here at Johns Hopkins?

Mr. HUANG. I arrived in the United States, I believe, in May or June 1945, but the studies began, of course, in September.

Mr. NITTLE. Where did you maintain your residence between the time of your arrival and the commencement of your studies in September 1945?

Mr. HUANG. For a short while in New York, a few days, and then immediately we came down to Baltimore, I remember.

Mr. NITTLE. You were with a group of students?

Mr. HUANG. Two of us were sent to Johns Hopkins.

Mr. NITTLE. Who received you here and introduced you to your school?

Mr. HUANG. Nobody. I don't remember anybody accompanied us, because there was only one director who accompanied the bunch of 40 students. He couldn't possibly take each one to the different schools. So we just came down by ourselves, the two of us.

Mr. NITTLE. At the time you left China, was it then free China?

Mr. HUANG. At that time China was under the K.M.T. [Kuomintang] Nationalist Government.

Mr. NITTLE. Prior to your arrival in the United States, did you have any association at all with the Communist movement?

Mr. HUANG. No, I didn't have any knowledge of that.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you made any studies of communism prior to your arrival in the United States?

Mr. HUANG. No, never.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any sympathy for communism at that time?

Mr. HUANG. I didn't know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to your arrival at Johns Hopkins and the commencement of your studies in September 1945, did you come in contact with communism in any way while in the United States?

Mr. HUANG. No.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you remain at Johns Hopkins?

Mr. HUANG. Only one semester.

I transferred to University of Maryland about February.

Mr. NITTLE. Of 1946?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. The next year.

Mr. NITTLE. While you were at Johns Hopkins and prior to your transfer to the University of Maryland, did you come in contact with communism in any way?

Mr. HUANG. No, never.

Mr. NITTLE. What did you study at Johns Hopkins?

Mr. HUANG. I was enrolled in premedical studies.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the occasion for your transfer to the University of Maryland?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I remember that some school fellow told me casually that life in the University of Maryland was more lively, with more social activities, unlike Johns Hopkins where studies were the main concern. He said it would be more interesting there at the University of Maryland and then he also said, as I recall, that it would take less time to complete my medical studies at the University of Maryland where, if you combined courses, you could get the medical doctor's degree in 7 years. In Johns Hopkins it would take longer time. So I thought these were all advantages. Of course, I had already wasted much time, waiting after graduation from the special class.

Mr. NITTLE. To effect the transfer to Maryland, did you have to obtain the consent of your Chinese people abroad?

Mr. HUANG. I do not recall exactly but perhaps I sent a letter of request to the authorities concerned and got approval.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you remain at the University of Maryland?

Mr. HUANG. Up to the end of 1948, but what month I cannot recall.

Mr. NITTLE. From the period of your arrival at the University of Maryland to the time of your departure, did you continue your premedical studies there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I did.

Mr. NITTLE. It was indicated to me that you might have changed your course of study from premedical to agriculture.

Mr. HUANG. Yes. That was at the end, near the date of my departure from the United States.

Mr. NITTLE. What induced you to alter your course of study from premedical to agriculture?

Mr. HUANG. The main reason, as I recall, was that, at the time, I had already decided to go back to China and I thought the public health and medicine in the United States were too advanced to be very practical in backward China. I might as well learn one or two things about raising cows or chickens, which would be more useful. So I thought I would try to do something along that line. That is why I changed into agriculture.

Mr. NITTLE. When did you decide to return to China?

Mr. HUANG. Of course, it is difficult to say just when I came to that decision, the exact date, but that was probably during the last few months of 1948. I was coming to that decision, but the exact date I do not remember.

Mr. NITTLE. At the time you decided to return to China, China was in a state of revolution and rebellion; was it not?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. There was a civil war between the Nationalist Government, which you had left, and the Communist movement. When you were intending to return to China, did you intend to return to Communist China or to Nationalist China?

(At this point Chairman Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. HUANG. My intention was to return to Communist China.

Mr. NITTLE. That is, the area which was then dominated by them?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. That was my intention, but I did not know whether it was possible.

Mr. NITTLE. The Chinese Communists had not at that time completed their conquest of the whole of China?

Mr. HUANG. No. I was thinking of going perhaps to the northwest or those areas occupied by the Communists. That was pretty early.

Mr. NITTLE. In 1948 was Yunnan Province under the control of the Communist regime?

Mr. HUANG. No, it was under the Yunnan Provincial Government.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have a family in Yunnan Province at this time?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. My mother was still living and I had a brother.

Mr. NITTLE. When did your mother die?

Mr. HUANG. When I was already working in Peiping. That is about 1950, I believe.

Mr. NITTLE. The only other close relative you have is a brother?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. Where is he living now?

Mr. HUANG. In south China, Province of Yunnan.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you maintain any contact with him now?

Mr. HUANG. No. I have had no contact with anybody.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know whether or not he is a Communist?

Mr. HUANG. No. I think he was not 3 years ago in 1959, when I left China to teach in Baghdad.

Mr. NITTLE. What was his occupation at the time you left?

Mr. HUANG. He was head of some accounting department.

Mr. NITTLE. For an industry or for the government?

Mr. HUANG. Industry is government. They don't have private industry. I know he worked for a government organization.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you relate to the committee the circumstances which led to your forming the desire to return to Red China?

Mr. HUANG. We were reading quite a bit at that time about the civil war in China, and this news was most disturbing to me and to others. Most of the Chinese students studying here talked about it, each expressing the same concern that, after the years of hardship during the war against Japanese aggression, Chinese were now killing Chinese in a civil war.

Mr. NITTLE. You developed an interest in the civil war and the participants in it?

Mr. HUANG. No, I wouldn't say that. At the beginning we were disturbed. We thought what is the use if the whole country is in flames, with no peace, what kind of work can we do? Whether we were studying medicine or agriculture, with the whole country in turmoil there would be no peaceful work for anybody. So I sensed that most students here were disturbed in various degrees. I was greatly disturbed. So I began to be more interested in politics and social problems and the way out for China as a whole and for me personally. So I began to neglect my professional studies and became interested in magazines and reports, and I also went to libraries to borrow books on social problems. Heretofore I never had very much interest in social problems.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you seek these books out on your own, or were recommendations made to you?

Mr. HUANG. On my own. In fact, I didn't know what books to read but I just looked into the Library of Congress and hunted out the books about China and social problems and I read some articles related to various aspects of social problems, among which there were socialistic books. Of course, I cannot recall the titles now. It was so long ago. My ideas were very vague and sketchy; but according to those sketchy few books I read, under socialism there would be equality and prosperity and freedom for every individual. So I thought, well, that is the kind of society the Chinese people should have and one I would enjoy living under, for I would not have to worry about my personal future, occupation, or job, and that kind of thing.

Mr. NITTLE. When you referred to books on "socialism," did you mean books on communism?

Mr. HUANG. At the time perhaps one or two. I do not recall. At first I did not know whether there was any distinction between communism and socialism. At the time another Chinese student, a postgraduate student, was doing research work at the University of Maryland—his name is Hsaio Chien-chou. This student came from central China and I remember he came on his own, not a government scholarship.

Mr. NITTLE. Had he come with you?

Mr. HUANG. No. I met him at the university.

Mr. NITTLE. Was he there when you arrived or did you see him later?

Mr. HUANG. I cannot recall whether he came earlier or later. I am not sure, but we stayed there for a couple of years together and this student influenced me greatly, much more than anybody else or even the books I had read. He never exactly said he was Communist or even pro-Communist. He didn't say that, but all his remarks were strongly against Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang government.

He talked about the ideal society which, according to my impression, was quite in line with a socialist society or Communist society. There was equality and full employment and liberty and all of that kind of thing.

So more and more I became interested in social problems, and I attended at least one lecture by Dr. Scott Nearing on socialism or some other topics related to socialism. All these ideas decided me to go back to the Communist revolution although, at the time, I had very little knowledge of the Communist movement in China.

Mr. NITTLE. Who put you in contact with lectures by Scott Nearing?

Mr. HUANG. I do not recall the exact circumstances but I seem to recall that I had seen the advertisement of a series of lectures conducted by Scott Nearing somewhere in the *Washington Post* or on some wall. I do not remember precisely.

Mr. NITTLE. In addition to discussions with a Chinese student, whose name you have mentioned and who spoke to you very favorably of communism, did you have discussions with any other students?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Who were they?

Mr. HUANG. There was another student but he was an American boy. He didn't give me much influence though. At the time, I was particularly fond of him because he showed very much interest in associating with foreign students. He was very kind, polite, and considerate.

Mr. NITTLE. Was he a friend of Hsaio Chien-chou?

Mr. HUANG. No, he was not. He was, as I remember, a senior, as I recall, of the sociology department. He perhaps met Hsaio Chien-chou once or twice but he was my friend.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me go back for a moment. Was your friend, Hsaio Chien-chou, known to you to be a Communist at that time?

Mr. HUANG. No, so far as I know even today he is not a Communist. An idealist probably.

Mr. NITTLE. I see; do you know where his family was from?

Mr. HUANG. I remember he said something about central China, perhaps Kiangsu Province but I can't be sure.

Mr. NITTLE. Was that under the domination of the Communist movement at the time of your discussions with him?

Mr. HUANG. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Tell us more about the senior in the sociology department, the undergraduate who talked with you.

Mr. HUANG. All right. I came into contact with this boy. He was very likable and very considerate. As a foreigner I was very lonely weekends, and he came to talk to me and sometimes helped me to correct my pronunciation, and we lived in the same dormitory at least for a period of time, not in the same room. Whenever he met me he was so nice and he wanted to learn some Chinese, too. So I taught him in exchange some Chinese words, a few, not much. He was just interested and a very considerate person. So I liked him. We didn't do anything else except this. We went—I do not recall whether I suggested to him or we saw the advertisement together—but it is a fact that we went to Scott Nearing's lecture together.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he suggest attendance at the Scott Nearing lecture?

Mr. HUANG. I don't believe so. Perhaps I suggested to him, probably——

Mr. NITTLE. Where did you obtain the literature that advised you that Nearing was delivering a lecture?

Mr. HUANG. I do not recall—maybe in the street in Washington. I happened to see that, but even before that I think I perhaps had already come across one or two books by him in the Library of Congress.

Mr. NITTLE. How did you come across books by Scott Nearing in the Library of Congress? There are quite a few books there.

Mr. HUANG. Well, you see, at the time I was reading on social problems and had looked at the catalogue on sociology and socialism, all of which are related.

Mr. NITTLE. That is how you came in contact with Scott Nearing's writings?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. I think so, because in this advertisement he probably stated socialism or something like that and I thought, oh, that is what I was interested in and perhaps then I discussed it. I am not so sure. Then we said nothing at the lectures. We just sat at the back in a room and listened.

Mr. NITTLE. About how many people attended that lecture?

Mr. HUANG. Very many, probably a hundred or so. Some sort of rented room, I guess, not very well furnished. After Nearing finished his lecture on socialism, I recall one incident. Someone in the audience stood up and said to Scott Nearing, "If you like socialism why don't you go to live in Russia?" I do not recall the answer, but it probably was something like this:

"Well, look, it is impossible for everyone to go to live in Russia." That is the only thing I recall about the lecture. Otherwise it was all very vague.

Mr. DOYLE (presiding). Mr. Nittle, that was a quorum call for us. The committee will have to recess for about 15 minutes.

The committee will stand in recess until 1:30. I am sorry to inconvenience you.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., Thursday, May 24, 1962, the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1962

1:30 p.m.

Mr. DOYLE (presiding). Let the subcommittee reconvene and let the record show that a quorum is present.

(Present: Representatives Doyle, Johansen, and Bruce.)

Mr. DOYLE. Proceed, Counsel.

TESTIMONY OF CHI-CHOU HUANG—Resumed

Mr. NITTLE. Just before the recess, you were telling us about your attendance at a lecture with an American student, the lecture being given by Scott Nearing.

Will you proceed in your own way to describe the incident.

Mr. HUANG. I think that was during late 1947 or '48, early '48. I am not very sure but this perhaps could be verified. I remember at the campus he was one of my good friends. I mean I associated with him quite more often. He helped me with my English. I taught

him a few Chinese characters. He was so nice and sociable. We went to the Scott Nearing lecture once.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you know that Scott Nearing [1] had been a Communist?

Mr. HUANG. No, I did not but I supposed he was at least a socialist. At the time I wasn't clear about the difference between communism and socialism and thought they were the same thing. And at the campus, I think I remember, at the time of Mr. Wallace's campaign for the Presidency in 1948, there was also a group of what they call Young Progressives [of America] or something—a small group—and I mentioned something. I talked with them. Very few I can remember.

Mr. NITTLE. Who introduced you to the Young Progressive movement on the campus?

Mr. HUANG. The Young Progressives, I just happened to see. I think they were quite active. They had a badge to support Henry Wallace, a kind of round badge. I bought one. Someone gave me it or I bought it, for one dollar I think. I was not eligible to vote.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they hold meetings on the campus or off the campus?

Mr. HUANG. Sometimes. I only remember a place on the lawn where several of them stood and I was there and I talked to them. At the time I thought Mr. Henry Wallace's democratic ideas, progressive, were quite in line with my ideas too. So I talked with them a little. I forgot this badge. I remember I paid a dollar for it. I could not vote but I thought I liked him. I just bought it for this.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you come in contact with any Communist literature at that time?

Mr. HUANG. Communist literature? Yes, during this period I continued to read books borrowed from the Library of Congress and some books I bought from what was called the "progressive" bookshop, or something like that, near the Greyhound bus station [in Washington] where all Communist literatures were sold. I bought some booklets by Lenin and Marx. So that during this whole period, '47 or '48, I continued to read occasionally, but not very many books.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you become familiar with a publication called *The Worker* or *Daily Worker?*

Mr. HUANG. I did not subscribe but I knew the existence of this paper because I read it occasionally.

Mr. NITTLE. Where did you obtain that publication?

Mr. HUANG. Sometimes I remember I bought it in Washington when I came in town. I think it was sold at the corner somewhere near a cafeteria. So when I went into the cafeteria I had my meals and when I came out on the corner I bought it. They were sold publicly.

Mr. NITTLE. Did anyone call your attention to this publication as an organ of the Communist movement?

Mr. HUANG. No one in particular but I knew it.

Mr. NITTLE. In your discussions with the American student, did you or he discuss the Communist movement?

---

[1] Mr. Nearing, a long-time and continuing supporter of Communist fronts and causes, was expelled from the Communist Party in January 1930, after having been a member for some years.

Mr. HUANG. I don't recall that he particularly mentioned the ideology, communism.

Mr. BRUCE. Did you discuss the socialist movement?

Mr. HUANG. No. I tend to put these two together. I believe he also—at least I bought the paper—sometimes he read it too. Although I cannot clearly say he actually did—but I have the impression that he read what I bought too. *Daily Worker* at the time. Sometimes was the *Sunday Worker* or something. Was there something like that?

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any other Communist publications?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. I remember. I did not remember but a few moments ago some of you gentlemen mentioned that name. I remember I read it, *Masses* and *Masses and Mainstream*. I read that too sometimes, not often.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you have any discussion on the subject of communism, Marxism, or socialism with any other students at the university?

Mr. HUANG. No, not any other students but with this Hsaio, the Chinese graduate student. We frequently exchanged what we learned about democracy and progressive movements; I think at the time it was all related to socialism. I exchanged my views quite frequently with this Hsaio, who was the only person I trusted politically.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did Hsaio remain at the University of Maryland?

Mr. HUANG. I think I left much before him.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you ever see him again?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, in China in Peking. But when I left the United States I didn't tell anybody, even Hsaio. I trusted him to a certain degree politically but I did not dare to tell even him that I wanted to go back to join the Communist movement.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you tell this to the American student?

Mr. HUANG. No, far less. I couldn't trust him. Actually with him it was more of a sort of friendship, his considerate manners, polite friendliness, and that sort of thing; but politically I trusted Hsaio more than him.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you attend any other lectures by Communists or socialists with your friends?

Mr. HUANG. I don't recall any other meetings I attended with any of them but I attended another political meeting, a big meeting, alone.

Mr. NITTLE. Where was that?

Mr. HUANG. At some "garden" in New York, when Mr. Wallace came back after his nationwide campaign.

Mr. NITTLE. In your sessions with the American student, did you have any discussions on the subject of communism?

Mr. HUANG. I do not recall very clearly what we actually discussed along political lines, not very much.

The influence upon me was mainly from that Mr. Hsaio as a person. I think I got more from reading. I mean my knowledge, and my ideas about socialism or communism.

Mr. NITTLE. What did the American student have to say about Scott Nearing's lecture? You must have had some discussion about that.

Mr. HUANG. I remember we came out. During the whole lecture we two sat at the side bench. The others sat in front of the rostrum but we went rather late. We sat at the corner, I remember, at the side. He didn't say anything. I didn't say anything much, but let's see—afterwards, did we say anything afterwards? At the meeting we just listened. Afterwards I cannot recall.

It is such a long time ago, but what happened which I remember is when we came down to the lobby, Dr. Blossom was there, the manager of Scott Nearing's lecture series, selling pamphlets down at the hall or lobby, and I went over and bought a few of them.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you known Dr. Blossom prior to this time?

Mr. HUANG. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you introduced to him by another, or did you seek his acquaintanceship?

Mr. HUANG. I think maybe it's mutual. When I went to the desk he sold me a few.

Mr. NITTLE. You were interested in this literature and after the lecture you went to his desk?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. He was attending and we——

Mr. NITTLE. Tell us what the conversation was, if you remember.

Mr. HUANG. Not very much. I don't remember much. He casually invited me. Let's see: "My office is on the booklet," or something, not exact wording, "when you have time or if you like you come and visit us."

Mr. NITTLE. When he referred to his office, was there any further explanation given to you as to the location and the name of the office?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. It was on the booklets printed. I remember that.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your recollection of the address?

Mr. HUANG. I can't remember, maybe northwest or something, 100 something.

Mr. NITTLE. Was it 125 Fifth Street, Northeast?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, probably. It seems to me it is the manager's office.

Mr. NITTLE. Was the American student with you at that time when you talked to Dr. Blossom?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I think so because I don't recall he left before me. I think he was there.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you suggest this meeting with Nearing to the American student or did he suggest this meeting to you?

Mr. HUANG. That I cannot say for definitely sure. I can't say because I don't recall.

Mr. NITTLE. Was Hsaio in attendance at the Scott Nearing lecture?

Mr. HUANG. No. That is strange. But I did not tell him about my activities with other people. At the time I had that association with the Christian clubs—is that what you call them—in the college, Maryland, one of the ministers was a good friend of mine, too, and a religious worker, Moya Ball, a girl worker. We were very good friends, but with my other duties I didn't have anything to do with Hsaio. I seemed to separate them. They did not meet each other, not in one group.

Mr. NITTLE. Having met Dr. Blossom at the Scott Nearing lecture, did you decide to visit at the address given you?

Mr. HUANG. No, not right away but later, when I decided or already prepared to leave this country. As I stated, I had the intention to go to join the Communists but at the time they were guerrillas fighting in the northwestern mountains and I didn't know how to get there. So I didn't know what to do. I had nobody to advise me and I didn't trust anybody to tell my intentions.

Mr. NITTLE. And you did not trust your American friend?

Mr. HUANG. No. He didn't even say he was particularly interested in supporting Mr. Wallace, I think, but he liked democratic discussion, progressives. But he did discuss with me this progressive movement because we talked with the Young Progressives on the campus together.

Mr. NITTLE. Did Dr. Blossom talk with your friend at the Scott Nearing lecture?

Mr. HUANG. No. He didn't seem to. He did not buy anything. They did not talk about anything. He stayed sort of with me.

Mr. NITTLE. You indicate that you made up your mind to return to Red China and you did not know exactly what to do?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. What did you finally decide to do?

Mr. HUANG. Well, first I thought it was quite difficult to get to north China. There were no ships directly and airplanes—I never thought of that possibility. I thought there were guerrillas fighting there in northwestern mountains. It was difficult to go there. So my first attempt was to go to the Soviet Union. So I went to the Russian Embassy. So where was it? Well, I can't recall.

Mr. NITTLE. In Washington, D.C.?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. The Soviet Embassy, and I knocked on the big door and a young fellow opened the door and asked me about my business. I didn't even go into the office. He didn't invite me. So I asked him, a young fellow. It seems he was a very minor official, doorkeeper, because one thing I noticed, which surprised me a little too, I remember his heels were all worn, the side like this, the shoes. I thought why could they wear such poor shoes. I had such an impression. Anyway, this young fellow received me and asked my business, and then I told him straightaway. I then said I wished to go to the Soviet Union, is it possible to work, to find a job? Is it possible? He said sorry, at the present time there wasn't any possibility because there were very few ships sailing between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. NITTLE. Was this a discussion with the doorkeeper?

Mr. HUANG. I didn't know for sure what he was but I thought he was.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he take you inside, into a room?

Mr. HUANG. No, he didn't go into a room, just in the hall.

Mr. NITTLE. This discussion occurred in the hall at the entrance?

Mr. HUANG. A few exchange of words because he told me right away there wasn't any possibility in the foreseeable future because of the transportation. He said there were very, very few ships transporting crews or passengers. But I remember he gave me some forms to fill out for application. Perhaps that is for visa or something, the form, and he said, "If you send them here and wait and if there is any possibility we could give you an answer. You can come again," that

kind of thing. But I did not wait that long when I saw there was no possibility.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he ask you what your motives were in desiring to go to Soviet Russia?

Mr. HUANG. No, he didn't ask me anything.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he ask you where you were from?

Mr. HUANG. I told him.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you tell him you were sympathetic to communism?

Mr. HUANG. I even hinted that I think, but I didn't say clearly. I said I would like to go back to China but I don't know how to go there so I would like to go to Soviet Union to work or to study if possible.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he ask you why?

Mr. HUANG. No, he didn't.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he take your name and address?

Mr. HUANG. No. He asked me to fill this form.

Mr. NITTLE. And return it later?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. But when I got those forms I never filled them out.

Mr. NITTLE. Then what was your next course of action?

Mr. HUANG. After this I became disturbed a little, what am I going to do. I didn't know what to do. Then I remembered this Dr. Nearing because he openly proclaimed socialism. I thought they also had the socialism, and it would be the same thing, their ideas would be quite close at least, and I thought I probably could ask this organization to help me, to give me some advice. That is why I went there.

Mr. NITTLE. You went where?

Mr. HUANG. This address you just mentioned.

Mr. NITTLE. The address that Dr. Blossom gave you?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I think that is the address.

Mr. NITTLE. Dr. Frederick A. Blossom. Is that his name?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. That is correct.

Mr. NITTLE. In the course of your introduction to Dr. Blossom at the lecture, did he tell you what his occupation was?

Mr. HUANG. I think he said, "I am the manager of this Dr. Nearing lecture series," but I had known that already because I read it in the advertisement. His name too, I think, was on there, manager or something.

Mr. NITTLE. I see. Did he tell you that he had been employed at the Library of Congress?

Mr. HUANG. No. Was he?

Mr. NITTLE. He had been; yes.

Mr. HUANG. We didn't discuss that.

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Proceed.

Mr. HUANG. So I went. I remember it is a very small office, tiny and very poorly furnished, but he impressed me very much by this: That he was so kind and genteel and he showed a great deal of consideration. He expressed great welcome, and I thought this is a great doctor and I am a student and he is so condescending. I felt very impressed anyway at the time and I began to like him very much. So I suddenly became very trustful toward him. So he asked me to sit down in a very poor chair in the corner, and I began without reserve to tell him all my intentions, wishes, plans: about I like this

idea of socialism; I wanted to go to the Soviet Union but I couldn't and I don't know what to do—I think along this line, not exactly the wording, but then I began to trust him. I told him the whole thing.

Mr. NITTLE. What did he say?

Mr. HUANG. Other things I could not recall because it was so long ago, but one thing I recall clearly is that he suggested that I perhaps could get help from a lady writer named Smedley.

Mr. NITTLE. Agnes Smedley?

Mr. HUANG. Agnes Smedley,[1] that is correct. He said perhaps she could help you because she was General Chu Teh's friend.

Mr. NITTLE. To what specific place did you tell Dr. Blossom you wanted to go?

Mr. HUANG. I wasn't clear, but to go back to China and eventually join the Communists.

Mr. NITTLE. You did not tell him that you wanted to go to the Soviet Union at that time?

Mr. HUANG. I thought I also did. I think—I do not recall but I presume everything, my intention, but I did not tell him directly what place I had to go because I didn't see the possibility, and he suggested his lady writer, Smedley, because she was General Chu Teh's friend.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he tell you where she was at that time?

Mr. HUANG. He didn't know. Then he tried to help me. I said how could I find out where this lady writer is, and he said, "Well, we will try to find out." He made some telephone calls, I think, but he couldn't locate where she is.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you recollect the place he called?

Mr HUANG. No, he did not tell me and I did not hear.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he telephone in your presence, or did he leave the room?

Mr. HUANG. Let's see. Some distance away or in the next room. I cannot recall very well. Then after he could not locate her and there was nothing to do, I became a little anxious.

Mr. NITTLE. I do not think we placed the time when you went to see him.

Mr. HUANG. The end of 1948.

Mr. NITTLE. Toward the end of 1948. Very well.

Mr. HUANG. That way I remember because all this happened in a rather short period of time. I decided to go back to China.

Mr. NITTLE. Proceed.

Mr. HUANG. Then I became disturbed. So at this time I think I recall a strong notion came over me. I thought, well, perhaps there is nothing to do. I will have to go back to Kunming, where I came from, and there I should try to contact with the Communist area agents. They used to have them.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you talk to Dr. Blossom that day?

Mr. HUANG. I should say about a half hour or so.

---

[1] Miss Smedley was affiliated with the Sorge Soviet espionage apparatus. She died in England in 1950, leaving her bank accounts and cash to her niece. Her will also stipulated that her body be cremated and her ashes shipped to General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Red Chinese Army, to be laid to rest wherever he designated. She also bequeathed to General Chu U.S. Government bonds she held, royalties due from her published works and "anything else of value included in my estate." On the first anniversary of her death, her ashes were interred in the Cemetery of Revolutionaries, outside Peking.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the result of this first meeting with Blossom?

Mr. HUANG. Only one meeting.

Mr. NITTLE. You had only one meeting with him?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. And he tried to get in touch with Agnes Smedley and told you he could not. Did he make any other attempts to contact anyone, or did he suggest any other names to you of people to see?

Mr. HUANG. No. Let me think for a moment. Oh, yes, yes. It has been so long ago. But there was only one meeting. After this Smedley contact could not be reached, he suggested there was another place you probably could go to find information about going back to China to find the connection. He gave me the address of a place, publication. I remember the name now—Maud Russell [1]—in New York.

Mr. JOHANSEN. A woman?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. The publication I also remember because when I got to New York they gave me, I remember, something like Committee Democracy or something. What kind of democracy? Far East of something. They should have publications.

Mr. NITTLE. Was it the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy? [2]

Mr. HUANG. That sounds familiar, but I can't recall for sure. Anyway, this person I remember, this lady, and I can't recall the address, but it is in New York. So I went there by bus. My things were already packed.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he make any arrangements for you to see her, by telephone or otherwise, in your presence?

Mr. HUANG. No, he didn't. At the time I already had my luggage packed and I left them I think at the station, the railway station. So I was ready to go anywhere, to leave this country. Then he suggested this as a last resort. He suggested this Maud Russell. I went to New York.

Mr. NITTLE. Now you had your baggage with you?

Mr. HUANG. No, not with me, but I remember I had my baggage left in the station.

Mr. NITTLE. You had already left the university?

Mr. HUANG. I think I had.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you notified the authorities that you were leaving?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. All this I had already done.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they ask you where you were going or why?

Mr. HUANG. No. What authority?

Mr. NITTLE. At the university.

Mr. HUANG. At the university I didn't care because I pleaded ill health, and they had to let me go.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you tell Hsaio that you were leaving?

Mr. HUANG. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you tell your American friend?

---

[1] Miss Russell, an active propagandist for the Chinese Communist cause since World War II, was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Mrs. Anita Bell Schneider, an undercover informant for the FBI, in testimony before this committee on July 5, 1955.

[2] Cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark on April 27, 1949.

Mr. HUANG. No. But he probably learned of my packing and asking the school for withdrawal. I think probably he did but I am not sure.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you tell him you had seen Dr. Blossom?

Mr. HUANG. Let me see. Maybe not. I do not recall. I do not recall.

Mr. NITTLE. All right. Then you went down to see Maud Russell?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. I went to New York to an office in a rickety place several flights up in a room, a large empty room, with some publications, prints, and papers of some kind in the office and a long desk.[1] I remember the impression, and a lady was there, a rather tall lady. I do not recall her name any more. I asked for this lady Maud Russell, but she told me she was not in New York.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you know the name of the lady to whom you talked?

Mr. HUANG. No, I don't. It was a very brief few moments.

Mr. NITTLE. What else occurred at the office of Maud Russell?

Mr. HUANG. I don't know whether that is her office or not. It didn't look like an office to me. There weren't that many chairs, quite empty, a big room; but nothing much happened. This lady told me she was not in New York and she said she probably is visiting Washington. So I said, "Well, I am coming here all the way from Washington to New York. Now she is in Washington. My trip would be in vain." She said, "I am sorry. She has been there for a few days already," or something.

Mr. JOHANSEN. "She" being Miss Russell?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, Miss Maud Russell—Miss or Mrs., I don't know, but this Maud Russell. This lady told me, this tall lady in the office or something told me, "Maud Russell is not in New York, she has been away in Washington for a couple of days." So I said, "Well, then, my trip has been in vain."

She said, "Well, if it is anything important, you can go back to Washington and ask the person who recommended you to come to see her for more information. He probably could locate her in Washington, because she is in Washington."

Mr. JOHANSEN. All right.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you told her who had referred you to Maud Russell?

Mr. HUANG. Perhaps I did, but I do not recall every detail; I recall the name. Perhaps I did, but I am not so sure. So I became disappointed again. I had given up. I said if he knew she was in Washington, how could he send me up here because I think I went at night many hours on that bus, and I became very tired, too. So I had to come back right away because I didn't want to stay in New York too long. Let's see. I don't know whether the Wallace meeting was at that time or a different time. I don't recall. Perhaps it is a different time.

Mr. NITTLE. It was the election of November 1948?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, because I remember I was in New York attending a Wallace meeting in a very big place—an open place. Just before the election I went up there.

Mr. NITTLE. Very well.

---

[1] 111 West 42d Street.

Did you attend the Wallace rally in New York with any other persons?

Mr. HUANG. No, I went all by myself.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, at the address of Maud Russell, the person in attendance at that office suggested you return to Washington——

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. —to see the person who sent you there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you then go back to Washington?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I did. Of course, I had to come back here because there was nothing more for me to do in New York any more. So I came back and at first I thought, well, it's not any use. How could it be possible? If he knew she was in Washington, why should he send me all the way up to New York? I thought he wouldn't possibly know where this Maud Russell was at first. So again I rode the Greyhound bus; but when I came to Washington, I had time and there wasn't much to do. So later I thought I would go and try again if there was any help. That would be better than nothing.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you return to see Dr. Blossom?

Mr. HUANG. Not right away. That is my thought. When I returned to Washington, first I thought of not trying again because I thought it was impossible, it wasn't any use, but later I had nothing much to do during that time and when I came back to Washington, I thought it won't do any harm for me to try it again to see what happened and attempt to find Maud Russell in New York. So I went to his office again, Dr. Blossom's office. When I went over to his office and I told him what happened, I was a little bit irritated but I didn't show it—I spend so many hours on the bus. But he was so kind and tried to help me. So I didn't show it. Anyhow, I told him about this trip and he said, "Is she really, did that lady really tell you that? How could it be possible?" He said, "Now let me try to see if I can find her." He again, I believe, probably made some telephone calls and he told me, "I phone her. She was really actually in Washington." So I think after a little time——

Mr. NITTLE. Did he tell you where she was in Washington?

Mr. HUANG. No, he didn't. I wasn't interested any more than that. I was interested in getting help from him. So after some time, I don't know how long but quite short, it wasn't such a long time before she came.

Mr. NITTLE. Into the office?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, that is right. So she came to this office and Dr. Blossom, of course, introduced us.

Mr. NITTLE. Was she a young or an elderly woman?

Mr. HUANG. Let me see, she gave the impression of full of energy. I mean she talked lively but she had white hair, you see. I don't really recall. But she seemed perhaps blond or something.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you form any impression of her age?

Mr. HUANG. Not exactly. Maybe 50 or 60 because her hair was white or blond. I can't recall. Anyway she was also noisy, and I asked her——

Mr. NITTLE. Did Blossom introduce you to her?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. What did he say when you were all brought together?

Mr. HUANG. "This is Mr. Huang, a student. He came to the United States from China but now he wants to go back, but there is a civil war. He doesn't know where to go and he probably eventually wants to go to join the Communists," and that kind of thing. I do not recall the exact wording, but this is probably what happened. Anyway we didn't exchange ideas very much and she said, "Well, you come from China and from Yunnan Province. I know your director, Lung Chang King."

Mr. NITTLE. Director of what?

Mr. HUANG. He is the director of that Yunnan Provincial special class training for us to come to study in the United States. He was the director and he was also the one who accompanied us, sent us in person, to the United States.

Mr. NITTLE. And she, Maud Russell, said she knew him?

Mr. HUANG. She said "Oh, that is interesting. You are one of his students." I said he did not teach but he was the director. She said, "Oh, I knew him well," but he was in China already. This Mr. King was in China. She said, "I knew him well; that is a very interesting coincidence," something like that. Then she said, "I am sorry. I couldn't help you very much because we don't have direct connections with the Communist movement guerrillas in northern China, or communication. We don't have the communication or connections."

She apologized. Then I thought there is nothing to do, but she suggested in Hong Kong there should be agencies or agents of that sort who have connections with the Communists. She said this is quite possible. There were many Communist—"democratic," I think she said—"democratic" movements. She didn't use the word "Communist."

Mr. NITTLE. Well, the Communists, we understand, habitually use a reverse language. They refer to communism as "democracy" to confuse people and for its propaganda value.

Mr. HUANG. She used the word that there were many "democratic" organizations in Hong Kong. "Why don't you go there and it is easy to find connections." I said, "But I don't know anybody in Hong Kong. I don't know anybody or any organization."

She said, well, then, there is *Hua Shang Pao*, the *Chinese Commercial Daily* in Hong Kong.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you referring to a newspaper?

Mr. BRUCE. What was that name again?

Mr. HUANG. Hua means China; Shang means merchants, commercial; Pao means newspaper.

Mr. NITTLE. Could you spell that?

Mr. HUANG. H-u-a S-h-a-n-g P-a-o. This is my spelling. That is a Chinese newspaper. That is my translation of it.

Mr. NITTLE. That was a publication in Hong Kong?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, a Chinese publication.

She said, well, then, that paper certainly supports the Chinese "democratic" movement.

Mr. NITTLE. She was probably choosing her language very carefully.

Mr. HUANG. Well, these are the things. I think except in Scott Nearing's lectures, when he directly upheld socialism, the other people I contacted, I recall now, they more often used "democratic movements" and didn't say I am all for socialism or communism. They often say "democratic" or "democracy movement."

Mr. NITTLE. This, of course, has a propaganda, as well as security, value and is a part of Communist deceit. Proceed.

Mr. HUANG. So that wasn't very much help, because at the time I wasn't sure the nature of this newspaper or how much help it could give me, even if I located it.

Well, I was just a student. I met Dr. Blossom the second time, the first day and the second. I came back from New York. She didn't know. She said she didn't know, she didn't have any connections but she suggested that newspaper. At first I thought there wasn't much help, but then I thought it was better than nothing. At least when I got to Hong Kong——

Mr. NITTLE. She apparently knew more than she told you. She was giving you a clear line as to where you could get help, while pretending that she did not have any really certain knowledge. You were not quite getting the hint and you thought she was not helpful.

Mr. HUANG. I couldn't say whether she knew more about the newspaper but I took that chance. I thought, well, it is better than nothing, at least when I got to Hong Kong I had somewhere to go to.

Mr. NITTLE. Did she give you the name of any particular person to see?

Mr. HUANG. No, but she just told me the name of the newspaper, no person. I didn't ask her for a personal introduction either. Perhaps I thought it was not proper to really ask, that asking more help was too much trouble, from other people. So let me see. I do not recall whether immediately that she couldn't do any more for me so I immediately went to leave the place. I recall perhaps she drove me out because she had a car, I remember. Yes, I think so. I think so. Yes, she wanted to leave, too, I think.

Mr. NITTLE. Did she ask whether you had sufficient financial resources to get to Hong Kong?

Mr. HUANG. No, she didn't ask me anything about that.

Mr. NITTLE. Did she ask you whether you needed help?

Mr. HUANG. She didn't ask that.

Mr. NITTLE. Did she suggest how to get to Hong Kong?

Mr. HUANG. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Or refer you to any particular travel agency?

Mr. HUANG. No.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you ask her about any?

Mr. HUANG. No, I didn't.

Mr. NITTLE. Tell us what happened next.

Mr. HUANG. Well, then I immediately didn't want to stay here because I already had decided to leave the country, the States. So I bought a train ticket across the country to San Francisco. There I went aboard a ship, *General Gordon.* I think it was *General Gordon.*

Mr. NITTLE. Where did you get the money to pay for your travel?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, this institute, China House. I think it is here somewhere. I came across it. The China House, that is an organization. This Mr. King sent us to the United States in person and he let us in schools, but this China House in New York was then in charge of the students' studies and financial subsidies, and every month this China House sent us each a check, monthly allowance.

Mr. NITTLE. But you would need more than a monthly allowance to go to Hong Kong?

Mr. HUANG. Sure. When I left this country, naturally I had to correspond with them. I told them I was ill, I wanted to go back to China but that is not true, of course. I wanted to leave the country and I think they persuaded me to stay. Did they write me to ask me to stay or something? But I insisted anyway. I made it very clear that I wasn't going to continue with my studies, there wasn't any point in that. So they finally approved and sent me a letter and the passage fare, just enough to get to China.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they ask you to what place you were going in China?

Mr. HUANG. They asked me to go to Shanghai.

Mr. NITTLE. What did you say?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I told them I wouldn't argue with them, of course, but I intentionally went to Hong Kong, of course.

Mr. NITTLE. They sent you money, not a ticket?

Mr. HUANG. Money, I think.

Mr. NITTLE. And you bought your own ticket?

Mr. HUANG. I think so. I think probably San Francisco. The traffic wasn't very heavy, I think I bought the ticket in San Francisco. Just enough money I think. When I got to Hong Kong I became nearly desperate. I had only $25 or something.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you go to the *Chinese Commercial Daily?* On arrival at Hong Kong, did you go directly to the *Chinese Commercial Daily?*

Mr. HUANG. No, not directly. After I got a place to live, a day or two afterwards, maybe 2 days later, I forget.

Mr. NITTLE. Tell the committee about your experience on your visit to the office of the *Chinese Commercial Daily.*

Mr. HUANG. Yes. When I got to Hong Kong, of course, in my circumstances at the time, I couldn't afford to stay at a hotel, which was too expensive, so I lived in the YMCA. That is the cheapest place for me. In Hong Kong, I got there and got a room.

After I put in my luggage and perhaps over night I rested and then I tried to find this place. I think I found it. Maud Russell didn't even give me the address. Perhaps she didn't know. I went to the street and the newspaper stand and easily found a copy of this *Chinese Commercial Daily* and I think I got the address from that. Then, of course, it was easy to find the place. When I found the place, I wanted to see somebody who was officer of that newspaper or something. I didn't know who to ask for, but then a man came out to see me after a little while. This person at the time of the first meeting received me rather coolly. At the beginning he asked me my intentions, why did I want to see the newspaper, and I told him that I wanted to find the connections to go to Communist areas. That is right. I told him my intentions.

Mr. NITTLE. Who was this man you were talking to?

Mr. HUANG. Fan Chien-ya. F-a-n C-h-i-e-n–y-a. I think that is the regular spelling.

Mr. BRUCE. What office did he hold on the newspaper?

Mr. HUANG. I wouldn't know. I didn't——

Mr. BRUCE. Was he the first man you met at the office?

Mr. HUANG. I met nobody.

Mr. BRUCE. Was this a small office?

Mr. HUANG. Small, but inside how big I don't know. It went up two stories and one door. Only one, a kind of big chair.

Mr. BRUCE. Was he alone in the room when you talked to him?

Mr. HUANG. No, he came out from the inside.

Mr. BRUCE. When you talked to him, did he talk to you alone?

Mr. HUANG. Alone, yes.

Mr. BRUCE. And he was quite cold in the beginning?

Anyway, proceed.

Mr. HUANG. I am just trying to tell you the actual facts.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move we take a 5-minute recess.

Mr. DOYLE. We will take a short recess.

(Short recess)

Mr. DOYLE. All right, Counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. You were telling us about your visit at the offices of the *Chinese Commercial Daily* and your conversations with Mr. Fan Chien-ya. Would you proceed?

Mr. HUANG. He didn't say much. He just asked me why I wanted to see the newspaper office, and I told him my intentions of going to Communist China, if possible I wanted him to help me.

He told me simply, "It is possible but we don't have so many boats to go to guerrilla area in north China. So you have to wait. You come to see us every couple of weeks."

I said, "Do I have to wait so long?" He said, "Well, there is nothing we can do unless you go by yourself. If you go back to Kunming and through south China, you can travel on your own."

Many young people, he said, went to join the north Chinese "liberated areas"—Did he use that term?

Mr. NITTLE. What term?

Mr. HUANG. "Liberated areas." I do not recall if he used that term.

Mr. NITTLE. It is quite likely that he did use it, because that is a common term in Communist semantics.

Mr. HUANG. Later it was very common, "liberated."

Mr. NITTLE. It is their reverse language. They speak of "liberated areas" as those which they have conquered and upon which they have committed aggression. It is "freeing" an area, in their language.

Proceed.

Mr. HUANG. He told me, finally, if I didn't want to wait and wanted to go by myself, I had to go this way. But he said many young people went to the "liberated areas" just by that way, just had to take the chance.

Many of them eventually, students, even professors, got to the "liberated areas." He said, "If you are not patient, if you don't want to wait, you can do that, too: but if you want to wait, you come to see us every couple of weeks, and I will tell you whether we have a chartered boat to go or not."

So I couldn't do anything else.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he ask you who had referred you to him or to that office?

Mr. HUANG. He didn't seem to be interested. He didn't ask me very much.

Mr. NITTLE. On that first occasion or in the course of any conversation with him, then or later, did he ask who had sent you?

Mr. HUANG. I am trying to recall did he ever ask me about that. No, I can't recall if he did. Even if he did, I can't recall that he asked that particular question.

Mr. NITTLE. Certainly you told him who had sent you there?

Mr. HUANG. I do not recall the conversation. Perhaps I did.

Mr. NITTLE. He knew you had come from the United States?

Mr. HUANG. I told him my intentions. That I remember very well.

Mr. NITTLE. You told him you had come from the United States?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. And that you had been referred there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I think I did. This last part, whether I mentioned Maud Russell or not, I am not very clear, but he didn't seem to be very interested. I do not recall that he was curious, asking me my background and that. He wasn't. He gave the impression that he didn't care. So I waited a long time, month after month, several months.

Mr. NITTLE. In Hong Kong?

Mr. HUANG. Each time I asked him what was the chance, he said, "No, sorry."

Mr. NITTLE. How were you managing to maintain yourself financially during that time?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I shall say this, too. So I had a little money when I got to Hong Kong and, of course, I lived very cheaply. Meals I paid very little. I spent little or no money on luxury or even films. So I lived very cheaply but I had so little money, I remember only $25 or $40 or something, not more.

So I was naturally anxious to leave, but there wasn't any boat. So I became anxious how I was going to live on. So eventually, I couldn't do anything else. I tried to look for a temporary employment. I asked the YMCA whether there was some sort of temporary employment but I didn't want long-time employment, but there was very little opportunity. So, eventually, yes, I sold some of my clothes. A camera, also, I sold, but those pawn shops didn't pay much, very, very little money for my clothes I bought here in the States.

I thought, well, if the luxury things were not useful when you go to join the revolution, you cannot wear such nice Western clothes. So I wasn't particularly worried about the little money they gave me. So I sold it.

Mr. NITTLE. How often did you visit Fan in the meanwhile?

Mr. HUANG. Every 2 or 3 weeks, just as he said.

Mr. NITTLE. Did he spend much time with you in those conversations?

Mr. HUANG. No, each time very little. He just said, "Come back in another 2 weeks or 3, no boat." I mainly relied on myself in the beginning; my little money was spent for meals. So, I began to sell my clothes and my camera and even after that I didn't have anything more to sell. I brought back with me a few books and dictionaries but those things could not be sold. Nobody wanted them.

So, I finally decided to write to Mr. King. He was back at the time, of course, in '48.

Mr. DOYLE. What books did you bring back?

Mr. HUANG. Books of English, dictionaries, Webster, and that kind of thing.

Mr. DOYLE. What other books?

Mr. HUANG. A few text books.

Mr. DOYLE. What were they?

Mr. HUANG. Mainly the others I left, but I remember I brought back with me the books I bought when I transferred to the Agriculture Department about raising leghorns and, I don't recall, cows. I thought that might be still useful. I thought they could learn to raise cows.

Mr. DOYLE. But you had a book or two that were paperback books. Didn't you bring anything on Marxism?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I brought some of it.

Mr. DOYLE. What books on Marxism?

Mr. HUANG. Well, a few, about five or six I remember, booklets I bought.

Mr. DOYLE. Those cheap books on Marx and socialism?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. Not very many. I didn't buy many because they were expensive, but I remember I bought five or six booklets at the "progressive" bookshop with Lenin's picture on it.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. HUANG. And some publication. I forgot the name.

Mr. DOYLE. You had already read those, though. You knew those. You knew everything in them? You had read them?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I did. But I didn't understand them very much.

Mr. DOYLE. But you didn't want to lose them?

Mr. HUANG. No, I didn't. I wanted to bring them with me.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. HUANG. And also some publications by that Scott Nearing.

Mr. BRUCE. Did you say that you called Mr. King?

Mr. HUANG. No, I didn't call. I wrote to him. Then I wrote him a letter telling him my situation in Hong Kong. I said I wanted to come back to China but I didn't tell him where I wanted to go. I couldn't, naturally, at the time.

I said, "Now, I am in Hong Kong, I have no more financial support. Could you help me?" And then he sent me 400 Hong Kong dollars. So that was quite enough for a couple of months. I lived very cheaply, one Hong Kong dollar a meal, I remember. Opposite the YMCA was a small restaurant. I often ate there.

So, on that money I was able to live until the departure in May, I believe, May or April, for north China.

Mr. NITTLE. Of 1949?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, '49. That is right. 1949, May of 1949. At the time I was told there was a boat.

Mr. NITTLE. Did Fan contact you?

Mr. HUANG. No, I contacted him always. He wouldn't bother about it. "In a few days, a certain day, there would be a boat but we want everybody who is able to go by this boat to pay his own fare, everybody, only those who are really helpless we perhaps can assist," and he asked me. I said, "I have no money but I have a radio. I have a large five-tube radio I bought in the United States. If it can be sold, that can bring me some money for the passage," and he said, "Why don't you try it?"

I said, "All right." So, I sold that radio in a radio shop. I got, I remember, 300 Hong Kong dollars. That was the amount, enough for the passage in the boat. So, I paid for the ticket with that.

Then I left on that certain date, in May or June. I have forgotten. Probably May, most likely.

Then, of course, the trip on the boat——

Mr. NITTLE. From whom did you buy the ticket, or was the ticket furnished by Fan?

Mr. HUANG. I think the ticket was given me by Fan.

Mr. NITTLE. What vessel was this, a Chinese or vessel of some other nationality?

Mr. HUANG. No, I think Chinese because on the boat I remember some Chinese words, but what words?

Mr. NITTLE. Was this a steamer, a modern vessel, a large one?

Mr. HUANG. No, it was a small boat, waving all the time. Very small. Many people got sick.

Mr. NITTLE. What flag was borne by the boat?

Mr. HUANG. It was certainly not the Chinese flag, maybe a Hong Kong flag. I don't recall. Maybe no flag at all. I don't recall what kind.

Mr. NITTLE. Who operated the boat, the Chinese or another nationality?

Mr. HUANG. I do not remember. I don't remember I saw any foreigners there.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you come in contact with the captain of the boat?

Mr. HUANG. No. I think very few traveled in the top class. They had first class, a very small thing, only a few perhaps. I don't know who they were, maybe just the captain. I saw him perhaps on the top place with his white uniform. All of us traveled in the same class. There were old men, Chinese.

Mr. NITTLE. Were there any Americans with you?

Mr. HUANG. I do not recall any Americans or foreigners, either. All Chinese, I think, but a lot of people, I still recall, on that trip.

Mr. NITTLE. Where did you get off the boat?

Mr. HUANG. Tientsin.

Mr. NITTLE. Was that in an area occupied by the Chinese Reds?

Mr. HUANG. Of course, at the time, naturally. I do not remember when they occupied that city. But that was the port we disembarked.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you receive any instructions from Fan as to what you were to do when you arrived at Tientsin?

Mr. HUANG. No, nothing at all. He didn't give us any instructions, just on the date when we went aboard we were handed over the ticket and that is all.

Mr. NITTLE. Tell us what happened on your arrival.

Mr. HUANG. On our arrival in Tientsin, we were received very well and, for the first time, I heard people mention these are democratic personalities, or something, the whole group on the boat.

In Tientsin we were referred to as "democratic elements" or "democratic personalities," those who want to come to the "liberated areas" to support them; that is what they meant, I think.

We were received very well, were put up at some of the best hotels, and they gave very good meals but we didn't stay very long in Tientsin. After a couple of days, I think, after a bit of sightseeing and rest, we proceeded by train to Peking. Yes, only a few days. We proceeded by train.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they tell you why they were sending you to Peiping?

Mr. HUANG. No, they didn't, but that is the place probably we all wanted to go because that was the political center.

At the time it was called Peiping, I think, Peking rather.

When they used it as the national capital they changed it into Peking. At the time, I remember, probably it was called Peiping. I think so.

At the time they didn't have a cabinet. They didn't set up the government formally, I mean. So, when we arrived in Peking, we were received very well, too. In Tientsin, we all stayed in the same hotel but in Peking, we more or less were separate.

Mr. NITTLE. What was your group composed of?

Mr. HUANG. All kinds of people, I suppose, Chinese, ladies, gentlemen, men and women, but I knew some educationalists, movie stars, painters. I remember a few.

Mr. NITTLE. What movie star are you referring to?

Mr. HUANG. A lady named Shu Hsiu-wen.

Mr. NITTLE. A Chinese movie star?

Mr. HUANG. I remember her because she entertained us on the ship. She acted a little, cracked some jokes. So, I remember her.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you know her then as a movie star?

Mr. HUANG. Well, everybody knew her. Not before, but on the boat when she was invited to act, of course, immediately everybody knew it.

Mr. NITTLE. What happened when you arrived at Peking? Did they segregate you as to groups?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, in Peking because in Tientsin probably it was just a transit stay.

Mr. NITTLE. At Peking, I mean to say, did they keep you educators together?

Mr. HUANG. No, no.

Mr. NITTLE. Then what happened?

Mr. HUANG. We were entertained. We were well looked at. We were given uniforms. They measured us; take our measurements and had a kind of Chinese uniform made.

Mr. NITTLE. Were they military uniforms?

Mr. HUANG. No, they were not military. They were civilian.

That was supposed to be a sort of—I don't know how to put it—because we didn't have any money—nobody had any Chinese money—everything was free.

Mr. NITTLE. Was this an official dress for all the people in the occupied area?

Mr. HUANG. No, not everybody. I mean new clothes. The civilians had their own old clothes. I mean we were particularly given some because some of us wore Western clothes only. Some wore long gowns that old-fashioned Chinese wear.

We were given something new, a simple uniform, and we were given pocket money. We were looked after by some officials. We were entertained with plays, films, and operas and that kind of thing. We were treated to feasts and taken out sightseeing at different spots. We just lived around there for quite a while.

Mr. NITTLE. Were these people on the boat who were returned and served in this fashion Chinese people who had emigrated from other countries? Were they Chinese who had been abroad and were attempting to get back into Red China?

Mr. HUANG. Probably there were a few, but as I recall mostly they were just Chinese.

Mr. NITTLE. Hong Kong people?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, Hong Kong people, because I remember the others but I don't know when and how they got there, like the educationalist. Yesterday I remember he had his name, Lin Li-tau. This is an old man, a very well-known Chinese educationalist, but when did he go to Hong Kong to return at this time, I wouldn't know, this kind of thing, and this movie star—why did she go to Hong Kong?

Mr. NITTLE. Then it appears as though you were being given special treatment for some special reason. It occurred to me that this was a sort of "welcome home" affair.

Mr. HUANG. Something like that, perhaps, but whether there were any British Chinese or American Chinese, I was not aware.

Mr. NITTLE. This period of festivity continued how long at Peking?

Mr. HUANG. Quite a long time. Let me see exactly. I think a month or more, but I was one among the first who wanted to leave.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you not employed in some way?

Mr. HUANG. No. I became anxious. I said, "I came back to work to do something, some useful work for the people, for the revolution. But why we are staying here all the time?"

I became restless. Then I was told, "Don't be impatient. You have been abroad for so long. It takes a little time for you to get reacquainted with the country and to readjust yourself."

Mr. NITTLE. Did they photograph you and your group?

Mr. HUANG. No, no. If they wanted to, they could, but they never did. I became restless and impatient and asked them, and this is what I was told: "You need a little rest. Get reacquainted and readjust yourself to this." So I waited.

Mr. NITTLE. Proceed.

Mr. HUANG. Then we were entertained for so long that I became restless and asked for some sort of job; and the other people I do not recall acted the way I did, but many of them were older, most of them were older, besides the children, older than myself.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they have you meet during this period in groups, and were you told some of the history of the revolution and its purpose?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. You had what one may call "study meetings"?

Mr. HUANG. No, not study.

Mr. NITTLE. Indoctrination meetings?

Mr. HUANG. You might call it indoctrination.

Mr. NITTLE. Lectures?

Mr. HUANG. Not study. They didn't give us anything to read, and during the entertainment there was always some official made some reports. They call the officials come to make reports and long ones, too, but we didn't understand very much.

Mr. NITTLE. When you speak of "long ones," did they daily talk to you and lecture to you? Did they require you each day to attend some kind of meeting or conference or lecture?

Mr. HUANG. No, mainly entertainment and rest during the whole period. Before I was sent, as I shall tell you later, to the university, I stayed in the hotel. Mainly it was rest and some people played chess and we visited different spots, but we heard, I remember, only twice, lectures, but each time it was quite long.

Mr. BRUCE. Were you asked to participate in these discussions?

Mr. HUANG. No discussion, just listened.

Mr. BRUCE. You just listened?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, twice. One I remember because it was very strange, to me at least. First there was a lecture, a report. They call it a report. To us Liu Shao-ch'i, the present President. At the time he was not the President. I did not know what he was. He was not known to me even. We were invited to that big hotel, maybe Hotel Peking, or something; I don't remember the name. Anyway, we were transported there by a big bus and we were taken there and we were invited into a room and Liu Shao-ch'i, the present President, came and somebody introduced him. They didn't even say what title he had, so I didn't know him, and he began to talk about the new "democratic" government and the economy of New China. I think that is what it was. He spoke with a very strong Hunan central China dialect.

Mr. NITTLE. He never used the word "Communist" China. He used the word "democratic" China?

Mr. HUANG. They didn't occupy the whole country then, so they didn't use "Communist." Communist actually came much later. During the past few years they were trying to establish even socialism, which is a much earlier stage. So I think at the time the joint economic—or what was the term? Oh, "coalition government."

Mr. BRUCE. Coalition?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, they used that. They did not use "communism" or even "socialism."

So, he gave, I think, the lecture about this coalition government.

Mr. BRUCE. Favorable to the coalition government?

Mr. HUANG. That is right. He wouldn't say anything against it because that is what they tried to establish at the beginning. Later it was, of course, changed.

I only understood him so much. He talked about the economy. But first he spoke with a strong central China Hunan dialect, which I observed, because I looked around and most of us didn't understand very well. Some people just became so tired.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did the lecture last?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, a long time, 5 hours I think.

Mr. NITTLE. And this one individual talked for 5 consecutive hours?

Mr. HUANG. Perhaps. I think there was no recess.

What surprised me was how could ever a man speak for so long. Never in my life I never heard a lecture or report or anything which lasted for such a long time as this report. And besides we didn't understand him much. That was the pity. He spoke with this Hunan dialect, and we didn't understand. I personally didn't understand even one thing.

Therefore, it was not a very attractive speech because, even if we understand the words, the meaning was usually obscure.

Mr. NITTLE. You had lectures during this period of approximately a month when you were doing nothing and you were entertained. Did they use entertainment for indoctrination and propaganda purposes?

Mr. HUANG. I should say so, because I remember a few plays they put on. Those plays were like everything they do in China, as related to politics. They would not do anything pure, I mean unrelated to politics. Everything serves a purpose.

Mr. JOHANSEN. There was no entertainment for entertainment's sake?

Mr. HUANG. No, that is clearly criticized and opposed. So, their entertainment was depiction. I remember a little play they put on in a hall. We were seated around and watched how the peasants suffered during the feudalist rule; then how the guerrillas came to help them, liberate them in the liberated area and they became a good life. I remember that.

So everything they do or did was related to that purpose.

Mr. NITTLE. What happened after this period of reception?

Mr. HUANG. Then I became restless and asked a couple of times. I said, "I am a young man. I don't like to stay here just to be entertained all the time." So then an official—of course, I don't know who is a Communist and who was not, but I presumed he must be a Communist official—he talked to me and said, "All right. You can go. We will send you to a university."

During this time, I heard a little about this university. They sent me to this North China University of the Peoples Revolution. That is my translation. I don't know how they called it in English, but it is North China University of the Peoples Revolution, something like that. So I went there with curiosity and interest because I heard a little about this university before I was sent there.

Mr. NITTLE. Where had you heard this?

Mr. HUANG. Well a lot of people mentioned it. People mentioned that there was such a university. So when this was suggested to me I said, "Why, it is better than just staying at the hotel," and I was curious. I would like to see how they conducted this university education.

Mr. NITTLE. What was your understanding of the type of university this was supposed to be?

Mr. HUANG. It was very clear even by the name. Peoples Revolution, that they would teach you things relating to Marxism-Leninism and socialism and communism and revolution. So that was my general idea of the university.

Mr. NITTLE. This was a school where you were to be re-educated as a Communist?

Mr. HUANG. That is the term they use, "re-educate" you, yes. We read just their publications. They didn't use the term "indoctrinate."

Mr. NITTLE. Of course I used the term "re-educate" quite accidentally, not being aware that they were so frank about it there.

Mr. HUANG. They use like I read recently about "brainwashing" and that kind of thing. They never used that.

So, when I first said it, I didn't know what it meant or what is the exact implication of that. They use "re-education," "thought reform."

So this was for that purpose obviously, for thought reform, re-education, of course, later then to change your views that you had about the old and they wanted to give you the new.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you the only one of your group sent over at this time?

Mr. HUANG. I think so.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you one of the first to be put to some employment?

Mr. HUANG. I think I was.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I interrupt at this point. There was a phrase, they wanted to rid you of "the old" and give you "the new."

Would you just comment a little further on that?

What sort of "the old"—ideas about capitalism or loyalty to the "old regime" or what do you mean?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, everything. At first it was very general, everything you learned you lived, you experienced. The things you lived under the former regime, the former society, they called "old society." This term they used, "old society" and "new society." Everything you lived through.

Mr. JOHANSEN. They wanted to wash your mind of that.

Mr. HUANG. That is right. They wanted to change your views toward those things and they wanted to establish new things in your mind, that is the communism views.

Mr. BRUCE. Part of this was getting you to participate, too, and confess.

Mr. HUANG. Yes, many things.

Mr. BRUCE. Constantly stand up and express your thoughts on where you were weak.

Mr. HUANG. That is right, always.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Self-criticism, and so on.

Mr. HUANG. That is right. Criticism, self-criticism, and mainly this is the process, but of course you read some documents, not very many. They didn't have very much literature; listened to reports; that kind of thing.

So the whole school was just like that.

Mr. DOYLE. Let us recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Witness, will you be here then?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

(Thereupon, at 4 o'clock, Thursday, May 24, 1962, the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Friday, May 25, 1962.)

"INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM"—RED CHINA STYLE

(Testimony of Chi-Chou Huang)

FRIDAY, MAY 25, 1962

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION [1]

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in Room 226, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Clyde Doyle, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle, of California, and August E. Johansen, of Michigan.

Staff members present: Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; John C. Walsh, co-counsel; and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. Let the record show the committee reconvened, with Messrs. Johansen and Doyle present.

Will you proceed, Counsel?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF CHI-CHOU HUANG—Resumed

Mr. NITTLE. At the time we adjourned yesterday, you were telling us about your assignment to the North China University of the Peoples Revolution.

Will you tell us what your experience was there?

Mr. HUANG. Well, to put it briefly, in that university, the students went through what they call a re-education, thought reform, or thought remolding. They used sometimes different terms, but what actually happened was that at the university, through several distinct but quite coordinated processes, the students were expected to, as they say, establish a new world outlook—this probably is quite well known in the West, or all over the world—establish a new view, outlook of the world, that is, a Marxist-Leninist view, or sometimes they say a materialistic, dialectical view of the world.

But, of course, at the beginning, I should say the majority, including myself, did not know what those terms actually meant and what the process was.

Mr. NITTLE. Was this university newly established by the Communist dictatorship, or had it been in existence prior to the revolution?

Mr. HUANG. According to my understanding—of course, I did not know the past history in that time—but I presume it was established by the Communist government.

[1] Released by the committee and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NITTLE. With respect to the facilities there, was it a traditional university that was taken over by the Communists?

Mr. HUANG. No, I do not think there had been formerly such a type of university in existence. I mean this probably started, most likely, I should say, was started when the Communists took power.

Mr. NITTLE. I see, this was a newly created university?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, I think it was.

Mr. NITTLE. Now do you refer to the buildings being newly dedicated to this purpose?

Mr. HUANG. No, not new buildings, they were old, old buildings. It didn't look like a university. I mean, just a lot of two-story houses, looked more like a barracks.

Mr. NITTLE. How many students were enrolled there at the time you arrived?

Mr. HUANG. Let me see. There were 20 classes altogether, with each class from 120 to 150, something like that, and so——

Mr. NITTLE. Did this include students, both male and female?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the proportion of the female students to the male? And would you describe also the age range of the students attending?

Mr. HUANG. Well, from 16 or so up to my age. I was among the older group. I should think, about 27, not beyond 30; 26, 27. And the proportion, I think, let us see, according to my class—of course, I do not know of all the other classes—probably perhaps one-fifth to one-sixth were women.

Mr. NITTLE. Now you were going to describe in more detail the course of instruction received. What subjects did you study?

Mr. HUANG. Well mainly, as the term indicates, it was for thought remolding. No other science, I mean, natural sciences and all, just political science.

Mr. NITTLE. And how was this instruction conducted?

Mr. HUANG. There were different forms, mass lecture where all the students—the whole student body—listened to one lecture through the microphone. That is one type. And what they called self-study, that is, reading of the few documents they were able to produce and then smaller group lectures—not lectures—well, you can say there were lectures, too, but that was not important. I mean individual classes met and listened to the director relay reports from the higher authorities, or something of that sort.

But most of the time, the process was small group discussions, criticism, and self-criticism. Most of the time, it was like that. I remember they emphasized this self-education. That is, they wanted mutual education. Each one would help the other to analyze the problems and mutually draw acceptable conclusions. That took most of the time. Once or twice a week there were lectures but sometimes when the lecturers were busy, perhaps, there would be no lectures for 2 weeks. So most of the time was spent in small groups.

Each class, I think—probably it is true of the other classes—the class I belonged to was divided into eight sections, so each section had about 18, 19, 20 students in one section.

So most of the time, the activities were conducted in the small group. We lived closely together; we ate together. The girls, of course, lived

in their own separate sections, but just for sleep. During the day, the five or six girls in each section came to join the men's classroom. It served as a classroom as well as a dormitory.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you given any instruction on the subject of revolutionary purpose relating to world policy of the Communist movement?

Mr. HUANG. Well, it went on from the simplest matters to more abstract, more complicated. In that university, as the president of the time emphasized in his introduction to us, to remember something like this is only to give you a basic understanding of our revolution. They could not have hoped to accomplish so much, I mean, the change of one's thought, in such a short period of time, half a year or so; but it did touch, of course, some aspects about the final goal. But most of the time, it was the purpose of the school to help these youth, these young people, compare their old ways of thinking and the new ways of thinking and to try to replace in their own minds the old by the new.

Mr. JOHANSEN. How was the ultimate goal defined, described?

Mr. HUANG. The ultimate goal was not very clearly emphasized during that time, but later, through the years, more and more. For instance, in my case, the whole final goal of the Communist movement was quite abstract. I mean, so far away, beyond reality. So we did not understand very much. But immediate problems, each individual's personal experiences, their former life and experiences, were the focal points of comparison, study, discussion, criticism. They did go into some—I remember there was one lecture devoted to, for instance, the development of human society.

But that was very sketchy. In that lecture, it discussed the development of human history, human society, from primitive communism, they called it, to slave society and to feudalist society and then to capitalist society and, finally, I think, through socialism to Communist society.

That was one of the more abstract courses. But most of the time was devoted on each individual's concrete personal experiences, past and present and future.

Mr. NITTLE. What "old" thinking were they trying to suppress or dissipate within the young people?

Mr. HUANG. Well, they called re-education or replacement—that is my own term, "replacement"—but they used the word "remold," yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they discuss the old ways and virtues of the Chinese people in contrast with what they expected you to accept now in this "new" state of society?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, the contrast was constantly made. That is one of the most important things. We also made the contrast.

Mr. NITTLE. Now can you be more specific?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, sir. They used this term, these two terms very, very frequently; it is always on the tip of the tongue, old and new, old society, new society, by which of course they meant before the Chinese Communists took power and the trying to establish a Communist society—or at the time, it was still "people's democratic" society.

They didn't even go very far, because socialism was still quite distant. They used this term—perhaps it was more acceptable to the

people—and they contrast this, new ways, new virtues, that is, equality—they said freedom—and mainly this human relationship, with how the individuals lived in the former societies, of course including the past.

China never really had a capitalist society as we generally understand it in the West. There were not very many, really, people who are so rich. The majority of them were really very poor. There was no comparison, but they did compare to the feudalist society. Well, those were, again, quite distant days, so they compared the new order mainly with the old society under the rule of Kuomintang, of the Nationalist Government, and they always brought up this past human relationship, claiming corruption, the oppression of man by man, exploitation of man by man, greed, and that kind of thing.

And this they proclaimed they were to do away with completely in the Communist society. But that was at the beginning of the Communist rule. Nobody really had experienced much at the beginning, and they compared what they called new ideas with the reality of the past.

Mr. NITTLE. You had occasion to live, then, in revolutionary China from early 1949 until 1961, at which time you defected. Did you, in fact, find that the Communists had introduced equality amongst the people, and did you find that they had, in fact, eliminated corruption in their government?

Mr. HUANG. My personal experience is, of course, limited, but I can say this:

They did, during the past 10 years, make some changes, like the corruption. I think they emphasized it very greatly and really did a tremendous job along this line. I participated in this anti-corruption movement that they tried, and even some of their higher ranking Communist officials were shot—even in the first, and San Fan, the Three Anti's, publicly tried and shot, too.

I mean, according to what I personally experienced, they tried to do away with corruption and were quite successful.

Mr. NITTLE. Did the Communist statements that were given you on the subject of corruption, attribute corruption to what they called "capitalist" society?

Mr. HUANG. They called this selfishness.

Mr. NITTLE. As a manifestation of "capitalist" society?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. But, of course, non-Communist society also abhors corruption, and there is instruction in the churches, schools, universities, and in public life against corruption. This is not new to the Communist society. Is that right?

Mr. HUANG. I think so, because many virtues started thousands of years ago.

Mr. NITTLE. Corruption is not considered a virtue in non-Communist society, is it?

Mr. HUANG. No, I should not think so. Every government is trying to fight against immorality.

Mr. NITTLE. I understand you to indicate that the Communist society was implanting in your mind the notion that there would be no corruption in a Communist society?

Mr. HUANG. That is what it was.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you, in fact, find that they had obliterated corruption?

Mr. HUANG. No, by far.

Mr. NITTLE. Now point number two: The true concept of the equality of men in their fundamental rights is likewise considered a virtue in non-Communist society, and particularly so in the United States. Isn't that preached here?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. Well, it is in your Constitution, yes.

Mr. NITTLE. So this is not a concept that is new to the Communists?

Mr. HUANG. No, it is not.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you, in fact, find that the Communists achieved equality of man?

Mr. HUANG. I don't think so, not so far.

Mr. NITTLE. Now, would you proceed with your experiences at the university?

Mr. HUANG. At the university, that is a way of things they tried to contrast, that was at the beginning of their power. Those were only ideas, but the people like myself, too, had to wait and see and hear and experience later how much really they accomplished. At the beginning, those were the contrasts.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question? What college books, what textbooks, what papers, what documents did you college students have to study? If you had any?

Mr. HUANG. You mean in that particular university I attended?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. HUANG. Only Communist publications, nothing else.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they give you some to take home to read and study?

Mr. HUANG. No, everybody lived in the university in the dormitory, no home.

Mr. DOYLE. You ate there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You lived there 24 hours a day?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, 24 hours a day, and at weekends you can go home, of course.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they mention the United States in those classes, or the free world?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, yes.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way?

Mr. HUANG. Of course, hostile attitude.

Mr. DOYLE. What?

Mr. HUANG. Hostile attitude. From the beginning.

Mr. DOYLE. What did they tell you about the United States?

Mr. HUANG. Well, the United States at the beginning, I remember, was mentioned, of course, was the leading country—what did they say?—the head of the——

Mr. DOYLE. Free world?

Mr. HUANG. We called it the capitalist country.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Did they use the word "imperialist" in relation to the United States?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, yes, more and more. At the beginning, it was not very much; but at the Korean war and afterwards, then the term "imperialist" was constantly used. Always.

Mr. DOYLE. Now please tell us what they said about the United States.

Mr. HUANG. Well, mainly, they said the society, American society, was based on capitalism, which they explained to the students was a form of exploitation of man by man, so they said in the United States the people were going to two extremes: the rich became richer, the poor people were becoming poorer and poorer.

Mr. NITTLE. That was what Karl Marx claimed.

Mr. HUANG. That is right, all their education was based on Marxist relatedness. Naturally, they would use that kind of argument.

Mr. DOYLE. Is that all they said?

Mr. HUANG. More or less along this line. Therefore, if a socialist society in which no exploitation of man by man were to be established, then, of course, it was in contradiction with the capitalistic society. A contradiction between a capitalistic society and a socialist society.

Mr. NITTLE. How did they explain away the exploitation of people by the Communist dictatorship?

Mr. HUANG. How do I explain?

Mr. NITTLE. How did they justify that to you?

Mr. HUANG. No, they did not say anything.

Mr. JOHANSEN. They would not admit that?

Mr. HUANG. No. No, there would be no exploitation.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this one further question: What, if anything, did they teach you about the necessity of revolution? Did they teach you that there would ever be a revolution in the United States?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, sure.

Mr. DOYLE. What did they say about it?

Mr. HUANG. All this education they called thought remolding never stopped, so all these years, repeatedly saying the same thing, that is, the final victory of socialism all over the world, that is what they believed—the final collapse of capitalist society. And that included the United States, they said.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they teach you that there would be a violent contest between capitalism and communism?

Mr. HUANG. Not at that time.

Mr. DOYLE. Of force and violence?

Mr. HUANG. Not at that time, yet.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, at any time?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, of course, then, in the end, about the time I was teaching in Iraq, then I heard more about this—I think, at the time of the Soviet Communist Party Congress, 22d, or 20 what, 23d? I have forgotten.

Mr. APPELL. Twenty-first.

Mr. HUANG. Twenty-first. At the time, this problem was more emphasized and discussed, how to look at the world, analyze the world situation. And I participated in meetings in Baghdad among the Chinese living there. Some were embassy officials. Some were employees; some, like me, were just Chinese who were employed by the Iraqi Government to teach Chinese there.

And at this time, I became more aware of these differences between the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist ideology; and so far as I can recall, my understanding was that the Soviet Union emphasized or stressed that the outcome of the world, the changing of the world, was inevitably final victory for socialism and communism; but then their stress was that it had to be developed along that line by peaceful competition, "peaceful coexistence," they said, because the terrible destructive power of the present stage was impossible to believe.

I mean, they said if there were to be a world conflict between the capitalistic societies, as they are called, and the Communist societies—no, socialist societies; they didn't say Communist and they used the word "camp"—they said between capitalistic camp and socialist camp—it would be a destruction of both. There would be no socialism, although they believed there would be no capitalism, but there would be no socialism either; so the Soviet argument, as I understand, stressed the means of development. Therefore, it seemed to me it was not a revolution, rather a sort of evolution that is meant.

But the Chinese Communist leadership stressed, they did not strongly argue against this aspect of "peaceful coexistence," but they stressed—this I know quite clearly, because at several, at least two meetings, this question was discussed, and I remember the Communist secretaries emphasized this—the possibility of the direct conflict between what they called the socialist camp and the capitalist camp.

Mr. DOYLE. By direct conflict, they meant force and violence?

Mr. HUANG. Naturally.

Mr. DOYLE. And armed conflict?

Mr. HUANG. Armed conflict.

Mr. DOYLE. And was that at Iraq, in Baghdad?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, in Iraq. Before that, that was not. Only hostile, of course, toward the West.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that?

Mr. HUANG. '60, I think. About 1960.

Mr. DOYLE. You were teaching there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. I was teacher at the Baghdad University.

Mr. DOYLE. And how many students did you teach?

Mr. HUANG. About altogether, let me see, at the beginning, there were more—at the end, about 40; about 40 students at the time.

Mr. NITTLE. During the course of instruction at the university you were attending, were you permitted to express views contrary to those given you by your instructors? Were you permitted to discuss matters and dissent?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, we are going back to China in 1950?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mr. HUANG. Yes, my personal experience is this. Perhaps it is better for me to sum up a little bit.

In the past 10 years or so, living in Communist China, at the beginning, there was more, much more freedom. Gradually, I felt, and I observed, too, gradually the freedom, the personal liberty was less and less, with more and more regimentation. The whole process was like that. Therefore, at the beginning of the university, there were these free discussions to a certain extent. Of course, openly the Kuomintang was the central, of course, the center of hostility and denunciation.

The United States and the capitalists were abstract, and more or less mentioned, but Kuomintang was very concrete. The Chinese Government, that was the central point of discussion.

Mr. NITTLE. What did they expect to do with the students at this university after graduation?

Mr. HUANG. As I already said at the beginning, the president told us the aim of the university was to give the students a beginning of education, or a first stage of education. To give you some foundation. To change.

Mr. NITTLE. How long was this course to last?

Mr. HUANG. Five or 6 months. I went there a little late. When I got there, it was going on already.

Mr. NITTLE. When you completed the course of instruction, did you receive a degree of some sort, a document evidencing your attendance there?

Mr. HUANG. I did not. They did not practice this system. Nobody has any degrees. Those who had degrees were old professors who received their degrees from abroad. In China, college graduates are not given a degree but they are given a job.

Mr. NITTLE. What was your assignment on completing your course at this school?

Mr. HUANG. I was sent to teach English at the Foreign Language Institute in Peking.

Mr. NITTLE. I presume that the students received various assignments?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, various, according to your qualifications, various assignments.

Mr. NITTLE. When did you report there?

Mr. HUANG. About February 1950.

Mr. NITTLE. What was this Institute of Foreign Languages?

Mr. HUANG. An institute. I am not very clear——

Mr. NITTLE. Was it a university?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, in fact, higher than that term, because most of the students there——

Mr. NITTLE. Had this been in existence for some years?

Mr. HUANG. No, I think at the time of my assignment it was beginning to really take form.

Mr. NITTLE. Had they taken over university grounds of Nationalist China, or had they created this anew?

Mr. HUANG. Anew, entirely anew.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they just take over buildings in the city of Peking?

Mr. HUANG. No, not in the city, in the suburbs; in fact, not very far from this revolutionary school.

Mr. NITTLE. How large was it?

Mr. HUANG. At the beginning, it was very small. English and Russian were the only two courses, and each had very few students, two classes, or so. But later, in 1956, many new campus buildings were built, modernized, and enlarged, and maybe ten times more students were enrolled.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you remain there?

Mr. HUANG. All the time until I left for the West.

Mr. NITTLE. What students were assigned to this institute for instruction, and for what purpose?

Mr. HUANG. At first, that is, in 1950, most of the students whom I taught had already graduated from colleges and universities. English department, like many were graduates from St. John's University in Shanghai English courses, so their English was already very good at the time.

At the beginning, that is, 1950, they were college graduates, university graduates, but later, of course, they could not always get the college graduates to come for further training, so finally, they enrolled high school graduates. It became more and more formal. At the beginning, it was a sort of transition period; they did not set down goals, rules. I suppose it was the lack of experience, or something, I don't know; but later, goals also were set down, that is, the purpose of the training, according to your question.

They set down, of course—I cannot remember so many, but to remember a few of the goals, why they instructed the students—a student must have good socialist virtue. That is one of the training purposes. And then they must have good health. And then they must have high qualified ability in the languages that they were trying to learn.

I think those were the three main ones I remember, because as a teacher we had to coordinate into this.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they tell you what was the objective of this language instruction? By that, I mean, were you being instructed to work in embassies, to translate documents, to engage in espionage, or what?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, the general purpose of this—these students went to whatever place, whatever branch, where they were needed. I know some of my students went into foreign service, to foreign embassies, and some went to teach English at various schools, high schools, and some became interpreters. Wherever they were needed, they were assigned. But espionage was not mentioned. Even if they had intended to have it, they would not have mentioned that in the purpose.

Mr. NITTLE. You indicated that the course of instruction was later expanded during the time you were there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, much more so.

Mr. NITTLE. To what extent was it expanded?

(At this point Mr. Johansen left the hearing room.)

Mr. HUANG. English was taught in a very simple manner. Just English, you practice conversation. We teachers made up some short conversation pieces and asked the student to repeat like a parrot. But later, instruction was on a more scientific basis.

Mr. NITTLE. I am not referring to the method of instruction. Were other courses given in addition to English and Russian?

Mr. HUANG. First, it was only English and Russian, but later there were geography, education, political science, economy, history, and, later, Chinese language.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you perform any duties at this institute other than giving instruction to students, and did the students perform any duties other than study?

Mr. HUANG. What do you mean by "other duties"? I am not too clear.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you given any employment of some sort?

Mr. HUANG. No. No, the student's purpose was to study, to learn. The teacher's duty was to teach.

But most teachers, I should say, did something of our own. Like myself. I became interested in translation, and translated half a dozen novels on my own. Sometimes I was criticized for doing so, because it took some time, you know, and brought financial gains. That was criticized. But, on the other hand, they said, "If you do not interfere with your regular teaching, why, it is all right."

Mr. NITTLE. Did you receive a salary while teaching at this institute?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. But only later, beginning with 1952. Before that, everybody got the same thing, except the older generation, those old professors who remained, everybody ate the same thing, got a little pocket money. They called that sort of a wartime communism, or something. That was practiced for a short while until 1952. They said the country's economy had recovered and they started a salary system. A ranking system also started.

Mr. NITTLE. Was the amount of salary equal among all the instructors and professors, or did it differ?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, it differed.

Mr. NITTLE. Some received more, some received less?

Mr. HUANG. Naturally.

Mr. NITTLE. What about the living assignments? Did some receive better assignments, and some worse assignments?

Mr. HUANG. Living quarters?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mr. HUANG. No, living quarters were based upon the needs of the family. Starting with 1952, they started the salary system, the ranking system, and they constructed a new building, living quarters.

(At this point Mr. Johansen returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. HUANG. And they were distributed, as I remember, rather strictly unto needs, because I was a lecturer, because I had children and I had——

Mr. NITTLE. How did they justify the differences in salary? Had they not proclaimed to you previously at the Revolutionary University that everything was going to be equal in China?

Mr. HUANG. No, that did not mean that. We never understood it as such. That was the final goal, when communism was established, a long time later, perhaps. At the time they applied a socialist principle for distribution. They said to each according to his labor, not according to his need. That was for communism society, they said, it is not for that stage. Some people did have a misunderstanding. They said, "Why don't we have equality right now?" That was criticized.

Mr. NITTLE. Did anything of significance occur during the years 1950 to 1959 while you were an instructor at the Foreign Language Institute in Peking?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, there were many movements, constantly movements.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the first movement that brought some changes in your life and experiences?

Mr. HUANG. It was very well known to the West, even, the movements. First, I——

Mr. NITTLE. Actually, the first thing was probably the Korean war, which took place in 1950?

Mr. HUANG. The Korean war didn't seem to have much effect among the intellectuals. I do not recall. I mean, there was a tremendous propaganda and rousing up of the whole country and the volunteers and that kind of thing.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they tell you students and instructors that North Korea had committed aggression upon South Korea?

Mr. HUANG. No, just the other way around, naturally.

Mr. NITTLE. They told you just the opposite.

Mr. HUANG. They just said this Korean war was instigated and headed by the United States to help South Korea to conquer North Korea. That is what they said.

Mr. NITTLE. You indicate that the Korean war had no great significance with respect to your life experiences at the time. Will you tell us what was the first great change that affected your life at the institute?

Mr. HUANG. Well, there were many factors, but gradually some become stronger, while some were not so strong.

Mr. NITTLE. Could you relate them and give a brief explanation for each?

Mr. HUANG. I will try. First, as I was saying, at the university, I already began to realize what they meant by "freedom" and "democracy." I felt it was not the same as I understood, I experienced in the United States, for instance.

In the United States, I experienced and saw and I learned from personal experience—of course, there were some things which I didn't like, like racial discrimination, and personally I encountered a few insults of this kind, but in many other things, like the Government, even the President was openly criticized by any individual in the newspaper. I thought that was a high degree of equality and democracy, which I never expected to have happen in, say, China. And the Government and the press was so free to reporters. They just dug into any secrets they could find and, whether they were good or bad, they just could publish whatever they found freely.

And amongst the people, although there were some very rich and some poor, even the very poor, I thought, were much richer than people in China.

So by this comparison, of course, even at the Revolutionary University, I did not absorb everything they wanted to impart to me, especially matters dealing with the United States, like the theory of half the Nation were in starvation, or were driven out to the streets because they could not pay rent, because I did not see those things in the United States.

Once or twice I attempted to discuss these things, but I was sort of instructed—not directly instructed, but the hint was given to me—"what you have seen in the United States may be true, but here in the university, we do not want to propagandize those good aspects of the United States, the prosperity, the high degree of democracy amongst the people." The Government was elected by the people, and I remember quite clearly, in 1948 Mr. Wallace campaigned, and he was considered progressive, but only a million or so people supported him. If the people wished even that Progressive Party, why

they could freely vote for him, and he would be elected, so it was a government by the people.

Mr. NITTLE. Exactly.

Mr. HUANG. And these things were my experience, and I saw them. Therefore, at the university, I already experienced a certain degree of limitation to personal freedom, thoughts, and action.

But at the time I was still youthful, idealistic, I expected some better change, and I thought perhaps during the war of revolution, fighting the civil war still going on, perhaps a certain discipline was necessary, and especially, their high ideals about the final goal, being at the time the people's democratic government, in which many good virtues were being brought into being. I was still very much attracted, at this date, but then I already felt the first degree of limitation to personal free thinking.

Mr. NITTLE. You were beginning to recognize that there was a great deal of difference between Communist talk and the actuality under that system?

Mr. HUANG. I was beginning to realize the "democracy and freedom," as they interpreted it at the time.

Mr. NITTLE. Was a different thing from what you had experienced freedom and democracy to be in a truly democratic country?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. But at that time they did not emphasize controls very much. The first movement to affect the Foreign Language Institute was the San Fan, or Three Anti's movement. I am sorry I cannot remember the precise dates, but I shall try to answer in chronological order as far as I can.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, and the approximate time.

Mr. HUANG. The Three Anti's movement, in which I experienced a sort of—I would not know how to describe it very properly—well, I just give the facts, perhaps it is better. You know I am not qualified as a sociologist or an analyst, but the facts, of course, are still quite fresh. The main thing, at least.

At the first, the party proclaimed that because they had gained power and had gotten to the cities, they discovered that, as they say, quite a strong influence—"bourgeois" influence, that is—had begun to affect the revolution, even some high-ranking party members, and the corruption was very serious, and waste, the greed, and that kind of thing.

They attributed all this to the "petty bourgeois" influence. They cited many examples that were all reported in the newspapers.

I remember a few. For instance, they said at the time some fairly high party secretaries thought that now they had won the victory, so it was time for them to relax and to enjoy life. So they built magnificent offices and they bought the latest model of American automobiles—from Hong Kong, I suppose, I don't know.

Mr. NITTLE. These are for the party leaders only, the Communist leaders?

Mr. HUANG. Some, not all. And one, I remember, even had a swimming pool built. They went much too far, and bribery, stealing government property, and corruption of various kinds were quite serious. So they started this San Fan, Three Anti's movement on bureaucracy.

Some of the officials, Communist officials, were doing very little, just were issuing orders, sitting in the offices. Bureaucracy, corrup-

tion, and waste. Waste of a lot of government money, although it was not their salary, but they could appropriate, or some of the offices were magnificently furnished with all kinds of luxurious furniture, and that kind of thing was widespread.

Therefore, the party proclaimed it was high time, it was very necessary to have a rectification campaign to clear this. They said if this was not done, if a rectification campaign was not carried through thoroughly, then the party would degenerate into a bourgeois party like the Kuomintang, and there would be nothing done, there would be no more revolution, so they said. They aroused the whole population to participate in this San Fan, Three Anti's movement.

However, at first, of course I was living at the university. I did not get around very much and did not know what was happening, actually, personally, but I can relate the events that have been in my school.

Am I too much in detail? Shall I make briefer?

Mr. NITTLE. I would summarize it, give us the main points and highlights.

Mr. HUANG. Yes, but sometimes I cannot do what I wish.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, we realize that.

Mr. HUANG. You can stop me any time.

So at first, the people did not know how to carry out this Three Anti's movement.

In a school, the students, teachers, did not know what to do, so the party's Central Committee said they will show, set the example.

They used a term which is still fresh, they said to "set fire" to the leadership first. That is, they wanted to say the leadership of every organization must by order of their government and the party organization show the masses that they themselves are willing to be burned clean, first.

So I remember that in my institute, the president, also a first party secretary, went up to the stage—and it was a mass meeting, of course—went to the stage and "set fire" on himself. He criticized himself. But there was not very much in that. He was also a scholar of some sort. He studied in former Yenching University, I believe, and he criticized himself, but then the directives issued to the people said, "This must be thoroughly done, without any reserve," regardless of his rank or his party standing. The movement must be thoroughly carried out if the party and the revolution wanted to go on; otherwise the party would die. They considered it very serious. So they wanted the masses to criticize strongly as much as they could, severely.

By and by, the masses were aroused and in my feeling became a little bit hectic and fanatic, because suddenly, somebody in the meeting hall shouted at the president asking him to kneel down on the stage. Before judgment, he was already considered as some sort of criminal. This was something surprising to me.

Well, with all this and the shouting, the presidium on the stage became afraid, too. The presidium consisted of professors, some heads of various departments. They did not know what to do. They were afraid of the mob. They said, "What is happening? Why suddenly they became so angry?"

After some time, even the president was scared, because I remember he stood there; he asked, "What have I done? You accuse me with facts. What on earth have I done?"

There were a few facts could be brought—I don't know, I still cannot understand what suddenly aroused them, so later, the meeting was called off. They said we had better stay and disperse and cool down; this must be conducted calmly and normally. Why all this shouting and cursing? This is petty bourgeois emotion. This is not a revolutionary discipline.

Mr. DOYLE. How many people were in those meetings?

Mr. HUANG. You mean——

Mr. DOYLE. This was at the meeting where they were shouting. How many people?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, several hundreds, mostly students; but teachers and others, all of them were gathered.

Mr. DOYLE. At the university?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Huang, we would like to summarize your career briefly, and then we shall return to these matters that you are presently discussing.

You remained at the Foreign Language Institute in Peking as an instructor from 1950 to 1959. Did you receive another assignment after that?

Mr. HUANG. You mean after 1959?

Mr. NITTLE. Yes.

Mr. HUANG. In October 1959, I was sent to teach Chinese in Iraq, to implement the cultural exchange program between China and Iraq. So I was an Iraqi Government employee. I was sent there.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you teach, then, at a university or school in Iraq?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Where in Iraq?

Mr. HUANG. I was employed by the Institute of Languages of the Baghdad University in Baghdad.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you remain as an instructor in Baghdad?

Mr. HUANG. Upon arrival in Baghdad, the dean of the institute, or no, of the Baghdad University—some official, I do not recall his name—had interview with me, and I was formally employed; and at this Higher Institute of Languages, the dean appointed me as head of the Chinese Section. And also, I was automatically a member of the school council, which consisted of all heads of the six different sections.

Mr. NITTLE. How long did you remain in that position?

Mr. HUANG. I stayed there until June 1961.

Mr. NITTLE. And then what happened?

Mr. HUANG. Then my contract was completed, but the Iraqi Government and the school authority wanted me to stay for another year or two, because they thought I should, if possible, help them to get it really more firmly established. The changing of personnel too often would not be to their advantage; and besides, they thought my instruction was quite successful, and highly valued. They mentioned that to me a few times and they earnestly desired my further stay.

However, the Chinese Embassy there, the Chinese Government, wanted us to go back to China for a "vacation," as they say. At pres-

ent that is their policy. Occasionally, especially when important things are going on, their personnel, called cadres, are called back to China. They want these people to go back to China for what they call "reorientation." If you lived abroad too long, all kinds of influences would have affected your thoughts and action, and besides, you would know so much less about your country, they said, which was so quickly developing. You must keep up with events and development of the country. So they told me. I was to go back to China to Peking, for a vacation. And they did not say definitely I was to return, but they say it is quite possible and quite likely, because the Iraqi Government, at the request of the Iraqi institute, had sent a diplomatic note to the Chinese Embassy requesting my further stay because of the need there. At least the dean told me they had done that.

Mr. NITTLE. The Chinese Government was afraid that if you remained too long you might become influenced by non-Communist society?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, that applies to every Chinese living abroad.

Mr. NITTLE. Apparently the Soviets have a similar system of rotation for fear that their citizens may become influenced by the society in which they live.

Mr. HUANG. That is right, rotation.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you call it a form of distrust of their own people?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I do not exactly know the implication of this term. But this I know for sure, that they did not want you to stay abroad too long and have too much influence from abroad.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you finally have to leave?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. What were your instructions as to the method of return?

Mr. HUANG. Method of return?

Mr. NITTLE. To China.

Mr. HUANG. That is simple. They just reserved plane tickets, and that is all.

Mr. NITTLE. In which direction did you go? What direction did you take?

Mr. HUANG. My route was to fly via Damascus and Athens and then to Prague, or somewhere, because I never got that far.

Mr. NITTLE. When did you leave?

Mr. HUANG. The 8th of June.

Mr. NITTLE. 1961?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, I think it was the 8th.

Mr. NITTLE. Was anyone sent back with you to accompany you?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, another teacher.

Mr. NITTLE. Had his term expired?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, our contract fulfilled.

Mr. NITTLE. Had he the same length of contract you had?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. Had he come with you from China to Baghdad?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. Had he been at the same school you attended?

Mr. HUANG. That is correct.

Mr. NITTLE. Now what happened at Athens?

Mr. HUANG. Well, as a fact, it became very simple. Simpler, even, than I had thought. In Athens, we had a stop, but I wasn't very sure, because I didn't travel in that way frequently enough to know, so I was not sure whether there would be a chance, a possibility, but it turned out to be rather simple.

At the Athens airport, I sat down with my colleague, and we were having a cup of coffee, and I said to myself, this is the last opportunity, there will be a half an hour or so of stay. So I just picked up my little suitcase, a handbag, and walked out of the station and asked the Athens authorities to give me permit to stay in Greece.

Mr. NITTLE. Had you decided at that point to leave Communist China permanently?

Mr. HUANG. Well, my understanding is once you leave that country, the possibility of returning is very, very slim. I don't know what would happen, of course, but if one went back I know one thing for sure, they would ask you to confess, criticize yourself for many years, and you would have no peace of mind. So I thought——

Mr. NITTLE. Why did you defect from Communist China at that stage?

Mr. HUANG. There are a few important reasons. Of course, I am not capable of deep, complete, absolute analysis, but some points are quite distinct in my mind. At least, they are, I think, the chief reasons.

One: In my experience during the past 10 years' life, including the life lived in Iraq, I found the regimentation, the limitation of personal liberty, unbearable. You cannot do this, you cannot do that, you have to think in this way, you have to in that way, and that way is the only correct way of thinking; so it made me in many cases feel that I was not honest.

I did try to present my true feelings, my thoughts, but each time, before I—when I barely started, when I barely started to reveal my true thoughts, I suffered great moral—what do you call that?—I could not find that term, sort of pressure, that is the right use, the right and wrong; now if you say this, you are wrong; if you say this, you are right.

That kind of mental pressure. They do not beat you. You are not beaten by roughnecks or hoodlums. They do not have such practice, because that would not carry them too far, but a sort of abstract pressure that I felt very strongly.

Mr. NITTLE. Resulting from this re-education process?

Mr. HUANG. The whole life. Constantly. It is a constant phenomenon. Pressure. Mental, not physical. They say this is right, this is wrong. If you said something against the party line, then you have something to worry about: I have said something wrong, I have acted in the wrong way, now I must start preparing self-criticism, and you don't know how long that will take.

Sometimes you write again and again to criticize yourself. Sometimes I felt rather sick of it, because I felt I have no more to say along this line. But they say it is still not good enough; you should study more and analyze your thoughts and your background further. That

was an endless process, and I felt it was not just mentally unbearable, but the wasting of time, too. They ask you to write the self-criticism, many pages at a time, hours and hours.

You could have accomplished something more valuable and useful, read a few books, for instance, listen to the radio, amuse yourself, or sleep to improve your health; but instead writing, writing, self-criticism.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask this: When did you come definitely to the conclusion to defect? Was that in Greece, was it in Athens; or when you left Baghdad, had you already made up your mind that you were never going back to Communist China? You must have made a decision sometime.

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. What about your baggage and everything else? When did you take care of that?

You understood my question, Mr. Witness?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I did.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, if you remember my question, will you please answer that question?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. The decision, of course, was not a simple one, because I had a family there—I had two little children, whom I loved very, very much.

Mr. DOYLE. How old are those children?

Mr. HUANG. A daughter eight, a boy five, now.

Mr. DOYLE. And your wife, where was she?

Mr. HUANG. At the institute. She was also a teacher at the same institute. As to the decision—of course I cannot definitely say on what day the idea came about. More and more, it became mature.

But, during the process of several months, I became deeply worried for not being able to make a choice, one way or the other. I wanted very much to leave the country and to speak of my mind freely, I very much wanted to do that, because in China in the past 10 years, there was only the party line which we could follow. We could not do otherwise. So I had a strong desire to speak up my mind.

Then, on the other hand, my family, the ties, the bonds that were so strong, kept me in constant distress. Therefore, the decision was not very sharp drawn. Sometimes, I had a strong urge to leave Communist China, but then I would waver back a little and then—but more and more, as I was just asked about the reasons, the reasons for my leaving Communist China became stronger, much, much stronger, so the decision became, of course, coming gradually to finality.

Although my ties with my family were still strong, I thought that is the best way for me to do, a better way, between the two choices. If I had to remain in China, I would remain, probably, forever, just as they demanded of every individual, a tool, a docile tool of the party. There is no individuality.

Mr. DOYLE. But you had made up your mind in Baghdad that you were going to defect?

Mr. HUANG. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. So that when you got on the plane, you knew you were going to defect?

Mr. HUANG. I was going to try, anyway.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. Now you had your two children with you?
Mr. HUANG. No.
Mr. DOYLE. Where did you leave them?
Mr. HUANG. They are in Peking.
Mr. DOYLE. Your wife also?
Mr. HUANG. Yes. I was all alone in Baghdad, as a matter of fact.
Mr. DOYLE. All right.
Mr. JOHANSEN. Do you have any opportunity of any contact with them, or would that be harmful to them?
Mr. HUANG. For one year I was thinking of writing to them, while living in Germany, but sometimes it seemed the thing to do, and sometimes it seemed better not, so I did not know what to do.

As I said, we were in two different worlds and we are both suffering pains for personal reasons, and all kinds of other reasons, so let this pain subside a little. And I would not—most of all, I would try, if I could, in any way, not to bring undue troubles to them. They are troubled already, much too much, so I wanted, if possible, to avoid any thought of contact which might bring them difficulties.

Mr. DOYLE. Does your wife get enough pay so the children are supported? How are they eating?
Mr. HUANG. In China, as you probably know, of course, the living standard is rather low. Therefore, the problem of living, as such—I mean not luxurious living, daily necessities, you understand—is not a problem.
Mr. DOYLE. Have you heard from your wife since you left Athens?
Mr. HUANG. No, I haven't.
Mr. DOYLE. Or your children?
Mr. HUANG. Nothing.
Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever work on a farm in China?
Mr. HUANG. Yes, I did.
Mr. DOYLE. For how long?
Mr. HUANG. For 10 months, and then later 3 months in mining area. First, I was sent to the villages, in November 1957.
Mr. DOYLE. And that was just farm work?
Mr. HUANG. Yes, manual labor.
Mr. DOYLE. You were ordered to do that?
Mr. HUANG. Well, you could say that, perhaps, but the process was to "volunteer." They didn't force me, I signed up.
Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever work in a factory in China, any kind of a factory?
Mr. HUANG. Not a modern factory. Only in mining. in an iron smelter factory, in the hills.
Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever try to practice medicine in China?
Mr. HUANG. No, I never did.
Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever try to do anything besides teach and work on the farm and work in the mines in China?
Mr. HUANG. Yes, I did.
Mr. DOYLE. What?
Mr. HUANG. Translation.
Mr. DOYLE. Translation and what else, if anything?
Mr. HUANG. Well, some—but it is not an employment. Once in a while I was asked to do some interpreting, but very rarely.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Johansen, you go ahead. I want Mr. Johansen to take whatever time he wants.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Did you engage in any Communist activity in Iraq? In other words, were your activities there limited strictly to your teaching?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. Even before we arrived, actually, we were given instructions, and when we got to Iraq, we received further, several times, a series of instructions saying that we must not as teachers in any way get involved in Iraqi politics.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Now those instructions came from your superiors in Red China?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. JOHANSEN. So that you had no contacts with Communists in Iraq?

Mr. HUANG. We were not allowed to.

Mr. JOHANSEN. This associate of yours who was at the airport in Athens, was he aware of what you were going to do?

Mr. HUANG. No, no.

Mr. JOHANSEN. You simply excused yourself?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, I just walked off.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Have you at any time, in Red China or elsewhere, had any knowledge of any Chinese views or Chinese activities, Communist Chinese views or activities, with respect to Cuba?

Mr. HUANG. Only from publications or occasional lectures, but mostly from the newspapers—of course, they all strongly supported Cuba.

Mr. JOHANSEN. And they have some of their own people in Cuba, I believe. Is that true, to your knowledge?

Mr. HUANG. I don't know. Because at that time, I don't think they had established any diplomatic—I am not sure. I don't know about this. But the newspapers, there were frequent reports and Cuba was highly praised.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Could you sketch for us very quickly where you were and your activities between your defection in Athens and your arrival back in the United States?

Mr. HUANG. Between Athens and the States.

When I asked a permit to stay in Athens, I was granted a temporary stay in Greece. Some friends then suggested I visit Germany since I had studied some German, and I thought it would be a good idea, too.

Mr. JOHANSEN. This, of course, is West Germany?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

I wanted to visit Germany and I was also beginning to think about my future.

During the flight, or even a little before, I was not sure what the outcome would be. I was going to try, but I could not be sure. I was not sure that I would succeed. Therefore, my mind was rather uncertain about the future. I did not even really think about it. I said first I had to succeed before I could think of my future. Therefore, when I was granted a permit to live in Athens, then I began to think about my future settlement. When someone suggested a visit to West Germany, I thought that was a good idea. I had always wanted to visit Germany.

Well, when I got to West Germany, I looked around for a while, and in the meantime, of course, I tried to improve my German; but I became restless again. I knew I would have to find a final settlement and start to live a normal life, to find the means to express my own thoughts and my own feelings. At least, I would give a true picture of Communist China to the Western World, because I thought any true understanding would be very useful among peoples.

I never can, in my life, hate anybody for any reasons. Maybe somebody may have made some mistakes, but I cannot hate anybody. My idea was that if I could present a true picture of communism, the evils practiced and the fallacies and the mistakes committed, the peoples' sufferings, mental and economic, as well as some of the things they did which were beneficial to the people, this would perhaps be helpful for a further understanding and judgment of what is really going on in Communist China, good and bad, evil and virtuous, or something. Then the dealings, the policies made toward China, perhaps would be of some value.

Mr. DOYLE. How long did you stay in Germany?

Mr. HUANG. I stayed there for about 10 months. Someone helped me to get a place, a decent place to live; and finally, when I began to think about my final settlement and somebody suggested that there was an organization called AFRF, he suggested——

Mr. DOYLE. What is that organization?

Mr. HUANG. I believe the initials represent American Friends of Russian Freedom, or something—AFRF.

Mr. DOYLE. A refugee association?

Mr. HUANG. It is an organization whose purpose is to help the resettlement of refugees from the Communist countries.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask you now the most difficult question of all? You spoke of the matter of the policies that you would like to see encouraged with respect to China. What are some of those policies and what ought to be, in your judgment, the attitude and relationships of the United States to China? What is the outcome, and how is it to be consummated?

Mr. HUANG. I am sorry—I am afraid I have not thought things out that far. I only felt that, since China tries to keep as many things as possible secret, possibly many of the things I had experienced were not known in the West. That is what I meant. I would tell my own personal experiences.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean that you hesitate to make an opinion?

Mr. HUANG. It is difficult, yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You fear something?

Mr. HUANG. Not fear, but I have not——

Mr. DOYLE. Why then can you not answer the question?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me pinpoint it to a specific question that is much discussed and debated in this country.

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Should the United States grant diplomatic recognition to Red China, or should we support the seating of Red China in the United Nations?

Mr. HUANG. This is, I am sorry, a very difficult question. I have not studied the authority or aspects. I have discussed it with some friends. Nobody seemed to understand, to draw conclusions you know, what actually should be done. It is difficult.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would we strengthen the Communist regime in China if we did those two things?

Mr. HUANG. No, you would not try to strengthen the Communist regime, because it is hostile to the United States.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think you misunderstood my question. I agree with you that we should not strengthen them, of course.

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. But would the granting of diplomatic relations, recognition, or the seating of Red China have the effect of strengthening those who exercise this tyranny over the people of China?

Mr. HUANG. I never thought of this question. I feel I am incapable to make any prediction or statement.

First, I am not politically trained in the Western sense. I was indoctrinated only in Communist sense, and my views of the past are one-sided.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I won't press the question.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you feel it is at all possible, or ever possible, for the free world and the Communist world to become reconciled in some way?

Mr. HUANG. Well, at least this I hope, there should not be a mutual destructive total war. I hope there won't be any such thing.

Mr. NITTLE. There won't be, if the Communist world does not commit aggression, because I think it is quite clear to everyone that the free world has no aggressive intentions.

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you think the Chinese people understand that?

Mr. HUANG. I don't think so.

Mr. NITTLE. Are they being misinformed?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, because in China it is a one-sided view. But in regard to China, I only have this wish, that these two peoples should become friends.

Mr. NITTLE. Let me ask you one more question in connection with this: Were you not instructed in Communist China that the World Communist Movement has as its objective the domination of the world?

Mr. HUANG. Well, yes, or as I said, they want the whole world to be Communist.

Mr. NITTLE. But if the free world accepts a so-called peaceful solution——

Mr. HUANG. Then that might be detrimental to the interests of the United States. You cannot give over your interests to accept. I mean, peace should not be detrimental to national interests.

Mr. JOHANSEN. It should not be surrender, in other words?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, that is right, never in such a great country, you should not surrender. I don't think you should even talk about a surrender. Far from that.

Mr. DOYLE. You went through this brainwashing or re-education, and it evidently had a good deal of effect on you, didn't it?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I think, in one way or another, there must be some because you listened to that constantly. But I always feel that I reserve my own judgment. I mean, I do not always follow things just told me like a baby. I think that is one of the causes I never conformed to the Communists.

Mr. DOYLE. They compelled you, didn't they, to join the Communist Party, the organization, to be a part of it? They must have done that.

Mr. HUANG. No, I was only a candidate, not a full party member.

Mr. DOYLE. What does a candidate do?

Mr. HUANG. You cannot vote, you cannot be elected, you cannot participate in party member meetings, you cannot participate at important meetings. It is more or less like the ordinary people.

Mr. DOYLE. But you had to attend some meetings?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, some meetings, I had to.

Mr. DOYLE. And as an intellectual, you participated in some of the meetings? They asked you questions?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, discussions.

Mr. DOYLE. Discussions, you joined in the discussions at the Communist Party meetings?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. They never made you sign anything?

Mr. HUANG. No.

(At this point Mr. Johansen left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. But they made you attend?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. How often did they make you attend Communist meetings?

Mr. HUANG. You see, I became a candidate party member in March 1959, after I came back to school from the villages. But immediately, I mean shortly afterward, I was sent to Baghdad, to abroad, so my situation was quite different. If I had stayed in China, I think I probably would have participated in more meetings and discussions, received more indoctrination.

Mr. DOYLE. Suppose you participated in a dozen meetings, a dozen or 15 meetings?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, about that. In Baghdad, this 2 years.

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, yes. And in Baghdad, too?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, only in Baghdad. In China, it was a very brief period.

Mr. DOYLE. But in Baghdad, there were 15 or 20 Communist Party meetings where you participated?

Mr. HUANG. I should say about a dozen.

Mr. DOYLE. You feel that they never re-educated you successfully against the United States Government?

Mr. HUANG. That is what I feel. Because I had lived in the United States before and I saw many things which are good.

Mr. DOYLE. But as I understand it, when you landed at Germany, you might have stayed in Germany instead of coming to the United States. Isn't that true?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. It was possible. Possible to stay in Germany.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right, so you didn't plan when you left Athens to come to the United States. You weren't sure?

Mr. HUANG. I was not sure where I was coming.

Mr. DOYLE. You did not know where you would go?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. So that your coming to the United States was more or less a matter of accident?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I would not say purely accident.

First of all, I did not know whether I could be admitted as an immigrant. I could not be so sure because of my political training in Red China, but when I contacted the AFRF organization, they responded quite warmly. They said they would help me to resettle.

(Mr. Johansen returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE. Have you heard from your wife since you left?

Mr. HUANG. Not a word.

Mr. NITTLE. Is she a Communist Party member? I don't recall whether you said.

Mr. HUANG. No, she is not. But she was a Youth League member, used to be, when she was young. After 25, you could not go on.

Mr. DOYLE. In this country?

Mr. HUANG. No, in China.

Mr. JOHANSEN. You married her in China?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. My wife is Chinese.

Mr. NITTLE. When were you married?

Mr. HUANG. 1953.

Mr. NITTLE. Was there any difficulty between you and your wife arising out of her dedication to Communist principles?

Mr. HUANG. I felt quite a deal of strain between us in this respect. Otherwise, I think she is quite a very nice woman and I love her much. But politically, from very early beginning of marriage, I felt that trouble.

(At this point Mr. Johansen left the hearing room.)

Mr. HUANG. Because at the time I was simply one of the masses. I had no party or youth affiliation. I was nobody. I was just a teacher.

But at the time she was a Youth League member, and so we sometimes, of course, quarreled a little at home, and she went to report that to the Youth League. She told the Youth League everything, and I was criticized by the other people. They all know what happened at home—something private. I felt that that practice was totally unacceptable to me.

Mr. NITTLE. She betrayed you to the Communists?

Mr. HUANG. I would not use such a bad word against my wife. But she was so loyal to the ideas of communism and she said, well, to confess everything, to be open to the party; she believed that.

Mr. DOYLE. She had never known anything else.

Mr. HUANG. No, she never had a chance to go abroad to see anything.

Mr. DOYLE. Now is she getting enough compensation in money or other benefits to support herself and two children?

Mr. HUANG. Well, she has a salary, of course, but I doubt that my coming to the West would help her to increase that.

Mr. DOYLE. How do you know she is still teaching?

Mr. HUANG. I don't know whether she is still teaching.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't know where your children are, then?

Mr. HUANG. I don't know anything about them in the past whole year.

Mr. DOYLE. Now what about your bank accounts? Do you get interest on them over there?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, quite high.

Mr. DOYLE. How does the interest get to you? You don't know where they are?

Mr. HUANG. You mean my personal bank account? Well, those were handled by my wife. My wife will receive that.

Mr. DOYLE. Your wife will get the interest. Does she get the money, too?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. How large an amount would that be?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, not much.

Mr. DOYLE. Five hundred dollars, one thousand dollars?

Mr. HUANG. Well, a few thousand in Chinese yen.

Mr. DOYLE. And how much would that be in U.S. money?

Mr. HUANG. Altogether, everything—I bought government bonds—perhaps a thousand or two.

Mr. DOYLE. And did you sign that over to her?

Mr. HUANG. No, before I left the country, I left everything to her.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I know, but did you have to sign something over to give her the bank accounts?

Mr. HUANG. No, not necessarily. It was just deferred to her, and then it is hers.

Mr. DOYLE. I see. In other words, the banks don't require any signature?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, I mean, when you deposit the money, the person gets it——

Mr. DOYLE. In both names?

Mr. HUANG. No, you get only the—what do you call that?

Mr. DOYLE. Deposit slip?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, then you can get your money with that by presentation.

(At this point Mr. Johansen returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Then she deposited the money for you, did she?

Mr. HUANG. I did it.

Mr. DOYLE. You did it?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, before I left the country.

Mr. DOYLE. So then your name was the only one on the deposit slip?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, but she could get it. You don't have to sign any signature.

Mr. DOYLE. She could get it because you disappeared, is that it?

Mr. HUANG. Well, if I was there, she could get it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Was it a joint account?

Mr. HUANG. What I mean is, anybody could get it by presentation of that deposit slip.

Mr. DOYLE. Now let me ask this: Because you are an intellectual—they rate you as an intellectual—they wanted you back in China.

Have you heard from China in any way, through any agent or anyone speaking for the Communist government or from anyone in China, since you left Baghdad?

Mr. HUANG. Athens; not a single word. Not one letter.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you expect to?

Mr HUANG. I don't think so. I have no connection with anybody, and they don't know where I am. How could they possibly?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you have written somebody back in Baghdad, haven't you, some of your friends?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, in Baghdad, but I didn't tell them where I was going.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what is your attitude right now, today, about our American Government, our American Nation? You did not plan to come here when you left Baghdad, you did not know where you were going.

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. So you are here. What is your attitude about it?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I must honestly say there are many things I like in this country. There are a few things I don't like.

Mr. DOYLE. What kind of things? Help us out.

Mr. HUANG. Well, this personal liberty is practiced to a very large extent. In other words, like myself: I think if I want to, I can just disappear, because I have been granted an immigrant visa, and just live anywhere, do what I like, so long as I obey the laws.

But in Communist China, everything is traced. You have a location, you are assigned to a particular place, you have no freedom of movement, except only for short terms. Your job, everything, is assigned. But here, personal liberty is practiced to a large extent. And in the Government, so far as I know, it is elected democratically by the whole population. And this is a high degree of democracy.

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Doyle was talking about intellectuals, and at this point it may be appropriate to have you briefly discuss the treatment received by intellectuals in China.

There was a movement, of which we have been informed, called the hundred flowers movement, and I believe that movement, or something that occurred in connection with it, resulted in your assignment to smeltering works and other manual labor, although you were trained as a teacher in a professional way. Could you elaborate on that briefly?

Mr. HUANG. Yes. Well, the intellectuals—of course, I cannot speak for all the intellectuals of China, they have various background and tastes and personal ways of thinking, but, in general, I feel from my personal experience and observations, although we did not talk to each other freely about all aspects of Chinese life, that most Chinese intellectuals suffer from this limitation of freedom and regimentation.

Why could I say this? Of course I have no facts to prove it. After each movement, people became more reticent, they did not like to speak very much. They worked hard. You had to do that, because they called it patriotism, building socialism, and that kind of slogan. But you could see that they are not very happy.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the hundred flowers movement and when did it take place?

Mr. HUANG. In China, of course, they did not use this term, "hundred flowers." This was one of the slogans.

I remember there were three stages in connection with the term you used. After 1955 or 1956, the Chinese Government felt that the country was to a large extent quite stabilized, and they said they thought through the past political movements, one after the other, the people, intellectuals especially, had gone through many thought reforms and largely were in conformity.

I remember the Premier, Chou En-lai, made a special report, which was published, in which he praised the intellectuals for having made so much political advancement—"progress" they called it.

So they wanted to give much more freedom and initiative to the intellectuals, to work more effectually and better.

(At this point Mr. Johansen left the hearing room.)

Mr. HUANG. So that report was a great encouragement to the intellectuals, or at least I felt personally, and I think many of my colleagues felt, now we will have some real more democracy and freedom, because, at the time, they started all kinds of educational reforms along the Soviet model. They began to encourage intellectuals for more independent research, intellectual pursuit for higher standards; before it was always politics, politics, politics. You could neglect everything, but not politics.

But afterwards, at this time, cultural advancement and scientific achievements were much emphasized. They even began to draw a plan, a 12-year plan, which later just disappeared and was never carried out. They began to draw a 12-year plan to catch up with the most advanced standard of the nations of the world, specifically, United States, most advanced country. They wanted to begin in many aspects to become the most highly cultured, scientifically developed, of the nations in 12 years. That was, I must say, a great encouragement to intellectuals, the freedom we were beginning to enjoy and the hopes we were trying to realize. There was nothing wrong in developing science and the culture and education.

Mr. DOYLE. And what is the next stage?

Mr. HUANG. So this was first stage, and then Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the head of the Communist Party, began to introduce this slogan. Nobody exactly said that was his slogan, but it was——

Mr. NITTLE. You are referring to the hundred flowers slogan?

Mr. HUANG. That is right, this slogan of—what was the exact word? "Let one hundred flowers bloom. Let one hundred different schools of thought contend." That was to give freedom.

So I remember at the time in Peking University, the University of Peking, even bourgeois economic theories, courses, were also studied. Some they called capitalist theories, courses, were beginning to be given by one or two professors. At the time there was quite a stir among the intellectuals.

So at this first stage, the intellectuals were encouraged to pursuits more along intellectual lines. I think one very significant event that I mentioned about before, the intellectuals could, according to Lenin, they said, reach their own philosophical world outlook along their own professional lines. That is, they could deviate from the Marxist line. Eventually, they could reach the final truth, and that was something very new, because we had experienced something quite different, you see, in the past.

So the intellectuals were beginning working hard, and a lot of research work was undertaken. In the institute, we studied research works, dictionaries, such papers, comparison of languages. I myself wrote a couple of such research papers, too. So everybody was happy at the time to enjoy more intellectual freedom.

That went on for a little while. Not very long. It was 1956 or 1955–56, along there. I am not sure of the exact date.

And then in 1957 the party wanted another campaign. First, it was the rectification campaign again. That occurred frequently in the Chinese Communist movement. I mean, it is not just one movement. They call it perpetual transformation, or something, to give you constant re-education. So that, first of all, they have to consolidate the party, so each time we started with the party. This one was just the same. They started from the party rectification campaign. The masses like myself, we did not belong to any party or youth league, we just kept aloof. We were busy with our work, teaching work, didn't pay much attention, either, what was going on in the party; but we observed the party members excused themselves from some other duties and joined in their meetings, and we knew they were busy participating in the party rectification campaign; and once in a while, I remember, I saw some party member downcast, very unhappy, and I thought he must have been criticized for his or her bourgeois ideology or bureaucracy or that kind of thing, perhaps, but we did not have much to do with them.

But by and by, the line suddenly switched a little. Then the school party secretary asked the participation of the masses in this campaign. They said the party alone would not be able to carry it out very thoroughly, because they didn't have enough criticism from outside. They wanted the masses, which were the majority, of course, to help bring pressure on the party members, so that it took a tremendous force to help them point out the defects from various angles.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the eventual outcome of the hundred flowers movement which you last referred to?

Mr. HUANG. It is connected with this.

Mr. NITTLE. Proceed.

Mr. HUANG. You see, that hundred flowers was not itself a movement. It was a slogan, a sort of principle at the time.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the result and effect of this relaxation of the party pressure and ideology?

Mr. HUANG. The result, as I said, was enthusiasm among intellectuals.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they then exercise their freedom of speech at this time?

Mr. HUANG. No, not yet. It will come later.

At the time, they were just devoting their energies and time and thoughts in their own professional achievements, like many young students, also, whom I knew quite well. At this time, they made very quick progress in their own profession. The students, before, their progress in languages, learning, was very slow, because they were tied down by political studies, political movements. But at this time, they had much more time.

Another thing to mention, I remember the time was limited for political studies, was limited to a maximum of 15 percent at this stage. Before it was much higher, time devoted to political activities; but at this time it was said too much political activity meant the intellectual could not have time for intellectual pursuits, so time was limited to 15 percent or something. The figure I am not very sure, but there was a limitation of it, that is, how many days in the week, how many hours in the day you have to leave the intellectuals alone. The party leader could not issue orders for any kind of political

activity. Before, they could do that any time they wanted, but now it was set down that they could not do that, so that at this stage, the intellectuals were absorbed in this 12-year plan, as I mentioned, to catch up with the most advanced countries, nations of the world.

But this was short lived, you know. So they soon started this party rectification campaign, and then before perhaps a month or so afterwards, they wanted the masses to help, to help them. So then the masses at the time, remembering what had happened earlier in the Three Anti's movement I mentioned, they said, "Well, if we say too much, later, we will get it back, with interest. We will be criticized, for what? We think it is right now. Later it will be wrong. We will be criticized."

So the intellectuals, the non-party intellectuals, just would not like to say anything, at first. And we just—well, you have to do something—I don't know whether you know the ta tzu pao, large-character newspaper, you write in large characters, write on the wall, so that everybody can see, many people can see at the same time from a distance. That is a new invention.

So at the time, the masses put up a few insignificant, trivial things, so the party said, "This does not help very much. This does not go very deep to the root of evils." Then they begged the masses, "You must help the party. This is for the country's good," and they would guarantee no retaliation.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, what stage is this in?

Mr. HUANG. This is, I think, beginning to merge into the second stage. The first stage was the hundred flowers slogan, putting on the intellectual freedom and the party rectification.

Mr. DOYLE. Then this is in the second stage?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, this is almost emerging to the second stage, so they wanted the masses to participate. It is perhaps still first, second—sometimes—I just give the events. It is not clearly drawn, the lines.

Well, still the masses—at least I was not enthusiastic. It was the same thing. Defects or shortcomings are not very mysterious. You can see them for yourself. If this is not good, don't do it. You can see something is wrong for yourself. If so, why all this commotions?

But more and more, the party cadres at school and the party leaders and the school presidents, officials, had quite a number of meetings to persuade, to guarantee there would be no retaliation, to persuade the masses to participate, because that would help the party in rectifying their ranks, to correct their mistakes, and to make the party stronger. Therefore, the nation would be greatly benefited from that.

Still I remember the masses did not do very much, still were afraid of this final outcome, were not sure; but by this time, quite a lot of the party members themselves put up strong, large-character newspapers, criticizing the party leadership. And quite bold. It was very strong; it never had been before.

And nothing happened, and we knew they were party members, and so we said, "Maybe this time Chairman Mao really means freedom, intellectual freedom, freedom of speech. This time, perhaps, it is really guaranteed by this slogan. The party line of 'let one hundred flowers bloom, let one hundred different schools of thought contend,' that is perhaps real." And then, at the same time, the news-

paper reports, especially the *People's Daily*, reported tremendous criticisms of the party leadership, government leadership, some leaders quite high in rank, and by the many, many people there as teachers, office workers, all these were reported in the press, and we were impressed.

We read this, and nothing happened. Some were very strong in terms of criticism. Some were even reported as having said, oh, "I don't like the Communists," or, "I even wanted to kill them." So strong terms were reported. Nothing happened, and we became relaxed and gradually we were drawn into it by persuasion, by all these phenomena; so we said, "Well, it is a good thing. Really, each of us have seen some defects among the leaders, the party or official leadership, at least in the school, and we want to help. If they are sincere, okay. If they are sincere, we will criticize, and if we correct these mistakes, it will be quite reasonable," and that is what the masses did, so thousands of large-character newspapers were put up. There was no place on the walls. All walls were plastered with them, even windows, every little space. It was not enough, so the school authorities helped to set up extra walls made with poles and matting, so that we can paste the wall newspapers up all over the school, thousands and thousands of them. And I knew it was not just our school, every other school.

Mr. DOYLE. That was the last stage?

Mr. HUANG. No, no, the second stage. The last stage has not arrived yet.

This was a very large degree of freedom, and you could see animation among people. Of course, some of them, in their criticism, were emotional, I mean derogatory accusations, just cursing, some of them. I think personal reasons, revenge, and took opportunity to curse some of the people that they did not like, but most of them—I did not read very carefully. Even at this stage, I was not fully aroused. I did not like this kind of thing. I mean, you should sit down to work.

But still, I read some of it, and looked around. There were so many. But most of them were genuine criticisms, pointing out the shortcoming, at a certain time, what event, what thing. "You did this. This is not a good thing, it is not the correct thing, not done in the interests of your school."

Mr. DOYLE. Now tell us the third stage.

Mr. HUANG. So after this booming of criticism, and it came one day, reported in the *People's Daily* editorial, I remember the title of that editorial "What does this mean?" That short editorial was the turn of the tide.

Mr. NITTLE. This was in an official Communist Party newspaper?

Mr. HUANG. I don't know whether it is Communist Party, but it is a chief newspaper.

Mr. NITTLE. It was the chief Communist newspaper, a government publication?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, most important. Whether it is directly from the party or from the government, I don't know.

Mr. NITTLE. The party and the government were the same thing?

Mr. HUANG. Perhaps—well, the government was controlled by the party.

Mr. NITTLE. Yes, of course, so that it was, in effect, the party newspaper?

Mr. HUANG. One and the same thing, I should say, one and the same, but there were many papers. This was the main newspaper.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the name of the newspaper?

Mr. HUANG. *The People's Daily.*

Mr. NITTLE. And what is it in Chinese?

Mr. HUANG. *Jen Min Jih Pao.*

So this editorial was the turning point of the second stage into the third stage.

Mr. NITTLE. Why did people fear this editorial?

Mr. HUANG. On the day of the editorial, we were not aware of the fact that it was a turning point.

Mr. NITTLE. You did not realize the significance of this editorial?

Mr. HUANG. But we were a little bit shocked. We did not realize that it was the turning point, that there would be a change of the policy or anything, but the editorial mentioned that so far, in the earlier stages of the campaign, the movement went very well; the people enjoyed the freedom of speech, and so on. But then it said, but during this movement, according to facts that have been collected, anti-party elements—anybody against the party was "anti-party elements"—took this opportunity to stir up and influence the people against the party.

It is not the exact wording, but that is what. And they listed a few facts. I remember one was that one official who was not a party member but belonged to a minor party—there were several minor parties that are called the democratic parties, besides the Communist Party; there were seven or eight rather small minor parties—one of the officials of this party received a threatening letter indicating that he should not criticize according to the—let us see, what was it? I cannot recall the exact words, but it is this, and he should not act exactly according to the Communist Party line; if he did, he would bear the serious consequences. I think he would be killed by a pistol, or something like that. But he was threatened, his life was threatened, and this official handed the letter to the Communist Party and said, "I am threatened. My life is threatened," so obviously, there are anti-party elements in this movement, and they picked out some party papers, I mean newspaper editorials, reports by the other parties, the minor parties, which were very critical of the Communist Party, also. They picked out those things and put, I think, a few points in there.

So by and by, the Communist Party came to this decision——

Mr. NITTLE. Perhaps you should clarify one point. You have mentioned other parties existing in China.

Mr. HUANG. Yes, eight or seven. I am not sure.

Mr. NITTLE. Did the Communists tolerate this?

Mr. HUANG. That was the "coalition" government.

But these minor parties, of course, as I understand, they do not have real power. They have to follow the Communist Party line, so their existence is not as independent as you know in the West.

Mr. DOYLE. You talked about the newspaper editorial.

Mr. HUANG. That is right, so then in our school, so it began. We began to hear from the party secretaries, and they said now we have discovered effectively, by concrete evidence, that there have been anti-party elements who took the opportunity of this enlargement of freedom, access of freedom, to create troubles against the government, the party, therefore, the interest of the people. That is what they said.

So before we could carry on our campaign to a successful conclusion, we must correct this course. Now the course is in the wrong direction. We must correct it.

So that is the starting of the third stage, the anti-rightist.

Mr. NITTLE. What happened to those people who did criticize?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, they suffered various punishments.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you think that this policy of the hundred flowers was a ruse or a deception of the Communist leadership, in order to reveal and weed out those who were not reliable in discipline?

Mr. HUANG. Well, there are several theories, but I am not sure just what.

Mr. NITTLE. What is your interpretation?

Mr. HUANG. My personal feeling might be quite wrong, but I felt that at first they were sincere, because they felt their powers firmly established. They thought that with more freedom, more work and better work could be accomplished. That is my personal feeling; but when the access of freedom was actually practiced, and the masses found many faults with the party and they criticized, the party became sort of frightened—I may be quite wrong—so they turned it around.

Mr. DOYLE. I would like to ask two more questions, and then I must go.

You mentioned you wrote some papers, some articles.

Mr. HUANG. A research paper.

Mr. DOYLE. Research papers and books over there?

Mr. HUANG. Translations.

Mr. DOYLE. Translations, and you left them there, of course, for the institute? Do they give you royalties?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, they do. No, not the institute, but the publishers. My contract was with the publishers.

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, you had a contract.

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Does your wife get those moneys, too?

Mr. HUANG. No, we already got the money, but later, if they had more publication, additional publications, they probably would send more money.

Mr. DOYLE. Send her the money?

Mr. HUANG. Well, send by my name. I suppose it is over, those books too seasonal, it could not last forever.

Mr. DOYLE. I remember the other day you said you had kept several of those paperback books and leaflets with you. You carried them with you. Where are they now?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, in China.

Mr. DOYLE. You left them there?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you bring any kind of booklets or pamphlets with you from Baghdad to Athens?

Mr. HUANG. No, no. From where we left China, sent us abroad to Iraq, we were not allowed to bring anything, paper, documents, nothing. We only were allowed to bring passport, nothing else, not a single paper, letters, nothing.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. HUANG. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you resume your discussion with respect to the development of the hundred flowers movement?

Mr. HUANG. I will make it brief.

Since you asked the questions, I am trying to express a little of my opinion, which may not be correct, because there have been many different theories concerning this hundred flowers.

Well, at first they appeared to me to be sincere, and so the people enjoyed, the intellectuals enjoyed, a greatly extended freedom. But I fear that at this time, when they discovered in the large-character newspapers that so many unsuspected ones were very critical of the party and concrete deeds committed by many party members, very critical, the party was totally unprepared for this. They thought all the intellectuals had made so many advances and ideological remoldings, as Chou En-lai praised them for, and that they sincerely loved the party very, very deeply. They did not expect the events to turn out as they did.

So they had to, as they proclaimed, change the course, because the course was not heading in the direction which they anticipated. Something else had emerged. So they changed this rectification campaign into an anti-rightist struggle.

In this struggle, everybody—I mean, every intellectual in every organization—had to go through the process of criticism and self-criticism. Some in small groups, some in larger groups—a few were conducted with the participation of the entire school, the school body—but many small groups. At these meetings, each person, each participant, had to re-examine his own thoughts. In other words, they had to go through a great process of thought remolding, by exposing their own views and thoughts. You read your own thoughts in written form, aloud to the group; and the group would criticize you, point out what was wrong and what was right, in addition to your own criticism. They would help you to understand the problem.

They made everybody go through a stage, a fairly long period of criticism and self-criticism, and finally, in 1957, late 1957, the party decided to take measures to send intellectuals to the countryside to go through a period of manual labor.

They proclaimed the three purposes, I remember, but later they changed or modified them a bit. I am not clear, but I remember that one was to cut down superficial personnel in number. That is bureaucracy, they said, and inefficiency. They cut down the number of officeworkers and intellectuals doing the same thing. Their desire to decrease the number of personnel to increase efficiency was one purpose for sending intellectuals to the country. Another was to bring culture to the villages. So the intellectuals went to the village. They were to help them wipe out illiteracy. And another purpose, the third one I remember, was to remold and reform the thoughts of intellectuals through manual labor.

Mr. NITTLE. Now let us pause for a moment. Do you think that the first two reasons which they gave were not the true reasons, but were the sugar-coating for the real purpose of sending you intellectuals to "corrective" physical labor, which was the third reason?

Mr. HUANG. Perhaps. I am not so sure which one is more important, but I believe at the time three reasons were quite plausible.

Mr. NITTLE. But they did not send intellectuals into physical labor until this hundred flowers movement disclosed that the students did not like communism and were criticizing it severely.

Mr. HUANG. That is true, that is true.

Mr. NITTLE. What kind of education did you impart by working in the fields?

Mr. HUANG. The working manual labor was one of our duties.

Mr. NITTLE. How many hours a day did you work at that?

Mr. HUANG. Well, during the "Great Leap Forward," many, many hours.

Mr. NITTLE. At least 16 hours a day, I am informed?

Mr. HUANG. Yes.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you feel much like imparting culture after 16 hours of hard labor?

Mr. HUANG. No, but in addition we had to do that; that was the hard part. The peasants were so sleepy. We had to teach them to read. They could not absorb very much. That is why it failed.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you think that was a serious program?

Mr. HUANG. I think it was a very silly program. It did not teach very much.

Mr. NITTLE. Do you believe that the real purpose of this program was to break you fellows up as intellectuals, as a group, and to dissipate your influence, to discipline you?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, sure. Discipline is one of the things they said, thought remolding.

Mr. NITTLE. This is our information, but I want to know whether this is correct.

Mr. HUANG. This is correct. They were there to reform our thoughts.

Mr. NITTLE. Were you also required to work in the commune system?

Mr. HUANG. That is right.

Mr. NITTLE. Were Chinese herded into dormitories on farms, husbands separated from wives, and children sent to nursery schools? Is that a correct description?

Mr. HUANG. That part of it, the children, during the day, were——

Mr. NITTLE. You had to eat in mass kitchens?

Mr. HUANG. Eating at the kitchen is true, and sending the children to the nursery schools; but separating the family, in my part, I did not observe.

Mr. NITTLE. In your area you did not witness that?

Mr. HUANG. No. They had their own family little huts, still the same.

Mr. NITTLE. Were they creating dormitories as time went on?

Mr. HUANG. I did not see that.

Mr. NITTLE. You did not see that in your commune?

Mr. HUANG. No, I did not. That was in 1958.

Mr. NITTLE. Were people happy with this kind of existence?

Mr. HUANG. Well, different—it fluctuates. And during that one year, at the time of the end reports were made about the great achievements, they called it, of the "Great Leap Forward," so much food produced. "We have solved the worst food problem in all history," and then the majority were very happy and they ate very much, too.

But then later, reports came to readjust, as I say. The figures were not so very much, cut down to half. The people's rations were much less to eat, and so forth. Then they were not so happy. It fluctuates, but even at that period, 1959, I didn't see serious discontent among the peasants, I did not observe.

Mr. NITTLE. Did you find it in the city?

Mr. HUANG. In the city, not—I don't observe very much among the inhabitants of the city, but in the schools, this, I think, can be true. My feelings, the intellectuals again learned one lesson, that is, if you are against in word or in action, against the party, you will suffer from various punishments.

Finally, the pro-rightists were put into definite categories, some first degree, some second, some third, some fourth degree. The severe ones, their salaries were cut, and they were sent to the country for remolding their thoughts for a longer period. We were not in the same category, you see. We were sent there, you see, not as rightists; we were sent there to be re-educated, as I say.

Mr. NITTLE. I see.

Mr. HUANG. And the rightists as a sort of punishment.

Mr. NITTLE. What effect did this treatment have upon the intellectuals you personally knew?

Mr. HUANG. That is one of the things which is bad in Communist China. You could not communicate sincerely, I mean among your friends. Practically, you didn't have friends as such are understood in this country. For instance, in America, if once you have a friend, two persons, three people become friends, you are so intimate that you tell each other everything you do or you think, right or wrong, you trust each other; but there, there was only the party line to follow. You don't know when you will be criticized. I have been criticized many times. One of the things that before they—let us see, '59, or something, at one time, I discussed it with one of my friends. At the time, I considered it wasn't impossible to have friendship. One of the teachers, anyway, we both talked freely and we enjoyed each other's company very much, so I told him one thing I never dared to tell even my wife. I said, "My feeling is that although the Communist Party constantly talks about democratic centralism and inner-party democracy, my feeling is that there is no real democracy inside this party." I said that to him. But later he told the party, and I was criticized. So at the time, in 1959, I was criticized, "Where you say there is no democracy in the party, you come in and join us, and you will find out we have full democracy."

I became a little, well, annoyed by that. You see, that kind of thing. Therefore, you cannot say you have real friends. You can say we have comradeship, but that means you always talk and act in the same party line. But no more than that, not more.

Mr. NITTLE. We shall have to terminate soon, even though there are many other things of value you could tell us.

Mr. Huang, would you tell us of the assignments you received to the commune system in the course of this hundred flower movement?

Mr. HUANG. Well, I have related the part in the agriculture, manual labor in agriculture. I am not quite clear.

Mr. NITTLE. You were a teacher at the institute?

Mr. HUANG. Altogether, 15 months.

Mr. NITTLE. And then apparently you were taken off that assignment and ordered to perform certain manual work in connection with a smelter operation?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, that is quite right.

Mr. NITTLE. And agricultural labor?

Mr. HUANG. Altogether 15 months. Twelve months in the villages, working on a vegetable-growing farm, and the 3 additional months in what they call an iron smelter plant.

Mr. NITTLE. Would you tell about both? What assignment did you first receive?

Mr. HUANG. It would take very much time.

First, we went to the villages. At the time, it was advanced agricultural cooperative, in November 1957.

We worked just manual labor. We didn't do much else. Then we taught the literacy classes, helping those peasants to learn to read and write, and we participated sometimes in discussions with the peasants on the farm problems, but most of the time, we just did manual labor, all sorts of manual labor connected with vegetable growing, from beginning to end.

Mr. NITTLE. How many hours were you employed at that?

Mr. HUANG. Well, at the beginning, there were few. Most—it was winter, about 4 or 5 hours a day at the beginning. The "Great Leap Forward" had not started yet. It was about 5 hours a day, and we had quite enough sleep, but then afterwards we would spend quite a lot of time sitting together with the peasants and talking about the farm problems, which we at the time didn't understand much.

But later, in 1958, the "Great Leap Forward" was started. Then a great increase of labor hours was carried out. Often, we had to work roughly 12, 16 hours a day. But sometimes when there was some specific task to tackle, we worked just right through the night and got a few hours' sleep the next day when the task was finished; for instance, some irrigation project which had to be accomplished within certain limited time. And then after work, we had to go to organized cultural activities, teach the peasant children singing, dancing, when they came back from school, and we organized literacy classes to teach older peasants—a few were young, too, but mostly old peasants—to read. Special little books for learning Chinese characters were printed.

But then at the time of the literacy classes, we were so tired, both teachers and the students, pupils were tired, very tired, sometimes we couldn't even hold our eyelids open, so that efficiency was poor, of course, and the results were very poor.

They sometimes made a great effort to memorize some few hundred characters, but because of the lack of continuation and more practice, they would forget quickly.

Mr. NITTLE. What was the reason for your transfer to the iron furnaces?

Mr. HUANG. That is a continuation of the whole program. Sending intellectuals to the countryside, the whole process, but after we had stayed a whole year in the countryside, villages, growing vegetables, then we were told a new iron smelting plant was just started and they needed us to go there to work, so we were just taken there for 3 months.

Mr. NITTLE. How many of you were employed at this particular iron furnace?

Mr. HUANG. The rough estimate—they came from a dozen universities, colleges around Peking. Each college or university institute set up their own brigade, working brigade, living in their own separate houses.

Mr. NITTLE. Was this in the area of Peking, or some other city or province?

Mr. HUANG. No, not another city. Maybe 50 miles from Peking, I am not sure of the distances. We traveled by train for some hours.

Mr. NITTLE. Was that a modern steel or iron plant?

Mr. HUANG. It is not modern. Very rudimentary. I think the cost, my rough estimate at least, for that 3 months' period of time, was a tremendous waste of labor and material, but very little result, up to the time I left; but later, they might have come to something marvelous. I don't know. But that 3 months, the things I saw there, the work carried out, I think I can say this: Almost everybody there worked terribly hard, and with quite great enthusiasm, because of their hopes based upon the accomplishment they might achieve. They were trying to produce—I remember one slogan—to produce 1,800 million tons of steel that year in the country—the whole country—so everybody was aroused by the party to participate in this great steelmaking movement.

Mr. NITTLE. How large was the furnace you were operating?

Mr. HUANG. Oh, I am going into that. But when we got there, of course, I had no knowledge of steelmaking, I never saw any. But when we got there, I saw already built 52—they had numbers painted on what they call these? Furnaces? Very small, perhaps about 3 to 5 meters high, with bricks, in rows.

But the thing is that at first I did not know. Of course, now I realize very clearly the fallacy in that project, because those were furnaces that were built with bricks by high school students who had no knowledge whatsoever what steelmaking was. They were given a few instructions as to the shape, size, and roughly of the form of the furnaces. That is fantastic. And these high school students and some college students were encouraged by this Communist spirit, the Communist spirit of boldness: "If you want to do something," they say, "you can accomplish it." So you want to make steel, all right, you can. So that is what everybody believed, was persuaded to believe that.

So when we got there, these 50 stove-like furnaces were built, but I noticed already at the time, as I looked around, several of them were cracked. I did not know at the time that that could not make steel. But later, of course, I learned, before I left the place, none of those 50 furnaces could make any steel.

It is impossible. How could they? Because any amount of heat would just make them crack. They were toys. So this fallacy shows the fantastic unscientific line of steelmaking, and the whole "Great Leap Forward," perhaps, propagated by the Communist Party, to make steel.

So, according to my observation, very little results were produced by the steelmaking.

Later, a couple of months later, they did, I think, abandon those little stoves and they built medium-sized ones in another area which produced some iron. I saw it piled up, maybe a few tons.

But the tremendous waste of labor and education—because thousands of students, workers, carpenters, and even soldiers were transported to work. We did everything.

We mined, too, but the mining, of course, was just like a primitive method. First, we used a chisel to dig, very strenuously, small holes, sometimes half a meter deep, into the rocks, the iron ore rocks, and then we would put a charge in it and blow it up into pieces; then we would collect them, very, very strenuous job, but many people were employed to do that, but very little steel. At least, at the time I left, I saw very few piles of iron. I don't know whether they were of good quality or not, I cannot tell, but they cost a tremendous amount of time, energy, labor, material.

Mr. NITTLE. How long were you at that work?

Mr. HUANG. Just 3 months.

Mr. NITTLE. When you were taken off that work, was there any change in the plan?

Mr. HUANG. They were going to enlarge it, modernize it, as they say, but I never revisited that place.

Mr. NITTLE. Did they continue employing intellectuals at manual labor?

Mr. HUANG. I heard, when we left, another group from our school changed, went there to take our place, other new cadres to take our place.

I heard that is the way they do, replacement. A group worked for a few months, then were replaced by a new group from their own institution or school. That again is a fallacy, because it took a lot of time to learn those things. I saw as we got into the work, we learned a little of something, then we left. A fresh group were there. So always, new workers, inexperienced, were busy, hard working there, but with very little result. That is also a fallacy of this whole project. This extends, too, to our working the farms. The same thing. At first, of course, it was very hard, but we became interested; by and by, we became interested in farm work and really liked to learn something and we learned from the peasants, we made friends with them; they really taught us how to grow this plant, what method to use, how to till the field, what seeds to use, we learned a rudimentary of something.

But as we learned something, we were sent away, a fresh group came in our place, so always, they were inexperienced. Therefore, actually, the help the intellectuals rendered to the peasants was not great.

Mr. NITTLE. Did this labor render the intellectuals more docile? Did they cease their so-called anti-party actions?

Mr. HUANG. I think that was the result.

Mr. NITTLE. This cooled them off a bit?

Mr. HUANG. Yes, when they worked there and for different reasons, I think with different individuals it is not always the same, but the main trend is—at least superficially—the intellectuals became more docile, and they perhaps—my judgment they learned once more,

now if you want to criticize the party out of bounds, out of limits, you will get your punishment, due punishment.

That is my impression.

Mr. NITTLE. I believe that covers it.

Mr. HUANG. I don't know. I could write three volumes.

Mr. NITTLE. I know you could.

Mr. HUANG. It depends on the detail.

Mr. NITTLE. We cannot hold you any longer. Thank you.

Mr. HUANG. Thank you again.

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon, at 1:20 p.m. Friday, May 25, 1962, the committee was recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

Page

Ball, Moya 1178
Blossom, Frederick A. 1165, 1178–1184, 1186
Chiang Kai-shek 1173
Chi-chou Huang ..... 1165–1168, 1169–1234 (testimony)
Chou En-lai 1222, 1228
Chu Teh 1181
Fan Chien-ya 1187–1191
Hsaio Chien-chou 1173, 1174, 1177, 1178, 1182
Lin Li-tau 1193
Liu Shao-ch'i 1194
Lung Chang King 1185, 1186, 1189, 1190
Mae Tse-tung 1166, 1222
Marx, Karl 1202
Nearing, Scott 1165, 1174–1180, 1190
Russell, Maud 1165, 1182–1187, 1189
Shu Hsiu-wen 1192
Smedley, Agnes 1181, 1182
Sorge (Richard) (alias Johnson) 1181
Wallace, Henry A. 1165, 1207

PUBLICATIONS

Jen Min Jih Pao (People's Daily, Peking, China) 1225, 1226
People's Daily, The (*See* Jen Min Jih Pao.)
Chinese Commercial Daily. (*See* Hua Shang Pao.)
Hua Shang Pao (Chinese Commercial Daily, Hong Kong) 1185, 1187, 1188

ORGANIZATIONS

American Friends of Russian Freedom (AFRF) 1216, 1219
China House 1186
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy 1182
Communist Party, China 1166, 1167
Communist Party, Soviet Union:
    Congresses:
        Twenty-first Congress, January 27–February 5, 1959 (Moscow) ... 1202
Foreign Language Institute (Peking, China) ... 1166, 1167, 1204, 1206, 1208, 1210
General Gordon (steamship) 1186
Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, Md.) 1165, 1170, 1171
North China Peoples Revolutionary University [1] 1166, 1195, 1197, 1207
Progressive Party 1165, 1207
St. John's University (Shanghai, China) 1205
University of Baghdad (Iraq) 1203
    Institute of Languages 1168, 1210
University of Maryland (College Park, Md.) 1165, 1171, 1173
University of Peking (Peking, China) 1222
Young Communist League, China (Youth League) 1219
Young Progressives of America 1165, 1176, 1179
Youth League (China). (*See* Young Communist League, China.)
Yunnan University (Yunnan Province, China) 1170

[1] Appears as North China University of the Peoples Revolution.