



No. 9335. v^o 175

11-18



GIVEN BY

U. S. SUPPLY OF DOCUMENTS

INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Blue book

*9335.4A175-

pts. 11-18

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT
DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 4 AND 11, 1953

PART 11

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1953

3653
3

March 25, 1955

* 9335-4A157

pts. 11-18

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

~~FEB 23 1954~~

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, *Chairman*

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin	PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana	HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah	JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey	ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	WILLIS SMITH, North Carolina
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho	OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana, *Chairman*

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah	PAT McCARRAN, Nevada
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey	JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho	WILLIS SMITH, North Carolina
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Page
Coe, Charles J. (Robert), June 11, 1953-----	707-723
Herrick, Elinore, June 4, 1953-----	657-667
Mins, Leonard E., June 11, 1953-----	679-701
Saposs, David J., June 4, 1953-----	667-678
Wuchinich, George S., June 11, 1953-----	702-707

INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:10 a. m. in room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator William E. Jenner (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jenner and Welker.

Also present: Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Robert McNamas, staff member.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Will Mrs. Herrick come forward, please?

Mrs. HERRICK, would you hold up your right hand and be sworn to testify?

Do you swear that the testimony that you will give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

Mrs. HERRICK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ELINORE HERRICK, NORWALK, CONN.

The CHAIRMAN. You may state your name to the committee.

Mrs. HERRICK. Mrs. Elinore M. Herrick, H-e-r-r-i-c-k.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you reside, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. 35 France Street, Norwalk Conn.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business or profession?

Mrs. HERRICK. I am personnel and labor relations director for the Herald Tribune, in New York, and I am also a member of the editorial board.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Morris, with the questioning of the witness.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, for how long have you held those positions with the New York Herald Tribune?

Mrs. HERRICK. Since the summer of 1945, August 1, I think.

Mr. MORRIS. What are your academic degrees, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. A mere A. B.

Mr. MORRIS. From what university did you obtain your A. B.?

Mrs. HERRICK. Antioch College.

Mr. MORRIS. What year?

Mrs. HERRICK. 1929.

Mr. MORRIS. You have been associated with the National Labor Relations Board, have you not, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. Yes, I have.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give us a brief description of your sphere of duty with the National Labor Relations Board.

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, you don't want me to begin with the Board that preceded what we now know as the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. MORRIS. I think so. I think it would be good for our record to have that as fully as possible in the record.

Mrs. HERRICK. When the NRA started, it had section 7-A in it, you remember, and in New York City the NRA people set up a special Mediation Board to deal with the strikes that were plaguing us at that time, and I was made chairman of that Board, which ultimately grew to a panel of some 66 public, labor, and employee representation.

Then Senator Wagner set up the first National Labor Board, I think in September 1934. I may be off on it a month or so. At that time I was asked to be chairman of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut setup. I felt that I couldn't, because it was going to be an unpaid job, and I had to work for my living. So they made me executive vice chairman at a salary, which amount I have forgotten.

I did that until the Schechter Chicken case came along, and that Board was knocked out because the NRA was declared unconstitutional.

There were a couple of months when, by Executive order, the work we were doing was authorized to be continued, and finally the Wagner Act, the first National Labor Relations Act, was passed, and the organization then changed to a division of the country into regions, and I was made regional director again for most of New York State, up to the Albany area, and Connecticut up to New Haven, and New Jersey down to Trenton, and continued in that capacity as regional director for the second region of the NLRB until August 1942.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. That was the extent of your service with the Board?

Mrs. HERRICK. At that time I resigned to take an industrial job.

Mr. MORRIS. In New York City?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, more or less. It was for the Todd Shipyard Corp., New York, but we had yards from Maine around to Seattle.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, have you been the author of any books on labor relations?

Mrs. HERRICK. Not on labor relations. I have written a lot of articles, and I have written one book on the special problems of women in industry, for Funk & Wagnalls, and any number of short articles for the space under the cartoon space on the editorial page, and editorials on labor and economics, and for the New York Times Sunday magazine and the Forum—which is now defunct—for the Reporter. I have forgotten what all.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, in the course of your employment with the National Labor Relations Board, did you have any experience with any Communist unions?

Mrs. HERRICK. Yes, I did, and particularly in NRA days, and I think the first one was the Fur Workers Union, with Ben Gold and

Irving Potash, who never denied or concealed the fact that they were Communists.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the extent of your experience with that particular union?

Mrs. HERRICK. There were organizational strikes going on in the fur trade in New York, in which that union was the leader, and I was really frankly horrified at the brutality of their methods, the totalitarian approach to the rights of workers, and it was a very upsetting experience. I, of course, have seen it repeated in many other situations. That was the first.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mrs. Herrick, you say you saw some evidence of what we might call the class struggle approach to the whole field of industrial relations?

Mrs. HERRICK. Completely so.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you could amplify that a bit for us?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, it was very disturbing to me when the Government was making what I felt to be very constructive efforts to protect the right to organize, that all the battle cry, particularly strident in the case of the left-wing unions, was to picture the employer as necessarily a villain. I had worked myself before my Antioch days, for a firm I considered a very excellent employer, and I had been not only an hourly paid worker, but a supervisor for them, and I couldn't see it in black and white terms, necessarily.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, now Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have had testimony here in the last few weeks of Mr. Edwin S. Smith, who was a member of the National Labor Relations Board up until 1940 or 1941.

We have also had testimony from the Secretary of the National Labor Relations Board at that time, Mr. Nathan Witt.

We have had evidence that both of these gentlemen were active members of the Communist Party during that time, and both of them when called before the committee and asked about certain practices and certain organization affiliations of theirs, invoked the privilege on the grounds that their answers might tend to incriminate them.

Did you encounter those two gentlemen, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. I certainly did.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you could tell of your experiences with Mr. Edwin S. Smith as a member of the Board, and Nathan Witt, as Secretary of the Board?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, you could hardly separate the experiences. I for a long time was very critical of what I felt were policies by the Board, and I felt Witt played a large role in formulation of policies.

I remember shortly after the Wagner Act was declared constitutional, that I had my first experience with an employer, a very substantial employer who was confronted with a demand for bargaining by two rival unions, and the poor company wanted to file a petition and have an election and have somebody tell them "with whom shall we bargain?" And, according to the rules that had been laid down, and I couldn't find any spelling out of that in the act itself, we were only allowed to accept petitions from the unions. I felt an employer was really in a hell of a fix under the circumstances; somebody ought to be able to help him.

I quite agreed with the Board's theory up to a point: Namely, that you couldn't give an employer the right to come in and file a petition

when there was only one union because he could file a petition at a very strategic time, to defeat the union before it had really organized, and I thoroughly agreed to that approach; but when two unions made claims, threatened strikes, or even struck, I really felt that something had to be done.

I first came directly at loggerheads with Smith and Witt over that, and I remember speaking at a staff meeting and urging that we change our rule to the two-union approach to it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, may I break in there? I wonder if at the outset of your description of your dealings with these two gentlemen, whether or not you could in general tell us whether they were influential in shaping the policies of the Board in those days?

Mrs. HERRICK. Oh, very much so. Madden, who was the chairman was an awfully nice person, but really saw through their eyes. I always felt that it was because he was such a nice person that he just didn't think anybody else could be otherwise, a little naive about various things.

Mr. MORRIS. And you do say because of the condition you describe in the case of the chairman, that the member, Edwin S. Smith and the secretary, Nathan Witt, were able to exercise a great influence over the policies of the Board?

Mrs. HERRICK. A very great influence.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you continue, Mrs. Herrick? I think you were describing generally what role they played in the formation of policies, and your own experience with them.

Mrs. HERRICK. Yes.

Then I felt, too, that when it came to the trial of a case, we would subpoena the witnesses that whatever union it might be wanted, and took the position that we wouldn't subpoena witnesses that an employer wanted, because if they were going to be friendly to them presumably it would influence them to come. Well, I saw situations where an employer wanted to subpoena a union member, perhaps a union member whom the union itself would not want to call as a witness, because his testimony might be adverse to the union. So, as I recall—and this is also many years ago—my next big argument with the Smith-Witt group on the Board came over the subpoena, the right of an employer to ask the Government to subpoena witnesses they wanted, my feeling being that, while the Wagner Act was designed to protect the rights of labor, it had to be administered in a way which also recognized implicit rights of employers, too, to be a fair and balanced administration.

Well, it took about 2 years of argument to get the rule changed on petitions.

Then the third thing that stands out in my memory as a source of often violent conflict between me and the others, was the dismissal of charges, which was then within the power of the regional director.

I felt if a union filed a charge and, after really thorough investigation, it couldn't be sustained and couldn't have issued a formal complaint and go under a formal hearing, ending up maybe in the courts, that the employer was entitled to have the record show in effect that the charges were not sustained, and I believed they should be dismissed.

Smith and Witt believed that we should let the unions withdraw them without prejudice, which, of course, as you being a lawyer know, means that they could have refiled them at some subsequent date.

Well, I just felt that that was not proper administration, and argued for it. Well, it was in the area of discussion of those particular administrative problems that I felt that the Smith and Witt influence was very, very strong. I think Donald Smith was also a member then, but he didn't really come out very much.

Mr. MORRIS. May I ask this, Mrs. Herrick: Did you notice whether Witt would act under the instruction of the Board, or did he pretty much pursue an independent course?

Mrs. HERRICK. At this point in time, I would say that he would act independently a great share of the time, and when he and I would tangle, he inevitably felt the need of some Board backing, which he always got.

Mr. MORRIS. What difficulties arose, Mrs. Herrick, in connection with the International Mercantile Marine Co. case.

Mrs. HERRICK. Well that was the first case where an employer sought the right to petition for an election, and there, if I recall correctly, it was a row between an A. F. of L. telegraphers union, and the newly formed American Radio Telegraphers' Association. I don't know whether it was then part of the CIO. It later was. I don't know recall that. And that was the beginning of my consistent effort to try to get the ruling changed.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you generally have much experience in the difficulties that arose in the communications field?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, I had a lot of cases. I remember the Postal Telegraph Co. and the Western Union. This group was quite active in the wartime situation. With the handling of, you know, 5,000 cases a year, I don't remember.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was Mr. William Leiserson, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. Mr. Leiserson happened to have been my professor of economics when I was a student at Antioch. In fact, I more or less went to Antioch because he was there, and was recognized as one of our experts in the field of mediation, as well as economics. He later became a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

I would say he succeeded Donald Smith, perhaps, but I am just not sure.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did he have the same kind of difficulties that you did, within the Board?

Mrs. HERRICK. I gathered that he had, from various things he said to me from time to time, and he was very aware of my difficulties.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you mean that he was generally in sympathy with you?

Mrs. HERRICK. What did you say?

Mr. MORRIS. Do you mean that he was generally in sympathy with you in your position?

Mrs. HERRICK. Yes. I know from things he said to me at various times that he felt that Witt was not impartial in his handling of cases, a feeling that I also had; and that he felt that there were procedural irregularities, shall I say, in the conduct of the secretary's office; and I think he had quite a tussle.

I don't remember just when he told me, but I believe it was at some point in there while I was still with the Board, he told me that he had refused to participate in decisions on some cases that Witt, he felt, had mishandled.

Mr. MORRIS. And that generally coincides with your own experiences?

Mrs. HERRICK. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, have you told us in full of your relations with what the executive staff, the Washington staff was doing during this period? Have you given us a full description of it?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, I might just add that there were, supervision-wise, certain things that occurred. The regional officers were supposed to be under the direction of a field division which was set up at some point in the development of the Board's administrative system. I couldn't tell you the exact time or year. That office was under the secretary's office, as was also a review section which reviewed the reports of formal hearings.

The field office reviewed all reports from the regional offices, and the secretary through the Field Office Section, exercised his supervision over the regional offices, and I had a considerably stormy experience quite often in the process of being reviewed by the Field Division.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was in charge of the review board generally, Mrs. Herrick.

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, I don't remember precisely, because actually it was so tied up with Witt.

Mr. MORRIS. Tied up with Witt or by Witt?

Mrs. HERRICK. Tied up with Witt, that anyone who was directly in charge—well, it is so long ago I don't remember names, frankly.

Witt did have two special agents. Fred Krivones and Robert Gates, were names I think I shall never forget.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you spell that first name for us?

Mrs. HERRICK. K-r-i-v-o-n-o-s.

Mr. MORRIS. You say they were both assistants of Witt, who did review work?

Mrs. HERRICK. In the field offices, and they would visit the various field offices.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the role of Thomas I. Emerson?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, he succeeded Witt. Witt, I think, was head of the review section, and then he succeeded Benedict Wolf, as secretary of the board, or they may have come up from the assistant general counsel's job. Emerson finally succeeded Witt on the review business.

Mr. MORRIS. Generally, what position did Thomas I. Emerson take? Did he take a position with you on these various difficulties or did he side with Witt?

Mrs. HERRICK. I haven't any idea, because I really didn't have much to do with him and I don't know what he did.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, may we get back to this review situation? You had mentioned the two assistants of Witt. Will you tell us what their general role was?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, to be frank, some of us regional directors, like Frank Bowen out West and myself, we called them the goon squad.

Mr. MORRIS. Goon squad?

Mrs. HERRICK. Goon squad, a waterfront term. They did investigate in a very odd manner, I thought. They came to my office once, and I must say I am not telling anything that hasn't become officially on the record, at prior Senate and House committee hearings.

Mr. MORRIS. Even if it were not, Mrs. Herrick, we want your full recollection of these details. Remember that you are speaking under oath before an official body, and we want your full recollection of what happened.

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, Krivonos and Gates were sent out to make a study of my office, I was told. When they came they were to appraise the work of the office and take measures to improve it.

When they came I asked them what their standards of measuring or improving the work of the office were, and they refused to give me any information, and I said I thought that that was very improper, that as the head of the office I certainly had a right to know by what criteria the work for which I took full responsibility was going to be appraised. And I got no satisfaction.

I had to concede the right of my superiors in Washington to investigate my office, and so when they said they wanted to go through all the files, all the files were made available to them and they spent, I think it was, 3 weeks or nearly a month going over files, and I never found out what they were up to or after, or what their purpose was; and finally I asked how long they were going to stay and they said they didn't know. I asked what they had found out, what their criticisms were, and they said "We cannot talk to you," or words to that effect, and to my great surprise they left abruptly that night.

I didn't know whether they were coming back. A few days later, 3 or 4 days later, I received word from Washington that they were coming back and wanted to see me in my office after office hours. I thought that was kind of odd, but I saw them and then asked them what they had found, what their measurements for appraising the work of the office were, and they refused to give me any information. They said this time they had come up under instructions to talk privately with every person on my staff and to tell those persons how they were to do their work.

Well that is when I hit the ceiling, I think understandably so. No responsible administrator will take that lying down.

So I composed a rather peppery telegram which I sent off to the Board.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Mandel do we have a copy of a telegram that Mrs. Herrick sent on February 21, 1939?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read it, please?

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

This investigation has been conducted virtually behind locked doors, in secrecy, and in such a thoroughly objectionable manner that far from being conducive to improved administration the investigation has caused the deplorable slump in the morale of the Board's largest and most important field office. It is the procedure one might expect from the OGPU but not from fellow administrators of an agency of the American Government.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that the telegram you sent, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, you felt it was conducted so surreptitiously and in such a clandestine fashion that you characterized it as work of the people in the OGPU?

Mrs. HERRICK. It was not intended to be constructive.

Mr. MORRIS. It was not intended to be constructive?

Mrs. HERRICK. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Leiserson sent a telegram at that time; did he not?

Mrs. HERRICK. To whom?

Mr. MORRIS. To the Board.

Mrs. HERRICK. I don't know.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you continue with your description?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, I don't remember exactly what happened except the investigation was called off after that telegram was received, and it is my recollection that I was called down to Washington and more or less bawled out by the Chairman of the Board, and that wasn't the first time.

Senator WELKER. Who was the Chairman of the Board?

Mrs. HERRICK. Mr. Madden, J. Warren Madden. And I went on doing the job the way I thought it ought to be done. Another running dispute that I had specifically with Nat Witt was over the way I handled cases of charges of unfair labor practices.

I always felt that the best way, and that was based on my experience during the NRA and the first NLRB, that the best way to (a) get at truth and (b) promote industrial peace which I conceive was the prime objective of the work, was to get both parties, the employer and the union in together, after a charge had been filed, and try to arrive at the truth in that way. It has been my experience that if a worker is charging his foreman with violation of the law in some respect, he tends to exaggerate when he does it ex parte, so to speak, and he comes closer to the real facts when it isn't ex parte, and furthermore the fact is that if you can get in a dispute the early stages before it is personalized, and people's passions have jelled to a white fire of irritation, or what-have-you, you have a better chance of working out a proper solution.

Mr. Witt's feeling was that the union's case should be fully investigated first, affidavits made, and all that sort of business, and then you confront the employer in a much more formalized fashion with whatever the investigation has disclosed.

That was, in my opinion, a one-sided procedure that wasn't really designed to accomplish the purposes of the law. So I had sort of a running battle for years with Mr. Witt over the way I called people together and tried to settle things, and that stands out in my recollection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, how often did Witt, for instance, visit you at your office?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, at first I didn't think too much about it, and then it became quite apparent to me after a month or so that he was coming to my office every Saturday morning, often in the office only 5 minutes, and practically never speaking to me. I could understand his not wanting to speak to me, but I thought official business warranting travel to New York and back required more than 5 minutes in the office.

Mr. MORRIS. You thought that is was unusual?

Mrs. HERRICK. I thought it was unusual.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you ever find out the real motive behind that?

Mrs. HERRICK. I never found out actually and positively. I was told by another agency that it was on personal business having to do with his political activities, but I don't know whether that was true or not.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know whether we are qualified as to whether we should ask the witness who told her?

The CHAIRMAN. It would just be hearsay.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was Benedict Wolf, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. He was Mr. Witt's predecessor as secretary of the Board.

Mr. MORRIS. What was his particular position with regard to you?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, so-so. We got along fairly well. He more or less left me alone to do things. You see, I don't have any records now, but I did make a practice of making regular reports public, and they were always carried in full by the New York Times and full news stories, but not necessarily full text in the Tribune and in other papers.

Wolf just simply accepted the fact that I was running the office. He didn't really interfere much.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, would you tell us what steps you finally had to take to protect yourself against Witt's tactics?

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, it wasn't just Witt. It was the general feeling of unease that I had. So I had, fortunately, a very trustworthy file clerk, and worked out with him a procedure for guarding the files. Incidentally, at one time through a mutual friend I did consult J. Edgar Hoover about what would be wise precautions, and got some suggestions from him. So we documented every piece of paper that went into the files accurately, numbered all the pages of affidavits—you know, the usual things that you do to make sure that when you take a file out you can tell if anything has been removed—and every day the file clerk would give me a list of all the files that had been withdrawn that day and by whom, and he would give me a list of all the files that were not returned at the end of the day and who had them. He had to go around and personally check on the desks, to make sure who had them so that they couldn't be passed from one to another.

Mr. MORRIS. Was anyone placed there to watch you, Mrs. Herrick?

Mrs. HERRICK. I rather suspected it, and then there came an incident that made me feel pretty sure.

There was a girl named Mary Bobrovich, B-o-b-r-o-v-i-c-h, who started out as a stenographer, and became the supervisor of the stenographic pool. When we moved our offices from the Woolworth Building to 120 Wall Street—and that I think was in 1937, shortly after the act was declared constitutional—she came to me and she asked me where her desk was to be. And I said, "Out in the stenographic pool, of course." She said, "I want it outside your office door." I said, "Why?" She said, "So I can keep in touch with what goes on." And I have the feeling—when I do, I don't use very ladylike language, so I won't tell you what I said, but it was to the effect that her desk would be one city block away from mine, believe you me; and later a committee of the employees union of the staff took it up with me as a grievance, and I was in difficulties, as far as I was concerned. I am still furious when I think of the nerve of it.

That, of course, was over, and I think the girl was very stupid to tip her hand so clearly, but I suppose she had been ordered to get her desk somewhere near my office and she was doing her best.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you could tell us what precautions you took in order to insure fairness in labor cases of the Board, because of the difficulties of which you have told us?

Mrs. HERRICK. That was a terrific problem, during dealings with one field examiner, with the resulting treatment and if the union tried to get that examiner again. I instituted a very strict system of control of the assignment of cases. No one could assign cases except myself. Even if a union would drift into a friendly examiner's office and leave the charge with him, the charges had to be initialed by me before they could be docketed.

I made an immediate record of every charge on my own personal card file system, and I assigned the examiners.

My effort was to assign cases in this way, so far as the size of my staff permitted and the volume of work permitted. With examiners that I had question marks in my mind about, I tried to give them election cases, most of the election cases, because in an election you have an employer representative present and you have a representative of any union or unions that are interested, and the Federal examiner really is under eagle-eye supervision by people who have an interest at stake. Then, as to the rest, I tried to guard against assigning cases that were brought in by left-wing unions to examiners that I wasn't very sure would handle them judicially, fairly, impartially; and I made a very strenuous effort to prevent my examiners, even those I had confidence in, from building up what I would call a clientele among the unions, so that not even my right-hand man or woman in whom I had absolute confidence, would ever build up a caseload that covered only 2 or 3 unions.

Then I also made a practice every single week of going through every single open file, and making my own analysis of the case, and if it seemed to have bogged down—and there were some cases where I felt that our efforts to develop proof were more tending toward a harassment of the employer than really to get at proof—I would reassign the case and quite often would hold a joint conference, with myself, to try and clear it up.

Mr. MORRIS. Mrs. Herrick, I wonder if you could tell us what difficulties you encountered with Nathan Witt in connection with concurrent investigations of cases?

Mrs. HERRICK. That is that policy where I felt that you should find out all you could about the case and not confine your investigation first solely to the union's side of it; that it was just as important if you had an affidavit after interview with a worker who charged that the foreman had done thus and so, that you had an opportunity to interview the foreman just the way you had the worker; and, as I believe I earlier indicated, that was frowned upon by Mr. Witt.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, is there anything else, Mrs. Herrick, that you think this committee should know in connection with the investigation that we are conducting into the role of, say, Mr. Witt and Mr. Smith, in the National Labor Relations Board? We would like to learn as much as possible what these gentlemen did. You are a qualified witness, Mrs. Herrick, in the sense that you were there, you saw what they did, you were part of the whole National Labor Relations Board setup, and you saw these people perform firsthand.

It is that sort of information that we need in order for the committee to evaluate the influence of Smith and Witt on the Board.

Mrs. HERRICK. Well, I can only say that there seemed to me to be a very strong influence that Smith and Witt exerted, that the attitude

was one that followed—well, what shall I say—for lack of a better expression, some of the theory of class warfare.

I remember one time—one further incident comes back to me, and I think it was shortly after the act was declared constitutional.

Up to that time, every employer, even if we only wanted to hold an election, had been hauling us into court on injunctions, and so forth, and, of course, the atmosphere changed after the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the act.

But we had a very big employer in that immediate period, who consented voluntarily to letting my office run an election among his employees, and that was the first time such a thing had happened to me; nothing but injunctions before then; and I really was impressed with the fair-mindedness of the employer in saying, "I am not going to fight. If our employees want to be represented by a union, let's find out, and surely the Government agency is the best one to do it."

So I rather praised this company. It happened to be the General Electric Co. I praised them in public statement to the press, and announced that this was the first consent election in the second region, and I wasn't very popular with Witt for having made a statement expressing appreciation of the employer's attitude.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mrs. Herrick, there is another gentleman, Mr. Allan Rosenberg.

What role did he have in the Board? Do you remember him?

Mrs. HERRICK. I remember the name.

Mr. MORRIS. You do not remember what role he played?

Mrs. HERRICK. No, I don't; I just remember the name.

Mr. MORRIS. We have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mrs. Herrick, for your testimony here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Call the next witness.

Mr. MORRIS. The next witness is Mr. David Saposs.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Saposs, will you stand and be sworn?

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

Mr. SAPOSS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID J. SAPOSS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your name for the committee?

Mr. SAPOSS. David J. Saposs, S-a-p-o-s-s.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you reside?

Mr. SAPOSS. 1660 Lanier Place NW., Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business or profession?

Mr. SAPOSS. I am an economist.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Morris, you may proceed with the questioning of the witness.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Saposs, were you the Chief Economist for the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. For what period of time?

Mr. SAPOSS. From the fall of 1935 to the fall of 1940.

Mr. MORRIS. That was during the period of time that Edwin S. Smith was a member of the Board and Nathan Witt was secretary?

Mr. SAPOSS. He became secretary in 1938, as I recall it, but before that he was attorney in charge of reviewing cases, but they were both with the Board during the period I was there.

Mr. MORRIS. What academic degrees do you hold?

Mr. SAPOSS. I did my undergraduate work and part of my graduate work at the University of Wisconsin, and the remainder of my graduate work at Columbia University.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give us a short sketch of your experience in the field of industrial relations, and generally in the field of labor work?

Mr. SAPOSS. Since about 1911 I have specialized in the field of what is commonly known as labor economics. I spent considerable time, 10 years, at the University of Wisconsin, and then I was with the Industrial Commission of the State of New York, with the Carnegie Foundation Study of Immigrants, and with various Government agencies, like the Labor Board, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the War Production Board, the Office of Military Government for Germany, the Marshall Plan Organization, and I am now Special Assistant to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, at this point I think I would like to put into the record a summary of the efforts made by the chairman of this committee to prevent the certification of the American Communications Association as the bargaining unit for some 5,000 employees of Western Union in New York.

In the course of the hearings, 2 weeks ago, I think during the time that Nathan Witt, the secretary of the National Labor Board, about whom we have had so much testimony today, was giving his testimony, that the accumulation of facts were brought into the record to show that a recertification at this time of the American Communications Association as bargaining representative of the employees of the Western Union posed a threat to the internal security of the United States.

The chairman put into the record the fact that all the tie lines of the Western Union, tie lines in the Pentagon, various key strategic centers, the Navy Communications Center for instance, the Brooklyn piers, the transport service, were all being manned by employees who were organized by people who it was testified at the time were Communist organizers.

It was pointed out that very often the shop stewards had access to various messages sent coded and uncoded, that went through New York to the various areas overseas.

The chairman put in the record the fact that this indeed posed a threat to the security of the country. In the event that the present emergency should grow greater, we would have these people with access to the vital communications of the country.

After the chairman had recognized that threat, he had a session with the National Labor Relations Board. Three members of the Board were present, and at the termination of that conference the chairman of this committee took certain action which I would like to mention for the record right now:

On May 29, 1953, Senator Jenner sent a letter to Senator H. Alexander Smith as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and

Public Works. He sent a similar letter to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to the House Judiciary Committee, and to the chairman of the House Labor Committee. The letters to the four chairmen were identical.

I am now reading, Mr. Chairman, the letter sent by you to the Honorable H. Alexander Smith, Chairman, United States Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare:

DEAR SENATOR: On Tuesday, May 26, during the course of a hearing on internal security, a situation developed which related to the internal security of the country. I summarized it as follows:

In 1951, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on the American Communications Association. In those hearings, the Communist control over that labor organization was amply established. This American Communications Association is now the certified bargaining agent for some approximately 5,000 employees of the Western Union Telegraph Co. in the metropolitan area of New York City, some 200 employees of the Western Union Cable Co. of New York City, for RCA communications on the east and west coasts, and for employees in certain broadcasting stations, mostly in New York and in Philadelphia. Recently, a National Labor Relations Board secret-ballot election, among Western Union employees in New York City, was held on May 19, 1953, when the employees voted, 2,421 to 1,619, in favor of the American Communications Association, as against the American Federation of Labor.

Another National Labor Relations Board election is now being held among approximately 1,800 employees of the American Cable & Radio Co. and the American Communications Association is on the ballot. The results of this election are to be announced on the 28th of May.

This Internal Security Subcommittee has taken cognizance of this situation at this time in view of the following facts found after preliminary survey by the staff of this subcommittee:

The main office of the Western Union Telegraph Co. is located in the Western Union Building at 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. Telegraph circuits to all major cities in the United States terminate or relay through this building. Telegraph messages of all kinds are handled by the employees, the majority of whom are members and under the control of the American Communications Association. Many of these messages are Government messages. For example, the following Government agencies are served by telegraph circuits, "tie lines," connecting the main Western Union office and the agency offices. The following is a partial list of these circuits: United States Defense Department Signal Center of the First Army Headquarters, Fort Wadsworth; United States Naval Air Station, Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn; New York Port of Embarkation in Brooklyn; United States Naval Shipyards, Brooklyn; Sea Transport Station, Atlantic Division, Army Piers 1, 2, 3, and 4; United States Navy Naval Communications Service, 90 Church Street, New York; Governors Island and Fort Jay, Second Service Command. The importance of the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the Western Union Cable Co. in our country's defense program can be judged by the following which appeared in the company's annual report for 1952: "More deep-sea amplifiers were placed in service, further increasing international-cable capacity. Increased service requirements of the Armed Forces, other governmental departments, and defense industries were fully met. Of special importance was the expansion of the extensive leased communication systems furnished by Western Union for governmental and other large customers. The company was awarded Government contracts by the Air Force, the Navy, and the Signal Corps for the development of special electronic equipment and for other projects, involving a total of \$6,000,000".

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee takes cognizance of this situation as possessing a threat to the internal security of this country.

Yesterday, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee met with Ivar Peterson, Acting Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, and Members Abe Murdock and John Houston, and entered into executive discussion. A copy of the transcript of that discussion is attached herewith.

At the termination of this session, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I made the following recommendations:

1. That the whole matter be brought to the attention of the President of the United States;

2. That the NLRB not certify the American Communications Association as the bargaining representatives of the employees of Western Union and the American Cable & Radio Co.

3. That in view of the NLRB's objection that they could not withhold certification with possibly being held in contempt of the district court, the NLRB obtain a stay from Judge Letts which would enable it to withhold certification of the ACA as a bargaining agent.

4. That appropriate legislation, now pending before the Congress which would remedy the present situation, be expedited.

Accordingly, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I ask that you give consideration to the enactment of whatever legislation there is before your committee that would remedy the present danger to the country.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman Internal Security Subcommittee.

The letter was also sent to the President of the United States, describing the situation to him.

Yesterday, Senator Jenner received by messenger a five page letter from Ivar H. Peterson, Acting Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, in which he outlined reasons why the Board was reluctant or unwilling to take the action for which Senator Jenner had asked, and I would like the five page letter to go into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It may go into the record and become a part of the record.

(The letter referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 235" and follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 235

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington 25, D. C., June 2, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
*Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Last Thursday, May 28, the three members of this Board then present in Washington and the Board's Solicitor and Associate Solicitor met, at your invitation, in executive session with you and members of the staff of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

To explain the purpose of the meeting, you read into the record a statement you had made during the May 26 hearing of the subcommittee on the threat to the internal security of this country arising from the employment in strategic posts by certain communications companies of members of the American Communications Association and from the certified bargaining status of that union in those companies. Your statement called attention to the fact that in a secret ballot election, held by this Board on May 19 among Western Union employees in New York City, the American Communications Association had polled 2,421 votes to 1,619 votes cast for the affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. Your statement went on to say that, on the basis of recited facts found after preliminary survey by the staff of the subcommittee, "The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee takes cognizance of this situation as possessing a threat to the internal security of this country." Thereupon, you asked this Board for advice on how to meet this situation.

At the outset, the Board explained that, in so far as the problem was one of access by employees to classified or strategic information, the Western Union Co., like any other employer, was free under the law to discharge or transfer or remove any employee for any reason other than his union membership. This point, we might add, was made clear in a very early decision of the United States Supreme Court (*N. L. R. B. v. Jones & Laughlin*, 301 U. S. 1 (1937)). The testimony of Mr. J. L. Wilcox, vice president in charge of employee relations for Western Union, before the subcommittee (report of 1951 Hearings on Subversive Infiltration in the Telegraph Industry, p. 91) is simply not an accurate statement of the company's legal rights. This aspect of the

problem, it seems to us, could properly be dealt with by the employer or, particularly with respect to those operations performed under Government contract, by the Department of Defense. We merely wish to underscore the fact that the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which this Board administers, presents no obstacle to the discharge of Communists or their sympathizers.

On the question whether this Board could withhold certification of the American Communications Association as collective-bargaining representative for the employees of Western Union among whom it won the consent election conducted on May 19, we explained that in our view section 9 (c) (1) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 made it mandatory for the Board to certify the results of the election in the prevailing circumstances. We pointed out that, as the officers of the successful union had filed with the Board the non-Communist affidavits required by the act, we had no alternative but to issue the certification. It was our view that the denial of the benefit of a certification to this union—even for reasons of national security—would be in contravention of the opinion of Judge Letts in the questionnaire case, now on appeal before the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Indeed, it was suggested that failure of the Board to act in these circumstances might be deemed contemptuous of the order of Judge Letts which is now operative and outstanding against each member of the Board. The only avenue of relief from a possible contempt adjudication, we indicated, would be by way of an application for a stay of the Court's mandate.

In closing the meeting, you said that the subcommittee would seek to expedite the enactment of legislation, and you requested the Board to give further thought to presently available legal measures for withholding certification, including the possibility of obtaining a stay of the Court's mandate.

Since last Thursday the Board has given serious consideration to the means available to it for dealing with the very grave problem which you described and which, as our testimony before several committees of the Congress will show, we have long recognized. We have explored thoroughly the wisdom and efficacy of all possible alternatives and have concluded, most reluctantly, that each of them is of such dubious validity and outcome that none can conscientiously be undertaken at this time.

First, we considered simply withholding certification of the American Communications Association for the New York City employees of Western Union. Apart from our view, expressed last Thursday, that such inaction would be inconsistent with the mandate of the statute we must administer, the Board anticipates, from past experience, that the union will proceed in the district court for a mandatory injunction to compel us to issue the certificate. In such a proceeding, which could be brought within the next few days, we would, it seems to us, be without any real defense. As the existence of a question concerning representation was stipulated by all parties to the consent-election agreement, including the employer, and as the election was won without objection by the American Communications Association, the Board has no discretion to hold back the certificate. Under these circumstances, and in the absence of a showing that the union will not accord fair and equal representation to all employees in the bargaining unit under section 9 (a) of the statute, issuance of a certificate is merely a ministerial act. Nor could we successfully contend that considerations of national security justify our failure to act. The law of the District of Columbia, the only venue for suit against the Board, has been clearly stated in Judge Letts' unreversed opinion. It is that, as long as the union's officers have filed current non-Communist affidavits with the Board, we may not withhold benefits to which the union is entitled under the statute. But even without that opinion, the legislative history of the non-Communist affidavit provision of the statute shows that Congress adopted that device as the sole means within the purview of the Labor Relations Act of dealing with the threat to national security presented by Communist controlled and dominated unions. The opinion of the Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of the non-Communist affidavit makes that clear (*A. C. A. v. Douds*, 339 U. S. 382 (1950)). It seems to us, therefore, that we could not seriously argue before a court that this Board has the power to impose sanctions other than those which Congress specifically prescribed.

In the case decided by Judge Letts the validity of the Board's action, there enjoined, turns upon the inherent authority of the Board, as a means of preventing abuse of its processes, to inquire into the bona fides of the affidavits filed. The Board did not devise or justify the questionnaire technique there attempted as an alternative to the non-Communist affidavit method Congress had provided

for dealing with the Communist threat. Our sole purpose, and the only one we deemed legally defensible, was to protect from fraud and abuse the very method Congress has selected to achieve its objective. We could not even defend our action there on the ground that a Federal grand jury had concluded that the operations of the unions in question were inimical to our security interests and that the non-Communist affidavits of their officers were worthless and in the nature of a subterfuge. Indeed, Judge Weinfeld, in later granting the unions' motion to expunge the presentment, held that the comments of the grand jury were in derogation of the principle of separation of powers of the judicial and executive branches of the Government.

On the first alternative, i. e., withholding certification, we must therefore conclude that our legal position is so tenuous as to deter us from pursuing it. Even its value as a means of delay, assuming we could conscientiously act for such purpose, is extremely doubtful. A suit for a mandatory injunction could be instituted by the American Communications Association within a few days. Such suits are, in their nature, brought to compel prompt action of the kind here involved. The case would undoubtedly be set for argument promptly and decision might very well be handed down from the bench. Another court victory against the Government by the American Communications Association would, we fear, only enhance the union's standing in these critical times.

We have also given much thought to the application for a stay of Judge Letts' mandate. This procedure might be predicated on the theory that the withholding of a certificate would contravene the Court's order. Such step, as further reflection reveals, is of very questionable value in achieving the subcommittee's purpose. The Court might well regard the order itself, as distinguished from Judge Letts' opinion, as not literally applicable to a denial of benefits for national security reasons. It would therefore deny the application. Or if the court found the application appropriate, it would, we think, almost certainly refuse to grant the extraordinary relief sought for lack of legal or equitable justification and because of the advanced status of the main proceeding on the merits. In either case a denial of our application would leave the union free to bring suit for a mandatory injunction, with the results we have already foreseen for such a proceeding made even more likely by the Board's failure in its attempts to obtain a stay.

The other basis on which a stay of mandate could be sought would be on the representation that the Board found it necessary at this time, for reasons of national security, to require answers to our questionnaires before certifying the American Communications Association. On this approach we would in essence be asking the court to recognize and sanction the exercise of authority which we have so far been told we do not have and which is at the very heart of the main proceeding. It is difficult for us to foresee a successful outcome, particularly in view of the advanced state of the main proceeding. But even if we were to succeed through the questionnaire method, the subcommittee's objective would be advanced little, if at all. Affirmative replies would give us no alternative but to issue the certificate, even though we would surely transmit those replies to the Department of Justice for possible criminal action. Negative answers are hardly to be expected.

The more we have assessed the situation the more apparent it has become that we are without real recourse at this time. We hesitate to contribute in any way toward another court victory for the wrong side by instituting or inviting legal proceedings that have such poor prospect of success. There is too much at stake. Our best judgment at this point is that less harm to the national interest will come of proceeding to certify than of taking our chances on the outcome in the courts of our very weak legal position on a denial of certification. A favorable opinion of the court of appeals in the questionnaire case, to be argued shortly, may afford a basis for nullifying the certificate. Of course, we feel that the enactment of legislation of the kind we have recommended to the legislative committees of the Congress would be a much better answer to this very difficult and serious problem.

I should like again to express the Board's appreciation for the opportunity you have so kindly given us to explore with you the possible avenues of approach to a goal we all desire to attain.

Very sincerely yours,

IVAR H. PETERSON,
Acting Chairman.

(The following letter was subsequently received and ordered into the record at this point by the chairman:)

EXHIBIT No. 236

THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO.,
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS DEPARTMENT,
New York, N. Y., June 8, 1953.

The Honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee,
Senate Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Newspapers throughout the country, reporting on your efforts to prevent certification of the American Communications Association as bargaining representatives for employees of the Western Union Telegraph Co. in New York City, have also carried stories quoting from Mr. Ivar Peterson's letter of June 2 to you, in which, as acting chairman of the NLRB, he responds to your request for advice in dealing with this problem. Incidentally, the NLRB again certified ACA on June 3.

Mr. Peterson's letter, explaining in some detail the several approaches to the problem explored by the Board, concludes that there is just nothing the Board can do to help in this situation. Gratuitously, he infers that the problem is really one to be solved by the Western Union Telegraph Co. Mr. Peterson's letter states that my testimony before the subcommittee is simply not an accurate statement of the company's legal rights. To this I take the strongest possible exception.

Mr. Peterson says that "insofar as the problem was one of access by employees to classified or strategic information, the Western Union Co., like any other employer, was free under the law to discharge or transfer or remove any employee for any reason other than his own union membership." And again "this aspect of the problem it seems to us, could properly be dealt with by the employer or, particularly with respect to those operations performed under Government contracts, by the Department of Defense." Possibly Mr. Peterson does not know that the two top officers of ACA are not now and never have been employees of Western Union. How does he propose we "discharge" them?

Now with respect to employees, surely no one is more familiar than you, Senator, with the complexities of proving an individual to be subversive. However, let me assure you that had the company any evidence of subversion on the part of any of its employees it would diligently pursue any and every remedy available to it.

Mr. Peterson's letter also states, as one of the reasons impelling the Board to certify ACA, the fact that the existence of a question concerning representation was stipulated to by all parties to the consent-election agreement, including the employer. Again I ask, what would Mr. Peterson have had us do? Would he have had the company decline to sign such a stipulation, which would have automatically insured retaining the ACA without giving our employees a chance to vote for another union?

I might point out in this connection that the very existence of ACA in Western Union stems from a decision made by the NLRB in 1944. At that time, when a national election was conducted among Western Union employees to determine whether AFL or ACA would represent them, the Board decided to split the company into seven bargaining units, one of which was the New York Metropolitan area where ACA was known to have strong support. While AFL was the winner by a large majority on a national basis, ACA won a majority vote in New York and thus, solely by reason of the NLRB decision, maintained its representation of some 5,000 employees in that area. The remaining 35,000 employees of this company are represented by AFL.

The split of the company into several bargaining units at the time, it should be emphasized, was utterly at variance with previous Board action with respect to bargaining practice in the industry. Collective bargaining in the telegraph industry had universally been carried on on a systemwide basis. In sharp contrast with its decision in the later Western Union case, the Board had held previously, on petition of ACA, that the former Postal Telegraph System constituted a single unit, and from 1938 until the merger in October 1943, bargaining in the Postal System was carried on with ACA as a single representative, on a systemwide basis.

We are happy that you and your committee associates have evidenced so clearly your recognition of the fact that the problem of subversion in industry is truly a national one, which cannot be solved by Western Union or any other industry acting alone. Industry must have the support and positive help of the Government and we are indeed grateful for your good efforts in this connection.

Very truly yours,

J. L. WILCOX, *Vice President.*

MR. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Saposs, in your capacity with the National Labor Relations Board are you able to give any comment on the situation that has just been described before you?

MR. SAPOSS. No; I am not familiar with that situation. That developed long after I had been connected with the Board.

MR. MORRIS. Well, I mean the situation that we described. I am not asking your experience about the particular situation, but about the position that this committee finds itself in when faced with this particular problem: namely, that a union is organized by people who have been shown to be Communists; and the question is whether or not they should be certified? I understand that you have done a lot of work along these lines, as to what unions should be certified and as to what unions should be disestablished. I wonder if you have any views on this situation?

MR. SAPOSS. Knowing the conspiratorial nature of Communists, and knowing the manner in which they inject themselves and infiltrate into unions for the purpose of sabotage and espionage, I believe this is an extremely serious case, and it seems to me there should be a way of acting to prevent them from carrying in their conspiratorial and espionage activities to the detriment of our country.

MR. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Saposs, you were an official of the Board when Witt and Smith were exerting an influence on the Board?

MR. SAPOSS. Yes, sir.

MR. MORRIS. Are you able to testify as to whether or not Edwin S. Smith and Nathan Witt were able to exercise a strong influence of the policies of the Board?

MR. SAPOSS. Well, Nathan Witt, first, as I mentioned, was the attorney of the Review Board, which was the unit which reviewed all cases and, of course, in reviewing cases, it was possible to interpret and analyze data.

Later on when he became Secretary, he was, of course, the executive office of the Board, which gave him full responsibility for the staff in the National Labor Relations Board, except the attorneys, and it gave him responsibility for the staff in the regions, the hiring of the regional directors, the hiring of the field examiners; again, everyone in the regional offices, except the attorneys.

In addition thereto, of course, all the routine work of the Board, such as, for instance, the assigning of the order in which cases were to be heard, the citing of how the material pertaining to particular cases was to be presented to the Board in executive session—all of that gravitated and was carried through the Secretary of the Board, and therefore, Nathan Witt, as Secretary of the Board, was undoubtedly the most influential person in the conduct of the affairs of the Board.

MR. MORRIS. Did Mr. Smith have an influential position on the Board?

MR. SAPOSS. Well, Edward Smith was a member of the Board, of course, and was always a very close, or sort of buddy or crony of

Nathan Witt, and, so far as I was able to observe, as the Chief Economist of the Board, they were the two people that evidently exercised the greatest influence.

Mr. Madden, the Chairman of the Board, seemed to be always preoccupied with the legal problems and legal principles of the Board, and paid very little attention to the administrative problems; so that in that case both Nathan Witt and Edwin Smith were in the position to actually run the Board.

Mr. MORRIS. And they did so?

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh, yes; no doubt about it. They enjoyed it.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you would just amplify a little more about the powers that Nathan Witt had at that time?

Mr. SAPOSS. Well, as I mentioned, he was able if any case came in—any case that came in, of course, came to him directly.

He was able to decide the order in which it was to appear. He was the one that presented a digest to the Board as to the issues in the case. He recommended to the Board what particular action should be taken, and so on, and in that way, of course, he had a tremendous influence; and also by appointing. You see, the civil service did not apply to the employees of the NLRB, and by appointing field examiners who were the ones, of course, who made the investigations, by appointing the regional directors, by controlling the staff at the national headquarters, he was, of course, in a position to exercise the greatest influence of anybody connected with the Board including the Board members.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Saposs, were you able to observe while you had this particular duty with the Board any Communist agitation?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes; there was, of course, constant agitation on the part of Communist-front organizations.

Mr. MORRIS. Can you remember any of the Communist fronts to which you refer?

Mr. SAPOSS. As I recall, it was the League for Peace and Democracy, and then there was the Women's—I forget the name of it—a women's organization.

Mr. MORRIS. Was it the League of Women Shoppers?

Mr. SAPOSS. League of Women Shoppers, the Washington Book Shop.

Petitions were always being circulated and donations were solicited in the Board during the office hours.

Mr. MORRIS. So the solicitations of these various organizations which have been listed by the Attorney General to be Communist organizations went on during office hours?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that done very frequently, Mr. Saposs?

Mr. SAPOSS. It was routine, I should say.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you think Mr. Witt and Mr. Smith, about whom we have been talking, knew about that?

Mr. SAPOSS. Oh, it was pretty generally understood that it was being done with their approval and support.

Mr. MORRIS. When you say it was generally understood, sir, you mean that there were conversations to that effect?

Mr. SAPOSS. The staff people knew that it was done with their support and approval, and were undoubtedly influenced in signing

petitions and making donations, were influenced because of the fact that these two people, who were influential people, approved of these activities.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Saposs, what was the role of Thomas I. Emerson at this time?

Mr. SAPOSS. He succeeded Nathan Witt as the head of the Review Division, and in that role was really responsible for hiring all the attorneys. Generally the practice was that the attorneys started in the Review Division and, after being there, they were assigned to other positions, either in the field, or to other positions within the Board. He was the key person in the hiring of attorneys. That was one of his responsibilities, in which he was in a position, of course, to exercise a great deal of influence.

The other one was the fact that the cases, after they were heard in the field and came to the Washington headquarters, were reviewed under his supervision, and in the important cases, of course, he always took a keen interest. So he was in a position to influence the reviews in all cases before they got to the Board.

Mr. MORRIS. Now did he generally share the outlook and the position that was held by Smith and Witt?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, he was pretty sympathetic to that role. He was, of course, a key member of the National Lawyers' Guild and was very active in it, and it was commonly understood insofar as the National Labor Relations Board was concerned, that he was of sort of a triumvirate, that it was Ed Smith and Nate Witt and Tom Emerson who were the triumvirate, and the key people who influenced the direction and activities and the hiring of staff within the Board.

Mr. MORRIS. And you were able to observe that they made up the triumvirate, on the basis of your long experience with the Board.

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now it is on that basis that you testify this morning?

Mr. SAPOSS. It is on the basis of my experience as chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board and, of course, I had an opportunity to be around and observe and learn.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you ever encounter in your official capacity, or were you ever in a position to observe in your official capacity any favoritism toward Harry Bridges' union by the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. SAPOSS. He was sort of regarded as a hero by these people. I remember Edwin Smith devoting a lot of time in trying to convince me that Harry Bridges was the greatest labor leader in the United States, and the general sentiment among those people was about the same.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you know a man named Allan Rosenberg?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. What was Allan Rosenberg's position?

Mr. SAPOSS. He was Nathan Witt's assistant, and a very energetic, dynamic, keen individual, who was sort of regarded as Nathan Witt's hatchetman.

Mr. MORRIS. Allan Rosenberg?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes, Allan Rosenberg.

Mr. MORRIS. I would like you to develop a little more, Mr. Saposs, the favoritism toward the Harry Bridges' union proposals, and the various labor situations that involved Bridges on the Pacific coast.

Mr. SAPOSS. The only specific situation that I can cite here is my function as the chief economist, which was to supervise the staff of people that did the economic research which was used in connection with the work of the Board, particularly in hearings.

When the longshoreman's case of the Pacific coast came up I was not asked to participate or prepare any economic data in that case.

However, when the record was presented, and I had an opportunity to investigate it, I was surprised that it was primarily a record of the economic history of labor relations and collective-bargaining procedures on the Pacific coast.

My surmise is that they deliberately kept me from preparing any of the material because by that time they knew what my point of view was and they knew what my general understanding was of the maneuvers, the manipulations of the Communists and the fellow travelers.

Mr. MORRIS. What position did you hold at this particular time?

Mr. SAPOSS. I was the chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. MORRIS. You were chief economist at that time?

Mr. SAPOSS. Presumably in charge of the preparation of all economic data that is to be used by the Board and particularly that was to be introduced into hearings, where records were made.

Mr. MORRIS. As a matter of fact, they actually accepted Bridges' recommendations at that time?

Mr. SAPOSS. You see, I was not in any of the hearings, and I was kept out of the case. My only knowledge is that this economic material that was introduced was not introduced through me as the regular official who was supposed to handle and introduce data of that kind.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Saposs, you are here in Washington, are you not?

Mr. SAPOSS. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. I think for the particular purpose of the hearing today, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Saposs has given his full testimony.

There is one other thing.

Was there a Miss Dubois? I do not have the first name.

Mr. SAPOSS. I don't recall the first name either. Dubois came into the picture in this manner:

Edwin Smith as one of the Board members, asked me to hire her as an economist on my staff. I asked what her qualification was and, as he put it in his own language, she was a "psychologist with a passion for economics."

I said that that hardly qualified her to be an economist in the Division of Economic Research, and I couldn't recommend that she be hired.

Shortly thereafter I had to leave Washington to act as an expert witness for the NLRB. I was gone about 3 weeks or a month. When I returned I found that Miss Dubois was on my staff, paid a salary higher than most of my staff members who were trained economists, and who were very good workers. I refused to give her any assignments, and refused to recognize her as an employee of the Economic Division, and went to Chairman Madden and told Chairman Madden that I would under no circumstances have her on my staff as an economist because she didn't qualify; that by keeping her on the staff as an economist and paying her a salary much higher than most of the competent economists that I had were receiving would demoralize the staff.

Chairman Madden then ordered her removed from my division which was, of course, my main concern. A day or two later Edwin Smith telephoned and asked me to come to his office, and he was very indignant, scolded me, and otherwise expressed great disapproval, why I didn't keep her on the staff. I listened, and when he was finished I got up and walked out. She later got a job at the CIO in the research department.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Mr. Mandel supply at this point in the record the proper name of the Miss Dubois we were talking about, lest there be any misunderstanding or wrong identity.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be done.

(Mr. Mandel, the research director, ascertained her name to be Marian.)

Mr. MORRIS. That is all, Mr. Saposs.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Saposs.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the next witnesses will relate to our educational hearings.

(Whereupon, at 11:15 a. m., the committee proceeded to further open session.)

INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT, AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:55 a. m., in room 318, Senate Office Building, Senator William E. Jenner (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jenner, Welker, McCarran, and Johnston.

Also present: Robert Morris, subcommittee counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Robert C. McManus, research analyst.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. MINS, would you be sworn to testify?

Mr. MINS. I shouldn't like to have photographs taken while I am testifying.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear that the testimony you will give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MINS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. If you want to take photographs, take them now, and do not interfere with the witness while he is testifying.

Mr. MINS. The lights will be off while I am testifying, I take it?

Mr. MORRIS. Is any light disturbing you?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You can use the lights on the committee or on the audience, just as long as you keep them off the witness.

**TESTIMONY OF LEONARD E. MINS, NEW YORK, N. Y., ACCOMPANIED
BY HIS ATTORNEY, SAMUEL P. SHAPIRO, NEW YORK, N. Y.**

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your full name for the reporter?

Mr. MINS. Leonard E. Mins, M-i-n-s.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you reside, Mr. Mins?

Mr. MINS. 130 West 57th Street, New York 19.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business or profession?

Mr. MINS. Playwright and translator.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that Mr. Mins is before the committee with his attorney.

I believe you have given your name in executive session, and it can be carried forward in open session. The attorney is Mr. Shapiro, of New York.

You may proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, you describe yourself as a playwright. What have you written, playwise?

Mr. MINS. I have been coauthor of a play, *Temper the Wind*, which was produced on Broadway in the season of 1946-47. It ran, I think, for 35 performances, or something of that sort.

I have adapted 4 or 5 plays by Viennese and German authors, none of which has been produced, although, if I am not mistaken, I received advances against production, which never came through.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. In what languages are you skilled?

Mr. MINS. I know French, German, and Russian.

Mr. MORRIS. How do you earn your livelihood at the present, Mr. Mins?

Mr. MINS. By translating.

Mr. MORRIS. For whom do you translate?

Mr. MINS. Various clients who want translations of a commercial or technical nature.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you would advise us as to who is your most important client? Who is the greatest source of your livelihood?

Mr. MINS. I cite my privilege under the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean that if you told us the principal source of your income at this time you would be putting into the public record here today evidence that would at least form a link in a chain of circumstances that would lead to your conviction, Mr. Mins?

Mr. MINS. I stand upon my previous answer to your question.

Mr. MORRIS. And you understand that that is the legal import of your refusing to answer here today?

Mr. MINS. I am not a lawyer, and I don't understand legal imports, Mr. Morris.

The CHAIRMAN. You have counsel with you, Mr. Mins.

Mr. MINS. He asked whether I understand it. My understanding is that I have the privilege of citing pertinent passages in the fifth amendment to any passages which I believe that they deserve the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. Let me also say that any time you want to consult your counsel, you may do so.

Mr. MINS. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. The committee would like to be sure that you understand the import of your invoking the fifth amendment, because it would not want you to invoke the fifth amendment without proper cause, and get yourself in legal difficulty.

Mr. MINS. Mr. Morris, I have done, as you may imagine, some homework, since I got your subpoena. This homework consisted largely of reading the test passages in the pertinent decisions and the like, in addition to the testimony of persons who did the invoking before your committee and other committees.

Mr. MORRIS. And you feel that you can legally invoke the rights as you did here today?

Mr. MINS. I believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Mins, you have worked for the Office of Strategic Services; have you not?

Mr. MINS. I have.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us the circumstances leading up to your retention by that organization?

Mr. MINS. I plead the privilege of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against themselves.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean that if you answered that question, describing to this committee the circumstances leading up to your becoming an official of the Office of Strategic Services, which was a wartime intelligence service of the United States Government, that you would be testifying against yourself?

Mr. MINS. Would you repeat that question?

(The record was read by the reporter.)

Mr. MINS. I stand by my previous answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you were, were you not, a research analyst, concerned with the collection and analysis of information from all sources on the Soviet Union for the Office of Strategic Services, Mr. Mins?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. MINS. I think that all questions connected with the nature of my work for OSS, the people I was in contact with during the performance of my duties for OSS, and all other information thereto pertaining, are covered by an agreement binding me to treat as an official secret all such matters, which I signed upon employment in OSS, and, if I am not mistaken, resigned upon termination.

I also believe that as an agency of the executive branch of the Government, my work in OSS is privileged, under the separation-of-powers clause of the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, this committee does not recognize the privilege under the separation-of-powers clause. We recognize your refusal to answer by involving the fifth amendment, that you are not required to give testimony against yourself.

Mr. MINS. I would like to ask you, Senator, does the committee recognize a binding agreement between a wartime agency of the United States Government and an employee, as binding thereafter for life?

The CHAIRMAN. No; because the information may be declassified and, if so, it is public information.

Mr. MINS. Under your ruling, Senator, therefore, I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee recognizes your refusal.

Mr. MINS. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. MINS, have you been in the service of the Soviet military intelligence?

Mr. MINS. My answer to that question is the invocation of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you at the present time in the service of the Soviet military intelligence?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the text of the fifth amendment as before.

Senator McCARRAN. At the time you were in the employ of the United States Government, were you employed by or in the Soviet military service?

Mr. MINS. Senator, I give you the answer you have reason to expect. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Senator McCARRAN. You are invoking that?

Mr. MINS. I am invoking it most specifically in the terms used in the Constitution.

Senator JOHNSTON. So you acknowledge that if you should answer the question that you were not a Communist when you were drawing pay from the Federal Government, that it might incriminate you?

Mr. MINS. Acknowledge what? Are you asking me a question?

Senator McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. MINS. I acknowledge nothing. I state merely for the record that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself. I am not a lawyer, and I am not a court, interpreting the Constitution. I am reading to you the text as I found it there.

Senator JOHNSTON. If you were not employed by some other government outside of the United States when you were drawing pay from the United States, how would that incriminate you?

Mr. MINS. Do I have to answer that, sir?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. MINS. My answer is the same as before, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself, as provided for in the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. You invoke the fifth amendment?

Mr. MINS. Precisely.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, did you not in the course of your duties with the OSS complete a survey on oil resources and oil production in a part of Asia, in connection with the strategic survey of that area that was being prepared by the Military Intelligence of the General Staff of the United States Army?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that the witness, before responding to the question, confers with his counsel.

Mr. MINS. I shall invoke the text of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, you are a teacher at the Workers' School, are you not?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment text, previously recited.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think our record amply shows that the Workers' School is a Communist training school here in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. It does.

Mr. MORRIS. You have been a writer for the New Masses, have you not, Mr. Mins?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. You have also worked for the International Union of Revolutionary Writers in Moscow, have you not.

Mr. MINS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment, as previously cited.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you also worked for the Power Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the same privilege, of the fifth amendment, previously cited.

Senator McCARRAN. Are you an American citizen?

Mr. MINS. Yes.

Senator McCARRAN. Where were you born?

Mr. MINS. Strange, isn't it? Yonkers, N. Y.

Senator McCARRAN. Where?

Mr. MINS. Yonkers, N. Y.

Senator McCARRAN. How old are you?

Mr. MINS. 53.

Mr. MORRIS. You are the brother, are you not, of Henry Felix Mins, Jr., a New York school teacher, who appeared before this committee last fall?

Mr. MINS. I am.

Mr. MORRIS. Was an iron shop operated by your father some years ago at 240 West 27th Street, and later at 339 West 24th Street, headquarters for the Communist Party of New York?

Mr. MINS. I invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a gentleman named Nicholas Dozenberg?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the same privilege previously cited.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you met Nicholas Dozenberg?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the same privilege previously cited.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you been, Mr. Mins, instrumental in introducing the Communist International Magazine to be published in the United States?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the same privilege of the fifth amendment, previously cited.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write a review of the Communist International Magazine in the Daily Worker of May 4, 1934?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the same privilege, of the fifth amendment, previously cited.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify that document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. I have here a photostat of the Daily Worker, May 4, 1934, page 5, containing an article entitled "C. I."—that being an abbreviation of Communist International—"C. I. Magazine to Be Published in the United States."

Reflects advances made by the Communist Party of United States during past year. Reviewed by Leonard Mins.

The CHAIRMAN. The article may go into the record and become a part of the record.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 237" and follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 237

[From the Daily Worker, New York, May 4, 1934]

C. I. MAGAZINE TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES

REFLECTS ADVANCES MADE BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF UNITED STATES DURING PAST YEAR

Reviewed by Leonard Mins

With the American publication of Nos. 2 and 3, volume II, the Communist International, official organ of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, enters upon a new phase in its expansion over all the world. The publishing of the C. I.

in this country marks a decisive step forward in the basic theoretical political education of the revolutionary working class in the United States and reflects the advances made by the Communist Party of the United States of America during the past year.

The Communist International now appears twice a month in English, Russian, German, French, Chinese, and Spanish; it is published in more different languages and at more widely distant points than any other journal in the world, as befits the organ of the international fighting working class.

The editorial in No. 2 reviews the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "the congress of victors, the congress of the construction of classless society." The magnificent achievements of the workers of the Soviet Union are graphically summarized in the fact that "on the eve of the first 5-year plan the U. S. S. R. occupied fifth place among the countries of the world. On the eve of the second 5-year plan, it had advanced to third place in the world and second place in Europe."

Comrade Stalin's analysis in discussing the revolutionary situation throughout the world is a timely admonition to the Communist Parties:

"A revolutionary crisis is maturing and will continue to mature. * * * But the victory of the revolution never comes by itself. It has to be prepared for and won. And only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare for and win victory."

An article on the revolutionary battles in Cuba gives a concise summary of political events in the Yankee semicolonies since the rise of the Grau-Batista government.

Once More About Work in the Reformist and Fascist Unions, by Comrade Piatnitsky of the ECCI, again raises the extremely vital question of the defects of Communist work in the labor unions. Taking concrete examples from the activities of the Swedish, Polish, German, and British Communist Parties, Piatnitsky points to the Communists' general failure to consolidate their gains made during the leadership of strikes—which is a major defect in our trade-union work in the United States as well.

The issue concludes with Comrade Earl Browder's speech at the 13th plenum of the ECCI, which should be read and studied for its cogent analysis of the New Deal and the problems facing the party in the months to come.

The leading article in No. 3 of the Communist International, by V. Knorin, an outstanding leader of the Communist Party in Germany, surveys the "Vanguard struggles of the second round of revolutions" signalized by the revolutionary events in France and Austria last February. What has happened in Vienna and in Paris is a timely object-lesson to the workers of the United States in their mobilization against the New Deal regime.

Fifteen Years of the Communist International, planned as theses for party instructors, is a very valuable and concise summary of the history of the international working class as reflected in the development of its world leadership, the Comintern. The colonial and national questions, trade-union work, the betrayal role of the Socialists, the rise of fascism, and the problems facing the Communist Party leading the proletariat toward Soviet power through revolutionary struggle are brilliantly analyzed in these theses issued by the Agitprop of the Comintern.

Comrade Rust, of the Central Committee of the CPGB, discusses the advance of communism in Great Britain during the past 15 years in his article on the problems of uniting all the revolutionary forces in Britain into a single, powerful, Communist Party. The lessons of the Communist work in England are of considerable importance for us in the United States.

The issue concludes with two valuable reports on the problems of provocateurs and illegality. Comrade Bronkovsky, of the Communist Party of Poland, discusses the recent exposure of agents-provocateur who had wormed their way into responsible posts within the Polish Party. The methods used by that party in disclosing and getting rid of these provocateurs within the ranks should be carefully studied by every party member here in the United States as a vital part of our constant, ever-vigilant efforts to keep the party ranks free of stool pigeons and police spies.

Comrade Richter furnishes another valuable article on Questions Arising in Communist Parties in Going Over to Illegality. He makes the experience of the German Communist Party in its transition from a legal mass party to a party working under difficult underground conditions against Fascist terror available to the brother Communist Parties throughout the world. With the growth of terroristic repression in the United States—see Imperial Valley, the Alabama

sharecroppers, and the general tightening of police measures against Communist activity—the party members must devote considerable study to the problems facing the party in building the apparatus and in the methods of work necessary for illegal activity.

At 10 cents per issue and \$2 for a year's subscription, the Communist International is indispensable for every class-conscious worker. It is imperative that every party organization, beginning with the factory nucleus, that all workers' schools, that every workers' club, make the Communist International a part of its regular periodical file for reading and study by its members. No proletarian library is complete without this important current survey of revolutionary problems and the work of the Communist Parties all over the world. Spread the Communist International, popularize its contents, organize discussion of the outstanding problems raised in each issue—make it part of our revolutionary life here in the United States.

Senator JOHNSTON. Are you the same Leonard Mins?

Mr. MINS. I plead the privilege of the fifth amendment, Senator. Did you hear me?

Senator JOHNSTON. You deny that you are Leonard Mins?

Mr. MINS. The name is Mins. I plead the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Senator McCARRAN. Do you deny that you are Leonard Mins; is that right?

Mr. MINS. I deny nothing, Senator. I state that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Senator McCARRAN. Did you not take an oath that you were Leonard Mins here?

Mr. MINS. I stated I am not denying Leonard Mins.

Senator McCARRAN. You are Leonard Mins?

Mr. MINS. Obviously. You are Senator McCarran.

Mr. MORRIS. The point is, Are you the Leonard Mins, though, who wrote the article in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MINS. It is to that that I am pleading the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the record is clear.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you read the first paragraph of that article?

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

With the American publication of Nos. 2 and 3, volume 11, the Communist International, official organ of the executive committee of the Comintern, enters upon a new phase in its expansion all over the world. The publishing of the Communist International in this country marks a decisive step forward in the basic theoretical political education of the revolutionary working class in the United States and reflects the advances made by the Communist Party of the United States during the past year.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, in your application for Federal employment, can you recall answering a question which read:

Did you advocate or have you ever advocated or are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?

Mr. MINS. I plead the privilege of the fifth amendment that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, do you recall ever having answered the question which I read? Do you feel that if you did recall answering that question, you would be testifying against yourself?

Mr. MINS. I have cited the privilege of the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. And you invoke that privilege to the question?

Mr. MINS. I invoke that privilege.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Shapiro, I offer you this document. Will you show it to the witness and ask him if that is his signature that appears thereon?

(Document handed to witness's counsel.)

Mr. MINS. Your question, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Is that your signature that appears on that document, Mr. Mins?

Mr. MINS. I plead the privilege of the fifth amendment, that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Shapiro.

Mr. SHAPIRO. You are welcome, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to the fact that question No. 17 is so worded and that Mr. Mins at that time answered the question "No," according to the document.

I would like the whole document to go into the record, Mr. Chairman. It contains much biographical detail. It gives Mr. Mins' references in connection with his application for employment with the OSS, and many other pertinent bits of information—

(Witness confers with counsel.)

that would be relevant to our inquiry.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that this is a sworn statement that Mr. Mins made on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The entire document will go into the record and become a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 238" and follows:)

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

12

82938

To U. S. Civil Service Commission

This space for U. S. Civil Service Commission

This space for applicant use

INSTRUCTIONS - Applicant must complete this application in duplicate. Type with care and legibility in black ink. Do not use correction fluid. If you are applying for a specific United States Civil Service Position, you must specify the position and the grade. If you are applying for a general position, you must specify the grade and the position. If you are applying for a position in the U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, you must specify the position and the grade. If you are applying for a position in the U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, you must specify the position and the grade. If you are applying for a position in the U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, you must specify the position and the grade.

1. Name of applicant (Last, first, middle initial)
 2. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 3. Present or former position (If former, specify date)

4. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 5. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 6. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 7. Date of this application
 8. Telephone number
 9. Residence phone
 10. Business phone
 11. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 12. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 13. Present or former position (If former, specify date)

14. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 15. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 16. Present or former position (If former, specify date)

17. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 18. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 19. Present or former position (If former, specify date)

20. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 21. Present or former position (If former, specify date)
 22. Present or former position (If former, specify date)

724549

This space for U. S. Civil Service Commission

<p>16. Do you have any other physical defect or disability which renders you unable to perform the duties of the position to which you have been appointed or to which you are being considered for appointment?</p> <p>17. Do you have any other physical defect or disability which renders you unable to perform the duties of the position to which you have been appointed or to which you are being considered for appointment?</p> <p>18. Have you ever been employed by the Federal Government?</p> <p>(a) If so, give the name of the Federal Government department, office, or position, and the dates of your employment.</p> <p>(b) If you have ever been employed, give dates, place, and position.</p>	<p>19. Have you ever been employed by the Federal Government?</p> <p>(a) If so, give the name of the Federal Government department, office, or position, and the dates of your employment.</p> <p>(b) If you have ever been employed, give dates, place, and position.</p>	<p>20. Have you ever been employed by the Federal Government?</p> <p>(a) If so, give the name of the Federal Government department, office, or position, and the dates of your employment.</p> <p>(b) If you have ever been employed, give dates, place, and position.</p>	<p>21. Have you ever been employed by the Federal Government?</p> <p>(a) If so, give the name of the Federal Government department, office, or position, and the dates of your employment.</p> <p>(b) If you have ever been employed, give dates, place, and position.</p>
<p>22. Have you ever been employed by the Federal Government?</p> <p>(a) If so, give the name of the Federal Government department, office, or position, and the dates of your employment.</p> <p>(b) If you have ever been employed, give dates, place, and position.</p>	<p>23. Have you ever been employed by the Federal Government?</p> <p>(a) If so, give the name of the Federal Government department, office, or position, and the dates of your employment.</p> <p>(b) If you have ever been employed, give dates, place, and position.</p>	<p>24. (a) Are you now a member of any branch of military or naval service?</p> <p>(b) Are you now a member of any other branch of the armed forces of the United States?</p> <p>(c) Are you now a member of any other branch of the armed forces of the United States?</p>	<p>25. (a) Are you now a member of any branch of military or naval service?</p> <p>(b) Are you now a member of any other branch of the armed forces of the United States?</p> <p>(c) Are you now a member of any other branch of the armed forces of the United States?</p>
<p>26. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>	<p>27. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>	<p>28. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>	<p>29. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>
<p>30. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>	<p>31. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>	<p>32. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>	<p>33. (a) Would you accept appointment anywhere offered in the United States?</p> <p>(b) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p> <p>(c) Would you accept appointment outside the United States?</p>

0-3089-1

Print or type your name here in Item 4

21. Have you made applications for any Federal civil service examination? (If so, list them below)

Leonard C. Mink

Title of organization

Rockwell International

Positions in what jobs

Asst. Dir. of Tech. Serv.

Acad. and prof. ratings

Asst. Dir. of Tech. Serv.

Years

1954-1958

22. Have you passed any State or other civil service examination (other than the above) within the last 5 years? (Also give details under Item 21)

23. EDUCATION: (a) Circle highest grade completed, (b) Is a utility or high school, (c) 1-5, 6-9, 10-11, 12. Did you attend?

Name and location of school

(b) College of University of Maryland at College Park, Md.
 Catholic University, Washington, D.C.
 High School of Easton, Md.

Date attended

From

To

Year completed

Day

Month

Progress toward

Other

Grade

Year

(c) Other

(d) List your first three undergraduate subjects

Physics
 Chemistry
 Mathematics

Consider as

List your highest graduate subject

Year

<p>Place <u>New York</u></p> <p>From <u>May 19 1936</u></p> <p>Name of employer <u>Director of Army</u></p> <p>Address <u>Washington</u></p> <p>Kind of business or organization <u>Army</u></p> <p>Name and title of your immediate supervisor <u>Mr. E. A. Tamm</u></p> <p>Number and class of employees and supervised <u>1000</u></p> <p>Place for leaving <u>Washington</u></p>	<p>Expected year of return</p> <p>Duties and responsibilities</p> <p>Mechanisms of loyalty</p>
<p>Place <u>New York</u></p> <p>From <u>May 19 1936</u></p> <p>Name of employer <u>American Tel. & Tel. Co.</u></p> <p>Address <u>175 Broadway, N. Y. C.</u></p> <p>Kind of business or organization <u>Bell Telephone Sys.</u></p> <p>Name and title of your immediate supervisor <u>Chief Inspector of Research</u></p> <p>Number and class of employees you supervise <u>1000</u></p>	<p>Expected year of return</p> <p>Duties and responsibilities</p> <p>Mechanisms of loyalty</p> <p>Place and report</p>

If you agree to contribute to Confidentiality Sheet (Standard Form 50) on a sheet of paper size 8 x 10 1/2 inches. Write on each sheet your name, full address, date of birth, and participation (if applicable). Process unattached with application.

Leonard E. Mins, 2200 R St., N.W., Wash. D. C. born March 1, 1873

Place Berlin, Germany

From Oct 1926 to ^{July} 1927

Exact title of your position: English publications editor

Salary: Starting: \$300.00 Per mo. Finally \$200.00

Name of employer: German State Railways Duties & responsibilities: Editor of English publications

Address: Berlin, Germany Kirchplatz

Kind of business or organization: Reich railway system

Number & class of employees you supervised: none

Name & title of your immediate supervisor: no name

Machines & equipment you used:

Reason for leaving: No opportunity to advance

Place of birth: _____ Salary: _____
 Starting: _____
 From Apr 1941 to 1942 Per: Final

Exact title of your position: _____
 Duties & responsibilities: _____

Name of employer: General
 Address: 1041 Schenck St. Philadelphia Pa.
19107

Kind of business or organization: General
Administration of the

Number & class of employees you supervised: 17

Name & title of your immediate supervisor: _____

Reason for leaving: _____

Leonard E. M... 2200 K St., Wash., D.C. born Jan. 20, 1900

Place New York, N.Y. Exact title of your position Chief Clerk Salary: Starting \$7 Per wk Final \$45

From 1921 to 1921

Name of employer Mrs. Henry

Address: 37 West 24 St., N.Y.

Kind of business or organization: Administrative

Number & class of employees you supervised: 7 members

Name & Title of your immediate supervisor: Mr. ...

Machines & equipment you used: None

Reason for leaving: ...

Place
Exact title of your position
Salary:
Starting: \$
Per Annum: \$

From 19__ to 19__

Name of employer:
Duties & responsibilities:

Address:

Kind of business or organization:

Number & class of employees
you supervised:

Name & title of your immediate supervisor:
Machines & equipment you used:

Reason for leaving:

Place *Printer's Shop* Exact title of your position: *None* Salary *thruout*
 Starting *to* For *Final*

From *Feb 1919* to, 19*23*

Name of employer: *Henry F. Hines & Co.* Duties & responsibilities: *Supervisor of the management*
 Address: *240 West 125th Street* *Printer's Shop, and business*
by father in training

Kind of business or organization:

Printers & bookmaker

Number & class of employees you supervised: *None*

Name & Title of your immediate supervisor:

Henry F. Hines, Proprietor

Machines & equipment you used:

usual machine tools: galleys, rollers, galleys, platters, printers, galleys, etc

Reason for leaving:

PC order airplane

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, you translated a volume called *Electric Power Development* in the U. S. S. R., did you not?

Mr. MINS. No person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself. I, therefore, invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. That is put out by the U. S. S. R. Committee for International Scientific and Technical Conferences, is it not?

Mr. MINS. Same answer, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Where were you when you translated this book, Mr. Mins?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the same privilege cited before.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, I wonder if you would tell us on how many occasions you have been to Moscow?

Mr. MINS. I shall read you a text. No person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself, a privilege granted me by the fifth amendment, which I hereby invoke.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder, Mr. Mins, if you would describe to this committee your experiences with Soviet military authorities in the United States and abroad?

Mr. MINS. I cite the privilege of the fifth amendment—that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

The CHAIRMAN. And you invoke that privilege?

Mr. MINS. I invoke that privilege. I am sorry I left the words out.

Mr. MORRIS. In the United States you have worked for aircraft companies, have you not?

Mr. MINS. I cite the privilege of the fifth amendment—that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself—and I invoke that privilege.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean that if you told us whether or not you worked for the Standard Aircraft and the Wright-Martin Aircraft Corp., which facts you have put on your application for employment, that would be testifying against yourself?

Mr. MINS. I cite the privilege of the fifth amendment and invoke the previously cited privilege.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, when you made out this application for Federal employment on the 8th day of January in 1943, were you telling the truth to the United States Government?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment—that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself.

Mr. MORRIS. Is your wife Ann G. Mins?

Mr. MINS. My wife is Ann G. Mins; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Was she born Baumberger?

Mr. MINS. She was.

Mr. MORRIS. Has she been a New York schoolteacher?

Mr. MINS. She has.

Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge, has she been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MINS. Same answer: No person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself, a privilege that I invoke herewith.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mins, how many members of your family have been schoolteachers?

Mr. MINS. One—my immediate family?

Mr. MORRIS. First your brothers and sisters.

Mr. MINS. My brother and my two sisters.

Mr. MORRIS. Your brother, Henry George Mins?

Mr. MINS. And my two sisters.

Mr. MORRIS. Identify them, please?

Mr. MINS. Helen Ann Mins, now Helen Ann Mins Robbins, and Sophie Evelyn Mins, now Sophie Evelyn Finger.

Mr. MORRIS. Does either of them still teach?

Mr. MINS. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, your wife has been a teacher. Has any of your brothers-in-law or sisters-in-law been a teacher?

Mr. MINS. Yes. I am sorry—my brother's wife was a teacher.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever met in Communist Party meetings with those people?

Mr. MINS. I invoke the privilege of the fifth amendment, previously cited.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I think, in view of the answers given by this witness, that I would refrain from asking any further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

If not, you will be excused.

Mr. MINS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Wuchinick.

(The following document was ordered printed at this point by the chairman:)

EXHIBIT No. 239

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SERVICE RECORD DIVISION

WASHINGTON 25, D. C., June 5, 1953.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL SERVICE

Notice to individuals.—This record should be preserved. Additional copies of service histories cannot be furnished due to limited personnel in the Commission. This record may be presented to appointing officers for their inspection.

Name: Mins, Leonard E.

Date of birth: 1-20-00.

Authority for original appointment (Examination from which appointed or other authority—Executive Order, Law, or other exemption): Excepted—Title 2, U. S. Code 140.

Effective date	Nature of action	Position, grade, salary, etc.
Apr. 22, 1942	Temporary Appointment.....	Social Science Analyst, \$3,500 per annum, Library of Congress, Division of Special Information, Washington, D. C.
July 1, 1942	Appointment made indefinite.....	
July 1, 1943	Leave without pay.....	

Above record by telephone—Library of Congress, Mar. 1, 1944.

A. M. DEEM,
Chief, Audit Section.

The above transcript of service history does not include salary changes, intra-agency transfers within an organizational unit not involving changes from one official headquarters or duty station to another, and promotions or demotions, since Federal agencies are not required to report such actions to the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you be sworn to testify? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I do.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE S. WUCHINICH, MALVERNE, N. Y., ACCOMPANIED BY JOSEPH FORER, ATTORNEY AT LAW, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. You may be seated. Will you state your full name to the reporter?

Mr. WUCHINICH. My name is George S. Wuchinich.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you spell that for the reporter, please?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I should, that's right, counsel, W-u-c-h-i-n-i-c-h.

Mr. MORRIS. Where do you reside, Mr. Wuchinich?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Malverne, N. Y.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your precise address?

Mr. WUCHINICH. 12 Clarkson Street.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Wuchinich, what is your present occupation?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Well, Mr. Morris, I have a good answer for that because my occupation over the last 30 years, and it involves my present, has been that of clerk, typist, stenographer, credit manager, export manager, salesman; I have been trained as an engineer; I have been a spy for the United States Government; I have been a paratrooper; I have been a swimmer; I have been everything that my country wanted me to be, but one thing I have been that's common to everybody: I have been unemployed, too, and have been unemployed at a time when I think that most of the American people didn't like that occupation.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer the question? What is your present occupation?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Gentlemen, why do you want to know where I work?

Senator McCARRAN. What is your present occupation?

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer the question?

Mr. WUCHINICH. You follow the pattern of blacklisting people, getting them out of jobs. Why do you bring me here? I don't know. But I'll tell you this much, Senator Jenner: I refuse to give that answer under my privilege of the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Senator Jenner, that question has become the laughing stock of the world. Here is—

Senator McCARRAN. Answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. You can answer the question. Are you a member or are you not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Senator Jenner, you brought me here. I don't know why. I'll give the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer the question?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I'll give the answer; yes, but I'll take my time because I'm a citizen. You must remember that flag stands behind me that stands behind you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are here to elicit information. This is a duly constituted committee of this Congress. You are here to answer questions and give information.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I will give you my answer—

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I refuse to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment which is not to bear witness against myself.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You may have some idea why you are here now. Proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Wuchinich, you have been an official of the Office of Strategic Services, the wartime intelligence service of the United States, have you not?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Indeed, and I am very proud of it. I think I did more than you, counsel, for the defense of my country. You may have a paratrooper haircut, but I don't believe you earned it. I have worn this haircut for 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. We will strike that voluntary statement of the witness from the record. It is not responsive to the question. Proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. WUCHINICH. Indeed it is.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Wuchinich, were you a member of the Communist Party while you were an officer of the OSS?

Mr. WUCHINICH. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a member of the Communist Party prior to the time you became associated with the OSS?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I refuse to answer that question under the same reasons that I gave before.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you rejoin the Communist Party after you left OSS?

Mr. WUCHINICH. You guys must be awful afraid.

Senator McCARRAN. Answer the question.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Senator McCARRAN. What reason?

Mr. WUCHINICH. The fifth amendment, which my ancestors, myself as one of them, fought to defend, the Bill of Rights, which we need more in this world in our country.

Senator JOHNSTON. Do you consider yourself a true American?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I consider myself a true American, indeed I do. Let me answer that question. You asked me. I'll give you the answer and right from the heart. I have here when General Eisenhower was head of the ETO, I have here a general order and I will read it to you and I want it in the record. This is the award of the Distinguished Service Cross via my country to me, so that I sacrificed, if I had to, my life, and here's how it reads. I'm a little nervous and I'll stand up. I feel better standing up.

Award of the Distinguished Service Cross—

Take this down clearly, Mr. Reporter.

By direction of the President, 8th of November, 1944—

at a time when I believe Senator McCarthy got out of the Army. I still was in until 1946.

Under the direction of the Army regulation 60045, as amended, the Distinguished Service Cross was awarded by the theater commander to the following-named officer: George S. Wuchinich—

That's me, ladies and gentlemen, and you schoolchildren too, look good, that's me.

O519816, captain, then first lieutenant, First AUS—

which means Army of the United States—

Company B, 2677th Regiment, Office of Strategic Services, for extraordinary heroism—

people—

in connection with secret military operations in the Balkans against an armed enemy during the period of November 28, 1943, to July 26, 1944. Captain Wuchinich's descent by parachute into enemy-occupied territory, his leadership and his resolute conduct in the face of great peril throughout the extended period in the successful accomplishment of an extremely hazardous and difficult mission exemplified the finest traditions of the Armed Forces of the United States.

That's why I say that flag should be beside me, but that isn't all.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WUCHINICH. I'll answer this question.

Mr. MORRIS. I think this man has spoken enough.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I'm a citizen. I was called here. The question was asked.

The CHAIRMAN. It may go in the record and now will you be seated? Let us have a little decorum here.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I have some more in the Office of Strategic Services.

The CHAIRMAN. You can put it all in, but I will ask you this question: At the time you received the award, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WUCHINICH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; now be seated, please.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, there has been testimony before another committee that this gentleman has been a member of the Communist Party in Pennsylvania and a close associate of Steve Nelson. I would like to ask this witness about that testimony.

Do you know a man named Steve Nelson?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I know many people.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Steve Nelson?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I know many people all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer the question, please, Mr. Witness?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Do you want to tighten the screws on everybody?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a very simple question: Do you know a man by the name of Steve Nelson?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Lots of them sometimes, but not in this court.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not a court.

Mr. WUCHINICH. All right; in the committee room.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer the question: Do you know Steve Nelson?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I refuse to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment, which is not to bear witness against myself. Why don't you ask me if I know Mr. Morris?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Mr. Morris?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I wouldn't be proud to know him.

The CHAIRMAN. However, you do not use the fifth amendment to refuse to answer that you do not know him, do you?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Why should I? He's trying to destroy us. He's trying to destroy of the Bill of Rights. I'm defending it. I gave—not one of you gentlemen offered your life for your country to do the service that I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you be seated, please?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Wuchinich, would you tell the committee about this service that you rendered? You were liaison with the Tito Communist forces in Yugoslavia, were you not? Was that the nature of your service?

Mr. WUCHINICH. If you gentlemen—you are asking the question. I'll answer it, but I must insist on a fair hearing, the system of American fair play, and I will tell you about the Office of Strategic Services.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

Mr. WUCHINICH. He's asking me. I can't answer—

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question, please, Mr. Reporter.

(The record was then read by the reporter as follows:)

Would you tell the committee about this service that you rendered? You were liaison with the Tito Communist forces in Yugoslavia—

Mr. WUCHINICH. There are two questions there: Would I tell about the service I rendered to my country? The second question: Did I perform liaison service?

The CHAIRMAN. Strike the first question. Will you answer the second question?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I want to answer the first question.

The CHAIRMAN. We will get all the answers if you just cooperate with the committee. Were you sent here by the Communists to carry on this tirade about this committee?

Mr. WUCHINICH. No, sir; I am an irate citizen, married, and have three children.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I refuse to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then were you sent here to carry on this tirade before this committee?

Mr. WUCHINICH. No, sir; I wasn't.

The CHAIRMAN. Then please answer the question.

Mr. WUCHINICH. But I feel about this: No man risks his life the way I am.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sick of that. Many millions of men risked their lives and they can come before this committee and answer the question as to whether or not they were a member of the Communist Party. Let me remind you that Benedict Arnold was also a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. WUCHINICH. You are implying I am a traitor.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not implying anything. Answer the question.

Mr. WUCHINICH. Do you go to the VA hospital? Were you operated on? Do you have fevers? You look pretty healthy to me. You say you're sick. I'm a sick man. I'm a disabled veteran and I have more scars on me from operations than probably you have.

The CHAIRMAN. We want the questions answered, sir.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I'll answer your accusation just as you have to me. I am not Benedict Arnold.

Senator JOHNSTON. Did the Russians put any scars on you?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I beg your pardon?

Senator JOHNSTON. You have never fought the Russians, have you?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Fought the Russians?

Senator JOHNSTON. Fought their system of government or anything else?

Mr. WUCHINICH. No; I haven't fought there, too.

Senator JOHNSTON. You have not fought their way of living either, have you?

Mr. WUCHINICH. I don't know about Russia. I know about my own country, and it's a mighty shame that a man like me has to be brought here and crucified in the press and everything. Why, you're stealers of bread from children. I have three kids.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Wuchinich—

Mr. WUCHINICH. That's what you are.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you answer the question, please? The question was put to you: Were you a liaison with the Communist Tito forces in connection with your work in OSS?

Mr. WUCHINICH. My government instructed me to lead the first American independent intelligence mission to Europe almost a year before D-day, and in those instructions I was told to make contact with the resistant forces in northern Yugoslavia, and from the size of you, I don't think you could go through a door. You couldn't go on a parachute. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. You will strike the last part of the voluntary statement of the witness. Please respond to the question.

Mr. WUCHINICH. I'm excited. Who wouldn't be?

Mr. MORRIS. In connection with your OSS duties, were you also sent as liaison with the Chinese Communists in north China?

Mr. WUCHINICH. When I returned from Yugoslavia, I was secretly flown out. My country asked me if I would volunteer. Remember, I was 35 years of age, had defective vision. The Army wouldn't accept me for combat service, but OSS did, and then I volunteered again for China, but I didn't specify that I should go to the Communists or the Nationalists or to anyone. I said I wanted to finish the job, and that was in November 1945, and I didn't get out until 1946 from Fort Belvoir Regional Army Hospital. I volunteered twice for my country, and I have nothing but the defense of her interests.

Senator McCARRAN. Could we have the answer read back?

Mr. MORRIS. You did contact the Chinese Communists?

Mr. WUCHINICH. Got the second question. No, on that, I was given in China the assignment to proceed to north China to the Province of Shansi to make contact with Marshal Yen—I believe he is the infamous guy in the book, I don't know, Bitter Tea of General Yen, something like, that highly romantic god, but in the process to go north and to secure all intelligence that I could that was to the best interests of the American people, and in the process of that, I didn't make contact with the Chinese Communists as a mission. I was actually saved in a battle in the Chinese temple far north where there were no white men around, and it so happened that in the midst of this battle when I was getting my radio set ready to send a message to headquarters, that we were surrounded in a battle between the Communists, the Nationalists, the puppets, the Ming-Bins, the militia, who the devil knows. All the devil knows I had four guys. The war was over by August 15, and here we were in the midst of the battle.

The Communists won that battle and, in the process, discovered that we were in the temple and took us along with them. That's how contact was made, if you want to call it such. I say if the other side had won, I probably would have been a dead Joe by then.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions to ask of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

You will be excused.

(The document requested printed by Mr. Wuchinich is as follows:)

[ARMY SEAL]

GEORGE S. WUCHINICH: To you who answered the call of your country and served in its Armed Forces to bring about the total defeat of the enemy, I extend the heartfelt thanks of a grateful Nation. As one of the Nation's finest you undertook the most severe task one can be called upon to perform. Because you demonstrated the fortitude, resourcefulness, and calm judgment necessary to carry out that task, we now look to you for leadership and example in further exalting our country in peace.

(Signed) HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Call the next witness.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Charles Coe is the next witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Coe, will you be sworn to testify? Do you swear that the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COE. That's right.

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES J. (ROBERT) COE, BROOKLYN, N. Y., ACCOMPANIED BY ISIDORE G. NEEDLEMAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW, NEW YORK, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your full name to the reporter?

Mr. COE. Charles J. Coe.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you reside, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. Well, I would like to—I gave that in executive session. I would like to be excused from giving the address here because I had a broadcast, nationwide broadcast, threatening me with being shot. There have been incidents around the house which therefore move me to ask that the address be skipped.

The CHAIRMAN. We have it in the executive session. I withdraw the question.

Mr. COE. I could state then, if you want to have it in, but if you ask that the press be notified that I am not a fugitive and was not under subpoena, then I will give the address.

The CHAIRMAN. I withdraw the question. You may proceed, Mr. Morris, with the questioning of the witness.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your present occupation, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. I am a writer and do research.

Mr. MORRIS. For whom do you work, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer that question on the basis that it might be self-incriminating.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean if you told this committee the source of your livelihood at the present time, you would be incriminating yourself?

Mr. COE. Well, Mr. Morris, I have heard you draw that inference—

Mr. MORRIS. You used the language.

Mr. COE. I did not use that language, Mr. Morris, and if I might answer the question, I say that this fifth amendment has a long his-

tory, of which I am sure that you as a lawyer are familiar with, and that instead of drawing inferences when a witness uses it, that the use of the fifth amendment in our courts through our American history is such that no inference should be drawn, and in view of the fact that the Senators here have sworn to uphold the Constitution, it seems to me grossly unfair that every time a witness avails himself of the fifth amendment that he should be castigated and bullied and bulldozed, as has been the case here.

Mr. MORRIS. Has anyone bulldozed you here today, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. Yes, you are doing it right now.

Mr. MORRIS. I am doing that now?

Mr. COE. In my opinion, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have——

Mr. COE. Might I ask, by the way, that these bright lights be turned aside? It's hard to testify.

The CHAIRMAN. Keep the cameras off of the witness.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Coe, you are also known as Bob Coe, are you not?

Mr. COE. That's a nickname I have had since childhood.

Mr. MORRIS. And you are brother of Frank Coe?

Mr. COE. That's correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have testimony before this committee in executive session that this witness here today was a member of a Communist cell in Washington back in the early thirties at a time when the Communist organization that has succeeded in penetrating the Government was having its start. The testimony was to the effect that this gentleman, Harold Ware, John Herman, Eleanor Nelson, Henry Rhine, Jessica Buck, Bob Coe, Victor Perlo, George Silverman, and Henry Collins were active in a cell that had penetrated the Government in the early 1940's, and the witness has been asked here today to answer whether or not that is accurate testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a member of a Communist cell in Washington in the early 1930's?

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. You may at any time.

Mr. COE (after conferring with counsel). Under the fifth amendment, the witness declines to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. From what university did you graduate, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. University of Chicago.

Mr. MORRIS. In what year?

Mr. COE. Well, I didn't bring my class certificates with me. I was served with a blank subpoena and I didn't know that this was material for internal security.

Mr. MORRIS. Very many people know the year of their graduation from university and I presumed you would know it.

Mr. COE. I would be apprehensive of giving an answer to this committee without checking the facts very carefully at any time. I'm sure you want the facts.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever been a member of any faculty at any time? Did you teach at any university?

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel on that?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. MORRIS. That question, for your information, is addressed to teaching on a recognized faculty in the United States.

Mr. COE. Well, could the counsel be more specific?

Mr. MORRIS. Were you on the faculty of Brown University for a period of time?

Mr. COE. I don't know whether it could be considered on the faculty. I believe I had a teaching fellowship or assistantship of some sort there.

Mr. MORRIS. When was that, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. Again, I didn't check the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you please tell us approximately?

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately.

Mr. COE. I'm sure it's probably more than 20 years or so ago.

The CHAIRMAN. How long were you there?

Mr. COE. Again, I haven't looked into it and I would hesitate—

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately; a year, 2 years?

Mr. COE. I would hesitate to give a flat answer, set a date which I haven't refreshed my memory on, but I believe again that same 20 years ago it might have been a matter of a year and a half or 2 years, or something of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Coe, do you recall that in 1932 a special delegation arrived in the United States from Moscow to start activities among farmers and among rural districts in the United States, this delegation being made up of a man named Otto Ostram, Henry Puro, Lem Harris, Jerome Hellerstein, John Barnett, and Harold Ware? Do you recall such a delegation?

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

Mr. COE (after conferring with counsel). Under the fifth amendment, I would decline to answer that on the basis that it might tend to be self-incriminating.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a man named Otto Ostram, O-s-t-r-a-m?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Henry Puro, P-u-r-o?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Lem Harris?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Jerome Hellerstein?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Harold Ware?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You have been associated for many years with an organization called Farmer Research, Inc., have you not?

Mr. COE. Again I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You are presently associated with Farmer Research, are you not?

Mr. COE. I thought I made it clear, I tried to, but I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You have presently an office at 39 Cortlandt Street, do you not?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Is not 39 Cortlandt Street, headquarters of Farm Research, Inc.?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know in connection with this Farm Research, Inc., a gentleman named Webster Powell?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Lillian Gales, G-a-l-e-s?

Mr. COE. I decline again to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Jerry Ingersoll?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. And Charles Garland. Did you know Charles Garland?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write a publication, Farmers, in 1944, by Charles J. Coe, editor of Facts for Farmers?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write a pamphlet called Food Now or Coffins Later, by Charles J. Coe?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may so much of these pamphlets go into the record as may be pertinent to our inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. They will go in the record and become a part of the record.

(The information referred to was marked "Exhibits 240 and 241" and follow:)

EXHIBIT No. 240

FARMERS IN 1944

By Charles J. Coe, editor, Facts for Farmers

NEW YORK ; FARM RESEARCH, INC

Published by Farm Research, 39 Cortlandt Street, New York 7, N. Y., March, 1944. Printed in U.S.A.

EXHIBIT No. 241

FOOD NOW OR COFFINS LATER

THE MEANING OF THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

By Charles J. Coe

CONTENTS

I. World Food Crisis

II. Is Food Being Used as a Political Weapon?

III. America Wants No Betrayal of the Peace

Published by Farm Research, 39 Cortlandt Street, New York 7, N. Y., July 1946. Printed in U. S. A.

AUTHOR AND PAMPHLET

Charles J. Coe, the author of this pamphlet, is one of the foremost authorities in the U. S. A. on agrarian problems. President of Farm Research, Inc., and editor of Facts for Farmers, his background includes several years as Fellow of the Brookings Institution and teacher of economics at Brown University. He has written and lectured extensively on farmers and their problems, and has won wide recognition as a distinguished specialist in this field.

Here are some comments on his newest pamphlet, *Food Now or Coffins Later*: "Lifts the curtain on the use of hunger as a political weapon. The same selfish forces that are writing this hunger policy abroad and are trying to lose the peace are also responsible for the artificial food shortages and price-gouging at home.—CEDRIC FOWLER, Editor of *FTA News*, published by the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union, C. I. O.

"*Food Now or Coffins Later* is the best analysis of the world food situation that I have yet seen. This pamphlet reveals the historical facts behind the curtain of lies and confusion used by reactionary politicians and monopolies. It should be read by every farmer in America who is interested in winning the peace of the world."—FRANCES LEBER, Director of Education, Eastern Division of the Farmers Union.

"*Food Now or Coffins Later* should serve the American people as a guide to action for achieving long lasting world peace through plenty."—MEYER E. STERN, District Director, District 6, Packinghouse Workers Union, C. I. O.

"This pamphlet plows deep into the serious question of food and famine. It should be read by every farmer in the U. S. A."—HOMER AYERS, Farm Relations Director, United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, C. I. O.

For additional copies and more information, write to: Farm Research, Inc., 39 Cortlandt Street, New York 7, N. Y.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you written under the name of Robert Digby?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer under the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write an article in the *Communist*, the official organ of the Communist Party, in August 1942, page 620, under the name of Robert Digby?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Another such article, October 1943, page 934?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer under the basis of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever written under that name for *Political Affairs*, a publication of the Communist Party of the United States, in February 1945?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. February 1946?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. February 1947?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. January 1948?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. For the *Daily Worker*, September 27, 1942, page 9?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. December 17, 1944, page 4?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. September 2, 1945?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. February 19, 1950?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you in charge of farmwork for the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

Mr. COE. (After conferring with counsel). Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. In connection with your work with *Farmer Research*, have you received subsidies from the Communist Party?

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel on that?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

Mr. COE (after conferring with counsel). Could you repeat that question?

Mr. MORRIS. Will you read that?

(The pending question was then read by the reporter.)

The CHAIRMAN. Farmer Research, Inc.

Mr. COE. I thought I made it clear that everything that concerned my relationship with an organization that you mentioned, I am declining to answer on the grounds under the fifth amendment, it might tend to be incriminating and similarly to this question. Therefore, I must decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you met in secret session of the Communist Party with the following Communist Party officials: Isidore Begun?

Mr. COE. Again, I decline to answer—

Mr. MORRIS. Max Weiss?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Bill Norman?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Henry Winston?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Robert Hall?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Doxey Wilkerson?

Mr. COE. Same answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you been connected with a publication called Facts for Farmers, Inc., Washington, D. C.?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with a gentleman named Max Lowenthal?

Mr. COE. I was asked that at the executive session. I think I said I did know of a clothing outfit by that name, but I declined to answer when it was made clear that the Max Lowenthal that you were asking about was a Government employee at some time.

The CHAIRMAN. You decline to answer under the fifth amendment?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you been the recipient of any of the proceeds of the so-called Garland fund?

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. You may consult counsel.

Mr. COE (after conferring with counsel). If you are talking about me personally, the answer is "No".

Mr. MORRIS. Well, your organization, Farmer Research, Inc.?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. And the same question addressed to the proceeds of the Robert Marshall fund?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Archie Wright?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a man named Meyer Parodneck?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge, has either one of those two gentlemen been associated with farmwork?

Meyer Parodneck is an attorney, is he not, specializing in farm-work?

The CHAIRMAN. You may consult your counsel.

Mr. COE. (after conferring with counsel). Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Senator McCARRAN. What was that last answer?

(The answer was then read by the reporter.)

Mr. MORRIS. In connection with the question addressed to you, Mr. Coe, about your being a secret member of the cell, a Communist cell in Washington in the early thirties, which proved to be the genesis of the Communist infiltration of government, I think we asked you whether or not you were a member of the cell and met with members of the government who were members of the Communist Party at that time and I think you refused to answer that question on your constitutional privilege; is that not right, Mr. Coe?

Mr. COE. Could I consult with counsel on that?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

Mr. COE (after conferring with counsel). The answer, I believe, was given before that, under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you employed by the United States Government during that period?

Senator McCARRAN. What period?

Mr. MORRIS. That is the early 1930's, Senator.

Mr. COE. I believe that for a few months I had a Government job which involved NRA codes, classifying them or something of that sort.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist at that time?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you identify this particular document, please?

Mr. MANDEL. This is photostat of the Daily Worker for October 29, 1942, page 4, which contains an article entitled "Farmers Do Wonders, But Planning Needed," by Bob Digby.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write that article?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It may go in the record and become a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "exhibit No. 242" and follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 242

[From the Daily Worker, New York, October 29, 1942]

FARMERS DO WONDERS, BUT PLANNING NEEDED

By Bob Digby (Special to the Daily Worker)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 28. —"The farmers have done a magnificent job of food production this year," declared Secretary of Agriculture Wickard as he paid tribute to the farmers for having broken all food records previously established. "It looked like a superhuman assignment to set a new record for the third year in a row," he said in commenting upon the 6 percent increase in farm production which the Department of Agriculture had set as the national goal after Pearl Harbor.

Originally, food goals called for an increase of only 3 percent over 1941, but these goals were later advanced to the 6 percent mark. Despite considerable doubt over the possibility of achieving these goals, the reports now show that

farmers have produced a total output of 10 percent more than the 1941 volume. This is 27 percent greater than the average for the years 1935-39.

Secretary Wickard pointed out that favorable weather and other conditions had much to do with the victory crops that were harvested this year and warned against any complacent attitude toward the problems of 1943. He stated:

"Farmers have produced a record crop this year, but it would be foolhardy to assume complacently that this production can be repeated again next year. The very abundance of our production this year is lulling some people into a feeling of false security. It is because this danger exists that I feel so strongly that our 1943 requirement must be carefully planned now."

SEEK NEW BOOSTS

Farm goals have not yet been announced for 1943, but the Department of Agriculture has already said that increases would be asked for all products except wheat and cotton. Farmers face the problem of achieving this task with less manpower and less machinery than in 1942.

Much of the work on this year's crop was done before Pearl Harbor, and most of it was done before the manpower crisis became acute. With 7½ million men scheduled to take up arms this year and with war plants looking for new sources of recruitment, the drain upon agricultural manpower is expected to become more serious in the months ahead.

Yesterday the press announced that the War Manpower Commission has developed a program for freezing farm labor. While this may help, particularly as regards the draft, there is danger that, without an overall manpower plan covering all phases of the problem, the farmers may have the same experience as in copper mining. Labor-freezing there has resulted in some places in making the job unattractive to new workers.

CENTRAL PLANNING

In its most recent report, the Tolan committee scored "the conflicting orders and demands emanating from Washington" and expressed its sympathy for the plight of local draft boards. It stressed the need for central planning and placed the blame for confusion on "the absence of any responsible central authority for determining how the requirements of this mass army and of the industrial army needed to provide it with war goods are going to be met."

The National Farmers Union has already endorsed the call for a planned, war-managed economy. The chairman of its legislative committee, M. W. Thatcher, recently told Congress that no price schemes, such as those proposed by the farm bloc, would solve the farmers' problems.

"For the duration we must move out of an economy controlled by prices into a war-managed economy in which the use of manpower and materials and resources is the test," he declared.

In the New York milk-marketing area, surveys are now being made to determine quotas for 1943 milk production. In August milk production increased in the milkshed by 2 percent over August of 1941, even though there was a loss of over 4 percent in number of producers. August production came from 57,040 dairy farms, as compared with 59,467 last year, according to the Market Administrator's Bulletin.

The same problem prevails here as with agriculture all over the country. The labor shortage is acute. Machinery and machine parts are scarce. Attempts are being made to solve the latter problems on the basis of strict priorities. But here again, the lack of an overall centralized program is felt.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you write an article in February 1945 in Political Affairs entitled, "Three Wartime Farm Conventions," by Robert Digby?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may that go into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. It may go into the record and become a part of the record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 243" and follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 243

[From Political Affairs, February 1945]

THREE WARTIME FARM CONVENTIONS

(By Robert Digby)

On the heels of the election came the conventions of the three national farm organizations—the Farmers Union, the National Grange and the Farm Bureau. All of these farm organizations are “nonpolitical,” much like the A. F. of L., and at none of the conventions were the elections discussed from the platform. Yet the outcome of the elections, the victory of the people over the forces of reaction, directly influenced the convention proceedings of these three farm organizations.

None of these farm organizations was, of course, politically neutral during the last election. The top leadership of the Farm Bureau and the Grange supported the anti-Roosevelt campaign, while the national office of the Farmers Union championed Roosevelt's reelection. But it would be a mistake to assume that any of these organizations is a unified body wherein the views of the national officers mirror those of the various State officials as well as those of the membership. In all of these organizations there are wide divergencies of opinion, and it is common knowledge that some of the Bureau and Grange leaders supported Roosevelt's reelection, while a small segment of the Farmers Union leadership lined up with the Dewey forces.

Earl Browder has remarked of the elections: “It is my opinion that no event in America since the time of Lincoln has had such a great effect upon the peoples of the whole world. This was an international, not merely a national event.” The recent farm conventions cannot be understood except in the light of the elections and the long campaign that was waged to turn the farmers against the Roosevelt administration. For years the reactionaries have regarded the farm scene as a special preserve set aside for their exploitation. Most defeatist, fascist, and other disruptive groups have, at some time or another, loudly proclaimed their right to speak for the farmers. Publishers like Frank E. Gannett and Col. McCormick, industrialists like the Pews, a traitor to the labor movement like John L. Lewis, and outright fascists like Father Coughlin or Gerald L. K. Smith have all partaken in this pastime of representing themselves as the true voice of agriculture. In Congress, the coalition of reactionary Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats has long made a practice of hiding its true identity and posing as a “farm bloc” whenever the issues make this subterfuge possible. Even Hamilton Fish found it convenient to cover up some of his treachery by pretending to be motivated solely by concern for the farmers.

But the reactionaries overplayed their hand with the farmers just as they did with the rest of the Nation. They took the farmers for granted and tried to use the whole wartime food program as a political football for their partisan purposes. In its first phase, the wartime strategy of the reactionaries openly called upon the farmers to wreck the Nation's food expansion program by publicly opposing cooperation with the Government's plan for increasing production. Dewey's farm lieutenants, H. E. Babcock and Dr. W. I. Myers, led this campaign which ended in dismal failure. The farmers refused to heed this reckless advice. Instead they proceeded to produce as much as they could, and each year they managed to break all previous food production records.

The second phase of the reactionary strategy sought to accomplish indirectly what they could not do directly. They attempted to prevent the passage of necessary legislation and to interfere with the carrying out of Federal farm programs, while blaming the administration for the chaos created. Although they now talked in favor of abundance, they continued to do everything possible to induce scarcity. Dewey's efforts to incite a feed panic in the Northeast and to frighten the farmers into killing off their cows, was an example of this brand of politics. But Dewey and his cohorts in Congress overestimated their own cleverness and underestimated the intelligence of the farmers. Their wrecking activities certainly did not inspire confidence on the part of the farmers. Even though little was done to answer or expose the machinations of these disrupters, the farmers refused to rally to this program which required them to sacrifice their economic interest as well as their patriotism and which had nothing to offer them except a hate-Roosevelt platform.

The result on November 7 showed that the farm strategy of the reactionaries had failed. They did not get the big increase in the farm vote on which their

rural leaders had counted to offset the pro-Roosevelt strength in the cities. The "farm revolt" which the GOP high command had so often prophesied did not materialize. Not even by using the wildest anti-Communist, antilabor and anti-Semitic propaganda were they able to stampede the farmers into joining their cause. To be sure, the lies spread by the Hoover-Dewey forces were rarely refuted in the rural areas, and many of the scars still remain; but even so, it must be recognized that the rural campaign failed to achieve its main objective. James Haggerty, Dewey's publicity chief, was reported in the newspapers as saying that, as soon as the up-State New York returns began to come in and disclosed the absence of any trend toward Dewey, the Republican high command knew the election was lost.

It was only by claiming to champion the President's war and postwar policies that the Dewey forces were able to retain the bulk of their traditional Republican farm vote in the North. Previously the reactionaries had assumed that the farmers could best be appealed to by capitalizing on petty, personal gripes—gas rationing, tire allocations, OPA restrictions, "redtape" and "bureaucracy." But it became visible, even in the primaries, that the farmers were thinking in larger terms as they cast their ballots against Senators like "Cotton" Ed Smith, Rufus C. Holman, and Champ Clark, as well as Representatives of the same stamp.

The grip of isolationist ideology upon farmers has in recent years been greatly weakened. Wherever the pro-Roosevelt forces conducted a nonpartisan campaign, taking the issues to the farmers, the response exceeded all expectations. Such instances were all too few in the rural areas, but where they occurred, positive inroads were made on traditional Republican stamping grounds.

It is against this background that we must look at this year's farm conventions if we are to understand the changes that have taken place.

But first, a thumbnail sketch of these three farm organizations may be in order. The Farm Bureau, which lists its membership at over 800,000, is the most powerful of the 3 organizations. It speaks primarily for the big farmers; the cotton planters of the South, cash-corn and corn-hog interests in the Midwest, and the most capitalistically developed farmers on the west coast as well as in the East. The Grange, which lists its membership around the million mark, including nonfarmers in this figure, however, represents what are popularly referred to as family-sized farmers. It is a fraternal organization, whose membership is to be found mainly in the belt stretching westward from New England and the Northeast to the Midwest as well as on the west coast. Politically, the Grange has been much less active than the Bureau and has tended to follow the latter's leadership on most questions of national policy. The Farmers Union, with 150,000 farm families in its organization, also speaks for the family-sized farms. Its strength has been primarily concentrated in the Wheat Belt, with additional support from the dairy, poultry, and corn-hog producers. It has been the most progressive of the three organizations and has most consistently backed up the administration's policies.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS ON WORLD COOPERATION

At their preceding conventions, these three farm organizations concerned themselves almost exclusively with domestic farm problems and paid scant attention to the question of international cooperation. This year, however, all of the farm organizations gave considerable attention to the problem of international cooperation. This was especially true of the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union. They recognized that foreign policy is also farm policy.

Ed O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau and long a critic of the Roosevelt administration, put aside his former partisanship and devoted the major part of his report at the bureau convention to a discussion of international affairs. O'Neal called upon his fellow bureau delegates to make a "new appraisal of international relations" and warned them that otherwise "we will not only fail to discharge our international obligations, but we will also do irreparable harm to our domestic economy." O'Neal declared:

"Plain commonsense indicates that the only course that offers any hope whatever for permanent peace is for peace-loving people everywhere to band together in a pact that proclaims to the world that they are prepared to maintain peace, by force if necessary."

The Farm Bureau president endorsed all of the machinery so far proposed by the delegates of the United Nations at Dumbarton Oaks and at Bretton Woods, as well as the projected International Food and Agriculture Organization.

O'Neal told the press beforehand that he expected fireworks to break loose from the floor when he finished his report, but none developed. Discussion on his report showed that the delegates welcomed the new orientation, and the convention voted its approval.

NATIONAL GRANGE

The national office of the Grange is generally regarded as the most isolationist minded of all farm organizations—more isolationist than most of its own State offices. But the war has wrought many changes, and the report given to the Grange convention in Winston-Salem by Albert S. Goss, the present master, is quite different from the views expressed by Louis J. Taber, former master and sponsor of the America First Committee in pre-1918 days.

Goss devoted nearly a third of his report to international considerations. At the very outset he declared, "The time has come to plan aggressively for peace," and acknowledged that international cooperation is essential if we are to have a lasting peace.

But Goss then went on to criticize the Bretton Woods monetary proposals, the International Food and Agriculture Organization, and even the Dumbarton Oaks draft for a World Security Council. Despite his professed acceptance of general purposes, Goss' position, ratified by the Grange convention, would require a complete redrafting of the monetary and agricultural plans submitted by the United Nations' delegates. On Dumbarton Oaks the Grange master took a more friendly position; yet even here he voiced various doubts, chiefly the fear so often raised by isolationists that the United Nations plan for world security might impair our national sovereignty. The Grange convention thereupon went on record in favor of "an effectively implemented organization of sovereign states, including a World Court, but with the right to declare war retained solely by Congress."

THE FARMERS UNION

"Full participation by the United States in a world organization based on political and economic justice, governed by law and with power to enforce its decisions," was urged by the Farmers Union. It gave wholehearted and unqualified approval to the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods conferences, as well as to the proposed international food organization (F. A. O.).

James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union, told the convention that "the shaping of a people's peace" requires the active support and participation of the farmers themselves. He called for farmer representation at the peace table and pointed out that the farmers have a tremendous stake in the "world's deliverance." There are "two roads" open to the farmers, Patton said, one "leads back to nothing but oblivion" while the other leads forward to "peace and security."

POSTWAR POLICIES

After World War I agriculture suffered a prolonged crisis, which began 8 years before the great depression engulfed the rest of the economy. Even in the period of recovery, agriculture lagged behind, with no markets in sight for the large surpluses it had piled up. Throughout the present war the farmers have been haunted by fears of another postwar crash and new surpluses piled up. Hence, it is not surprising that they have listened with skepticism to talk of postwar abundance and that they have been slow to understand the new situation, unique in the history of capitalism.

But the American farmers have been listening with interest to proposals for postwar international cooperation and friendly trade between nations. The cotton, wheat, tobacco, and other growers who must have foreign markets for their products have been particularly concerned with postwar international trade policies. They remember what happened after the last war with the loss of foreign markets, and they have no desire to repeat such folly. They have therefore been quicker to understand the economic importance of postwar international cooperation than to appreciate the implications of such a policy for our domestic economy as a whole. Many of these farmers are just beginning to see that full production for our economy, as well as for other freedom-loving nations, must necessarily be considered an inseparable part of the United Nations policy.

The Farmers Union was the first farm organization to recognize full production as a practical objective and to begin orienting its thinking in the direction of this goal. Subsequently, on September 3, 1943, the directors of the Farm Bureau drafted a special report, endorsing "the philosophy of abundance" and out-

lining some of the steps that must be taken if agriculture is to be included. But this Bureau proclamation remained on paper, and the official organ of the Bureau, *The Nation's Agriculture*, continued to publish articles of the type that appeared in its May 1944 issue, claiming "there is full agreement" on the inevitability of colossal postwar unemployment. In utter disregard of the steps being taken by our Government in concert with the United Nations for postwar economic reconstruction, the Bureau article stated, "The most optimistic figures of responsible planning bureaus and committees place the total at 8 million or more * * * who will be seeking work actively, but will be unable to find it." No attempt was made at that time to reconcile such catastrophic views with the Bureau's avowed "philosophy of abundance."

The election forced the scarcity prophets to change their tune. Even the Hoover-Dewey forces had to give lipservice to postwar full production as a realistic and realizable objective, while themselves pretending to be its champion. The result was that back-to-scarcity theorists, like Dr. W. I. Myers, dean of the New York State College of Agriculture, who had long been "proving" the inevitability of a postwar crash, were seriously embarrassed. Thus, the whole direction of the election campaign did much to convince the farmers that a program of postwar abundance was more than a pious hope and to show them that broad sections of the Nation's economy were determined to achieve this objective.

At their conventions this year, both the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union devoted serious attention to the economy of abundance and declared it to be the main objective of all postwar policymaking. Both stressed the need for expanding domestic purchasing power and for a large volume of friendly trade between nations, if we are to maintain our high level of wartime production. Both agreed that the backward countries must be encouraged to industrialize themselves. In short, the Farm Bureau and Farmers Union recognized the broad principles essential to the abundance objective. Even though they still face the task of adjusting their thinking on concrete, immediate problems, both domestic and foreign, to this objective, their conventions must be credited with having taken steps in the right direction.

While the National Grange also endorsed "an economy of plenty," it has not yet begun to recognize the basic principles on which such an economy must be built or to undertake the task of bringing its own program into harmony with the objective. No sooner does the Grange platform mention the "economy of plenty" than it hastens to express fear lest such a program deprive the "American farmer" of "the American market" and, instead of concentrating on the construction of a positive program to implement the abundance objective, its resolutions seem to envisage a return to high tariff walls and two-price plans. The drafters of the Grange platform were not looking forward to abundance but were obviously looking backward to the days of widespread depression and surplus. And Goss, in that section of his report purporting to deal with methods of achieving abundance, does little more than state real or fancied difficulties in the way of obtaining it, declaring, "it is altogether probable that we will not be able to maintain full production or full employment."

IMMEDIATE DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

No useful purpose would be served by attempting the impossible task of summarizing the hundreds of resolutions passed by these three organizations on immediate domestic programs. A few remarks on changes made this year and a comparison of their respective positions on the question of price stabilization will illustrate their positions.

Farm Bureau: Most significant of the changes made by the Bureau is the elimination of partisan, antiadministration chaff from its resolutions. Their tone is more positive, and instead of sour notes on "bureaucracy" and "governmental bungling," there is now a general awareness that cooperation between the farmers and the Government must be maintained. At one point, for example, O'Neal told the Bureau convention that "Due to many factors, it is probably true that Government must have a hand in carrying out policies to maintain full employment."

On the price stabilization program, the Bureau now declares that price control must be continued into the postwar period. Many people still remember the Bureau's president as author of the famous comment, "We need a little inflation," and certainly the Bureau has dropped this position of open, headon hostility to the stabilization program. However, it cannot be said that the Bureau has done much to integrate its thinking on domestic programs with its

expressed desire for postwar abundance. On this very question of stabilization, it persists in its opposition to subsidies, endorses a tax program equivalent to that of the National Association of Manufacturers, and calls for "the retention of the Little Steel formula."

Farmers Union: The convention of the Farmers Union addressed itself to the problem of putting some solid farm props under the abundance platform. It drafted a farm program providing for voluntary production agreements between the farmer and the Government which would do much to lift the mass purchasing power of the farmers. It worked out detailed, positive resolutions to strengthen the various Federal farm agencies and to extend their benefits.

It clearly recognized the importance of developing the St. Lawrence seaway and the seven TVA's, of passing the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, of enacting a broad program for returning veterans, and of rapidly broadening the Nation's social-security program. In regard to price stabilization, it voiced no direct or indirect quarrel with the Government's efforts to control prices, including the use of subsidies, and it even urged that steps be taken "to prevent further land price inflation."

National Grange: The Grange has continued its official program, with only minor changes and insertions. Most of its resolutions are so general, however, that they do not necessarily close the door to new interpretations required by new and changing conditions. Moreover, it is important to recognize that the Grange is a loose-knit fraternal organization, whose locals have a high degree of autonomy and whose membership is, for the most part, unaware of the action taken by its leaders at congressional hearings. Despite the relatively unchanged nature of its resolutions, with their heavy emphasis on State rights, bureaucracy, and governmental centralization, there are certainly new currents flowing in the Grange ranks, as reports from some of its State conventions indicate. It should be pointed out, too, that the Grange like the other farm organizations, passed positive resolutions on the development of waterways, social security, health programs, veterans' aid, and other measures which afford a basis for joint action.

With respect to the price-stabilization program, the Grange disagrees with the Administration's whole attempt to control prices by applying ceilings and opposes the use of subsidies. Thus, its position on price stabilization is more inflationary than that of the other farm organizations.

COOPERATION WITH LABOR AND OTHER GROUPS

It is particularly significant that each of the three farm organizations passed resolutions this year pledging cooperation with labor, industry, and other groups in working out postwar programs. These resolutions were not the usual perfunctory expressions of good will, such as were sometimes passed in previous years.

President Ed O'Neal of the Farm Bureau told his convention: "As a result of the colossal expansion of our industrial setup during the war years, our productive capacity is now great enough to produce abundance for all." He took issue with those who "have thrown bricks at the success that organized groups have had in the formulation of national policies" and said: "In a democracy, organized pressure, if you want to call it that, is the only possible way for the various groups to express themselves effectively, and for that reason it should be encouraged."

Instead of fearing the rise of the CIO or its PAC, the Bureau leader urged that "the tremendous power of the organized groups" be united for "a coordinated attack on national problems." "It can be done," he declared. Prominently featured in the Bureau's resolutions is the call:

Therefore, with all the earnestness of which we are capable, we appeal to the leaders in other groups of agriculture and the recognized leader in labor and in industry, to join in a series of conferences in 1945 to formulate a program necessary for the establishment and maintenance of policies designed to assure large-scale production. * * *

The Farmers Union, whose president, James G. Patton, served as vice president of the Citizens' PAC, also issued a call for closer cooperation with "organized labor, business, and industry such technical, professional, religious, political, civic, and welfare groups as concur in the objective of abundance for all."

The National Grange likewise declared that "planning for the postwar period" must be carried out "in cooperation with labor, industry, and other groups."

All of this demonstrates that the time has come for tearing down the flimsy walls that separate farmers and workers. Labor has always been aware of the

antilabor sentiment whipped up in rural areas, but it has seldom appeared sufficiently aware of the extent to which prolabor sentiments prevailed in the countryside. Despite the Hillman-Browder bogey that was conjured up for the farmers and insufficiently exposed during the election, the conventions of the farm organizations demonstrate that now the farmers are particularly anxious to have closer working relationships with labor. These conventions further indicate that there are many important issues crying out for joint discussion and action on the part of farm, labor, business, civic, and other groups. Among these are Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods, the St. Lawrence seaway, seven TVA's, veterans' assistance, social security, and reconversion. Conferences on a local, State, and national basis would do much to strengthen national unity, to bridge the chasm between city and country, and to bring discussions of abundance down from the clouds. After all, the real test of adherence to the abundance objective must be found in what is done on the immediate, concrete questions. It is, moreover, important to avoid the mistake of prejudging organizations and banishing them permanently to a purgatory of scarcity without first exhausting every avenue of cooperation.

For half a century the farmers of America have found themselves becoming more and more isolated politically from progressive currents in the rest of the Nation. With the industrialization and urbanization of the United States, the farmers saw their political influence wane following the collapse of the Populist movement, and the policy of business unionism adopted by the rising A. F. of L. barred the way to realistic farmer-labor political cooperation. It is not altogether surprising that most requests for farmer-labor cooperation have in recent years come from the farmers. Even now it cannot be said that labor has yet worked out the forms for making this cooperation effective, although considerable headway is being made.

ISOLATIONISM OF THE FARMERS

While the war has greatly intensified the desire of farm people to break through their isolation, both physical and political, no solution has been generally available except to those who have gone into the Armed Forces or into war plants. The coalition of people's forces in the 1944 elections and the contributions made by labor have, for the first time, made it possible for some of the forward-looking sectors of the farm population to see a solution ahead. Unfortunately, however, many northern farmers, during the election campaign, were precluded from active participation in the pro-Roosevelt national coalition because of the weaknesses of the Democratic Party and all other organized groups comprising the coalition. As a result the pro-Roosevelt machinery for reaching the farmers was developed only in limited areas. Where this machinery was developed on a non-partisan basis, or even partially developed, the farmers rallied to the national unity camp.

This year's farm conventions offer additional evidence that large sectors of the farmers can be won to the national unity camp. The main proof of this is the farmers' expression of a far more positive attitude toward the Government, which is also indicated by their call for cooperation with labor and other groups in working out postwar programs for abundance.

How can the farmers be brought into the national coalition? All of the pro-Roosevelt forces bear a responsibility for seeing to it that every available channel is used for reaching the farmers, and the approach must necessarily be non-partisan along the lines of the coalition campaign for the reelection of Roosevelt. During the campaign itself, some of the State Democratic committees in the North began to show an increased interest in the farm voters, and the National Democratic Committee encouraged these State committees to strengthen their rural apparatuses and to conduct a nonpartisan campaign in the countryside. Where such measures were taken, through independent nonpartisan committees or farmers-for-Roosevelt committees, the results were positive and showed the need for continuing such forms of activity.

The administration has done much for the farmers, whose income is now at an all-time high and whose debts are the lowest in the past quarter century, but it has not done enough to convince the farmers of its role in securing these gains and little to enlist the active political support of the farmers. The county and community AAA committees, through which the farmers administer the Federal farm program, constitute the largest farm organization in the United States. But these communities have been prevented from making their full contribution to the war food production program and to the political life of the farm communities because of the overlapping, hamstringing controls exercised by State extension

services, restraints imposed by the Hatch Act, and, in the South, the domination practiced by the planters. Every step taken to liberate the Federal farm programs will not only strengthen farm unity but will also speed the process of bringing farmers into the national unity camp. While the administration and the leadership of the Democratic Party are in the most strategic position to bring about such changes, the support of the farmers themselves, labor, anti-Hoover Republicans, and all other forces in the national unity camp will be needed to effect the legislative and administrative changes.

Today the farm problem is not just a problem for the farmers. The problem is to bring broader sections of the farmers into the camp of national unity, and this is a problem for all persons and groups who recognize the urgency of strengthening our national unity. The 1944 elections showed us how dangerous are the city versus rural and the upstate versus downstate contradictions. In looking ahead to the 1946 elections, we must begin to iron out these contradictions.

Immediately we face the question of what action the Senate will take on the plans for international cooperation worked out by the United Nations at Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Hot Springs. Approximately, nearly two-thirds of the Members of the Senate come from farm States, and many others have a high percentage of farm and rural voters in their States. In order to win the fight for prompt and favorable action by the Senate, it is essential that all forces in the camp of national unity, especially the labor movement, assist the farmers in making their influence felt on the side of international cooperation and the program for postwar full production.

Mr. MORRIS. Daily Worker of Saturday, November 28, 1942, page 5, a 2-column article entitled "Farmers' Convention Opens Upstate Today," by Robert Digby, special to the Daily Worker. Did you write that article?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment, I claim the privilege.

Mr. MORRIS. Once again, October 18, 1942, America's Victory Harvest, by Robert Digby. Did you write that article?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, I claim the privilege.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Farmer Research, Inc.—the offices of Farmer Research, Inc.—the meeting place and the headquarters of Government workers who were infiltrating the Government on behalf of the Communist Party?

Mr. COE. Under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, I decline to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, there is more information required in connection with this particular inquiry sought of this witness, but, in view of the responses that he has been giving, I would like permission to desist questioning at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions by any member of the committee?

Senator McCARRAN. What was your suggestion, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I feel that there are other questions we would like to have answered, information we would like to have in our files and in our record, but, in view of the responses given by this witness up to now in connection with this question of infiltration of the Government, I think it is futile to pursue the inquiry any longer.

Senator McCARRAN. What is your present occupation or business?

Mr. COE. I think that was answered early in the testimony, that I am a writer and do research in the field of agriculture.

Senator McCARRAN. Do you write under your own name?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Senator McCARRAN. Do you write under any other name than your own?

Mr. COE. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.



Senator McCARRAN. The fact of the matter is you do write under different names, do you not?

Mr. COE. I decline, Senator, to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Senator JOHNSTON. Are you on a Government payroll now?

Mr. COE. Am I on the Government payroll now?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. COE. May I consult counsel?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

Mr. COE (after conferring with counsel). The answer is "No."

Senator JOHNSTON. When were you last employed by the Government?

Mr. COE. Well, Senator, I think that's a matter of record, but it's too ancient for me to recall precisely. I believe it was some 20 years ago or something of that sort; and, I repeat, the subpoena that I was served is blank, and I was not told to bring any records of that sort. I didn't know that it concerned the internal security of the Nation, and it was employment of a very few months on NRA codes, which at the time anyone could get by sending in what was then a 1-cent stamped post card.

Senator McCARRAN. Are you receiving any compensation or emolument now from any agency or group, or division of the United Nations?

Mr. COE. The answer is "No."

Senator McCARRAN. The answer is "No."?

Mr. COE. Yes; no international spy complications, I trust.

Senator McCARRAN. What was that?

Mr. COE. No international spy complications, I trust. Is that the question? Could I be—

The CHAIRMAN. No implication at all; just a question to ascertain facts.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, in your research, have you found Mr. Coe listed officially in connection with any of those organizations that we have been asking him about today?

Mr. MANDEL. We have consulted Polk's Washington Directory for the following years and find the following information:

1934, Farmer Research, Inc., 704 17th Street NW., room 515, Mills Building; Charles Garland, secretary, Farm Research, Inc., residence, 1456 Euclid NW.

1935, Farm Research, Inc., 1343 Eighth Street NW., People's Life Insurance Building, Harold M. Ware, agricultural engineer, Farm Research, Inc., residence, 1456 Euclid Street NW.

Mr. MORRIS. There is quite a list of them. May they go in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. They may all go in the record and become a part of the record without further recitation.

(The information referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 224" and follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 244

(Source: Polk's Washington Directory)

1934: Farm Research, Inc., 704 17th Street NW., room 515, Mills Building; Charles Garland, secretary, Farm Research, Inc., residence 1456 Euclid NW.

1935: Farm Research, Inc., 1343 H Street NW., People's Life Insurance Building; Harold M. Ware, agricultural engineer, Farm Research, Inc., residence 1456 Euclid Street NW.

1936: Farm Research, Inc., 1343 H Street NW., People's Life Insurance Building; Charles Garland, secretary-treasurer, Farm Research, residence, Silver Spring, Md.; Charles J. Coe, economist, Farm Research, Inc., residence, 40 Independence Avenue SW.

1937: Charles Garland, secretary-treasurer, Farm Research, residence, 1456 Euclid NW.; Charles J. Coe, accountant, Farm Research, Inc.

1938: Charles Garland, secretary-treasurer, Farm Research, residence, 1456 Euclid NW.; Charles J. Coe, editor, Facts for Farmers, residence, Silver Spring, Md.

1939: Robert Handschin, statistician, Farm Research, Inc., 201 Second Street, SE.; Charles Garland, secretary-treasurer, Farm Research, residence, 1456 Euclid NW.; Charles J. Coe, economist, Farm Research, Inc., residence, Chevy Chase, Md.

1940: Charles Garland, secretary-treasurer, Farm Research, residence, Silver Spring, Md.; Charles J. Coe, editor, Facts for Farmers.

1941: Charles J. Coe, secretary, Farm Research Co-op, residence, 327 Willard Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions? If not, the witness will be excused.

(Whereupon, at 11:58 a. m., the committee recessed, subject to call.)

×

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3962

