



No 9335. 1/2 191/



THE 1/3

GIVEN BY

---







# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—Part 1

---

## HEARINGS

### BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

MARCH 23, 24, AND 25, 1953

---

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

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1953

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

### UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

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

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

# C O N T E N T S

---

<b>March 23, 1953:</b>	
Testimony of—	<b>Page</b>
Danny Dare.....	268
Harold Adolph Hecht.....	293
Edward Heubsch.....	317
Philip Dey Eastman.....	319
<b>March 24, 1953:</b>	
Testimony of—	
Julian Gordon.....	327
David A. Lang.....	336
Max Nathan Benoff.....	355
Francis Edward Faragoh.....	361
<b>March 25, 1953:</b>	
Testimony of—	
Edward Huebsch.....	371
Bart Lytton.....	381
Joseph Springer.....	398
Silvia Richards.....	413
<b>Index.....</b>	<b>433</b>



The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

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

## PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### RULE X

#### STANDING COMMITTEES

- \* \* \* \* \*
17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

### RULE XI

#### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

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

(A) Un-American activities.

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

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

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

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

\* \* \* \* \*

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

\* \* \* \* \*

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

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

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

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

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—Part 1

---

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Los Angeles, Calif.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10 a. m., in room 518, Federal Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson (appearance noted in transcript), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. VELDE. Will the committee please come to order?

Miss Reporter, let the record show that there are present the following members of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives: Mr. Clardy, of Michigan; Mr. Scherer, of Ohio; Mr. Moulder, of Missouri; Mr. Doyle, of California; Mr. Frazier, of Tennessee; and the chairman, Mr. Velde, which constitutes a quorum of the full committee for the purposes of this hearing.

I am advised that Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, will arrive during the course of the day. And I am advised, too, that Mr. [Donald L.] Jackson was detained on the way down here.

Before the hearings resume, I would like to make a statement for the benefit of the witnesses who have been subpoenaed, the television companies which are participating in the televising of this hearing, and the public.

After receiving a request to permit the televising of this hearing as a public service, the following resolution was adopted by the committee on March 4, 1953:

*Be it resolved*, That in the event the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities or the chairman of any subcommittee thereof, duly appointed by the chairman, shall admit to the hearing room television facilities as a public information medium under the provisions of a resolution adopted by the committee on the 22d day of January 1953, the hearing may be televised under the following conditions:

(1) That television facilities in the hearing room be restricted to two cameras and the minimum lighting facilities practicable, all television production to be available on a pooled basis to other established television companies desiring participation;

(2) Telecasts of committee hearings shall be on the basis of a public service only and this fact shall be publicly announced on television at the beginning and close of each telecast. No commercial announcements will be made from the hearing room and no actual or intimated sponsorship of the hearings will be permitted in any instance; and

(3) Upon the request of a witness that no telecast be made of him during the course of this testimony the chairman shall direct the television cameras to refrain from photographing him during the taking of his testimony.

I also desire to call to the attention of the audience which is present that you are here as a courtesy of this committee and that the committee will not tolerate any demonstration either by way of approval or disapproval of anything which may occur during this hearing.

Smoking will not be allowed. There will be no standing in the aisles or along the walls. The area in the corridors immediately adjacent to the hearing room shall be considered a part of this hearing room while the committee is in session. Anyone who violates these instructions shall be removed from the hearing room by the United States marshal or his deputies who, in addition to his responsibility as a Federal officer, is appointed sergeant at arms for the purpose of preserving order during this hearing.

Mr. TAVENNER, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call as the first witness Mr. Danny Dare.

Mr. VELDE. Will you stand and be sworn?

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

Mr. DARE. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF DANNY DARE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN GANG

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. DARE. Danny Dare.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record? I do not see counsel present.

Mr. GANG. Martin Gang is my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell your name, please, Mr. Dare.

Mr. DARE. D-a-r-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. DARE. New York City, March 1905.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. DARE. Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly, please, what your educational background has been?

Mr. DARE. Public school, eighth grade; high school, approximately 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been the record of your employment?

Mr. DARE. Sporadic.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since 1935.

Mr. DARE. Since 1935, staging shows for picture theaters, occasional studio jobs as a dance director, unemployed for a period of approximately 2 years from 1937 to 1939, and following that I was



employed at a picture studio for approximately 6 years, and then unemployed from the middle of 1948 to early 1950, and from then on in television.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dare, during the course of the hearings conducted by this committee in Los Angeles in September of 1951, a person by the name of Martin Berkeley testified, and I want to read you a portion of his testimony which related to you.

This question was asked him:

Is there an organization in Hollywood known as the Hollywood Theater Alliance.

Mr. BERKELEY. There was such an organization; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you come in contact with the work of that organization?

Mr. BERKELEY. Yes. I worked. I attended a few meetings of the faction of that organization around 1938 or 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know the circumstances under which it was organized?

Mr. BERKELEY. The Hollywood Theater Alliance was organized directly by the Communist Party for the purpose of presenting so-called progressive or left-wing anti-Fascist propaganda. I believe their first production, which was the one I couldn't think of before in relation to Mr. Bassman was Meet the People, which was very successful, both here and in New York. I attended a meeting of the faction which helped organize the Hollywood Theater Alliance, although I had no active part in the Theater Alliance at all. As a matter of fact, I attended a meeting of this organization and subsequently when there was talk of doing my Lincoln play, by that time there was no money left and the Lincoln play was never done.

The leading spirits in the faction were——

QUESTION. And again, by "faction" you are referring to members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BERKELEY. Dues-paying members of the Communist Party. Mostly, actually, the members of this faction were the men who helped organize the show and put it on—writer, director, and so on. Edward Eliscu, a writer, was a member of this group and very active in the show itself. Incidentally, it was a very amusing show. Robert Rossen.

QUESTION. Is he the same Robert Rossen who appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, as far as you know?

Mr. BERKELEY. Yes, sir. Edward Chodorov. Incidentally, he was the first producer I worked for in town, and the man I went with was Guy Endore. To go back way early this morning, he is a well-known playwright and producer, and Henry Blankfort, a writer.

QUESTION. Is he the same individual who appeared before this committee yesterday?

Mr. BERKELEY. He is, sir. I saw his picture in the paper and there is no doubt in my mind. Danny Dare, producer and director, who has worked for several of the major studios in both capacities, and I believe is now working on television.

And then the witness proceeds to name other persons who were connected with that enterprise.

(Continuing to read:)

QUESTION. Do you know whether she is the same Bess Taffel who occupied the chair yesterday that you are now occupying?

ANSWER. Yes, she is the same girl. George Sklar, an excellent writer; Irving J. White; and Francis Faragoh, the writer.

QUESTION. Did you attend a meeting in the home of Offner? I understood you to say that you attended a meeting but you did not state where it was.

Mr. BERKELEY. I attended the first meeting of this group at the home of Mortimer Offner, who was then a screen writer, and today I believe is a television writer or producer or director, I don't know which.

Now, soon after that testimony was taken by the committee, the committee received a telegram which I would like to hand you and ask you whether or not you can identify it as a telegram which you sent to the committee.

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer it in evidence and ask that it be marked as "Dare Exhibit 1."

Mr. VELDE. It will be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked "Dare Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. TAVENNER. This telegram reads as follows:

NEW YORK, September 24, 1951.

*Chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee:*

Feel I have been unjustly accused. Cannot understand vague charges in Berkeley testimony. Am willing to appear at once. Can you arrange conference tomorrow with committee counsel for this purpose. Please reply collect.

Did you then receive a telegram from this committee?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you to look at this copy of a telegram and state whether or not that is a copy of the telegram you received.

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer it in evidence and ask that it be marked "Dare Exhibit 2."

Mr. VELDE. It will be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked "Dare Exhibit No. 2.")

Mr. TAVENNER. This telegram reads as follows:

DANNY DARE,  
New York City:

Committee expect to adjourn tomorrow.

It bears date of September 24, 1951.

Will make arrangements for your appearance in Washington as soon as practicable after return of subcommittee.

FRANCIS WALTER,  
*Acting Chairman, Un-American Activities Committee.*

Now, in response to that exchange of telegrams, did you appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington on September 27, 1951?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you appeared there before some of the committee members had been able to return to Washington from the hearing, as well as members of the staff who were working here.

Mr. DARE. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. At Los Angeles.

Mr. DARE. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. The records of the committee show that you did appear on September 27 before a subcommittee composed of Representatives Francis E. Walter, James B. Frazier, Jr., and Bernard W. Kearney. In the course of that hearing, Mr. Walter, the chairman of the subcommittee, made this statement:

I understand you desire to make a statement concerning testimony given within the last few days in California before the subcommittee that was taking testimony out there.

Do you recall that question having been asked or statement made?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your reply?

Mr. DARE. Would you repeat the question, please? I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Walter, according to the transcript of the testimony, made this statement:

I understand you desire to make a statement concerning testimony given within the last few days in California before the subcommittee that was taking testimony out there.

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I will read from the transcript of your reply and ask you whether or not it is correct as far as you can remember.

Mr. DARE. I can only say what I read in the newspaper, that he listed a large number of names, of which mine was one, and I don't know the exact statement he made, but the implication was he named me as a Communist.

Mr. WALTER. As I recall the testimony, you are correct. He did list a great number of names of people who were in the Communist Party with him, and he was very specific that these were all people that he knew and people who had attended Communist Party meetings with him.

(At 10:20 a. m., Representative Donald L. Jackson entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read) :

Mr. DARE. That is not true.

Did you make that reply?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. At another place in the transcript of the testimony appears this:

Mr. WALTER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. No, sir.

Do you recall those questions and replies?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. At another place in the transcript Mr. Walter asked this question:

The question was did anybody ever ask you to join the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. No.

Do you recall that exchange of question and answer?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. After that testimony the committee continued in its investigation regarding the statement and testimony made by Mr. Martin Berkeley regarding you, and as a result of its investigation, the testimony relating to this subject was referred to the Department of Justice for its consideration in determining whether or not prosecutive action was justified.

Subsequently, Mr. Walter received a letter from you in which appears this language:

I did a very stupid thing in asking you to take me to Washington and then testifying falsely before the committee.

This was a copy of a letter addressed to another person which you sent Mr. Walter. Is that correct, according to your recollection?

Mr. DARE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. You also stated in the course of this letter:

I will tell the committee everything I know and try to make amends.

Was that contained in your letter?

Mr. DARE. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. To Mr. Walter?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you whether or not any promise or representation of any kind was made by this committee or anybody in its behalf to you to induce you to come before this committee and make any statement whatever further than that which you had already made.

Mr. DARE. None whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is your appearance here the result of your own initiative and your own decision in the matter?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you realize that the answer to any question that I might ask you might be used in a subsequent proceeding?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in spite of these things, you desire to appear before this committee and state to it all that is within your knowledge and truthfully answer all questions that are propounded to you?

Mr. DARE. That is true, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as shown from the transcript of the record, you denied before this committee that you had ever been a member of the Communist Party. Now, what do you desire to say about that?

Mr. DARE. Well, I was in New York at that time with my family, employed, and the way the news was broken to me was quite a shock. I was called in by my employer and shown a newspaper article mentioning my name, as the testimony showed.

Well, I became panicky, and realizing that if I said, "Yes, this is true," I would immediately lose my job, which I particularly did not want to do at the time, not only from my financial standpoint but I was in the midst of doing an anti-Communist show called The Crusade for Freedom, which was a nationwide telecast, and I became emotionally panicky and I thought I could brazen it through, because actually I had been so little advised that I just did the wrong thing, did the stupid thing, through fear and panic.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the facts regarding your alleged Communist Party membership? Were you at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became a member, both as to time and place and method of recruitment into the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. If you will bear with me, I will try. Up until 1938 I had been in show business all my life and never stayed in one place long enough to have a home, and as a result had never voted or never been interested in politics. That year I went to a show and during intermission I overheard a conversation that disturbed me very much between two men who were talking about what a good job Hitler was doing in Germany and that that was the right thing to do to the minorities over there; of course, he might be going a little too far in exterminating them, but he should confiscate their possessions and put them in concentration camps.

I turned around and saw two very normal looking, intelligent people who said it casually, and I was frightened. I intended to be married shortly and raise a family, and it preyed on my mind. I belonged to an athletic club where I spent my time playing handball, and so forth. I discussed it with some of the members there, and a couple of them said, "Well, you don't know what is going on in the world, and you should try to learn." They started to tell me things about what was going on in Germany, and how it might happen here unless people took an active part in fighting it, and I was asked to go to—they said it was a local election coming up, and if I was interested, would I go to see some of the candidates and hear what they said, and see what they were doing to fight, and if I was interested, to vote for them.

I went to a couple of meetings, and before I knew it I was a member, of the Anti-Nazi League and the Hollywood Democratic Committee, and so I became interested. Then as a result of that, I imagine—incidentally, I was not active in those organizations. My participation was signing a slip and paying dues, and that was it. I didn't attend any meetings. I must have gotten on all the sucker lists, because I started to get literature through the mail, and one day a circular came asking me if I was interested in a live theater in Hollywood. Of course, I was. This was my profession, and I hadn't been employed for a couple of years. It said, "If you are interested, come to a meeting at" such and such a place. I went. I don't remember where it was. There were at least 50 or 60 people there, and I am quite sure that this was not the first meeting of the Hollywood Theater Alliance, which it later turned out to be, because there were committees functioning, and I know that I was not there at the inception of this organization.

This was supposed to be a nonprofit community venture to give employment and opportunity to young actors, directors, and so forth. It was decided by the people talking that the venture of this theater should be a musical revue, because it would involve more people. Of course, I didn't know what that meant at that time, but I do now. Volunteers were called for to assist in producing this show, and, of course, I raised my hand; this was my line of work, and I found myself on a committee with the job of producing this first show.

I had never known any of these people before, and the other people on the committee were Morley, Offner, Henry Meyers, and Jay Gorney; and we proceeded to start to work on gathering material for this show. At this meeting a gentleman by the name of Irving White came up and introduced himself to me, and said he had been a stage manager on Broadway, and said he knew me by reputation, and said he thought I could make a good contribution to this show.

Well, we started to gather material, and some time during the next 2 or 3 months Mr. Edward Eliscu was added to this committee. There were arguments about what materials should go into the show and what materials shouldn't go into the show, and one day Mr. Irving White, who had held some sort of position with the Hollywood Theater Alliance, as it now was called, came to me and said, "You just don't understand what the show should be about. You need a political education. If you are interested in fighting Mr. Hitler, you should join with the people who are doing this thing," and the sum and

substance of it was that he said, "And the Communist Party are the people that are actually doing this."

Well, I asked him the two §64 questions, "What is this I hear about the Communist Party being dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence?"

He assured me that this was not true and he could show it to me in the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States at that time.

I also asked him, "What about this talk I hear about taking orders from Moscow?"

He said that was positively not true, that the party is independent and acted on its own.

Well, I thought it over and he kept talking to me and eventually I agreed to do this.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, you stated that Mr. Irving White stated to you that you needed some political education.

MR. DARE. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the nature of his statement to you in full and what was the occasion for his making such a statement to you?

MR. DARE. Incidentally, this was around August 1938, to set the date for you. Well, I had never been interested in politics and my motive for doing anything about joining any organization was to try to prevent what happened in Germany from happening here, and while I might have been intense and eager to do something, I didn't maybe know the reasons why I was doing things, and they said, "You don't know what the forces are that are actually behind the so-called Fascist movement in America, and in order to understand that you must get an education, and in order to see that the right material went in the show, you should be able to analyze material and judge its value."

MR. TAVENNER. Well then there was a definite connection between that conversation and the purpose of the show?

MR. DARE. I believe so; yes.

MR. TAVENNER. And it was in that connection that you were advised to go into the Communist Party?

MR. DARE. That's right, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to any special group in the Communist Party?

MR. DARE. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that?

MR. DARE. Well, the first gathering I went to with Mr. White was—there were about 30 people present, to the best of my knowledge, at that meeting. Again I didn't know any of them. I do remember two people who addressed us. One was John Howard Lawson and the other was a fellow by the name of Cyril. I didn't know his last name and never have seen him since.

Mr. Lawson spoke about what was happening here, and the sum and substance of it was, "You can't be an ostrich and stick your head in the sand and say it can't happen here because it happened in Germany."

This fellow by the name of Cyril spoke something about Marxism, which didn't interest me and I didn't understand it, and that is all I remember about that meeting, except that I was told that in the future that it would be broken up into smaller groups of six.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of one of the smaller groups of six?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did that group meet?

Mr. DARE. The first meeting that I remember was at the home of Frank Tuttle, although he was not present.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you receive information as to where and when the meeting would be held?

Mr. DARE. Mr. White told me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were present at that meeting?

Mr. DARE. A woman by the name of Jessie Burns, Tanya Tuttle, a fellow by the name of Ray Spencer, and a woman by the name of Pauline Lauber, and also Mr. Herbert Biberman.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did that group meet?

Mr. DARE. I don't remember whether it was supposed to be once a week or once every 2 weeks; I really don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time did you meet with this group?

Mr. DARE. To the best of my recollection, perhaps 5 times maximum, although I can only actually remember 2. But I am sure I went to a couple more.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Could you further identify the persons you have named by their occupation or the work they do?

Mr. DARE. I will think, sir. Irving White, I believe was trying to be a writer, although I don't know that, where he was, actually was, ever employed. He had some sort of a small-paying job with the Hollywood Theater Alliance for a while, I think, I am pretty sure.

Ray Spencer, I think, was also supposed to be a writer, although I don't remember that he ever worked in a studio or anywhere that he ever worked, or what he wrote.

Jessie Burns, I understood, was a reader at a motion picture studio.

Pauline Lauber, I believe, was a secretary, but I am not positive.

Tanya Tuttle was the wife of Frank Tuttle and was interested in the ballet theater or dancing, but I don't believe did it as a profession.

Mr. MOULDER. Is that as much information as you have to identify them by?

Mr. DARE. So far as their vocation is concerned; yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee how this particular group functioned, as to what their purpose was, what its chief interest was?

Mr. DARE. By this particular group you mean the Hollywood Theater Alliance?

Mr. TAVENNER. I meant this particular group of the Communist Party.

Mr. DARE. I am sorry. I was lost for a moment. Mental suggestion. Well, I remember that when I got there they were there already. A lot of lighter literature was out, and I think we read one of them about fascism in America and what was happening in Germany on that particular subject, and it was discussed. This occupied most of the meeting, so far as I remember.

Oh, I remember that we were told that there would be a rotating chairman each time so that each one would gain the experience of conducting a meeting.

Then there was a discussion of another pamphlet on Marx, which I didn't understand. That is about all I remember about the meeting.

I think—yes; I think the dues were explained to us, that if you were working you were supposed to pay 5 percent of your salary. If you weren't working, which I wasn't, it was either 10 cents or 50 cents a month; I forget which.

MR. TAVENNER. During the time that you attended those meetings, did functionaries of the Communist Party on higher levels appear before your meeting?

MR. DARE. I couldn't swear to that, but I got the impression that Mr. Biberman might have been. But the others didn't seem to be.

MR. TAVENNER. What interest did this particular group of the Communist Party, to which you were assigned, have in the alliance group that you first referred to?

MR. DARE. At that time I don't know whether it had any distinct relationship with the Hollywood Theater Alliance, although the Hollywood Theater Alliance show was discussed in there. Perhaps after I left there was some purpose in this particular unit being formed, and I am sure there must have been some motive in having these particular people in this group, but I don't believe I ever found out exactly why.

Incidentally, to give you another date, at the time Mr. White solicited my membership in the party was around March of 1939.

MR. TAVENNER. Let us go back and consider further the work that was being done by the Theater Alliance in the production of the play. I think you volunteered for a part in the production of that play?

MR. DARE. Yes; to direct it.

MR. TAVENNER. To direct it?

MR. DARE. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the name of the play?

MR. DARE. It became—there was no name at that time. It became known as Meet the People.

MR. TAVENNER. Meet the People?

MR. DARE. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Was it a successful production?

MR. DARE. Yes; quite.

MR. TAVENNER. Did it make money?

MR. DARE. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. How long did the play run in Los Angeles?

MR. DARE. Over a year. I would say approximately a year and 3 months; somewhere around there.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the production went on to New York?

MR. DARE. Yes, a second company was formed while this company was playing here, and the second company went on the road and then eventually opened in New York.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, you have stated that Mr. White advised you during the progress of the work on this play, that you needed political education and indicated that you did not understand the political implications from this play.



Have you made a study of that production to determine what the implications were from it?

Mr. DARE. I certainly have, since my invitation by the committee. I have done some research, and what I thought was perfectly innocuous and amusing in those days, as I read it now, I can see the connection and what it actually was meant to accomplish.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just in a general way, what would you say that it was meant to accomplish, by the production of this play?

Mr. DARE. Well, to propagandize and expound the theories that at that time was the Communist Party line.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. I would like to ask a question for my information. Do I recall the first name of Mr. White, or who he is——

Mr. DARE. Irving.

Mr. TAVENNER. Irving White. How do you spell Irving?

Mr. DARE. I-r-v-i-n-g.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall any particular features about this play that would demonstrate what you have just had to say, namely, that the play was intended to propagate the Communist Party line as it existed at that time?

Mr. DARE. Yes——

Mr. VELDE. May I ask at what time again?

Mr. JACKSON. And what was the Communist Party line at that time?

Mr. DARE. I think it might be best explained—I am not qualified to per se give a long explanation of the Communist Party line. I can only cite the relation of the material that went in the show——

Mr. JACKSON. Were the Communists at that time with Hitler or against him?

Mr. DARE. It depends on the day you are asking about.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean during the course of this the line changed?

Mr. DARE. Yes. Maybe not so much as being against Hitler—I think they were always against him—but as regards Mr. Roosevelt, I think their sympathies changed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what is the first thing that occurred which would indicate political significance?

Mr. DARE. Of course, this show had quite a long rehearsal period due to the lack of success in raising money and resistance to certain opinions contrary to the opinions in Hollywood, what was not a Communist opinion at that time, and there were certain groups that refused to rent space to the groups respecting their motives.

There was trouble getting a police and fire permit for a certain building, because pressure was put on the fire department not to issue the permit. As a result, the show was in rehearsal and preparation for quite a long time; I would say 6 months.

When the show first started to be prepared there was a song written called, Mr. Roosevelt, Won't You Please Run Again?, which was a plea to Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, and to forget all the opposition to a third term.

By the time the show opened, which by that time the Nazi-Soviet pact had occurred, this never wound up in the show, and, as a matter

of fact, there was some fairly anti-Roosevelt policies sketches in the show.

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

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. "Meet the People" was not a play, was it? It was a series of specialty acts?

Mr. DARE. It was a musical revue.

Mr. JACKSON. A musical revue rather than a play.

Mr. DARE. Yes, consisting of songs, skits with no story line, but what was called a thread of a story.

During this period, of course, when this number did not get into the show, this was around May or June of 1939, and by that time, by the time the show opened after Roosevelt had supported Finland, as a result of Russia's attack on Finland, the song was eliminated from the potential list of material.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. How long after Roosevelt supported Finland did this song disappear from the script, was it a matter of days or weeks or months?

Mr. DARE. I couldn't say. It was on a potential list of material for the show and then it just never got into the show. I couldn't be specific about the exact date when somebody said, "This does not go into the show."

Mr. DOYLE. Your conclusion is it was on account of the United States supporting Finland's position?

Mr. DARE. Plus Mr. Roosevelt giving aid to the Allies who were fighting Hitler.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. How was that handled, Witness? In other words, was there some discussion amongst the entire group, or did someone in particular merely hand down the order that, "This does not go in the play"?

Mr. DARE. This I don't know, because I had been in and out of the Communist Party, and while I continued to direct the show there was a committee that selected the material for the show, of which I was one. Who, what, why decided this, I couldn't say. I do know it never got into the show, but I actually couldn't say how.

Mr. CLARDY. Based on the knowledge that you have acquired since that event, would you say that the order, however it came, was from a group of Communists?

Mr. DARE. I am pretty sure of that.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dare, you mentioned the fact that the President gave aid to the Allies during a certain period.

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any change made in the script that reflected the Communist Party line on that question, that is, the question of aid by this country to the allies?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir, I have before me two of the scripts from the show, one dated February 20, 1940, and the other dated January 20, 1941.

In the version of 1940 there was a sketch which was a prelude to a song and a dance, which had the United States Senate as the setting. The only implication in that was that the scene was based on two fairly successful pictures at that time which were "Mr. Deeds Goes To Washington" and "Mr. Smith Goes To Town," which was the only reason for the setting being in the Senate.

In the first script it had no political implication at all, and was merely a setting for a song and a dance. By January of 1940 the same sketch had been changed to attack, ridicule Mr. Roosevelt and ridicule his domestic policies, satirized his giving destroyers to England and satirized the building of the factories for defense, satirized his—or, accusing him of stretching the Monroe Doctrine and ridiculed the idea any Senator would ask for a small amount for relief.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Dare, this script was dated January 20, 1941, was it not?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. I think you said 1940. This is just to get the record straight.

Mr. DARE. I am sorry. The second script was 1941. This was the same sketch, only rewritten at that time. At what point it was rewritten I can't say, but by the time January 1, 1941, arrived, this was the state it was in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, would you give the committee a little clearer idea of just the way in which that satirization took place, by reading pertinent parts of the script?

Mr. DARE. The Senate is in session. Senior Senators, secretaries and one junior Senator are all seated.

Two gavel knocks.

Voice off stage says, "The President of the United States of America."

A comedian came out with a fishing rod and old fishing hat, such as Roosevelt used to wear.

A hand comes out from the wings and takes the fishing rod away from him.

He turned and said, "Thank you, Wendell."

This was during the Willkie-Roosevelt campaign.

He said, "I have served you faithfully for 8 years."

The Senators applaud.

"And I hope to serve you for 4 more."

Senators almost applaud, but show resentment instead.

"My message today is this: We have troubles in our country—now. We have unequal distribution of wealth—now. We have strife and havoc on all sides—now. And I plan to do something about it—later." Much applause. Two gavel knocks.

Junior and senior Senators: "Mr. President."

A voice says, "The Chair recognizes the senior Senator."

Senior Senator: "I move we appropriate \$1 billion for monkey glands for overage destroyers."

All but junior Senator applaud.

Junior and senior Senators: "Mr. President."

"The Chair recognizes the senior Senator."

Senior Senator: "I move we appropriate \$5 billion to build factories for underprivileged millionaires."

All but junior Senator applaud.

Junior and senior Senators: "Mr. President."

"The Chair recognizes the senior Senator."

Senior Senator: "I move we appropriate \$12 billion for rubber bands to stretch the Monroe Doctrine."

All but junior Senator applaud.

Junior Senator (angrily): "Mr. President."

Over the PAV (very tired): "Oh, all right. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator."

Junior Senator: "Thank you, Mr. President. I move we appropriate \$1 for relief."

Everybody gasps in horror.

Senior Senator reaches for gun. Everybody jumps up. There is a struggle for the gun, which developed into a jitterbug dance.

Mr. VELDE. What was the date of that script, Mr. Dare?

Mr. DARE. January 20, 1941.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, would this be a convenient breaking-off point for a recess?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in recess until 5 minutes after 11. (Short recess was taken.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dare, you referred earlier in your testimony to the attack made by the Soviet Union on Finland.

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there anything in this sketch or in any of the sketches or any part of this play which carried the Communist Party line with regard to Finland?

Mr. DARE. I think so. If I may quote from the script. There was a sketch in the show that—

Mr. TAVENNER. The show you are referring to is "Meet the People"?

Mr. DARE. That is right, sir. There was a sketch in the show which concerned two tramps out of work, sitting on a bench discussing conditions. A policeman comes in, and, incidentally, during this sketch there were jibes at Mr. Roosevelt and the domestic policies at the time. At the finish of the sketch a policeman comes in and tells the two men to get moving.

As he says this, a woman comes in with a receptacle asking for contributions. She says, "Officer, would you care to make a contribution?"

The cop says, "What is it for?"

The woman says, "Mr. Roosevelt's fund for needy Finns."

The cop very warmly says, "Why, sure, Lady. Poor things." And he drops a quarter in the can.

"Thank you," says the woman, and she exits.

The cop said to the men, "I thought I told you two bums to clear out."

The two men start off and, as they walk, the first man says, "Hey, are you a Finn?"

The second man says, "No. Are you?"

The first man says, "No."

The second man says, "Too bad."

The implication, of course, being there was money for Finland but for nobody at home that needed any money.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any attack upon domestic policies which would carry out the Communist Party line?

Mr. DARE. As I studied it recently, I think so. At that time I quite didn't realize the implication.

This is a sketch called With Mr. Hollywood in Darkest Washington, which opens with the depicting of a supposed Republican Party. This was during the time the Republicans were going to pick a candidate to run against Mr. Roosevelt. I guess it would be in 1940. They are trying to decide what kind of a candidate they should select.

Do you want me to tell you about it or—

Mr. TAVENNER. I think if you just describe it generally it will be all right.

Mr. DARE. They say, "We have got to have a man who will appeal to the people." And he says, "There is"—they have a candidate, but he looks awful. He is a real scarecrow. They said, "We have got to do something to liven this man up."

He says, "The only man I know to do it is Mr. Hollywood, the big producer."

He says, "What will he do with it?"

He says, "Look what they did for the British Empire, Lloyd's of London, Gunga Din, Henry the Eighth."

They call Mr. Hollywood in to tell them how to make their candidate to appeal to the voters.

He brings his own makeup man with him and they go to work on him.

He says, "The first thing we have to do is to delve into the complete characterization of the part. A man's looks always reflect his thoughts. Where is the script?"

One says, "Script? What script?"

He says, "As a president this man will stand for something. What's his platform going to be? What does he mean?" He says, "What are we going to promise the Republican voters?"

"Oh, that is different. The first thing we are going to promise—"

"Wait a minute. Get ready, please."

"Now, give it to me with feeling—emotion—dialog. It is the day before election. He is presenting his platform to the people—the best people. His words will thunder, 'Lower taxes for the millionaires, higher taxes for the workingman.'

"Wonderful—make him generous—bighearted—more, more.

"His first cry will be, 'We must balance the budget.' Caution—give him caution. Cut down the relief. Thrift. More money for the Navy. Strength, let's have strength. Cut down on public health.

"More freedom for Wall Street. Consideration—regard. Less money for the farmer. Economy. More money for the Army. Amend the Wagner bill. Amend the Bill of Rights. Scrap the WPA. Strengthen the FBI. Give him everything. More money for the Air Force. Smash the Labor Trusts. More money for the rich. Throw out the New Deal. Bring back the Old Deal."

And at that point he says, "Fine, I think we have got him."

In the meantime the makeup man has been putting a mask on this character, with his back to the audience, and when they turn him around it is a mask of Mr. Roosevelt. The implication being no matter what candidate the Republican or Democratic Party picked it would be the same thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any incidents that occurred during the production of this play "Meet the People" which indicated to you any political significance on the part of the individuals who were responsible for the production of the play?

Mr. DARE. Not specifically, that I can recall. I didn't realize it at the time, but it is perfectly obvious to me now that someone or some group were dictating, how I don't know, what should go into this show.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any suggestions made by you at any time which were either approved or refused and which might indicate to the committee what the attitude was of those who were responsible for the production of this play?

Mr. DARE. I am sure that I didn't quite agree with everything that was said all the time. And I remember in one specific instance there was a number which concerned two couples dressed in tails and evening clothes. One was supposed to be a gigolo and the number in itself was quite innocuous.

It wound up with the gigolo trying to find out which of the three had the most money, his partner or the other woman, and he eventually found out it was the other man, so he asked him to dance with him. This was followed by an encore, which was inserted at some point as these people left the stage, of Hitler and Stalin coming in dancing together.

This was sometime during the Soviet-Nazi pact. Mr. Hitler had his back to the audience and we couldn't see his hand, which was behind Mr. Stalin's back, until they reached the center of the stage, at which point, as Mr. Hitler whirled Mr. Stalin around, we saw a knife was pointed at Mr. Stalin's back by Mr. Hitler.

My argument at the time was, "How can you do that? You have to put a knife in both their hands if you want to be honest." This caused a big argument. I was told that, of course, Mr. Stalin was acting in good faith, whereas Mr. Hitler was a dangerous man and couldn't be trusted; he had a knife at Mr. Stalin's back.

This wasn't in the show for a very long time. I forget at what point it went in and when it went out. I know it was in the show and I know this discussion and argument took place.

Mr. VELDE. Well, do you remember, Mr. Dare, was it before or after the pact was broken, before Germany marched on Russia?

Mr. DARE. What year was that?

Mr. VELDE. 1941.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall with whom you had this conversation concerning the characters, when you suggested to put a knife in each of their hands, whom you were talking to, discussing that problem with at the time?

Mr. DARE. People connected with the Hollywood Theatre Alliance.

Mr. MOULDER. You can't remember who they were?

Mr. DARE. I am sure that the people who worked on the committee joined in the discussion, but I am also sure there were other people connected with the Hollywood Theater Alliance, and I couldn't swear as to who exactly took what side or who agreed with me. I know it would have been discussed within the Hollywood Theatre Alliance.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question now?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Did anyone else who was on the committee or in the group agree with you?

Mr. DARE. I think so.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many out of the group agreed with you, that you ought to have a knife in both their hands?

Mr. DARE. I don't know, but not many.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, 2, 3, or 4 out of the 12 or 15?

Mr. DARE. Probably. Maybe less than that, maybe 2 or 3. I don't know, but the majority, of course, were for the other version.

Mr. VELDE. That would definitely be before the peace pact was broken?

Mr. DARE. I imagine so.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Dare, it is obvious to me, from your testimony, that you claim to have joined the Communist Party when you did because you felt at that time that the Communist Party was opposed to anti-Semitism, is that right?

Mr. DARE. That is true, definitely.

Mr. CLARDY. That was your reason?

Mr. DARE. That is true.

Mr. CLARDY. You know, as a matter of fact, today that the Communist Party is as anti-Semitic as the Nazi Party was under Hitler?

Mr. DARE. I certainly do. As a matter of fact, I can't understand anyone who at that time would have joined forces with the Communist Party or actually joined the party to fight anti-Semitism, why they couldn't today, with the same zeal and energy, fight the Communist Party, because, in essence, it is much worse today, because it tries to hide the fact it is anti-Semitic.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean it is much worse than the Nazi Party was?

Mr. DARE. I would think so, because the Nazis and the Fascists made no bones about where they stood. This is much more insidious, by protesting, "No; we don't do that," when all the reports and everything are quite the opposite.

Mr. CLARDY. Let me say I thoroughly agree with your conclusions in that respect.

Mr. DARE. In relation to that, may I say this: In order to fight this, if the organizations that are fighting communism could reach out and grab persons like myself, I am sure there are millions of them with the same intensity, and as the Communists grabbed me when I said, "I want to fight Hitler," that would be a great thing for the country.

The minute I opened my mouth and said, "This is wrong, you ought to do something about it," they were ready to say, "Here is how you do it. Let's join this organization." If the same thing could be done for the other side, I would like to take an active part in it and I am sure there are thousands of others that would. There don't seem to be the organizations on the level of myself to say, "Come on, here is what you can do."

Mr. CLARDY. Don't you think this committee is doing something about it?

Mr. DARE. That isn't it. I am talking about organizations like the Anti-Nazi League, like the Hollywood Democratic League and Hollywood Theater Alliance. There are thousands who would join them. If one didn't suit the specific thing that they were fighting against, there was another that suited their purpose.

Mr. CLARDY. Isn't that what the American Legion and the veterans' organizations are doing, sparking a pretty good move in that direction?

Mr. DARE. That is fine. I can't join the American Legion. But I am talking about organizations that—

Mr. CLARDY. You want an organization that is as broad in its membership as the electorate of the Nation.

Mr. DARE. That is true. When I was asked if I wanted to produce the Anti-Communist Crusade for Freedom in New York, I jumped at the chance. That was something I could use my talents for, just as the Communists used my talents for themselves.

Mr. CLARDY. Don't you think this committee will in some measure encourage the thing you are talking about and thus help to reach the ends you are suggesting?

Mr. DARE. That is true. This is not a criticism of the committee.

Mr. CLARDY. I understand.

Mr. DARE. This is for organizations for people, just as the Communist Party was supposed to be, and they can say, "Let's get together," me and my neighbors, "and form an organization to do this."

Mr. CLARDY. You want to fight fire with fire, in other words.

Mr. DARE. That is true. You have to do it with the same intensity they were supposedly fighting Hitlerism.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have any knowledge of an organization called the Jewish League Against Communism?

Mr. DARE. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I would suggest that perhaps it might fill some of the qualifications you say you are looking for.

Mr. DARE. The mere fact that I don't know anybody belonging to it makes me think—and this is no criticism—they may be a little remiss in reaching the people.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps the league is not on hand any time that the occasion arises to reach out and get a recruit, as the Communist Party was at the time you heard the discussion and decided to do something about it. One of the great weaknesses of freedom's forces today is the lack of effective organization it has. The Communist Party, the Communist conspiracy, is highly organized and highly vocal. If freedom is worth living for it seems to me it is worth looking for.

Mr. DARE. I do look for it, but I haven't been able to find it. I am sure there are millions more like me.

Mr. JACKSON. There are a number of organizations doing extremely effective work against communism. I am sure with a little effort you could find some such organization to fit your own requirements and your own needs.

Mr. DARE. I will be glad to do anything I can, and anyone can have my phone number and call on me for my services. I will be glad to do it.



Mr. VELDE. You did mention one organization, one anti-Communist organization is all.

Mr. DARE. Yes, the Anti-Communist Crusade for Freedom.

Mr. CLARDY. We had a professor in Washington who is also of the Jewish race, and I think some of the members asked him, I know I asked, whether he didn't agree with what you said a moment ago, that the Russian people and the Russian nation and its dictator are anti-Semitic.

He refused to agree. He said he had seen no evidence in that direction. Have you run across that sort of people out here, in the Jewish race, who take that attitude?

Mr. DARE. No, because I haven't associated with anybody like that for a long, long time.

Mr. CLARDY. Can you think of any excuse why anyone of the Jewish race should take an attitude like that?

Mr. DARE. No; I certainly cannot, unless they refuse to believe the truth, for other motives.

Mr. CLARDY. A subsequent witness suggested about the only thing we could do with that man would be to send him over to Russia. What do you think of that?

Mr. DARE. I don't want to pass judgment on anything or anybody like that.

Mr. CLARDY. It would be a little harsh, wouldn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dare, you stated this picture was a success financially—

Mr. DARE. This play, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I meant the play. This play "Meet the People." What was done with the money, do you know?

Mr. DARE. The purpose for which the organization was formed was to do quite a variety of things. Produce dramatic shows and other things, establish a school for actors and so forth. I had very little, if anything, to do with the Hollywood Theater Alliance once the show was finished. I know they produced a dramatic show, which was a very big flop and lost money on it. It was a show called "Zero Hour" by Albert Maltz.

Subsequently I heard that. By this time I think we were in the war and they were financing a little group of entertainers to go around and entertain in the defense factories. By this time I am sure they favored the defense factories and hospitals and Army camps. There were all sorts; there was a finance committee, there was a membership committee, there was a ticket committee.

Our only function was to produce this show, so I couldn't say what happened to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the official connection of Irving White with the Hollywood Theater Alliance, if you know?

Mr. DARE. I don't actually remember. I think that for a time he was a paid employee of the Hollywood Theater Alliance, for a small amount of money. I don't remember exactly in what capacity it was.

Mr. VELDE. How long has it been since you have seen Mr. White, Mr. Dare?

Mr. DARE. Mr. White, in 1950.

Mr. VELDE. Where was that?

Mr. DARE. Around a place called the Actors' Lab.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know whether or not he is still interested in the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. I do not, because I have not discussed—as a matter of fact, ever since then I have—incidentally, I had not seen him from the time “Meet the People” closed in 1950, and I saw him at that time; and, of course, I never discussed politics with him.

Mr. VELDE. What was his occupation in 1950?

Mr. DARE. He was engaged on a committee that was producing a show for the Actors’ Lab.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know where he is at the present time?

Mr. DARE. No, sir; I haven’t seen him since then.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. You stated it was a financial success, this “Meet the People.” In what terms do you refer to it as a monetary success? How many thousand dollars’ profit, for instance, if you have ever heard or knew?

Mr. DARE. Gosh, I couldn’t say. I know it made a couple of thousand dollars a week for a long period of time. It went on the road.

Mr. DOYLE. For 6 months or a year?

Mr. DARE. For a year.

Mr. DOYLE. A couple of thousand a week?

Mr. DARE. I actually couldn’t be sure. I don’t want to name any great sum and then find out I was wrong. I know it made money, and I know it made fairly important money. And, in all fairness, a lot of it was used. There were a lot of people working around. Whether they needed them or not, I don’t know, but they were people who would be paid.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. DARE. But there was money made.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Through the course of your testimony you have given as reasons for your decisions and actions that it was because of your attitude on the issue of anti-Semitism. The question I am about to ask you has no reflection on you or to determine the issue—I ask you, are you of Jewish heritage?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. You stated that you were a member of the Communist Party some years ago.

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. DARE. I was in for approximately 2 or 3 months and have been out since then.

Mr. FRAZIER. Now, the first faction that you belonged to consisted of 5 or 6 persons, of which Mr. White seems to have been the moving spirit. Since your withdrawal have you had any contacts with the other members of that group?

Mr. DARE. No.

Mr. VELDE. Any association?

Mr. DARE. The people were never friends of mine, including the people who were in the Hollywood Theater Alliance, were never my social friends. Tanya Tuttle and—

(At this point Mr. Dare conferred with Mr. Gang and others.)

Mr. DARE. And Mr. White had something to do with a show at the Actors' Lab, which I directed in 1950, early 1950.

Mr. FRAZIER. Do you know of your own knowledge whether these persons that you have mentioned are still members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. The persons I have mentioned?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Mr. DARE. No; I wouldn't have known ever since then, because once I just stopped going—I went to 2 meetings that I can recall, but I am sure that I went to 1, 2, or 3 more, and I was just bored. I couldn't sit around and listen to a lot of talk that I didn't understand. I was just interested in doing something to fight Mr. Hitler. I just stopped going, and I was asked by Mr. White about going to a meeting, and I said, "I'm too nervous. I just can't sit around, and I don't know what you are talking about." Since that time no one has ever told me anything officially about the Communist Party nor have I ever discussed any official business of the Communist Party with them.

Mr. FRAZIER. What year was it when you withdrew your active part?

Mr. DARE. I was in from around March 1939 to around May 1939, which may explain the fact that I was unaware of things happening around the Hollywood Theater Alliance. I had already been out before the show went into its rehearsal. Therefore, I guess I wasn't taken into confidence and given the reasons why certain materials should be in the show at the time.

Mr. FRAZIER. Thank you very much.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Dare, since you severed your connection with the Communist Party, have you attended any functions of the party?

Mr. DARE. By "functions" you mean—

Mr. JACKSON. Have you attended any meetings of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. Oh, never.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you participated in any activities of any Communist-front organizations?

Mr. DARE. Not knowingly, at least, to my knowledge.

Mr. JACKSON. Without your personal knowledge at the time, have you subsequently discovered that you have participated in Communist-front organizations or have had any activity whatever in any organization which has been proscribed as "Communist front"?

Mr. DARE. I may have gone to some of the so-called parties around town during the run of Meet the People, which maybe was raising funds from refugees from Russia, or whatever it was, or Nazi Germany.

I wouldn't want to say "I didn't" unless I was pretty sure I didn't.

Mr. JACKSON. Your last association with the Actors' Laboratory was in 1950, I understand.

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. The Actors' Laboratory was proscribed as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in their 1947 report, page 74. What was the nature of your work at the laboratory in 1950?

Mr. DARE. I would like to preface that by saying that, having lost all interest in so-called leftists, I did not follow the committee's hearings, many committee hearings. I did not keep up with what was considered "Communist front" or wasn't.

By early 1950 I again had been unemployed for about a year and a half or more, and Eddie Elisen and Henry Meyers came to me and said that the Actors' Laboratory wanted to do a show and would I direct it. Not being employed and thinking of it as strictly a commercial venture, I signed a contract to do this show, which I did.

Mr. JACKSON. Who produced this show?

Mr. DARE. I think it was the Actors' Lab.

Mr. JACKSON. Who directed it?

Mr. DARE. Or a committee from the Actors' Laboratory.

Mr. JACKSON. Who directed the show?

Mr. DARE. I did.

Mr. JACKSON. You directed it?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Was Morris Carnovsky in any way associated with the production?

Mr. DARE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. What was his capacity?

Mr. DARE. I first met Mr. Carnovsky when I agreed to do the show. They said, "You will have to meet with the committee that is producing it," and this was the first time I met with Mr. Carnovsky, so far as I know. He was on the committee that was producing the show.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you also associated with Albert Maltz in the production of this show?

Mr. DARE. I do not know Mr. Albert Maltz.

Mr. JACKSON. My understanding was that you had mentioned having met him or having last seen him at the Actors' Lab.

Mr. DARE. Oh, no. The only time I mentioned him was in connection with the fact that the Hollywood Theater Alliance produced a play of his, which I had nothing to do with. I was not on the committee that produced that play.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the play entitled "Zero Hour"?

Mr. DARE. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know, at the time of your association with the Actors' Laboratory in 1950 or several years after its citation as a Communist venture or a Red front, that Mr. Carnovsky had been identified as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. No; I didn't.

Mr. JACKSON. Over how long a period of time have you had consecutive residence in the Los Angeles area?

Mr. DARE. Consecutive?

Mr. JACKSON. Consecutive residence, allowing for short trips to New York or elsewhere.

Mr. DARE. From 1937 to 1950, and then I went to New York for a year and a half, and then back here.

Mr. JACKSON. During that period of time you had no specific knowledge as to the identity of the witnesses before this committee or other duly constituted agencies of Government or of the nature of the testimony they had given?

Mr. DARE. Not specifically. I was in New York for a year and a half, and of course the newspapers there don't report daily as they do here when the meetings are held here. Actually, I did not follow the meetings of the investigation closely.

Mr. JACKSON. I find that I am in error, and I should like to correct the record. The identification of Mr. Carnovsky, I am told, was in 1951.

Mr. DARE. I still don't know it.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you now prepared to state, Mr. Dare, under the compulsion of your oath, that you have given the committee all of the information in your possession with reference to the meetings you attended and those who attended the meetings who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARE. To the best of my knowledge, with one exception, which I have been prepared to name, but we skipped over that part of the story. I remember a fellow by the name of Kelly Glickman attending one meeting.

Mr. JACKSON. Aside from the ones you have already named, you have no personal knowledge of any other members of the Communist Party during the period of time you were in the party?

Mr. DARE. To the best of my knowledge, no, and I do not remember attending the so-called fraction meeting at which I was named. I remember attending a meeting of the Hollywood Theater Alliance to discuss Mr. Berkeley's play Abraham Lincoln, but as I remember it, it took place in the upper lobby of what was then known as the Music Box Theater, and I do not recall—as a matter of fact, I hardly know Ed Chodorov or George Sklar, and I am positive I have been at no meetings with them, not only Communist meetings, but almost any kind of a meeting.

Mr. JACKSON. You have never attended a meeting in company with any other person or persons whose names you have not given to the committee this morning?

Mr. DARE. That is true, except as I said, the first meeting that I went to must have had about 30 people, and I am sure that the 6 I was later identified with were at that meeting, but who the other people were I couldn't say. I don't remember.

Mr. WALTER. With whom did you go to the first meeting?

Mr. DARE. Mr. White.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question here?

Mr. VELDE. Yes, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you said when you were in New York this newspaper was brought to you showing that you had been named by Mr. Berkeley and you said, "I thought I could brazen it out." What did you mean by that? Brazen out what?

Mr. DARE. Well, in the first place, I didn't remember Mr. Berkeley from our party, and still don't, and had been so involved in such a short time I just thought that I could say I wasn't and get away with it. Of course, I didn't know at that time, I didn't realize the seriousness of perjury in front of this committee. I was just thinking of myself and my family, in trying to protect them, and I did the stupid thing on the spur of the moment.

Mr. DOYLE. You have just stated with reference to your perjury, and I think that it is clear that you did tell a falsehood in connection

with your not having been a member of the Communist Party, and you now say you were.

Mr. DARE. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, it is true that you told a falsehood.

Mr. DARE. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, let me ask you this: You know it is a standing offer of this committee, this committee often urges men and women who have been Communists or who are Communists to come forward and volunteer whatever the truth is about their connection with the Communist conspiracy. You know that is true, don't you?

Mr. DARE. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, what can this committee do, if anything, in your judgment, to actively make it more known or more widely known that there is that standing offer by this committee to have American citizens who want to clean up their back connection with the Communist conspiracy, subversive conspiracy? What can we do, if anything, in your judgment, to get more cooperation from men and women who wish to help in our national security against subversive communism? Have you any suggestions?

Mr. DARE. I feel sure, for instance, that had I been approached by an investigator for the committee privately and said, "Look, here is the situation: So and so is going to name you; what about it?" I might not have gotten scared and panicky and probably would have cooperated fully from the first, which I am glad I am doing now.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, we don't have enough employees. We don't have a staff numerically strong enough to send all over the country to tell these people that they have been named.

Mr. DARE. I realize that.

Mr. DOYLE. You realize that.

Mr. DARE. I realize that; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Therefore it couldn't be that kind of a program, but is there any inducement, any honest, fair, just inducement that we could make to former Communists or present Communists in this country who want to clean up their conspiratorial record, to come clean and help protect our Nation against this subversive conspiracy? Have you any suggestions?

Mr. DARE. Well, to me, it would depend a little on how deeply anyone was involved. Had I known the treatment that I would have received from this committee, as I have subsequently learned—incidentally, this was the thing that made me change my mind. I had visions of being persecuted and everybody being down my throat.

Mr. DOYLE. You have been, haven't you?

Mr. DARE. Well, no.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't mean you have been persecuted? I thought you had been.

Mr. DARE. Well, I don't think so. As a matter of fact, when I engaged counsel and he put me in touch with the investigator for the committee and certain other people in Hollywood who were trying to tell people who may be accused falsely and I saw the reception I got and the kindness and consideration with which I was treated and that they were honestly trying to help me, I thought I was doing justice, not only to them but to myself and my family, and I said, "Well, look; let's face it, and this is the truth. You have been nice to me and I can't double-cross you and put you out on a limb for me."

Now, I think if that is made known to people, this might do it. Outside of that, I wouldn't know.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, Mr. Dare, the reason I asked you that specific question was to give you an opportunity—I didn't know what your answer would be, but I wanted to give you an opportunity to tell the American people how you had been treated, if you had been treated fairly.

Mr. DARE. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, I think more than fairly in view of the stupid action that I took originally.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Does counsel have anything further?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I do have just one question. Mr. Dare, at the beginning of your testimony, I believe you stated that at the time you were considering joining the party or when these persons were talking to you about joining the party, you asked them whether or not the Communist Party advocated the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, and I believe you told us at that time they said that it did not advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Since that time, what is your opinion with reference to the advocacy by the Communist Party today with reference to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence?

Mr. DARE. Well, I think the courts have decided that that is a fact, that they have been convicted of that very charge by legal evidence.

Mr. SCHERER. I know. The courts have decided that, but I want to know what you think at this time from your experience and your reading and your knowledge of the activities of the Communist Party, whether in your opinion the party does advocate today the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Mr. DARE. I would like to make the answer all-embrasive, and I think they would do anything to accomplish whatever their motives are that is necessary, including that.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one further question?

Mr. VELDE. I would like to finish shortly with this witness, if possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dare, you have stated that since the time that you withdrew from the Communist Party that you have taken part in certain activities which would indicate your opposition to communism. I don't know that you have stated definitely what those matters were.

Mr. DARE. And I would like to, if I may. Incidentally, before I say that, I would just like to say that no one I have ever been con-

nected with or worked with in the Hollywood Theater Alliance has ever worked with me at a picture studio or on television, and I never fraternized or socialized with these people. I would like to bring that out. They were merely people I worked with in the theater.

I would like to say that in 1942 I took 4 weeks off at my own expense and traveled with the Hollywood Victory Caravan selling war bonds. I was one of the committee that opened the Hollywood Canteen. I have a citation from both Army Relief and Navy Relief in 1942 commending me for the work I did. During the war I donated blood to the Red Cross 11 times and again in 1951.

In 1944 I helped stage the show for Truman when he was running for Vice President here.

In 1947 I produced a show for the Variety Clubs of America for underprivileged children.

In 1948 I staged a show for Mr. Truman when he was here, when he appeared here to speak for President, when, incidentally, everybody was afraid of backing a losing horse.

In 1949, from March to December, I organized and was chairman of a Cub Scout group.

In 1949 and 1950, my wife and I worked for the PTA as officials.

In 1951 I did a show for the Red Cross, a telecast. I have citations from the Big Brothers of America commending me for the work I have done with them.

Mr. VELDE. Is there anything further, counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused and the committee will stand in recess until 1:35.

(Thereupon, at 12:00 noon, the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:35 p. m., same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:50 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, Representatives Harold H. Velde, Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr., being present.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Counsel, do you have a witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call Mr. Harold Hecht.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Hecht, will you stand and be sworn?

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

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Miss Reporter, let the record show at this point those present are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the full committee.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.



# TESTIMONY OF HAROLD ADOLPH HECHT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. HECHT. Harold Adolph Hecht.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. HECHT. I am.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Edward Bennett Williams, of Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. HECHT. I was born in New York City, June 1, 1907.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly to the committee what your educational training has been?

Mr. HECHT. Public school and high school in New York. I was graduated from high school in 1923. That is the extent of my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. How have you been employed since 1935?

Mr. HECHT. In 1935 I was employed at the Summer Hotel in New York. In 1936 I did a play for the Theater Guild, But for the Grace of God. I was assistant to the director and assistant to the stage manager.

In 1937 I was employed by the Federal Theater.

In 1939 I left the Federal Theater and came to Hollywood. Later in 1939, at the beginning of 1940, I became an agent for the Goldstone Agency.

In 1942 I entered the Army. In 1945 I was discharged. In 1945 I went into the agency again in partnership with Louis Rantz. In 1946 I dissolved that partnership and was in the agency business alone, and in 1947 I went into the production of motion pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hecht, during the course of the testimony taken before this committee in September 1951, your name was mentioned by Mr. Martin Berkeley as one of those whom he knew as a member, of the Communist Party. Now, that testimony was taken in closed session of the committee and not in an open session, and due to the fact that the committee learned that you were, I believe, in Italy—

Mr. HECHT. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that by taking that testimony in closed session, you would have an opportunity to cooperate with this committee, as it was your desire, before your name had been made public as a member of the Communist Party. I think the committee was in receipt of a message from you, a telegram, indicating that the testimony of Mr. Martin Berkeley with regard to you was correct.

Mr. HECHT. That is so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that so?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, that is so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then we want to take this opportunity to question you regarding your former Communist Party membership, but before doing that I would like to ask you, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. No, I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I was a member of the Communist Party from 1936 until the end of 1939 or the beginning of 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore, you were a member of the Communist Party during a part of your career in New York City and also during a part of your career in Hollywood?

Mr. HECHT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. In 1935 I left Hollywood. I was without a job and also without any money. The motion pictures I had been working in were more or less stopped. They were higher-budget pictures, and I was a dance director at that time. I was out of work for some time. I went to New York. I remember going to New York, and it was on a May Day. I saw a vast army marching.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the year?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir, 1935. I saw this army marching. There were pamphlets, literature, and other material handed out. I read the Daily Worker. It interested me. That summer I heard more about communism, that communism found jobs galore, spoke about the growing need for social reform and social security, with one voice fighting nazism and fascism, and these things interested me, and in 1936 I joined the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in New York City?

Mr. HECHT. That was in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who recruited you in the party?

Mr. HECHT. I was going to a labor school at that time. I was recruited by a man who was attending classes with me, a man named Lewis. I happen to remember his name because it was the same name as the head of the CIO. At that time the Communist Party and the CIO were working together.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was not the same person who was the head of the CIO?

Mr. HECHT. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say at the time that you were recruited you were attending a labor school. Will you tell us more about that labor school?

Mr. HECHT. The labor school was in the headquarters of the Communist Party, a building on 4th Avenue between 12th and 13th Streets, I believe in New York City. I took several courses there, 1 in political economy, 1 in current events, and 1 in the rise of Marxism and Leninism. I attended about 5 hours a week.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what was your purpose in attending the school if you were not a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. HECHT. Well, the theory and ideas of communism interested me and I decided to find out more about it, and that is the reason I went to the labor school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were other persons in attendance at that school non-Communist persons?

Mr. HECHT. I believe so. It wasn't necessary to belong to the Communist Party to go to the school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee anything about the faculty of that institution at that time? Were there any members who

became known to you later to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. No, I knew none of them. My only connection with them was in their actual official capacity conducting classes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Marxism taught?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; it was. I took a course in Marxism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the person by the name of Lewis, who recruited you into the party, a student or a person connected with the school?

Mr. HECHT. He was a student, but I believe that he might have been a student who was more or less a perpetual student in the class, and that is why, I think, that they weren't all Communists that went to school, because I believe that his main function in attending the class was to recruit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was to recruit?

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he recruited any other persons who were students at that school?

Mr. HECHT. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were recruited into the party, were you assigned to any particular group or cell of the party?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; I was. I was assigned to a group in Brooklyn. This man Lewis was part of that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons composed that group?

Mr. HECHT. About a dozen. It was a neighborhood group of a number of housewives and a number of men unemployed, and this man Lewis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of that neighborhood group?

Mr. HECHT. About 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the principal interests of that particular group were, what objectives they sought to accomplish?

Mr. HECHT. As I said, it was a neighborhood group. They circulated petitions, canvassed for elections, sold subscriptions to the Daily Worker. We worked with what was called the Workers' Alliance which was in that neighborhood, and we did more or less what I would consider the lower level of Communist activities of that day.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you closely associated with their work in the Workers' Alliance, that is, the work of the Communist Party within the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. HECHT. No. I went to a number of meetings of the Workers' Alliance in this neighborhood, but I was not closely associated with them. I know that the Workers' Alliance was, I believe a union of, the unemployed and there was great pressure put on at that time for jobs for everybody, for greater appropriations for the WPA, and that was the way the alliance functioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall at this time any particular activities of that Communist Party neighborhood group in promoting the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. HECHT. There were sidewalk features, door-to-door canvassing for signing petitions, constant pressure on Washington to increase appropriations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not the Communist Party at that time advocated or supported a plan by which Communist Party members should give their full time to the work of the Workers' Alliance group, and at the same time be supported by relief? Did you have any experience of that character?

Mr. HECHT. No; I am sorry, I haven't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, at the end of 5 months, do I understand you were assigned to another group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. That's correct. I was assigned to another group that met near Broadway on West 46th Street, I believe. This was a group that was composed to a great extent of secretarial workers, not people connected with the theater, although there may have been some secretaries who were connected with the different offices.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you happen to be assigned to that particular group?

Mr. HECHT. Well, I wasn't happy with the group that I was working with in Brooklyn. One of the things that disturbed me very much was the shifting support for candidate for office in Brooklyn. The Communists had been supporting him for some time and they suddenly decided to shift their support to the other candidate. This seemed to me to be the rashest kind of opportunism and bothered me very much. I was also disturbed by things that disturbed many other people that belonged to the Communist Party, lack of democracy.

In addition to that, I was looking for work in New York and on Broadway, and this seemed to be a much better place for me to be assigned to the group. Both factors were important in my changing. I would think that the first was more important than the latter.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain with this second group?

Mr. HECHT. About 3 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that began at about what date and ended about when?

Mr. HECHT. That began in 1936 and ended, oh, I should say about the beginning of 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names, please, of any persons whom you can now recall who were members of that group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I can recall of the second group, I can recall a girl named Sylvia Siegel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that?

Mr. HECHT. I only know the phonetic spelling, S-i-e-g-e-l.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. HECHT. Who was the secretary in charge of the group. I also remember another accountant. I remember an accountant, another person whose name was Arren. He had charge of the financial affairs.

(Representative Kit Clardy left the hearing room at this point, 2:05 p. m.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the cause of the severance of your connections with that particular group after being with it 3 months?

Mr. HECHT. I started working in the Federal Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before I ask you about that, how many persons were in that group of white-collar workers or secretaries, which was the second group to which you were assigned?

Mr. HECHT. Eight or ten.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you joined what organization—the Federal—

Mr. HECHT. I was employed by the Federal Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were employed by the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. In 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what capacity were you employed?

Mr. HECHT. I was in charge of a unit there, a show, a musical revue.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a WPA project?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say you were "in charge of a unit," will you explain that a little more fully, please?

Mr. HECHT. This was a musical revue. It was necessary to compile songs, sketches, lyrics, something similar to what Mr. Dare spoke about. However, I had started organizing it from the start. I got a number of writers to work on the songs, sketches, music, dancing, costumes, et cetera, and also we had to secure a cast. These people were recruited from roles in the Federal Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not hear the last part.

Mr. HECHT. I said these people came from the Federal Theater. Is it difficult to hear me?

Mr. TAVENNER. I can hear you now. How long did you occupy that type of a position with the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. I was there until 1939, when I left to go back to Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any particular show that you worked on while employed by the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; there was a revue called Sing For Your Supper.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sing for Your Supper?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did it take to produce that show?

Mr. HECHT. About 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why was it necessary to take that much time to produce it?

Mr. HECHT. Well, it was a very large show. There were many people in the show who went back to private industry, particularly people who were important to the show.

In addition to that, their appropriations were constantly being cut in the Federal Theater, and we would have to cut the cast and rearrange numbers and rearrange the show, and that was the reason it took so long.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the play finally produced?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; it was. It finally produced in April, I believe, 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it meet with reasonable success?

Mr. HECHT. I would think so. Not a great success, but I think it met with reasonable success.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons were in the cast?

Mr. HECHT. About 200.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you define just exactly what your duties were with regard to the persons in that cast and the production of the play?

Mr. HECHT. I was in charge of it.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point, 2:10 p. m.)

Mr. HECHT. There was a dance director, one for the modern dance group and one for jazz dance group. There were sketches to be rehearsed and people to rehearse them. Countless numbers of people who were to be in the show, and I had charge of the entire business.

Mr. TAVENNER. That meant it was your responsibility to hire and fire members of the cast?

Mr. HECHT. Well, it was not my sole responsibility. I was not entirely in charge of that, but I had something to do with it certainly.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had a very heavy responsibility with regard to the personnel?

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I assume from your statement you did.

Mr. HECHT. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party while you held that position?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What group of the Communist Party did you belong to at the time that you were employed by the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. I belonged to a group that was concerned with this particular show.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean to say that there was a Communist Party cell or group established within the cast which produced this play?

Mr. HECHT. Well, there was the cast, there were the workers. I said there were 200 in the cast. I should say from the time we started the show until the show went on there might have been 500 people connected with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. But probably about 200 at any one time; is that correct?

Mr. HECHT. That is correct.

(Representative Kit Clardy reentered the hearing room at this point, 2:13 p. m.)

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons composed this group or cell of the Communist Party, within the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. About 40.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many?

Mr. HECHT. Forty.

Mr. TAVENNER. Forty. Now, were there other plays being produced at the same time that you were producing Sing for Your Supper?

Mr. HECHT. Oh, yes; many of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything about Communist Party groups or cells within the cast which were involved in the production of other plays?

Mr. HECHT. No; I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee just what the objective was of the group of Communists that had been organized within the Federal Theater, at least within your project, the one that was producing Sing for Your Supper?

Mr. HECHT. Well, they had the immediate objective of keeping their jobs, trying to influence the content of the show to some extent, and they had the larger objectives which all Communist Party members have of following the party line, of reading literature, of doing certain neighborhood work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well now; with regard to the objective that you said all Communist Party groups have, in following the Communist Party line, do you recall in what way that manifested itself?

Mr. HECHT. Well, there was constant pressure to keep up the appropriations for the Federal Theater and the WPA. There were certain groups organized to go to Washington and there was—

Mr. TAVENNER. You are speaking now of groups of Communist Party members?

Mr. HECHT. That is right. There was a great deal of picketing, for one reason or another. I can't remember much else. It seems to me there probably was something more, but I didn't spend a great deal of time at these meetings. I went to them approximately once a month or once in 3 weeks, and I had no other connection with it than that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you have any official connection with this group? I mean did you hold any position at any time?

Mr. HECHT. I was what you would call in charge of literature, the literature director for a while. I sold the pamphlets to people. I took up subscriptions for the Daily Worker. I did all the various things connected with distributing and disseminating literature.

When I was part of the group I had no greater position than anyone else in the group.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder reentered the hearing room at this point, 2:15 p. m.)

Mr. TAVENNER. So that you had a rather small part in the Communist Party activity of the cell, as such, though you held a very important position in that you were the head of the project?

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, did the Communist Party endeavor to influence you as the manager—is that the right term to use in your position?

Mr. HECHT. Producer, I would say.

Mr. TAVENNER. As producer of this play?

Mr. HECHT. At one time there was great protest among a number of the comrades over the content of the show. There was a dress rehearsal and V. J. Jerome, who was the cultural director of the party, was at this dress rehearsal. The rehearsal was not given for him, but he was there. After the show—

Mr. TAVENNER. V. J. Jerome at that time was the cultural director of the Communist Party in this country, was he not?

Mr. HECHT. I believe so. I am not sure that is his actual title, but that describes the position he held.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has appeared in the evidence during the course of this hearing or these hearings that V. J. Jerome was the person sent out from national headquarters to various parts of the country to settle disputes that existed within the party. He was sent here in the very early days of the party to straighten out various difficulties.

Now you are telling us that he appeared at the dress rehearsal of your play, which you have described?

Mr. HECHT. That is right. He settled this one. I remember we had a midnight meeting and he talked to us about the play. He felt that it was good, that while it did not necessarily follow the party line or was as left as a number of the people wanted it to be—

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "a number of people," what people?

Mr. HECHT. As I said before, there was a group of the people in this unit who had protested about the content of the show. They felt it wasn't sufficiently slanted to the left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those persons members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. Oh, yes; they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were.

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, this dispute raised within your Communist Party cell——

Mr. HECHT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Where some of them were of the opinion that the propaganda was not pointed enough?

Mr. HECHT. Or sufficiently strong.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or sufficiently strong?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And V. J. Jerome was called in to settle that dispute; is that what I understand?

Mr. HECHT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, just tell us what V. J. Jerome did.

Mr. HECHT. Well, he said he thought that it was a good show. If it was slanted any more it would become sectarian. The content of the show was good and these criticisms were unjust.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then was the show put on in substantially the same form that had been planned?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; it was.

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

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Suppose Mr. Jerome had not been in approval, do you believe that his influence would have been sufficient to change the content matter?

Mr. HECHT. Well, we were pretty far gone by that time. I think it might have been.

Mr. JACKSON. You think any suggested changes he might have made would have been incorporated into the production?

Mr. HECHT. I wouldn't say any suggested changes, but I think if he suggested changes they certainly would have been taken into consideration.

Mr. JACKSON. The fact of his presence there would have indicated he was more or less acting in the capacity of censor of the production, would it not?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; I think you would say acting as a judge.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who took part in the conference with V. J. Jerome on the occasion that you mentioned?

Mr. HECHT. I don't think there was anybody else from the official—from the party, any of the higher ups, any of the higher hierarchy.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are of the opinion that there were no persons superior to you that were involved in the Communist Party efforts to control this production; is that it?

Mr. HECHT. I am sorry. I thought you said "Who else appeared with Mr. Jerome?"

Mr. TAVENNER. I did start out the question that way. So let's start over.



Mr. HECHT. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did anyone else take part in the conference with V. J. Jerome—excuse me. Let me change that again.

Who did take part in this conference with V. J. Jerome when he said that the play should not be more slanted than it was?

Mr. HECHT. No one, other than the people who were concerned with our group or unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. HECHT. There were a number of functionaries. There was Rose Pearson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Give us the spelling, please.

Mr. HECHT. I believe it is P-e-a-r-s-o-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Rose Pearson.

Mr. HECHT. Yes. Trudy Peck.

Mr. TAVENNER. Trudy Peck, P-e-c-k?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir. Robert Sloan and Georgia Burns.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Burns?

Mr. HECHT. B-u-r-n-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the first name?

Mr. HECHT. Georgia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell it, please?

Mr. HECHT. G-e-o-r-g-i-a.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Hecht, I believe it would be of great help to the committee if you would identify the occupations of these individuals, if you have that information.

Mr. HECHT. These people were connected with the project. They were aspiring actors and actresses. The Federal Theater was created for the unemployed in the theatrical profession, and most of the people were drawn from those ranks. These people were part of that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they hold any official positions in the Communist Party group of which you were a member?

Mr. HECHT. No, sir. These were people who were just part of the unit, a part of the show.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they members of the Communist Party unit?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, indeed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of which you were a member?

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that another objective of this Communist Party group was to maintain the positions of various persons in and with the Federal Theater, if I understood you correctly.

Mr. HECHT. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. HECHT. Well, if there was a tie or if there was a matter of doubt, we were expected to keep and to continue the member who belonged to the Communist Party. As I said before, at that time appropriations were being cut and there were quite a number of firings. While it was recognized that there couldn't be discrimination; however, we were expected to favor the members of the Communist Party in retaining their jobs. There was one instance I remember very well when we were asked to drop a number of people from one of the groups, and there was a person reported to be a

Trotskyite and we let that person go. However, that person was not necessarily inferior to a number of other people who were in line for that same position.

It struck me recently, when the suit was brought for \$51 million, the Communists claimed that they can't be employed now because they are Communists, but they were framing to allow someone to be fired who was not a Communist, who was considered an enemy of the Communist Party.

MR. TAVENNER. So that the Communist Party interested itself in the firing of a person who was thought to be a Trotskyite.

MR. HECHT. That is true.

MR. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman?

MR. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

MR. MOULDER. Are you referring to the \$51 million lawsuit, you mean the lawsuit filed against members of this committee and other persons?

MR. HECHT. Yes; I think I might become a partner of yours in that lawsuit.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Hecht, as far as that lawsuit is concerned, let me say for myself that I consider it a frivolous action, designed as a device by the Communist Party to hamper and hinder these hearings, to prevent us from uncovering the activity of those people who filed the suit against us; that it will be considered by me as such type of suit.

Now, proceed.

MR. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman?

MR. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE. If you refer to the summons and complaint that was also served on me about an hour ago for about 51 million dollars, I want to give notice to the Communist subversives in this room or in the country or who are directly or indirectly interested in filing that suit, that that will not stop me in going after them. If they are subversive I will go after them any place. That is the way I feel about the suit you refer to.

MR. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, may I interject a remark?

MR. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

MR. CLARDY. We two members have not been honored by being included in that suit, but if they think they will intimidate either of us from pursuing the activities of the committee by this threat, they are going to find themselves misjudging us.

Do I speak for you, Mr. Scherer?

MR. SCHERER. Yes; and we haven't got a million dollars.

MR. CLARDY. But I am flattered that they think the members do have.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, not on that point, but on another point—

MR. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON. I think it is extremely interesting that the non-Communists in the Federal Theater setup were blacklisted in much the same manner. I should judge from your testimony, as is presently being claimed by unfriendly witnesses here in Hollywood.

Am I to understand that if it came to a question of firing a Communist or non-Communist, you were expected to fire the non-Communist?

Mr. HECHT. That is true. If the non-Communist—I wouldn't say the non-Communist. I would say the outspoken anti-Communist.

Mr. JACKSON. The anti-Communist.

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. He got the ax.

Mr. HECHT. That's right.

Mr. JACKSON. In a matter of casting, if you had a Communist and a non-Communist critic, I suppose there was no question as to who was to be employed.

Mr. HECHT. No.

Mr. JACKSON. The Communist would get the job.

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. It is interesting to know there is some historical precedent for blacklisting.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. The members of this project were paid from Federal funds at that time, were they not?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, they were.

Mr. SCHERER. Sir?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, they were.

Mr. SCHERER. Could I ask another question?

Mr. VELDE. Yes, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe you said that Mr. Jerome, when he was reviewing the play, said that if the play would be slanted as the Communists wanted it to be slanted it would appear too sectarian. Do you know what he meant by that?

Mr. HECHT. I think he meant that it would be an out-and-out Communist propaganda.

Mr. CLARDY. They wanted to be more subtle about it, in other words.

Mr. HECHT. Yes, they did.

Mr. SCHERER. Who was head of the Federal project at that time?

Mr. HECHT. In New York George Kondolf was the head. Hallie Flanagan was the head of the national Federal Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you give us those spellings, please?

Mr. HECHT. George Kondolf, K-o-n-d-o-l-f. And Hallie Flanagan, F-l-a-n-a-g-a-n.

I would like to say, if I may, I consider the Federal Theater a hallmark in the history of the American theater. There were a great many plays put on by the Federal Theater. A great many people saw them and a great many people got a great deal of enjoyment out of them. The art of the theater was really increased by the Federal Theater, and I hope you don't consider my remarks in any way an attack on the Federal Theater itself.

Mr. JACKSON. Were there a great many non-Communists in the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. There were a great many non-Communists. A great many plays were produced and these plays were accorded very high esteem.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of the witness' observation, however, about the Federal Theater, I think his testimony at this time shows that the

maximum number of people participating in the cast at any one time were 200 with a total cast membership of 500 during the whole period; that there were about 40 members of the Communist Party in the cast, which means about 1 in 5. So the Communist subversives made pretty good gravy.

Mr. HECHT. Out of this particular group; I don't know about the others.

Mr. DOYLE. I only refer to the group you were testifying about.

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Another question suggests itself: You mentioned the fact that the Trotskyite branch were blacklisted, so to speak. Do I understand you correctly?

Mr. HECHT. I never quite understood what a Trotskyite was. It seems to me a Trotskyite was anyone who had been a Communist and who no longer was a Communist and who might be attacked for that reason, as differing from an anti-Communist who had never been a Communist. I don't believe there was any organized Trotskyite group.

Mr. CLARDY. By that do you not mean those who adhere to the Trotsky brand of communism?

Mr. HECHT. It was a more embracing term than that, I would think.

Mr. CLARDY. What do you mean?

Mr. HECHT. I think it included many people who had been Communists and who were not Communists any longer and it was a very convenient label for them.

Mr. CLARDY. Is it not true that you probably blacklisted anyone who did not adhere to the official Communist Party line as such?

Mr. HECHT. Do you mean who had been a member of the party who did not—you see, there were a great many non-Communists in the Federal Theater.

Mr. CLARDY. No, I mean this: Whether they were or were not members of the Communist Party is unimportant for the purpose of my question. I am trying to get at this: Isn't it true, if you were or had been a Communist but did not adhere firmly to the official party line, you were just as bad off as though you were completely outside the party?

Mr. HECHT. Worse off, I would say.

Mr. VELDE. I believe this will be a proper place to break off for our recess. We will stand in recess until 2:45.

(Short recess was taken.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

The chair recognizes Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, under the resolution of the committee relative to the matter of television facilities in the hearing room and in the Federal Building, the committee was unanimous in its expression that the facilities were considered desirable for public information, subject to certain specific provisions which were set forth in the resolution.

I understand the resolution has been read in full. However, the one paragraph which is pertinent to a matter which has developed should be read again. That is paragraph 2 of the resolution, which states:

Telecasts of committee hearings shall be on the basis of a public service only and this fact shall be publicly announced on television at the beginning and close of each telecast. No commercial announcements will be made from the hearing room and no actual or intimated sponsorship of the hearings will be permitted in any instance.

It develops, and there have been several complaints received by the committee to the effect, that immediately preceding the hearing this morning there was telecast a program which might have left an inference with the public that the hearings were being sponsored. The committee desires to make it very clear that that is not the case. There is no sponsorship of these hearings. It was the expressed hope of the committee that this fact would be made absolutely clear.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the television groups which are operating under this pool arrangement must take steps to insure that it be made very clear to the people of southern California there is no sponsorship nor should any be intimated.

Mr. VELDE. The chair recognizes Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I join in the observations made by Congressman Jackson of Los Angeles County.

I wish to expressly ask that the television outfits that are televising this committee work the rest of the week and today, the rest of the time today, either directly or indirectly immediately comply with the resolution of the committee. I would say if they don't comply they ought to be discontinued.

We are not here as an advertising medium for any organization. We are here as United States Congressmen. I don't think that in any way any television outfit or any publicity outfit ought to capitalize on these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying again very emphatically they ought to discontinue it forthwith.

Mr. VELDE. The chair agrees with both the distinguished gentlemen from California. I feel it is the prerogative of these gentlemen to handle the issues which come up in their own State.

However, I do want the public to know that we by no means are allowing these hearings to be broadcast for commercial purposes. This is merely a public service so that the people might have more information as to what goes on in their United States House of Representatives and their Congress.

So the Chair will greatly appreciate it, and will insist no further reference to these hearings be made on a commercial basis.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hecht, it seems that you must have been put in a very difficult position, having a responsibility to your employer, the Federal Theater, in doing the right sort of a job and at the same time being responsible to the Communist Party to observe its dictates with regard to whom you should continue in work, as to whom you should discharge.

Now, have you anything further to say about that situation?

Mr. HECHT. Again, Mr. Tavenner, I don't want to give the impression this was flagrant. This happened all the time. These cases were isolated and few. Nevertheless, they existed.

The Federal Theater couldn't have been the success it was, couldn't have done the work it did if this was a continual practice in the Federal Theater. But, certainly, it often made things difficult.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I understand it correctly, the Federal Theaters were sponsored solely by Federal funds.

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Funds from the United States Government.

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you terminate your relationship with the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. In 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what was the reason for it?

Mr. HECHT. The show had gone on, the Federal Theater was cutting appropriations to a great extent, and I could see that if I didn't leave very soon they would leave me. So I left the Federal Theater in April—I think probably in May 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. HECHT. My next employment was as an agent with the Goldstone Agency.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, had you asked him questions along the lines of discovering whether his knowledge really went beyond the one unit to which he was attached?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I asked him that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you think you have that thoroughly covered?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I understood the witness to say he did not know about the Communist Party in any other group.

Mr. HECHT. Not in any other group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me be certain about that. Did you have knowledge whether or not there existed a Communist Party cell in any other group of the Federal Theaters engaged in the production of any play?

Mr. HECHT. I didn't have any direct knowledge, although I should imagine there were quite a few. I said I didn't have any direct knowledge. I never met with any of the groups, although I imagine there were quite a few.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not there was a fraction meeting of any kind made up of representatives of your own Communist Party cell and representatives of any other Communist Party cell within the Federal Theater?

Mr. HECHT. I don't remember attending any.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have knowledge of Communist Party membership on the part of any other person in Federal Theaters, other than the ones you have mentioned?

Mr. HECHT. No, I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that cover it?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, that is what I wanted.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment after you terminated your relationship with the Federal Theater in May 1939?

Mr. HECHT. I came to Hollywood. I was without a job for some time and then I became an agent with the Nat Goldstone Agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become an agent in that firm?

Mr. HECHT. Late in 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the other members of that firm at that time?

Mr. HECHT. There was Mr. Nat Goldstone, his brother Charles Goldstone, Louis Rantz, William Fay, and several others. I don't

remember them immediately, but I certainly could find out, if you wanted to know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your becoming affiliated with that agency, had you reaffiliated with the Communist Party in Los Angeles?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee how that occurred.

Mr. HECHT. I met a Madelaine Ruthven after I had been here for about a month. I met her at a social function and she talked to me about coming to meetings. I had not sought her out, although I had heard that she was the secretary or the organizer for the Hollywood group.

She asked me why I hadn't been to see her. Evidently she had heard about me and she felt I should have been to see her. I told her I had been inactive for some time before that, I hadn't gone to meetings for several months before I left New York, and I didn't care particularly whether I went to meetings or not.

I again was out of work. I was feeling very low. I had great disillusion with the party, and I discussed this with her. She felt that this might be just a matter of my own personal feeling, and that when you are once a Communist you never could drop it completely or entirely, and she asked me to attend a meeting at Herbert Biberman's house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me stop you there a moment. How did Madelaine Ruthven know you had been a member of the Communist Party in New York?

Mr. HECHT. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you advise her before she said something to you about it?

Mr. HECHT. No, I didn't. But she had evidently heard about me. I think it might have gone through the mail or through someone who, seeing that New York and Hollywood was rather closely alined, although the party here was more secretive than it was in New York, that in one of those ways she probably found out about me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You attended a meeting at whose home?

Mr. HECHT. Herbert Biberman's.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe him more fully, please, as to his occupation?

Mr. HECHT. Herbert Biberman was a director in Hollywood. He was formerly theatrical director in New York. He directed a number of plays, "Green Grow the Lilacs," and I believe he directed a play called "Red China," or "Raw China," but at any rate, he directed a number of plays in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many meetings did you attend at his home?

Mr. HECHT. I attended several. I was then asked to go to meetings at Gertrude Purcell's home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the spelling of that name, please?

Mr. HECHT. P-u-r-c-e-l-l, I believe. I would like to explain the circumstances of this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HECHT. At this meeting at Herbert Biberman's house I met a Frank Tuttle. Frank Tuttle was a director of a picture for which I directed the dances at Paramount Pictures when I was in Hollywood before. He was the only man that I knew at that meeting. I was rather surprised to see him there.

After the meeting we had a discussion about my own feeling about communism, about his attitude toward it, and he asked me if I would go to a meeting at Gertrude Purcell's house, which I did. I went to a number of meetings there over a period of, I would say, about 6 to 8 months. I went to a number of meetings there and to a number of meetings at Biberman's house.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. What was discussed at those meetings? That is one of the things we are interested in and would like to hear about. What was said there and what was your purpose in going there?

Mr. HECHT. I don't remember it too well. We discussed the state of the Nation, the state of the world, what the Communists must do to make it better. At that time the party was going through one of its changes and I remember in that year, I think it was August or September, the Nazi-Soviet pact was signed and that really blew the lid off. For a couple of months more this was the thing that was discussed.

I think I went to about 4 meetings or 5.

Mr. MOULDER. When did you discontinue your affiliation with the Communist Party organization?

Mr. HECHT. At the beginning of 1940.

Mr. MOULDER. At the beginning of 1940?

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. At anytime since then have you in any way been connected with the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I have not attended a meeting or been connected in any way with the Communist Party since then.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you think your prior membership with the Communist Party has influenced you in any way as a writer?

Mr. HECHT. I am a producer.

Mr. MOULDER. Or as a producer?

Mr. HECHT. No, I don't feel that it has influenced me in my work at all.

Mr. MOULDER. It has never at any time so influenced you?

Mr. HECHT. I have never hired a Communist because he was a Communist. I have never had any communism propaganda in my pictures or never been accused of having any.

Mr. MOULDER. Was there any attempt on the part of any Communist leaders or persons in the party organization to so influence you?

Mr. HECHT. No, there wasn't. I left the party and no one ever tried to rerecruit me.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Hecht, I noticed before the recess you said "other things disturbed me a great deal, the lack of democracy." Those I think were your exact words. Now, a few minutes ago you said "I had great disillusion with the party." What did you mean when you said that the lack of democracy in the Communist Party disturbed you a great deal?

Mr. HECHT. One of the things that was told us and taught to us was that the Communist Party is a democratic organization, the members of which decided on the action and line of the party. This I found never to be true. I found—

Mr. DOYLE. You say never to be true?



Mr. HECHT. Well, it may have been true on ordinary and mundane things, you know, whether they should walk on a picket line at 3 or 5 o'clock. When there were important decisions, when important decisions were made, these decisions came down to us.

Mr. DOYLE. Came from where?

Mr. HECHT. Some place from up above.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you mean from some source of which you had no knowledge?

Mr. HECHT. Yes. These matters were decided and they were passed on to us. It was considered a matter of party discipline to follow the line.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, did all members of the cell in which you were a member follow the party line, even though the orders came from somewhere, you didn't know where?

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you take dictation, in other words, from some outside source?

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. DOYLE. Why did you do that?

Mr. HECHT. Because there were other things that I felt that the Communist Party stood for, and as I said before, it bothered me so much that was one of the most important reasons I left.

Mr. DOYLE. What other disillusion, if any, did you have with the party? You said you had a great disillusion with the party.

Mr. HECHT. At this time Roosevelt was called a warmonger. The Communist Party had supported Roosevelt and supported him strongly, and suddenly he became a warmonger. It was a little difficult to follow and a little difficult to swallow. It was also at this time, as I said before, the Nazi-Soviet pact occurred.

One of the reasons I came into the party was because the party was fighting against nazism and against facism, and now for some reason that I couldn't understand or believe in, although there were great attempts made to explain it, this was changed and communism and nazism were alined.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, didn't you have any power of helping to make those decisions, as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. As I said, Congressman, there was no democratic procedure in the party. You could have questioned. There was often discussion, but at the end of the discussion you were supposed to be clear on it.

Mr. DOYLE. From some outside source?

Mr. HECHT. From some inside source, the origination of which you didn't know.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Just one question.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. During the past 12 years, or since you ceased affiliation with the Communist Party, have you any information or knowledge of any Communist activities in the entertainment field, motion picture, musical or on the stage, concerning the efforts of Communists to infiltrate in and take control over their organizations or to influence their productions?

Mr. HECHT. No; I haven't. I have read a number of things that have come up during the committee meetings, but outside of that I had no knowledge.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Hecht, during your membership in the Communist Party, from 1936 to 1940, I believe you stated you belonged to three separate and distinct cells. First, in Brooklyn and then—Where was the second cell you belonged to, in New York City?

Mr. HECHT. That is right.

Mr. FRAZIER. And then—

Mr. HECHT. West 48th Street, and the other was also on West 48th Street.

Mr. FRAZIER. Then a cell composed of the Federal Theater, is that right?

Mr. HECHT. That was the third.

Mr. FRAZIER. Now, did the teachings that were carried on in these cells have any similarity with the same things carried on in each one of these cells?

Mr. HECHT. To a great extent. Propaganda and party line changed constantly, and we struggled to keep abreast of the events.

Mr. FRAZIER. Do you recall any of the members that you were associated with up in the Brooklyn cell?

Mr. HECHT. No; I don't.

Mr. FRAZIER. I believe you said there were about 40 members of the Federal Theater to which you belonged.

Mr. HECHT. That's correct.

Mr. FRAZIER. Do you recall any of those names of members that associated with you there?

Mr. HECHT. I gave the names of the four members I recall.

Mr. FRAZIER. Only the four?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRAZIER. Have you had association with any of those men since you left the Communist Party, men or women?

Mr. HECHT. No. I have never seen them. You see the Federal Theater was composed, for the most part, of actors who had been unemployed, who were interested in working in the theater, and there was professional and also semiprofessional. These people I have had no contact with since I saw them last during this part.

Mr. FRAZIER. That's all.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hecht, as I understood you to say, you wanted to describe the circumstances under which you attended the Communist Party meeting at the home of Gertrude Purcell. I am not certain whether you finished your testimony about that.

Mr. HECHT. I thought I did. You asked me if I belonged to the group at Purcell's house. I said I went to meetings at both groups and I never considered myself and I didn't know whether the Communists considered me particularly identified with either group, but I went to meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. At both homes for a long period of time?

Mr. HECHT. I would say between 6 and 8 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee who were in attendance at those meetings, that is, the Communist Party at Biberman's home and at the home of Gertrude Purcell?

Mr. HECHT. You want the names?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HECHT. Betty Anderson.

Mr. JACKSON. With identification as to occupation, if you know the occupation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Give all of the identifying material you can.

Mr. HECHT. Betty Anderson, I believe, is a housewife, was a secretary.

Martin Berkeley was a writer.

Edward Biberman, a painter. Herbert Biberman, director.

John Bright, writer; Gordon Kahn, writer; John Howard Lawson, writer; Mel Levy, writer; Albert Maltz, writer; Gertrude Purcell, writer; Meta Reis, housewife at that time; Madelaine Ruthven, professional Communist; Budd Schulberg, writer.

Madelaine Ruthven was also a writer. Gale Sondergaard, actress, and Frank Tuttle, director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you mention the name of Budd Schulberg?

Mr. HECHT. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the following persons who were just mentioned by the witness have testified before this committee and admitted their former Communist Party membership and have testified freely before the committee; namely, Betty Anderson, George Bassman, Martin Berkeley, Mel Levy, and Meta Reis [Rosenberg], Budd Schulberg, and Frank Tuttle.

Did you go through any formality in terminating your Communist Party membership?

Mr. HECHT. No; I didn't. I just stopped going to meetings, drifted out. I drifted out. I left the party and I went to no more meetings after the beginning. I would say, of January and February of 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you withdrew from the party by ceasing to attend meetings, you were with the agency that you mentioned, the Goldstone Agency?

Mr. HECHT. The Goldstone Agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. With the Goldstone Agency, were you not?

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your withdrawal from the Communist Party result in any change in attitude on the part of former business associates with your agency?

Mr. HECHT. You mean clients?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HECHT. Whom I might have represented in the agency?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HECHT. No; I made no formal break with the party. I had no quarrel with the people in the party. I was disturbed and disillusioned about many of the facets and the practices of the party and I just left. However, I made no formal observance of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you in a position to state to the committee what percentage of your clients while you were an agent were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. Yes, sir. You probably noticed me looking at a number of notes I have here. I have gone through these things rather carefully and if you don't mind I will refer to them more or less constantly.

When I first went into the agency business, this was 1940 to 1942. In 1942 I went into the Army. I had 36 clients. Ten of these clients were named.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have been named?

Mr. HECHT. Before this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before this committee as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Out of a total of how many?

Mr. HECHT. Thirty-six.

Mr. JACKSON. On that point, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you have any connections, professional connections, in line with your job as agent in the studios who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. You mean officials of the studios?

Mr. JACKSON. Officials or those with whom you dealt in your work as an agent.

Mr. HECHT. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. No one in the studios who were known to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you an actor's or writer's agent?

Mr. HECHT. Mostly writer's agent.

Mr. JACKSON. Then I will rephrase the question: No one with whom you were called upon to discuss scripts in the studios, none of these individuals were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I believe Meta Reis became a story editor at Paramount Pictures, but I think this was much later. At any rate, I never discussed party activities with her during the work and I never represented or tried to sell any material because it was written by a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. Was George Willner a member of your agency during the time you were a member of the Goldstone Agency?

Mr. HECHT. George Willner came to the agency sometime after, sometime shortly before I went into the Army. George Willner, incidentally, met me in the hall and said, "I understand you are going to be a stool pigeon."

I want George Willner to know that he will not intimidate me in any way by remarks and expressions of that kind.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that occur?

Mr. HECHT. In the luncheon recess.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. HECHT. Today.

Mr. JACKSON. Here in the Federal Building?

Mr. HECHT. Here in the Federal Building.

Mr. SCHIERER. Who said that?

Mr. HECHT. George Willner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the members of the committee who were not here at the time, George Willner was brought before the committee and refused to testify on a previous occasion.

Mr. SCHERER. On grounds it would incriminate him?

Mr. TAVENNER. On grounds it would tend to incriminate him. A number of witnesses have identified him as having been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. Is he here in the hearing room now?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not know.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. When he asked you the question or made the statement as to whom you were going to turn stool pigeon on, what was he referring to?

Mr. HECHT. We carried the conversation no further. I imagine he was referring to the fact that I was going to divulge the fact that I was a member of the Communist Party and tell the committee all the things I know about the Communist Party and all the people I knew working in it.

Mr. MOULDER. He was referring to your testimony as a witness subpoenaed here, the testimony you were about to give in this hearing.

Mr. HECHT. I only know what he said and I didn't question him any further about it, Congressman, but I would deduce that is what he was referring to.

Mr. MOULDER. Was there anything else said?

Mr. HECHT. No.

Mr. MOULDER. How long were you in the United States Army?

Mr. HECHT. Three years.

Mr. MOULDER. That would make your return from the service about 1945, I believe?

Mr. HECHT. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. After you returned from the service in the United States Army how were you employed?

Mr. HECHT. I went into the agency business by myself, or, rather, in partnership with Louis Rantz, who had been working with the Goldstone Agency since I was there.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you reaffiliated with the Communist Party when you were discharged from the Army?

Mr. HECHT. No; I have never been to a meeting of the Communist Party since I left the Communist Party in the early part of 1940.

Mr. MOULDER. Has any effort been made on the part of any person to recruit you again into the Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. No, there hasn't been. As a matter of fact, I wondered why. The Communist Party evidently thought that I was not a good Communist. As a matter of fact, Martin Berkeley, who identified me and who has helped me recollect a number of things that have helped me in my testimony today, remembers me as being a very poor Communist. So I think that the party probably thought there wasn't much that they could actually get from my being in the party.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you represented known members of the Communist Party since your return from your service in the Army?

Mr. HECHT. I have never represented any member of the Communist Party because he was a member of the Communist Party. I have represented known Communists. I represented a number that were known to me as Communists; two, as a matter of fact, Frank Tuttle and Roland Kibbee. Kibbee is a man that I lived with when he first came to Hollywood in 1939, and at that time he told me that he was leaving the party.

Mr. MOULDER. Since your return from the United States Army have you knowingly employed any member of the Communist Party in connection with your own work?

Mr. HECHT. I have not. I have never employed a member of the Communist Party because he was a member of the Communist Party. I employed people purely and simply because I thought they were talented and the best suited to the work that I was looking for.

In December 1950 I made a flat policy with our company of not hiring any more Communists, investigating them and making sure that we did not hire any more Communists, and since that time we have carried this out.

Before that—I want to say again—I never hired anyone because I knew he was a Communist, for that reason, but from that date we investigated and made specifically sure as to that.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the witness why you declared that policy in December 1950.

Mr. HECHT. At that time the Communist conspiracy became clear to me.

Mr. DOYLE. What conspiracy?

Mr. HECHT. The conspiracy of the Communist Party in this country with the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union's aggressive actions against this country throughout the world.

Mr. DOYLE. What evidence did you get in December 1950 or before that, which made you believe there was a Soviet conspiracy against this country?

Mr. HECHT. Shortly before this the Korean war broke out.

Mr. DOYLE. What did that have to do with it?

Mr. HECHT. This showed me fully and clearly that you were either in one camp or another. This is a policy, I might say, that I followed with the studios.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you mean to tell me, in answer to my question, that when you say you are either in one camp or another, that a Communist cannot be in the American camp and still be a member of the American Communist Party?

Mr. HECHT. I think that's correct. I think you will agree with me when I say that is so.

Mr. DOYLE. I do agree with you. The fact is that I asked you a question the way I do is not because I differ with you, but because I was in Korea a few months ago and I had that made manifest to me by what I have seen with my own eyes.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask two more questions of this witness?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. What propels or compels you to come here today and tell not only your own experiences but to do what this man Willner evidently criticized you for doing, becoming a stool pigeon, in his filthy

language. That is what he called you, and when you do give the names of known Communists to this committee it is helping us very materially and it is a help to your country.

What got under your skin to make you do that? You are a noted producer. I feel your answer to that question may help the public and this committee very much to understand.

Mr. HECHT. I think it has become clear that Communists and people associated with Communists are enemies of this country. We must be alined with the forces of democracy and against communism. We can no longer straddle the fence. Today I wouldn't represent a Communist. I wouldn't hire one. Communism is a conspiracy and the Communist Party in this country is a tool of the Soviet Union. I didn't look forward to my appearance here today in a sense of enjoying it. I am not a public speaker, but I am grateful for the opportunity of being allowed to testify. I think this committee renders a valuable service in providing the forum for an ex-Communist to state his present position clearly and firmly. There are many people in this country similar to me, people who are not necessarily Communists, but people who are left all the way to the center, and these people, I believe, are gradually becoming more and more aware of the sinister ways of the Communist Party and the place where they belong. They need new forces to work with and new friends. That is an important part of the anti-Communist program and I would like to be a part of it.

Mr. DOYLE. My last question, Mr. Chairman, is this:

We operate, or this committee operates under Public Law 601. A part of that law passed by the Congress provides that this committee in its work shall recommend to the United States Congress remedial legislation in the field of subversive activities or propaganda. While I realize that you, sir, are not to be considered an expert in that field any more than we are, in view of the fact that our statutory assignment as a congressional committee expressly says in the statute 601 that we shall recommend to Congress remedial legislation in this field, have you any suggestion to us as a congressional committee of any different or additional legislation at the national level, which we ought to consider?

I know the ordinary legislation that is brought out is to outlaw the Communist Party. Before you answer in any other way I would ask you if you have any considered opinion on that subject; should the Communist Party be outlawed or not?

Mr. HECHT. It seems to me it would be a good idea. I can't understand why it hasn't been done before. There may be various reasons for it that are not clear to me.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any other suggestions?

Mr. HECHT. No, but I would like to think about it and I would like to write you about it.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, we would welcome his suggestion.

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

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

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

Mr. JACKSON. I have just one question.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. The emphasis to this point has been upon those in the theater, the Federal Theater, who were Communists or who followed the Communist line, emphatic and vocal.

Can you give me any idea of any anti-Communists who were in the Federal Theater, who were outspoken in their denunciation?

Mr. HECHT. No; I don't remember any in the Federal Theater. I think at that time, if you remember the political climate then, to be an outspoken anti-Communist during that period, I believe you probably would have been called a Fascist.

Mr. JACKSON. In that time and in this time as well. What was the year, Mr. Hecht?

Mr. HECHT. 1937, 1938, and 1939, during the Communist support of the New Deal. The point is a little vague to me, but I think that is probably so.

Mr. JACKSON. Aside from the committee investigators your counsel and our counsel, the gentleman you spoke of a little while ago who called you a stool pigeon, have you discussed this appearance with any other person or persons?

Mr. HECHT. I told my wife about it.

Mr. JACKSON. It is pretty hard to get down here, I imagine, without doing that.

Mr. HECHT. She wouldn't let me go without——

Mr. JACKSON. But you have not discussed it with anyone else? No effort has been made by anyone to dissuade you from appearing?

Mr. HECHT. No.

Mr. JACKSON. And no promises have been made for your appearance?

Mr. HECHT. No.

Mr. JACKSON. That's all.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. A number of times in your testimony, and, of course, it appears consistently in the testimony of practically every witness before us who cooperates, we find the phrase "party line" and the "shift of party line."

Then, a moment ago, you frankly told us that you understood it to be the implacable purpose of the Communists to destroy us, to turn us over to the Soviet system.

I just want to be sure that this record does not have something in it that might lead us to a wrong conclusion. When you talk about a shift of the party line you do not mean that the Communist purpose to destroy us has shifted, but merely the Communist tactics to achieve it, is that true?

Mr. HECHT. That is true. It takes a long time for things to become clear.

Mr. CLARDY. It finally became clear that was their purpose and these shifts from time to time were merely shifts in tactics in their efforts to achieve that objective.

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Hecht, when Mr. Tavenner was asking you your reasons for leaving the party, I believe you said, and I quote, "became disturbed and disillusioned by many of the facets of the party."

Mr. HECHT. Facets and practices, probably.



Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact, Mr. Hecht, that originally you felt that the Communist Party was opposed to anti-Semitism and that now you know it is violently anti-Semitic?

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. SCHERER. Your experience indicates that what I have said is true about the party?

Mr. HECHT. That is true.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. I have only one question. You made some reference a while ago to a professional Communist. What is a professional Communist?

Mr. HECHT. I would say a professional Communist is someone who works for the Communist Party and gets paid by the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. A party organizer, and works for the party?

Mr. HECHT. That is right.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, is there any reason why this witness should not be dismissed?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. VELDE. The Chair desires to thank the witness for his appearance here, adding considerable knowledge to the great fund obtained by this committee, and disseminated throughout the country.

It has been a privilege to hear you speak frankly on the issue of communism, and give us the benefit of your beliefs. The witness is hereby dismissed.

Mr. VELDE. Your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Edward Huebsch.

Mr. VELDE. Will you stand and be sworn.

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

Mr. HUEBSCH. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show at this point that present are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde.

### TESTIMONY OF EDWARD HUEBSCH, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WILLIAM B. ESTERMAN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Edward Huebsch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I am, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself.

Mr. ESTERMAN. I am William B. Esterman, counsel for the witness. I have a brief motion to make, which I can discuss with Mr. Tavenner. I will address myself very briefly to the committee.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Esterman, I think you have previously represented witnesses before this committee and are aware of the rules of the committee with reference to counsel.

Mr. ESTERMAN. It has to do with the TV proceedings.

Mr. VELDE. May I tell you again you are permitted to address motions in writing to the committee.

Mr. ESTERMAN. We are in a situation——

Mr. VELDE. You are not permitted to make any voluntary statements. You are permitted to confer with your own client at all times.

Mr. ESTERMAN. I have conferred with him.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have a motion to submit in writing?

Mr. ESTERMAN. No. I have submitted it in writing. But I have discussed the matter with your own counsel, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Esterman, have you a motion to submit in writing?

Mr. ESTERMAN. I have a motion which I have submitted in writing concerning which I have had no reply. I have discussed this with Mr. Tavenner and told him I will make this motion. I am an attorney at law and I have a right to make this motion.

Mr. VELDE. The Chair orders that any voluntary statement on the part of counsel will be stricken from the record.

I will ask you, Mr. Counsel, if you have received a written motion of any kind.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is the first intimation I have had of a written motion.

Mr. ESTERMAN. I discussed an oral motion which concerns the television——

Mr. VELDE. These voluntary statements and remarks from counsel will be stricken from the record. You know the rules of this committee. You have a written motion to submit? If so, you will transmit it to the chairman.

Mr. ESTERMAN. May we have a response to the written motion we have filed by telegram, a copy of which I have here?

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee will be in recess for 5 minutes to consider this motion.

(Short recess was taken.)

Mr. VELDE. The meeting will be in order.

May the record show that present at this point are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde.

For the record, the committee has considered the written motion submitted and now the Chair will ask the witness whether the witness concurs and agrees with the motion presented by his counsel.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I do so concur, basing myself on the written opinion in the Federal District Court of Washington, D. C., which held that television broadcast facilities violate the atmosphere of a calm judicial legislative hearing. Not that I myself object to being televised, but I object to the legislative hearings of the United States Congress being so abused.

Mr. VELDE. Accordingly, the witness is excused until Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock, at which time you will——

Mr. ESTERMAN. May we ask——

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused and so is his counsel.

Before calling the next witness, the Chair would like to state that it is the purpose of the committee to disseminate the results of these hearings to the public, in order that we might fairly treat our public information services, the news, the newsreel, the still photo camera as well as television and the radio.

However, this witness has requested that all television apparatus be removed from the room before he will testify. I hope that he will testify when the television apparatus is removed from the room next Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock.

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Philip Eastman.

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

**TESTIMONY OF PHILIP DEY EASTMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS  
COUNSEL, MORRIS E. COHN**

Mr. EASTMAN. I do. I would like to make a request I not be televised.

Mr. VELDE. Will the television cameras desist for just a moment, please.

Mr. EASTMAN. I will also like to request that the photographers not take my picture during my testimony.

Mr. VELDE. That request will be granted.

I want to ask the witness what he referred to by not being televised. Do you have any objection to the television equipment being in the room?

Mr. EASTMAN. I object to my voice and picture being transmitted over the air. I have no objection to the apparatus being in the room. I do object to the act of television.

Mr. VELDE. But you do have objection to the sound being transmitted through the microphone, the sound of your voice over television?

Mr. EASTMAN. May I talk to counsel for a moment, please?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

(At this point, 4:10 p. m., Mr. Eastman conferred with Mr. Morris B. Cohn.)

Mr. EASTMAN. I do object to my voice and to my picture going over the air.

Mr. VELDE. Does that also include the radio, Mr. Witness?

Mr. EASTMAN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. You have objection to the radio, too?

Mr. EASTMAN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. As I understand it, also to being photographed while you are giving your testimony?

Mr. EASTMAN. During testimony; I have no objection to being photographed before or afterward. May I make this clear: This will result in my testimony being postponed. I would prefer to go on today, giving my testimony today.

Mr. VELDE. That is just about what the chairman was going to do, postpone it until Wednesday morning. However, may I ask this question: Have you any objection to testifying without the television cameras being turned on you or any part of your body at any time during the procedure of the hearing?

Mr. EASTMAN. I don't want to be televised.

Mr. VELDE. To the still photographers, will you take your pictures now, before the witness begins to testify? The same is true with respect to the movie cameras, please.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question of the witness then: As I understand it, you waive your objections to everything excepting the matter of the television cameras being directed on you, and you object to that, in your testimony?

Mr. EASTMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. You have no objection to television pictures being made of everything else in the room, have you?

Mr. EASTMAN. That is right.

Mr. CLARBY. You don't object to the committee being televised then, I take it.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. EASTMAN. My name is Philip Dey Eastman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell it, please.

Mr. EASTMAN. P-h-i-l-i-p D-e-y E-a-s-t-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. SCHIERER. I can't hear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little, please, Mr. Eastman? Are you represented by counsel, Mr. Eastman?

Mr. EASTMAN. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. COHN. My name is Morris E. Cohn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of Los Angeles?

Mr. COHN. Yes.

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

Mr. EASTMAN. I was born in Massachusetts in 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. EASTMAN. I reside in Los Angeles, city of Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Los Angeles?

Mr. EASTMAN. Approximately 15 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been?

Mr. EASTMAN. After graduating from college I attended art school in New York City for 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What art school?

Mr. EASTMAN. It was the National Academy of Design. Since that time I have educated myself in the fields of art, music, and literature.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. EASTMAN. I am an artist and writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since the completion of your art course in New York?

Mr. EASTMAN. May I confer for a moment with my lawyer?

(At this point, 4:15 p. m., Mr. Eastman conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. EASTMAN. Since 1936 and up to about a year ago I have been more or less steadily employed, except for occasional layoffs, in the field of animated motion pictures, that is, animated cartoons.

This was interrupted for about 2½ years by my service in the Army. And at present I am a free-lance writer and artist. I do not work for any particular—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak a little louder, please.

Mr. EASTMAN. I am trying to, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom?

Mr. COHN. Pardon me just one moment, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(At this point, 4:17 p. m., Mr. Cohn conferred with Mr. Eastman.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Eastman, where have you been employed as an animated cartoonist, if that is the correct description of your work?

Mr. EASTMAN. Well, there are many different kinds of jobs in the animated-cartoon field. You mean as a writer and artist?

Mr. TAVENNER. In whatever capacity you were employed.

Mr. EASTMAN. I worked for about 5 years—I think the first 5 years of my work was at the Walt Disney Studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be over what period of time?

Mr. EASTMAN. Roughly from 1936 to 1941. I am not exactly sure of the date because I was—

Mr. TAVENNER. A period of 5 years, did you say?

Mr. EASTMAN. Approximately. Now, this was quite a while ago and I can't remember the details too accurately.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in that work for any other company other than the Disney Co.?

Mr. EASTMAN. Yes, sir. Let's see if I can remember the continuity of my employment. After leaving the Disney Studio, and a brief period of unemployment, I worked for what was then the Leon Schlesinger Studios. He doesn't have that name any longer. I believe it is called Warner Bros. Cartoons now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time did you work for Leon Schlesinger?

Mr. EASTMAN. I believe that was—well, it would be from some time in the latter part of 1941 to the time that I went into the Army, and that was—I can't remember exactly. I think it was in 1942 or 1943—1942, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1942?

Mr. EASTMAN. I am not sure. I will have to look at my induction card.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were employed by the Disney Co. and also by Leon Schlesinger, did you do work which was generally termed the work of a sketch artist?

Mr. EASTMAN. During part of the time that I was at the Disney Studio I worked as a sketch artist.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the difference between a sketch artist and story-board sketch artist, or is there any difference?

Mr. EASTMAN. It is about the same. I would say it was almost identical.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Bernyce Polifka Fleury testified in executive session before this committee, Mr. Eastman, September 10, 1951. She admitted that she had been a member of the Communist Party.

I want to read to you a part of her testimony regarding an incident, as a basis for asking you several questions.

Mrs. Fleury was asked the question of what they discussed in these Communist Party meetings. Her reply was this:

We talked mainly about how we could improve the animation business. And also how the artists could contribute more to the—I guess you would call it—and I am guessing on this—social welfare or social something or other of the people.

As an example, Ed Biberman had very decided ideas about art. I have decided ideas about art. We did not agree at any time.

Do you recall attending a meeting at which there was a substantial disagreement between Ed Biberman and Mrs. Fleury on the subject of art?

Mr. EASTMAN. I am not going to answer your question, and I am going to give you the reasons. They are contained in portion of the Constitution that is dedicated to the protection of the rights of individuals.

My first reason for not answering your question is that your question invades the rights under that portion of the Constitution which guarantees me freedom of speech and the freedom to associate with whom I please, and also the freedom of conscience.

The second reason why I decline to answer is that I consider that you are bringing me here under subpoena to an unreasonable search and attempt to seize the contents of my mind.

I also have an objection to make on the fact that, in a sense, the atmosphere here is one of a trial, and that you have accepted the testimony of witnesses without permitting me to bring witnesses of my own.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, the committee is not interested in your opinions of the membership or of the committee, as a whole.

We are asking you a question, purely and simply to obtain facts and information.

The Chair would appreciate it, and the committee would appreciate it very much, if you would answer or decline to answer for legal means, and state your legal grounds.

Mr. EASTMAN. I am trying to state my legal reasons, and I believe all the reasons I am stating are valid and legal reasons. I am not an attorney myself.

Mr. VELDE. How much longer do you intend to proceed with your legal reasons?

Mr. EASTMAN. It won't take very long, maybe 3 minutes.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed. We will give you just 3 minutes.

Mr. EASTMAN. I also object—this is my fourth ground—on the ground that I feel this committee has imposed cruel and unusual punishments upon me in keeping me under subpoena for the better part of a year.

My last and final ground for declining to answer is because 161 years ago a woman named Mary Bradbury in Southboro, Mass.—Mary Bradbury happens to be my great, great, great, great, great, great grandmother, and she was convicted of consorting with the devil, despite the fact that 117 of her neighbors testified that she was a good and pious woman.

Because I believe she would not have been convicted of witchcraft had she had the privilege of the fifth amendment available to her, to the privilege against self-incrimination, I not only do stand on my privilege, but I am proud to stand on it.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing with the testimony of Mrs. Fleury, we find that she was asked this question by Mr. Wheeler:

What were Mr. Biberman's ideas about art?

To which Mrs. Fleury replied:

Well, this is, strangely enough, believe it or not, our disagreements on our talk was not concerned with political issues as much as it was with the form of what

the art would take. In other words, in painting a picture, as far as I am concerned, it does not make it a better picture because it is a poor little baby than if it is a big painting of an aristocratic woman.

In other words, it is the form that is the important thing to my way of thinking, as far as painting is concerned. That was the biggest disagreement, one of the big disagreements that Ed Biberman and I had.

In other words, he felt that painting was a documentary thing and I felt it was not a documentary thing, that that was under the jurisdiction of photographer, where it would be true documentary.

Mr. JACKSON. Was his feeling that a painting should carry a social message rather than simply the abstract conception of the art?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, and I felt it was more important in the design in the abstract aspect of art.

Mrs. Fleury testified as to that disagreement that existed on the subject of art with Ed Biberman, and which led eventually to her getting out of the Communist Party, and Mrs. Fleury also testified as follows—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Tavenner, before proceeding, the committee is about to recess until tomorrow. Do you have further questions to ask this witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just two or three further questions to ask this witness.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury then identified you as a member of this same group of the Communist Party, of which she was a member.

In the course of describing you, she said:

He is what was called a sketch artist, storyboard sketch artist.

Mr. JACKSON. Employed where, do you recall?

Mrs. FLEURY. He was, whether at that time he was at Disney or whether he was at Leon Schlesinger, which is now Warner Bros. Cartoons, I don't recall.

Now, was Mrs. Fleury truthful in her statement that you were a member of this group? Did she identify you properly and truthfully as a member of the group of the Communist Party of which she was a member?

Mr. EASTMAN. Mr. Tavenner, you are asking me the same kind of a question, and I decline to answer your question on all the grounds which I have stated a few moments ago.

Mr. SCHERER. Does that include that the answer you might make might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. EASTMAN. I am not a lawyer, sir, but I think you know that I would not be required to give the reasons why I am standing on that portion of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you standing on the fifth amendment?

Mr. EASTMAN. I think I made it very clear I was not only standing on the fifth amendment, but four other amendments to our Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. The fifth amendment, namely, that your answer would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. MOULDER. I understand the witness declines to answer for the same reasons stated awhile ago.

Mr. EASTMAN. I think you understand me.

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

Mr. EASTMAN. You are asking me the same kind of a question, and I decline to answer on all of the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. EASTMAN. Mr. Tavenner, this is the same kind of a question, and I am not going to answer it. I will state my grounds over again, unless agreeable that I say that I stand on all of the grounds on which I previously stood.

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

Mr. VELDE. Do any of the members of the committee have any further questions?

Mr. JACKSON. I have one observation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. With respect to the case of Mary Bradbury, to which the witness referred, the only difference between her situation and the situation of the witness today is that there were no witches in Salem. There have been a number of Communists identified in Los Angeles.

Mr. VELDE. That is a very good observation, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Counsel, is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness may be excused.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the unanimous consent of the committee to insert in the record of the hearings at this point the action taken by the board of trustees of the Los Angeles Bar Association at its meeting on February 17, 1953.

I might add that the action taken by the bar association grew out of the activities of some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee in hearings here last September.

Mr. VELDE. And the counsel?

Mr. JACKSON. The witnesses and their counsel, and in several instances, at least, the witnesses themselves were members of the legal profession.

Mr. VELDE. Would you care to read it in the record?

Mr. JACKSON. The substance of the report is that it represents some changes in section 6068 of the Business and Professional Code, and the principal change is to point out that it is the duty of an attorney "(a) to support the Constitution and laws of the United States and of this State," and (b), "to maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers, and to refrain from disrespectful, offensive, or disorderly conduct during the course of hearings before lawfully constituted legislative, executive, and administrative bodies, boards, committees, or officers."

(The aforementioned document is in words and figures as follows:)

The Board of Trustees of the Los Angeles Bar Association at its meeting on February 17, 1953, considered the report of the committee headed by Mr. Frank B. Belcher recommending a revision of section 6068 of the Business and Professions Code. That committee proposed that the section be amended to read as follows (principal changes are italicized):

"6068. Duties of an attorney.

"The following are the duties of an attorney:

"*Subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) shall be duties of an attorney whether in the course of his relation as an attorney or otherwise:*

"(a) To support the Constitution and law of the United States and of this State.

"(b) To maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers, legislative bodies and their committees, administrative bodies and administrative and executive officers of the United States, any of the several States or Territories or any political subdivision thereof.



"(c) Never to seek to mislead by an artifice or false statement of fact or law a court of justice or judicial officer, *legislative body or its committee, an administrative body, or an administrative or executive officer of the United States, or of any of the several States or Territories, or any political subdivision thereof.*

"(d) To employ for the purpose of maintaining the causes confided to him such means only as are consistent with the truth.

"(e) To counsel or maintain such actions, proceedings or defenses only as appear to him legal or just, except the defense of a person charged with a public offense.

"(f) To maintain inviolate the confidence, and at every peril to himself to preserve the secrets, of his client.

"(g) To abstain from all offensive personality, and to advance no fact prejudicial to the honor or reputation of a party or witness, unless required by the justice of the cause with which he is charged.

"(h) Not to encourage either the commencement or the continuance of an action or proceeding from any corrupt motive of passion or interest.

"(i) Never to reject, for any consideration personal to himself, the cause of the defenseless or the oppressed."

The report specifically referred to the problems raised by the conduct of certain lawyers in the cases of *People v. Foster*, *United States v. Bridges et al.*, and at the hearings at Los Angeles called by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. The board was not unmindful of these problems and endorsed generally the views expressed in the committee's report. Nevertheless, the board believed that the proposed amendments to section 6068 are too sweeping, and might tend unduly to limit the right of free speech to which lawyers are entitled along with other citizens.

The basic evil to be corrected is the offensive and sometimes disorderly behavior of a very small number of attorneys in the course of certain trials and certain public hearings before legislative or administrative bodies. So far as court trials are concerned, it is agreed that the existing injunction "to maintain the respect due the courts of justice and judicial officers" sufficiently covers the situation. Courts and judicial officers are entitled to respect from all members of the bar. The respect due them is not limited to the time that they are conducting hearings, nor is the corresponding duty of the attorney limited to his behavior during court appearances. In the view of the board, there was some risk that the proposed legislation would cast doubt upon the right of an attorney, in common with any other citizen, to speak or write his opinions freely of the legislative, the executive, and numerous administrative officers, boards, and committees.

The board also was of the view that the language of the section should as far as possible be left in broad general terms, rather than specifically to refer to the different jurisdictions in reference to various legislative bodies, etc.

The board accordingly approved the report of the committee but recommended that in lieu of the text suggested by the committee, the section be amended to read as follows:

"6068. Duties of an attorney.

"*It is the duty of an attorney:*

"(a) To support the Constitution and laws of the United States and of this State.

"(b) To maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers, and to refrain from disrespectful, offensive or disorderly conduct during the course of hearings before lawfully constituted legislative, executive and administrative bodies, boards, committees or officers.

"(c) Never to seek to mislead by an artifice or false statement of fact or law a court of justice or judicial officers, or a legislative, executive, or administrative body, board, committee, or officer.

"(d) To employ for the purpose of maintaining the causes confided to him such means only as are consistent with the truth.

"(e) To counsel or maintain such actions, proceedings or defenses only as appear to him legal or just, except the defense of a person charged with a public offense.

"(f) To maintain inviolate the confidence, and at every peril to himself preserve the secrets, of his client.

"(g) To abstain from all offensive personality, and to advance no fact prejudicial to the honor or reputation of a party or witness, unless required to by the justice of the cause with which he is charged.

"(h) Not to encourage either the commencement or the continuance of an action or proceedings from any corrupt motive of passion or interest.

"(i) Never to reject, for any consideration personal to himself, the cause of the defenseless or the oppressed."

Mr. VELDE. The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 24, 1953.)

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—Part 1

---

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Los Angeles, Calif.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:10 a. m., in room 518, Federal Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Mr. MARSHALL. I request permission to address the committee.

Mr. VELDE. The permission will be refused. At the proper time you will be allowed to.

Let the record show present are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum and the full committee.

Mr. Counsel, do you have a witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Mr. Julian Gordon.

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GORDON. I do.

## TESTIMONY OF JULIAN GORDON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. GORDON. Julian Gordon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented or accompanied here by counsel?

Mr. GORDON. No; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been the practice of the committee to permit a witness to consult with counsel at any time he may desire during the course of his testimony, and whether or not counsel is with you or not, you still have that right.

Mr. GORDON. I have no counsel.

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

Mr. GORDON. I was born in Boston in April of 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has your previous educational training been, that is, your formal educational training.

Mr. GORDON. I graduated at Harvard in the class of 1930, and then went abroad for graduate study at Cambridge University in England.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you attend school in England?

Mr. GORDON. In 1931.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. GORDON. I make the stock and advertising accessories for an independent small motion-picture producer.

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

Mr. GORDON. After I finished at Cambridge University I went to the Bank for International Settlements at Balk, Switzerland, the World Bank, where I was to work with Leon Frazier, the head of the bank. This was soon after President Hoover declared the moratorium on the payment of war reparations on Germany of the Allied Powers. There was very little to do at the bank and I soon left, coming to this country.

I worked at the newspapers in Los Angeles, the Examiner, the Times, and then for the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles.

I became ill for a year or so, and after that did some teaching in private schools.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin in that work?

Mr. GORDON. I taught for a year in a preparatory school in 1940 and 1941. Soon after 1941 I went to work for the Technicolor Laboratory as a technician for several years.

In 1947 I went to France for a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you work in Technicolor Laboratories, specifically between what dates, that is, approximate dates?

Mr. GORDON. From 1941 to 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I understand you went to France?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment there?

Mr. GORDON. I worked as a technician on a motion picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom did you work?

Mr. GORDON. For the Bunin organization that made Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the organization?

Mr. GORDON. Bunin.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom did you work prior to accepting the position in France?

Mr. GORDON. In Technicolor.

Mr. TAVENNER. What company?

Mr. GORDON. The Technicolor Motion Picture Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Hollywood?

Mr. GORDON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return to this country?

Mr. GORDON. In 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was your employment after your return?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room at this point, 10:19 a. m.)

Mr. GORDON. I taught for a brief while at a boys' military school, and then taught for a couple of years at the Berlitz School of Languages.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gordon, the committee has information through sworn testimony indicating you have been a member of the Communist Party, and it also has information indicating that you left the Communist Party approximately in 1947.

It is my desire to ask you questions relating to your experiences in the Communist Party and your knowledge of it, if you were a member, and I call upon you to cooperate with the committee in answering these questions.

First of all, I would like to call to your attention that by a sworn statement made by Mr. Lon Rosser, who had stated that he himself had been a member of the Communist Party, you were identified as having been a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Max Silver, a former high functionary of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County, testified before this committee on January 24, 1952, in executive session, and when he was asked to identify persons known to him to have been members of the Communist Party, he responded in this fashion:

Julian Gordon, the husband of Emily Gordon, a teacher, and later was employed in the movie industry in Technicolor as a technician, was involved in the Hollywood strike and was a victim of that strike. He lost his opportunity to work either in the industry or at his teaching profession. Later went to Paris with some group to make a movie. I don't know which one it was.

I would like to ask you first whether the identification of you by Mr. Rosser as having been a member of the Communist Party, or the identification by Mr. Max Silver are correct, or whether either is in error or false in any particular.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson reentered the hearing room at this point, 10:23 a. m.)

Mr. GORDON. That identification is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GORDON. In 1939; September.

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

Mr. GORDON. I thought it was the best way to end war and poverty. I remained a member, as your information tells you, until, say, 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you left the party?

Mr. GORDON. I lost my belief.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you elaborate on that? What do you mean by saying that you lost your belief?

Mr. GORDON. It struck me there were other forces that were more important.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well now, I am sorry, but I do not quite understand what you mean. You say that you lost your beliefs. What beliefs were you referring to?

Mr. GORDON. That this was the way to achieve the purposes for which I originally joined the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was it that caused you to lose those beliefs? Well, may I put the question this way: Did you have any experiences

within the party which stand out in your memory as being milestones in your decision to renounce the party or to get out of it, that is, the Communist Party?

Mr. GORDON. Perhaps I should tell you a little of my party history.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I would certainly want to know that.

Mr. GORDON. In 1944 I helped to form the Hollywood Communist Club. I became the president of that club.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the club?

Mr. GORDON. The Hollywood Communist Club. I helped to form that club. I was its president for a year and a half until the club was broken up. It was shortly thereafter, with the end of the war, that I left the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the cause of that party breaking up?

Mr. GORDON. The policy of the party had changed. That was basically the reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in what respect had it changed?

Mr. GORDON. There were no longer to be community clubs, but smaller groups, principally for the protection of the membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the mere changing of the number of persons in a group couldn't have been such an important change in policy to have affected the existence of the club, could it?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. Instead of meeting in a large open hall, they then in smaller groups met in homes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the party was going underground at that time; is that in substance what you mean?

Mr. GORDON. The belief was that the membership would be better protected and would not be so open to exposure if they did not meet in large open public halls.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that change in policy led to the end of the Communist group that you were a member of? Is that what you mean?

Mr. GORDON. Led to the end of the Hollywood Communist Club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, then, the dissolution of that club was nothing more than a practical realignment of the organizational structure of the party; there was nothing basically different in the operation of the party after that than there was before, other than that for security reasons you were to meet in small groups.

Mr. GORDON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, what I am getting at is this: I wanted to know basically what the reason is for your decision to terminate your relationship with the Communist Party, and you started, I thought, to tell me that by relating your experience in the party, but I do not believe that what you just told me is responsive to that inquiry.

However, if there is anything else you desire to say about that, why, I do not want to cut you off. My inquiry at the moment is to find out what occurred to cause you to lose the beliefs which you said you formerly had; and, if there was an experience that you had in the Communist Party that would be helpful to this committee in understanding why you left the party, we would like to know it.

Possibly I can refresh your recollection as to one instance.

Mr. GORDON. The basic reason was the release of atomic energy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you explain that, please?

Mr. GORDON. I came to the conclusion that there was no longer any reason for the hatred between the two sides, and that I would do no

more to increase the hatred because the reason for it had disappeared with the discovery of atomic energy, that men could now produce enough for all.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, let me recall to your mind an incident which was the subject of testimony on the part of Dr. Louise Light. Probably you have read this from the testimony.

At the outset I want to say to you that I am not going to abuse the confidential privilege between husband and wife, but I want to refer to this incident to see whether it had any part in your decision.

When Dr. Light was on the witness stand at a hearing conducted in Washington, January 21, 1952, I asked her this question:

Were any directions given by the Communist Party as to preference in employment of nurses or employees, office employees of the doctors?

DR. LIGHT. Yes; I had an experience myself where I had employed a girl and she had been in my office perhaps a week and a half or so, who was previously a party member, who had dropped out of the party because of lack of interest. They came to me and told me that—they didn't ask me, they told me would I discharge this girl because of the fact that she was no longer a party person; she was under suspicion. They had no specific proof, because I knew this girl very well, and that they could supply someone in my office who would be much more suitable. Of course, I disagreed with them very strongly.

MR. TAVENNER. Who was the person employed by you?

DR. LIGHT. The name was Emily Gordon.

MR. TAVENNER. Emily Gordon?

DR. LIGHT. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. You said they came to you.

DR. LIGHT. Well, a committee of two of the professional sects. The one who did the talking with me was a Dr. Max Schoen, a dentist.

Did that incident have any part to play in your decision or had you made your decision prior to that time?

MR. GORDON. My decision was made prior to that time.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know of any other instances in which the Communist Party organization within the professions, either medical or legal, exercised that kind of dictation to its members; that is, determine who should be employed and who should not be?

MR. GORDON. I am sorry, I cannot answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. When you say you are sorry you cannot answer, you mean to indicate there were such instances but you do not desire to speak of it? Because, if it is a matter that relates to your wife, I do not want to ask you about it.

MR. GORDON. It has nothing to do with my wife.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, do you know of any other instance when that was attempted or when it was done?

MR. GORDON. I am sorry; I will not answer that question.

MR. JACKSON. May I ask upon what ground your refusal to answer that question is based?

MR. GORDON. The decision I arrived at 7 years ago that I would do nothing to add to the hatred between the two sides, because there is no longer any reason for that hatred, since with atomic energy men can now produce enough for all.

MR. SCHERER. When you say "two sides," would you clarify that statement?

MR. GORDON. The United States and the Soviet Union.

MR. TAVENNER. When you joined the Communist Party in 1939, how many composed the cell or group to which you were assigned? Was it a large group or a small group?

Mr. GORDON. I am sorry; I will not answer this kind of question.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many different groups of the Communist Party were you a member of between 1939 and the time you left the party?

Mr. GORDON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer?

Mr. GORDON. The same. I will not answer this kind of question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). I ask the witness be directed to answer.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the Chair feels that is a legitimate question. I believe that you could be of great help to this committee if you would answer these questions. Of course, I might advise you, too, that you are under oath and that you do have a right, of course, to refuse to answer questions.

But, in order to make it impossible or improbable that you might possibly be cited for contempt, you must state your refusal to answer on a legal ground, a constitutional ground.

With those instructions in mind, I now direct that you answer the last question that was asked of you.

Mr. GORDON. I have respect for the authority of this committee, but again I must refuse.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask a question at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. You say you left the Communist Party when the physical structure changed from large units to small units, and I believe you said the small unit system was erected for the protection of members. Will you explain what you meant by that?

Mr. GORDON. As the situation changed from the wartime cooperation with communism to the conflict with them, increased protection for the membership seemed advisable.

Mr. WALTER. Protection from what?

Mr. GORDON. Exposure.

Mr. WALTER. Exposure? Why were they fearful of exposure?

Mr. GORDON. Mostly for their jobs.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question there, please, following Mr. Walter's question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, at this period in your experience—let's see, what year was that? That was in 1944, I think you said.

Mr. GORDON. 1945, the latter part.

Mr. DOYLE. You helped form the Communist Club of Hollywood in 1944?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And it dissolved in 1945?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And when it dissolved you were still president at the time. You said you served for a year and a half, I think, until it began meeting in private homes.

Mr. GORDON. The early part of 1944 until the latter part of 1945.

Mr. DOYLE. At that time was it the practice to discharge folks because they were members of the Communist Party, if that was known? Was that your knowledge of the local situation in 1945?



Mr. GORDON. It was beginning to take place.

Mr. DOYLE. In the entertainment field?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Or the field in which you were an expert? Was it beginning to be the practice in that field of activity in 1945?

Mr. GORDON. It was beginning to take place.

Mr. DOYLE. I think your exact language was, "There was belief that the members would not be so open to exposure." That is the wording I wrote down as you used it. I think you used those exact words.

Well now, was the exposure you were afraid of the exposure of membership in the Communist Party, because at that time, even, it would be likely to make you lose employment or make the Communists lose employment if it was known they were Communists?

Mr. GORDON. It was felt that was likely.

Mr. DOYLE. What was there about Communist Party membership in the Los Angeles area in 1945 that was so in disrepute in 1945 that made people lose their jobs, or attempt to? See what I am getting at? I am not in disrespect, sir, of your considered reasons. I notice you said you have respect for the authority of this committee. I appreciate your saying that, because some people do not, even though we are a constituted committee of the United States Congress.

It is rather refreshing to have a man come, without the aid of private counsel by his side, and state openly he has respect for this committee.

What was there about the Communist Party membership in the Los Angeles area in 1945 that made them want to keep unknown as Communists?

Let me ask you this way: Without asking you now who had been discharged, if anyone, on account of Communist Party membership in 1945, at the time you relate, had there been anyone discharged from the entertainment field because of Communist Party membership, to your knowledge? You have stated that that was——

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle, he has five questions before him now.

Mr. DOYLE. I am trying to——

Mr. WALTER. I suggest he be permitted to answer them before you ask any more.

Mr. DOYLE. I am trying to stay in the field of cooperating with the witness, to give him every chance in the world to give us helpful answers, if he will.

Mr. GORDON. To the best of my memory, that was the case.

Mr. DOYLE. There had been someone discharged?

Mr. GORDON. Yes: there was a feeling this would take place.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one more question?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I had one more question. You volunteered this statement, sir, as I recall it, "Perhaps my party history will help answer that question." Then you volunteered the statement in 1945 you helped form the Hollywood Communist Club. As I recall it, you volunteered one statement that "Perhaps my party history will help." Do you remember that?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Well now, what other party history, Communist Party history have you in mind that you would relate? You related you

formed that club. What else did you do in the Communist Party, as part of your Communist Party history, about which you volunteered this statement?

MR. GORDON. The thing I said, what I said was the major things in my party history, and I want to put it on the record.

MR. DOYLE. That is all.

MR. TAVENNER. You were a member of the Communist Party at the time that the Duclos letter was received in 1945 which caused a re-organization of the Communist Party, were you not?

MR. GORDON. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Did the receipt of that letter play any part in your ultimate decision to leave the Communist Party?

MR. GORDON. No; it did not.

MR. TAVENNER. Of what group were you a member, what was the name of the group of which you were a member at the time of the receipt of the Duclos letter?

MR. GORDON. I am sorry. I cannot answer that question.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman. I think I will have to ask that he be directed to answer the question.

MR. VELDE. First of all, did you say you cannot, or you refuse to answer the question, Mr. Gordon?

MR. GORDON. I refuse to answer the question, Mr. Velde.

MR. VELDE. Then the chair feels it is a perfectly proper question which could be answered without any fear of self-incrimination or otherwise, and I do direct you to answer the question.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you subpoenaed to appear as a witness?

MR. VELDE. Just a minute.

MR. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

MR. VELDE. Will the witness abide by the Chair's direction?

MR. GORDON. I am sorry.

MR. JACKSON. You persist in the refusal to answer?

MR. GORDON. Yes.

MR. JACKSON. Is the witness here under compulsion of a subpoena?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have the subpoena before me, and I would like to offer it in evidence as Gordon Exhibit No. 1.

MR. VELDE. It will be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked "Gordon Exhibit No. 1.")

MR. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Jackson?

MR. JACKSON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Clardy?

MR. CLARDY. No questions.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

MR. MOULDER?

MR. MOULDER. Just one question, Mr. Chairman.

In what year did you say you disassociated yourself of active affiliation with the Communist Party?

MR. GORDON. At the end of 1945.

MR. MOULDER. Since that time have you in any way been affiliated with the Communist Party activity?

MR. GORDON. No; I have not.

MR. MOULDER. Then you are not now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GORDON. No.

Mr. MOULDER. I would be interested in knowing just what your belief is. Do you still believe in the philosophy or the policy of the Communist Party or the philosophy of government that they believe in?

Mr. GORDON. At the moment, sir, I know only one truth.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I am trying to make is even if you were not actively a member or attending meetings of the Communist Party, are you, in fact, still a Communist at heart and in belief and sympathy for the party?

Mr. GORDON. I have only one belief now.

Mr. MOULDER. You haven't answered my question. My question, what you believe in, as far as the Communist Party is concerned.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GORDON. I believe—

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. GORDON. I believe there is only one truth; that God is an active moral force. That is the only truth. Everything else is colored by self-interest; that both sides can agree on this truth.

Mr. MOULDER. In the event of a conflict between this country and Communist Russia, which side would you believe would be holding to the truth or would be just, according to your philosophy?

Mr. GORDON. I have seen both sides, and both are based on good.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. VELDE. That is not an answer to the question Mr. Moulder put to you. Can you give us an answer which side you think has right and truth, in the event of a conflict between those two? That can be answered very simply. The committee would appreciate it very much if you would answer the question.

Mr. GORDON. In the event of a war?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Between the two countries? I would fight for the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Why, if I may ask?

Mr. GORDON. For the same reason that you would.

Mr. JACKSON. I would fight for the United States for a number of reasons, including the fact that the Soviet Union has given every evidence of attempting to destroy all of the concepts of divine philosophy and spiritual and moral ethics. Does that enter into your concept of why you would fight for the United States, or is that one of the reasons?

Mr. GORDON. I have stated my beliefs. All I can do is repeat them.

Mr. JACKSON. I would say to you, sir, that in a day when men of God, ministers of the cloth, are rotting in Communist prisons throughout the world, it should not be difficult for one who bases his life on moral and spiritual ethics to make a decision in that regard.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason, Mr. Counsel, why this witness should not be dismissed?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. What is the date of service of the subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Beale has it.

Mr. BEALE. February 4, 1953.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, were you served with the subpoena which is marked "Gordon Exhibit 1"?

Mr. GORDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. On February 4 of 1953?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused and the committee will be in recess for 10 minutes.

(Representative Velde left the hearing room during the recess, which lasted from 11 a. m. to 11:18 a. m.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will come to order. Counsel, will you call your next witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Mr. David A. Lang, please.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LANG. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Will you take that chair, please?

### TESTIMONY OF DAVID A. LANG

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. David A. Lang?

Mr. LANG. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. LANG. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are entitled to counsel, if at any time you desire to consult one.

When and where were you born, Mr. Lang?

Mr. LANG. Excuse me, Mr. Tavenner. I would like to ask a question of the committee. Are these gentlemen behind me, are they in the camera? Because I want it clearly understood I am not represented by counsel, and I see there are some of those behind me.

Mr. JACKSON. It will be so noted.

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

Mr. LANG. I was born in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. LANG. In 1915, November 30.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your educational training?

Mr. LANG. My training was—

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, your formal training.

Mr. LANG. I went through eighth grade and went into high school in New York City, DeWitt Clinton High School. I attended DeWitt Clinton for a year and came to California and continued my training in high school here through the 11th grade.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to California?

Mr. LANG. In 1928. I left high school in the 11th grade and went to work.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. LANG. I am a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a screen writer?

Mr. LANG. I have been a screen writer since 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where have you practiced your profession?

Mr. LANG. I have practiced my profession in the various studios in Hollywood, starting at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that in 1941?

Mr. LANG. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1941 how were you employed?

Mr. LANG. I had various positions. I worked in gas stations. I worked at a tango parlor down on Santa Monica pier. I shipped out to sea for a year. I worked in a dry-goods store.

I was a cartoonist, starting in 1936, for Screen Gents, Inc., and continued as a cartoonist until 1941, when I became a writer in the motion-picture business and was given a junior writer's contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. Yes; I have.

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

Mr. LANG. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. I joined the Communist Party sometime in the latter part of 1942 or early 1943, and I was associated with the party up to approximately the end of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you joined the party, that is, the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. Well, it was shortly after I became a writer that I realized that many things that had been left undone, so far as my education was concerned, needed filling in. I became very interested in philosophies, history, psychology, and naturally I became acquainted with many men in the profession I was then part of, and in particular with a man who is now deceased, a man by the name of Stephen Morgan. He was not a writer, but through many of the contacts I became part of, I met Mr. Morgan and he was very influential in setting up many of the kinds of things for me to read. He was exciting to listen to. He was very much of a student and I became so imbued with many of the things he talked about, and gradually we moved in toward the philosophies of Marx and Engels, along with Schopenhauer and Hegel, and even so my interest was so great that he and his wife were instrumental in presenting to me the opportunity of becoming a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just how was this opportunity to become a member of the Communist Party presented to you?

Mr. LANG. After many weeks or months of conversations and talks, social gatherings, evenings at home, he realized that I was looking for something more than he could really give me. And he presented it to me in such a way, if I became a member of the Communist Party I could delve further into the beliefs and philosophies of the party and learn what it means and its historical background.

On this basis it intrigued me greatly. At this time I was not aware of this revolutionary involvement. I knew to some extent it had involvements that were not in accord with many of the beliefs of this country, but it never occurred to me that by becoming a member of the Communist Party I could in any way do anything against the beliefs that I had as an American citizen, because I must say at this time I was aware that the Communist Party was a legal party, and it had an enormous influence on my coming to the realization I could

accept it, because I did not feel that I was abrogating any of the ideas that I originally had for my country.

Parenthetically, I wish to add I found, particularly at this particular point, none of these problems had arisen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about your first induction into the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. When Mr. Morgan presented to me—I asked him to give me some time to think about it, and about a week later I called him and said I had thought about it and I was agreeable.

He then said he would contact the proper authorities within the party and have me cleared. Now, this was a very strange first induction; I had to be cleared. But I agreed to this.

He said also that he would contact me or have someone contact me as to the next move. Three or four days later he did call me and said that I had been cleared and would I contact a woman by the name of Madelaine Ruthven.

Mr. CLARDY. Spell that.

Mr. LANG. I am not positive on the spelling, it is R-u-t-h-e-v-e-i-n, or a-v-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. R-u-t-h-v-e-n is the correct spelling.

Mr. LANG. He gave me her address, somewhere on Canon Drive, and I was to meet her sometime in the late afternoon the following day, and I did.

Madelaine Ruthven greeted me and accepted me as a cleared person to be a member of the party. At that time she told me that I would be expected to pay a percentage of my income, a very small percentage. I think it was somewhere between 2 and 5—no; it wasn't 5—2 or 3 percent, something of that order.

Strangely, too, at this point she made it clear that the party was not necessarily a revolutionary party. This is an interesting point I wish to take up a little later. But she made it quite clear that the Communist Party was not a revolutionary party, and that anything I would hear to that effect was strictly an attempt upon the party by the Trotskyites, reactionaries, because the party was not interested in the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to a particular group of the Communist Party, as a result of your contact with Madelaine Ruthven?

Mr. LANG. Yes, sir; I was. I was put in contact with an indoctrination group. This was not a definite group of the Communist Party, in terms of a fraction or a cell. It was formed only for the new people who would become members of the party, to be indoctrinated into the beginnings of Lenin, Stalin, Marx, Engels.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this: We have had testimony in some instances indicating that study groups—Marxist study groups—were formed, composed of persons who sometimes were members of the party, and in other instances were not, and that sometimes these study groups were used as a recruiting ground for the Communist Party.

I want to know, in this instance, whether this was a group of Communist Party members who were being indoctrinated—that is, persons already admitted to the party—or whether it was a study group of the character that I mentioned a moment ago.

Mr. LANG. In regard to the group that I joined, they were all members of the Communist Party, just as I was. Now, it is quite true that a number of groups were carried on in this city by members of the Communist Party, but not under the nominal idea that it was anything connected with communism. They were current-events groups, historical groups, reading groups, philosophy groups. A lot of people were brought in who were interested in these subjects, but communism in that case was never brought up until it was discovered that certain individuals within the group wished to go further. Then these people were recruited by the person in charge of the group that had been sent out by the Communists.

Now, in regard to the group I am speaking of, the indoctrination group I was sent to, it was a Communist group and everyone in it had been accepted as Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who conducted the course of instruction or indoctrination?

Mr. LANG. A man by the name of Michael Wilson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us a little more about this person and what his occupation was?

Mr. LANG. Michael Wilson was a screen writer. At that time he was not too well known, but had been a functionary within the party for some time. He was quite a bright man. He had exceptional background in the philosophies of the Communist Party.

They had enormous confidence in his ability to teach this particular subject. He was quiet; he listened; he drew you in, because, after all, you were a potential worker. In the event you became proficient you would be sent out to do a good job for them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were your meetings held?

Mr. LANG. In this particular case they were held consistently at Mr. Wilson's house.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you attend that indoctrination course?

Mr. LANG. I would say between 8 and 10 weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed the members?

Mr. LANG. A very small group. I think, offhand, not over 8, 7, or 8 people.

Mr. TAVENNER. After the completion of this 10 weeks' course, were you transferred to another group?

Mr. LANG. Yes; I was. I was then transferred to a definite cell that worked within the Hollywood section. We met in a home somewhere in Beverly Hills.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many of those who were in the studio group with you were transferred to that group?

Mr. LANG. I would say 4 or 5.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall their names?

Mr. LANG. Yes. A man by the name of Carl Foreman, his wife Estelle Foreman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, if you will, give further identifying information, if you can, relating to these persons. Carl Foreman, what was his occupation at the time?

Mr. LANG. He was a screen writer. His wife was a housewife. There was another man by the name of Sol Barzman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what his occupation was?

Mr. LANG. I understood at that time that he was a writer. A man by the name of Lou Solomon.

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

Mr. LANG. S-o-l-o-m-o-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the first name?

Mr. LANG. I believe it would be Louis, L-o-u-i-s. I can't recall anyone else from the original indoctrination group who joined this cell group except that we met at the house of another person who had not been in the indoctrination group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall whether other persons were transferred from the original indoctrination groups to other groups of the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. Can I recall that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Recall who they were and if that occurred.

Mr. LANG. Frankly, I cannot, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. You were transferred to this new group. What type of people generally composed this new group to which you were assigned?

Mr. LANG. There was another couple at whose home we met, by the name of Leonard, Charles Leonard. At this time he was attempting to become a writer. He had sold an original story, I believe, to Paramount, and on the strength of that broke away from whatever occupation he was involved in and tried to become a writer.

His wife Helen—

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in this group?

Mr. LANG. Oh, for some many months. I would say 6, 8 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed this group?

Mr. LANG. Well, let's see. Solomon, Barzman, the Leonards, that is 2, 4, the Foremans, 6, and myself, 7; 7 people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you then transferred to still a third group?

Mr. LANG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose or the reason for that?

Mr. LANG. Well, after a length of time within this group it was decided to separate the writers from any of the Hollywood cells and concentrate them in what was known as writers' cells, comprising nothing more than just writers, radio writers, anybody who wrote, mostly for pictures. This caused a large amount of people to be moved back and forth; geographically they were twisted around, and it took some many months to organize this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whose decision was it that resulted in that transfer?

Mr. LANG. Well, we understood that the decision came from New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. From New York?

Mr. LANG. It was brought to us here for slight discussion, but there was no question in the mind of anyone it wouldn't go through.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who brought the directive from New York?

Mr. LANG. Well, it was first promulgated here by a man named John Howard Lawson, and there were a considerable number of meetings on this, which I did not attend. Lou Solomon came to our group after some meetings with Lawson and told us about it, and though it was put up to a vote, there was not much to do but accept it, because it had been more or less accepted by the hierarchy of the party.



Mr. TAVENNER. I believe I understood you to say there were about seven in this group.

Mr. LANG. That is all, sir, I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you given the names of all of them?

Mr. LANG. I believe so. Solomon, Barzman, Leonard, Foreman. All I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, would you tell the committee, please, what was the primary purpose or function of this last group of the Communist Party to which you were assigned?

Mr. LANG. Well, it was understood that if the writers could be brought together as a group their common interests and problems would be more clearly enunciated, so that action could be taken immediately, rather than to go through channels. I didn't mean to say it obviated going through channels, but it just cut a number of them down.

The party in Hollywood was very interested in creating a strong writers' front, so that the content of the motion pictures from their point of view could be approved, and that many of their ideals and their beliefs could be worked into the motion pictures.

This is not to say only in the scripts of the motion pictures, but into the various organizations that were part and parcel of the entire motion-picture scene, which took in the guilds, which took in all organizations that had any part of making a motion picture.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Do I understand from what you have just said the real purpose was to further the Communist cause in any way you possibly could, in every direction?

Mr. LANG. That is quite correct.

Mr. CLARDY. In the script, in the production, and in the outside activities of the members in general, to promote the Communist cause?

Mr. LANG. That is right. Being a group of writers they felt a closer bond would be created among the writers who were Communists, so they could then carry on the work with other writers and that other writers would feel they would be coming into a group that understood their problems. It as a very neat little affair.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask, again, what year or years did this activity or plan exist?

Mr. LANG. I would say somewhere in 1944. I am not terribly correct on that date, 1944, 1945; I think it was 1944.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Lang, I don't know that counsel brought it out—I don't think he did—what are your screen credits?

Mr. LANG. My screen credits—well, they are extensive, but I will try to remember some of them. The first picture that I made was a show called Yank on the Burma Road for MGM. And I made another one for MGM called Northwest Rangers.

Mr. MOULDER. Could he give the dates, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. LANG. That was—let's see, 1942, maybe the second one went into 1943. At Metro you work on a script a considerable length of time. You do many other duties between them, and a lot of things I did there never got on the screen, which happens to every writer.

I left MGM after 3 years being under contract, and I sold an original to Paramount called Cheezit the Cops. And they made it.

I did People are Funny. This is very interesting, to show the effect the party had already exerted upon me. While I was doing an innocuous a picture as People are Funny——

Mr. CLARBY. As what?

Mr. LANG. As innocuous——

Mr. CLARBY. I didn't hear the title.

Mr. LANG. People are Funny, a situation arose in which a character in the picture——

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little, please?

Mr. LANG. A situation arose in which my producer wished to create a situation in which a character in the picture was to blacken his face. It was perfectly all right, as far as he was concerned, but I immediately took umbrage. I said, "This is a terrible thing. You cannot do a think like that," when actually there was nothing about it, now that I think about it, that was derogatory to the Negroes—nothing was said, no act was performed—but yet such a profound influence was exerted on me I made a terrible situation out of it. I refused to do it. It came to a point whether I would do it or get off the script. I said I would get off the script.

It was brought then to the hierarchy of the studio, my executive producer for Paramount, and they accepted it. They wanted the script done, so they said, "All right. Just pass this, and he will write it in."

I only mention this in passing to show in such a slight thing as this what influence is brought up by the party. Nobody told me to do this. I did it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your indoctrination took.

Mr. LANG. It should.

Mr. TAVENNER. You used a method of describing the activities of this group, in which you said the influence of one writer upon another or the carrying on of work by one writer with another. What were you referring to there? Did you have any special thing in mind? What type of work was there an occasion to do between writers if they were employed separately on scripts?

Mr. LANG. Oh, well, a very interesting sidelight to the formation of the writers in Hollywood came along with the idea of what was called writers' clinics were created. This was a small group of top-echelon writers who were at the service of all members of the party to discuss scripts, originals, stories that were in work at the studios, and to improve, from their point of view, the material and the quality of the script.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there. You speak of a writers' clinic.

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a group composed exclusively of members of the Communist Party, or did it include also non-Communists of any sort?

Mr. LANG. It was only composed of those members of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this service which you have described extended to non-Communists or limited solely to members of the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. Well, it would be very difficult to extend it, I would think, because they would not want to reveal themselves, and it was more or less just concerned with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I interrupted you. I am not sure that you have fully described the activities of that group.

Mr. LANG. Well, the interesting aspect of this particular group which occurs to me, and they, too, thought so much of it, was intended to create an enormous dependence upon the party by the writers, because if a writer felt that he was being helped by functionaries, it was quite difficult to separate yourself from the party. You would be more prone to do many things that they asked you to do in writing, in the writing field. And they infused you with a sense of loyalty to the party.

And, as I noticed a few moments ago, the effect of this certainly rubbed off on me, even though it was not a matter of my going to the writers' clinic. Probably what I did was not so terrible, but let's assume that something more important was asked of somebody, you were caught up in a situation like this: Yes, you could very easily say, "I refuse to put it in the script." Because you are a writer you could very easily not put it in, or say that they cut it out, say that the studio took it out or the producer took it out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder, please.

Mr. LANG. I say you could very easily leave it in the script and then take it out, and later on when the picture was released you could have said, "They took it out." But this was not the case, because in many instances men were carried along with this idea that whatever the group would discuss and argue for, as long as it didn't destroy or disturb the story, it was a sidelight, it was left in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the leaders of this clinical group that you have spoken of?

Mr. LANG. Men such as Dalton Trumbo, John Howard Lawson, Lester Cole, Paul Jarrico, Dick Collins, Paul Trabisis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is it correct to say that another result of such activity would be to keep the Communist writers employed by improving their scripts and improving their product?

Mr. LANG. Well, that was certain part and parcel of the whole thing, because as long as a man was employed he was to pay dues.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was also an inducement for a person to be a member of the Communist Party, to receive such assistance from such persons.

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. Part of the sales talk, in other words; was it?

Mr. LANG. Well, it was a pretty good sales talk.

Mr. CLARDY. It worked on you.

Mr. LANG. You see, they were in a very good position at this particular time to do this, because, when the war was on, the Soviet Union was our ally. It was not too difficult to incorporate stuff in the script that was agreeable to many men in the industry that were naive enough to accept. I think it would be very difficult, I think personally it would be impossible. I think the motion-picture industry, I think the heads of it, the producers of it are really far more aware than ever before of the ideas.

Mr. WALTER. More than that, aren't the people who would ordinarily be persuaded to become parties to this movement aware of what it actually means?

Mr. LANG. Excuse me, sir. I didn't catch the entire question.

Mr. WALTER. I say, more than the reasons you have given, aren't those people who would be attracted to the Communist Party now aware of what it actually means, and for that reason would not become parties to the movement?

Mr. LANG. Oh, definitely.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. During the time you were a member of the Communist Party, or at any time during your career, were you ever employed to slant your screen writing to aid in the Communist propaganda at all?

Mr. LANG. No, sir: I was never, because, among other things, I never worked on pictures that carried that particular type of a situation, and I cannot say for sure that I know of any particular instance in which it was done. It was done in a subtle manner. You see, it went deeper than just coming out and saying this is right and this is wrong. The entire idea of the Communist Party is revolution, and any subject matter which broached on minorities or any circumstance that in our country had tendencies of being maltreated, ill treated, so that they would say about certain things by inference, they felt this was nothing: this was good.

Mr. WALTER. Were they successful in their efforts?

Mr. LANG. If you can make a people more discontented by showing them themselves portrayed on a screen in a better light, they felt that this was doing a good job.

Mr. MOULDER. You have to some extent given us detailed information concerning the objectives of the Communist Party leaders in forming cells among screen writers and other professionals in the entertainment field.

In your opinion, were they ever successful in their plans along that line, successful to an effective extent?

Mr. LANG. Yes; to an extent they were. They were very effective, because they proselytized it very well. They got people, writers who would be more sympathetic, and though it might have been right for the moment, their intent was wrong.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you give us any specific instance of any picture or any play or other entertainment that in your opinion you would designate as having effective Communist propaganda?

Mr. LANG. No, sir, I cannot. I cannot, because it was spread over so thin an area or, rather, such a wide area and was spread so thinly that it would have been not only the field of minority problems, but the field of housing and the field of our interest in government.

Mr. MOULDER. That would not necessarily be a Communist philosophy or belief. That might be of interest to all American citizens.

Mr. LANG. Yes.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Lang, I made a couple of notes trying to catch your exact language as you talked on a couple of points. I want to ask you if you feel you can add anything to what you have already said, to explain. I notice you, in your reference to Madelaine Ruthven, said she made it quite clear the Communist Party was a revolutionary party, was not interested in the overthrow of government.

Now then, you said also, "At this time I was not aware of its revolutionary purpose."

Now, I am wondering why did you ever become aware of any revolutionary purpose of the Communist Party, what sort of a revolution, what kind of a revolutionary party, what sort of a revolution, when is it to come, and under what conditions.

Mr. LANG. The concept of the Communist Party, it is an international organization. Let's not fool ourselves about this.

Mr. DOYLE. About what?

Mr. LANG. It is an international organization, the Communist Party. If you, which I did many years too late, go back into the history of the war and how they changed their point of view so as to gain a foothold wherever they could and wherever they felt a foothold would be hard to gain—that knew that it is difficult to arouse people in a country like the United States into revolutionary tactics, some man who has been born and raised here, to overthrow the Government that he has been given the opportunity to improve under. So, they changed the face that they originally started out with.

If you will read a man by the name of Dimitrov, he said that the Communist Party will always be a revolutionary party, the concept of the party, it came out of revolution and the end of it is to be only the overthrow of the capitalist and all that the capitalist stands for. It must be a party of the proletariat, and we must gain the peasants and workers.

But this was not Russia. This was a country that was rich and powerful, and to come into this country and to bring about an organization such as the Communist Party wasn't that easy, because there weren't that many people who were suffering, and to get men like me and many like me, they had to make it more palatable, they had to make it more esoteric, more intellectual, and they did a darned good job.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I note it is adjournment time. May I be permitted to ask a couple of questions of this witness right after lunch?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. The witness will be back after lunch.

Is this a good place to break, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; this is a good point.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee has received a great number of telegrams and communications from the people of Los Angeles expressing their appreciation for the hearings, and I might say that there is up to this point no one opposed to the activities of the committee. The committee is gratified by this public interest and response.

The committee will stand in recess until 1:45 p. m. this afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 12:02 p. m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 1:45 p. m. same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:58 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson (appearance noted in transcript), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr., being present.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show at this point that Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, are present, a quorum of the full committee.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

## TESTIMONY OF DAVID A. LANG—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe a member of the committee was interrogating the witness when we stopped.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, counsel. You are always very thoughtful, as well as capable.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered the hearing room at this point, 2 p. m.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Lang, I think before the noon recess I asked you the question bearing on the subject of your statements about the revolutionary intent and purpose of the American Communist Party.

To refresh your memory, just two brief statements by you. "At this time I was not aware of its revolutionary purpose," referring to the American Communist Party.

And, secondly, referring to Madelaine Ruthven, "She made it quite clear the Communist Party was not a revolutionary party, not interested in the overthrow of the Government."

Then you also stated, "I later found out differently."

You also stated, "I did not feel I was abrogating any of my loyalty to my country when I joined the Communist Party."

Now, on the subject of revolutionary intent and purpose of the American Communist Party, what sort of revolution were they advocating when you were a member of the Communist Party? Was there any force or violence directly or indirectly involved?

Mr. LANG. Not to my knowledge. There was no force and violence ever shown around me. When I mentioned earlier that the intent of the Communist Party was revolutionary and for revolution, I mean that the party was formed for the specific purpose of revolution. They reiterate this in all their statements.

But at one time, as I said, when they realized they wished to infiltrate into the United States and cover many people who might be against this exception, they had to change the general form of the party. And they made it quite clear at this time they were separating themselves from any international organization and becoming nothing more than the American Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. About what year was that, please?

Mr. LANG. This was much earlier than I was ever in. I would say back in the middle 1930's.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Now, what processes then were to be engaged and used, during the time you were in the party and learned anything about it, to project their revolutionary purpose and intent?

Mr. LANG. Only intellectually, at least so far as I was concerned. People that I associated with never discussed any overt act, such as overthrowing the Government, because the concept was that by the very condition of our society it would destroy itself, and that we could only help it further by clarifying the issues that were destroying this society within, so that we would be ready—we would be the vanguard—when the time came.

There was no time limit put to this, but the intention was that they had to create the nucleus of men and women who could lead the millions of people who would revolt when our society began to disintegrate.

Mr. DOYLE. My other question which I indicated was that you said "I did not feel I was abrogating any of my loyalty to my country at that time."

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever change your opinion on that? I mean when, if ever, did you come to feel you were abrogating?

Mr. LANG. I changed my opinion when I realized the intention behind the act, when I realized that I was being used to lead during a revolt. Revolt I considered so far afield that it never entered my mind. But when I began to see that I was being taught the things that the Communist Party advocated, that in a simple way I was being used through propaganda to incite, to make those people malcontent, instead of working within the confines of our law and our courts, that we were just using the material that the party taught us to make people more uneasy, more revolutionary.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand then that while you were in the Communist Party part of its program was the teaching of you, for instance, training of you, and you awoke to the fact they were training you to use you as the leader along with the other leaders, even at that time, to incite strife and stresses and unhappy situations, economically and socially in our country?

Mr. LANG. Yes; that is right.

Mr. DOYLE. To stir up all the strife they could between races and minorities and majorities?

Mr. LANG. When I found this out, this is when I broke away. I felt very strong while in the party, that I would be in the position to understand a lot of things that happened, and to help these things happen within the elements of our law and our courts, but when I began to see that the party looked askance at our courts and made fun of everything we stood for and took every advantage of our mistakes—and Lord knows we make plenty of them—and there is nothing wrong with making mistakes—to take advantage of a mistake, to set people against one another or set people against the country, that that was a part of this I couldn't stand for, so any knowledge they could impart to me by becoming a member of the party would have been of no value.

I was against it. And, educationally, I felt I could learn far more by getting out of it, without having the influence of these people about me.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Lang, who was chairman or who acted as chairman of this special group of writers to which you were assigned?

Mr. LANG. I remember a man by the name of Joe Solomon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which group is that that you are referring to?

Mr. LANG. I am now referring to the group that I was associated with after the indoctrination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Now, you have testified about being assigned to another group composed chiefly of writers, as I understood.

Mr. LANG. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was the group as to which you testified there was a writers' clinic established?

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the chairman or leader of that group, or was there more than one?

Mr. LANG. There were many more than one.

Mr. TAVENNER. How is that?

Mr. LANG. Many more than one. The chairman rotated from meeting to meeting, and they had a list of maybe 8 or 10 or 15 men to take over the chairmanship. They usually selected men who were articulate, who were of the higher bracket, who were more in the function of the party, to that they would be able to enunciate the directives more clearly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall who acted in that capacity from time to time?

Mr. LANG. Yes; I can. A man by the name of Guy Endore, a man by the name of Sam Ornitz; Robert Rossen, I believe. Adrian Scott, Alvah Bessie, Dalton Trumbo, Ring Lardner, Jr., Paul Jarrico, Paul Curtiss, Dick Collins, Gordon Kahn, John Howard Lawson, Allen Boretz, John Bright, Harold Buchman, Arnaud D'Usseau, Edward Eliscu, Lester Cole, Dan James.

These are the men that I remember distinctly being chairman of the group that I was associated with.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who was the financial secretary of the group?

Mr. LANG. To the best of my knowledge I can only remember one man, and his name was Cy Endfield.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you occupy any position in that cell or group at any time?

Mr. LANG. For a very short period of time I acted as literature chairman, which consisted of nothing more or less than picking up pamphlets and reading material that would be part and parcel of the subject matter that would be taken up at the previous meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you obtain the Communist Party literature and books?

Mr. LANG. I obtained them at a place called the Lincoln Bookstore on Highland Avenue just above Hollywood Boulevard.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything regarding the formation of that bookstore or the establishment of it?

Mr. LANG. Yes. At one time it was brought up that it was quite necessary that the Hollywood section be represented by a bookstore so that it would facilitate receiving material quickly, because there had been only one bookstore and that was downtown, but it was a matter of money, and we were asked to give money for the bookstore, with the idea that it would be repaid as soon as the bookstore was on a financial basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little, please? Well, do you recall how much money was raised by your Communist Party unit to establish this bookstore or assist in it?

Mr. LANG. I never found out how much money was raised. I assume that it was considerable, because they had to pay cash for everything and they did have a considerable number of books, and they had rent to pay in a locality that I am sure was not cheap.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know by whom this bookstore was operated?

Mr. LANG. It was a man by the name of Milton Labouiski.

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

Mr. LANG. Only by inference, because I assumed that no man would be in charge of any bookstore working for the party who was not a member of the party.



Mr. JACKSON. Is that bookstore still in operation?

Mr. LANG. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not the bookstore changed its name at a later date?

Mr. LANG. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee in whose homes this group met while you were a member of it?

Mr. LANG. I can recall distinctly that we met in the home of a man named Paul Trivers, Henry Meyers, Hugo Butler, Lester Cole, Maurice Raph, R-a-p-h,<sup>1</sup> Henry Blankfort, Waldo Salt, and Ring Lardner, Jr.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you sure of the spelling of Rapf's name? I think you said R-a-p-h. Is it R-a-p-f?

Mr. LANG. I am sorry. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall while you were a member of that group that it was addressed by functionaries of the Communist Party from a higher level?

Mr. LANG. I can recall a few people who attended the meetings who had been sent out here as a spearhead on different subjects, and to my knowledge a man by the name of Joseph North, N-o-r-t-h, who was editor of the New Masses, addressed us at one time; a woman by the name of Ella Winter; another women by the name of Oleta O'Connor Yates. That is spelled O-l-e-t-a O'Connor Y-a-t-e-s. And a man named William Schneiderman; that is spelled S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period was it that these people appeared before your group?

Mr. LANG. Well, they would appear periodically. It was not a meeting that was set; it depended upon the issue at the moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of this group and attended its meetings?

Mr. LANG. I would say I was a member of this group over a period of a year and a half, 2 years. The latter year that I continued membership in the party I attended very few meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are the years when you attended the meetings of this group?

Mr. LANG. '45—'44 and '45.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall aproximately how many persons were members of this group?

Mr. LANG. I can recall quite a number. At the closed meetings I met men by the name of, such as George—

Mr. TAVENNER. Closed meetings of what?

Mr. LANG. Communist meetings. These were definitely Communist meetings. No one was allowed at these meetings unless they were members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they members of the group or cell to which you belonged?

Mr. LANG. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. LANG. George Bassman, B-a-s-s-m-a-n; Nick Bela, B-e-l-a; Edward Biberman, B-i-b-e-r-m-a-n; Henry Blankfort, Laurie Blankfort, William Blowitz, Hugo Butler, Howard Dimsdale, Morton Grant, Edward Huebsch, Lester Koenig, Millard Lampell, Pauline

<sup>1</sup> Spelling corrected by witness to R-a-p-f.

Lagerfin, Isobel Lennart, Al Levitt, Arnold Manoff, M-a-n-o-f-f; Mortimer Offner, O-f-f-n-e-r; W. L. River, Bob Robert, Marguerite Roberts, John Stanford, Wilma Shore, George Sklar, S-k-l-a-r; Bess Taffel, Connie Lee Bennett, Max Benoff, B-e-n-o-f-f; Henrietta Martin, Seymour Bennett, Eunice Mindlin, Val Burton.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is that name?

Mr. LANG. Val Burton, Julian Zimet, Frank Tarloff, Louise Rousseau, Maurice Clark, Dorothy Comingore.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of George Willner?

Mr. LANG. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of that group?

Mr. LANG. No, sir; I do not remember him to be a member of that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Wexley, do you recall him?

Mr. LANG. John Wexley, correct; W-e-x-l-e-y, John Wexley.

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

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did he attend closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. LANG. He did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not know whether you have mentioned the name of Michael Uris.

Mr. LANG. Michael Uris was a member of that group. I forgot his name. It is so difficult to remember some of these names, but I am sure that he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Victor Shapiro?

Mr. LANG. Yes, sir; I do. He was a member of that group. He was not a writer; he was a publicist.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know he was a member of that group?

Mr. LANG. He attended the meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Elliott Grennard?

Mr. LANG. Grennard, that's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how to spell the name?

Mr. LANG. G-r-e-n-n-a-r-d, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that person known to you to be a member of this same group of the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. That is correct; he was a member of the Communist Party in this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Art B-i-r-n-k-a-r-n-t?

Mr. LANG. Yes, sir; I do.

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

Mr. LANG. B-i-r-n-k-a-r-n-t.

Mr. TAVENNER. What knowledge did you have of his activity, if any, in the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. To my knowledge Arthur Birnkarnt was not a writer, but he was assistant to a man named Buchman.

Mr. TAVENNER. What Buchman?

Mr. LANG. I know the name, but I cannot recall it at the moment. Harold Buchman's brother.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occupation——

Mr. LANG. Sidney Buchman. Sidney Buchman was a producer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your knowledge of his Communist Party activities, if any? That is, of the person of Art Birnkarnt?

Mr. LANG. I am not aware of what he actually did. I just know that he was an assistant to Mr. Buchman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party group of which you were a member?

Mr. LANG. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know that?

Mr. LANG. Because he was a member, he attended too many meetings not to have been a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you told us how long you remained in the Communist Party?

Mr. LANG. I remained in the party officially until the latter part of 1946. It was sometime, though, before 1946 that I broke away, at least in the physical sense, because I was soon learning that this was not my dish of tea. But, unfortunately, it had left some mark, some associations, some feelings, and they imbued you with a false sense of loyalty that carries you along considerably, and it takes time to break away, just like it takes time to join it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did your breaking away begin and when do you conclude that it was final, if it was final?

Mr. LANG. It was definitely final at the latter part of 1946, when I realized that I could no longer maintain an association with people that I had no sympathy for, when I learned that I did not have to fear them, not in any physical sense, but in a social sense; that they were so completely different in their feelings than I was that it made no difference whether they continued to be my friends or not, and I had been so long from the party, and they had so many times asked me why, and I had made all sorts of excuses, and the time came when they asked me again, and this time I said, "Look, I don't want to stay in it; I want out, I don't like anything you are doing; I don't agree with any of your activities; I want no more association with you; please don't bother me any more."

That was the end of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since that time have you affiliated with the Communist Party or supported any of its activities, to your knowledge?

Mr. LANG. To my knowledge I have supported not one activity. My associations with the members of the Communist Party broke off very suddenly after this. I was not very socially adjusted to many of the people, anyway, and I returned to friends that I had continued with through the years that had no connection with the party in any way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything of a concrete character that you can point to to indicate that your break with the Communist Party has been final and complete?

Mr. LANG. Yes. Let me go back on that question just before this, when you say I did not associate with any members of the Communist Party once I became a non-Communist.

I did associate with two people that I was responsible in bringing into the party. Their names are Bargeman—Bertha Bargeman—and a man named Marvin Bargeman. We disagreed violently on every issue, but the years of friendship that had gone on before either of us had ever joined laid some cement for the years that proceeded, and when I finally made up my mind to break forever and to reveal what I know of the party, because I know of its function now, I even went so far as to contact both of these people, and I told them, I said, "I know this is the end of whatever friendship we have, but I am going to name you, because I think you are wrong; it is time that you got off the dime and made a clean breast of this thing. I do not agree with any of the things that you stand for, and I can no longer protect you and no longer will protect you. This is your baby and you have got to take the brunt of it like I am going to take it, because I know that I am right."

To show the effect that this took, a day later Mrs. Bargeman came to my wife, and she said, "How can you be married to a man such as this, to have done such a deed, or is going to do such a deed?"

MR. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little?

MR. LANG. "How can you be married to a man such as this, who is doing what he is doing, and actually, you know, David is going to be against the wall in 10 years; they are going to shoot him."

So that was great. That gave me the whole key. I realized now that I was holding onto something that was a miasma that had no meaning, because if people carry their emotions to such degree as this, then you are dealing with people that are not capable of working in a period of conflict or upheaval, when chaos is the only thing that is going to give them impetus to action, and this scored the whole issue very beautifully for me.

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

MR. VELDE. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Lang, first of all, I should say how much we appreciate your cooperation in coming before the committee, giving the committee, the Congress, and the American people, the benefit of your knowledge of the operations of the Communist Party.

I might say if you go before a wall you will have a lot of company. Are you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

MR. LANG. I am, sir.

MR. JACKSON. Did you retain your membership over the period of years—

MR. LANG. I have.

MR. JACKSON (continuing). That you were in the Communist Party?

MR. LANG. I did.

MR. JACKSON. How many members of the Screen Writers' Guild, during the period of your membership in the Communist Party, did you know to be members of the Communist Party?

MR. LANG. Every name that I have given as writers involved in the functions of the Communist Party as a part of the group were members of the Screen Writers' Guild.

MR. JACKSON. Were you a member of the so-called progressive caucus of the Screen Writers' Guild?

MR. LANG. My name was on it. I was never a member of it. I never participated in any of their activities.

MR. JACKSON. What was the function of the caucus?

Mr. LANG. The caucus was formed to bring issues that the party felt were important for the welfare of the Hollywood writer, never taking into consideration the fact this was an uphill fight for the writer to gain recognition, to gain a minimum wage, and that each thing must be taken in its course and a door must be closed before another door is opened. But they would make such issues that would not aline the guild as a solid functioning group. They would bring up all side issues, whatever came to their mind, to give the feeling that we were being led wrong, we were being made dupes of by the producers, and that we must be fighting harder, and this only caused more uncertainty, more split, and they kept saying all the time, "We want unity," and the more they talked about unity the wider the chasm grew. They didn't function in a good way, that I ever saw.

Mr. JACKSON. How extensive was the influence of the caucus in the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LANG. I never found them to be very extensive, and to that extent they are so completely in the minority today that they are not even around. They have been in disrepute for some time, I would say. They cut their own throats.

Mr. JACKSON. You say they are not around. Do they no longer hold membership in the guild or attend meetings of the guild?

Mr. LANG. They are not active. They are not vociferous. They have been squelched so beautifully.

Mr. JACKSON. It was at all times a minority membership in the guild? They were the Communists in the guild?

Mr. LANG. I would say so. I would say there was a minority membership in the Communist Party in the Hollywood scene, so far as the writers are concerned. They tried very diligently to infiltrate into the picture business. They didn't get very far.

Whatever you might say, the picture business has always been on the offensive. They have always fought anything that was Communist. I have never found a producer, never found an actor associated with anybody in the picture business who tried to sell me a bill of goods. I am talking about the men who are the heads, that decide and make the movies. A writer could very easily put things in a script. It is not so easy to get it past the men who know what it is all about.

Mr. JACKSON. Were the members of the caucus able to put their members on the board of directors of the Screen Writers' Guild or in any other capacity?

Mr. LANG. They got on the Screen Writers' Guild because they were pretty clear on issues for the moment.

Mr. JACKSON. They knew where they were going?

Mr. LANG. They knew where they were going, and they made it strong and to the point, and so many honest, decent guys in the guild who were not active that could not enunciate these ideas, they felt, "Here is leadership." This was the principle behind the Hollywood Communist group leadership, get in, work from within.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you feel that you knew most of the members of the Communist Party in the Screen Writers' Guild? Is there any reason to believe there are others of whom you have no knowledge?

Mr. LANG. There are reasons to believe there are a few left I didn't meet. As I say, this group I was associated with was one of 3 or 4.

They were geographically set up so that most men and women in the valley would be closer to their group than those in Hollywood and Beverly Hills, so you didn't meet them all. There were many times, of course, when writers would come into your group, having moved, so on and so forth.

Mr. JACKSON. Again may I express my thanks to you for your cooperation before the committee this afternoon.

Mr. LANG. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. You have named a considerable number who you said were members of the party and active in pictures in one fashion or another. How many of those are still active in pictures today?

Mr. LANG. There has been nobody named that has been an unfriendly witness or that has stood on the fifth amendment that works in a motion-picture studio today, to my knowledge.

Mr. CLARDY. So that you have named everybody removed from the scene, in one fashion or another?

Mr. LANG. I believe they have been.

Mr. CLARDY. In summing up your testimony, as a whole, as I gather it, and regardless of the facts you have just now stated, those have been moved out again, which you say, based on your experience, that that medium of public information is particularly vulnerable and you have to be on guard continuously to prevent the thing happening again?

Mr. LANG. I would go further than that. You have to be on guard on every issue and every line.

Mr. CLARDY. The Commies work 24 hours a day?

Mr. LANG. They work all the time.

Mr. CLARDY. If we are going to succeed in keeping it squelched, we will have to stay on the job the same length of time.

Mr. LANG. That is my opinion.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No more questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Lang, do you know from your own experience that the Communist Party today advocates the overthrow of the United States Government?

Mr. LANG. No, sir; I do not. All I can say is that the whole basis of communism is international. When people begin to realize this they will realize that whatever guise the party takes, it is all the same thing. It doesn't make any difference. The final answer to their objective is for the overthrow of any government that is antipathetic to the Soviet Union.

Mr. FRAZIER. Does the Communist Party in the United States take its orders from the Communist Party in Russia?

Mr. LANG. This is rather difficult to answer, because there is nothing definite that can be pointed to. All I can say is that in 1935—pardon me, 1945, a man by the name of Duclos wrote a letter in criticism of

the Communist Party activities in this country. It was at the time Earl Browder was the head, and he advocated at that time an emergency of the party. He could see new horizons coming out of the war in which the party could come out in the open and work clearly with capital and labor and be a function within the Government of the United States. Whether he was right in this or wrong, I am not in a position to say. It never came to pass.

I do know Mr. Duclos wrote a letter in violent opposition to it, which was taken up by the party and carried through to the final end where Browder was ousted. I can only answer your question by saying that if this isn't an international party, then how can a man like Duclos have such influence upon the American scene? Where did Duclos get his ideas?

Mr. FRAZIER. Thank you very much.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to join in my colleague's comments and thanks for the excellent testimony which you have given before this committee. Unfortunately, I was not able to hear you this morning, but we do appreciate the information you have given us. It has been a great help in the performance of our duties.

Is there any reason, Mr. Counsel, why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. There is no reason why he should not be excused.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is excused. The committee will be in recess for 10 minutes.

(Representative Velde left the hearing room during the recess, which lasted from 2:43 p. m. to 3:10 p. m.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will come to order. Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Who is your next witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. The next witness is Mr. Max Benoff.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Benoff, will you stand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BENOFF. Yes, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF MAX NATHAN BENOFF, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. BENOFF. My name is Max Nathan Benoff.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the first name?

Mr. BENOFF. Max.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BENOFF. I was born in New York City, September 21, 1915.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. BENOFF. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am Edward Bennett Williams, of Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Benoff, were you present in the hearing room while the witness just before you testified?

Mr. BENOFF. I was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness, Mr. David Lang, identified you as one of the members of the Communist Party group to which he was assigned, the one composed of writers.

Mr. Benoff, were you a member of that group?

Mr. BENOFF. Well, I don't remember which group he talked about, sir, because he mentioned quite a few names, but I mean, I was a member, if that is what you mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Now before talking to you about that and asking questions, I will further identify you as to your educational background and your record of employment. Will you state to the committee, please, what your formal education has consisted of?

Mr. BENOFF. I was educated in the public schools of New York City. I attended the grammar school and the junior high school, and from junior high school went to high school and completed high school, and that is the extent of my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. BENOFF. I am a free-lance writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Free-lance writer?

Mr. BENOFF. Comedy writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in that occupation?

Mr. BENOFF. Oh, about 15 years, between 15 and 16 years, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you briefly summarize for the committee, please, what your record of employment has been and if you have screen credits, tell the committee what they are.

Mr. BENOFF. I will be glad to.

Mr. TAVENNER. The principal ones.

Mr. BENOFF. Certainly. I began to write comedy in—well, I actually wrote comedy all my life. When I was just a young fellow of 15 or so I used to contribute to Walter Winchell's column quite frequently. I think I was one of his leading contributors—I don't like to promote myself, but I contributed to Winchell's column and I decided I might as well make some money out of it.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean that was for free?

Mr. BENOFF. They didn't pay for it anyway.

Mr. SCHIERER. You might as well have been working for Jack Benny.

Mr. BENOFF. What was that?

Mr. CLARDY. You may have thought you were working for Jack Benny.

Mr. BENOFF. That is right. Jack pays very well. I started writing cartoon jokes, and I wrote some stuff for Ballyhoo. You gentlemen probably never read the stuff. At any rate, I was writing stuff for Ballyhoo, and I wrote the cartoon jokes for Peter Arno and people like that. I also wrote for radio.

About 1938 I had a couple of weeks with Eddie Cantor. I did odd things. In 1939 I really got started, because I went to work for Ed Gardner on a program called So This Is New York. From that show I went to the Phil Baker program. I worked on that for, I don't know—as long as it lasted, which wasn't very long, then on the Tommy Riggs show, and he didn't last very long, either.



Mr. CLARDY. Would you mind keeping your voice up? I don't want to miss any of this.

Mr. BENOFF. Anyway, in 1940 I went to California, and I worked on the Texaco Star Theater, starring Ken Murray. I went back to New York and was married, and then in 1941 I went to Chicago and worked on another program called—I don't remember. I just remember it was snowing all the time in Chicago.

I got back from there fast, and I went to work on a program for Ed Gardner again, a program called Duffy's Tavern. I worked on Duffy's Tavern until 1943, and in 1943 I came out to California to do a picture, and I went to work for Paramount. I left the radio program and went to work for Paramount. They didn't make the picture. I guess they read the script. They never made mine.

Anyway, after I left that, at the end of 1943, then in 1944 I worked for Twentieth Century-Fox just only a few weeks. I worked at RKO for just a few weeks. I worked for Warner Bros. The name of the picture was Take It or Leave It, one picture. The other picture was, I am ashamed to say, The Girl Rush.

Then while at Warner Bros. I did Hollywood Canteen. I didn't do very well in pictures. I went back to radio and I did the Baby Snooks program, and then I went in the Navy.

In the Navy I did programs like Command Performance, Command Call, and stuff like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of your going into the Navy?

Mr. BENOFF. 1945 and 1946. I got out in 1946, worked for Eddie Cantor, for Joan Davis, then for different programs like Ray Bolger, Colgate Comedy Hour, 1947 and 1948 on a picture, then I went to Fanny Brice and the Baby Snooks show, and then in 1949, in January of 1949, I began to write a program called Life With Luigi. Some of you may have heard that program, and that lasted up until now.

Mr. TAVENNER. During how long a period of time were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BENOFF. I was a member a very short time, Mr. Tavenner. That is, I was a young man of about 27 or 28 at the time and it was in 1944, for a period, as near as I can estimate, of 3 or 4 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long a period?

Mr. BENOFF. Just for 3 or 4 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please tell us the circumstances under which you joined the group that you were assigned to?

Mr. BENOFF. Well, I didn't have any indoctrination or anything like that that Mr. Lang told you. I am not a political person. I am a comedy writer, and frankly I didn't have very much interest in politics, with apologies to you people, and at that time I came out I wanted to get into pictures. I didn't want to do any radio work and I was anxious to meet the big picture writers.

Of course, it was a difficult time for anyone to try to meet such people. I met a man by the name of Bob Rossen, and I got to know Mr. Rossen. I was naturally proud of my association with him, because he was one of the top writers in Hollywood, and one time, as nearly as I can remember—I want to give the committee all the facts and everything that I remember, and as close as I can remember, he said, "Come out to a meeting of the party, of the Communist Party, and meet a lot of big writers."

I was, of course, glad to meet the big writers.

Mr. TAVENNER. As I understand, you were influenced in the action you took by the prominence of the individual who paid you special attention.

Mr. BENOFF. Absolutely, sir, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any other persons who were led into the Communist Party who took that action as the result of the stature or the prominence of people who were already members of the party?

Mr. BENOFF. No, Mr. Tavenner, I don't. Truthfully, I practically know nothing about communism or people who believe in communism or who are in or out of communism, or anything like that. I never discussed it.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of these hearings, particularly during the early part of it, in 1951, we heard quite a bit about the objective of the Communist Party in Hollywood, namely, to use to the fullest extent glamor names and personalities in recruiting for the Communist Party.

Do you have the impression that the interest that was shown by Bob Rossen in you was a matter of that kind, a thing which attracted you because of his prominence?

Mr. BENOFF. Well, if you mean—I can tell you nobody ever recruited me. There is no such thing as saying, "Here is a piece of paper. Give me \$10," you know. "Here is a slip. Go home." I mean, "You are in," or anything like that.

I never had anything like that. I just went to the meeting. I don't know why. Rossen did it, you see. I think it was a matter of friendship, a gesture of friendship. He said, "You will meet big people."

I went there. I attended a very few meetings. The meetings were dull. They weren't interesting. I don't expect to get laughs everywhere I go, but I didn't get anything, one way or the other.

I was in, like a bathing beauty in a swimming pool, I dipped my toe, I dunked it and ran. That was the whole thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have often been told there was no humor in the Communist Party. Maybe this is some evidence of it.

Mr. BENOFF. Well, I never wrote any material.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in the study of the Communist Party literature while you were a member of the party?

Mr. BENOFF. No, sir, not to my recollection I didn't. I know I didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you study any of the books on dialectic materialism?

Mr. BENOFF. I don't even study books on vegetarianism.

Mr. TAVENNER. What brought about the termination of your relationship with the Communist Party?

Mr. BENOFF. I never had a termination. Probably the whole thing was mutual. They were probably as glad to get rid of me as I was to get out.

Nobody ever asked me to come back and I have never heard from them since. I have never seen my picture in the post office, saying, "Reward for that guy." Just nothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. You came to Hollywood when, in 1924?

Mr. BENOFF. No, 1943, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, according to the statement you just gave, you were engaged in the same general type of work in New York for a period of time.

MR. BENOFF. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Had you affiliated in any manner with the Communist Party while you were in New York?

MR. BENOFF. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you approached on the subject while in New York and requested to join the Communist Party?

MR. BENOFF. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. During the period of time that you were a member of the party or since that time, have you knowingly permitted yourself to be used in the employment of members of the Communist Party who were not as well qualified as other persons for the particular task involved?

MR. BENOFF. No, sir. It is as much news to me as it is to you. As a matter of fact, I told you when I was at—at the time I was in I was in the picture business, trying to be in the picture business. If I had gotten any help I would have gone a heck of a lot further than I did.

Nobody has helped me. I never tried to help anybody. When I came out here I tried to get into the picture business. I was a very small person, you might call me a junior writer, something like that.

MR. TAVENNER. Who were some of the persons whose names you can recall or give us the names of all the persons you can recall who were members of this group of the Communist Party to which you belonged.

MR. BENOFF. Mr. Tavenner, I have gone over this with my counsel, and everything else. Believe me, really, 10 years is really tough to remember.

I can remember this, and the reason I remember this is that it seems to me the meetings I attended I saw these people all the time there. Ring Lardner, Dalton Trumbo, John Lawson, Richard Collins. I am sure I saw Richard Collins—I couldn't be positive. Gordon Kahn, Paul Jarrico, and Albert Maltz.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you had any discussion on the subject of communism with any of those persons since you withdrew from the party?

MR. BENOFF. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. I believe that is all I have to ask, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Clardy.

MR. CLARDY. Mr. Witness, as I understand it, your connection with the party was rather fleeting, so to speak.

MR. BENOFF. Yes.

MR. CLARDY. There was no formal joining and no formal breaking away from the party.

MR. BENOFF. No; none.

MR. CLARDY. Were you ever called on to contribute, as the other witnesses have testified, a percentage of what you might earn?

MR. BENOFF. I am glad you asked me that. To my best recollection I don't remember ever giving 1 cent to dues. I don't even remember paying any dues. I don't remember signing a card.

I always considered myself as not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. Well then, as I understand it, what you are trying to tell us is that you were trying to make your way up the ladder in your chosen profession and this offered opportunity and you availed yourself of it?

Mr. BENOFF. Absolutely, sir. If someone had said to me, "Come on to a meeting of the Republican Party and meet a Democrat," I would have gone.

Mr. CLARDY. I presume you would have extended that to cover the other parties as well.

Mr. BENOFF. You know, you can't say that, because the Hollywood Democratic Party turned out to be a fun organization.

Mr. JACKSON. We will get back to the subject at hand.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you, since the termination, if we can call it that, completely disassociated yourself, both in action and spirit, from the things you ran across while you were connected with the party, if we can call it that?

Mr. BENOFF. Well, I am glad and I appreciate and thank you for asking me that, because my name—and we have really gone over this—my recollection, by looking at lists—and everybody has a list today—and any place at all, you can't find my name on one organization, front, back, sideways, or anything: just nothing. I don't join. I am not a joiner. I am a stay-outer.

Mr. CLARDY. Let's hope that continues. Let's get down to the serious business of this meeting. Are you convinced today that the things the Communist Party stands for and which you have discovered for yourself, both in these meetings and otherwise, are against the best interests of this Nation?

In other words, are you genuinely converted to the American way of life, as you should be and you tell us you are?

Mr. BENOFF. Congressman Clardy, I wish you wouldn't say am I converted to the American way of life.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't mean it the way it sounded.

Mr. BENOFF. I think, as I have always thought, and you have heard my program. You know—I don't want to say pro-American. I am an American. I don't think anybody can beat America. I don't think there is any country like America. I don't think we need have any fear of intervention by other people. I don't think there is any other system like our system.

Mr. CLARDY. Would it be fair to say, sir, you look back on this brief interlude of a few months with a great deal of regret?

Mr. BENOFF. A great deal of regret; yes. It is the kind of thing I wish had never happened and it is just too bad, you know; it is just one of those things.

Mr. CLARDY. I take it then this is the opportunity, since you have been named, to express yourself as you have and is welcomed by you.

Mr. BENOFF. Not only welcomed, but I would have demanded it.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. When Mr. Rossen invited you to attend this meeting, did he indicate to you by joining his group you would be assisted in your ambition to be somebody in this profession?

MR. BENOFF. No, sir. There was never any promise, implied or otherwise, anybody would have gotten me a job. If that were the case Mr. Rossen would have tried to get me a job.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

MR. SCHERER. I have no questions.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE. When you discontinued attending the Communist meetings to which Mr. Rossen had first taken you, sort of sponsored you, I take it, at the first meeting, did you tell him goodbye or did you tell him you were disassociating yourself?

MR. BENOFF. No, sir. What happened at the time was I didn't go and in a short time after that I went into radio. So, actually, the contacts were different.

Then after that I went into the Navy and the contacts were different again. When I came back I went into radio again.

MR. DOYLE. Thank you. No other questions.

MR. JACKSON. Mr. Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER. No questions.

MR. JACKSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Benhoff, for your testimony. I think you and the Communist Party are about even. You got no laughs and they got no dues.

MR. BENOFF. That isn't fair. I don't like to leave with somebody topping me.

MR. JACKSON. That wasn't the purpose. You said, Mr. Benhoff, you would have demanded the opportunity to appear after having been named.

I think it is perhaps well to stress again at this time that anyone who is named and feels that they have been unfairly treated has a standing invitation from this committee to notify the committee to that effect and the committee will at the first opportunity give them an opportunity to be heard. This is a standing rule of the committee.

Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

MR. TAVENNER. No further questions.

MR. JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Benhoff.

MR. TAVENNER. Francis Edward Faragoh.

MR. FARAGOH. May I request I not be televised during the hearing?

MR. JACKSON. Do you object to the audio or visual portion?

MR. FARAGOH. Just the visual portion.

MR. JACKSON. Will the television operators kindly keep the cameras off the witness during the course of his testimony.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. FARAGOH. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF FRANCIS EDWARD FARAGOH, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MORRIS E. COHN

MR. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

MR. FARAGOH. My name is Francis Edward Faragoh.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you please spell your name?

Mr. FARAGOH. F-a-r-a-g-o-h.

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

Mr. FARAGOH. I was born in Hungary, rather, at that time in the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, in 1895.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mr. FARAGOH. 1909, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you naturalized?

Mr. FARAGOH. The year is correct, 1935. I am guessing that it was in February.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee, please, what your formal educational training has consisted of?

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, I began my formal education in Hungary and continued there until the age of 14. Upon coming to this country I attended elementary and high schools in New York City and also attended the College of the City of New York and Columbia University. That has been my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pardon me for my failure to ask you whether or not you are accompanied by counsel.

Mr. FARAGOH. I am, sir.

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

Mr. COHN. Yes. My name is Morris E. Cohn, of Los Angeles?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation, Mr. Faragoh?

Mr. FARAGOH. I used to be a writer, sir; I am retired.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you retire from your profession?

Mr. FARAGOH. In 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you engage in the business of writing?

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, this is not going to be particularly accurate. I think it will serve the purpose to say since 1920, and continuing until 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time, did you reside in Los Angeles or in this vicinity?

Mr. FARAGOH. No. I came to Los Angeles in 1929.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have remained here since that time?

Mr. FARAGOH. No; I have not. About 5 years ago I left Los Angeles, a little over 5 years ago, as a matter of fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Faragoh, during the testimony of Mr. Sidney Buchman before the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 25, 1951, Mr. Buchman took occasion to refer to you. He stated that he had read from the testimony of certain witnesses, who had appeared before the committee, that you had been at one time a member of the Communist Party. And in referring to you he used this language, "Mr. Faragoh, to the best of my knowledge and by statements from time to time, I can't place them exactly, when or where, but I believe that Mr. Francis Faragoh is not a Communist and never has been."

After making that statement I asked Mr. Sidney Buchman if he had ever attended a Communist Party meeting in your home.

His reply was that he had never attended a Communist Party meeting in your home at which you were present.

Now, my first question is, did you at any time attend a Communist Party meeting at which—either in your home or at any other place, at which Mr. Sidney Buchman was present?

Mr. FARAGOH. Will you phrase that question again? I missed the first part of it. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time attend a Communist Party meeting in your home or at any other place, at which Mr. Sidney Buchman was present?

Mr. FARAGOH. I shall decline and do decline to answer this question, sir, basing my declination on the fifth amendment, on that provision of which protects me from acting as a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss with Mr. Sidney Buchman prior to his appearance as a witness before this committee in September 1951, what his testimony would be with regard to you?

Mr. FARAGOH. May I consult counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(At this point Mr. Faragoh conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. FARAGOH. Sir, I shall decline to reply to this question, inasmuch as Mr. Sidney Buchman has appeared before this committee, and my testimony might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you refuse to testify as to whether you and Mr. Buchman conferred before his testimony was given before this committee?

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, inasmuch as Mr. Buchman is connected with that question, I do decline to answer this question as well.

Mr. JACKSON. Your declination is on the same ground as previously stated, the provisions against possible self-incrimination?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was the last time you saw Mr. Sidney Buchman and talked to him?

Mr. FARAGOH. This again involves Sidney Buchman, and I shall again decline on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not Communist Party meetings were held at any time in your home?

Mr. FARAGOH. There again, sir—

Mr. TAVENNER. To your knowledge.

Mr. FARAGOH. Here again, sir, inasmuch as it mentions an organization which has been listed as subversive, I shall decline to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment, of the same provision which I gave before.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to call to your attention, Mr. Faragoh, for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to make any explanation you desire, or to deny the statements as being true, the testimony of Mr. Dmytryk and Mr. Martin Berkeley, and Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg, relating to you, and in the course of Mr. Dmytryk's testimony before this committee on April 25, 1951, Mr. Dmytryk was asked to tell the committee what he knew with regard to a group of the Communist Party to which he had been transferred.

Mr. Dmytryk's testimony was as follows:

I was transferred to a special group. This was toward the end of the Communist Political Association. I don't know exactly why this special group was organized.

I was told later—I believe I heard it at the original hearings—they were called the Davis group.

Mr. TAVENNER. You heard it was called the Davis group?

Mr. DMYTRYK. They started naming the groups after famous dead Communists. They wouldn't use live ones because they didn't know how they would wind up. That group met in San Fernando Valley.

They were people either considered super secret or super prestige. I attended two meetings. I have no idea what the ultimate purpose of the group was, but I know it was a secret thing.

I attended two meetings of this group. One meeting was at Sidney Buchman's house, although Sidney Buchman was not present at the meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the circumstances under which you met at this house?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I can't say exactly, except Adrian Scott had been called and told to bring me along and come to a certain person's house. We went there and found no one there, and a servant told us to go to Sidney Buchman's house, and we did. Sidney Buchman was not there.

In this group were John Howard Lawson, Adrian Scott and myself, a writer named Francis—that is the masculine Francis—Faragoh and his wife Elizabeth Faragoh, and a couple I had never met before—

and so on.

Mr. Martin Berkeley, in the course of his testimony, which I have already read during these hearings to another witness, Witness Danny Dare, identified you and a person by the name of Irving J. White as members of the Communist Party.

And as I mentioned a moment ago, the witness Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg identified you as a member of the Communist Party, along with Herbert Biberman, Dorothy Tree, and her husband Michael Uris.

I would like to ask you whether or not any phase of the testimony of these three witnesses relating to you is untrue?

Mr. COHN. May I confer just a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Cohn conferred with Mr. Faragoh.)

Mr. FARAGOH. I shall like to request you withdraw that question for the following reason: I am—rather, I understand from your reading of the testimony of certain witnesses that some people have testified that I have been a member of the Communist Party and other witnesses have specifically denied that I have ever been, both parties under oath.

Mr. JACKSON. Counsel, may I suggest that should be broken down into individual statements.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me get the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Your question has combined all these.

Mr. TAVENNER. My first question, then, will relate solely to the testimony of Mr. Dmytryk, who testified, as I think you will recall from my reading of his testimony.

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. To the effect that you were in attendance at this Communist Party meeting which he attended of a group which was known as the special group over in the San Fernando Valley.

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there anything about that statement or that testimony of Mr. Dmytryk which was untrue?

Mr. FARAGOH. Again I must make the same request to you, sir. Inasmuch as I have the testimony against me and I have some testimony to the contrary of that, I am in the position where if I answer your questions I will deny what one or the other party testified to, and I believe that is a very perilous position for any witness.



Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you predicated your request upon testimony having been given by another person that you were not a member of the Communist Party. To what testimony are you referring, if I understood you correctly?

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, I have read the record, sir, and I am referring there to Mr. Sidney Buchman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I read Mr. Sidney Buchman's statement to you, which was that "Mr. Faragoh, to the best of my knowledge and by statements from time to time, I can't place them exactly when or where, but I feel Mr. Francis Faragoh is not a Communist and never has been."

Did you construe that as proof of your contention that you never were a member of the party?

Mr. FARAGOH. Sir, when you use the word "proof," I believe it is proof to the same degree as the testimony of the other witnesses.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. The fact that one person says that from his conversations he doesn't believe you to be a member of the Communist Party, is not at all the equivalent of a statement by another person that you were present in a Communist Party meeting with him and that you were a member of the Communist Party.

One is a negative statement and the other is a positive statement. I mean I don't want to argue that with you.

Mr. FARAGOH. Nor do I wish to argue it with you, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have asked me to withdraw the question, and I can't do that, Mr. Faragoh. There is no reason why you should not be asked that question any more than any other of the hundreds of witnesses who have answered similar questions.

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, I ask for my counsel to address the chair.

Mr. JACKSON. No, I am sorry. Your counsel cannot address the chair. Under the rules of the committee your counsel is here for the purpose of lending advice and assistance only on matters of your constitutional rights.

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, sir, these happen to be very special circumstances and a very special situation.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sorry, but I can't permit counsel.

Mr. FARAGOH. What would be your present ruling on my request that he withdraw the question?

Mr. JACKSON. You have been asked a question by counsel. If I were called upon to rule on it, I would direct that you answer. The testimony of Mr. Buchman, it appears to me, is a conclusion of Mr. Buchman's, and I don't know that any individual is in a position to state definitely that any other person is not a member of the Communist Party.

However, the testimony of Dmytryk and the others who have been mentioned by counsel contains direct references to your alleged membership in the Communist Party. That is the positive testimony which has been put in the form of a direct question to you, so I would direct that you answer the question asked by counsel.

Mr. FARAGOH. May I just hear the question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the testimony of Mr. Dmytryk that I read to you a few moments ago?

Mr. FARAGOH. I do, sir, but not to the extent of being able to answer without your reminding me of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I will reread the testimony. I will read this portion of Mr. Dmytryk's testimony:

They started naming the groups after famous dead Communists. They would not use live ones because they didn't know how they would wind up. One group—meaning the group to which he was assigned, Mr. Dmytryk was assigned—

met in the San Fernando Valley. They were people who were considered super-secret or superprestige. I attended two meetings. I had no idea what the ultimate purpose of the group was, but I know it was a secret thing.

I attended two meetings of this group. One meeting was at Sidney Buchman's house, although Sidney Buchman was not present at the meeting.

QUESTION. Can you give us the circumstances under which you met at this house?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I can't say exactly, except Adrian Scott had been called and told to bring me along and to come to a certain person's house. We went there and found no one was there, and the servants told us to go to Sidney Buchman's house, and we did. Sidney Buchman was not there.

In this group were John Howard Lawson, Adrian Scott, and myself, a writer named Francis, that is the masculine, Francis Faragoh, and his wife Elizabeth Faragoh.

And so forth.

Now, is there any portion of that statement, of that testimony by Mr. Dmytryk, which to your knowledge is untrue?

Mr. FARAGOH. Sir, I decline to answer this question on the grounds of the same provision.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Martin Berkeley identified you as a member of the Communist Party. Was his identification correct or was it false?

Mr. FARAGOH. It is the same question and I give the same answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg identified you along with Samuel Ornitz, Herbert Biberman, Dorothy Tree, and her husband Michael Uris, as members of the Communist Party.

Was any part of that testimony, to your knowledge, untrue?

Mr. FARAGOH. The same answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FARAGOH. I decline to answer that question on the ground of the fifth amendment.

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

Mr. FARAGOH. Same answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you contributing to the Communist Party at present?

Mr. FARAGOH. This is the same answer, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean you are standing on the fifth amendment again?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all right. You may just repeat the same ground.

Mr. FARAGOH. I am sorry.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all right. I am just trying to help you out a little and shorten this up.

Do you subscribe to or do you receive the Communist Daily Worker?

Mr. FARAGOH. Will you give me a moment?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; you may confer with counsel any time.

(At this point Mr. FaragoH conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, as a matter of fact, I do not, sir, and I was merely asking my counsel whether this would fall under the provisions of the fifth amendment. In that case I would have refused to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever received it?

Mr. FARAGOH. I shall refuse to answer that question, fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you belong to any organization any member of which to your knowledge is a Communist?

Mr. FARAGOH. Just one second, sir, please.

Mr. CLARDY. You may consult him.

(At this point Mr. FaragoH conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. FARAGOH. I will tell you why I am not answering without conferring. This question is almost impossible to answer, because that would indicate that almost anything, any organization of any description, I would have to know independently the makeup of the membership.

Nevertheless, specifically, on this question, I wish again to use my rights under the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You decline to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you acquainted with any person you know to be a Communist?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is the same question, sir, and the same answer.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. You said you came to California in 1929 and with the exception of 5 years have resided here continuously since that time.

Mr. FARAGOH. That is right, sir.

Mr. WALTER. During what period of time did you reside elsewhere?

Mr. FARAGOH. I am sorry. I am residing elsewhere now. In other words, I left Hollywood in 1948, in the month of February.

Mr. WALTER. Between 1929 and 1948 you resided continuously in Los Angeles or Hollywood?

Mr. FARAGOH. No; I made some trips to Hollywood and I made trips to the East and I stayed there for extended periods. I cannot give you the specific dates, however. This period I will put between 1931 and let us say 1942 or 1943, without wishing to stand on those dates for pinpoint accuracy.

Mr. WALTER. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever write anything for the Communist Party? You are a retired writer; is that right?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. During the time that you were writing actively, did you ever write anything for the Communist Party?

Mr. FARAGOH. This again falls under the provisions of the fifth amendment, and I shall decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever receive any compensation or anything of value from the Communist Party?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is the same question, and the same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. You refuse to answer?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. If you were not a member of the Communist Party, would you be willing to so state, Mr. Witness?

Mr. FARAGOH. I think—may I confer with counsel?

(At this point, Mr. Faragoh conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. FARAGOH. In consultation with counsel, I have come to the decision which I grabbed for before. That is a hypothetical and speculative question, and I wish to decline on the ground of the fifth amendment, because it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. JACKSON. You are under no compulsion to answer.

Mr. FARAGOH. I understand, but I do decline.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, you asked Mr. Tavenner to withdraw a certain question he asked you just a few minutes ago, and I believe the basis for your asking him to withdraw that question was the fact that two or three witnesses had said that you were a member of the party, and another witness testified that you were not a member of the Communist Party. Is that right? Is that statement correct?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is substantially right; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. Now I would like, Mr. Tavenner, for you to read Mr. Sidney Buchman's testimony to the witness again.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Faragoh, to the best of my knowledge and by statements from time to time—I can't place them exactly when or where, but I believe that Mr. Francis Faragoh is not a Communist and never has been.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the testimony which you said indicated that Mr. Buchman had testified that you were not a member of the Communist Party, and was the basis for your asking that the question be withdrawn; is that correct?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, will you tell the committee whether or not Mr. Buchman's statement is true?

Mr. FARAGOH. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. You came to the United States, Mr. Faragoh, at the age of 14?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. You came with your parents?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes; I did. That is my father.

Mr. DOYLE. You were naturalized in 1935?

Mr. FARAGOH. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Either before you were naturalized or since, did you engage in any foreign travel to any foreign country?

Mr. FARAGOH. I applied for a visa in 1931 to go to England, but I didn't go. I may have been to Tiajuana, I wouldn't swear to it, sir. Otherwise, I can very specifically state that I have not been abroad.

Mr. DOYLE. You were active from 1920 to 1947?

Mr. FARAGOH. In motion pictures.

Mr. DOYLE. In writing?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you done any writing since you retired?

Mr. FARAGOH. Well, I am trying to work on a play, but it is not current work, and I am not employed.

Mr. DOYLE. Since you became an adult and were naturalized in this country, have you ever given any lectures on any subjects?

Mr. FARAGOH. On any subjects, sir?

Mr. DOYLE. Or given any classes, instruction or group instruction of any sort? I mean as a teacher or instructor?

Mr. FARAGOH. I am searching my memory. I never gave a course of any kind.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, it would not have to be a course.

Mr. FARAGOH. I am sorry. You also included the word "lecture"?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. Have you lectured on any subject, in other words, to a group, either large or small? Well, let me be more specific.

Mr. FARAGOH. Please be.

Mr. DOYLE. You may want to stand on your constitutional rights. Since becoming an American citizen in 1935, have you given any speech in support of the objectives of the Communist Party of America?

(At this point Mr. FaragoH conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. FARAGOH. No, sir, I never have.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever written any pamphlet or any booklet in support of the objectives of the American Communist Party?

Mr. FARAGOH. One second, sir.

(At this point Mr. FaragoH conferred with Mr. Cohn.)

Mr. FARAGOH. I think I am ready for my answer now. I have never written anything of the nature that you have mentioned.

I wish to exclude from that possibly, and only possibly, any writing of mine which may have coincided with any single objective or group of objectives of the Communist Party in any one period, although, as I state, I am not aware of having written any such thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever used any other name in writing, other than your legal name?

Mr. FARAGOH. I used the name of Edward Francois in the early twenties, I think I might say before 1925, for some potboiler magazines.

Mr. DOYLE. You say you are writing a play in your retirement. Was that the nature of your writing before you retired, in connection with the entertainment field?

Mr. FARAGOH. I was doing work on motion pictures.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. I believe you stated you were retired; is that correct?

Mr. FARAGOH. Yes.

Mr. FRAZIER. If you are retired, I am at a loss to understand why you decline either to state that you are a member of the Communist Party or that you are not a member of the Communist Party. Are you laboring under the impression that it is a violation of law to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FARAGOH. I think I gave the answer to that when I answered the original questions by advice of counsel.

Mr. FRAZIER. You decline to answer?

Mr. FARAGOH. I decline to answer.

Mr. FRAZIER. Have you ever voted for a Communist candidate for President of the United States?

Mr. FARAGOH. I think, sir, that that would involve the secrecy of the ballot.

Mr. FRAZIER. Not necessarily.

Mr. FARAGOH. And I stand on the fifth amendment in that connection.

Mr. FRAZIER. All right.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you finished?

Mr. FRAZIER. I have finished.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Counsel, do you have anything more?

Mr. TAVENNER. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Wednesday, March 25, 1953.)

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA—PART 1

---

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Los Angeles, Calif.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment at 10:08 a. m., in room 518, Federal Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder (appearance noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Miss Reporter, show that present are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Frazier, and Mr. Velde (chairman), a quorum of the full committee.

Mr. Counsel, do you have a witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call at this time the witness who was put over until today by the direction of the chairman on Monday, Mr. Edward Huebsch.

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

Mr. HUEBSCH. I do, sir.

## TESTIMONY OF EDWARD HUEBSCH, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WILLIAM B. ESTERMAN AND DANIEL G. MARSHALL

Mr. VELDE. At the request of the witness it was decided by the committee that this hearing would not be televised. I ask now that the television cameras cease and desist, and we will proceed with the regular meeting.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, I did not so request.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, before we go any further, I am going to ask this witness if you think it is funny to wear the button you

---

<sup>1</sup> See p. 318 for references to a motion filed for this witness by his counsel, and in which the witness concurred, against the use of television while he was on the stand. The committee considered the motion in executive session and excused the witness until a day of the hearing when television would not be used.

have on. I assure you it is contemptuous. You are now appearing before a committee of the United States Congress, and I resent that very, very much.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, this is in a way a resolution, in the form of a resolution before the Democratic Members of Congress.

Mr. WALTER. I resent very much having anybody appear with a button like that on.

Mr. HUEBSCH. There are other buttons here.

Mr. VELDE. I think we can resume.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, I have not asked and do not ask that the television cameras be turned off during my appearance here. I have asked that my subpoena be quashed for several legal grounds. And I do not know at the moment whether this committee has ruled on the motion that I made through my attorney.

Mr. VELDE. The committee does not rule on motions. The committee just makes directions, and I have made the direction that the television cameras be turned off so that we might proceed with this meeting, and that is at the request of the witness himself, that he not be televised.

Mr. HUEBSCH. That is not true.

Mr. VELDE. And that the audio also be turned off.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I did not so request, and I do not so request.

Mr. WALTER. They are turned off, and you are not going to have an opportunity to put on the kind of an act you came here prepared to put on.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I came here in answer to a subpoena.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. HUEBSCH. My name, sir, is Edward Huebsch, H-u-e-b-s-c-h.

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

Mr. HUEBSCH. I was born in New York City, sir, on February 20 of 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I am, sir. But, sir, I would like to point out that counsel's motion has been denied here, not even ruled upon, and it seems to me that my rights and the rights of counsel have been violated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify themselves for the record?

Mr. ESTERMAN. I hesitate to open my mouth, but I will identify myself.

Mr. WALTER. I don't think it is necessary. We all know who you are.

Mr. ESTERMAN. William B. Esterman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Daniel G. Marshall.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the matter of this television motion should be made perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman. The other day, when the present witness was called before the committee, a motion was filed, not only that the witness not be televised, but that all television equipment in the room be removed during the course of his interrogation.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room at this point, 10:13 a. m.)

Mr. JACKSON. Acting in accordance with that motion, the committee retired, as you will recall, and took up the matter and came back and made the ruling. I think it should be made perfectly clear



to all concerned that the reason there is no television here today is because of the motion that was filed by counsel on, I believe, last Monday.

Mr. HUEBSCH. If you would have the reporter read the record back of my remarks there, I believe you will find I did not object to being televised. I ask you to read the record of my remarks and also of the attorney's motion which was filed with this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee is acting upon the motion of your counsel, who is presumed to speak for you in the matter of the television.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, the motion was to quash the subpoena. I did agree to appear on television.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I do agree.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a general statement of your formal education training, Mr. Huebsch?

(At this point Mr. Huebsch conferred with Mr. Marshall and Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. HUEBSCH. My formal education, sir, was limited to public school and high school in the city of New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Well, sir, I would like an understanding with the Chair. Representative Velde is the author of bills and a couple of books. I don't believe he is qualified to conduct an impartial hearing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question, please?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, you were asked a question, and the answer can be given very simply.

Mr. HUEBSCH. We are now having an unusual type of hearing, and I submit, sir, that you are the author of a book——

Mr. VELDE. That is in the nature of argument, and not an answer.

Mr. WALTER. And not the truth.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I will submit the bill. I will submit a copy of the bill as a document in this record.

Mr. JACKSON. I move that the remarks of the witness having to do with this extraneous matter be stricken from the record, Mr. Chairman, as not being pertinent to this inquiry and not being responsive to the questions that are being asked.

Mr. VELDE. It is so ordered. All the matter which is not responsive to the question, which is volunteered only, will be stricken from the record.

Mr. HUEBSCH. With your permission, I would like to inquire from the chairman——

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. There is a question pending which he has not answered.

Mr. VELDE. That voluntary remark will be stricken from the record, too.

Mr. HUEBSCH. The question is what was my occupation, sir. My occupation is not an occupation that does not carry with it certain responsibilities. In the discharge of those responsibilities I am trying to answer the question.

Mr. WALTER. We are not asking about your employment with the Communist Party. We are asking about what you do that you admit that you do.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Mr. Congressman, if you will put your question in proper terms, I will try to answer your question, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you the question in this form: It seems to be taking so long for you to answer. Have you ever been a screen writer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I, sir, have been and am a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become a screen writer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I became a screen writer 10 days after my discharge from the Army in 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1946 you were in the Army, the United States Army?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Prior to January 10, yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you been in the United States Army?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I entered the Army late in '42. I volunteered for the Army right after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come from New York to Los Angeles?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I came to Los Angeles directly—I spent a few days with my family in New York and then immediately flew out here to California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that your first residence in California?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Yes; it was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of the Communist Party prior to your coming to Los Angeles, at the time you have indicated?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Well, sir——

(At this point Mr. Huebsch conferred with Mr. Marshall and Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. HUEBSCH. This question goes to the issue of my right to attend meetings, and if I submit an answer—I cannot answer that because Congress cannot tell me what meetings I should go to and which I should not go to. That is the question of the first amendment.

Now, sir, in these days of hysteria, Congress has passed the Smith Act, which put a man in this position: They violate his rights to go to a meeting and they say to him, "If you say, 'Yes, I went to a meeting,' then the wagon is waiting outside. So you can't force me to make an answer to this question."

Now, if a man says "No" to a question like this, you simply force him to abandon the right of going to any meeting or to any group of people where free speech is permitted.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't agree with the Supreme Court of the United States, do you?

Mr. WALTER. I don't think we ought to listen to all this wrangling. Let's have an answer to the question and then proceed.

Mr. VELDE. It is the opinion of the Chair that we have gone into that subject far enough, that you have rambled far enough. It is in the nature of an argument, one that we have heard many times before, from witnesses just about like you.

Mr. WALTER. And better qualified.

Mr. VELDE. And we are not interested at all in hearing any more of that type of argument.

I now direct you to answer the question put to you by counsel.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, I am answering this question in a rough layman's language, about what all this means to me. I ask you to bear with

me. The grounds that I have spoken of so far deal with free speech and the right not to be compelled to give up this free speech in the face of hysterical laws condemned by the CIO and the A. F. of L.

I finally state to you that you, my Congressmen, are my representatives, that you must listen to my views and that you must abide by them.

Mr. WALTER. I think it would be better to listen to the Kremlin. It would be more logical.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, you are listening to the Constitution.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I know something about that myself.

Mr. JACKSON. We are listening to something that sounds very much like an editorial from the Daily Worker.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Well, the Daily News recently ran several editorials, the like of which you don't appear to approve of.

Now, sir, I have told you as clearly as I can that I assert my rights as a citizen under the first, fifth, ninth and tenth amendments, and that my answer to this question is neither yes nor is it no, and that you cannot infer or make anything other of it than that.

Is that right, counsel?

Mr. ESTERMAN. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Therefore, you decline to answer the question?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I have said what I have to say. My answer is neither yes or no, asserting my rights as a citizen. You can't make anything more of it than that, for all of these grounds which I have gone into, and I am prepared to go into at great length, dealing with all of the legislation, the question of what the Supreme Court has ruled and what it may rule in the future.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I am glad you asked me this, Congressman Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I'm sorry I asked it. I will withdraw the question and I will let counsel ask it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Huebsch, the only recognized legal ground for refusing to answer the question which you have assigned is that of the fifth amendment.

Mr. HUEBSCH. By whose recognition?

Mr. TAVENNER. By what provision of the fifth amendment do you refuse to answer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. By whose recognition?

Mr. TAVENNER. By the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Would you please quote that document to me wherein only the fifth amendment is recognized by the Constitution?

Mr. TAVENNER. That wasn't my statement.

Mr. HUEBSCH. You said it was only recognized——

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you what provision of the fifth amendment is it that you rely on as the basis for your refusal to answer.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Now I am going to tell you again——

Mr. TAVENNER. You haven't told us the first time yet as to that.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I believe I have made it quite clear. If I haven't made it clear, I intend to make it clear. I am no lawyer. I am a writer. I told you that for many years I have gone to meetings. I have worked to improve the conditions of writers——

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the answer is not at all responsive to my question. May I ask that the witness be confined to answer the

question I asked, and that is merely what provision of the fifth amendment is it that the witness relies upon as the basis for his refusal to answer.

(At this point Mr. Huebsch conferred with Mr. Marshall and Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, would you have the reporter repeat the last question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question to the witness, please?

(The question was read.)

Mr. HUEBSCH. Now, I have had a conference with distinguished counsel, and they say, to boil it down, that every court permits a witness to explain his answer. I am sure that this committee does not rise above the courts, and I would like to make such explanation.

Mr. VELDE. As long as that explanation is not in the nature of argument or voluntary statements such as the witness has been making during this hearing, the witness will be permitted to make a legal explanation of his refusal to answer.

Mr. HUEBSCH. To King George III, I am sure, all constitutional provisions were questionable, but I don't think we are ready to crown King Harold Velde here.

Mr. JACKSON. I resent that, as a member of the committee. If you can't show any respect for the Congress of the United States, the best thing you can do is to keep quiet. Leave personalities out of it.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I will explain my answer.

Mr. JACKSON. You can't explain that statement. I will ask to have it removed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested as an individual member of this committee in what the man's reason is for declining to answer the question, and I am sick and tired of these typical Communist tactics. This is a very familiar picture, and it seems to me that we are just wasting our time asking this witness a lot of questions. Let's find out two or three things and excuse him and get on with our business.

Mr. VELDE. As chairman, I heartily concur in what the Congressman from Pennsylvania has just stated.

Will you answer the question asked of you?

Mr. HUEBSCH. I was asked to explain my previous answer, which was—

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not asked to explain anything. You were asked to state what provision it was of the fifth amendment on which you base your declination to answer the question.

Mr. WALTER. What difference does it make?

Mr. TAVENNER. The only difference that it makes, I believe, is that the witness explained in great detail and great length numerous amendments, but referred in such a general way to the fifth amendment that it would lead one to think that he was not actually relying upon it, and that is the only legal basis as far as this committee is concerned, I think, for his refusal to answer the question.

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest you ask him point blank whether or not he is relying upon that part which deals with self-incrimination; in other words, is he not answering because he is afraid he will incriminate himself?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, there is a question pending. I ask that the reporter read the question.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't address anything to you. I suggested to counsel that he ask that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the committee member's request, I will withdraw the question and put it in another form.

Mr. Huebsch, when you stated that you were relying upon the fifth amendment as the basis for your refusal to answer, did you mean to rely upon that provision which grants immunity from testifying or privilege against testifying as to any matter which might incriminate one?

(At this point Mr. Huebsch conferred with Mr. Marshall and Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. Just a moment.

Mr. HUEBSCH. My answer is, sir, that in the face of unjust laws passed by the Congress—

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the voluntary statement be stricken from the record.

Mr. VELDE. Yes; the voluntary statement will be stricken.

Mr. HUEBSCH. That is not voluntary, sir. That is not voluntary. The Congressman knows better than that.

Mr. CLARDY. I move those exclamations be stricken from the record.

Mr. VELDE. They will be so stricken from the record.

Will the witness please proceed to deal with the question, which is very simple and can be answered.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I am dealing here with reality of 1953, sir. Now, let me answer in terms of these realities, of the situation which I face.

Mr. JACKSON. I ask that the extraneous matter be stricken, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRAZIER. You are tiring out the patience of the whole committee.

Mr. VELDE. It will be stricken out of the record.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I wish the committee would have a little more patience.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to ask that that remark be stricken, and certainly no committee could be any more patient with obvious contempt for this committee, for the Congress of the United States and for the American people, the contempt which you have shown this morning. You were asked a very straightforward question. You have had ample opportunity to use this committee table as a sounding board for the Communist Party.

Now, having accomplished that, will you kindly answer the question which has been put to you?

Mr. CLARDY. You may answer it "Yes" or "No."

Mr. JACKSON. I assure you that from this point on that I am going to ask that every single statement which you make which is not responsive to the question be physically stricken from the record.

Mr. WALTER. I object to that because I want it all in the record, because it clearly shows that this man is in contempt of the Congress of the United States, and therefore I am going to oppose Mr. Jackson's position.

Mr. JACKSON. Understanding the gentleman's reasons, and sympathizing with them, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask that he be directed to answer "yes" or "no," because that question will permit of that kind of answer.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. The witness is so directed to answer that question "yes" or "no."

Mr. ESTERMAN. Answer "yes" or "no?"

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Huebsch conferred with Mr. Marshall and Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in recess for 5 minutes, which will give counsel ample opportunity to find, I am sure, whatever they are looking for.

(Short recess was taken.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Is the witness ready to answer the question?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Since there has been a recess, let's start with the question again, and I will try and frame a response.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will the reporter read the question?

(Whereupon, the following question was read by the reporter: "When you stated that you were relying upon the fifth amendment as the basis for your refusal to answer, did you mean to rely upon that provision which grants immunity from testifying or privilege against testifying as to any matter which might incriminate one?")

Mr. HUEBSCH. I now want to have, in my own language—

Mr. VELDE. Does the witness remember that the Chair directed him to answer "yes" or "no"?

Mr. HUEBSCH. The Chair directed me to answer "yes" or "no" to a question? I am instructed by counsel that the Chair cannot instruct me to answer "yes" or "no" to a question, especially since I want to respond by reading as my own language the fifth amendment:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life and limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor to be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Mr. WALTER. Now that you have read the Constitution, I am sure that you will be willing to answer the question, because you see that the privilege against testifying is in any criminal matter, and this is not a criminal matter.

Mr. HUEBSCH. That is not true. The courts have held to the contrary. I wish, sir, to add also to my statement, to my answer, that part of Judge Yankwich's decision—these are legal grounds, sir. These are legal grounds, sir.

Mr. VELDE. The committee is not interested in that. Again this is purely a voluntary statement and in the nature of argument.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Are you waiving aside the ruling of a judge of the United States court?

Mr. VELDE. The Chair directs the witness to answer the question of counsel.

Mr. HUEBSCH. It is in response to why I have answered in the way I have answered. I am basing myself on part of a ruling made in the Federal court, I believe in the ninth circuit.

Mr. JACKSON. It isn't necessary for you to read precedents or read the findings into the case. All that is necessary for you to do is to say "yes" or "no" in answer to the question.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I do it in my own language, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Your own language? Mr. Chairman, from now on I am going to renew my motion, that anything extraneous be stricken. It is not responsive.

Mr. DOYLE. I might make this observation to the witness: There is no decision by a Federal judge that supersedes the United States Constitution. You have read the fifth amendment. I think that would be far more important, and the only thing you need. If you stand on that—

Mr. HUEBSCH. I agree with you, Mr. Doyle, nothing needs to precede the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Stop arguing and give your answer.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I am not arguing.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, you are.

Mr. HUEBSCH. Judge Yankwich brought up to date—

Mr. VELDE. That is purely a voluntary statement. Will the witness say whether or not he is relying on the fifth amendment for his refusal to answer questions concerning his communistic—

Mr. HUEBSCH. I have asserted my rights in the first, fifth, ninth, and tenth amendments of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party since you became a screen writer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. This question, sir, has as its issue politics.

Mr. VELDE. That is purely a voluntary statement. Of course, it should be stricken from the record. It is stricken from the record. Will the witness answer or decline to answer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Sir, my answer to this question is neither in the negative nor is it in the affirmative. My answer to this question is that in the realm of politics Congress is forbidden to make laws—

Mr. VELDE. That remark will be stricken from the record.

Will the witness answer or decline to answer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Shall I read it in de novo the language of the first amendment?

Mr. SCHERER. I move you instruct the witness to answer the question. If he doesn't answer, I think we should dismiss this witness.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, the gentleman is absolutely right. The question is simple. I am sure the witness knows the answer to it.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I think the witness has answered. He has answered. He said, "My answer is neither 'yes' nor 'no'." That is his answer. Let's let the record stand on that.

Mr. HUEBSCH. No, it is not, sir; no, it is not.

Mr. WALTER. That is exactly what you said.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I have not finished my answer. The reason that a person's answers are not—

(At this point Mr. Huebsch conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. HUEBSCH. Look, now, you have got a writer up here. You haven't got a lawyer. You gentlemen are Members of the Congress. I don't dispute with you on points of law. I don't want to. That is not what I am here for.

My familiarity with the Constitution goes back to my school days. But I am asserting here that the Constitution says I do not have to answer that question one way or the other, and you can't say that I haven't answered it one way or another. That is the first amendment to me, because it is a violation of my politics.

Mr. WALTER. Let's see if we have that straight.

Miss Reporter, read the answer.

(Whereupon, the answer was read.)

Mr. WALTER. That is the answer.

Mr. HUEBSCH. That is not the answer.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Unless that question is withdrawn, sir, I will absolutely require—I need to finish my answer. Now——

Mr. WALTER. You have an answer. You answered it and the answer was read back to you.

Do you have any other questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. HUEBSCH. That is only a part of the answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I don't have any more questions.

Mr. HUEBSCH. There is——

Mr. CLARDY. I ask the witness be dismissed from the stand.

Mr. HUEBSCH. I assert my right to refuse to answer yes or no on the first, fifth, ninth, and tenth amendments of the Constitution.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Tavenner, do you have any further questions?

Mr. HUEBSCH. Is that of record? Is my answer of record?

Mr. JACKSON. What was your answer?

Mr. HUEBSCH. My answer was that I assert my rights to refuse to answer yes or no on the first, fifth, ninth, and tenth amendments of the Constitution.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is dismissed.

The Chair wishes to state, for the benefit of the television audience, that on last Monday the witness who has just been heard objected to being televised, and also insisted that the television equipment be removed from the room during the time that he was testifying.

The committee, after this request was made, went into executive session and decided that there would be no television of this hearing this morning, and it was so announced last Monday by the Chair.

The Chair, and I am sure the members of the committee, regret that we had to deprive the public of the benefits or lack of benefits that were derived from the testimony of the last witness.

However, we will proceed now. Unless another witness objects to being televised, we will proceed with the television.

Mr. Counsel, do you have another witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. The next witness is Mr. Bart Lytton.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

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

Mr. LYTTON. So help me God.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Reporter, let the record show at this point the presence of Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde, a quorum of the whole committee.



TESTIMONY OF BART LYTTON, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,  
ROBERT A. MOFFITT

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. LYTTON. My name is Bart Lytton.

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

Mr. LYTTON. I am, though I was told that maybe a personal body-guard would be better. My counsel is Robert A. Moffitt.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address, Mr. Moffitt?

Mr. MOFFITT. 403 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles 14, Trinity 8341.

Mr. TAVENNER. We wanted it only for the purpose of the record.

Mr. VELDE. May we have order?

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

Mr. LYTTON. I was born in 1912 in Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where in Pennsylvania?

Mr. LYTTON. In Lawrence County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee, please, what your educational training has been, that is, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. LYTTON. Yes. I went through grade school, preparatory school, Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., Westminster College, and the University of Virginia, and I took some graduate courses at Northwestern University.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. LYTTON. Real-estate development and finance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever had any occupation other than that of the real-estate business?

Mr. LYTTON. Yes, I was a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been in Los Angeles?

Mr. LYTTON. Approximately 13 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time were you in business?

Mr. LYTTON. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been, that is, describe it in a general way, since you came to Los Angeles 13 years ago?

Mr. LYTTON. It might take a long time, in terms of—

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean not too much in detail, but just to give us a general idea of the nature of your work.

Mr. LYTTON. Well, first in Los Angeles I did police reporting for several magazines and the Country Press. Following that I worked in radio, and then in motion-picture studios; I worked in motion-picture studios through 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since that time have you been in business for yourself?

Mr. LYTTON. No, sir. I went in business in 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed between 1944 and 1948?

Mr. LYTTON. Rarely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lytton, in sworn testimony before this committee by Mrs. Townsend, Mrs. Pauline Townsend, we were advised that you at one time were a member of the Communist Party. Is that information correct?

Mr. LYTTON. It is, for a very brief period.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long a period of time were you in the party?

Mr. LYTTON. There were two brief periods. I would say one was approximately 4 or 5 months and the other was a matter of 6 weeks, 6 or 8 weeks in all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you willing to tell the committee what your experience in the Communist Party was and answer any questions which may be asked you regarding your knowledge of the Communist Party activities?

Mr. LYTTON. I am not only willing, Mr. Tavenner, I will be very pleased to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Some witnesses apparently are not willing to advise the committee of their knowledge of Communist Party activities. I am glad to learn that you are.

What motivated you or what has motivated you in expressing your willingness to advise the committee of what knowledge you have of the Communist Party?

Mr. LYTTON. Well, Mr. Tavenner. I never would have had any unwillingness at any time, including the time that I was in the Communist Party. It strikes me that this is a duly constituted committee of Congress, and at any time in my life I have felt that the processes of law were to be observed, and if one didn't like what happened, there were many ways to protest that, but that the protest—well, if a traffic police officer gives me a ticket, I don't tear it up, so let's put it that way.

So I would say that there was no problem of arriving at that decision, but I would say that I had—I feel that there are an evergrowing number of people who were formerly in the Communist Party, who were in at one time or another, or people who were friendly to it, who resort to the use of the fifth amendment when it is not a subject properly coming under the fifth amendment, because I feel in the first place I never did anything incriminating, I never did anything illegal, I never did anything to incriminate me.

I resent people resting themselves on the fifth amendment just because hoodlums and gangsters and now many people whom I think individually are fine people, but in the position that they take I think that they are doing an injustice to the Constitution, they are vitiating the very purpose for which the fifth amendment was placed in the Constitution among the first 10 articles, or the Bill of Rights.

I heard the previous witness, a gentleman whom I didn't know, Mr. Huebsch, read the fifth amendment. I hadn't heard it for a long time. I found a sardonic amusement in his use of the very last phrase of the article, which was that property shall not be taken except through due process of law. It had not been my impression of the Communist Party that they meant to pay for it.

Mr. VELDE. Let's have order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your knowledge of the Communist Party has led you to the belief that the Communist Party did not respect the property rights of individuals in their political thinking, in their Marxian thought?

Mr. LYTTON. The Communist Party respected no rights of individuals. I certainly know that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you advise the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became originally a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LYTTON. Yes, I will be glad to do so. I might surprise the committee at this point, because naturally I have listened to a great deal of testimony, and it struck me that people joined the Communist Party and have been friendly to the party for a variety of reasons.

I joined the Communist Party because I became interested in socialism, and I thought that socialism was a good thing at the time. I was told that the Communist Party represented scientific socialism, Marxian socialism and dialectic materialism, and I believed in socialism, and it seemed a very logical basis to move. The reason to me was simple.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you go back in your memory to the first occasion which prompted some action on your part toward a mental impression which later developed into your getting into the Communist Party?

Mr. LYTTON. I think that the first time I even knew that there was what is called a movement, let alone the Communist Party, progressive movement, which is sometimes called Marxism and so forth, was when I was in attendance at the University of Virginia.

The then editor of the Communist Daily Worker in New York, by name Clarence Hathaway, was an invited speaker at a forum at our university, where there always has been, and to my knowledge remains, free speech.

Mr. WALTER. By "our university" you mean the University of Virginia?

Mr. LYTTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is also my university.

Mr. FRAZIER. And I am glad to say it is mine.

Mr. LYTTON. We didn't have much of a football team; I was around it, but we had a mighty fine university.

In any event, Mr. Hathaway—he was then to me just Mr. Hathaway. I didn't know him. I didn't attend this particular forum, because I think I was possibly 19 or 20, and I was interested in football and boxing, occasionally in studies, and always in girls, and I had no political interests at the time.

Hathaway came down and spoke, in any event, and a group of athletes—I was not among the group—a group of athletes went in to break up that meeting. They were pretty rugged boys, and I know it. I fought with them on the team and played around with them and so forth, and they were pretty rugged boys, and they went in and they broke up the Hathaway meeting, and they threw out Hathaway, and managed to get into fights with those that were in attendance.

I heard about the incident. I wasn't anywhere around it, but I heard about it, and I was worried about it; I didn't like mob action, and I felt that this was an injustice. I felt that the boys had acted incorrectly, that they had discredited the university, and I spoke about that to many people.

Let's put it this way: I have always been articulate to some extent, and I spoke about it to many people. I thought at the time and still think that you have got to do some thinking about the world you live in. I didn't even know there was such a thing at that time. I don't believe that I was aware of the existence of the Communist Party, as such, and I am not even sure that the persons who talked to me were Communists, but we talked about Marxism.

And they talked about socialism, and so forth. They handed me pamphlets and they talked and they talked and they talked. It began to condition me—let me place the year. The year was, I believe, 1933. It was very easy in 1933 to be conditioned in the direction of socialism. As a matter of fact, I might say the people I talked to in regard to my appearance here today, if as many people voted for Norman Thomas in 1932 as they assured me they did, I think he won, and the votes were stalled.

In any event, this was 1933 or 1934. I don't recall the exact year. My feelings began then in the direction of the various pamphlets, books, and so forth that I was handed, and I thumbed through.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am interested to know just what part this incident played in your mental approach to this whole subject. That is, the incident where you felt an injustice had been done in denying the right or privilege of free speech.

Mr. LYTTON. I think a large part, Mr. Tavenner—let me put it this way: Life has many fortuitous and unfortuitous terms. If someone hears something, at the moment he is pretty impressionable, and it may have an effect on him. I wasn't interested in the political scene at the time. I would say it had a very appreciable effect.

I would say this, sir: that, if such an incident occurred at any time, I think any decent person would think, "Wait a minute. That is mob action. I don't like it." And I still don't like it. I would draw utterly different conclusions from it today.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then proceed with your description of the circumstances under which you got actually into the Communist Party.

Mr. LYTTON. When I left university training, I went to New York City. I was subsidized at the time by my parents, I had \$15 a week to become a writer. It was sufficient at the moment. I had nothing to do except the hours that I devoted to writing.

I recall roaming around and finding New York a fascinating city. I recall Columbus Circle, where many speeches were made at the time. I used to get involved in all-night sessions in cafeterias in the area where one could sit for five cents' worth of coffee and discuss things all night. I used to argue them out.

I began to think that socialism was a good thing, and I believed what I was told: that it was inevitable. I still argued, however, I didn't like the connection between the Communist Party and the Soviet Union; though it was a period of great friendship to the Soviet Union, I couldn't understand it.

It was suggested to me by one of my new-found companions that I take a course at the Workers' School in New York, which is on 13th Street in Communist Party headquarters. I went down and enrolled and took two courses, as a matter of fact, at that time.

While in attendance at the Workers' School, I had been perhaps 6 weeks there, and a very lovely Irishman by the name of Jim Casey was the managing editor of the Daily Worker at that time. I think he became pretty unhappy about it later. In any event, Jim Casey came in to address us. I was interested in newspaper work, and I questioned him closely. I don't recall his answers. I only know at a certain point he said, "Why aren't you in it?"

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room at this point, 11:15 a. m.)

Mr. LYTTON. I said, "I am not ready."

He said, "The only way you can get ready is to come on in." Somebody handed me a card. I don't know who, just one of the students in the class whom I don't believe I saw more than one more time following that. Somebody handed me a card. Somebody else I was introduced to told me his name was Jimmy Higgins, which I genuinely believed at the time. I learned later that is a popular name in the party, to cover a certain hard worker that doesn't want much glory. Anyone that is a hard worker and not seeking glory is called a Jimmy Higgins.

At the time, I believed this chap's name was Jimmy Higgins, and I called him Jimmy Higgins. I was given a card and I was unemployed and I paid 10 cents. It was the roughest dime I ever spent.

I was assigned to what was then called a unit on the lower East Side of New York on Avenue B, an Irish-Italian—composed primarily of Irish and Italians in the area. The language disparity between them made for grave difficulties. I was assigned there because it was felt that, being from the middle class, the middle of the middle class, I needed to meet the workers.

I went to a number of meetings down in this particular unit, and while I was in attendance there, there was held what was called the Seventh World Congress of the Communist Party. It was decided that, well, in fact, it had been held, the decisions were being made at the very time. The party was Americanizing, so to speak. It was decided to have what they call branches, big open clubs of 100, 150 people in them, to have a mass base. I was called in to 13th Street, which was Communist headquarters, and asked if I would organize, be the organizer for a branch.

I did not accept the assignment and was subsequently assigned to a branch. I attended 1 meeting and then I think 2 more subsequently sometime later, and I left active membership in the Communist Party at that time.

This whole period was perhaps—I don't know how many months, but it was a matter of months.

MR. TAVENNER. In the Communist school, the Workers' School which you attended, can you tell us anything about the Communist Party membership of the teachers?

MR. LYTON. No, sir; I can't. The only one who made an impression upon me was Jim Casey.

MR. TAVENNER. Do I understand that you left the Communist Party at the time you have just mentioned, after membership of a matter of months?

MR. LYTON. That is right, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. What was your reason for leaving the Communist Party at that time?

MR. LYTON. Well, I was vaguely disturbed. I can't say the leaving at that time was a turning of my back upon it. I was vaguely disturbed at the—what I saw. Nothing specific.

Then two incidents occurred, and they made up my mind for me. One, I was approached and asked if I would be willing to take, I believe it was, some kind of railroad spike with a note wrapped around it, and if I would throw it through the window of the Italian Embassy, somewhere in New York, I don't even know where it was.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell us that again?

Mr. LYTTON. I was asked if I would do this. I wasn't asked by someone that I know as a member of the Communist Party. In fact, I don't even remember the chap who asked me. I don't know that he was a Communist, incidentally, and my testimony shall be truthful, and therefore I don't want to say that this happened as a result of the party, because I never knew. I only know someone came up to me and said, "Will you do this?"

I said, "Why?"

He said, "This is a time of Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, and this is a protest from the people of New York."

I took the spike and looked at it. He had it right there. I unwrapped it. It was in brown wrapping paper of the type you wrap meat in, and in pen was written a message. The essence of it was that the people of New York were protesting against the Italian invasion, and it was just signed, "The People."

I was embarrassed at the moment and I accepted the spike. I didn't like it. I was told that a taxicab would pick me up in the Eighties somewhere, and I was accompanied by a seaman who was not to my knowledge at the time a member of the Communist Party because I was trying to recruit. He never went in.

In any event, he went along with me. I said, "No, I can't do this."

He laughed. He thought it was a great escapade. He said, "What's the matter? Are you chicken?"

I said, "You know I'm not. You know me better than that, but I just don't like it."

He said, "Why?"

"I just don't like doing things this way."

And that was the end of the incident. I didn't do it.

Mr. DOYLE. What did you do with the spike?

Mr. LYTTON. I didn't swallow it, and I am darned if I remember.

Mr. WALTER. That sounds sort of like blowing up power lines.

Mr. LYTTON. I will have to repeat on that that I don't know that it was a member of the Communist Party that approached me because it was just a chap that saw me at one of the large massive affairs that was held. It was a street thing, as I recall, and he didn't identify himself, but he said, "Would you like to do this?"

He must have had some reason, but I don't know who he was, and that is the way such a thing would happen, naturally. I don't know that it was identified.

In fairness there, in New York at that time there were probably—oh, there were several score of radical groups of all kinds and complexions, and they used to hassle it out. I don't know who proposed that I do. I just know that I was disturbed by the incident.

Mr. TAVENNER. That disturbance had an effect on your decision to get out of the Communist Party?

Mr. LYTTON. That disturbance was crystallized for me some time later, not too long later, when a script that I had written—I had just become a professional writer—was supposed to go on. It was an adaptation of a Fanny Hurst short story. It was supposed to go on a series called The Greatest Story on the network. It was my first big break. I had my first TV show.

The script was submitted. The producer liked it immensely. He said, "This is terrific, and we are going to give you lots more work."

The director, however, rejected the script. He came to me and he said, "Look, you ought to know better. I know a little about you and you ought to know better than to write a script like this."

I asked him what he meant. The subject matter was concerned with an immigrant family. He said, "This is chauvinistic."

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "You are using accents."

I said, "For heaven's sake, don't they talk accents?"

He said, "That's chauvinism."

I said, "What right do you have to question me about it?"

He said, "Well, I just won't be identified with a script like this. I won't put it on."

Now, this was a warm and human story of Fanny Hurst. It was a lovely thing. My script was, I think, a decent and clean rendition of or adaptation of that story, and I was proud of it.

He said, "Well, I'll tell you what. I have talked this over with V. J. Jerome." The name meant nothing to me at the moment. I learned subsequently who V. J. Jerome was. "He agreed with me that this is chauvinism," he said.

MR. JACKSON. For the purpose of the record, would you identify V. J. Jerome?

MR. LYTON. To the best of my knowledge, I only met Mr. V. J. Jerome once, and to the best of my knowledge I was told that he was the cultural director of the Communist Party. By "cultural director" I don't mean social activities.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, would you continue?

MR. SCHERER. He didn't finish. He just got to the point.

MR. TAVENNER. I meant for him to continue.

MR. LYTON. Yes, sir. The script was not put on, and my resentment was keen. First, it was an opportunity for me as far as I was concerned. Secondly, I am proud of that script today. I was proud of it then. It was a good script. It was subsequently played, and it led to other radio work. It played well, and the very people whom he insisted were being lampooned thought it was a lovely, warm, and human thing.

As a matter of fact, subsequently, I believe that in various periods I have followed, why, just this sort of thing was done when it suited the purposes or line, I should say. When the lines changed of the Communist Party, I have seen them do somewhat similar things. But at the time this was disapproved. This was verboten. I resented this very much.

What I did was this: I simply left the Communist Party. I didn't say anything to anybody and I left. Now, when you leave the Communist Party it is much like coming out of a decompression chamber. It takes a while in order to go through the various emotional and intellectual phases that naturally take place.

When I left the Communist Party at this time I was leaving. As far as I was concerned, I was leaving the Communist Party. I did not at that time feel that I was leaving what were my convictions insofar as socialism was concerned, because I believed in it then. I just didn't believe in the Communist Party any longer at that time. I was vaguely uneasy at the beginning, and then I became angry, and I left.

Now, I had been in only a short time and it was a time of great foment for the Communist Party as well as the world. It was of the time of Ethiopia through to the beginning of the Spanish civil war. The Communist Party during that time had many changes of form. It was almost as hard to keep up with the changes of form as it was to keep up with the changes of line, and therefore, one did not always know who did and who did not belong, and so forth and so on, because you were moved about frequently.

I didn't say anything to anybody. I just simply left and had nothing further to do with it. I stopped participation very quickly thereafter in any form of political activity, but first, it was the Communist Party. As I said, I said nothing to anybody about it. I just did it.

I think that probably for several years a number of people thought that I was a member of the Communist Party, or at least friendly to it. A number of people didn't think so because when they asked me, they got a direct answer.

MR. TAVENNER. I am very much interested in your statement with regard to the effort of V. J. Jerome to censor or review the project that you had worked on.

MR. LYTTON. I wish I could help you, Mr. Tavenner, but the only thing that V. J. Jerome censored in the way of a project was an idea I had for a mobile theater to go around the country, and he thought it would take too much money.

You see, I was told that V. J. Jerome agreed—when I happened to meet V. J. Jerome under different circumstances, it was in regard to a project for a mobile theater.

MR. TAVENNER. Tell us about the occasion when you met him.

MR. LYTTON. This was in 1936, I believe, and I had come out to Hollywood to raise money for a project that was dear to me. I wanted to send mobile theaters throughout the country. I was a theater director at the time, as well as writing scripts. I was put in contact with V. J. Jerome. I was told I had to clear my matter through him. This was just before the other incident of which I spoke.

I met him in front of Schwab's drugstore in Laurel Canyon on Sunset Boulevard here in Hollywood.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you say that you were told you had to clear the matter through V. J. Jerome?

MR. LYTTON. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. Tell us what the circumstances were of that.

MR. WALTER. About when was this?

MR. LYTTON. 1936.

MR. WALTER. In the fall?

MR. LYTTON. No, sir, it would be summer, I think. No, it was Easter. I recall because I was going to school again at the time, as well. I came out here during the Easter vacation.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee who suggested that the matter should be cleared through V. J. Jerome?

MR. LYTTON. No, sir, I cannot advise you of that, because I honestly can't do that. I do not recall. I recall that I discussed the matter with the New Theater League in New York and that somebody there said, "Well, when you get to the coast, you better see V. J. Jerome."



Mr. TAVENNER. That suggestion came from New York, not from Los Angeles?

Mr. LYTTON. That is correct. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Will you proceed, please?

Mr. LYTTON. Well, I saw Mr. Jerome there. I was given a telephone number to call. I called it and he arranged to meet me in front of Schwab's drugstore. I described the project to him. He said it was very good. He said it was swell and if I wanted to raise the money for it, fine, but that any of their people out here, any of the contacts they had and so forth, they preferred that I left them alone, because there were worthier purposes for their money.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that is an interesting point. Was that an indication to you that there were persons in Hollywood assisting V. J. Jerome in putting across the projects that he was interested in?

Mr. LYTTON. Well, that would be a conclusion on my part. It is a reasonable one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any further information from V. J. Jerome or from any other source?

Mr. LYTTON. No, I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to just what projects V. J. Jerome was interested in putting across?

Mr. LYTTON. No, sir, I did not. Specifically, in regard to my mobile theater project.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, have you any direct information as to what groups or individuals he wanted saved for his own projects instead of being utilized in the sponsorship of your project?

Mr. LYTTON. Mr. Jerome didn't tell me. He just told me that he wouldn't make any contacts for me out here, that was all, I was on my own.

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Whom did you understand that Mr. Jerome was representing at the time he said to you that he didn't want these mobile units to be—

Mr. LYTTON. Well, I presume that he was representing out here the Communist Party, but I wasn't put in contact directly in that regard. I knew his name, after all. It was not a name unknown to me. His name appeared often enough in the Daily Worker and the New Masses and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had met V. J. Jerome prior to that time?

Mr. LYTTON. No, sir. I have only met him once.

Mr. TAVENNER. The occasion that you described to us when you met him in regard to a play in New York, I thought was a different occasion.

Mr. LYTTON. This was a different occasion, Mr. Tavenner, but I did not meet Mr. V. J. Jerome. I was told that V. J. Jerome agreed.

Mr. TAVENNER. So this is the only occasion on which you actually met him?

Mr. LYTTON. That is right, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you stated that you were advised in New York to get in touch with V. J. Jerome here, and that you were given his telephone number.

Mr. LYTTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood that.

Mr. LYTTON. That is right; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee who it was?

Mr. LYTTON. No, I don't recall who told me specifically. I know that I had discussed—I had written articles for the New Theater League magazine, New Theater. I sometimes went to the offices of the New Theater League, and somebody there, I discussed the project with somebody there, and somebody said, "Now look, here is how to do it. When you get out there, you get in touch with V. J. Jerome. If he likes it and clears it, you will be put in contact with money."

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Lytton, I would like to interrupt your testimony at just his moment to make one matter clear. It is a thing that has frequently occurred. We have subpoenaed witnesses before and then found out there were two people by the same name, or very similar names.

Mr. LYTTON. I am glad you brought that up because I thought of a chap that bears virtually the same name as I bear.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think in fairness to both of you—

Mr. LYTTON. Mr. Tavenner, last week I tried to find his name in the telephone book and I couldn't locate it. We decided perhaps he was out of town or something. I wanted to call him and tell him I was going to appear and perhaps he would like to join the audience and tell a few things. I don't know him. I have never met him. I have seen his name in trade papers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Herbert Lytton?

Mr. LYTTON. That's right. He is on radio.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is a screenwriter also at the present time?

Mr. LYTTON. Is he? I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. He may be a radiowriter.

Mr. LYTTON. If he is, I hope that he is getting some use out of my old credit.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are not in the same field of endeavor at this time.

Mr. LYTTON. I don't know the man. I have seen his name in the trade papers. Naturally, I was struck with it, Herbert Lytton.

Mr. TAVENNER. There should be no excuse for anyone confusing the two of you because you are not in the screenwriting business at this time at all.

Mr. LYTTON. I am not in the screenwriting business or in any form of writing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Lytton, you have described your experience up until the time that you withdrew from the Communist Party, after an experience of a matter of months within the party. Can you fix the approximate date when you withdrew from the Communist Party in New York?

Mr. LYTTON. No, sir. That would be hard to do. It was about the period that I told you.

Mr. TAVENNER. That period was approximately when?

Mr. LYTTON. I would think about 1937, perhaps 1936. I would have to go back and look at historical events in order to place it, because to some extent that is how I would be able to fix it, but I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand you correctly to say that it may have been a matter of a year and a half or more from that time until you became interested again in any way in the Communist Party?

Mr. LYTTON. It was much longer than that, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Suppose you tell us about that.

Mr. LYTTON. Well, I continued writing. I began to get assignments here and there, and began to build my career. I came out to Hollywood in 1940 with the objective of establishing myself as a screen writer. I was in the process of writing a play and I had the play pretty well set forth, I should say, and a writer now dead, who was not the grand Posh-Bah of the Communist Party out here but who was their darling, one of their 2 or 3 darlings, but he is now deceased and I would rather not be asked his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will not ask you.

Mr. LYTTON. Though he was well known, he had been a very prominent writer during the 1920's. He had been considered a very promising, rather than prominent, novelist, and I told him about my play. He became quite excited about it and he said, "I think that I can get this thing on the boards of New York in 6 months."

He then suggested a collaboration. I learned later that this, of course, was a common suggestion. At the time, I was a little taken back. It seems that he was an experienced writer. He had written many shows for pictures. He told me his many virtues, and he had them, incidentally, as a writer.

At the particular period of his life he had everything but the willingness to work. He suggested we collaborate. He said he had a producer ready, and he said that the producer ready was a man who had subsidized at one particular time Jet Harris in New York and that Jet Harris would probably direct the play.

After considerable time considering the matter, I think probably 24 hours, I decided that it might be a good thing and that he could teach me a great deal about the craft of playwriting, and that I would work with him.

He invited me to move to his residence.

(Representative Harold H. Velde reentered the hearing room at this point, 11:40 a. m.)

He invited me to move to his residence in Hollywood and to work under very nice material circumstances. He produced the money necessary for the writing of the play and I was put on a deal where I was to receive \$50 a week during the course of the writing for a specified period of time, a contract that was never completely lived up to, but that is neither here nor there at this moment.

We worked on the play and we engaged in many arguments about its meaning, about its ideology. The play was simple and it was about people. He would argue with me that it just didn't have the political sharpness in it that it should have. I would argue in return that I considered myself a writer and I certainly wanted to continue to be a writer and I thought that that was an inhibitory process, "Let me write the play" being my argument, and "What must come out, let it come out."

He would inhibit me and he would desire to see page after page, and then there would be these frantic arguments about the meaning of lines and the meaning of scenes and so forth, and we became quite unhappy in the course of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well now, are you describing a situation which was criticized possibly at a later period when Albert Maltz took the position at first that writing should not be—his art should not be used as a weapon, and then later reversed himself on the point?

Mr. LYTTON. Well, let's say that there is some relationship in problems here. I don't know that my position was that art shouldn't be used as a weapon. It was simply that I wanted to write the play as I felt it, and if it proved to be a weapon, fine, because it would be a weapon for whatever I believed in. I wasn't concerned with sitting down and writing—the term then used was "agit prop." I wanted to write what I wanted to write and let people find in it what they found in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What you were writing or proposing to write did not meet with the approval of—

Mr. LYTTON. Of this writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of this writer who was looking at it from the Communist Party standpoint?

Mr. LYTTON. I don't know. He was a very, let's say a very circumspect man, and he had a reason to be, and he would always refer to the "movement" and never to the Communist Party. However, he suggested to me very strongly, he said, "I understand you were around the movement in New York 4 or 5 years ago. You ought to be back in." We didn't agree on that.

Following this disagreement, we had many about the script itself. The play was called *Big With Tomorrow* at the time and there were disagreements with it. I had been asked by him to rejoin the movement, as he put it. I didn't. He told me that I was foolish, that if I wanted a career in Hollywood I would have to sharpen my thinking, that this was a particularly perilous time in world history; those arguments and so forth.

Additionally, that I would have an opportunity, if I became a Communist, to meet and work with the best minds out here. This would sharpen me as a writer and be valuable to me. But I refused.

About a week later I was told, "The honeymoon is over. The play will not be produced." That was the end of that particular episode.

Now, I think, Mr. Tavenner, I will have to go back here. Your question was, How did I happen to once again rejoin for a time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. And in stating your reasons and how it occurred, we are very much interested in all the efforts that were made to bring you into the party and any other experience you had in connection with the party.

Mr. LYTTON. Very well. I worked in Hollywood—I got my—I started to earn, earned my living at the time doing what is called fact stories, factuials. Factuials are stories that appear in the factual, so-called factual magazines. I was given a press card by Country Press, and I did a large number of these stories to earn my living.

At that time I was a 6-cent-a-word writer. That was a very high price, because it started at about a half a cent. It was a prolific period for me, and I was concerned, first, with these fact stories and from there—I joined a Radio Writers' Guild and got some small radio assignments.

The Radio Writers' Guild sent me down to work for the Motion Picture Democratic Committee. They said there was a job open down there to do radio publicity, time slots and so forth. I had

had considerable experience in that previously. There was a job there at the then magnificent salary of \$35 a week. I looked at it, however, as a chance to get in radio here. I went down and took the assignment.

The Motion Picture Democratic Committee at that time had been the Democratic committee of the Communist Party in Hollywood. There was a split on the Finland question. At that time Helen Gahagan Douglas led a group of people out of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee because the people in control of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee were attacking our stand on Finland.

I went to work for the Motion Picture Democratic Committee at that time and I lasted 4 or 5 weeks there. There was a campaign going on and I didn't understand the issues of the campaign, and I was disturbed by the fact that I was for Roosevelt and the committee wasn't.

I said, "This is a job and it doesn't make any difference: I will try to listen to this and see what it is about." I was vaguely disturbed about it at the time and I became more and more uneasy. And the period that followed, I worked for a number—I got a reputation as knowing this particular kind of work in terms of getting agencies of one kind and another on the radio.

There was no TV at the time. I worked for a number of agencies as a professional during their—I worked—I did work for Red Cross, for Navy Relief, for China War Relief, for Russian War Relief and for USO.

I was paid in this period, and my salary kept going up as a paid publicity director or public-relations director, or I was brought in for a special assignment. During this period I didn't have—when I came to Russian War Relief, I should say, I was surprised to find that the membership of Russian War Relief was composed of non-Communist people, definitely who weren't for communism. It was composed of people against Hitler. There were many White Russians in it, who at that time were for the fatherland or the motherland, or whatever it is, the whole way. There were others that believed we should help an ally in the war. It looked to me like it was getting pretty respectable to speak up for Russia.

By 1942 I was working in motion-picture studios. I had sold a script and began to work in motion-picture studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that point what screen credits did you have?

Mr. LYTRON. You know, this is the most embarrassing question you have asked me yet. I only mean that some of them I would like to forget.

My first picture was called "Tomorrow We Live." It was produced by Seymour Nebenzahl.

My second picture, as I recall, was called "Spy Train," and it had to do with German spies aboard a train here attempting to commit sabotage. It was produced by King.

My third was "Bowery to Broadway," an all-star, big musical, and that was at Universal where I worked right straight through, story, screenplay and so forth.

I think I am in chronological order here. My next picture was—the title escapes me now. Maybe I want to forget that picture. I

didn't like the way it came out. The title escapes me, but I will recall it.

It was—I think it was called "Follow Your Heart," and that was at RKO. But I don't think it was released under the title of "Follow Your Heart." It was released under another title. It was a story of a little war refugee who comes to America and loves it.

I also did a picture on the story of Ledice, Czechoslovakia, the wiping out of that town, the monstrous wiping out of that village by the Nazis. This picture was considered a very fine job all around.

I think that about covers—the rest of my screen credits were the typical credits for additional dialogue and a lot of typical picture doctoring.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you to have you give us an idea of the screen credits you had. You were telling us about your interest in Russia at this particular time when you were writing scripts for the movies.

Mr. LYTTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

Mr. LYTTON. In 1944, during the summer of 1944, just before that, at the end of 1943 my family had learned officially of the death of my brother in action. He was a B-17 chauffeur in the Mediterranean, action over the Mediterranean. I was quite disturbed by this time. All my brothers were in action, and I wanted to be. I was quite disturbed at the time, I think, over the going of the war; and, like countless millions of Americans, I was praying for every possible victory that the Russians could have. They put up a fine defense at Stalingrad and had impressed the world.

In 1944 I was working at RKO Studios, at the time that Henry Wallace was still Vice President of the United States and was up for renomination. He got 510 votes or something of the sort, but he didn't quite make it. I liked Wallace. I thought at that time that Henry Wallace was a fine kind of American and my kind of American. He didn't get the nomination. I lost \$50 in a bet with another writer. I recall it very well.

He didn't get the nomination, and this additionally bothered me. I said, "Well, look, I think the people wanted Wallace. That is the way I read it. The people wanted Wallace and they didn't get Wallace."

At that time I was approached—wasn't approached—to tell it more correctly, I was seated in another writer's office. I was in the directors' building at RKO. I went in for a chat, as people do on the lot, into another writer's office, and we were talking about his script. It was a comedy. It had to do with women. By that I mean, more specifically, it had to do with the role of women in society, so to speak: should they or shouldn't they have careers, and so forth.

He started, entered discussions about the meaning of this script. We had a long and interesting discussion about what it meant.

He suddenly looked at me and he said, "Why aren't you one of us?"

At the first moment I thought he meant the guild; for just about one moment. I said "I am."

He said "No; you are not."

I said "Oh," like Don. I said "I didn't have too happy an experience. I just don't see it is for me. I don't like it, really."

He asked me why, and I gave my reasons. He said, "Well now, look, Bart, times have changed. The party has changed. It isn't sectarian now. It has a big, broad base and you have these objections to it. Now, you are a reasonable man. Why don't you come and take a look and see if it is what you think it is."

We argued that out for a while. He knew of my disturbances that I just mentioned, how I felt about them. He used them.

And I said, "Well, I don't know. Maybe I will give it a try. I don't know." I didn't commit myself.

About a week passed and he came back to me and he said, "Say, what is this about you?"

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "Well, I understand you were expelled."

I said, "Expelled from what?"

He said, "From the Communist Party."

I said, "Not to my knowledge; no, of course, I wasn't."

He said, "I understand there were a lot of charges against you and you were expelled back in New York in 1936."

I said, "Why, that is a lot of poppycock. I walked away."

He said, "Well, that is the story." And he said, "Brother, if I were you I would get that cleared up, because if you don't get that cleared up your name is mud in this town."

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it that you were conferring with?

Mr. LYTTON. George Beck.

Mr. WALTER. When was that?

Mr. LYTTON. 1944, I would say approximately August or September.

Mr. WALTER. I mean when he said "Your name is mud in this town."

Mr. LYTTON. He didn't say it is. He said it would be.

Mr. WALTER. Unless you had this cleared up.

Mr. LYTTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Beck has appeared, as you know, as a witness before this committee.

Mr. LYTTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And he testified as to Communist Party membership and his subsequent withdrawal from the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER. Was it the fact that at that time, unless you were active in the Communist Party, your opportunity to progress in your profession was hurt?

Mr. LYTTON. I am not prepared to answer by just saying it was or it wasn't a fact, Congressman, because my own experience, which will follow, was so short that I haven't knowledge as to whether it was a fact at that time. I am willing to testify as to what happened to me.

Mr. WALTER. But it was a fact at that time if you were a member of the Communist Party your opportunities were enhanced?

Mr. LYTTON. I don't know if they were enhanced or they weren't enhanced. I do know that naturally; we will say if you belong to the right fraternity your fraternity brothers are going to give you a lift, and that you can just take for granted if you belong to the Elks and there are a lot of Elks in an industry, whatever it may be, you are going to have certain opportunities enhanced.

But I am not prepared to answer in terms of whether that was a fact at that time. I was told that it was a fact, but I have no evidence it was a fact nor, incidentally, did I give one hoot.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, I believe this would be an appropriate place to recess at this time.

Before recessing, the Chair would like to make a statement for the benefit of the viewing audience. This morning I ordered that television be cut off during the testimony of Mr. Huebsch, who was represented by Mr. Esterman as counsel. This order was based on the ruling that the committee made last Monday, in answer to a motion that was submitted by Mr. Esterman, in which he demanded that all television equipment be removed and that as long as his witness, Mr. Huebsch, was on, the proceedings should not be televised.

Now, there are some very serious legal problems involved in this hearing. The committee recognized that fact and without any idea in mind, I am sure, of depriving the public of this important information, acceded to the witness' demands and request, and accordingly we necessarily had to ask the television cameras to desist from further televising the proceedings. We hope this will not happen again, but if it does, of course, I hope the public understands that it is because we are not only trying to be fair, entirely fair to the witnesses, but because of certain legal problems involved in this process.

We will be in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 12 noon, the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m., same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 2:10 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed. Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Donald L. Jackson, Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript), Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, and James B. Frazier, Jr., being present.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show that a full quorum of the committee is present.

The Chair wishes to announce that the hearing which we had this morning will be continued until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, due to the fact we have other witnesses we would like to hear at this time.

Mr. Counsel, do you have a witness to call?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Joe Springer.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I do.

Mr. VELDE. Before any questions are asked of the witness, I should like to make a statement.

The committee, during the course of its current investigation in California, has developed information that recently there was held at Crestline, Calif., a secret Communist Party school. According to the information available at this time, the school was held during the weekend of December 5 to 7, 1952, at a place called Camp Tenaya.

The committee has ascertained this camp, which is closed during the winter months, is under the operation of Joe and Preva Springer.



It has further been ascertained the Communist Party school held there was not an ordinary school, but one of great importance. This school was only for Communist Party functionaries and was held upon the direction of high Communist Party officials.

Also in attendance at this school, in addition to the Springers, was Max Klansky and Walter Smith, both of whom have been identified to the committee as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Will the Chair yield to me the opportunity to interrogate and cross-examine the witness on this subject?

Mr. VELDE. If the gentleman will wait until I finish my statement, I will be glad to yield to him first.

Also it is of particular concern that this school was one of a series of new schools to be held by the Communist Party for the purpose of issuing directives to infiltrate shops in key industries, and in particular, defense establishments.

It is alleged that this school was concluded with an announcement that a dictatorship of the proletariat would take over immediately after a revolution to secure power, and that it would be necessary for the party comrades to safeguard against the resurgence of capitalism.

The announcement also pointed out it had taken the Soviet Union 27 years to accomplish this purpose.

The witness Joe Springer has been called to assist the committee in verifying this information regarding the school at Crestline.

Now I yield the floor to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. JACKSON. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the witness object to both the video and the audio part of the television?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. The request is made that neither be used during the course of his testimony?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in recess for 5 minutes.

(Short recess was taken.)

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show at this point that present are Mr. Jackson, Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, Mr. Velde. A quorum of the full committee.

Mr. Springer—

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, may I make a request? The light bothers me.

Mr. VELDE. As I understand it, I would like to get the picture clear, as far as television is concerned, what you do object to and what you don't object to. Do you object if the television cameras do not turn their lights toward you or photograph you during the course of the hearing? If they are allowed to continue and make photographs of other parts of the room and other people in the audience, including members of the committee, but they are ordered not to turn their lens directly toward you, do you have any objection to that?

Mr. SPRINGER. The lights would bother me. I understand that television, you have to have a certain amount of equipment; and, therefore, the lights would bother me; and, if you don't mind, I would like

the lights off. Therefore, I don't think you would be able to televise without lights.

Mr. CLARDY. Suppose the lights were turned away from the witness, and it would be some relief up here, too, from the heat, but if we turn them to the back, away from you, would you have any objection?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Congressman, I prefer that the television would be off.

Mr. VELDE. By that, you mean both audio and video?

Mr. SPRINGER. Correct.

Mr. VELDE. The Chair is constrained to grant the request of the witness, in view of the vote of the committee on this matter.

And again I wish to say to the television audience that we regret that it is necessary to ask the television company to turn their cameras off at this point.

The meeting will proceed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can we get those lights off, if you don't mind, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VELDE. We will suspend until the lights are turned off.

Mr. MOULDER. After hearing the statement by the chairman, my particular interest was directed to your case and the testimony you are about to give, especially because in my congressional district we have a number of summer camps.

I understand you are the owner of a summer camp?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mrs. Springer and myself are the owners of the camp.

Mr. MOULDER. Information has been carried to me on the subject which I am about to interrogate you on.

Mr. SCHIERER. I can't hear you.

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman yield to identify the witness and counsel?

#### TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH SPRINGER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, WILLIAM B. ESTERMAN

Mr. MOULDER. Your name is Joseph Springer, I understand.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Will counsel identify himself?

Mr. ESTERMAN. William B. Esterman.

Mr. DOYLE. Hadn't you better make sure that the witness is perfectly comfortable now and his eyes are not bothered in any way?

Are you comfortable?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Where do you reside, Mr. Springer?

Mr. SPRINGER. I reside in Los Angeles.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you give us your exact address?

Mr. SPRINGER. 4237 Drucker, D-r-u-c-k-e-r, Street, zone 32, Los Angeles.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were you born?

Mr. SPRINGER. I was born in Poland.

Mr. MOULDER. In what year?

Mr. SPRINGER. 1910.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. How did you become a citizen?

Mr. SPRINGER. I came here as a minor; my father took out his papers in 1928.

Mr. MOULDER. The chairman in his statement referred to a camp. What is the name of the camp of which you and your wife are the proprietor and owner?

Mr. SPRINGER. My wife and I run the camp of Camp Tenaya, T-e-n-a-y-a, and we took that name from a lake in Yosemite.

Mr. MOULDER. Where is that camp located?

Mr. SPRINGER. Crestline, Calif.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I really can't hear the questions or the answers. I wonder if the loudspeaking equipment is working again in this room.

Mr. MOULDER. What kind of camp is it, Mr. Springer?

Mr. SPRINGER. A children's camp run during the summer vacation when children get off from school.

Mr. MOULDER. And for what period of time during the summer?

Mr. SPRINGER. From June up to September.

Mr. MOULDER. You don't operate the camp in that respect during the wintertime.

Mr. SPRINGER. No.

Mr. MOULDER. During this last year, during the months of, particularly the date of December 5 through to December 7 of 1952 of last year, were you then operating the camp?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. During the off season, so to speak, after the camp closes we usually rent it out to various organizations or groups of families that want to rent the camp in order to defray some of the expenses that are incurred.

Mr. MOULDER. On those dates, December 5, 6, and 7, were you then here in Los Angeles or were you at the camp?

Mr. ESTERMAN. What year?

Mr. MOULDER. 1952.

Mr. SPRINGER. I don't recall the exact dates. However, we have rented that camp during the month of December or November. I don't recall the exact date.

Mr. MOULDER. Of last year?

Mr. SPRINGER. Last year; yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Now, were you there at any time during the month of December of last year?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to consult with my attorney, if you don't mind.

Mr. VELDE. You may consult your attorney.

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. Thank you very much. I was asking if that was amusing, because some of the audience seems to think so.

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry. Let us have order in the audience so the witness can have full advantage of conferring with his counsel.

Mr. SPRINGER. In view of the statement which was read here by the chairman of this committee at the outset, I would decline to an-

swer this question, because it would mean to testify against myself and, therefore, I claim the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. It is in view of the statement made by the chairman that information has come to this committee, and an opportunity is now being given to you to clarify and to testify concerning the facts or to deny them and clear yourself, and we are just trying to find out from you whether or not this information is true. You are now being given the opportunity to tell us whether or not it is true.

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Congressman, you have asked not 1 question, but you have asked 3 in 1.

Mr. MOULDER. I just asked you if you were at your camp during the month of December. It is a very simple question. You often go there, do you not?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that I have made my answer very clear, just a while ago when I referred to the remarks made by the chairman at the outset of this meeting—of this hearing.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, were you there, then, during the month of November of 1952?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that this is the same question, and I can only give you the same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you operate the camp last summer?

Mr. SPRINGER. I did.

Mr. MOULDER. You did and your wife, also?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. And now you don't want to tell us whether or not you were back there in the month of December 1952? Is that the way I understand your testimony?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have answered that question before.

Mr. MOULDER. Now, isn't it true, or is it a fact that during December, on the 5th, 6th, and 7th, at Camp Tenaya, at about midnight, approximately 20 people traveled there by automobiles and held a meeting at that camp, and you were present at that time?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. Can we have an agreement if he says it is the same thing, that that applies to his reference to the fifth amendment.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Let it be understood if the witness declines to answer "for the same reasons," those reasons are because of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which provide against self-incrimination.

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have answered this question previously, and I give you the same answer to this question.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know whether or not those people were there at the camp during the month of December, on the 5th, 6th, and 7th of last year?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have answered that before.

Mr. MOULDER. Isn't it true that they were all leaders of the Communist Party of this area?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the same question again and the same answer I can give you.

Mr. VELDE. That is, you decline to answer?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. For the same reasons?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Now, are you acquainted with a man by the name of Max Klansky?

Mr. SPRINGER. I don't think that you can ask me a question of that sort.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, I asked it and all you have to do is answer it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand you asked it, but I am standing on my constitutional ground and I give you the same answer to the same questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Was he present there at that meeting?

Mr. SPRINGER. Same question again and the same answer.

Mr. JACKSON. For the same reason?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. In other words, you decline to answer the question for the same reasons you declined to answer other questions?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. For the reason you feel it might tend to incriminate you?

Now, is it true or not that Max Klansky is known to you personally and intimately as one of the organizers of the Juarez division of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. Same question and I can give you the same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. It isn't the same question. It is a different question.

Mr. VELDE. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio.

Do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. ESTERMAN. Can we consult for a moment?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. He says he wants an understanding. He says he declines to answer for the same reasons he gave before, or will he need to repeat them? Will it be understood if he says he declines to answer the questions for the same reasons he gave before, that it will be understood he is incorporating them by reference without having to give them again.

Mr. VELDE. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel, the chairman stipulated that with the committee, stipulated with you and the witness before. The chairman had the authority to stipulate that would be the fact. You don't need to ask it again.

Mr. ESTERMAN. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know the purpose for which this meeting was held there at your camp?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer for the same reasons I have given before.

Mr. MOULDER. Don't you know it is a fact that at that meeting Max Klansky made a speech and you were present there with your wife and he advised all those present, because of security reasons, not to walk around in the daytime and to stay in their cottages so they wouldn't be seen by anyone else in that area?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer for the same reasons I have given previously.

Mr. MOULDER. Isn't it true you took notes at that meeting and made a record of what was stated and said and how you were instructed by Max Klansky at the meeting?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer on the same grounds I stated before.

Mr. MOULDER. And that this meeting was composed of the top functionaries and the leaders of the Communist Party of this area? (At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. May I ask a question?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And I understand you decline to answer because of the same reasons previously given?

Mr. ESTERMAN. I didn't understand the question. When you say "and," do you mean that previous questions have been answered—

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. ESTERMAN. That is not a fact.

Mr. MOULDER. I am just asking you if those statements which I have stated are true or false. Now, you decline to answer—that is what I understand—for the reasons previously given?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Isn't it true that Max Klansky, in his opening remarks at this meeting, referred to the meeting as one of the historic meetings of the Communist Party in this area and one of the series of the new schools being held by the Communist Party in California? Is it true or not that he made such a statement there at that meeting?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer on the same reasons I have given previously.

Mr. MOULDER. What was your reaction to his statement that the group had met there at your resort or your camp and that they reflected the Bolshevik devotion of the comrades, all those present, as being loyal working Communists?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer on the same reasons I have given previously.

Mr. MOULDER. Was it Max Klansky who spoke at that meeting wherein he stated and delivered a lecture at this meeting on the subject of how the Communist Party members there present were to recruit other members of the party to infiltrate into the shops and key industries and defense establishments, and particularly in the California area?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have answered it before. I will decline to answer this one on the same grounds I stated before.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will decline to answer this question on the same grounds I have given before.

Mr. MOULDER. Or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. Same question, the same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. What are you doing now?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am working.

Mr. MOULDER. What are you working at?

Mr. SPRINGER. Producing ladies' coats and suits, an operator.

Mr. DOYLE. Where is your factory located?

Mr. SPRINGER. In Los Angeles.

Mr. DOYLE. Where?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it is a very unfair question, because it might—

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. DOYLE. You don't have to answer it if you think it will incriminate you.

Mr. SPRINGER. I don't think it is pertinent to this hearing; and, therefore, I don't think I am obligated to answer a question of this sort. If you can tell me the legislative purpose of it, I might consider it.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask a question at this juncture?

Mr. VELDE. Will you yield to—

Mr. MOULDER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARDY. Have any Communist meetings been held at that location where your manufacturing operations are carried on?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer on the same grounds I have given previously.

Mr. CLARDY. Where is that located?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have asked before for the legislative purpose of this question.

Mr. CLARDY. I am asking the question. Where is the shop located?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have just asked you, Mr. Congressman—

Mr. CLARDY. I am not answering.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is here to answer questions propounded by members of the committee and not to ask questions of the committee. So, the Chair would appreciate it very much if you would answer, or decline to answer.

Mr. ESTERMAN. May I explain?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. ESTERMAN. He is asking for the legislative purpose under the case of *Jones v. Securities and Exchange Commission*. If the Chair will order him to answer and state if it has a legislative purpose, he will answer.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure the address of the building where he now operates is very necessary in the performance by this committee of their duties, and it will be useful to know what the address of your shop is.

Mr. MOULDER. May I proceed?

Mr. CLARDY. Let's get the answer, and I am done.

Mr. SPRINGER. 910 South Los Angeles Street.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you give us the name of your wife?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have stated that before.

Mr. MOULDER. I don't recall it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Preva Springer; P-r-e-v-a.

Mr. MOULDER. I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Springer, have you ever rented the property known as Camp Tenaya to any person or persons known by you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that this question is similar to questions placed to me before, and I will refuse to answer this one on the same grounds that I have given before.

Mr. JACKSON. How many persons lectured during the period in question last December at Camp Tenaya?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the same question, and all I can do is give you the same answer.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, do you have some questions to ask?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask some questions?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. I pass.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to ask a couple of questions.

Mr. CLARDY. I know I won't get an answer; so I will give up.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I am familiar with the Crestline area geographically, being a Los Angeles County resident and loving the mountains. How many cabins do you have in your Camp Tenaya?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have 1 large lodge and 6 platform tents—what you call them?—with wooden sidings.

Mr. DOYLE. When you say "1 large room," is that an auditorium or a little assembly room where you have music and dances and so forth?

Mr. SPRINGER. No. There is a dining area there, cooking facilities for the summertime for the children.

Mr. DOYLE. Is this a large room?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. It is a lodge, isn't it?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; a lodge. It is one huge room, and there is only one bedroom in it, and the fireplace; and it has, naturally, seating capacity around it.

Mr. DOYLE. How many years back does the ownership of you and your wife to this nice camp extend?

Mr. SPRINGER. One year.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you the sole owner, you and your wife?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Neither directly nor indirectly is there any other ownership other than you two?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, there isn't any. As a matter of fact, we hocked our house to make a down payment on it.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you traveled to Poland or Russia since you became an American citizen?

Mr. SPRINGER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Or any other foreign country?

Mr. SPRINGER. No. I might have been once down to Tijuana, maybe, for an hour or so, that is about all.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you written any books or pamphlets of any sort since you became an adult?

Mr. SPRINGER. I don't think that that is necessary for me to answer this on the ground that I have stated previously.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, whatever books, if you have written any, or pamphlets, would tend to incriminate you; is that your answer?

Mr. ESTERMAN. Excuse us.

Mr. DOYLE. I haven't asked you whether you wrote any Communist books or not.

Mr. ESTERMAN. Do you mean any kind of book?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, is he an author for pay, or an amateur, or what, don't you see?

Mr. SPRINGER. I never wrote anything except a letter, maybe, to a friend. All I know is I am an operator at cloaks and suits, producing ladies' coats and suits, that's all.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sure that wouldn't incriminate you.

This meeting that was held up there in December, I mean, you had some people up there in the month of December, didn't you? I am



not asking you who, now; I am asking if you rented any cabins in the month of December?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I think that a similar question of this sort was asked me before. I think I have answered that question. I think it would be ridiculous on my part to say again the same thing as I said before.

Mr. VELDE. You can say it in a lot less time than you have just used making that statement.

Mr. SPRINGER. Do I have to answer this question?

Mr. VELDE. Yes, a reasonable repetition.

Mr. SPRINGER. Therefore I will answer it the same way that I have answered before. I stated previously that I cannot and will not answer a question of this sort on the grounds that I have stated previously.

Mr. DOYLE. I assume, or am I in error—I have been away from California now several years in Washington, and I may not be exactly familiar with the law involving the keeping of registers and a record of people in lodges and hotels, and facilities.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room at this point, 2:55 p. m.)

Mr. DOYLE. Do you keep a register of people who use your rooms and assembly rooms overnight?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Doyle, would you clarify this question for me?

Mr. DOYLE. As I recall it, Mr. Springer, there at least used to be a California hotel, lodge, and inn law which required you to register every person who comes to your camp and stays overnight. I assume that law is still on the books. Is it, do you know?

Mr. ESTERMAN. You don't have to answer that.

Mr. DOYLE. Your counsel says you don't have to answer that. I think you are charged with knowledge of the law, however, if it is on the books.

Now, I want to ask you this question: In the month of December did you keep a record of all the adults who stayed in your inn and lodge overnight at any time during the month?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have answered previously, when the chairman stated it, I have answered the chairman before, and it is the same type of a question that was presented to me at the beginning, and, therefore, I would decline to answer this question on the same basis, on the same grounds that I have stated before.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you claim your constitutional privilege that it might incriminate you if you stated that you complied with the law of the State of California in keeping a register of your hotel guests. That is the effect of your answer to me, Witness.

Mr. ESTERMAN. Is that a question?

Mr. DOYLE. It is my statement. I wanted to explain, Counsel. Now, do I understand that in view of my statement of what I am trying to get from you—I don't see how it would incriminate you—I am not arguing with you, but I am just stating to you frankly that if it is the law of California, and I believe it to be, I don't see how in God's name it could incriminate you under the fifth amendment if you said that you kept a register of all your guests in the month of December 1952. Now, if you didn't keep it, and it is the law, I can't understand why you wouldn't want to say anything about it.

Mr. ESTERMAN. There is no question.

Mr. DOYLE. I asked him if he kept a register of all his adult guests during the month of December 1952.

Mr. ESTERMAN. He answered that. Do you want him to answer it again?

Mr. DOYLE. He pleaded the fifth amendment.

Mr. ESTERMAN. There is no question pending.

Mr. DOYLE. The question still stands and his answer still stands. Well, one more question, Mr. Chairman.

Did you participate in sending out any written invitations or announcements for any adult group to come as a group to your camp in the month of December 1952? I mean through a letter or through a printing advertisement or an invitation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that to this question I could only give you, Mr. Doyle, the same answer that I have given previously—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you are running a public camp, aren't you—

Mr. ESTERMAN. Wait a minute. He hasn't finished his answer.

Mr. SPRINGER. On the same grounds of the fifth amendment that I stated previously.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask you this: If I misunderstand, I didn't want to misunderstand you. This is a public camp and you rent it for hire to folks who come and have the fee to pay it, don't you; that is true, isn't it?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is a children's camp mainly.

Mr. DOYLE. But you rent to whatever qualified children come, and their fees are paid?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't you keep their parents there with the children, ever?

Mr. SPRINGER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. You send the parents home after they bring the children?

Mr. SPRINGER. The children come up there and the parents leave them for 2 or 3 weeks or 4 weeks, or for the entire season.

Mr. DOYLE. How do the children know the camp is there? How do you get notice to parents that your camp is open in the summer? What announcement do you make?

Mr. SPRINGER. We have a brochure, and if you are interested, Mr. Doyle, after the hearing I could give you one.

Mr. DOYLE. I would appreciate having one, of all copies of your publicity during the last year.

Mr. SPRINGER. And then there is advertisements in papers.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you furnish the committee with a copy of all your ads during the last year? No doubt you keep a scrapbook. Let us inspect them, at least.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Doyle, I would like to accommodate you and the committee. However, my counsel advises me that if we get a formal request, and I would like my counsel to look it over, I will be glad to furnish all these things to the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I am making that request that the chairman ask that the operator of this public camp furnish the committee a copy of all the announcements made through newspapers or otherwise during the last year in order to attract public trade at his lodge, or private groups.

Mr. VELDE. Did the witness say that he would be willing to do that?

Mr. ESTERMAN. He said he would be willing if I could see the formal request.

Mr. SPRINGER. If my counsel could see the formal request.

Mr. ESTERMAN. Give us a subpoena duces tecum.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is requested to abide by the wishes of the gentleman from California. Mr. Doyle, relative to the material that he asked for.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this closing question, perhaps, without being bound that this is my last question: Do you advertise in the People's World or the Daily Worker, two of the papers which by reputation are Communist Party papers, for your camp?

Mr. SPRINGER. I cannot answer this question for the same reasons that I have given you before under the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you advertise in any of the daily papers in the Los Angeles area? Did you advertise during the last year in the Los Angeles—well, the Times, the Herald, or the Examiner; did you place ads with them advertising your camp?

Mr. SPRINGER. I advertised in the B'nai B'rith Messenger, the Valley Jewish News, and La Opinion, a Spanish-speaking paper. Those I think are the only papers.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, at this point I think it is very proper and pertinent that I give some 8 or 10 lines of Public Law 831 to this witness' knowledge, because he has asked what legislative purpose was served by certain questions asked by my colleagues and myself.

In answering that question, in part, may I say for your information, Public Law 831 of the 81st Congress, chapter 1024, the second session, title I, section 2, said this—now this is a declaration by your United States Congress, Mr. Springer. [Reading:]

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

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

Did you ever know that the United States Congress made that declaration during the 81st Congress as a matter of national policy?

Mr. SPRINGER. Counsel advises me that I don't have to answer this question.

Mr. DOYLE. Would it incriminate you in any way to admit whether or not you knew what bills and laws Congress has passed?

Mr. SPRINGER. I didn't say that it would incriminate me to any extent. But counsel advises me that I don't have to answer that, and I am not an attorney; therefore, if my counsel advises me, I presume that that is the proper position for me to take.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish the record to show, Mr. Chairman, to my last question or statement, I am surprised to learn that any member of the American bar feels that it would incriminate any client to admit that his client knew the text of bills passed by the United States Congress.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle, counsel didn't say that he believed it would incriminate him.

Mr. DOYLE. But his client pleaded the fifth amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. I didn't.

Mr. DOYLE. He gave the same answer that he gave before, and that involved the fifth amendment, believe it or not.

Mr. VELDE. I believe, Mr. Doyle, that the answer was that he was advised by counsel that he didn't have to answer that question.

Mr. ESTERMAN. He will be glad to answer it if you want to proceed.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed and ask him why.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to know why you refused to state if you ever heard of that act.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Doyle, I don't usually follow all the laws that Congress passes; and, therefore, I don't know what the specific law refers to. All I know is that I go to work and I make cloaks and suits.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, as Members of Congress, we don't claim that we know all the laws backward, but this law refers to one subject, a world Communist movement, and claims a world conspiracy.

I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Springer, did anyone have a joint interest or a financial interest of any character with you and your wife in the property that was used as a camp, at any time during the month of December 1952?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. I can only give you the same answers that I have given you previously, Mr. Tavenner. I think I have made my position clear in reference to the camp, who are the owners. However, on this question, the way it is phrased I cannot answer it. I can only answer it on the previous grounds, as I said before—the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me understand your answer a little further. You testified that no one was interested or is interested in that property at the present time except you and your wife. That was your testimony originally.

Now, I am merely asking you whether or not any other person had an interest with you and your wife during the month of December 1952.

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Tavenner, I think at the outset—I don't remember which gentleman here, I think Mr. Moulder, asked the question: Who are the owners of the camp? And at that time I stated Mrs. Springer and myself are the owners of that camp, and that is since last year.

Mr. TAVENNER. And my question is, Who were the owners in December 1952?

Mr. SPRINGER. So, I just stated that since last year Mr. and Mrs. Springer are the owners of the camp.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you answer my question, please? Who were the owners of that camp in 1952, December 1952?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. He answered that several times.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have answered it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not answered that question at all.

Mr. CLARDY. By the word "since," do you mean during the entire year 1952?

Mr. ESTERMAN. When did you buy it?

Mr. SPRINGER. We bought the camp last year, and it went through escrow, I believe, sometime in the month of March or April, and we are the sole owners. As a matter of fact, we are still making payments on it.

Mr. CLARDY. Since March of last year?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then do you mean to state that no one else has had a joint interest with you in this property since March or April of 1952?

Mr. ESTERMAN. You just answered that.

Mr. SPRINGER. We are the owners, as I just stated. It is the same thing as before. We are the owners of the camp, Camp Tenaya, since last year.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that you are, but have you been the sole owners since March or April of 1952?

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no partnership. Mr. Chairman, I really can't understand Mr. Tavenner's questions. I really don't know. I just stated awhile ago that Mrs. Springer and Mr. Springer, myself, are the sole owners of the camp. What more does Mr. Tavenner want?

Mr. VELDE. And have been since March or April of 1952?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. Subject to a mortgage?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct, Bank of America.

Mr. VELDE. I think that answers the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. That does answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Springer, will you tell the committee what other names you have used besides the name of Springer?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. What names does the Congressman have? I would like to know.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking you what names you have used besides the name of Springer. Springer wasn't your original name, I know that.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, don't tell me that. This I resent. This I resent.

Mr. SCHERER. What other names have you used?

Mr. ESTERMAN. Ask him where he found out that that isn't your original name.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to have proof of that, Mr. Congressman, what other names, because you have made an accusation here against me.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the witness be instructed to answer my question. What other names has he used?

Mr. VELDE. Do you understand what the question is, Mr. Witness?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Congressman said what names do I use. My name is Joseph Springer.

Mr. SCHERER. What other names have you used other than Joseph Springer?

Mr. DOYLE. If any.

Mr. SCHERER. In the past.

Mr. SPRINGER. I don't go around lying like some of your witnesses did here last week, or yesterday, rather.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, all I am asking you is—

Mr. SPRINGER. And don't make any accusations against me like that because I think it is very unethical on your part.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. You answer my question, then. Answer this question: Have you used any other names in the past other than Springer?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not.

Mr. SCHERER. You have not used any other names other than Springer? What name did you use as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. I refuse to answer that question on the previous grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you use another name as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. Same question and same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, are you an agent of the Russian Government?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. ESTERMAN. Sit back and take it easy. We want to consult.

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred further with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, would the Congressman from Ohio, I believe it is——

Mr. SCHERER. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will you explain to me that question?

Mr. SCHERER. Are you an agent of the Russian Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. What does that mean?

Mr. SCHERER. Your attorney can tell you what an agent means.

Mr. ESTERMAN. His attorney can't because his attorney doesn't know what you mean. Do you mean is he a registered agent?

Mr. SCHERER. No. I mean is he an agent, an agent of the Russian Government in any way, in any capacity?

(At this point Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. I could only give you one answer. I can only answer in one way. I would like to answer it in a different way, but I could only answer it in one way, and that is on the statements that I made before under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You refuse to answer on the ground that your answer might incriminate you; is that right?

Mr. ESTERMAN. He doesn't say anything.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. If you were not an agent of the Russian Government would you so state?

Mr. SPRINGER. The same question, the same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, you can give the same answer but it is certainly not the same question. Now, are you an agent of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. The same question and the same answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you ever an agent of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. Same question and the same answer. I think I have told you that before.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, have you ever received any compensation from the Russian Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. I could only say——

Mr. SCHERER. Directly or indirectly?

Mr. SPRINGER. I could only answer you the same way as I did before.

Mr. ESTERMAN. Take it easy.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever received any compensation from the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. I could only answer you on the same grounds that I have stated before.

Mr. VELDE. And that is a declination to answer, you decline to answer the question?

Mr. SPRINGER. I decline to answer the question on the grounds I stated before.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I heard an answer a few minutes ago, perhaps 5 or 6 questions back, in which you stated: "I am not lying like the other witnesses who testified yesterday." Who lied yesterday? Now, I am sure the record will show that you used some such term in which you said that witnesses lied to this committee yesterday.

Now, to me, Mr. Chairman, that is, unless it is cleared up, equivalent to his charging in the same forum, that a witness or witnesses on yesterday were heard by him to lie or perjure themselves. He was here yesterday, apparently. Were you here yesterday, Mr. Springer?

Mr. SPRINGER. I was.

Mr. DOYLE. So you heard the witnesses, apparently, to whom you referred when you said they lied. Now, if they lied they perjured themselves before this committee. Now, I am asking you to identify—and you were here and heard them—I am asking you now to identify whom you heard lie yesterday on that witness stand to this committee. I don't want all the witnesses to have the label of being liars by this witness.

(At this point, Mr. Springer conferred with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. DOYLE. We certainly have no knowledge of any lying, perjured testimony, and if there was any we ought to know it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. I agree with you, Mr. Doyle, and I will allow the witness to answer the question.

(At this point, Mr. Springer conferred further with Mr. Esterman.)

Mr. SPRINGER. I expressed an opinion here yesterday—I expressed an opinion here just a little while ago on the answer to Mr. Doyle. I don't think that I have to explain my answer and I will not explain my answer.

Mr. VELDE. Has the witness finished with his answer?

Mr. ESTERMAN. Yes; he has finished.

Mr. DOYLE. I certainly try to give you every opportunity to explain it. One question more.

You emphasized this was a children's camp, I suppose, during the summer. Do you have any classes for the children up there of any kind, any handcraft or any clay modeling, any blackboard classes, any swimming classes, any recreation classes?

Mr. SPRINGER. I told you before, Mr. Doyle, I would be willing to give you a brochure where it exactly tells of our activities, horseback riding, swimming, arcraft, and various woodcraft and naturecraft, sewing—I mean weaving, various types of ball playing for the kids, and hikes, and et cetera.

Mr. DOYLE. I used to be a summer-camp director myself. I would assume you would do some of that.

In any of these groups of children that you have during the summer, are they spoken to or instructed by any member of the Communist Party or at the request of the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will refuse to answer this question, as I have refused in the past to answer, on the same grounds I have stated previously: fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. What ages are the children you take into the camp?

Mr. SPRINGER. From 7 to 15.

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

Mr. VELDE. Does counsel have any other questions?

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

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness should be retained under subpoena any longer?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is excused, and the committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing during the recess, which was from 3:28 to 3:43 p. m.)

Mr. JACKSON. The committee will come to order.

The committee is in receipt of a number of communications protesting the blackout of the television hearings, and it is felt that a very brief statement in this connection is desirable.

There is involved in the question of television of committee hearings a constitutional question, and for that reason the committee has seen fit to take the position that, pending a clearcut legal decision in the matter, witnesses objecting to being televised on the witness stand will not be so televised.

The committee, contrary to the charges and allegations of many of its critics, operates within the laws of the land and is subject to court decisions and findings on matters pertinent to its inquiries.

Television, so far as committee sessions are concerned, is largely in the formative stage and clearcut decisions have not been made on many problems arising from the use of television as a medium of public information in connection with committee investigations.

Forcing a witness to appear before the television camera, in spite of his protests, and in the light of previous decisions, in effect deprives the committee of its power to institute legal procedure against recalcitrant witnesses or to cite for contempt in instances where it is deemed desirable.

The committee is certain that the people of southern California will appreciate the realities of the situation as they exist, and will understand the necessity for the occasional periods of blackout. We ask for that understanding on the part of the people who are listening.

Mr. CLARDY. May I add one word?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Another phase of that, I think, we ought to call attention to is the fact that both the television and the press have given



an excellent service. The press has been giving, I think, the best coverage I have seen anywhere, and I want to commend them for what they have been doing.

The telegrams before us are overwhelmingly favorable to television, but I think we ought to let everyone know that what they missed on television this afternoon they can at least partially get from the press.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentlemen would expect that kind of service in California.

Mr. CLARDY. Always a Californian.

Mr. JACKSON. Now that the chamber of commerce discussion is finished do you have a witness now, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. May I make an announcement?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the testimony of Mr. Bart Lytton, a message was received by me, raising the question of possible lack of proper identification of the witness, inasmuch as there was another person by the name, somewhat similar, that was in the screenwriting field.

I thought I made it perfectly clear in the course of my questioning that the witness on the stand was a different person from Mr. Herbert Lytton, who is now engaged in screenwriting.

But in order there be no possible misunderstanding about the matter, I want to read a message which I received. The message is as follows, Mr. Herbert Lytton, Social Security Number, 555-227-522, of 1819 Taft Building, called and said he is having telephone complaints regarding the questioning of Bart Lytton now on the stand, who is also a screenwriter.

Of course, the testimony was that Mr. Lytton is not now a screenwriter. Nevertheless, that was the message.

Then I was requested in this message to announce publicly the Mr. Herbert Lytton is not the party in question. I don't see how anything could have been plainer than what I brought out. If it wasn't, I think this covers the situation.

Mr. JACKSON. It meets the situation. Do you have a witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I would like to call Silvia Richards.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give to this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has the witness been sworn?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

### TESTIMONY OF SILVIA RICHARDS

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Silvia Richards.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born, Mrs. Richards?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Indianola, Iowa.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a brief statement of what your formal educational training has been?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I went to grade school and high school in Colorado Springs, Colo., and I went to Colorado College in Colorado Springs for 2 years.

MR. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

MRS. RICHARDS. No, sir; I am not.

MR. TAVENNER. I suppose you have seen enough of these hearings to know that all witnesses have the privilege of asking or seeking the advice of counsel at any time during their testimony, if they so desire.

MRS. RICHARDS. I understand that.

MR. TAVENNER. What is your occupation, Mrs. Richards?

MRS. RICHARDS. I am a screen writer and formerly a radio writer.

MR. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in the business of radio and screen writing?

MRS. RICHARDS. Since sometime in 1944. That is about 9 years.

MR. TAVENNER. Where did you begin in that work—in California or in the State of New York?

MRS. RICHARDS. In California. I came out here in October of 1943, and I started writing radio scripts, because my husband and I had separated and he had gone into the Army, and it was a matter of necessity. I worked that year on Cavalcade of America, Suspense, Rogues' Gallery, Philip Morris Playhouse, and various other mystery programs. Mostly on Cavalcade of America and Suspense.

MR. TAVENNER. That was in the course of your work in connection with radio script writing?

MRS. RICHARDS. That's right.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a description of your work as a screen writer?

MRS. RICHARDS. Well, sometime in 1945 I went to work at Warner Bros. on Possessed, a picture starring Joan Crawford. Later I worked at Universal-International for an independent company, Walter Wanger—a partnership of Walter Wanger and Fritz Lang.

MR. TAVENNER. Would you mind raising your voice just a little?

MRS. RICHARDS. All right. And I was under contract to them for about 2½ to 3 years. The only credit during that period was a picture called Secret Beyond The Door. Subsequently I did a picture called Tomahawk for Universal-International, and I worked briefly at Columbia. I sold some original stories, including the original story for Rancho Notorious, and this last year I did a picture for Bernhard-Vidor Productions, for Twentieth Century-Fox release, called "Ruby Gentry."

Since then I have also worked at Columbia again, and am now working at Twentieth Century-Fox.

MR. TAVENNER. The committee is in receipt of information which it has had for a period of time, indicating that you were at one time a member of the Communist Party, and also that you are not a member of the Communist Party at this time.

MRS. RICHARDS. That is correct, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. You were a member of the Communist Party at one time.

MRS. RICHARDS. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the Communist Party?

MRS. RICHARDS. Well, I was a member from either late in 1937 or early 1938 up until early 1946, with several long leaves of absence during the time that I had my children and had problems of illness and so on.

MR. TAVENNER. Up until about what time?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Early 1946 is about as close as I can fix it. It was in relation—I can fix it in relation to other events later.

Mr. MOULDER. May I inquire what you mean by leave of absence?

Mrs. RICHARDS. For instance, when I married and was leaving—this was when I lived in New York, and was leaving New York and leaving my present activities when I knew I was going to have a child. I asked for a leave of absence from the party and this is often given under certain circumstances, and so I had no activity in the organization until after the birth of my second child, which was 2½ years later.

Mr. CLARDY. I think it would help if you would stay a little closer to the microphone and face counsel over here, regardless who of us may ask questions. It is hard to hear you when you turn your head.

Mrs. RICHARDS. It is a little difficult getting used to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, where were you residing in 1937 when you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. In New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed at that time?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, I went to work in New York City in September of 1936. I did a little of free-lance radio work then, although it was not successful, and I think that at that time I was working for the World's Fair Corporation in the publicity department where I worked up until the opening of the fair. This was on the preparation of the fair before it opened.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, let me ask you to tell the committee the circumstances which led up to your becoming a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. RICHARDS. As I say, I went to New York in 1936 and New York as a whole had a tremendous impact on me. I had come from a nonindustrial, middle class town. I think anybody knows Colorado Springs. It is very different from New York.

Mr. CLARDY. What town was that?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Colorado Springs. In my youth I had heard a great deal of political discussions, because my father's family for many generations had been teachers and ministers and missionaries with an enormous concern about social questions, so I had some previous interest in these questions.

But when I arrived in New York after my father's death, and during the depression, I felt somewhat mentally, I think, adrift. I remember on May 1, 1937, I saw the May Day parade, which was, I believe, one of the biggest May Day parades ever held in New York. It was during the Spanish war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you elevate your voice a little?

Mrs. RICHARDS. All right. It was during the Spanish war and there was a tremendous amount of emotion around this parade, and I was deeply impressed by it and moved by it.

I don't know whether it was subsequent to that or just previously that I met a man socially through a mutual friend, who was either the circulation manager for Soviet Russia Today or the financial manager for Soviet Russia Today. But after the May Day parade, in conversations with him, I learned that he was a Communist, and he told me how the Communist Party was in the leadership on all

these questions which concerned me: the rise of fascism in Europe and the Spanish war, the questions of unemployment and the depression.

He saw that I was interested and he invited me to visit a neighborhood branch on Avenue C near Fourth Street in New York City. I went and visited it sometime during the summer of 1937 with him, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to interrupt you at that point.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was this person that you say was connected with Soviet Russia Today, who suggested that you attend Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. RICHARDS. His name, I believe, was Herbert Goldfrank.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any further identification of the person, as to what he did and—

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, his job at that time was, as I say, with Soviet Russia Today. I met him through a friend who was not at all interested in politics, but who had been acquainted with him or had become acquainted with him at Time, Inc., where I think Mr. Goldfrank was trying to raise money among certain contacts at Time, Inc. They had a fund drive on at the time, and, as I say, the friend, I am sure, had no political interest in him at all. He brought him home to a cocktail party or something of that sort, and that is how I became acquainted with him.

I am afraid I cannot give any further identification, because the only other time I saw him was in the Avenue C branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the individual mentioned was further mentioned in the hearings involving Leon Josephson.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know where Mr. Goldfrank is today?

Mrs. RICHARDS. No. I have had no contact with him at all after 1938. He was extremely active at that time, but I have had no contact with him since at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, we think we know in what business he is now engaged, but possibly I should not say anything further without additional checking.

Mr. WALTER. Certainly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, as a result of your conference with him you attended this Communist Party meeting?

Mrs. RICHARDS. That is correct. I didn't join then, I know. The only way I can pin down the time when I joined was that it must have been winter, because there was snow on the ground that night. I remember walking a tremendous distance to a subway. Avenue C was very difficult to reach, and I was walking through snow, so it must have been early in that winter of 1937 when I joined the Communist Party.

I attended meetings at Avenue C at this neighborhood branch for a little more than a year. It was a very big neighborhood branch which had mostly open meetings, which people from the neighborhood attended.

I couldn't estimate the membership. It must have been as much as 100. They were a very large branch. They were very large meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what was the primary objective or interest of this group of the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. This particular group involved itself in neighborhood questions. There was a canvassing of the neighborhood, for instance, to inform people of their rights under I believe it is the old-age-tenement law. There was a big drive by the party, in other words, the party tried to make itself a kind of service organization to the neighborhood in order, of course, to gain sympathy and members.

Then there was a tremendous open air protest meeting held at the site of a tenement fire. There was a tenement fire where several people had been killed and they held a marathon open air protest meeting. I remember that.

In addition to that, there was the collection of money for Spain, and large educational forums of various kinds, the selling of the Daily and Sunday Worker. And of course any particular political drives of the party at the time, the collecting of signatures on petitions and financial drives for the support of the party itself took place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, to what extent were you active in those interests or objectives of the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, I never held any office in that branch, except once or twice I think I was in charge of selling literature for the evening. I attended many of the meetings, the open-air ones, and then I remember going once in a white uniform or supposedly a white uniform to look like a nurse to collect money for Spain in front of a theater.

I loaned my car for a parade once. That is about all. I attended meetings. As a matter of fact, at that period and probably for months of my party life, I was something which I think causes a great deal of trouble in the world; I was a political dilettante. I am not saying this with any pride or frivolity. I think you can become engaged in activities which you would not have thought about—which you did not think about thoroughly and which you were not willing to really face the consequences of, because of immaturity, but, nevertheless, that causes a great deal of trouble in the world and that period, particularly, I was a dilettante. A great deal of it was for fun. It gave me a certain sense of excitement and importance, and I think that a great many people who join the Communist Party, while they join on the basis of such issues as fascism and unemployment, really do it for other reasons.

This does not explain why 98 percent of the people who are sincerely concerned about these questions do not feel the need to become a Communist. I think I became a Communist because I was young and was irresponsible and because I didn't want to think for myself. It was extremely comforting to have all the answers in a series of books and I would never have to think again. I think that is why a lot of people will continue to cling to Communist thinking, even when the facts don't fit, because it is a little painful to take responsibility finally for your own thinking and for your own mistakes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But in that connection do you not feel that young people in particular, if information is furnished them and made available to them as to the seriousness of the final consequences of supporting an international conspiracy, that they might be led out of the Communist Party instead of finally being driven out of it?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes, sir, I do think so. And I think if we give them—I think if there is a really aggressive campaign on the positive values of a democracy, that some of the satisfactions which young people find in the Communist Party they can find in normal democratic life.

Mr. TAVENNER. You would emphasize then the great importance of an educational campaign?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Phase of the problem.

Mrs. RICHARDS. I certainly would, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. How old were you at the time you joined the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I was 20. Now, when I say I was immature—some people are immature at 20—I happened to be very slow at growing up, and I am talking about my judgment through the years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us at this time who were those who were principally responsible for leadership in that group of the Communist Party, of which you were a member, between 1937 and 1938?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Mr. Tavenner, I can give you some names from that period but I am not at all certain how valuable they will be, since from that branch we had party names, and my party name, for instance, was Silvia Peters.

Herbert Goldfrank's party name at that time was Herbert Davis. Now, he was the only person I knew socially at all outside of the branch meetings, and so I didn't have occasion to know them or to know whether their names were real or were assumed for that branch.

There was a man named Ed Brandy. I don't know how it was spelled. That is how it was pronounced.

There was a man, an elderly man named Torg. I suppose that is spelled T-o-r-g.

There was a man named Becker, I remember.

These people were in some ways in the leadership.

Now, Ed Brandy, for instance, taught the beginner's class to which I went.

There was a woman named Greenberg, and then there was a man I knew only as Comrade Lev. That was evidently an abbreviation of his first name. I understood he was a publisher.

Most of the people were from that neighborhood, although there were a few like myself who came from another neighborhood, who were middle-class or professional people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not individuals were recruited from that cell of the Communist Party into the specialized work of the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I have no personal knowledge of that. I had a feeling that I myself was there in order to be, so to speak, educated as a proletarian. That was completely outside any of my previous experience. I had no real basis for contact with the people in that neighborhood, I mean by origin, by work. In every way they were different from myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did that continue, that is, your association?

Mrs. RICHARDS. My association through the Avenue C branch continued until shortly after my marriage. I was married in, I think November of 1938. Shortly after that I knew that I was going to have a child and we were going to move to the country, and so as I say, I applied for a leave of absence and was granted a leave of absence.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return to active work in the party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, during the period of leave of absence—I am not sure if it was absolutely regular or not, but I was contacted—we moved to Rockland County, N. Y., Palisades. It is also known as Sneed's Landing. It is a little town on the Hudson about 12 miles above the George Washington Bridge, and sometime during that, occasionally during that period I was contacted by the section organizer for the payment of dues and probably for the collection of money.

I remember some visits from 2 or 3 different section organizers during that time. The section, as I understood, was composed of three counties, Westchester, Rockland, and another county, and the section organizer, part of his duties, his or her duties, would be to ride around and contact people who were in sort of far-flung districts.

Then sometime after October 1941, I began to go to some of the neighborhood, the countywide neighborhood meetings in Rockland County.

I was also engaged at that time in a tremendous amount of war activities. I was in civil defense, and an airplane watcher, and I worked for Russian War Relief, British War Relief, and I also was active in the American Labor Party, all of which was in a sense considered by me to be party work, since the position of the party at that time was entirely "win the war" emphasis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, during the period when you were a member of this first group in New York City—

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your group addressed at any time by high functionaries from the party, and if so, by whom?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes, it was from time to time. I can remember three of them—Mother Bloor addressed a meeting, and Israel Amter, and Roy Hudson. Those are the three I remember, but there were other people from the national headquarters who did address meetings there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall now what functions those persons had in the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I don't know whether they were at that time members of the national committee. I would be guessing, I am afraid. I know that they were all from the national headquarters of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, when did you come to California?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I came to California in October of 1943. However, I did not contact the party out here until the following April. I had a certain amount of personal trouble, and then after my husband and I separated I again contacted the Communist Party in Santa Monica.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you make that contact?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I have been trying to remember that. I remember before I left Rockland County taking a trip across into Westchester to the home of the section organizer, who was at that time a woman. I am very sorry but I can't remember her name. I think that I informed her that I was coming to California. However, I do not remember a formal transfer, and I don't remember turning in a formal transfer.

I was contacted out here by a man by the name of Vidaver, Matt Vidaver.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you further identify him? Can you give further identification or information regarding him?

Mrs. RICHARDS. At that time, I don't know what his work was. I had an impression he was working in a cement factory or something of that sort, but he was—I also had the impression that he was, whether paid or not, a party functionary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn that he was the Communist Party organizer for the Bay City Club of the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. It was my impression he was an official or a functionary of the group that met at Ocean Park.

Another thing I cannot remember is its being called the Bay City Club, although I understand that that is what it was called. In my memory it was merely the club which met in Ocean Park.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were telling us of this individual meeting you.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. He contacted me. The major activity of that club at that time was the establishment of a bookstore in Santa Monica called the Thomas Jefferson Book Store. I went to some meetings with Matt Vidaver in Ocean Park. The branch met in a rented hall near the amusement pier. I told them that I had very little time. I remember informing Matt and others that I had very little time.

I had just begun to write for the radio. I was very lousy at it, it was painful, and I also had the full-time care of two very young boys, and a 7-bedroom house, and it was wartime and there was no help, even if I could have afforded it.

So I explained all this, and they said that the major activity was in relation to the bookstore, the attendance at meetings was not the most important thing, and that—this was during the period when the party was called the Communist Political Association, and Browder had expounded the theory that the party did not need to have the regular meetings and the political activity that it had in the past, that it could operate openly in an educational capacity, that we were going to have a peaceful evolution from capitalism to socialism. And as a result I didn't attend meetings regularly during that period.

However, having this large house, which was, I am sure, the largest house in the branch, my house was used for numerous parties and for, possibly, other activities. This I am not certain about. But it was certainly used for parties to raise money for the bookshop.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the address of your house?

Mrs. RICHARDS. 607 Ocean Front. It was a very fancy house, indeed, and one I could ill afford. That is why I became a writer. I had to write day and night to pay the rent.

Mr. WALTER. You said they said that it wasn't important to attend meetings. Who do you mean by "they"?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I meant the branch executives. I applied to the branch executive. I know Matt Vidaver was an executive of that branch. It was my impression a man named Bill Young was also a member. Possibly his wife Molly was, although I am not certain, although I knew them both in this group. They are two of the people that I remember in the group, and I know that Bill Young was, undoubtedly was an executive on that group.



MR. TAVENNER. Now will you tell the committee just how these functions were arranged and who suggested them, the benefit parties for various Communist Party projects?

MRS. RICHARDS. The first one, there was a discussion during the branch meeting, they asked who had a house, and I raised my hand. And then a committee was appointed to run the party. So that most of the arrangements were out of my hands.

They would have raffles and sell drinks and charge admission. Because it was a beach house, I think some of them were daytime parties and people went swimming. That I am extremely foggy about. As I say, I was writing. That year I wrote—I looked it up the other day—I wrote 62 half-hour radio scripts which is something like 30 full-length movies. It was a tremendous volume of work.

So I wasn't present when all the arrangements were made. Sometimes I was upstairs typing, people were downstairs. I remember once raising a beef about them not cleaning up when they left, or something, and they appointed a cleanup committee for the next one.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, you used the expression that you were advised, in effect, that it wasn't so important to attend meetings; that the principal emphasis was upon the work at the bookshop and educational.

MRS. RICHARDS. This was the period which preceded the Duclos letter, and because of this, Browder was, as a matter of fact, accused of destroying the apparatus of the party. In a sense he did. I think it is very interesting that the party felt itself incapable of functioning on the kind of broad base that Browder envisioned. For whatever reasons he envisioned it, I am not going into Mr. Browder's motives. It is true that during the Browder period the party Americanized itself, it adapted itself to the peculiar and unique aspects of the American scene much more than it had before or since.

And the Duclos letter said that this policy was destroying the apparatus of the party. It is perfectly true that people did not attend meetings as regularly when they didn't have to, as they did later.

MR. TAVENNER. You mentioned the receipt of the Duclos letter.

MRS. RICHARDS. Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the effect of the receipt of the Duclos letter in the group of the Communist Party to which you were assigned?

MRS. RICHARDS. I went to that meeting. I was called by Matt Vidaver who said it was an extremely important required meeting. There was a discussion. Rather, no discussion, a reading of the directives is really what it amounted to from New York on the question of Earl Browder. There was an attempt at a discussion.

I can remember several elderly people who were bewildered and confused by the fact that Mr. Browder was suddenly in the doghouse, and then they were beaten down and there was a unanimous vote by that branch to expel Browder from the party. And which, of course, must have happened unanimously in every branch throughout the United States.

MR. TAVENNER. Why do you say it happened unanimously throughout the United States? Take your own group, for instance, was that the unanimous feeling of the members of your group, that all that Browder had done should be repudiated?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, there were a few articulate people who presented the reasons. The objections were, a few objections were, raised. As I can remember, they were treated, the objections, with withering contempt. An elderly man was told he was not really—he didn't really understand the science of Marxism, Leninism, that it was only lack of political education which really was raising objections. That, after all, the leadership of the party in New York and the leadership of the party throughout the world were agreed to it, so that they acquired a unanimous vote.

I don't know what feelings—I know—what the individual feelings were. I know this was the moment, the first moment when I—my own feelings began drastically to cool, although it took some time for me to move all the way out.

It was around the question of the new type of party versus the party of Browder that I began to have my first doubts in relation to the organization, my first serious doubts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were those who took the leadership and the sponsorship of the Duclos letter?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I cannot remember who presented it that evening. I know that people I have mentioned were active, but then there were some other younger people. There was an organization, a girl who acted as educational secretary named Dorothy Olson, and her husband, Ben Olson, was fairly articulate in the group.

I remember mostly these few younger people because they were the ones who contacted me outside party activities. They would come down to use the beach and they were the ones whom I saw socially, to a certain extent.

There was another girl I remember, named Celia Wilby. I don't know whether that is "ey" or "y." She at that time, I believe, was working at the Douglas plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. Working at what plant?

Mrs. RICHARDS. At the Douglas plant.

Mr. CLARBY. Counsel, might I suggest—we know what the Duclos letter is and all about it, but a brief word at this time might be fitting, I think, so everyone would understand it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I think that is a good suggestion.

What did you understand by the Duclos letter?

Mrs. RICHARDS. The Duclos letter, as I understood it—and I am far from being a profound political thinker—was a letter written by a French Communist named Duclos, which appeared, I believe, first in *L'Humanité*, or one of the other French Communist publications, discussing the American Communist Party and Browder's theory of the peaceful evolution of capitalism to socialism.

This letter was the signal for a concerted attack on Browder and this country. I have a feeling it was the signal for a change of policy of the international Communist movement following the war. In a sense it was a signal that the honeymoon was over.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may add, by the testimony of a high former Communist Party functionary, upon the receipt of that letter that individual stated that he considered it a declaration of war by the Soviet Union against the United States. That the only element of uncertainty was the time at which it would occur.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, I believe it certainly was a declaration that the alliance was ended, that the peaceful alliance that went on during the war was over. They felt that now, far from working with the United States, that their interests were diametrically opposed to those of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Duclos letter considered a directive from the Communist Party International to the Communist Party in the United States?

Mrs. RICHARDS. It was treated as such. It is very hard, when you are in the lower echelons, to know how much weight to give the various directives that come. But one thing is certain, that the debate was very short, that the change was very rapid. Within a matter of weeks the Communist Party had changed its entire face in relation to policy in this country.

Mr. JACKSON. Actually, following the Duclos letter and denunciation of Browder, the party again went underground, as distinguished from the Communist Political Association?

Mrs. RICHARDS. During the next year there was a tremendous reorganization. The groups were made smaller. I suppose that was for security reasons. The word "underground" I never heard. I did hear at times comments of preparations to go underground.

Mr. JACKSON. The meetings were not advertised in the press?

Mrs. RICHARDS. They were no longer open meetings. They tightened it up tremendously in relation to the recruiting in the next group I belonged to, which I will tell you about later, and I belonged to only briefly; you could no longer bring people to the meeting. The names of possible recruits were presented to the meeting and discussed thoroughly. If there were any real security objections, the person could not be recruited.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it be well to fix the approximate date of that Duclos letter? I think it was April or May 1945.

Mrs. RICHARDS. It was in the spring of 1945. I am not certain of the date.

Mr. TAVENNER. In May of 1945.

Mr. CLARDY. It served as a public declaration of policy that short-circuited the necessity of going through channels. It notified all Communist Party members that because of the position that Duclos occupied, what the line was to be from there on out, didn't it?

Mrs. RICHARDS. That is right. I suppose there was a chance that a revolt—I meant a split—could have occurred, a serious split in the Communist Party. There was a gamble there because, as a matter of fact, Browder enjoyed brief personal popularity.

I know—at least, I have heard—I don't know anybody that left because of Browder. I am certain that some members of the party and probably some very, very able members left with him.

Mr. WALTER. That is why their groups were smaller. You said they were made smaller. They were made smaller because of resentment.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes; I am certain a great number of people left at this time. Whether right or wrong, Browder did adapt himself to the American scene. Whether right or wrong in his theories, which is not really the question, or what his basic intentions were, he certainly presented the Communist position differently than anybody else had.

Mr. WALTER. And he had a personal following.

Mrs. RICHARDS. A large personal following.

Mr. CLARDY. Doesn't that letter give about the best illustration of the iron discipline that prevailed in the Communist apparatus?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. The question of discipline is very interesting to me. It has something to do with why I joined the party.

I think a large number of people are in the party because they don't want to think for themselves. They like the security for only the right answer and the unquestioned right answer, and therefore they don't dare to question these directives, because they are flung out in the cold world, where they have to figure out the answers themselves.

Mr. CLARDY. Their whole foundation is gone, in other words?

Mrs. RICHARDS. It is a question of personal inside security with many, many people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, who was the treasurer of this group?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I cannot remember, sir. I remember paying dues, but there is no face connected with it. I did pay dues at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of the persons who were members of this group with you, which you have described?

Mrs. RICHARDS. This Ocean Park group?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. RICHARDS. I have given you about all the people that I can remember in the group. There were many other people, but because I had no social life with them and because I was so busy I—I believe I have given you all I know. Celia Wilby and Dorothy Olson, Bill and Molly Young and Matt Vidaver.

Now, all of these I remember because they seemed to be active in these parties that were given at my house, and as I say, there may have been other activities at the house. My memory is very incomplete.

Mr. TAVENNER. You told us a moment ago you joined or were assigned to still another group of the Communist Party.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. It was shortly after the Duclos letter. Shortly after the Duclos letter there was a plan to form a separate radio branch.

Now, this is not radio writers, but anybody working in radio.

Mr. TAVENNER. That means technicians, as well as writers?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. Anybody working in the field of radio. The reason for forming the branch, I believe, was to recruit. Actually, there were very few people in radio at that time who were members of the Communist Party. I think they later did successfully recruit a considerable number of people.

I was told to call, I believe told by Matt, or else—I don't know whether I made the call or the call was made to me, but the first contact was Sam Moore, a radio writer.

He asked me to meet with him to discuss organizing a radio branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there a moment.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your discussion of this matter with Sam Moore, did you learn the underlying purpose of the Communist Party in endeavoring to organize a cell within radio?

Mrs. RICHARDS. The only purpose I can remember was the purpose of recruiting Communist Party members.

Now, when you get to whether I understood the purpose of the Communist Party, I was interested in hearing some of the other witnesses here on this question, because I knew the purposes of the Communist Party, in one way, from the beginning. I don't see how anyone can go on to beginners' class of the Communist Party without understanding it has an eventual aim as well as the immediate goal, and the eventual aim is to seize power for the proletariat and to destroy the institutions of the capital estate. I learned that in lesson 2 of my beginning class in Marxism.

However, it is quite true that this does not loom as a very important point in your mind when you are functioning as a Communist. Then you are working for immediate aims and you don't really think that the revolution is just around the corner, not if you live in the United States; there aren't enough signs of it.

Also, you are told, in relation to force and violence, that the violence, if it comes, will be violence forced upon the people by the capitalists who will resent the will of the majority, who will fight savagely to hang onto the institution of capitalism. If you want not to think, as I wanted not to think, you buy this, until one day you take a long look at how the will of the people operates in Czechoslovakia or in other countries, and you find out that the majority will of the people has nothing to do with it. Actually, it is a question of seizing power for the sake of seizing power. So, as I say, I knew the eventual aims of the Communist Party, but I didn't consider them in a very serious way. This, again, is the question of being a dilettante. I think if Hitler had been a good painter he wouldn't have been an amateur politician.

Mr. TAVENNER. That brings us back again to the importance of the educational phase of this whole problem, doesn't it?

Mrs. RICHARDS. That is true, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I interrupted you as you were stating that you had a conference with Mr. Sam Moore about the advisability of organizing a group of the Communist Party within radio.

Mrs. RICHARDS. That is correct. Now, we had several organizational meetings. At first I think Sam and I met alone at his house. Later a girl named Pauline Hopkins became, in a sense, the secretary of the group. And gradually people were added to this group. Either they were transferred in from other groups, as I had been, or perhaps in some cases they were recruited. But at the beginning there were the three of us.

We met, because I had to come clear in from Santa Monica and was very busy. Sunday mornings for a time at Sam's, and later at the house of Pauline Hopkins. I remember Pauline Hopkins' husband, Owen Vinson. However, I do not remember him actually in a meeting. He was baby-sitting downstairs while we met upstairs.

I remember in that group an actress named Lynn Whitney.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point, 4:32 p. m.)

A man named Hy Alexander, I remember, and a girl named—a woman—I believe she was an actress named Georgia Backus. I also remember other people, but not names.

I remember a radio engineer, who attended while I was in the group, perhaps two or three meetings. Oh, yes, there was a man named

Charley Glenn. There were two girl writers, a team. I think they wrote—

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not this person, Charley Glenn, acquired another occupation at another time?

Mrs. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, I have no idea—at that time I don't think his occupation was radio then. I have a feeling—I can't place him in radio at all. If he was in radio I personally don't know what he did. He was married to some woman, I understand, who was a functionary of the party. But that is a name I can't remember, either.

As I say, there were two girl writers whom I cannot remember by name, except one, and the first name was Hope. There were some other people who attended, I remember. I remember an actor that attended. I don't know his name. But I have never seen him since; and another radio actress whom I have never seen again.<sup>1</sup>

But I was actually in the group a relatively short time, because just about the time I started to work in motion pictures and became a screen writer and not a radio writer, so very shortly, I would say in a matter of 2 or 3 months. I was transferred into a screen writing branch, rather than a radio branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the screen writers' branch of the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I can't tell you exactly how long. The party was by this time in turmoil, and especially the Hollywood section of the party, over the great cultural controversy. While I was still in the radio branch there were endless, endless discussions as to the role of the writer in society, and the party's approach to culture.

I remember that Sam Moore and I drew up what we called a minority approach, defending the right of the writer to write, reflecting life as he saw it, rather than to use his writing as a weapon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me stop you there a moment.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say a great deal of discussion occurred within the Communist Party with regard to the role of the writer.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. And in relation to culture generally, the arts generally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what do you mean "in regard to culture and the arts"? Just what was the discussion?

Mrs. RICHARDS. The relation to what function a writer or artist, what function his art should perform. Or for what he should use his art. In other words, the position which finally won—and I am sure this was also, in a sense, part of the international picture, if you see what happened to artists in the Soviet Union, the position which won is that the function of the artist is to use his art as a weapon for progress. If you put it in their words, for the victory of socialism.

The minority, who lost, contended that the function of an artist is to reflect the life around him as he sees it, to shape it into a form and to tell truths with his art, the truths that he feels as an individual and not in relation to some past—

Mr. TAVENNER. To translate that into practical terms, if that were the radio group, to pledge that that group then would be attempting

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently the witness added the following: "I omitted the name of Karen Kinsel, who at the time was not married, but who, I believed, subsequently married Abe Burrows. I am unable to give further identification as to her occupation at the time I knew her."

to mold its product in the form that would best suit the Communist Party.

Mrs. RICHARDS. That would mean that I always felt, and Sam Moore and I always felt that the entire discussion was extremely abstract, in regard to radio. I believe very few radio writers are artists.

I want to say on the question of trying to slant things for Communist propaganda, it seems to me inevitable, if you were a Communist and you believed what you were doing, that will reflect itself in your work.

However, in my personal experience it was impossible to write anything for commercial radio or for motion pictures—this is my personal experience—which did not agree with what was then the popularly held ideas of the times.

I was working, for instance, on Cavalcade of America, under the sponsorship of the Du Pont Corp. Believe me, not one word went out over the air nor did I try, because I was interested in writing good radio shows, or as good as I knew how—not one word could go out which the advertising—the man in charge of advertising for the Du Pont Corp. did not agree with in his heart.

Of course, in that period there were many—the Communist Party was in agreement with a lot more people. I mean it was using the issues on which the people were agreed much more than the issues it uses today. But I think it is terribly important to separate the issues from the Communist Party.

In other words, that if a man—if the Communist Party is anti-Fascist, it doesn't mean that anti-Fascists are Communists. I think this is A, B, C. I feel this very deeply. We should learn that the Communist Party will, as a matter of fact, join forces with fascism if it serves their purposes.

We know about the Nazi-German pact. I remember in Rockland County when the Communist Party was joined with the America First Committee on a platform against lend-lease—I think the America First Committee has also been investigated by the committee—today it has been factually proven former Nazi groups are financed behind the Iron Curtain.

I think it is extremely important to separate the issues from the party. While it may have been the aim of the Communist Party to influence the content of radio scripts, very little could be done with which the American people were not largely in agreement with.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder reentered the hearing room at this point, 4:43 p. m.)

Mr. TAVENNER. After you were transferred to the group of screenwriters, who were the members of the Communist Party in that group that you were associated with?

Mrs. RICHARDS. One of the members was Ed Chodorov. We met once, I remember, at his home. And Millard Lampell and his wife, whose name I do not remember. A man named Louis Allen and his wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occupation of Louis Allen?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Louis Allen, I believe, was a playwright. He was at that time active in the Actors' Lab.

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

Mrs. RICHARDS. Allen?

Mr. TAVENNER. Allen.

Mrs. RICHARDS. I don't know whether it is "en" or "an," A-l-l-e-n or a-n. But he was a playwright and his wife was also a member—George and Tiba Willner. He was an agent. It was a writers' group, largely, but he was an agent.

Howard Dimsdale, Ed Rolfe, a writer, and Lee Gold, and a girl, Tamara Hovey.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the first name?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I believe it is T-a-m-a-r-a. I am not sure of that. Tammie, they called her; it is a nickname. There were other members in that group. These were the ones I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any particular activity of that group which would indicate its primary interest?

Mrs. RICHARDS. If "primary interest" was writers and their problems, the cultural controversy continued to rage. I think the famous Albert Maltz article on left-wing criticism was published at about the time that I entered that group, and its retraction was published some 2 or 3 weeks later.

I can remember mostly my last meeting with that group, and my last meeting in the Communist Party at which a discussion was led by Louis Allen. The discussion was called the Contribution of Writers in the War. And, as he started to discuss country by country the tremendous roles that writers had played in winning the war, it became apparent that the only writers who had done anything to win the war were Communist writers.

As an example, the only writers he mentioned in France, in which nearly every writer was in the underground, were Louis Aragon and his wife, whose name I forget at the moment, a novelist.

Then in this country he mentioned Theodore Dreiser and Howard Fast.

When he got to Spain, Spain having not so many well-known writers, he mentioned the Spanish poet Lorca, and said Lorca was executed by the Franco forces during the Spanish Civil War, and he said that Lorca was not a Communist when the Fascists killed him, but he was about to become one.

So, at the end of the meeting or when the discussion started, I took rather violent exception to their discussion. I said that I thought it was an extremely narrow approach to the question of what writers had done to win the war; that I thought it was presumptuous to assume that Lorca was about to become a Communist, since there was nothing political in any of his writings. He was, as a matter of fact, a lyric poet and dramatist, and most of his plays are about love and not about politics.

Then I said, "And if Theodore Dreiser had died 2 years earlier, he wouldn't have made the list."

So, this was not received very well, and I never attended a Communist Party meeting after that, although I had one brief contact with the Communist Party after that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I received a call from a man named Arnold Manoff, who wanted to know why I was not attending party meetings. I said that I had differences with the party.



He said that if they were cultural differences these were going to be ironed out; that this was a sectarian period.

I said that by now my differences were also political; that I was no longer a Communist and did not want to be considered one.

And that was my last contact with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately when was that?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Again I can only place it by the Maltz article, which I believe was early in the summer of 1946, spring of 1946. And I left soon thereafter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, since that time have you been affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Not since that time; no sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you knowingly aided or abetted the Communist Party in any of its projects since that time?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I don't know whether—I believe I signed the petition for the 10 or for the 19 who went to Washington in 1947. I am not certain about that. I may have.

I think you have heard over and over that leaving the party is a gradual process. You think your way out, as you didn't think your way in.

I was thinking today of what happened to me after that particular night. I started to read the forbidden books of Koestler, all these wicked things. I read with great interest the controversy of Lysenko in the Soviet Union, and I began for the first time to think what I had been in.

The two things that stand out the most are the Lysenko—the Soviet bulletin on musicians, somebody showed me the Soviet Embassy bulletin after the musicians, the composers, had been disciplined, and when I read how great composers like Shostakovich would say humiliating things such as, "I have the greatest respect for melody and I will try to use more of it in the future," this did a great deal to wean me away.

Then I read in Arthur Koestler a very interesting thing. He said, in *Darkness of Noon*, "In the life of every Communist there comes a moment when he hears screams."

The first screams I heard were outraged intellect. But I since then have been able to see the slave-labor camps, and the 14 million killed in China, or 11 million; the figures vary.

So, as I say, it takes a while to get out, but when you finally are out it is a complete change.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am interested in the statement that you made about your reading the forbidden things.

Mrs. RICHARDS. There were a great many books that were forbidden for one reason or another to Communist Party members. Books by Trotskyites, books by enemies of the party, books which are decadent, such as Andreiev, Proust. I don't suppose a person would be expelled from the party for reading Proust, but these people are attacked as decadent.

Magazines like the *Partisan Review*, which is a fine literary magazine; it is considered a Trotskyite publication.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, there is a form of book censorship in the Communist Party?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. As a matter of fact, on the subject of Trotskyism, friendship with a Trotskyite was ground for expulsion throughout my membership in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time gone to a Government agency and informed them of your knowledge of the Communist Party activities?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes, sir; I did. Shortly after the beginning of the Korean war I felt that I wanted to clarify my position; that I did not want to be identified with the death of U. N. soldiers in Korea, or to even share the responsibility in a negative sense; so I went to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and made a statement. It was about 2 weeks after the beginning of the Korean war.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I believe at quite an early date you spoke with investigators of this committee, or one of them?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I believe nearly 3 years ago I met Mr. Wheeler for the first time.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long ago?

Mrs. RICHARDS. At the very beginning of the hearings. I think that was nearly 3 years ago if my memory is correct, or 2½ anyway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not in your opinion there has been any change in attitude on the part of the public, and possibly the employers in this area, with regard to the question of communism within the entertainment field?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I think there has been a very distinct change in the motion-picture industry. I can't talk about the public. We live in sort of little tracks out here. We go to the studio and we go home; that's about all. But at the beginning of this investigation I think there was a tremendous amount of confusion in Hollywood with relation to them.

There is one thing that has cleared up in particular that I feel very good about. One of the things which deters people from making a public announcement of their change in relation to communism, even if they have left the party is that in addition to earning the hatred and contempt of their former friends and associates, they are shunned by a large number of other people who think that once a Communist always a Communist.

Now, in the motion-picture industry, while it is very sensitive to public opinion, has in this regard done this—and it is a very courageous thing—and that is they have made it possible for people to announce this change of position without stigma or without being penalized.

I think this is due to a number of factors. That the committee itself, the procedures of the committee, in that it has heard evidence and not wild hearsay and gossip, has been very reassuring to the industry.

I think there are certain individuals in the industry—some of the first cooperative witnesses had a very rough time. One is a close friend of mine, and I know he had a rough time. But because of certain individuals that I don't know—I understand Mr. Roy Brewer has worked very hard to get the industry to recognize this policy toward people who come before the committee, and as a result, generally speaking, insofar as my knowledge is concerned, the industry is extremely friendly to people who come here and cooperate with the committee.

Of course, another thing which has changed the feeling in town a great deal are the recent Prague trials and the use of anti-Semitism which is involved, and the use of this anti-Semitism for political purposes.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mrs. Richards, may I, on behalf of the committee, thank you for your appearance here today and assure you that we are very happy to have the sum of your testimony added to that already received by the committee.

Your intelligence and your understanding of the problems which grow out of your experience are much needed by the forces which are combating human slavery throughout the world today. Your contribution is unique in this fight and will continue to be unique because of the fact that you can draw upon your personal knowledge of these things.

I am sure that I express the opinion of all the committee members and of the staff in wishing you well and in thanking you very much for your kind cooperation.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You are excused.

The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 5 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Thursday, March 26, 1953.)



# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Alexander, Hy	425
Allen, Louis	427, 428
Amter, Israel	419
Anderson, Betty	311
Aragon, Louis	428
Arno, Peter	356
Arren	296
Backus, Georgia	425
Baker, Phil	356
Bargeman, Bertha (Mrs. Marvin Bargeman)	352
Bargeman, Marvin	352
Barzman, Sol	339-341
Bassman, George	269, 311, 349
Beck, George	395
Becker	418
Bela, Nick	349
Belcher, Frank B.	324
Bennett, Connie Lee	350
Bennett, Seymour	350
Benoff, Nathan Max	350, 355-361 (testimony)
Benny, Jack	356
Berkeley, Martin	269-271, 289, 293, 311, 313, 363, 364, 366
Bessie, Alvah	348
Biberman, Edward	311, 321-323, 349
Biberman, Herbert	275, 307, 308, 311, 364, 366
Blankfort, Henry	269, 349
Blankfort, Laurie	349
Bloor, Mother	419
Blowitz, William	349
Bolger, Ray	357
Boretz, Allen	348
Bradbury, Mary	322, 324
Brandy, Ed	418
Brewer, Roy	430
Brice, Fanny	357
Bridges	325
Bright, John	311, 348
Brinkarnt, Arthur (Art)	350, 351
Browder, Earl	355, 420-423
Buchman, Harold	348, 351
Buchman, Sidney	351, 362-366, 368
Burns, Georgia	301
Burns, Jessie	275
Burrows, Abe	426
Burton, Val	350
Butler, Hugo	349
Cantor, Eddie	356, 357
Carnovsky, Morris	288, 289
Casey, Jim	384, 385
Chodorov, Edward	269, 289, 427
Clark, Maurice	350
Cohn, Morris E.	319-326, 361-370
Cole, Lester	343, 348, 349

	Page
Collins, Richard (Dick)_____	343, 348, 350
Coningore, Dorothy_____	350
Crawford, Joan_____	414
Curtiss, Paul_____	348
Cyril_____	274
Dare, Danny_____	268-292 (testimony) 297, 364
Davis, Herbert (alias for Herbert Goldfrank)_____	418
Davis, Joan_____	357
Dimitrov_____	345
Dimsdale, Howard_____	349, 428
Dmytryk, Edward_____	363-366
Douglas, Helen Gahagan_____	393
Dreiser, Theodore_____	428
Duclos, Jacques_____	334, 354, 355, 422-424
D'Usseau, Arnaud_____	348
Eastman, Philip Dey_____	319-326 (testimony)
Elisen, Edward_____	269, 273, 288, 348
Endfield, Cy_____	348
Endore, Guy_____	269, 348
Esterman, William B_____	317-319, 371-380, 396, 398-413
Faragoh, Francis Edward (pen name, Edward Francois)_____	269, 361-370 (testimony)
Faragoh, Elizabeth (Mrs. Francis Faragoh)_____	364, 366
Fast, Howard_____	428
Fay, William_____	306
Flanagan, Hallie_____	303
Fleury, Mrs. Bernyce Polifka_____	321-323
Foreman, Carl_____	339-341
Foreman, Estelle (Mrs. Carl Foreman)_____	339, 340
Foster_____	325
Franco_____	428
Francois, Edward (pen name for Francis Faragoh)_____	369
Frazier, Leon_____	328
Gang, Martin_____	268-292
Gardner, Ed_____	356, 357
Glen, Charley_____	426
Glickman, Kelly_____	289
Gold, Lee_____	428
Goldfrank; Goldfrank, Herbert (party name, Herbert Davis)_____	416, 418
Goldstone, Charles_____	306
Goldstone, Nat_____	306
Gordon, Emily_____	329, 331
Gordon, Julian_____	327-336 (testimony)
Gorney, Jay_____	273
Grant, Morton_____	349
Greenberg_____	418
Grennard, Elliott_____	350
Harris, Jet_____	391
Hathaway, Clarence_____	383
Hecht, Harold_____	292, 293-317 (testimony)
Higgins, Jimmy_____	385
Hoover, President_____	328
Hope_____	426
Hopkins, Pauline_____	425
Hovey, Tamara_____	428
Huebsch, Edward_____	317-319 (testimony), 349, 371-380 (testimony), 396
Hudson, Roy_____	419
Hurst, Fannie_____	386, 387
James, Dan_____	348
Jarrico, Paul_____	343, 348, 359
Jerome, V. J._____	299-303, 387-390
Jones_____	403
Josephson, Leon_____	416
Kahn, Gordon_____	311, 348, 359

	Page
Kibbee, Roland	314
King	393
Kinsel, Karen	426
Klausky, Max	397, 401, 402
Koenig, Lester	349
Koestler, Arthur	429
Kondolf, George	303
Lampell, Millard	349, 427
Lampell, Mrs. Millard	427
Lang, David A.	336-355 (testimony), 356, 357
Langerlin, Pauline	350
Lardner, Ring, Jr.	348, 349, 359
Lauber, Pauline	275
Lawson, John Howard	274, 311, 340, 343, 348, 359, 364, 366
Lennart, Isobel	350
Leonard, Charles	340, 341
Lev, Comrade	418
Levitt, Al	350
Levy, Mel	311
Lewis	295
Light, Louise	331
Lorca	428
Lubouiski, Milton	348
Lysenko	429
Lytton, Herbert	390, 413
Lytton, Bart	380, 381-396 (testimony)
Maltz, Albert	285, 288, 311, 359, 392, 428, 429
Manoff, Arnold	350, 428
Marshall, Daniel G.	371-380
Martin, Henrietta	350
Meyers, Henry	273, 288, 349
Mindlin, Eunice	350
Moffitt, Robert A.	381-396
Moore, Sam	424-427
Morgan, Stephen	337, 338
Morley	273
Murray, Ken	357
Nebenzahl, Seymour	393
North, Joseph	349
Offner, Mortimer	269, 273, 350
Olson, Ben	422
Olson, Dorothy	422, 424
Ornitz, Samuel	348, 366
Pearson, Rose	301
Peck, Trudy	301
Proust	429
Purcell, Gertrude	307, 308, 310, 311
Rantz, Louis	293, 306, 313
Rapf, Maurice	349
Reis, Meta ( <i>see also</i> Meta Reis Rosenberg)	311, 312
Richards, Silvia	413-431 (testimony)
Riggs, Tommy	356
River, W. L.	350
Robert, Bob	350
Roberts, Marguerite	350
Rolfe, Ed.	428
Roosevelt	277-279, 281, 309, 393
Rosenberg, Meta Reis ( <i>see also</i> Meta Reis)	311, 363, 364, 366
Rossen, Robert	269, 348, 357, 361
Rosser, Lou	329
Rousseau, Louise	350
Ruthven, Madelaine	307, 311, 338, 344, 346
Salt, Waldo	349
Schlesinger, Leon	321, 323
Schneiderman, William	349

	Page
Schoen, Max	331
Schulberg, Budd	311
Scott, Adrian	348, 364, 366
Shapiro, Victor	350
Shore, Wilma	350
Shostakovich	429
Siegel, Sylvia	296
Silver, Max	329
Sklar, George	260, 289, 350
Sloan, Robert	301
Smith, Walter	397
Solomon, Joe	347
Solomon, Lou	340, 341
Sondergaard, Gale	311
Springer, Joseph	396-413 (testimony)
Springer, Preva (Mrs. Joseph Springer)	396, 403, 408, 409
Stanford, John	350
Taffel, Bess	269, 350
Tarloff, Frank	350
Thomas, Norman	384
Torg	418
Towusend, Pauline	381
Trabasis, Paul	343
Tree, Dorothy	364, 366
Trivers, Paul	349
Truman, President	292
Trumbo, Dalton	343, 348, 359
Tuttle, Frank	275, 307, 311, 314
Tuttle, Tanya	275, 287
Uris, Michael	350, 364, 366
Vidaver, Matt	420, 421, 424
Vinson, Owen	425
Wallace, Henry	394
Wanger, Walter	414
Wexley, John	350
White, Irving J.	269, 273-277, 285-287, 289, 364
Whitney, Lynn	425
Wilby, Celia	422, 424
Wilkie	279
Williams, Edward Bennet	293-317, 355-361
Willner, George	312-314, 350, 428
Willner, Tiba (Mrs. George Willner)	428
Wilson, Michael	339
Winchell, Walter	356
Winter, Ella	349
Yankwich, Judge	379
Yates, Oleta O'Connor	349
Young, Bill	420, 424
Young, Mollie (Mrs. Bill Young)	420, 424
Zimet, Julian	350

## ORGANIZATIONS

Actors' Laboratory	285, 286, 287, 288, 427
American Federation of Labor	375
America First Committee	427
American Labor Party	419
American Legion	284
Anti-Nazi League	273, 284
Army Relief	292
Bank of America	409
Bank for International Settlements	328
Bay City Club of the Communist Party	420
Berlitz School of Languages	329
Bernhardt-Vidor Productions	414
Big Brothers of America	292



	Page
British War Relief	419
Bunin	328
California Committee on Un-American Activities	287
Cambridge University	328
Camp Tenaya	396, 399, 400, 403, 404, 409
Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles	328
China War Relief	393
Congress of Industrial Organizations	294, 375
College of the City of New York	362
Colorado College	413
Columbia Pictures	414
Columbia University	362
Crusade for Freedom	272, 284, 285
Cub Scout	292
Department of Justice	271
DeWitt Clinton High School	336
DuPont Corp.	427
Federal Bureau of Investigation	430
Federal District Court of Washington, D. C.	318
Federal Theater	293, 296-299, 301-306, 310, 316
Harvard University	328
Hollywood Canteen	292
Hollywood Communist Club	330, 332, 333
Hollywood Democratic Committee	273
Hollywood Democratic League	284
Hollywood Democratic Party	360
Hollywood Theater Alliance	269, 273, 275, 276, 282, 284, 285, 287-289, 292
Hollywood Victory Caravan	292
Italian Embassy	385
Jewish League Against Communism	284
Juarez Division of the Communist Party	401
Leon Schlesinger Studios	321
Lincoln Bookstore	348
Los Angeles Bar Association	324
May Day Parade	415
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer	336, 337, 341
Motion Picture Democratic Committee	392, 393
Nat Goldstone Agency	293, 306, 311-313
National Academy of Design	320
Navy Relief	292, 393
Nazi-Soviet Pact	277, 308, 309, 427
New Theater League	388, 390
Northwestern University	381
Paramount Pictures	312, 340-342, 357
Parent-Teacher Association	292
Radio Writers' Guild	392
Red Cross	292, 393
RKO	357, 394
Russian War Relief	393, 419
Screen Gents, Inc.	337
Securities and Exchange Commission	403
Seventh World Congress of the Communist Party	385
Screen Writers' Guild	352, 353
Staunton Military Academy	381
Supreme Court of the United States	374, 375
The Technicolor Motion Picture Co.	328
Theater Alliance	285
Theater Guild	293
Time, Inc.	416
Thomas Jefferson Book Store	420
Twentieth Century-Fox	357, 414
United States Army	293, 312-314, 321, 374
United States Navy	357, 361
USO	393
Universal	393
Universal-International	414

	Page
University of Virginia.....	381, 383
Variety Clubs of America.....	292
Walt Disney Studios.....	321, 323
Warner Bros.....	357, 414
Warner Bros. Cartoons.....	321, 323
Westminster College.....	381
Workers' Alliance.....	295, 296
Workers' School, New York.....	384, 385
Works Progress Administration.....	295, 297, 299
World Bank.....	328
World's Fair Corp.....	415

## PUBLICATIONS

Ballyhoo.....	356
Bnai Brith Messenger.....	407
Country Press.....	381, 392
Daily News.....	375
Daily Worker.....	294, 295, 299, 366, 375, 383, 384, 389, 407, 417
La Opinion.....	407
L'Humanité.....	422
Los Angeles Examiner.....	328, 407
Los Angeles Herald.....	407
Los Angeles Times.....	328, 407
New Masses.....	349, 389
New Theater Magazine.....	390
Partisan Review.....	429
People's World.....	407
Soviet Russia Today.....	415, 416
Sunday Worker.....	417
Valley Jewish News.....	407





