

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

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

MAY 22, 23, 24, 25; JUNE 25 AND 26, 1951

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



**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1951**

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN S. WOOD., Georgia, *Chairman*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

	Page
May 22, 1951:	
Testimony of José Ferrer-----	533
May 23, 1951:	
Testimony of Budd Schulberg-----	581
May 24, 1951:	
Testimony of Frank Wright Tuttle-----	625
May 25, 1951:	
Testimony of José Ferrer (resumed)-----	647
June 25, 1951:	
Testimony of Robert Rossen-----	671
June 26, 1951:	
Testimony of J. Edward Bromberg-----	719

LII

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:30 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter (appearance as noted in transcript), Morgan M. Moulder (appearance as noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order, please.

Let the record show that there are present of the members of the committee, Messrs. Doyle, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Wood, a quorum of the committee.

Whom do you have, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. José Ferrer.

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

Mr. FERRER. I do, sir.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF JOSÉ FERRER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ABE FORTAS AND EDWARD REISKIND

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

Mr. FERRER. José Ferrer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. FERRER. I am, sir.

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

Mr. FORTAS. I am Abe Fortas, of the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, Ring Building, Washington, D. C., representing Mr. Ferrer.

Mr. REISKIND. I am Edwin Reiskind, New York City, attorney for Mr. Ferrer.

Mr. WOOD. What is your office address, please?

Mr. REISKIND. 1270 Sixth Avenue.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer, will you state briefly for the committee what your educational training has been?

Mr. FERRER. Most of my education took place, through high school, in New York City. I went to various schools, and I only went to school in Puerto Rico 2 years, first and second years of high school.

Mr. WOOD. May I ask that you speak a little louder? We can't hear you up here.

Mr. FERRER. Righto. Most of my education up to college, that is through high school, took place in New York City. The first and second years of high school, I went to school in Puerto Rico.

When I graduated from high school I spent a year preparing for my college-entrance examination. I went abroad, to Switzerland, for a year, then entered Princeton in the fall of 1928 as a member of the class of 1932. I did not graduate in 1932, but did graduate in 1933. I majored in architecture. In 1933 I decided to change my profession, and did an additional year's work at Princeton in modern languages.

Then from 1934 to 1935 I studied at Columbia University with the intention of getting a master's degree in modern languages. I completed all the requirements for this degree except that of writing my thesis, the reason for not writing my thesis being that in June 1935 I decided to go into the theater professionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline briefly to the committee what your experience has been after entering the profession of acting?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered hearing room.)

Mr. FERRER. Well, to make it brief, from 1935 to the present time I have been connected with 24 Broadway productions; I have done about 70 weeks of stock; and I have been in 4 motion pictures. Would you care for any names, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Suppose you name three or four of the principal Broadway productions with which you have been associated.

Mr. FERRER. The ones that might be best known to the general public, sir, would be Brother Rat, Charlie's Aunt—

Mr. TAVENNER. Both of those were also adapted to the movies?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in the movie productions?

Mr. FERRER. No; I did not. The Theatre Guild's production of Othello; Cyrano de Bergerac on the stage; The Silver Whistle; and now Twentieth Century with Miss Swanson.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Now if you will state the main screen productions.

Mr. FERRER. There were four. The first was Joan of Arc, starring Ingrid Bergman. The second was Whirlpool, starring Gene Tierney. The third was Crisis, starring Cary Grant. And the fourth was Cyrano de Bergerac.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about the picture Strange Fruit?

Mr. FERRER. That has never been made on film.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a stage production?

Mr. FERRER. Yes. I produced and directed it but did not play in it. I didn't mention it because it was not very much of a success. It only ran a few weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the period of time during which you were engaged as an actor in screen productions? What was the date of your first engagement as an actor?

Mr. FERRER. I am trying to remember if it was 1947 or 1948. I think it was 1947, September of 1947. I was engaged for a period of 3 weeks in Joan of Arc. Whirlpool was in 1949, the months of June and July. Crisis was in 1950, the months of January and February. And Cyrano was in 1950, the month of July.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in Hollywood on each of the occasions you have listed?

Mr. FERRER. Generally speaking, Mr. Tavenner, it has been my practice to leave Hollywood as soon as the picture is terminated. There are two exceptions. In every case I arrived just in time to start work. After Joan of Arc I remained in Hollywood for approximately 4 weeks beyond the term of by contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you not have to be in Hollywood for a period of time prior to the actual production of the picture?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. As a matter of fact, when I arrived in Hollywood for Joan of Arc they had already begun shooting. That was a vast production, 4 months, and I only worked 3 weeks. For Whirlpool I arrived just before they began shooting and left right after. Crisis, I stayed afterward because we began preparatory work for Cyrano de Bergerac. I worked on Cyrano for 3 or 4 months before the actual shooting began, because having produced as well as played in the Broadway production, they felt I could be useful to them in the capacity of a technical adviser on the film.

Mr. TAVENNER. What periods did you spend in Hollywood in addition to those you have described?

Mr. FERRER. I was in Los Angeles, living in downtown Los Angeles, for 3 weeks when Othello played in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in 1943, was it not?

Mr. FERRER. 1945, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1945?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir, in January 1945.

I was in Hollywood for 4 weeks during the summer of 1939 under contract to RKO, a contract which resulted in no work. At the end of 4 weeks we called it off by mutual consent.

I was in Hollywood on several occasions during 1950 for a day or two or a week at a time, when I was doing a national publicity junket for Cyrano. I traveled all over the country and appeared in about a dozen cities, spoke on Cyrano, and during the course of this junket had occasion to return to California on several occasions.

Mr. Wood. Again may I suggest that you talk a little louder.

Mr. FERRER. I am sorry, sir. I thought this [indicating loud-speaker] was serving some purpose. Apparently it isn't. I will speak louder.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you completed your answer?

Mr. FERRER. I was just going to say, Mr. Tavenner, which may be a gratuitous remark on my part, that my stay in Los Angeles has always been as a transient. I have never lived there or considered it my residence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer, after the service of a subpoena on you, the committee received a letter from you, through counsel, in which you stated:

I attest and will so swear under oath that I am not, have never been, could not be, a member of the Communist Party, nor, specifically, am I a sympathizer with any Communist aim, a fellow traveler, or in any way an encourager of any Communist Party concept or objective.

Is that substantially your statement?

Mr. FERRER. I assume it is, Mr. Tavenner. In any event, that definitely reflects my views.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reason I read it to you is it appeared in the letter as a quotation, and therefore I assumed it was your statement.

Mr. FERRER. Yes. I now have a copy of the letter. Yes, it is accurate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. I am not now nor have I ever been.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a sympathizer?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paraphrasing the language of your statement, have you been a sympathizer with any Communist aim, or have you been a fellow traveler, or in any way an encourager of any Communist Party concept or objective?

Mr. FERRER. The only time I could even remotely be said to have been in sympathy with any Communist aim was when it coincided with the aim of our Government. For instance, when they wanted us to win the last war, I certainly was in sympathy with that; but in the sense you indicate, I never was.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information indicating your affiliation or connection with quite a number of organizations which have from time to time been cited by various governmental agencies as Communist-front organizations. You, of course, are aware that affiliations with or activities in Communist-front organizations, if true and unexplained, leave the implication that one is in fact a member of the Communist Party or has been, or that he is in fact a sympathizer of the Communist Party or an encourager of Communist Party concepts and objectives. You agree with that, do you not?

Mr. FERRER. Yes. This has been made dramatically clear to me recently, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is quite concerned about the use of Communist fronts in exploiting the objectives of the Communist Party, and that is particularly true with regard to Hollywood, which is only one phase of the entertainment field.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. A witness who appeared here before this committee last week, Mr. Roy M. Brewer, whose position with a labor union in Hollywood over a long period of time has put him in a position of having special knowledge on this subject, states that the real power that they [the Communists] had in Hollywood was through their front organizations. He also testified at some length regarding the Communist fronts in Hollywood. This may in one way or another be true as to all the entertainment fields. At least, it applies to Hollywood.

Mr. Brewer testified as follows, on page 131 of the transcript:¹

* * * The Communist fronts played a very important part in publicizing the class struggle and publicizing their efforts to infiltrate and take control of all trade-union activities which they felt would promote the philosophy of their party.

But in this Hollywood situation the fronts played an even more important part in this control of the thought of the community, which certainly followed over into the unions and made it very difficult for those of us who were trying to expose the Communist nature of this thing to get that idea across.

During this period the fronts played a very important part in controlling the thought of the community, which I testified to yesterday. This was really the instrument by which they got all these people, most of whom were honest, sincere people who wanted to do the right thing, who wanted to serve humanity in a practical way, and wound up finding themselves in an organization that had been manipulated by the Communist Party day after day, week after week, and month after month.

That illustrates what has been testified to here as to the importance of Communist-front activities in the entertainment field.

Now, the committee desires to ask you a number of questions relating to your own special knowledge of Communist fronts in Hollywood, not only for the purpose of finding what your own connection with those organizations was, but to ascertain the manner in which your assistance was secured, if that be true, and the method by which these organizations function. So, I will start off asking you about various Communist-front organizations with which we have information that you have at one time or another been connected.

First of all, do you have any comment to make upon the testimony of Mr. Brewer that I have just read to you about the importance of Communist-front activities in, let us say, the broader field of entertainment, unless you desire to confine it to the Hollywood area particularly?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner, my comment would have to be in the broader field, because I don't know enough about any organized activity in Hollywood. I have never belonged to any committee or group in Hollywood of any sort whatever except the Screen Actors' Guild. Regarding the broader phases of the entertainment field, I would say that undoubtedly what Mr. Brewer says probably is very perceptive and very accurate, not only as regards Communist-front activities, but also, very importantly from my personal point of view, the way innocent and well-intentioned people have been deceived and lured into participation in causes which at one time seemed worthy and later on appeared unworthy.

Any comment, I say, I would have to make on Mr. Brewer's testimony, would have to apply to the broader field and not to Hollywood specifically.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have anything else you desired to say?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a pamphlet entitled "Artists' Front to Win the War," published by that organization October 16, 1942. It reflects that you are one of the sponsors of the theater section of that organization. Were you affiliated with it in any way?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner, may I see the pamphlet?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

¹ See pp. 518 and 519, pt. 2, of hearings printed under this title.

Mr. FERRER. And to explain my request to see it, I would like to tell you that my memory in these matters is controlled largely by association. If I can see where a function took place and who was there, then I am able to tell you accurately my participation.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will be glad to refresh your recollection as far as we can.

Mr. FERRER. Thank you. [After examining document:] I have no recollection of this whatever, Mr. Tavenner. It is entirely possible, and even probable, that the listing of my name is legitimate and that I did authorize it, but I do not have any recollection of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. This pamphlet, under date October 16, 1942, has a heading, as you noticed, in the center of the pamphlet, For a Second Front This Year. You do recall, do you not, that that was the Communist Party line during that period in 1942, to urge the establishment of a second front, and that the Communist Party went all out to establish that line?

Mr. FERRER. I recall that in the light of later knowledge. I did not know at the time that it was the Communist Party line.

Mr. MOULDER. A second front in what?

Mr. TAVENNER. In World War II. That is correct, isn't it?

Mr. FERRER. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. In fact, that is the only purpose shown for the establishment of this organization, Artists' Front to Win the War?

Mr. FERRER. Would you like me to explain why I probably allowed my name to be used?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. Looking over the names of the sponsors, the general technique is to come to someone, by letter or otherwise, and say, "You realize that a second front must be established." And to make yourself appear to be a person of some sagacity, you say, "Yes." Then they say, "Important people are ready to move in that direction," and they show you a list of distinguished names, leaders in cultural and various fields, names you associate with integrity and authority, and if it seems a worth-while cause—and I am speaking only for myself—you say, "Certainly, use my name."

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were one of the distinguished persons in the field of actors?

Mr. FERRER. I don't think I was very distinguished in 1942, Mr. Tavenner. There is a question whether I am distinguished now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who solicited your affiliation with this organization?

Mr. FERRER. No; I don't. I have no knowledge of this organization at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do recall that sometime later this organization was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities and the California committee; do you not?

Mr. FERRER. I recall it in the light of the work and the research that I have done recently; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was a committee known as the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The committee possesses information indicating that your name was listed as the sponsor of a dinner given by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born held April 17, 1943, at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City. Do you recall sponsoring that dinner and attending it?

Mr. FERRER. I am pretty sure I did not attend it, Mr. Tavenner, and I will say I think I remember sponsoring it simply because it has been proven to me time and again, especially in the last few weeks, that one's memory can be treacherous, especially about things which, although undoubtedly important, are peripheral to one's activities.

Were you to ask me about the theater, I would recall even if it was a long time ago, but this kind of thing, I do not devote most of my thought to it, and I can't say I remember or don't because I am not sure what I do remember. I am sure my name was used legitimately in this connection. I am reasonably certain, because of the people connected with this dinner, that I authorized the use of my name, but I must be tentative in my answer if I am to be entirely truthful, which I am trying to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. What association did you have with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, if any?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember any connection whatever. What probably happened, again, is that I received a letter saying: "We are having this dinner; will you lend us your name?" Then they cited some distinguished names connected with the dinner. I don't remember who they were, but wasn't Mrs. Roosevelt's name and other names used in soliciting sponsors?

Mr. TAVENNER. There were the names of a number of people. I do not see the name you mentioned. I am handing you the list of sponsors.

Mr. FERRER (examining list). Dorothy Thompson, William Allen White, and Edward G. Robinson were among the people who spoke at that dinner.

In connection with the foreign-born, Mr. Tavenner, I would say that I would probably be predisposed emotionally to help the foreign-born in any legitimate cause in this country, because of the fact that I am a Puerto Rican, that I was born in Puerto Rico, that I was born an American citizen in Puerto Rico, as all Puerto Ricans are, and I am deeply aware of the fact that although I myself have always been treated admirably in this country, I have many Puerto Rican friends, and there are many I don't know, who are treated as foreigners in this country and as people who are unwanted. I am extremely sympathetic to their problems and do all I can to alleviate them. Therefore, an organization to help the foreign-born would have an immediate appeal to my emotions.

Mr. TAVENNER. But are you familiar with the extent to which the Communist Party has endeavored to infiltrate organizations that may be interested in that cause?

Mr. FERRER. Unfortunately, I have become aware only in recent months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know that this organization has been cited as subversive?

Mr. FERRER. I know that now.

Mr. TAVENNER. By this committee and also by the California committee. I want to ask you questions now concerning the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The December 21, 1943, issue of New Masses, at page 31, contains an advertisement indicating that José Ferrer, among others, was to be an entertainer at an all-star show to be held on January 26, 1944, at the Imperial Theater in New York

under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Did you appear as an entertainer on that occasion?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain to the committee how your name happened to appear in the advertisement?

Mr. FERRER. I think what probably happened is that they came to me and said, "Will you appear?" and I agreed to appear because, as I remember, Jimmy Durante, Milton Berle, and other people prominent in show business were going to appear. The reason I didn't appear is probably because an actor such as I am as not qualified to entertain at this kind of a benefit. When a man can sing a song or tell stories or make jokes or tap dance, he is qualified to go out and entertain 2, 3, 4, 5, or 10 minutes with an act. An actor is, as a rule, in a play which begins about 8:30 or 8:45 and ends at 11, and he works with other actors in a carefully designed entertainment program. What we usually do when called upon to appear at benefits is either to introduce entertainers or to say, "I am very happy to be here, greetings, and good night," and get away as gracefully as possible until Ray Bolger comes.

What probably happened is that I got cold feet and ducked, because I knew if I appeared I would be somewhat of a lull in the program. But I did agree to appear and just didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were more or less active, were you not, with this organization, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. FERRER. I was from time to time; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make contributions to it?

Mr. FERRER. I don't believe so. If I may ask counsel, they would be able to tell you better than I can.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. FERRER (continuing). They are of the opinion I did not.

Mr. FORTAS. We have a list, Mr. Tavenner, of all contributions Mr. Ferrer made to any cause so far as they can be ascertained from his own records, and will be glad to supply that if you want it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you take a hurried glance at the list and see if you have made contributions to this organization?

Mr. FERRER. I suspect they will take careful glances.

Mr. FORTAS. Would you like to have a copy, Mr. Tavenner?

(Copy of document was handed to Mr. Tavenner.)

Mr. WOOD. May I inquire if there are extra copies of the list available for the members of the committee?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes, sir [handing copies to members of committee].

Mr. TAVENNER. I have looked at the list, and I do not see any contributions to this organization. Does that mean that you did not make any contributions as far as you know?

Mr. FERRER. As far as I know, Mr. Tavenner. Any contribution I would have made I would have made by check, and this list is made from a thorough search of my check books.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in other activities with regard to the raising of money or benefits for what was known as the Spanish Refugee Appeal?

Mr. FERRER. I think I probably did, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were acquainted with the fact that the Spanish Refugee Appeal was one of the projects of the organization with

which you say you were connected, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. FERRER. I am aware now. Whether I was then, I am not sure. I certainly linked them together in my mind. I am not trying to evade your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information indicating you were the guest of honor at a meeting sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in San Francisco on March 10, 1945. Do you recall that?

Mr. FERRER. If it is the one at which Walter Huston spoke, then I do recall it; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about that meeting. What was the purpose of it?

Mr. FERRER. My memory is vague on that subject. I suspect the purpose was, so far as I knew and so far as Mr. Huston's speech indicated, which is what I remember about the meeting, action against Franco. We who called ourselves liberal Democrats considered Franco a dictator, a man who was against the democratic processes, as Hitler had been and as Stalin is today, and anytime there was an occasion to oppose him I, for one, rather unquestioningly did so.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information that you spoke at a Spanish Refugee Appeal benefit held for the purpose of raising funds on May 5, 1945, at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., which was sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Do you recall that?

Mr. FERRER. I think I do. I know I spoke.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us what the arrangements were by which you were to appear at these various meetings, and whether it was a series of meetings that you attended.

Mr. FERRER. No. During the season 1944 to 1945 I was on tour with Othello, and what would happen, as in San Francisco or Madison, would be that we would be playing in San Francisco, and in the case of Madison we were playing in Chicago, and Madison is only 3 hours away, and I was asked would I appear and speak, and I agreed to, my sole thought being anti-Franco activity.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any arrangement made prior to your leaving on this tour with Othello for you to appear in behalf of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee at various places?

Mr. FERRER. I don't think any definite arrangements were made, Mr. Tavenner. I seem to recall having been told that from time to time, if the schedule coincided, they might contact me and that I would be asked to speak, and I said I would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who guided and directed that course of procedure? In other words, who made the suggestion to you and the arrangements?

Mr. FERRER. Gosh, I wish I could remember, Mr. Tavenner. Very often these things came in a phone call, and I don't remember specifically any persons or name because, strange as it seems, I would get a letter or phone call and be asked to appear, and I would say "Yes," and I would appear and that would be the end of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were rather active, I take it, in connection with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, over a considerable period of time?

Mr. FERRER. Active only in appearing at public functions. I never appeared at private meetings or anything of that sort. My only activities were in connection with public functions.

Mr. TAVENNER. We find, for instance, in the issue of the Daily Worker of September 25, 1945, an article listing you as a speaker before a group of 17,000 persons at Madison Square Garden on September 24, 1945, as a function held under the auspices of the Spanish Refugee Appeal. Were you a speaker on that occasion?

Mr. FERRER. I think I introduced Paula Lawrence, Josh White, and the CIO chorus. That was my function during the evening I acted as master of ceremonies, if that is the occasion.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article mentions that, so I guess that is the meeting.

Mr. FERRER. I think that is the night Mr. Laski spoke from England.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. He is chairman of the English Labor Party.

Mr. FERRER. And made remarks supposed to be derogatory to the Catholic Church, and Frank Fay—

Mr. TAVENNER. This is another meeting?

Mr. FERRER. This is the meeting which provoked Frank Fay.

Mr. TAVENNER. And at that same meeting Dr. Edward K. Barsky, chairman of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, spoke and made a special appeal for funds for the Spanish cause?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember that.

Mr. TAVENNER. And at the same meeting Mr. Nikolai Novikov, acting head of the Russian Embassy, was a speaker and called for the prosecution of Franco as a war criminal. Do you recall that?

Mr. FERRER. No. I don't know if you have ever attended any of the meetings at the Garden, but I can give you my view of what happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. Any explanation you wish to make.

Mr. FERRER. Say a meeting is scheduled for 7:30. They would say, "We want you to introduce some of the speakers." I would say, "I am engaged in a production on Broadway," which I was at that time—I was working on Strange Fruit—and I would say, "If you will submit the material you want me to use, and write the introductions, I will be there at that time, and as soon as I am through I will leave." If they say, "We want you at 9:30," I arrive at 9:30. The activity is taking place on an elevated platform, something like a prize fighting ring. Around the bottom of this arena is a tremendous hustle and bustle of newspaper people, photographers, people coming and going, and one very seldom listens to what is happening on the stage, because one is busy preparing one's own material, and when he is through, he leaves.

I remember a Spanish lady, Isabel de Palencia, was there. I was introduced to her. I remember Paula Lawrence and Josh White, and that is all I remember of that meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. You made mention of the fact that there was a later meeting held criticizing this particular meeting?

Mr. FERRER. It was charged, was it not, that this meeting sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was a Communist-inspired program that was being conducted there; you recall that?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; I do, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any investigation to determine for yourself whether there was any substance to that charge, whether or not this organization, of which you were a member and in which you had been very active, was tainted with communism?

Mr. MOULDER. What year was that?

Mr. FERRER. 1945, September, I believe. Is that right, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. I did not, sir. I regret to say that I didn't, and one reason I may not have was that the charges of communism against his meeting and against this organization at that time were made by Frank Fay, who, although he turns out to have been factually right in regard to this meeting, behaved in such a scandalous and ill-advised manner throughout that charges were brought against him by his own union.

I was then on the council at Equity, and I know Mr. Fay to be a man of excessive conduct, a man who automatically, if you are a decent and fair-minded person, throws you into an opposite point of view. I mean this very sincerely, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wouldn't it have been a warning? Wasn't it a flag in your face?

Mr. FERRER. I admit I was wrong, and take all the blame for not listening, but I would like to explain that listening to Mr. Frank Fay is something that doesn't come easily to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you become connected with this organization, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner, my connection with the organization was that they would call me up and say, "Will you appear?" and I would say "Yes." I never was in any way connected with them in the sense that I worked with them, except to agree to appear at rallies and meetings, and on those occasions either I would be approached by phone or by letter, depending on the importance of the occasion.

Mr. VELDE. Do you remember any of the names of persons who called you?

Mr. FERRER. I do not, Mr. Velde. Mr. Tavenner asked me a while ago if I remembered, and I tried to think of some names, but you must believe me when I say I am not trying to avoid the question. I can't remember or think of a name or a face in connection with this matter.

Mr. TAVENNER. This meeting to which we referred was September 24, 1945, as to which we spoke of the flag which should have notified you of the Communist Party purposes of this organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited this organization on March 29, 1944, more than a year prior to that.

Weren't you aware of the fact at that time, in September 1945, that the Communist Party infiltration into that organization was a publicly known charge?

Mr. FERRER. I don't believe I was, Mr. Tavenner.

I should like to explain something else about appearing at this sort of meeting. Before any member of an actors' or entertainment union is allowed to appear at any function and lend his services, he has to check with an organization known as Theater Authority, the chairman of which was Alan Corelli. If they say, "Do not appear," you do not appear, because if you do appear against their instructions, Equity, my union, takes a very, very serious view of it.

Theater Authority was established by Equity, Screen Actors' Guild, and other unions. I can only say, to explain my answer, that there were people in the organization whom I considered not subversive, including the CIO chorus, and because of that fact, plus the fact Theater Authority gave me permission to go ahead, I did appear.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did secure authority on that occasion?

Mr. FERRER. I would have to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was in charge of Theater Authority in September 1945?

Mr. FERRER. Alan Corelli has been in charge for many, many years until just recently.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it brought to your attention through any source that this committee had cited that organization?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know if it was or not, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first learn it?

Mr. FERRER. I suspect that I first learned it recently, when I had to do a lot of studying that I probably should have done long ago.

Mr. WOOD. Is that your best recollection?

Mr. FERRER. That is my best recollection.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Ferrer, aren't artists such as you required to make certain appearances other than theatrical appearances?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. We are not required to do anything.

Mr. WALTER. A witness testified before the committee sometime ago that, under a contract she had, she was required to make public appearances wherever her manager said she was to appear.

Mr. FERRER. That is a special arrangement she had with her manager, but it is not a typical arrangement, Mr. Walter. Of course we do have the habit of appearing whenever we can for what appear to be worthy causes, but there is no obligation to do so.

Mr. WOOD. Do I understand you to say that you have no choice about where you appear?

Mr. FERRER. No, Mr. Wood. You misunderstood me. I have the choice. That is what I was telling Mr. Walter. I cannot be forced to appear but I can be prevented from appearing; yes.

Mr. WOOD. Are the organizations or meetings at which you do appear selected for you, or do you exercise some choice about it yourself?

Mr. FERRER. This body, Theater Authority, when you are asked to appear at a function, if you decide that you want to appear—

Mr. WOOD. Then you have to clear it with them?

Mr. FERRER. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. And if they turn thumbs down you can't appear?

Mr. FERRER. You cannot appear.

Mr. WOOD. Can they require you to appear?

Mr. FERRER. No.

Mr. WOOD. So your appearance is voluntary?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. And it was in this instance?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It was not compulsory?

Mr. FERRER. It was not compulsory. I take full blame.

Mr. Wood. And you have the privilege of making a full investigation of the organizations that ask you to appear, before you appear?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. And you had that privilege in this instance?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. Wood. And in this instance you did not make such investigation?

Mr. FERRER. I did not make the investigation I should have. I can only say that in the future I will.

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

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Is it one of the functions of Theater Authority to be a clearing house as to whether the event is a proper event? In other words, if they would have knowledge that it was Communist infiltrated, should they have told you to stay away from that event?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know the answer to that, Mr. Doyle. I know that I was told, when I joined Actors' Equity Association, that during the period of years when excesses occurred and actors were requested to appear for anything and everything, Theater Authority was established to protect them. What screening they do, I do not know.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't know what their rules or bylaws are, or what investigation they make of events, or knowledge they have of events?

Mr. FERRER. I do not.

Mr. DOYLE. Is Theater Authority still in existence?

Mr. FERRER. I think it is, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. Wood. Does it still screen the organizations at which actors are asked to appear?

Mr. FERRER. I believe it does.

Mr. Wood. Do you still belong to it?

Mr. FERRER. Theater Authority?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. People don't belong to it.

Mr. Wood. Are you still under its jurisdiction?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; as long as I am a member of Actors' Equity Association, I am under its jurisdiction.

Mr. KEARNEY. Who is head of Theater Authority?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know who is now. Alan Corelli was for many years. He no longer is.

Mr. DOYLE. Do they have offices in different parts of the country?

Mr. FERRER. I only know of the office they used to have on Fifth Avenue in New York.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they ever tell you in writing whether you should appear? Did they ever send you a written letter telling you not to appear?

Mr. FERRER. No; I was never told not to appear. Every function I was asked to appear at, they O. K.'d. However, time after time I have seen Mr. Corelli at the functions. He was extremely busy, but was almost always there whenever I was at these functions.

Mr. DOYLE. These occasions at which you spoke or introduced persons who spoke, I take it were money-raising events, most of them?

Mr. FERRER. Certainly a great proportion were.

Mr. DOYLE. Then I would infer that part of the reason for the existence of Theater Authority would be to, as far as they could,

protect you actors from being imposed upon by being asked to appear at events which in fact were not charitable. Is that correct?

Mr. FERRER. I would think so.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you have that understanding at that time, that that was the function of Theater Authority?

Mr. FERRER. I am sure it is one of the functions, but I cannot answer your other question as to whether their authority extended beyond that.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any occasion on which Theater Authority denied you permission to appear at a function on the ground that it was under Communist influence and control, or was a Communist organization?

Mr. FERRER. Not that I remember, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. These various instances when you participated in activities of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, were you always called by the same individual or by different individuals?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know, Mr. Tavenner, because, as I told Mr. Velde, I have no recollection of an individual. Sometimes I was approached by phone; sometimes I was approached by letter. I don't remember an individual.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any occasions when you recall that you were called by persons who were members of organizations other than the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, asking that you participate in one of these affairs?

Mr. FERRER. You mean someone who was not a member of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, but who might be interested from an entirely different angle.

Mr. FERRER. Not that I know of, Mr. Tavenner; not that I know of. May I say one more thing, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. I am scratching around the back of my head trying to discover why these requests for my appearance are so anonymous in my memory, and one reason I may submit is the fact that I don't go to my office very often. My office where I produce from receives my mail, my secretary opens my mail, and messages are often transmitted to me by phone, and sometimes I may have gotten invitations to appear second or third-hand, and I would say "Call and say 'yes'."

Mr. TAVENNER. This organization known as Theater Authority screened and passed upon the public appearances you could make?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they also screen and pass upon the organizations you were permitted to sponsor?

Mr. FERRER. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. So organizations you sponsored were entirely upon your own initiative?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. A voluntary act without any restrictions of any sort?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to ask you now about—

Mr. FERRER. Excuse me. Their jurisdiction extends to a professional appearance. When I act as an individual, they have nothing to say about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you consider that your appearance at this meeting of September 24, 1945, was a professional appearance or a personal appearance?

Mr. FERRER. It was professional in the sense that they published my name, and my name was linked with others who were going to perform.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you had been advertised without the word "actor" after your name, would that mean you were appearing in a personal and not a professional capacity?

Mr. FERRER. No. If they promise you a show, and your name is listed as an individual appearing for many people to look at and listen to, then that is a professional appearance.

Mr. TAVENNER. But if you were to take part in a public meeting to argue a question in which the meeting was interested, that would be a personal appearance?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. As distinguished from a professional appearance?

Mr. FERRER. It is my understanding that is the fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. The American Committee for Spanish Freedom was an organization formed after the civil war in Spain. According to a letterhead of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom bearing date January 21, 1946, you are named as one of the sponsors of this organization. Will you please explain to the committee what motivated you in becoming a sponsor of that organization, if you did, and how your sponsorship was obtained?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left hearing room.)

Mr. FERRER. I do not remember this specific organization, Mr. Tavenner. However, once more I must plead guilty to the charge of carelessness. If I was approached on an anti-Franco question, the chance is I would agree to sponsor it. Without knowing, I suspect that probably the same people sponsored it, the same set of people, as sponsored the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and that there was a community of activity which I accepted without question.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, an interlocking membership of these organizations?

Mr. FERRER. Certainly in my mind. In January 1946 Strange Fruit was on its last leg, a financial crisis for me, and I was preparing for Cyrano, and my feeling is that I would be very cursory in my examination, and if I was asked to appear and it was something at which I wanted to appear, I would say "yes" and forget about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. FERRER. January 1946, when I was preparing Cyrano.

Mr. TAVENNER. At an earlier date, in May 1945, you were listed as a member of the Arts and Sciences Division of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom. In other words, it is a more formal sponsorship in that it is of a special division.

Mr. FERRER. In May 1945 we were completing our tour of Othello, which had taken us out of New York for 10 months. I probably allowed them to use my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. This organization was cited also by this committee, but at a later date, 1948, and by the Attorney General in 1949.

The committee is in possession of information indicating that on June 22, 1944, you were introduced as a guest speaker at a Negro Freedom Rally sponsored by the Negro Labor Victory Committee at Madison Square Garden, New York City, and that you were one of the entertainers at this function. Did you take part in that meeting?

Mr. FERRER. Is there any document, Mr. Tavenner, that I could examine to refresh my memory as to who else participated?

Mr. WOOD. Does that mean you do not have any independent recollection?

Mr. FERRER. No, I don't, sir. My memory in most of these cases is by association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having attended that meeting sponsored by the Negro Labor Victory Committee?

Mr. FERRER. I do not, Mr. Tavenner. I am sure I probably did, but I don't remember; no, sir. I could be very specific if I saw a document on the subject. But the chances are I did. I worked with a great number of Negro artists in the theater. I have seen them suffer injustices, and I am extremely sympathetic to their situation.

I have here a note to the effect that this June 26, 1944, rally of the Negro Labor Victory Committee which you mentioned, one of the speakers at that rally was Mayor LaGuardia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall that you took part in it?

Mr. FERRER. No. Even the name of Mayor LaGuardia does not make me remember being there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do know that the Negro Labor Victory Committee has been cited as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. FERRER. I know that now; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both by this committee and twice by the Attorney General, by Attorney General Tom Clark in his letters to the Loyalty Review Board released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948.

Mr. FERRER. To the best of my knowledge I think that is my only connection with the Negro Labor Victory Committee. Isn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall anything about that meeting at all? You made mention of the fact that Mayor LaGuardia was there. Do you recall whether Benjamin J. Davis spoke there?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember anything about the meeting. In fact, I do remember that in some of the research I made in connection with this appearance, I read that Mayor LaGuardia did not appear because of illness. I don't remember this occasion. I remember meeting Mr. Davis on another occasion.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the other occasion?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left hearing room.)

Mr. FERRER. The other occasion was, I believe, in April 1944. It was a birthday celebration in honor of Paul Robeson at one of the armories, I believe the armory on Park Avenue in the thirties.

Mr. KEARNEY. Thirty-fourth Street?

Mr. FERRER. That would be the one. I do remember meeting Mr. Davis then because he was a speaker that night.

Mr. TAVENNER. What official position did he hold at that time in the city of New York?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember whether he already was councilman of the city of New York or running for councilman, but it was one or the other. .

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in April 1944?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. When he did run for reelection you lent your name in support of his candidacy, did you not?

Mr. FERRER. I am not sure that I did, Mr. Kearney, but if I did it was because, in my mind, he was being presented to me as being endorsed by the Democratic Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. Was that endorsement subsequently withdrawn?

Mr. FERRER. At the time he ran? I don't know.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you contribute anything toward Mr. Davis' reelection?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know. I don't think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the September 25, 1945, issue of the Daily Worker, you became one of the group of sponsors for the election of Mr. Davis. The heading is, "Thousand artist, writers back Davis. Formation of an artists', writers', and professionals' group for reelection of Benjamin J. Davis was announced yesterday by Paul Robeson, chairman of the new group."

Then the article gives the names of sponsors, among whom your name José Ferrer, appears. Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. FERRER. No. I have no recollection of ever authorizing my name to be used. I repeat, I may have authorized it to be used, but I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me hand you the article to see if your memory is fully refreshed, if it can be, on that point [handing article to the witness].

Mr. FERRER (after examining article). I don't remember, Mr. Tavener. There are a great many names listed whom I remember among my acquaintances and friends.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name does appear there?

Mr. FERRER. My name does appear there; yes; and I probably authorized it, but I don't remember.

Mr. Wood. You say you probably authorized it. Have you any recollection?

Mr. FERRER. I have no recollection, but there are so many names of people I know and whom I have associated with that I would accept this as evidence against myself if it should be submitted.

Mr. Wood. That was what year?

Mr. FERRER. September 1945.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Davis was serving at that time as a member of the council?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember.

Mr. Wood. You had met him?

Mr. FERRER. I had met him a few months before. Mr. Tavenner asked what was his position at that time, and I said he was either serving as councilman or was elected later. I don't remember.

Mr. Wood. Didn't you know that at that time he was serving as councilman, and that he had been elected on the Communist ticket?

Mr. FERRER. I did not.

Mr. Wood. You didn't know that?

Mr. FERRER. I did not.

Mr. WOOD. And at the time you say you probably sponsored his reelection, didn't you know he was being sponsored by the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. I did not. If I had, I would not have authorized the use of my name.

Mr. WOOD. Would you sponsor the reelection of a man without ascertaining on what party ticket he was running?

Mr. FERRER. I linked him in my mind as being sponsored by the Democratic Party. This is only an evidence of how careless I can get. But I did not know he was running on the Communist ticket.

Mr. WOOD. You had no knowledge or information about it?

Mr. FERRER. No.

Mr. WOOD. When did you find it out?

Mr. FERRER. Recently, when I was doing research on the things listed against me.

Mr. WOOD. When was the last time you saw him?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember seeing him after that birthday party. The next time his name was brought to my attention was when he and a number of others were brought up on trial as being—

Mr. KEARNEY. One of the 11 defendants?

Mr. FERRER. That was the next time I thought of Benjamin J. Davis, when his name became prominent in connection with that trial.

Mr. WOOD. You at that time were living in New York?

Mr. FERRER. I was.

Mr. WOOD. A registered voter of New York?

Mr. FERRER. I was on tour much of the time.

Mr. WOOD. You did vote?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Have you ever voted?

Mr. FERRER. No. I have always been on tour when the elections have been held. Actors usually go on tour September and October when everyone has to register.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean you never even registered, then?

Mr. FERRER. No, because by the time I got my absentee ballot in Ossining, generally I was on tour. If I had voted for him I certainly would have known what party he was running on.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may have misunderstood your testimony. Do I understand you are in doubt as to whether you permitted your name to be used in support of the candidacy of Benjamin J. Davis for councilman or not?

Mr. FERRER. I said I did not recollect giving permission to use my name, but after seeing the document submitted, with the list of names on it, I told Mr. Kearney, and I told Mr. Wood, that the chances were I probably had authorized the use of my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. You use the word "probably"?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to refer to a letter you addressed yesterday to the chairman of the committee, and I quote from that letter:

I have long supported the National Urban League and the Negro Actors' Guild of America, neither of which has any Communist connection, so far as I can find: but I also permitted my name to be used in support of the candidacy of Benjamin Davis as councilman of New York City.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That doesn't indicate any uncertainty about authorization of use of your name for that purpose. It is a plain, positive statement that you did do that?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't that correct; that you did permit the use of your name for that purpose?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner, the reason I wrote this in the way I did is as follows:

I assume that most of these charges that are leveled against me are true; most of them. If you ask me under oath, "Do you remember endorsing Benjamin Davis?", I say, "No; I don't remember," but I say I probably did when I see the list of names associated with me.

I wrote this carelessly, again, for the purpose of simplicity.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am trying to get the facts. If you are uncertain, I want to know it.

Mr. FERRER. I am uncertain.

Mr. TAVENNER. We want the facts.

Mr. FERRER. Is my position clear now?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think so.

Mr. Wood. You were reading from a letter addressed to me as chairman of the committee on the 21st?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. Wood. I believe that letter was released by you to the press on yesterday?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have asked you a question about the meeting of September 24th which announced the organization of a group with Paul Robeson as chairman to back Benjamin J. Davis in the campaign.

Mr. FERRER. What question did you ask me?

Mr. TAVENNER. I referred to that. Now I am asking you as to what comment you have to make regarding an article which appeared in the Worker, issue of September 30, 1945, entitled "Ben Davis Backed by 1,000 Leaders in the Arts."

This is subsequent to the holding of that meeting. I want to call a part of this to your attention, and then let you examine it.

Mr. FERRER. Fine.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article begins as follows:

The campaign to reelect Benjamin J. Davis to the New York City Council is winning strong support from outstanding figures in the various cultural fields. Davis will have the active backing of leaders in the theater, radio, motion-picture, literary, fine arts, music, dance, educational, and allied fields.

Headed by Paul Robeson, more than 1,000 citizens in these crafts last week announced the formation of an artists, writers and professional division of the Davis Nonpartisan Committee. They believe with Paul Robeson that "If Ben is reelected, that means we're in there."

And further down in the article it states: "Sponsors of the artists, writers, and professional division, in addition to Paul Robeson as chairman, include" various persons, and among them appears the name of José Ferrer.

This is the second article, you see, that appeared on this subject.

Will you examine it and state whether or not that further refreshes your recollection, and that you now recall that you were a member of the so-called nonpartisan group?

Mr. FERRER. I am sorry to say, Mr. Tavenner, that this does not refresh my memory. I repeat that among these people are many many people whom I know, whom I have worked with, and it is possible and even probable that I did allow the use of my name, but I cannot in all honesty tell you that I remember doing so.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Kearney, did you have a question to ask?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Ferrer, to the letter that the chairman spoke about, under date of May 21, 1951, directed to him, of which I believe all members of the committee received a copy.

I am simply searching for the truth. I can't reconcile your statement with that portion of your letter which states: "I also permitted my name to be used in support of the candidacy of Benjamin Davis as councilman of New York City."

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner just asked me about that, Mr. Kearney, and I told him that when I am now asked under oath, do I remember, I cannot honestly say "I do remember". The reason I wrote this this way—and I still say it was careless on my part—was that I come here to testify before you gentlemen assuming that most of the charges leveled against me are true.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is this true: "I also permitted my name to be used in support of the candidacy of Benjamin Davis as councilman of New York City."

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember, but I say it probably was, Mr. Kearney. Under oath I don't want to say it was. For the purposes of brevity and simplicity, in this letter I said it was true.

Mr. KEARNEY. We want to know if it was true.

Mr. FERRER. I can't honestly, completely say it was true.

Mr. KEARNEY. This letter was written 2 days ago.

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. A lot of the matters you testified about occurred in 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945.

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Here, only 2 days ago, you stated definitely that you permitted your name to be used to further the candidacy of Benjamin Davis as councilman of New York City.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. It is now 10 minutes after 12, and there is a quorum call; and, in order to enable the members of the committee to answer that call and get lunch, we will suspend until 2 o'clock.

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

AFTER RECESS

The hearing reconvened at 2:20 p. m., upon the expiration of the recess.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Acting under the authority of the resolution establishing this committee, I, as chairman, have set up a subcommittee, for the purpose of continuing this hearing, of the full committee.

Mr. Doyle, Mr. Kearney, and Mr. Wood are present.
Proceed.

**TESTIMONY OF JOSÉ FERRER, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
ABE FORTAS AND EDWARD REISKIND—Resumed**

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer, I was asking you this morning about your alleged endorsement of Benjamin Davis for election to the position of councilman of the city of New York in 1945. In connection with that, you were asked a question by a member of the committee regarding the alleged endorsement of Davis by the Democratic Party, and I made the statement at that time I had certain exhibits which I wanted to use to refresh your recollection regarding those matters.

As I understand it, you made a statement this morning that he was endorsed by the Democratic Party. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir; or had been endorsed when I first met him, which was earlier that same year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. When I met him in April, which is the only time, as I remember, that I ever met him, I was introduced—he was introduced to me, or he was referred to me as having been endorsed by the Democratic Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I will read to you from the July 26, 1945, issue of the Daily Worker, in which Councilman Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., is stated to have charged that the action of the Democrats in withdrawing their designation of him for reelection was a disservice to the Democratic coalition of forces.

In other words, Davis himself recognized, as shown by this article appearing in July 1945, that he recognized that that action had been taken by the local organization of the Democratic Party in withdrawing support.

Now, do you not recall that that support was withdrawn after I have refreshed your recollection about it from this news article?

Mr. FERRER. I did not know it at the time, Mr. Tavenner, because if I had known that Davis was to all intents and purposes a candidate of the Communist Party, that he was affiliated with the Communist Party, and that he was serving allegiance to the Communist Party, I would never have lent my name to support him.

And, as we went into it this morning, I don't remember doing so, but I am willing, because of the list of people you showed me, to admit that I probably did.

I have never seen an issue of the Daily Worker, and that is what you just quoted to me from. So I certainly never saw that article.

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. That is true; it is of the Daily Worker, which is an organ of the Communist Party.

Mr. FERRER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. But if the Communist Party openly and avowedly takes a position, it is certainly reasonable to suppose that the public generally are aware of that situation.

Mr. FERRER. Definitely.

Mr. TAVENNER. I refer now to an article in the October 21, 1943, edition of the Communist Party.

Mr. FERRER. Of the Daily Worker, you mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Daily Worker, I meant to say—which is an organ of the Communist Party.

I think before I refer to that article I desire to refer to one appearing in the Daily Worker on August 28, 1945, which is still a date ahead of the time it is alleged that you gave your endorsement of Davis; in which this statement is made:

The progressive forces in the labor and people's movement are also rallying to the reelection of their champion. The New York CIO Council has endorsed and will actively campaign for Davis's reelection. True, Davis is the nominee of only the Communist Party, but he was elected through the support of broad circles of our citizens in 1943 as the candidate of the Communist Party alone.

That is a statement appearing in the Communist press in August 1945 as to Davis' status in 1943, when he ran for the council.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered hearing room.)

Mr. FERRER. If I may interject something, I was told during the luncheon recess, Mr. Tavenner—which I didn't know, but I submit it in the interests of accuracy—I was told that candidates for council do not run on a party ticket.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, are not petitions filed by those who become candidates for the city council in New York?

Mr. FERRER. Apparently on a nonpartisan basis, as I was told, Mr. Tavenner. This is not my knowledge. I am passing this on in the interests of accuracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. And do they not have to state on what party ticket they are running? Is not that a fact?

I am asking for information. I am not a specialist on the laws of New York by any means.

You do not know; is that right?

Mr. FERRER. No; I do not, sir. If I had, I would have mentioned it before lunch.

Mr. KEARNEY. But there is not any dispute; is there, Mr. Ferrer—

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. KEARNEY (continuing). That during the time that he was a candidate, even under the so-called nonpartisan basis, that he was a candidate of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. I merely offer this as a possible reason why I did not know that he was a candidate of the Communist Party; besides which, I was given to understand in his earlier candidacy in 1943 he had been endorsed by the Democratic Party, it is true, before September.

According to what you tell me, sir, their support had been withdrawn. I did not know about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. It seems strange that you should know that the local organization at one time supported the candidacy of Davis, and yet you at the same time are unaware of the fact that Davis was elected on the Communist Party ticket in 1943 and again in 1945.

Mr. FERRER. It may seem strange, Mr. Tavenner, but it remains the fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think we have probably a petition of Ben Davis to run as councilman, and we will see whether or not it does provide on what party ticket.

(After examining document). Mr. Ferrer, there appears on Davis' petition for reelection the name of "José Ferrer" and the address of the person given, whose name is given as "José Ferrer," is 65 East One Hundred and Tenth Street, New York City. Was that your name, or is it the name of another person?

Mr. FERRER. That is the name of another person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever live at 65 East One Hundred and Tenth Street?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I never have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time sign a petition for Ben Davis?

Mr. FERRER. Not to the best of my recollection, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me now, Mr. Ferrer, a nominating petition for councilman, Borough of Manhattan, addressed to the board of elections in the city of New York, under date of August 13, 1945, which shows that the candidate selects and designates the party ticket upon which he is running.

In this instance it is the Communist Party.

I will ask you to look at this and verify that fact, as it is contrary to what you stated you have been advised during the recess (handing document to witness).

You will find it in the first paragraph.

Do you understand?

Mr. FERRER (after examining document). I think I do, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever signed a similar petition for Ben Davis?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember ever signing; I don't remember ever seeing such a petition, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The petition does state—

Mr. FERRER. Yes; it does.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing.) On its face that the individual designates the Communist Party in this particular instance.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

You understand, Mr. Tavenner, that I did not mention that in order to evade any responsibility I may have in this matter.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand.

I believe you stated that you first became acquainted with Benjamin Davis at the birthday party that was given in April 1944 for Paul Robeson. Did I understand you to say that?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you known Paul Robeson?

Mr. FERRER. I met Paul Robeson, I believe, in the spring of 1942—it was either the spring or the early summer—at a brief interview, which lasted a few minutes, the purpose of which interview was for him to meet me and either approve or disapprove of me as the actor to play the role of Iago in Othello.

Apparently I met with his approval. I did not see him again until we began rehearsing in the late summer of 1942.

We rehearsed for 2 weeks and we played for 2 weeks; 1 week in Cambridge, Mass., and 1 week in Princeton, N. J.

Then I don't believe I saw him again for a year, until we began rehearsals in the late summer of 1943 for the Broadway engagement of Othello.

The Broadway engagement, after a number of weeks out of town, in September and October, opened in New York on, I believe, October 19, 1943—I think it was around that time—and ran into June, I think, of '44.

We had a few weeks off that summer, during which time we recorded an album of records of almost the entire play of Othello for Columbia Records.

And then in the fall of 1944 we started this 10-month tour, visiting, I believe, forty-odd cities that I mentioned earlier in my testimony.

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

Mr. FERRER. I am referring to the theatrical company involved in rehearsal.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Paul Robeson associated in all those trips?

Mr. FERRER. Oh, yes. He was the star of the play. He played Othello.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was through the year 1945?

Mr. FERRER. Until June of '45. Then we disbanded in June.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is the person named as the chairman in the press release of September 25, and also of September 30, of this artist's group to promote the election of Ben Davis.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he talk to you about your support of Ben Davis?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner, I don't remember whether he did, or not, but it is entirely possible that he did, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he ever discuss with you the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he ever make any statement to you with reference to the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You are sure about that, but you are not sure about the support of Ben Davis?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, I am, Mr. Velde. And I will tell you why: Because, strange as it seems, I don't believe I recognized Mr. Davis as a Communist candidate. Had Mr. Robeson ever spoken to me about the Communist Party or Communist matters at all, I would have been very aware of the conversation.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would that be true of all left-wing organizations?

Mr. FERRER. I don't understand your question, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would that be true of all Communist-front organizations?

Mr. FERRER. If they had Communist conversations with me?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. Oh, it certainly would be true; yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. And that would be also true as far as your attitude, of course, toward Communist organizations?

Mr. FERRER. Definitely. Definitely.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to show the witness Mr. Counsel, a picture appearing in the Daily Mirror and ask him to inform the committee under what circumstances that picture was taken [handing to Mr. Tavenner].

Mr. FERRER. I know the picture, Mr. Tavenner, if you want me to answer the question without looking. I saw enough from what Mr. Kearney had in his hand.

The picture appeared in the Daily Mirror, I believe, and under a column by Victor Reisel (Rye-sell) or Reisel (Ree-sell).

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. FERRER. And the name of the man in the photograph with me is Charles Collins.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. FERRER. I had completely forgotten this incident and I don't to this day remember it, but my press agent in Cyrano does remember it. He is the man who is working for me now as press agent for Twentieth Century and for my more recent production, Stalag 17.

When this appeared in the paper, I showed it to him and I said, "This man Reisel (Rye-sell)"—or Reisel (Ree-sell) "says that I left the theater in make-up and costume to be photographed with Mr. Collins."

And I said to him, "I remember very distinctly that the only time I ever left the theater in make-up or in costume in Cyrano was on three occasions."

I then named the three occasions. I am very definite about everything that happens to me in the theater. My memory is extremely accurate about my theatrical activity and I do not go out in the street wearing a long nose, a wig, a beard, a mustache, and a flowery 200-year-old costume casually.

I did not leave the theater for that photograph despite what Mr. Reisel (Rye-sell) says.

Mr. Lipsky remembers that we were taking press photographs in the theater at this occasion and that a phone call came in, and somebody whom I know, whom I knew, whose name I don't remember—I don't even remember whether it was a man or a woman—said, "There is a Negro called Charles Collins running for office in New York. Would you endorse him?"

And very stupidly again I said, "Sure; send him over and we will take a picture."

So they took a picture of a man I have never seen before or since. I have completely forgotten the incident.

Mr. KEARNEY. You did not even know what party ticket the gentleman in question was running on?

Mr. FERRER. Only to this extent, sir: that I was probably told what the party ticket was, and it was not the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it your custom to endorse candidates that are running on any political ticket?

Mr. FERRER. Generally speaking, no, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. In this particular instance, did you endorse the candidacy of Charles A. Collins?

Mr. FERRER. I am not sure that I endorsed it, Mr. Kearney. I was asked to be photographed with him shaking hands, and I did. I never endorsed Mr. Collins, that I know of.

Mr. KEARNEY. At that time, did you know what political party Mr. Collins was running on and for what office?

Mr. FERRER. I was probably told at the time; yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. You do not remember now?

Mr. FERRER. I only remember what I have read since.

Mr. KEARNEY. If I refreshed your memory by saying that I read from this article that he was a candidate for senator in the State of New York, on the American Labor Party ticket, would that refresh your recollection?

Mr. FERRER. I have read the article, Mr. Kearney, and I don't remember the incident.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you, at the time you endorsed this candidacy, know about what ticket he was running on?

Mr. FERRER. I was probably told, Mr. Kearney. I don't remember now. I can't conceive that I was not told.

Mr. KEARNEY. You cannot conceive of endorsing anybody running for a political office until you know what ticket he is running on?

Mr. FERRER. That is right.

Mr. KEARNEY. But from your testimony here today, it is probably true that you have endorsed candidates not knowing what ticket they were running on.

Mr. FERRER. Maybe not knowing, Mr. Kearney, but thinking I knew, thinking I knew.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you contribute any funds to the candidacy of Mr. Collins?

Mr. FERRER. Very strongly I did not. I never laid eyes on him before or since, and I never heard of him again until this article.

However, we can check the list, if you wish.

Mr. KEARNEY. However, you did hear of him at the time you had your picture taken?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; I certainly did, because I was photographed shaking hands with him.

Mr. KEARNEY. Outside of that list that was handed to the committee through counsel, were there any contributions made through cash? Those are checks. Did you make any contributions to any political party or any political candidate by cash?

Mr. FERRER. I am morally certain that I did not, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. But you do not know definitely as to whether you contributed to Mr. Collins' candidacy, or not?

Mr. FERRER. I am pretty sure I didn't.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can you swear that you did not?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Kearney, I am very careful about what I swear to, because I don't want, through carelessness or eagerness to finish with a subject, to commit perjury, and that is why I am being so careful.

I am not trying to avoid any responsibility. When I tell you that I am—

Mr. KEARNEY. I would be the first one, Mr. Ferrer, of this committee, to suggest that you did not commit perjury.

Mr. FERRER. You would be the first one to suggest that I did?

Mr. KEARNEY. That you did not.

Mr. FERRER. That I didn't; yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you make any speeches for Mr. Collins?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. That I know.

Mr. Wood. To further clarify the matter of contributions: A list has been furnished here to counsel and to the members of the committee, which is headed "Contributions of José Ferrer, 1943, through 1950, based on information derived from check stubs and the records of the subcommittee, including all identifiable contributions."

Does this list contain an itemized statement of all the contributions that you made either to charitable, eleemosynary institutions, or individuals about which you now have any knowledge?

Mr. FORTAS. May I answer that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Wood. I do not see how you could possibly answer what was within the witness' knowledge.

Mr. FORTAS. I am sure I could not answer, but I can tell you how this list was prepared, if you would like to know.

Mr. Ferrer did not prepare it on the basis of information furnished, ascertained from his check books, by counsel. In other words, counsel went through all of Mr. Ferrer's check stubs.

Mr. Wood. Then, as I understand it, these items that are here listed are reflected in stubs of checks.

Mr. FORTAS. Yes, sir; and they are all available.

Mr. Wood. All of them?

Mr. FORTAS. All of those items are on his check stubs and they are all available to your investigators.

Mr. Wood. The question I would like to ask is this:

Are these items of contributions which you made either to charitable, eleemosynary institutions, or to individuals, which were paid by checks by you?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Wood, the only item of that nature that I would have made would be the sort of thing when you are stopped on the street and asked to buy a poppy or to help the orphans, or that sort of thing; I never, never make contributions except by check, because that is one thing that I like to keep a record of.

Mr. Wood. Then do I understand that such contributions, where they were made in fact by cash, are not now within your recollection? That you do not recall any of them? Or could you name some?

Mr. FERRER. As I say, the Veterans' Day poppies, and that sort of thing.

Do I make myself clear to you on this point, sir?

Mr. Wood. Did you make available to your counsel these stubs of all the checks that you have in your possession that reflect contributions made within this period of 1943 to 1950?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir; I turned all the check books over to him. Everything. I did not select check books.

Mr. Wood. So that there are no contributions within the period mentioned here, and that is '43 to '50—is that inclusive, '43 to '50?

Mr. FORTAS. Yes.

Let me take a look at this.

Mr. Wood. Let us leave it between those 2 years, between 1943 and 1950.

Mr. FERRER. I am sure it is inclusive, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. All inclusive?

Mr. FERRER. I am sure it is.

Mr. Fortas' office did the work.

Mr. Wood. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer—

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to ask you now regarding various May Day celebrations which you participated in in one form or another, either as a sponsor or otherwise.

I have before me the April 22, 1946, issue of the Daily Worker, which shows a headline: "Noted artist, professionals, back May Day. Parlay spurs parade preparations."

The article proceeds to state:

Some of the outstanding names in the cultural and other professional fields today lent their support to the forthcoming May Day parade and urged a unity of professionals and trade-unionists in the battle for peace and security. Famous names of stage, among writers, artists, and radio topnotchers were included in the list, who urged a gigantic turn-out on May Day as a fitting answer to the war makers by the American people.

And your name, "José Ferrer, actor," appears as one of those enunciating that position.

Mr. FERRER. Sponsoring the May Day parade?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Will you tell the committee the circumstances upon which you sponsored that parade and urged the turn-out that it referred to here?

Mr. FERRER. Well, Mr. Tavenner, I don't remember sponsoring the parade. However, it is entirely possible that I did, because I did not know at the time, and, in fact, I only found out a few weeks or a couple of months ago, that May Day was the annual celebration of the American Communist Party.

Yes, I knew that May Day had a connection with Soviet Russia. If I sponsored this parade it was with the thought that since Russia had been our ally in the recent war, this was, along with a great many other people, a casual tribute to Russia.

I never urged any turn-out for the May Day parade. I never spoke in behalf of the May Day parade. And if I endorsed it at all, somebody came up to me and said, "Can we use your name?" and I said, "Yes," and forgot about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, this language is also included in the endorsement; it says:

Topnotchers were included in the list, who urged a gigantic turn-out on May Day as a fitting answer to the war makers by the American people.

Now, this was in 1946.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the war makers?

Mr. FERRER. The Daily Worker knows better than I, Mr. Tavenner. That is their newspaper. I have never seen the Daily Worker and I don't want to have their words put into my mouth.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Ferrer, do you want this committee to believe that during all the years you lived in New York City, that you never knew that May Day was the Communist Party day in the city of New York and all over the Nation?

Mr. FERRER. I would like them to believe, but even if they don't, it is the truth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you supported the May Day on more than one annual occurrence, did you not?

Mr. FERRER. I am supposed to have; I don't think I did. I am supposed to have supported it in 1949 also.

Mr. WOOD. You said you are supposed to?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. On what do you base that statement, Mr. Ferrer?

Mr. FERRER. On the fact that in Red channels, I believe, and in other lists that have appeared in newspapers against me, my name is listed as a supporter of the May Day parade of 1949.

Mr. Wood. Is that the only evidence of your support, alleged support, that you know of?

Mr. FERRER. There may be other photostatic evidence, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Do you have any independent recollection?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. Wood. In 1949?

Mr. FERRER. But I know this: That by 1949 even I was beginning to understand some of these issues, and I would have been very, very chary, I think, of lending my support to the May Day parade of 1949.

Mr. KEARNEY. When you acted as a sponsor for this one May Day celebration, did you take the trouble to find out whether it was sponsored by the Communist Party, or not?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Kearney, as I remember, not because I remember what happened then, but subsequent research has shown that this May Day parade in 1946 was endorsed, among other people, by the American Federation of Labor and the CIO.

I would like to say something, which is that my testimony, I think, will make clear, as we go along, the fact that I have time and time and time again used sign posts. I have relied on the names of other people, the names of organizations in whom I had faith, to guide me in letting my name be used.

If I may make an analogy, if any of you gentlemen were to come to New York and say you wanted to see a show, you would pick up a newspaper, and if you saw the name of Helen Hayes, the name of Alfred Lunt and Lynne Fontanne, or the name of Katherine Cornell, you would assume that it is worth seeing because these people have built up a reputation through the years.

When I see something endorsed by the American Federation of Labor, of which I am a member, and the CIO, when I see Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's name, or Fiorello LaGuardia's name, of Mayor O'Dwyer's name, I drop my guard and say, "Yes, I think it is safe to go along with these people." I have been wrong time and time again, and so have they.

Mr. KEARNEY. So have some of the individuals you mentioned.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, they have, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. TAVENNER. What I am interested in, in addition to what you say, is: How did your support of all those organizations come about? You just do not go out looking for those things.

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I certainly don't. I know that one of the purposes of this investigation is to find that out. You told me very kindly and very clearly at the beginning of the investigation, and if I were able to think of a name or remember a person who said, "Come here, will you sign this paper?", I would hasten to give it to you, Mr. Tavenner. So far I have not remembered anything specific.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the letterhead of the American Relief for Greek Democracy, bearing date of November 15, 1946, you were one of the sponsors of that organization. Will you tell us how you became a sponsor of that organization?

Mr. FERRER. Could I see a document on the subject, sir, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir [handing document to witness].

Mr. FERRER. Thank you.

[After examining document.] I do not remember, Mr. Tavenner, how I became associated with this organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the January 19, 1946, issue of the Daily Worker, page 12, there is an article entitled, "Anti-Bias Vets Win Hunter College for Rally," at which you were listed as a speaker for the Veterans Against Discrimination, of the Civil Rights Congress of New York.

Does that refresh your recollection?

In other words, the Veterans Against Discrimination was a branch of the Civil Rights Congress—at which it is alleged you appeared as a speaker for it.

Mr. FERRER. I would like to make a positive statement at this time.

I generally have a very, very clear recollection of the auditoriums, theaters, and halls at which I speak, and that is why so often I ask to let me see the document, because if the document tells me where this took place, it refreshes my memory.

I have appeared at Hunter College on one or two occasions, and I don't remember any of them being political. I do not remember appearing at Hunter College on this occasion. I very clearly do not. If I did, it will surprise me greatly, because I do not remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. I should call to your attention and make it plain, if I have not already done so, that this stated that the meeting would be held. It does not state that you had spoken.

Mr. FERRER. I see. Well, I have no recollection.

That was January of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right, sir.

Mr. FERRER. At that time, my show Strange Fruit was closing, and I was beginning to work on Cyrano.

And I would like to remark once more, if I may, that this sort of activity, numerous though it has been through the years, is extremely peripheral and that I worked very, very hard continually at my profession in the theater, and that this sort of thing is the kind of thing that they call you up—or you receive a letter—and say, "Will you be there?"

"At what time?"

"Nine-fifteen."

And I will be up there at 9:15 and I will go and say "Hello" and leave. Or I appear, or whatever I have to do, and it does not penetrate my consciousness or my memory the way my work does.

Mr. TAVENNER. The next instance I will call to your attention is of a little more concrete character, because your name appears on the letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination, of Civil Rights Congress, as a public sponsor. The letter bears the date of May 11, 1946.

Do you recall having become a sponsor of the Veterans Against Discrimination, of Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I do not.

May 11, 1946, I was busy playing in Boston in Cyrano. We had received very bad notices and I was killing myself trying to make a hit out of a flop.

I had been working very hard on the show for 3 months and I have no recollection whatever of having time to do anything of this sort.

Mr. TAVENNER. This may refresh your recollection about the particular thing: This letter on the stationery of the Veterans Against Discrimination, of Civil Rights Congress advertises a mass rally to abolish the Wood-Rankin committee.

Does not that refresh your recollection.

Mr. FERRER. What date is this, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. The date the meeting was to be held was May 23, 1946, at the Manhattan Center.

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

No, by then I was in Philadelphia, still worrying.

Mr. TAVENNER. In fact, the letter, on its face, states:

The Un-American Committee can and must be abolished.

Maybe you had better look at the document and see if that refreshes your recollection [handing document to witness].

Mr. FERRER (after examining document). No, it does not refresh my recollection.

What is it you would like me to recollect?

Mr. TAVENNER. As to whether or not you sponsored a meeting, a mass meeting, to be held to abolish the Wood-Rankin committee.

Mr. FERRER. I do not remember sponsoring that.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you noted, the letter refers to the fact that Dr. Edward K. Barsky, chairman of the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee of which we have shown your activity—

Mr. FERRER. Definitely.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Was to be one of the speakers.

You recall, do you not, that this committee had subpoenaed Dr. Barsky before it in an effort to ascertain how the funds of that organization, in which you were a participant or in which you were active, were being used—

Mr. FERRER. For which I had appeared a few times; which is different from being active in the committee. I was never active in the committee, Mr. Tavenner. I may have been their instrument, but I was never active in the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I understand what you mean.

Does that not refresh your recollection of what you were sponsoring, according to the record here, the written record?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. I am sorry to say that I do not remember sponsoring that. I may have sponsored it, but I do not remember doing so.

Your question is: Do I remember?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. My answer must be I do not remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not remember. But quite evidently, you did sponsor it at that time.

Mr. FERRER. I probably did, Mr. Tavenner; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, does that mean that at that time you held to the view that Dr. Barsky should not have been required by this committee to produce evidence from its records as to what it was doing with the money which was being collected on the public assertion that it was going for relief in Spain?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; it does not mean that at all. It means that, along with a lot of other people, I did not always approve of the method of action of Mr. Dies, as later on I did not always approve of the method of action of Mr. Parnell Thomas.

And I believe you said this meeting was directed against this committee, did you not, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. And has nothing to do with Mr. Barsky and his books, in my mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. But Mr. Barsky was one of the principal speakers at this meeting which you sponsored.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir; but I have—

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not think there is a connection there?

Mr. FERRER. There probably is. I am just trying to point out it is possible that I was not aware of it, Mr. Tavenner, because for weeks I had been out of town. I had been out of town with an ailing show.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another speaker was the Reverend Richard Morford, executive secretary of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, who had also been subpoenaed before this committee, and who had refused to give information about a subject of inquiry over which this committee had jurisdiction.

Mr. FERRER. To the best of my knowledge, I never heard of the Reverend Morford until this instance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another person who was to speak, according to this letter, the letter of the organization of which you were a public sponsor, was George Marshall, who was chairman of the national board, Civil Rights Congress.

That was the board of the congress of which this very organization was a branch. And he likewise had appeared before this committee and had refused to give it information relating to source of funds which they were inquiring about.

Does that not bring to your mind that there was a definite connection?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

If you want, I can go through the list of sponsors and point out some very, very notorious anti-Communists, such as Mr. John Golden, whose name is very prominent there right below mine; a man who by no description could be called a sympathizer or interested in the least way in communism, except to destroy it, a very important member of my profession, sir. A man whom I have known and admired for many years, and a man whose name I would hold impeccable.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say, then, that, as far as you are concerned, the Communist Party angle to this organization was not being endorsed by you. Is that it?

Mr. FERRER. No Communist Party angle has ever been endorsed by me knowingly, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn of this mass meeting after it was held?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember the meeting now, Mr. Tavenner, so I don't know whether I did learn of it, or not, since I have no recollection of it. I was out of town at the time. I was in Philadelphia..

Mr. TAVENNER. It would rather seem, then, if you disapproved of any of these movements, that you would have taken some action to see that it did not recur.

Mr. FERRER. Oh, yes. But in order to disapprove it and in order to take the action, you have to know about it. And I have been trying to point out, Mr. Tavenner, that through extreme activity in my theatrical field and also through plain, stupid carelessness, that I have not known about a lot of things that I undoubtedly should have known about.

I am perfectly willing to assume the responsibility of ignorance, but I cannot assume the responsibility of knowledgeable guilt.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is more than just a question of assuming responsibility. We want to know the circumstances under which it occurred and under which it was done.

Mr. FERRER. In my particular case, I don't know how my name was gotten, who approached me, or in what manner. I do know that during this period I was working as hard as it seems possible for a human being to work, to take a play that had received bad notices in Boston and try to make a hit out of it, because it was a hundred thousand dollar proposition, thirty or forty thousand dollars of which was my own money, and my future and the future of my child was very much at stake in this play.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I want to ask you a number of questions relating to the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Were you at any time affiliated with the Puerto Rican Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

I think that is not quite the correct name. Is there a title "Casa de Puerto Rico," Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. FERRER. I don't—I mentioned several Latin-American groups in my letter, the Spanish-American Youth Bureau, the Union de Mujeres Americanos, and the Casa de Puerto Rico, in Harlem.

My only connection with the ICC [Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions], Mr. Tavenner, that I know of—and this is one that I do remember—was as head of the theater division. My interest in ICC was to further theatrical activity to increase the interest of the public in the theater.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the "ICC"?

Mr. FERRER. Independent Citizens' Committee, which Mr. Tavenner mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, now, had you completed your statement?

Mr. FERRER. Just that my activity for them was chairman of the theater division, and my main concern was the development of the theater, if possible.

Mr. Wood. On page 3 of your letter to me, you stated that you sponsored the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, in the first paragraph on the page.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, I remember it.

Mr. Wood. Does that aid in refreshing your recollection?

Mr. FERRER. In what respect, Mr. Wood?

Mr. Wood. I understood the counsel to ask you if you had been a sponsor of that organization.

Mr. FERRER. No. Counsel asked me if I had been a sponsor of any Puerto Rican group in the Independent Citizens' Committee, and I answered that I did not remember ever sponsoring a Puerto Rican group, but that I did remember very distinctly being chairman of the theater division of the Independent Citizens' Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having attended a meeting at the Essex House in New York City on January 5, 1946, where a conference was being held, entitled "Puerto Rico Rights to Freedom"?

Mr. FERRER. I remember going to the Essex House one night, and I didn't know that the conference had this purpose. I remember being given a highball when I arrived, being introduced to Frank Roosevelt, Jr., being introduced to a gentleman by the name of Polletti, I believe—

Was that his name?

Mr. REISKIND. Yes.

Mr. FERRER (continuing). Staying for a half an hour and leaving. Social chit-chat was my entire contribution to the thing, and I left very soon thereafter.

This was probably the meeting I was referring to, since I have been very seldom in the Essex House, that I remember this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you a speaker on that occasion?

Mr. FERRER. Oh, no. There were about 10 people in the room. I knew nobody but the people in the room. They all know more about it than I.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then were you not a speaker at any such conference as I have described?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of having had a position or a chairmanship, I believe, of the art division.

Mr. FERRER. Theater division.

Mr. TAVENNER. The theater division of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

When did you hold that position and that office, and for how long a period of time?

Mr. FERRER. I think that I—what do you say—received the office, moved into the office, or whatever the term is—I accepted the office, I would say, sometime in 1945, when I came back from tour in Othello.

I believe that Mr. Louis Callhern had been the chairman up to then; either Mr. Callhern or Mr. Frederic March. I think it was Callhern, I am not sure.

Anyway, I believe that I accepted the office sometime in 1945, and what happened was as follows: As regards my position in this office—

The first year we had quite a number of meetings, talking about forming rehearsal groups, proposing a fine-arts bill in Washington, trying to increase theatrical attendance, lowering the 20 percent theater ticket rate; all that kind of thing.

The purpose was how to make more people want to go to the theater more so that employment and activity in the theater would be increased. As time went along, I became more and more busy, more and more active in my own theatrical endeavor. I became less and less active and as the ICC began to become other organizations and change names periodically and the messages that I received from them got less and less theatrical and more and more political, I slowly

faded out of the picture, and although I never fully severed connection with them, I would say after about the first year—and I am a little hazy about this—after the first year or two, my connection was extremely tenuous.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of the board of directors?

Mr. FERRER. I think one was automatically a member of the board of directors if one was the chairman of a division, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, the May 18, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker states that you were chairman of the theater division of the New York City Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. In that same article it is indicated that on, I believe, the very evening of your election, or, rather, probably it was on 18th day of May, the date of the issue of the Daily Worker, that there would be a meeting to protest the Mundt bill, which was then before the House of Representatives?

Did you organize this meeting for the purpose of discussing the Mundt bill?

Mr. FERRER. This May 18, 1948?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRER. Can you tell me where the meeting was held, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. At the Mansfield Theater, West Forty-seventh Street, on Tuesday, May 18, 1948, at 11:30.

Mr. FERRER. I know the Mansfield Theater well because I have worked on Forty-seventh Street on several occasions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Herbert Biberman, a screen writer, who was one of the Hollywood 10, was listed as one of the speakers at this meeting.

Mr. FERRER. I am sure I did not organize it, because I have never met Mr. Biberman, and I don't remember ever being in the Mansfield Theater backstage.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you, as chairman of the theater division of the New York City council, must have had some responsibility?

Mr. FERRER. Undoubtedly so.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the conduct and the call of that meeting.

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Tavenner, what may very well have happened was that they said, "You are the chairman; can we have the meeting?" and I said, "Go ahead," and, "I am busy at the city center, just don't involve me in it."

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not mean to say you were just a figurehead in this organization?

Mr. FERRER. I certainly mean to say exactly that. I would feel very badly if I was anything but a figurehead.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why?

Mr. FERRER. Because, from what you tell me, this was not an organization to be too intimately connected with, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you not know it then?

Mr. FERRER. If I had known it, sir, I would not have been connected with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "they" asked you to go ahead with this meeting, that the meeting would be held, to whom were you referring?

Mr. FERRER. I am referring to someone who would call me from their office on the phone.

Mr. Wood. Are you saying that that happened, or are you speculating that probably would happen?

Mr. FERRER. I am speculating that probably is what happened.

Mr. Wood. You have no recollection about it?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. Wood. I do not think we get very far with pursuing the course of investigation when the witness cannot remember any details and it is pure speculation.

It is not accomplishing very much for the committee or to the witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not realize that. I thought in this instance that someone had phoned him.

Mr. FERRER. No, I didn't recall. I said quite definitely that, my memory being what it is, I don't remember being backstage in the Mansfield Theater.

Then I began to speculate when you said, "Your name was used on this thing," and I said I probably gave a careless authorization.

I was then preparing the spring season for the New York City Center and working very hard at that.

Mr. Wood. In other words, your details are of certain circumstances which may have existed.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. And, of course, the procedure that may have been followed.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. But you have no recollection about it.

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you ever connected in any way with the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. FERRER. Not that I know of, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever contribute any funds toward that organization?

Mr. FERRER. Not that I remember, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. It could be that you possibly did, though?

Mr. FERRER. Under oath, I won't say "No." But I don't remember ever doing so, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, if it is not so, there would not be any stub in your checkbook from the list that you sent up here to the committee showing any such contribution.

Mr. FERRER. That is right. If I have contributed between 1943 and 1950 it would be on that list.

Mr. KEARNEY. Unless you contributed it in cash.

Mr. FERRER. No, I never did contribute it in cash. I never contributed this kind of thing in cash.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer, I will hand you the news item of May 11, 1948. It may be that on further study of it your recollection may be refreshed as to the part you played as chairman in the holding of that meeting [handing document to witness].

Mr. FERRER (after examining document). This clipping from the Daily Worker, Mr. Tavenner, confirms my impression that I was not at this meeting.

I know Alfred Drake very well. I have never laid eyes on Herbert Biberman. I know Miss Muriel Smith, and I know Mr. James Gow. And I would certainly have remembered if I had been there.

This says that sponsoring the meeting are the theater, radio, music divisions, and that I am the chairman of the theater division.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the June 11, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker there appears an article in which it is stated that—

Jose Ferrer was elected vice chairman of the organization meeting of the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, held on June 9, 1948.

Were you elected as vice chairman of the organization meeting of this New York branch of the organization?

Mr. FERRER. If I was, sir—and you say the Daily Worker says I was?

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker says so.

Mr. FERRER. Well, that seems to be—to make it—I knew nothing about this. I was working at the City Center then and I was about to go to start in summer stock on Long Island, Mr. Tavenner. I was elected without my knowledge. I certainly did not run for office in competition with anybody else.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were rather active as an official in various branches of the organization, having been chairman of the actors' division.

Mr. FERRER. The theater division.

Mr. TAVENNER. Vice chairman of the New York branch of the organization, and a director of the organization. It shows a rather definite connection.

Mr. FERRER. Oh, the connection is there, definitely, Mr. Tavenner, but I would say rather than that I was active, I was extremely inactive in these capacities. I did nothing in these capacities.

Mr. Wood. Extremely inactive, did you say?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It appears from the December 29, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker that José Ferrer was among the signers of a statement issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, demanding the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Do you recall that—that you were a signer of such a letter?

Mr. FERRER. I do not recall it, sir, but I—

Mr. TAVENNER. Or a statement.

Mr. FERRER. I beg your pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. A letter or a statement.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, but I don't recall it.

Mr. Wood. Was the subject ever mentioned to you?

Mr. FERRER. Probably, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Do you recall it?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. Wood. Can you recall?

Mr. FERRER. When you say "ever," do you mean—

Mr. Wood. The subject of the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. FERRER. Do you mean at this time, or at any time?

Mr. Wood. At that time.

Mr. FERRER. I cannot recall.

Mr. Wood. You cannot?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not quite understand that answer, Mr. Chairman. Do I understand the witness to say that at no time during the past year he ever remembers talking with anyone about the abolition of this committee?

Mr. WOOD. That is not what he said. I asked him about the time the proposal was up and that is the time I asked.

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Wood asked me specifically of around December 1948.

Mr. KEARNEY. I will withdraw that question.

Mr. WOOD. Well, for approximately 3 years, from early 1946 until the latter part of 1948—let us put it between those two dates—was the subject of the abolition of this committee ever mentioned to you by any person?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, I am sure it was. I remember discussing it on various occasions. I don't remember who I discussed it with, or how, but I remember discussing it.

But I remember, for instance—if this is the sort of think you want to know, Mr. Wood—that when I was in California shooting Joan of Arc with Ingrid Bergman, which was when the business of the Hollywood Ten began, and along with most of the motion picture colony and the people that I subsequently worked with in the theater, I came back and I felt a certain amount of disapproval of the way Mr. Thomas conducted the hearings.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the record should stand corrected there. I do not believe that "most" of the motion-picture colony took that position.

Mr. FERRER. All right, sir; then let us correct it.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us say a small "minority" of the colony and the industry.

Mr. WOOD. Let me ask the witness, then: What activity did you exercise on behalf of such a move?

Mr. FERRER. None whatever, sir. At the time I was in California there were two broadcasts given on subsequent Sundays—which is why I said a large part, Mr. Jackson—in which a great many stars and writers participated.

Mr. WOOD. What support did you give it?

Mr. FERRER. I didn't give any, sir. I didn't participate in any way whatsoever.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were some of those writers later convicted?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know, sir, because the only writer that was convicted that I ever met in my life was Ring Lardner, who was in college with me. I didn't know any of the other boys.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not ask that question with the idea of indicating that you did not have the right to oppose this committee.

Mr. FERRER. I know you didn't, Mr. Tavenner. I know you didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. But I want to know what your action was and the reason for it.

In that connection, let me call your attention to some further information that we have on that subject.

On March 23, 1948, about 1,000 writers and actors had a meeting at the Hotel Astor, at which was formed, so we understand, an anti-censorship committee, which was instructed to carry out a strong campaign on a national scale against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, against the Tenney committee, of California,

and to fight against what was known as the Dewey plan of establishing a similar committee in New York State.

You were alleged to be one of the speakers at this gathering.

Mr. FERRER. I introduced several people, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us how that organization was formed.

Mr. FERRER. This was in the spring of 1948; was it not?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1948; yes, sir.

Mr. FERRER. To the best of my recollection, I was either phoned—I think I was probably phoned and told that this meeting was going to be held, and the names of some of the people who were going to be present—

Mr. TAVENNER. Who phoned you?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know. I don't remember, Mr. Wood.

(Continuing) : were going to be present were given to me. Among these names was Moss Hart. And because I like and admire Mr. Hart, and because all of us in the theater are against censorship, I agreed to appear.

Mr. KEARNEY. Not because you were in favor of the abolishment of this committee?

Mr. FERRER. I didn't know enough about the committee to be in favor of the abolishment of the committee as a whole, Mr. Kearney. I was more opposed to forms of activity, and censorship was the issue at this particular point.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were also concerned with the raising of funds for the defense of the 19 who had been subpoenaed before this committee, at that meeting?

Mr. FERRER. I don't believe I was concerned with that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that was the business of the meeting, was it not, in part?

Mr. FERRER. I remember that I introduced a painter and I introduced a writer, and I also said that I could not exist as an actor or as an artist if my art were controlled and if I were told how to do things and what to do. I said that the very essence of being an artist is liberty, is freedom, and that, therefore, like a great many people in the arts, I was opposed to censorship.

That was the extent of my interest in the matter, and that is what I said, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Right here, I am anxious to ask you a question right along that line.

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have information to the effect that you were one of a number of people who sent greetings to the Moscow Art Theater, on November 1, 1948.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you do that because of the same love that you expressed and the same necessity for freedom in the practice of your art and your profession?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I did it for entirely different reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason?

Mr. FERRER. The reason was that this was the birthday of the Moscow Art Theater, and the Moscow Art Theater is the cradle of some of the most important developments of our modern theater. The Mos-

cow Art Theater was the home of one of the greatest directorial geniuses the theater has ever known, Stanislavsky.

It was in the Moscow Art Theater that the plays of Anton Chekov first saw the light of day. Several great actors have developed in the Moscow Art Theater.

And on a cultural plane only, and completely divorced from any political implication, when I was asked, "Would you send a telegram to the Moscow Art Theater, saying, 'Congratulations on your fiftieth'—or whatever it was—'birthday,'" I said, "Yes."

I would like to say—I would like to submit here a telegram from a gentleman you may have heard of, Mr. Lawrence Langner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you spell that, please?

Mr. FERRER. L-a-n-g-n-e-r.

Mr. Langner is one of the directors of the Theater Guild, and also an extremely prominent patent attorney all over this country and in Europe. Mr. Langner is a very serious, very thoughtful businessman; a man who is not nearly as trifling as I am—because it has a bearing on what we are talking about.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before you submit that, let me finish my point.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All of the great things which you attribute to the Russian theater, were things that were done earlier than 1934 and 1935; is not that true?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir; that is true, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you taken the pains to study or to understand what had happened to the artists and the people of your profession in Russia since that date?

Mr. FERRER. May I submit this in answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, if it has a bearing on it.

Mr. FERRER. It has a very definite bearing, sir.

Do you want me to read it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Suppose you read it.

Mr. FERRER. In answer to a request from my counsel, Mr. Reiskind, for an affidavit regarding Mr. Lawrence Langner's impression of my character and my Americanism, he wired back:

Flying to Europe; hence unable to prepare affidavit. To the best of my knowledge, José Ferrer is loyal to this country and has expressed himself to me as being opposed to communism. This came up in discussion regarding Soviet interference with creative artists in the theater. Regards.

LAWRENCE LANGNER.

Mr. TAVENNER. But yet you were congratulating the Moscow Theater.

Mr. FERRER. I would congratulate the Moscow Theater in the same way, Mr. Tavenner, that I would disapprove of the discontinuance of, say, playing the music of Wagner while we were at war with Germany. The Moscow Art Theater, to those of us who are in the theater, is a symbol of something, and this is a congratulation, in my mind, completely and totally divorced from any political implications.

I repeat that I have never had any sympathy for anything communistic, and this conversation that Mr. Langner refers to I had completely forgotten until he mentioned it.

Mr. JACKSON. That is in the nature of being a character reference, is it not?

Mr. FERRER. Maybe so, Mr. Jackson. But the fact remains that he said I am opposed to communism and "this came up in discussion regarding Soviet interference with creative artists in the theater."

Which is what we were discussing before; which is why I mentioned it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that discussion take place?

Mr. FERRER. It must have been when I was working for him in the Silver Whistle, which was the season of 1948 to 1949; sometime in that period.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned a moment ago that someone asked you to send this congratulatory telegram. Who was the person?

Mr. FERRER. I believe it was Margaret Webster.

Mr. VELDE. Who is she?

Mr. FERRER. She was the director of Othello, for the Theater Guild. She is an extremely prominent director in the theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. The January 10, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker contains an article, from which it appears that you were one of several who signed an invitation to a peace conference to be held March 25 through 27, 1949, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, sponsored by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Did you sign the invitation?

Mr. FERRER. I do not remember signing the invitation, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you held all of these various positions with the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. FERRER. Yes. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name was used, as we have seen here.

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Many, many times.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly there must be some answer other than the fact you do not remember.

Mr. FERRER. The answer is probably my carelessness, Mr. Tavenner. I don't deny these things. If you ask me if I remember, I cannot tell you I remember. But I have told you time and again that I think it is probable that my name was used justifiably.

I am not sure in this case, but I do know that the opening day of the conference I was in the Waldorf-Astoria—I broke through—which was picketed. The conference took place in the Waldorf-Astoria and I was in the Waldorf-Astoria. And although I was invited to the conference the opening day, I was to a party given for Ed Sullivan that night by the Circus Saints and Sinners, and I was a guest of Mr. Rutgers Nielsen, of RKO Pictures.

My connection with this conference, whether my name was used, or not, was a nonexistent one, because I never attended the conference.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever repudiate the use of your name by any of these organizations?

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

And I wish I had now, because I may say that one reason that I didn't, aside from my natural inertia and my greater interest in my work, because of the fact that at that time I was an actor.

Now, an actor in New York today, the way the theater is set up, is a kind of floating individual. He works for a company until the show closes, then he looks around for another job.

Today I am no longer an actor. Today I am a producer, I am a director. I have my own office; I have my own press-relations staff.

When I want something to go to the press I have the channels and the personnel to accomplish it today.

When I was in the Silver Whistle, which was 1949, I was an actor who had terrible financial losses to recoup, and I did not have to hand, to immediate hand—I could have secured the means—I did not have it at hand, and I just let things slide.

Today I would not do that because I have the machinery within my own office to take care of these things. Also, I have learned a rather bitter lesson, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, am I to understand that if you had to do it over again you would not allow your name to be connected with any of these organizations?

Mr. FERRER. That is right, sir. I would not allow my name to be used by any organization that was a Communist organization, that I knew to be a Communist front, a Communist affiliated, Communist anything. And I have learned the hard way that there are agencies that inform you on these things, and I intend to avail myself of them in the future because I still believe in the principles that I had in mind.

I believe in helping people who need help if their cause is a worthy one, and I regret that I have been careless in so doing.

But I do not regret the impulse, and I intend to maintain the impulse under more careful circumstances in the future.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you still believe in the abolishment of the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. FERRER. No, I do not. I do think the House Un-American Activities Committee today is not only fulfilling an extremely important function, which I know that the FBI has been doing all along, but I know they are doing it in a way which I consider much more fair, much more decent; and I am now opposed to abolishment.

Mr. KEARNEY. When did you change your mind on that score?

Mr. FERRER. Well, today, among other things.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, since the subpoena was issued?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; because I was not very much aware of the activity of the House Un-American Activities Committee personally until the subpoena was issued.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you make a study of it since that time?

Mr. FERRER. To a certain extent; yes, sir. Superficial, as usual, but a study.

Mr. KEARNEY. Then, according to your own testimony, it must be favorable.

Mr. FERRER. Yes; it is favorable, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I reserve final judgment on it.

Mr. FERRER. Well, of this moment, Mr. Jackson, I cannot see into the future.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ferrer, in a report by this committee, of April 19, 1949, a rather lengthy report relating to the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, that organization was described as a "super mobilization of the inveterate wheel horses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

The report described the purposes of this conference, which the record shows you to have indorsed or sponsored, to be:

1. To provide propagandist forum against the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, the American foreign policy in general;
2. To promote support for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union;
3. To mobilize American intellectuals in the field of arts, sciences, and letters behind this program, even to the point of civil disobedience against the American Government;
4. To prepare the way for the coming world peace conference to be held in Paris on April 20 to 23, 1949, with similar aims in view on a world scale under similar Communist auspices;
5. To discredit American culture and to extol the virtues of the Soviet culture.

Is your knowledge of the work of that conference such that you recognized that the conference had those purposes?

Mr. FERRER. If I had ever heard that the purpose of this conference was to discredit American culture or to advocate—I don't remember the exact wording—but disregard for the American Government, I would have been extremely loud and unpleasant in opposition.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take any steps to at that time ascertain what its true purposes were?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. And one reason I didn't take any steps was that I don't believe I ever authorized the use of my name, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you taken any steps to repudiate your written sponsorship of—

Mr. FERRER. Did I?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. No; I did not, sir. I tried to answer that question to Mr. Kearney a few moments ago.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know that your name was being used in that connection?

Mr. FERRER. I probably did, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. The newspaper accounts contained rather extensive coverage of the conference.

Mr. FERRER. Yes. Yes; I think I did know.

I would like to say, Mr. Jackson, that it presents a problem, as I say, to an actor who hasn't got the machinery set up around him how to repudiate it. If you write a letter to the people involved with your name on the letterhead, your name has been used. The damage has been done; they will probably disregard it.

In those days I had not made very many motion pictures. I was not anywhere as near prominent as I am today, and if I had made some kind of a public statement to the effect, it probably would have been thrown in the wastebasket. That was my feeling.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, Mr. Ferrer, the thing that is perplexing many people is the fact that your situation at that particular time was not in the slightest degree unusual. The situation in which an artist was importuned to permit the use of his name was one which was shared by hundreds of artists in all fields of the cultural arts, hundreds of men and women upon whose names and characters no taint of suspicion has ever been cast. Your case was not at all unusual when considered in the same light and the same period during which the Cary Grants, Randolph Scotts, and John Waynes were climbing the success ladder. There were literally scores of others who avoided these pitfalls.

Somehow or other these artists kept themselves from being placed in the situation where they eventually became suspect because of their activities. So your situation is not at all unusual, Mr. Ferrer, because of the fact that you did not have the physical mechanics at hand to counteract the unauthorized use of your name. Neither did the others.

Mr. FERRER. I know John Wayne and I know Cary Grant, and believe me, these men, when you get to be that successful and that prominent, you have either, through the studio or through your staff of secretaries—because when you are that successful and that well known, you have to have all kinds of machinery to dispose of, which a stage actor just never, never needs or can afford for that matter.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, there are on the legitimate stage in New York a number of actors and actresses who, during that same period were in very like situations. I mean that they were "top names." They were not people who were drawing down large salaries. They were people who, like yourself, were coming up the ladder and who were subject to the same pressures and the same unauthorized use of their names as you were.

Mr. FERRER. I agree that I should have, Mr. Jackson. I am not arguing that point. I was just offering one more weak excuse.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been honorary president of the Casa de Puerto Rico of the International Workers' Order?

Mr. FERRER. I have a letter in my files, Mr. Tavenner, which I wrote. I believe I was on tour.

Was I?

I was out of town. Anyway, I wrote a letter to my lawyer, Mr. Arthur Friend, who is now dead, I am sorry to say, in which I said:

I see by letterhead that I have been honorary member of this thing, and this is the first I have heard of it. It comes to me as a considerable surprise.

This was done again completely without my authorization or anything of the sort, and this I have a record of. I don't have it with me [addressing Mr. Fortas]. Do you?

Mr. KEARNEY. When you wrote down your surprise, did you repudiate it?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I did not repudiate it. I know it was to be that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke this morning of the Theatre Authority and Mr. Correlli, Alan Correlli—

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Who is the head of the—

Mr. FERRER. Was.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Who was the head of it? Is he the same person who was a character witness in behalf of Larry Adler and Paul Draper in Connecticut, in the libel suit trial that was held not long ago?

Mr. FERRER. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with his testimony at that trial?

Mr. FERRER. When was the trial, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. April 4, 1950.

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I am not familiar. I was in California at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any suggestion that you would like to make about the use of Communist-front organizations in your profession?

Mr. FERRER. A suggestion to whom, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee, as to how Communist-front organizations may be made less dangerous in your profession, or may be put upon a basis whereby the innocent members of your profession might well avoid pitfalls?

Mr. FERRER. I have one suggestion, sir. And maybe this has been done already, but if it hasn't been done, it should be done more, and that is: I think it is extremely important that in theatrical circles and in the entertainment profession it be highly publicized the availability of this committee and the Attorney General's office rapidly to inform any member of the profession who wants instruction.

I think that this service exists. Does it not?

But I don't think the people know about it. I think that if they knew, "We can go in and find out," if they had a place that they knew is set up just to help us out, to keep us out of this trouble, next to making it illegal, the Communist Party and all Communist activity—which would be the thing that I think would be the biggest help of all—I think some kind of a center where people who want information and want help can get it and can receive a welcome when they come asking questions and can get it rapidly so they can answer quickly when they ask a question, and the publicizing of this would be a tremendous help to you people and to all of us.

I think it is a matter of public relations, for the members of the entertainment profession to be aware that it is their duty to find out and to tell them to go where to find out.

Mr. KEARNEY. In a situation like that, would it not also be true that you would have those who want to believe who would believe?

Mr. FERRER. That would be a big step in the right direction, wouldn't it, Mr. Kearney, to know who they were?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes. But certain members of not only your profession, but of other organizations have their own ideas about what you were talking about, and even if a hundred-point proof was placed in front of them, they still would not believe it.

Mr. FERRER. Except that I think there is nothing like dragging something out into the open and exposing it to air; the examples set, let us say, by the few who use this service, or who may use this service, or used it and disregarded it, who are lonelier and lonelier and who would be finally left not in a large group such as I was, but falling by themselves and having to face alone this responsibility.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is what this committee has been doing for years, and even on your admission you did not believe it until only a few days ago.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir. And that is why I say it is a public relations job to advise them to avail themselves, that they have this committee to avail themselves, and to have a place to go and get these questions answered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Ferrer, what possible course of action could this committee, or any other agency, take in advertising the fact that May Day is an international Communist celebration?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Jackson, you must remember I was asked a question and I am trying my best to answer. I am offering suggestions.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not asking facetious questions. I mean what process of added information can we pursue when the entire press of the Nation—

Mr. FERRER. I think that is no longer necessary.

Mr. JACKSON. What possible course can we take, as far as artists are concerned, in instances where they support, knowingly or unknowingly, Communist candidates for public office? That is a very personal matter which requires self-investigation. No committee can or should control those arts.

Mr. FERRER. That is perfectly true. On political matters there is absolutely no question.

Mr. JACKSON. The whole essence of this investigation is political. The whole thing is a political situation.

Mr. FERRER. I think we have all learned a lot in the last few months, sir. I certainly have, Mr. Jackson.

If the question ever comes up before me, I am going to very strongly advise people to find out and to tell them that this committee exists and they should—

Mr. KEARNEY. Why wait until the question comes before you? Why not start now?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Kearney, I will ask you for a few suggestions. If you tell me how, I will be glad to. I will. I am talking about other people—if it comes up in conversation, I mean.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Ferrer, many of the people with whom your name, advertently or inadvertently, has been associated, have appeared in the same chair in which you are now seated.

That particular group is not going to require it at all, because they are fully informed as to what this committee is doing and the information it is attempting to obtain.

Mr. FERRER. I mean younger members in the theater, young newcomers in the theater, that I come in contact with. They say, "Joe, how did you make out today? What are you going to do in the future?" and so on.

I will tell them. Obviously, those are my juniors. Others will know better, those who didn't before. I think the youth, the people who are becoming the tomorrow of the theater, I think there is where we can all be very useful, because I think it is important that the motives that prompted this should not die, and I think it is important that the method that we employ be better.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Wood. The counsel informs me that he is finished with all the questions he has to ask. So I will yield to you now.

Mr. JACKSON. I simply wanted to carefully cover one sore point.

Do I understand Mr. Ferrer, that you advocate and endorse the outlawing of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir; I do. Definitely. Emphatically.

In dealing with it—

Mr. JACKSON. Would you assign a reason for your belief in that connection? Why do you think it should be outlawed?

Mr. FERRER. Because, through conversations, investigation, and research that I have done because of the subpoena and my appearance here, I have been convinced and it has been pointed out to me irrefutably that the Communist Party of America is the instrument, definitely, of a foreign government; that its aims are those of a foreign government, and have nothing to do with our own life or our own welfare.

And the mere fact that it is un-American seems to me to make it ipso facto illegal. I think that it would be simpler and more clear-cut if the Communist Party was an outlaw and there would be right black or white, one or the other.

I am not an expert in legal matters, but this is my unprofessional opinion.

Mr. Wood. I know the witness is probably tired, and so is the reporter. It has been a rather long day. If you desire to interrogate the witness at some length, it might be well to adjourn until tomorrow.

Do you have some questions to ask, too, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. And you, too, Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. Wood. I appreciate the fact that we have been here long today and I certainly do not want people to get too tired.

If it is agreeable to the witness to remain over until the morning, the witness can meet us back here at 10 o'clock, instead of 10:30.

Mr. FERRER. I am supposed to play a matinee tomorrow afternoon, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Where?

Mr. FERRER. In New York City.

Mr. Wood. At what time?

Mr. FERRER. I should be in the theater by 2:15, 2 o'clock.

Mr. Wood. Would that mean, then, that you should get away from here this evening?

Mr. FERRER. I have a play tonight. Yes, sir. I have to catch a plane and I am giving a performance tonight.

Mr. Wood. At what time tonight?

Mr. FERRER. I should be in the theater by 8 o'clock.

Mr. Wood. What time does your plane leave?

Mr. FERRER. Five o'clock is the reservation I have. But I would be glad to take a later plane, or do whatever you gentlemen suggest.

Mr. Wood. What is the latest plane you could get that would get you there in time? It is 4 o'clock now.

What day would suit you, Mr. Ferrer, to return here for the questions that the other members of the committee may desire to ask you?

Mr. FERRER. Thursday, or Friday, Mr. Wood, if you don't think we can do so now.

Mr. Wood. I am apprehensive and some of the members have indicated that their questioning may consume a little time. I am apprehensive that we would not be able to finish here before 5 o'clock this evening.

And I am speaking for myself only now, but I have not had a chance to read my own mail today. The rest can answer for themselves. I think we should have a little time.

Can you return, then, at 10:30 Friday morning, Mr. Ferrer?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. I will say for the benefit of the members of the committee particularly that it would be impossible for me to be here Friday, but I am going to ask Mr. Walter to take over.

Also, I think because of the absences here we had better maintain the same schedule so that I can be sure to have it.

You may be excused, then, Mr. Ferrer, until Friday morning at 10:30.

Mr. FERRER. Friday morning at 10:30. Thank you, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. The committee will stand in recess until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 4 p. m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, May 23, 1951.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:45 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter (appearance as noted in transcript), Morgan M. Moulder (appearance as noted in transcript), James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson.

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

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that there are present of the full committee Messrs. Frazier, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Wood, constituting a quorum of the full committee.

Whom do you have, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness this morning, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Budd Schulberg.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Schulberg, will you stand, please, and be sworn. You do solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat, sir. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF BUDD WILSON SCHULBERG, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, GERARD D. REILLY AND CHARLES EDWARD RHETTS

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, will you state your full name, please?

Mr. SCHULBERG. My name is Budd Wilson Schulberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I am.

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

Mr. RHETTS. Mr. Gerard D. Reilly and Mr. Charles Edward Rhetts of the firm of Reilly, Rhetts & Ruckelshaus.

Mr. WOOD. Local address, please?

Mr. RHETTS. Tower Building, Washington, D. C., sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Schulberg?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was born March 27, 1914, in the city of New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you live?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I now live in New Hope, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee briefly your educational training?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I went through the public-school system of the city of Los Angeles, graduated from Los Angeles High School, went to Deerfield Academy, and to Dartmouth College.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you at Dartmouth College?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was graduated in June of 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take additional educational training after that, or not?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir, I didn't. I received no other degrees except my B. A.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Schulberg, have you ever served in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. What branch of the military service?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Naval Reserve.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become active in the United States Navy?

Mr. SCHULBERG. March 10, 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you enlist?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I enlisted.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an officer?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I became a lieutenant in the Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you serve in the United States Navy?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Until March 17, 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any foreign service?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I did. I received one battle star in the European theater of operations. I received commendation from the War Department for directing a security Nazi film to be used as evidence in the Nuremberg trial of major war criminals. I also received a commendation from Secretary Forrestal.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you discharged from the United States Navy?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was released to inactive status on March 17, 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. You still retain your commission in the United States Naval Reserve?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter upon your profession?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It is a difficult question to answer, sir. I have been writing since about the age of 11 or 12, I would say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline to the committee what your professional experience has been since you graduated from Dartmouth in 1936?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I will try to do it, sir, as briefly as I can.

In the summer of 1936 I returned to Hollywood, Calif. During that summer I wrote short stories. In the fall I went to work at a film studio called the Selznick International, as a reader, and from that time to, I would say, 1939, on and off, I was what is known as a junior writer for the screen, although my main interest was in short-story writing and fiction.

And from 1936 until the present I have been publishing almost constantly in international magazines, as well as writing some novels.

Mr. TAVENNER. What novels have you written?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have written three, sir. The titles of them are: "What Makes Sammy Run?", "The Harder They Fall," and "The Disenchanted."

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write them in the order in which you named them?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, there has been testimony before the committee by Mr. Richard Collins, who appeared here on April 12, 1951, that you had been a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood in the late thirties, and that he had understood that you had withdrawn from the Communist Party as the result of a difficulty over the book, *What Makes Sammy Run?*

Mr. SCHULBERG. I guess some others run too, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And shortly after that testimony, in fact, on April 14, this telegram was received by the chairman of this committee:

I have noted the public statement of your committee inviting those named in recent testimony to appear before your committee. My recollection of my Communist affiliation is that it was approximately from 1937 to 1940. My opposition to Communists and Soviet dictatorship is a matter of record. I will cooperate with you in any way I can.

BUDD SCHULBERG,
New Hope, Pa.

Now, as a result of the receipt of that telegram, you were asked to appear at a time that the committee could hear you.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you at any time voluntarily made known to an investigative agency of the Federal Government, prior to the testimony of Richard Collins, that you had been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I had.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to refer back for a moment to your educational training. You state that you completed your college course at Dartmouth in 1936. While at Dartmouth, did you become acquainted with William Remington?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe when I was a senior at Dartmouth College that he was a junior—no; I am sorry. I mean a freshman; and that when I was the editor of the college newspaper that he was one of the heelers, freshman heelers, for the paper. A heeler is someone bucking for a job on a newspaper. I did meet him at that time; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had left Dartmouth College prior to his return to that institution after having been with the TVA in Tennessee?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I am not sure of the dates of his return to college. I am more sure of mine. I left Dartmouth College in June 1936, and in May 1939 I didn't return to the college, but there is a town very close by where I took up residence while I was writing my first book.

Mr. TAVENNER. The testimony of Mr. Remington before this committee was that he returned to Dartmouth in September 1937. That would have been after you had left the institution?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; it would; I would say about a year and 2 or 3 months after I had left the institution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you attended Dartmouth College?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, there has been testimony before this committee of efforts made by the Communist Party in Hollywood to influence the work of writers in Hollywood, such as the Albert Maltz incident, with which I am certain you are familiar.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The screen play written by Richard Collins, which you may recall from the testimony of Mr. Collins; and the adaptation of a book to the screen, I believe the title of which was "Cornered," or possibly the title of which was "Crossfire"; do you recall which of the two it was, with which Mr. Dmytryk was concerned in his testimony?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Well, I am not sure. I believe he made both of those pictures and I am not sure about the case.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is unimportant as to which it is.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I think he made them both.

Mr. TAVENNER. The point is that Mr. Dymtryk testified at length regarding efforts made to influence the production of that picture, that is, efforts by the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I am aware of that, and that did strike a bell with me. I remember a somewhat similar incident in my life at a much earlier date.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to tell the committee in detail what your experience was while a member of the Communist Party with the efforts of the Communist Party to influence you in your writings.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered hearing room.)

Mr. SCHULBERG. I will try to do that, sir. From about 1937, as I say, I was first in a study group, a Marxist study group, which without any formality that I remember, became a Young Communist League group, and then I believe became a youth group, still more or less the same group, some changes here or there, a youth group of the Communist Party, as I say, in each step without much formality that I remember.

I joined because at the time I felt that the political issues that they seemed to be in favor of, mostly I recall the opposition to the Nazis and to Mussolini and a feeling that something should be done about it, those things attracted me, and there were some others, too.

At the same time I was very much interested in my own writing, as I say. In 1937, while a member of the group, and in 1938 also, I

began to write short stories. These stories were published in many, many different magazines.

I believe the feeling of the group was that these stories were not exactly what would be expected of someone writing as a Communist. Long before any difficulty that I got into for writing *What Makes Sammy Run?* I was told these stories were too realistic, they were too depressing, decadent, and there were many other words.

Having some soft sides in my nature, and on some sides a little stronger, I decided that as a writer I had to go ahead and write as well as I could what I felt like writing.

During these years, I would say through 1938, while there was considerable and I would say a growing tension about this dispute, I must say I was on the political side still in favor of the immediate issues as the Communists seemed to be following them.

I don't remember having any arguments then about trying to arouse people against the Nazis, and so forth, but I do remember many arguments about my writings. Though I had been somewhat of a zealot in 1936, I think I was much more of a zealot before I was in any organization. It is much easier before you are subjected to any discipline.

By early 1939 I was definitely backsliding. I was trying to avoid as many meetings as I could and as many responsibilities as I could. I wasn't seeing the right people. Most of the people I was seeing were writers. Some of these writers might have been strongly opposed to the party. Some perhaps had not even heard of the party, I don't know, but they were not interested in the party as a group.

The subject was brought up at the meetings that I was attending, and I told them that I was then interested in—

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of meetings are you referring to now?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I would say by 1939 that these were meetings of the youth group of the Communist Party. Whether it was a Young Communist League in early 1939 or a youth group of the Communist Party in the party, I honestly cannot say. I haven't been able to check. To my mind it was more or less a technicality. I think anytime around 1938 if they had asked me, "Do you mind if it is changed?" I don't think I would have said "No," but I don't remember its being discussed.

At these meetings I do remember my writing was discussed, and my attitude toward my work was discussed, and it was suggested that I correct my errors, I suppose you would say.

At that time I told them I had decided to write a book. The feeling of the group was: "That is fine. Writing is very important, books are very important, provided that they are useful weapons. What kind of a book do you intend to write?"—since I had used my book as an excuse for dropping out and not going to meetings.

I said I had written a short story published in *Liberty* magazine in 1937 which was entitled "*What Makes Sammy Run?*", and that I had been thinking seriously of developing that into a novel. In fact, I had written more than one short story. I had begun to write a series of short stories about a central character which were published in *Liberty* and other magazines and which later became a part of the book that I was to write.

The reaction to my idea for this book was not favorable, I would say. The feeling was that this was a destructive idea; that, again, it was much too individualistic; that it didn't begin to show what were called the progressive forces in Hollywood; and that it was something they thought should either be abandoned or discussed with some higher authority than the youth group before I began to work on it.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you at that point. Who in the Communist Party group made suggestions of that type to you and engaged in a discussion of the matters you have referred to?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Well, sir, in the youth group many people felt strongly about it. I believe the one who either felt most strongly or was most responsible at that time was Richard Collins. He disapproved strongly of my attitude toward writing and toward the Communists.

When no agreement could be reached, and when both sides were adamant about this, it was suggested by Collins, as I recall, that I speak to John Howard Lawson and that possibly he could advise me on the changes of the approach or in some way direct my work so that it would not have the destructive and individualistic approach that the group felt I was taking, one which was in opposition to the program of the party, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as a result of that advice, did you confer with John Howard Lawson?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I did. I went to see Lawson. I believe it was suggested—I can't remember any longer if it was the group or Lawson that suggested that before I dropped out to do the book, that I submit some kind of outline, but either in the group or through Lawson it was suggested that I submit an outline and discuss the whole matter further, and if it was considered a project that was useful—there was a lot of talk at that time about proletarian novels. That is a museum piece now, but at that time there was a great deal of talk about the proletarian novel and how writers could be useful.

Mr. TAVENNER. Describe to the committee the proletarian novel to which you refer.

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is a difficult assignment. I will try. It was a kind of stock writing formula in that day. The writers were trying to write books about factories, about strikes, about opposition to capitalists, and so forth.

This would be hindsight. I don't pretend any wisdom on the subject. But now that I look back, after having studied it more fully, I think it was very similar to what the writers in the Soviet Union were being told at the same time. They were being told that anything that helped the 5-year plan, that made the workers happier in their role, was a good book; if it did not, it was not a good book.

Looking back now, it seems that most of the best writers in the Soviet Union were silenced because they were not willing to take that command. But I don't pretend to have known that at the time I was having my squabbles and arguments with Richard Collins, John Howard Lawson, and other people in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. I interrupted you in your narrative of what occurred with reference to the pressure brought to bear upon you by Lawson and others.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe it was decided that this was not a worthy project unless I submitted to much more discipline. It is always called self-discipline, though I didn't find much self-discipline in it, but it was called self-discipline and it was suggested you submit to it. Many people have submitted to this self-discipline, which, from what I can see, is imposed from without and does not have much to do with self.

I decided I would have to get away from this if I was ever to be a writer. I decided to leave the group, cut myself off, pay no more dues, listen to no more advice, indulge in no more political literary discussions, and to go away from the party, from Hollywood, and try to write a book, which is what I did.

I went to Vermont in May of 1939. I settled there and I began to write. I stayed there all through 1939 and into 1940. I believe I spent a month or two at Mount Kisco in a hotel doing my final revisions—not final revisions, I guess a book is never finally revised, but doing some revisions.

After that I returned to Hollywood again, after I had submitted my book to the publishers.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return to Hollywood?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe in February or March 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, had your book been published by that time?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; it had not been published. It was at that time being prepared for publication. It was not to be published for another year. There is a long period of work, doing the manuscript-cutting, going over the galleys, and so forth, before a book is published. The book finally was published on March 27, 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any further difficulty, or did you receive any further advice from the Communist Party, before the publication of the book?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I did. When I returned, Richard Collins came to me—I am not absolutely sure, but I believe by this time he seems to have grown somewhat in importance in party groups. I think he had been treasurer of the group when I left. He seemed now to be in some position of greater authority.

He came to me and said that they felt that my whole attitude had been sharply in opposition to the party; that I had gone away without announcement. In those days—I suppose it is the same today—I am sure it is—you were not supposed to go away without saying where you were going and getting what was called a transfer. You were supposed to transfer so that they could pick up your dues, and so forth, at the next place you went. I hadn't done this. I had simply broken off and gone away. They didn't think this was a very good idea. They didn't think finishing my book and turning it in to my publisher without further consultation was a very good idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. Right there let me ask you: You were requested to furnish to Lawson an outline of your book?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you do that?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; I did not. I think it was also suggested that I show him the book itself, which, also, I did not do. I feel very, very strongly that every writer has to choose his own guidance in these matters.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you of the opinion that the lack of freedom of that description would destroy you as a writer?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I am not sure how consciously I knew it at that time. At the time I felt I had to get away from any control in order to be able to write at all; and, as I say, though Mr. Collins, I think, suggested that I get out because of the adverse criticism of the party to my book, actually, as I am sure he would remember, this had a very long history. It had begun with my very first short story and had increased as I continued writing.

What was your question?

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you to ask whether or not you had furnished to Lawson a copy of the book or outline.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Never; never; I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you were describing to us what had occurred prior to the publication and release of your book.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir. Collins came to me and told me all the criticisms that had been made against me. By this time it had increased. By this time there was another problem. I didn't seem to be too much in favor of the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us go into that subject a little later. Let us confine ourselves for the moment to this pressure and influence brought to bear upon you as a writer.

Mr. SCHULBERG. He said he thought I should come back to the group and not just go away and talk against them, as he had heard I had talked; not to be undisciplined, as he felt I had been for many years; and if I had these objections which he had heard I had told to others that I should come and at least present them and do it clean.

I believe he said, "Are you in or out of this thing?" and that I said, "As far as I am concerned, since I left in May I am out."

I had these discussions with the group, which were lengthy, both sides presenting their views, which continued to clash, and it was then suggested that I talk to John Howard Lawson, and that since they couldn't settle it, that maybe he could; and I did have a talk again with John Howard Lawson about the book. He felt that they should see it, and felt that it was not the sort of thing I should do, and in a sense indicated that I was not functioning as a Communist writer.

This was also inconclusive. I think both positions were maintained just as they had been in the group. Finally it was suggested that I talk with a man by the name of V. J. Jerome, who was in Hollywood at that time.

I went to see him. Looking back, it may be hard to understand why, after all these wrangles and arguments, I should go ahead and see V. J. Jerome. But maybe every writer has an insatiable curiosity about these things; I don't know.

Anyway, I went. It was on Hollywood Boulevard in an apartment. I didn't do much talking. I listened to V. J. Jerome. I am not sure what his position was, but I remember being told that my entire attitude was wrong; that I was wrong about writing; wrong about this book, wrong about the party; wrong about the so-called peace movement at that particular time; and I gathered from the conversation in no uncertain terms that I was wrong.

I don't remember saying much. I remember it more as a kind of harangue. When I came away I felt maybe, almost for the first

time, that this was to me the real face of the party. I didn't feel I had talked to just a comrade. I felt I had talked to someone rigid and dictatorial who was trying to tell me how to live my life, and as far as I remember, I didn't want to have anything more to do with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have spoken several times of your conferences on a lower level with a group, and you named Richard Collins as a member of that group. Will you identify that group more fully at this time as to whom they were who were talking to you, endeavoring to persuade you to desist in your plan of writing? I am not asking you to state at this time the names of all the members of the Communist Party with whom you came in contact. I want to limit it at this point to those who took part in these discussions to which you have referred.

Mr. SCHULBERG. This would be the tone of the group in general. Some would feel more strongly about it and others less so. We think of the Communists as a monolithic block and in general movements I am convinced they are a monolith. The individuals varied. There were some stronger and some weaker. But I believe it was also the view of Paul Jarrico, and not to the same extent that of Ring Lardner, Jr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Ring Lardner, Jr., who I felt always to be more tolerant in these matters than the others.

Those are the principal members in the group itself that I remember discussing this with.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were in the course of telling us what occurred after you returned to Hollywood in 1940 and prior to the release of your book in 1941.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir. Well, in the fall of 1940 I returned to New York to correct my galleys, and stayed there doing that and making last minute changes until sometime early in 1941. It seems to me I returned to Hollywood again shortly before my book was actually supposed to appear.

I was only there a short time then, but I gathered that the feeling of the Communist Party against the book had been mounting. I think by that time there were advance copies of the book out. A book is in a sense out sometimes 3 months before it actually appears.

I think advance copies had been read before it was out, and the feeling was that all the storm warnings that had been raised against me had been disregarded, and that the work that was about to come out was even worse than anyone could imagine.

I was told at that time that a meeting would take place. Well, no, I am not sure I was right then; I am not sure. I was a little bit excited at that time because it was my first novel and I was very curious as to what people would think of it, and I felt some people were not going to like it very well, and I decided to go down to a quiet spot and sit around on the beach, and maybe drop in at de Houslaus' Bar or something, and wait until this whole thing blew over. I did. I went to Ensenada, and I thought I was waiting for it to blow over. I guess it hasn't quite blown over yet.

As I say, I had been told that there was going to be a meeting against the book. When I returned to Hollywood after the book

had been published, I ran into various people. It turned out to be rather a controversial book inside the Communist Party, apparently, and outside. People took rather violent sides on this. Some people disliked it intensely, and others were more favorable to it.

I heard that a meeting was to take place. No, it wasn't quite like that. There was a review in the Daily Worker about that time. I think it was early April sometime before I returned from Ensenada.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. How long was that before the release of the book, do you recall?

Mr. SCHULBERG. As I recall, it was shortly after. It would be about the time any other book review would come out.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of the release of your book?

Mr. SCHULBERG. March 27, 1941. So I would say that was about a week later.

The book review was a very favorable book review.

Mr. TAVENNER. From the Daily Worker?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir. It said that this was "the Hollywood novel." It said that most of the novels before that treated with Hollywood had resorted to filth, and that this book was hearteningly free from all of this; that it dealt realistically with the Hollywood scene. I think I was called a realist; I think I was called an important comer; and in general it was a pretty good review.

Apparently the review was a mistake. I heard there was consternation about the review and that somehow the reviewer had missed a signal.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any meetings held in Communist Party circles before the so-called mistake had been discovered?

Mr. SCHULBERG. What meetings there were in Communist circles before, I honestly couldn't say, because I wouldn't have been a part of them, but I was told there was going to be a public meeting engineered by, but I don't believe confined to, Communists, at which the reviewer would be called to account and the real party line on the book would be laid down.

I was asked if I wanted to come to this meeting, and I said that I didn't believe any writer should defend his book in public. I have never defended a book in public. I hope I am not doing it here, because it is something I don't believe in. A book is defended by the writer when he writes it, and after that everybody has a right to like or dislike it if he wishes.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, in the United States?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Exactly; in the United States and I would say generally in the Western World.

Mr. JACKSON. Who extended this invitation or told you of this indignation meeting that was to be held?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That I can't remember. I can't remember exactly who it was who asked me to the meeting. It may have been one of any number of people, and I don't recall. I simply remember I was asked, and I remember what I said and that I refused to go.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, after the meeting, I understand various mistakes were discovered. What were you referring to?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Well, I understand that it was pointed out at the meeting that this review was entirely opposite to what it should

have been; that the book was not an honest book; that it was a dishonest book. I have copies of the two reviews. It would be too lengthy to describe them point by point.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have them here. I will introduce them.

Mr. SCHULBERG. In that case I will try to remember it as well as I can. The feeling was that I had slandered the progressive forces. I believe they said it was not a Hollywood novel at all.

All the things brought out in the meeting which I am reporting, I neglected to say, appeared in a new review shortly after the meeting. The new review, by the same reviewer. It is the only time I have been reviewed good and bad by the same reviewer. It is the only time I ever remember one book reviewer reviewing the same book twice, 10 days apart, and in almost every instance one review was completely at variance with the other, point by point. The book which was not filthy was filthy; the book which was realistic was reactionary; the book which was healthy was diseased.

Mr. VELDE. Was it reviewed by the same man in both instances?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes. I remember his name. It was Charles Glenn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was Charles Glenn then employed?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I imagine both by the Daily Worker and the People's World. I believe those reviews appeared simultaneously in both newspapers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you known Charles Glenn prior to that time?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I may have met him once in Hollywood browsing around in a book shop one day. I knew him, I think I was introduced to him once before that, and that is all, simply as somebody who wrote on that paper.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask you a question at this point? What was there in the book, What Makes Sammy Run? that would cause the Communists to attack the book?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Well, sir; they could answer that much better than I could. As I recall the attack and the reviews, the objection was to what I believe they called the whole approach to literature. I think they feel that you have to have a propagandistic point of view. They felt that I simply had not shown the things that they thought ought to be shown; that I had just written an individual story about one person. I never intended it to be typical of Hollywood. I didn't intend it to be typical of all the Hollywood producers. It was the story of one person as I saw him, characteristic, that I thought could happen but didn't happen in Hollywood all the time. It was at variance with what they thought a book about Hollywood should be.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, they objected to the fact you had overlooked a chance to slant a story?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I would say so, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In fact, one of the criticisms was that you had not dealt strongly enough with the work that had been done in the re-organization of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That was one of their many objections, that they felt I had almost—I am not sure if the word "slandered" was used, but they felt I had completely overlooked the real work that had been done to build up the guild, and had not placed enough emphasis on the little people of Hollywood and so on. I was not attempting to prove or disprove anything. I was just trying to tell my story.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Elizabeth Leech Glenn?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir. I don't remember ever being acquainted with her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to introduce in evidence the book reviews referred to.

The first is taken from People's World of April 2, 1941, page 5, the heading of which is "Novel—the story of a Hollywood heel," by Charles Glenn. I desire to offer it in evidence as Schulberg exhibit No. 1.

The second is the issue of the Daily Worker of April 7, 1941 [p. 7], the heading of which is "What Makes Sammy Run?—story of a Hollywood heel," by Charles Glenn. I offer it in evidence as Schulberg exhibit No. 2.

The third is the issue of the Daily Worker of April 8, 1941 [p. 7], and appears under the heading, "News in the world of stage and screen," by Charles Glenn. I desire to offer it in evidence as Schulberg exhibit No. 3.

The next is the April 24, 1941, issue of the People's World [p. 5], under the heading, "Hollywood vine," by Charles Glenn. I offer it in evidence as Schulberg exhibit No. 4.

And finally, the issue of April 23, 1941 [p. 7], of the Daily Worker, an article entitled, "Hollywood Can Be Won to the Side of the American People—Actors and Directors Respond to Criticism of Film Audiences," by Charles Glenn. I desire to offer it in evidence as Schulberg exhibit No. 5.

Mr. Wood. Let them be received.

(The book reviews above referred to, marked "Schulberg Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5," respectively, are filed herewith.)¹

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney left hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, I referred a moment ago to the review by Charles Glenn in which he made a favorable review, and the only criticism was that which I mentioned, that the battle to organize the Screen Writers' Guild was sketched too lightly in the novel. And you have described in a general way the favorable comment that was made by the representative of the Daily Worker.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I tried to.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was also an additional review by Charles Glenn on April 8, 1941, page 7, which has been introduced in evidence as Schulberg exhibit No. 3. Were you familiar with that second review which was also a favorable review?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; that I don't know about. I was aware of two reviews, one favorable and another that was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of this second review, exhibit 3, this statement is made:

Originally, we passed on second-hand word about Budd Schulberg's new book, What Makes Sammy Run? Having finished it now, may we pass on word that while it doesn't qualify as the great American novel, it's still the best work done on Hollywood?

Showing that there had been a rather deliberate and painstaking review of your book by the reviewer of the Daily Worker which extended over a period of days.

¹ Retained in committee files.

I would like to read into the record that portion of exhibits 4 and 5 in which Glenn explains the reasons for his change.

In the Daily People's World of April 24, 1941, Mr. Glenn explained his about-face by this statement, and I quote:

Since writing the review, I have received several criticisms on it. On the basis of these criticisms, I've done a reevaluation of my work. It's rather important that this reevaluation be done, not in the light of breast beating, but in the light of constructive self-criticism, by which anyone who writes for this paper must work. Understanding your own mistakes is the first requirement of criticism. If you don't understand your own, how can you be expected to consistently understand the weaknesses and mistakes of those on the other side of the fence?

I want also to read into the record the explanation which appeared in the Daily Worker of April 23, 1941, which is exhibit 5. It is in this language, and I quote:

On the basis of quite lengthy discussion on the book, I've done a little reevaluating, and this helps me emphasize the points I've tried to make here. * * * To say I felt more than a trifle silly when these weaknesses (in the Schulberg novel) were called to my attention is putting it a bit mildly. It is precisely the superficial subjective attitude shown in this review which reflects the dangers of an "anti-Hollywood" approach, conscious or unconscious. This isn't breast beating. It's a necessary criticism, because until the attitude reflected is cleaned up, Hollywood will not and cannot be considered the force for peace and progress it is and can be.

Those were the explanations given after the meeting which you have referred to, in which your book had been criticized and Glenn had been called on the carpet about his first favorable report on your novel.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I had not realized there were two different reviews, but that does check with my memory of the one review I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. To emphasize clearly the way in which the Communist Party changed and followed the dictates of some directing authority, I want to read into the record, just very briefly, some of those outstanding points which you mentioned in the course of your testimony. What I am going to read now is from the Daily Worker of April 7, 1941, and also from the People's World of April 2, 1941, being the favorable review of Charles Glenn. This is his language:

For slightly fewer years than they have awaited the great American novel, whatever that may be, American bibliophiles and critics have been awaiting the Hollywood novel. While they may argue its merits and demerits I've a feeling that all critics, no matter their carping standards, will have to admit they've found the Hollywood novel in Budd Schulberg's What Makes Sammy Run?

Now, in the retractive statement of Charles Glenn published in the People's World of April 24, 1941, this is what he says, and I quote:

The first error I made was in calling the book the Hollywood novel.

And I quote again, from the Daily Worker of April 23, 1941:

Recently I wrote a review on Budd Schulberg's book, What Makes Sammy Run? I said it was the story of a Hollywood heel and could be regarded as the Hollywood novel. On the basis of quite lengthy discussion on the book, I've done a little reevaluating, and this helps me emphasize the points I've tried to make here.

He then makes various criticisms, and adds:

Can it then be termed "the Hollywood novel"?

I want the record to also show one or two other points, so that it may be plain. I quote from the Daily Worker of April 7, 1941, and the People's World of April 2, 1941, which was the favorable review:

Former works on the film city have been filthy with four-letter words, spoken and implied. * * * None of these things hold true for Schulberg's novel.

There is nothing vulgar in what he says, nothing superficially vulgar, that is. * * *

Writing in the first person, Schulberg tells of the good as well as the bad.

Then, after the meeting, from the Daily Worker of April 23, 1941, appears this statement:

We do not intend to go into all the aspects of the conscience of a writer, a conscience which allows him (with full knowledge of the facts) to show only the dirt and the filth.

And from the People's World again, of April 24, 1941, after the meeting, I quote:

In a full-drawn portraiture of either Sammy Glick or Hollywood, the people must be seen in action, living the lives they lead. Even more effective would the filth of Sammy Glick become when counterposed to the cleanliness of the people.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, may I make a comment at this point?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I feel very definitely that this illustrates the degree of control the Communist Party had over the People's World and the New York Daily Worker and all writers in their jurisdiction.

Mr. TAVENNER. I call attention to one other point which I desire to be shown in the record. In the Daily Worker of April 7, 1941, and the People's World of April 2, 1941, which are the favorable reviews, this language appears:

Characters [referring to former books on Hollywood] have been drawn black and white, most Hollywood denizens turning out to be unadulterated heels.
* * * None of these things hold true for Schulberg's novel.

Then, after the meeting, from the People's World of April 24, 1941, appears this language:

Some day that story of the Guild will be thoroughly told, well dramatized, and done in all the shades of gray which entered the picture, not on the plain black and whites drawn in the Schulberg book.

You mentioned a moment ago that you have never known of a more complete reversal in a review than there was in this case.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have never seen anything like that; no, sir. I have seen some reviews of my work that I myself might like to change a little bit, but I believe very deeply that in this country every man must act on the basis of his own individual conscience, and that that is one of our privileges and that no one should ever have to change his mind because of dictation from above or outside.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has your attention been drawn to another criticism of your book from Communist sources?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Well, sir, I could not identify it as officially a Communist source, but there was a magazine review which I believe was more or less in line with this general attack on me and my work; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the article written by W. L. River, appearing in the Clipper publication?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. The issue of June 21, 1941, at page 20. I will ask you to look at that review and state if it is the one to which you refer?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Thank you. [After examining document:] Yes, it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire merely to file this. I will not introduce it as an exhibit.

Mr. SCHULBERG. May I say, sir, that I do remember that review quite well, and that I felt he had a right to write it. If it was his own individual opinion, I would have no objection. If it was part of, in a sense, a mass effort, I would then object very strongly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the writer, W. L. River?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I knew him slightly; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I could not say definitely that he was; no, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know whether or not Charles Glenn was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Only by assuming that anyone writing for those publications would be.

Mr. WALTER. By that you mean nobody would have a job with the Daily Worker or this other publication unless he was a Communist?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That would be my hunch. I have never tried to get a job with them, but that would be my hunch.

Mr. WALTER. A pretty good hunch.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Pretty good; yes.

Mr. VELDE. As a matter of fact, I think testimony before this committee was to the effect that all writers for the Daily Worker, People's World, and New Masses had to be Communist Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, is this effort within the Communist Party of the United States to control the work of writers, which you have so graphically described in your own case, consistent with what is occurring in Russia, from any information that is available to you?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe it is; yes, sir; I do. I believe that writing has been very tightly controlled there, and that those who refused to follow the party line were not able to write, or sometimes ceased to exist. On the other hand, those who did, received all kinds of emoluments and were the most privileged people there. I think that has been the history of writing in the Soviet Union, with perhaps one exception.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been in the Soviet Union?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In 1934, during the summer.

May I say that I don't want to sound too sure of the subject, but 2 or 3 months ago I did begin to write an article on the subject of what has happened to writing in the Soviet Union between my first visit in 1934, when I must say I was very impressed, and 1951, which is a relatively short period. I have done a great deal of research on the subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee the benefit of your research and your views at this time, briefly? I think it fits in exactly with the pattern that you have described in matters that have affected

you, and it is particularly pertinent that you contrast the experience which you have gone through with what you have discovered from your studies are the conditions in the other country.

Mr. SCHULBERG. In the late twenties and early thirties writing was controlled by a proletarian group. I have forgotten the name of the organization. It was an organization that controlled all writing, and unless you were satisfactory to the head of this group you just didn't write.

I am talking about the Soviet Union. This is in Russia.

Those writers who didn't conform to that were silenced. I think the very best writers, Isaac Babel and many others, felt they could not write under those circumstances. They had slogans for writing. One slogan was: "All novels must make workers feel happier under the 5-year plan." If the book suggested it was not altogether true, or only 99.9 percent true, there was a good chance it would not be published. If it suggested it was only 50 percent true, there was a good chance the writer would not be around any more.

One day, according to my research, Stalin looked around and said, "Our writing is pretty dull." They said, "Let's find the man who is making it dull." They got the man, who was the head of this group, and sent him to Siberia and shot him.

For 2 years there was a lessening up. When I went there in 1934 there was a writers' congress, which was more or less a welcoming back of all the people who had been silenced and under cover. The reason for that was that Gorki, head of the writing organization, believed there should be a more lenient attitude.

I was on the platform at that writers' congress, and that is what did impress me. I remember Gorki speaking, and a man named Bukharin spoke, and Isaac Babel spoke, and many of the great poets, Pasternak, and so forth.

This is hindsight. I think it is a striking fact that every man who appeared on the platform and called for greater leniency—I think it was called a new silver age of literature—every one of these men by 1938 had either been shot or been silenced, and after that none of these writers, who were trying to follow their individual line, were able to function any more. Some were silenced. Some committed suicide. Some disappeared. Some decided to conform and wrote in the approved style and made a lot of money and did very well.

I believe that is much the situation today. I really believe that you have to conform or in some way you get out or they put you out.

I don't know if I should say it in connection with this, but there is an organization called Friends for Intellectual Freedom.

Mr. TAVENNER. I was just going to ask you about that. What part have you been playing in the work of that organization, and describe the work of the organization.

Mr. SCHULBERG. The organization is interested in helping those writers who have suffered under those conditions and who are able to get out and to try to rehabilitate them and to help them write as they please. For that reason, a number of writers, novelists—Arthur Koestler, Aldous Huxley, Graham Greene, John Dos Passos, James T. Farrell, Richard Revere, Stephan Spender, and myself, among others; I believe there are others—have decided to try to raise funds, if they can, to help these people.

I am in a sense sorry to have to mention it, because it has not been an organization that has been seeking any publicity at all. It is supposed to be just a direct contribution from writer to writer and has discouraged any wide publicity. The thought was that those who were able to write as they pleased would turn over a percentage of their own royalties to those people who haven't been able to do that.

Mr. WALTER. Where are the beneficiaries of that program located?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In Western Germany, I believe, and in France, and here, any writers who are deemed worthy and who are refugees from the system.

Mr. RHETTS. Mr. Tavenner, we have here simply a statement of what this organization is, its purposes, and something about it, and if the committee would like to have it I would be glad to make it available.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; we shall be glad to have it.

Mr. RHETTS. Would you care to introduce it as an exhibit?

Mr. TAVENNER. We will file it with his testimony.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe through these people we will have an opportunity to get first-hand information on what has actually been happening. For instance, I have heard a number of stories. One is that a very distinguished Soviet critic, Corvely Zelinsky, decided he would try to write the history of the Soviet literature. He began with high hopes after the writers' congress I have described, but so many changes had to be made, for instance, one chapter would have to be thrown out because it was written about a writer who was just arrested, and so forth, that he decided after 3 years that it was impossible to write a history of literature in the Soviet Union that would be honest.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the changes were probably for the same reason that John Howard Lawson was required to change his history that he was writing, if you are familiar with that testimony?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe it does have exactly the same effect; yes, sir.

I was very interested in finding out that meetings are held and writers are denounced and from that time on their works are no longer in publication. I feel that the only difference with me is that we have many different forms of publications. There is not a single one where, if you fall out with a group, you are finished.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have there been any instances where you have obtained direct information from a person who has been subjected to that type of treatment in Russia?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir. In the preparation of this article which I began, as I said, 3 months ago, I wrote to someone who was somewhat of an authority in this field, who had come out of Russia only in the last 2 or 3 years, and I told him of my experience in 1934 when I had been impressed.

I told him I had met Gorki and a playwright by the name of Alfino-genoff, and many others, and it had begun to strike me that all the people who told me how hopeful they were, in 1934, weren't around any more. I said I didn't know any more about it than that writers' congress, because I had attended. I asked if he could fill me in on what happened after that time, and he did write me a letter which I found extremely enlightening, and if you wish I will read some parts of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will not ask you to disclose at this time the name of the person who wrote you the letter.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Thank you, sir. It is a rather long letter. I don't want to read it all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to read the parts that are pertinent to the inquiry, whether short or long.

Mr. SCHULBERG (reading) :

You were very fortunate to be in Moscow in 1934. The period from April 1932 (decree abolishing the special proletarian groups in literature and art) to 1935 was a time of good and new hopes. During that period the Soviet literature was under the strong and friendly leadership and protection of Maxim Gorki. The apogee of that short "silver age" was the first convention of the Soviet writers in September 1934. The principal speakers at the first convention were Gorki (Soviet Literature and Socialistic Realism) and Nicholai Bukharin (The Problems of Soviet Poetry). The last name certainly shows what a tolerant atmosphere was present at the convention. Among the many speakers was Isaac Babel. This gifted novelist was silenced since 1927 (or 1928) and I still remember how surprised and pleased I was to see him on the podium speaking a brilliant speech in his usual sharp-witted manner.

The all materials of the first convention seemed to be unorthodox, doubtful and unreliable for Stalin. This is very important for clear understanding what had happened in 1936 and 1937. It is easy to remark that all repressions and liquidations in the literature and in the literary circles which took place during the Yernov era—

I don't know what that is—

were tightly connected with the first convention, its most important speakers and organizers. Gorki was poisoned (1936), Bukharin was dismissed from his office as editor in chief of "Izvestia", arrested (1937) and shot (1938) * * *

Then there were a bunch of Russian names (continuing reading) : and many other novelists were arrested—the same as poets Pavel Vassiliyev, Boris Kornilov, Zaholotsky, Smelyakoff and others. Some of their colleagues—prominent Soviet writers and poets completely stopped their creative activity—among them Selvinsky, Pasternak, Sholockov, Fedin, and Leonov.

After 1937 Soviet literature was like a big army retreating after unsuccessful decisive battle. Some generals were missing, some retreated in silence, trying not to show their fear and doubts. Others tried to make a gay look and impression that nothing of importance was happening. This group did not stop their activity during the Yernov era and produced some bad plays and novels. * * *

Some of the writers who belonged to the silent group later (in 1939 or 1940) broke the silence and started to write in the new orthodox way. It was a great creative degradation for them. So did Tolstoy, Sholockov, Fedin, poet Antokolsky. Some of the writers never tried again—like Boris Pasternak—the finest poet of contemporary Russian and an extremely noble and honest person. So far as I know he only translates from English and French. During the war he translated Hamlet. But I have never heard that any of them did something active "anti" like Meyerhold.

I might say when I went to the Soviet Union in 1934 one of the things that had impressed me most was that I had an opportunity to meet Meyerhold, who was the foremost stage director in the Soviet Union and probably one of the outstanding ones in the world, and he showed me through his theater (continuing reading) :

The case of Meyerhold was a unique one. It certainly was a very rare combination of the big mistakes of the Government. * * *

I think I should explain he is writing something that is known to me. Meyerhold had been a director until 1937. At that time his technique fell into disrepute and he was under a very strong cloud. I don't think he was allowed to produce anything at all in 1937. In 1939

there was a meeting of the stage directors in Russia and Meyerhold, who had been silenced for a long time, asked for an opportunity to speak. He got up and spoke on June 14, 1939, and I honestly believe that his speech will go down as one of the great speeches in defense of individual conscience in the field of art. He told them he had always done the best that he could in his own way; that he couldn't follow anybody else's line or point of view; but that if he was a formalist, and if all the plays he saw on the stage at that time were Socialist realism, he was glad to be a formalist, and so forth.

The day after that speech Meyerhold disappeared, and when the yearbook came out at the end of the year, giving all the speeches of the directors at this convention, Meyerhold's speech was conspicuous by its absence. I think in another 20 or 30 years probably nobody in that country will have ever heard of Meyerhold. I think he will be completely removed and will be what is called a non-person.

Shall I continue this letter, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. If there is anything else there pertinent to our discussion.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I don't believe so, except for one last word about Afinogenoff. He had been one of my hosts. I had gone to his home when I was in the Soviet Union in 1934. I went to see one of his plays. I asked what had happened to Afinogenoff, and he said in 1937 or 1938 they decided Afinogenoff's plays were not good, not following the line, and they were removed from the repertoire of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. And do I understand it was the same general type of disagreement with regard to a writer's freedom to write that caused your original disaffection with the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I now believe it was. I didn't relate it that way at that time, but it was something which the Communists call a social command. A writer in a sense was looked upon as a soldier, and he was given certain social commands, and if he didn't follow those social commands he was no longer permitted to function in that system.

I think at that time I was being given a social command. I didn't know it at the time by that name, neither did they, but I think in a mild way that is what it was.

Mr. Wood. The committee will stand in recess until 2:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:20 p. m., a recess was taken until 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show the committee members present consist of Mr. Doyle, Mr. Walter, Mr. Velde, and Mr. Frazier.

TESTIMONY OF BUDD SCHULBERG—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, in the course of your testimony this morning you told us of your trip in 1934 to the Soviet Union. Were you a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would now tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party, fixing the date as nearly as you can.

Mr. SCHULBERG. In the summer of 1936 I returned to Hollywood and in the fall of that year I went to work as a reader in a studio and what they call a junior writer. As I said this morning, I felt like many young men in that particular period; I was disturbed by the unemployment problem and what seemed to me the rising tide of aggression in Europe. It was during that period that somebody came to me by the name of Stanley Lawrence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Stanley Lawrence?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir. I have been trying to fix the place where we met, and I can't. I have the impression of his just coming up to me somewhere, either at home—I am just not sure any more—and saying that he had heard that I was interested in this problem, that I was concerned about the growth of naziism and so forth, and that I might be interested in joining a Marxist study group. I said that I thought I would be interested in joining it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know or did you know at that time whether or not Lawrence held a high position within the Communist Party in Hollywood?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir, at the time I had no idea who he was. He said that he had done a good deal of teaching of Marxism and had a job during the day and was interested in teaching this class at night. As far as I know at that time that was the only way I could identify him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you subsequently discover how high his position was in the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I would say in the next year and a half I definitely did, sir, yes. By degrees, I would say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe what his function was in the Communist Party as far as you are able to do so?

Mr. SCHULBERG. We began this study group it seems to me it was somewhere early in 1937. I think that the teaching of Marx was fairly elementary, and I honestly don't think I ever mastered it. After the study group was going for some time, Lawrence dropped out of it and only would come once in a while. It was only later on that I did find out that he had started, I suppose, many groups like this one group that I was in and that he had become the head of the Communist movement in Hollywood at that time. I believe that would be around 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did other individuals confer with you either before Stanley Lawrence spoke to you or soon thereafter about your joining the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. There were two people about the same time late in 1936 or early in 1937 who talked to me about the Communist Party in general and told me that they felt that it was sort of leading the way in trying to work up as much feeling as possible against the Nazis and against aggression in Europe and so on. They talked to me in pretty general terms, but they did talk to me about the Communist Party. They didn't ask me to join it directly; no.

I should say that this first study group was not part of the party. When Stanley Lawrence came to me he simply said, do you want to

join this study group, and I said "Yes," not conscious that this was actually a part of the Community Party. In fact, I suppose in some ways it wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did the conversation with the two other persons take place in relation to the first approach by Stanley Lawrence?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In my mind it is just about the same period, either late in 1936 or somewhere early in 1937. I think it preceded—I think it preceded Lawrence's coming to me and asking me about the study group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the individuals who approached you?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Their names were Robert Tasker and John Bright.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bright? How do you spell the last name?

Mr. SCHULBERG. B-r-i-g-h-t.

Mr. VELDE. How do you spell the first person you mentioned?

Mr. SCHULBERG. T-a-s-k-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tasker is now deceased, I believe.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, I think he is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any information as to the present occupation of John Bright?

Mr. SCHULBERG. He was a screen writer at the time. I haven't seen him in many years, and I don't know where he is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you proceed to tell us further about your recruitment into the party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. The group was studying Marx, and Lawrence at that early time would relate these things to current events. At some point which I can't identify exactly, there was a change—I think one reason I can't is that it wasn't a formal change and was pretty much the same group, as I remember, and I remember them mostly because these were the people who went on with me as being the ones I mentioned this morning, Richard Collins and Paul Jarrico, and Ring Lardner.

At some point it was suggested by Lawrence that these things that we were talking about and all believed in, which at that time were very, very general issues because the feeling in those days seemed to be extremely broad, they said that any man of good will, anybody opposed to fascism, really could join the party. I believe it was even said that you didn't have to believe in all of the points of the program. You could even disagree with some. I am pretty sure that was said to me at that time. It was also said that this was not a revolutionary organization and that it supported the Constitution and so forth. That was also said.

Anyway, somewhere in 1937, I believe, the group changed from a study group to a Young Communist League group. As I said, without any formality that I can recall, they all came back and sat down the same way as before and sat around and talked the same way as before, pretty much the same people as before, but simply implemented their studies now with more actual activity. The stress began to be more in the field of activity than in any kind of study.

Mr. WALTER. Then what actually happened was that Stanley Lawrence set up this organization and after giving the members some fundamental instructions he moved on to continue the same sort of work elsewhere.

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is exactly the way it seemed to me, sir. At first he spent most of his time, all of his time, and then less and less, and the group continued by its own momentum.

Mr. WALTER. Who took over after he abandoned it?

Mr. SCHULBERG. There was no real director of it. There was a leader. I think at the very first I was probably as much of a leader as anybody was. I would say around 1937. As I became more interested in writing I became less interested in being active in the political activities. Lawrence would drop in from time—he would come in often, as a matter of fact, not just from time to time. He would come in, say, every two or three times, and sometimes even at the end of such a gathering he would come in for 15 minutes or half an hour. So in a sense I would say he kept tabs on it probably in the same line, I am not sure, also he kept tabs on it probably in the same way.

Mr. TAVENNER. He joined the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and was killed in overseas fighting; was he not?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I heard that he did; yes, sir. I don't remember exactly. It seems to me it was in 1938 sometime.

Mr. JACKSON. How many members were there in this group that was established by Mr. Lawrence?

Mr. SCHULBERG. About eight—six to eight. It would vary somewhat because things were much more informal in those days. Young men would be asked in or invited or just drop in, who were not actually members of the group and could sit in and see if they liked it. People would bring friends, and so forth, so it would vary. That is why I think more of the people who went on, but others did come in and go out. I would say an average would be seven or eight.

Mr. JACKSON. How many meetings would you say you attended over the period of time in which you were associated with the group?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have never tried to figure that out, sir. I believe the group met about once every 2 weeks. My attendance was quite consistent at the beginning, and then from 1938 on began to drop off. In other words, there would be meetings that I would not attend.

Mr. JACKSON. But your attendance commenced when?

Mr. SCHULBERG. My attendance—let's see. The study group began early in 1937. Just when we made the change to the Young Communist League, I am not sure.

Mr. JACKSON. It was a period of about a year, then, that your attendance was more or less regular.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I would say more or less regular. I think from 1937 it was probably most regular, at which time it was a study group, and I would say that somewhere along the end of that year is when the change was made to the Young Communist League, although I am not sure of the actual date of transition.

Mr. JACKSON. This was not by any chance the same study group that gave Mr. Lawrence headaches; was it? He testified that dialectics gave him headaches. Was Marc Lawrence in that group?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I think not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your testimony has related to Stanley Lawrence, an entirely different individual?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Not Marc Lawrence, but Stanley Lawrence. I can understand how the dialectics would give people headaches over many things which are difficult to understand.

Mr. VELDE. I am not quite sure on the name of the organization which you first joined. Was it the Young Communist League or was the name changed?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No sir. The first organization had no name at all. In other words, Lawrence came to me and said, "Are you interested in joining a study group which studies Marx," and so forth. There was no name and no formal organization attached to it at all. It was like any informal class at night.

Mr. VELDE. Then later it did, in 1938, change into the Young Communist League?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is right, sir.

Mr. VELDE. And you had membership then in what you knew as the Young Communist League?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. VELDE. I believe this morning you testified that later it changed into something else. Was that the American Youth for Democracy—the AYD, as it is commonly known?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I don't remember that at all. This is my impression of the transition. It seems that it went through three or possibly four stages. First, a study group which had, as far as I knew, no organizational connection. It was just a study group. Then it became a Young Communist League group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it in the nature of an indoctrinational group for prospective Communist recruits?

Mr. SCHULBERG. The Young Communist League?

Mr. TAVENNER. The first group.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I am sure that that is what it was, though I didn't think of it that way at the time. That is what it turned out to be because at a time when we were far enough along and when Lawrence said, we are really doing the same things, and these were the things which seemed to me right at the time, we were concerned with this problem and it did seem to me—and we were also being told at the same time that the Communists seemed to be taking the lead in breaking down the feeling of isolationism and so forth, building up and participating in the Anti-Nazi League, and that sort of thing. At one point Lawrence said, "Well, this is really the same thing. You feel this way and think this way," which I did. "And the Young Communist League has the same principles, except that they do more about it than simply sit around and study," and at that time I agreed.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned the Young Communist League again. I wonder if counsel recalls when the Young Communist League was changed to the American Youth for Democracy.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I didn't know that it had been.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will give you the exact date in a moment. It was October 1943.

Mr. VELDE. Then as far as you are concerned, Mr. Schulberg, you never participated in any of the activities of the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; I don't think I know much about it, for that matter.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question. I notice, Mr. Schulberg, the group about which you testified organized in 1937? You said that in 1939, at the age of 25, you broke with the Communists because of their

efforts to dictate. You just stated that Mr. Lawrence made certain statements to you, and you replied "I agreed." Did he make those statements to you alone or were you in a group which he was trying to convert? In other words, was it an argument? Was it a speech? How did he present these comparative ideas showing that the Communist idea was the same as that which the group already held? Was it to you individually or to the group?

Mr. SCHULBERG. This would be to the group, sir; to a group. He would say that this is really an extension of democracy; that these things needed to be done. He would talk about the current events of the time to the group, not to me alone. I don't recall after the first meeting any—I can't recall, at least, any talks with him alone.

Mr. DOYLE. Was he an invited speaker? Was he a program speaker? How did it come about that he attended the meetings?

Mr. SCHULBERG. He formed it. He set up the group in the beginning.

Mr. DOYLE. Was he the sole speaker or did you have other speakers—this group which he organized?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It wouldn't really be as formal as that. It was a study group which he would lead.

Mr. DOYLE. He was the sole leader?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; he was the sole leader.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you whether the individual whose name was John Bright was a member of this group.

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; he was not in that group. One reason might have been that these were all very young people, all about from the age of, I would say, almost 18 or 19 to 21 or 22. It was set up specifically as a group of young people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any of the work which Bright did later in the moving-picture industry?

Mr. SCHULBERG. He was for a long time—he has written many screen plays over the years. I am not sure specifically of any one. I connect him chiefly with gangster films in those days, around 1936 or 1937. I think he wrote a number of gangster films.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other persons who from time to time became affiliated with that group—that is, the group in the Communist Party to which you belonged?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Besides the ones I remember definitely in 1937, there was Waldo Salt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Waldo Salt?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes. I don't believe he was in the original group, but came in at some later time. I couldn't place the time. It seems to me early in 1938, but I am not too clear on these dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. In whose homes were meetings held?

Mr. SCHULBERG. They would be held at the various homes of the people in the group. As far as I recall, it would rotate. Once in a while, mine, sometimes at Jarrico's or Collins' apartment, at the house of Lardner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ring Lardner?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ring Lardner, Jr.?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Who assumed the initiative in calling these meetings?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It went on under a kind of momentum, I would say. They would be at set periods, I think, every 2 weeks. It might have been every week. I think there was a time when it varied—sometimes every 2 weeks and sometimes every week. At the end we would just say next time we will see you over at such-and-such a place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet at the home of Waldo Salt?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe so. I can't say for sure, but I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you in the course of your statement of the names of persons who became affiliated with this group. You named Waldo Salt.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, are there others?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Meta Reis was in this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Meta Reis Rosenberg? Is that the same person?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Meta Reis Rosenberg; yes, that is right. At that time her name was Meta Reis. She was in it. It seemed to me that at some point, as I remember, she was there for not very long and then went to some other group. I am not sure exactly how that was or how it took place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there others?

Mr. SCHULBERG. The others that I remember are Mrs. Tuttle, Tania Tuttle, who was also in this group. She may have replaced Meta Reis in it. That is my impression. I believe that she did. Then after I left and came back—after I left the group—

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. Go ahead.

Mr. SCHULBERG. In 1939 when I began these—not began, but when the argument culminated about my writing which I had begun about the end of 1937, which had been going on in short stories, and I had begun to think about novel writing, when I came back in 1940 and talked to Collins and told him I didn't want to come back at all and he urged me at least to present my point of view, at that time I also had written out my reasons for being against the Nazi-Soviet Pact. I told him all these different reasons why I didn't want to go back. Much of what I went into this morning was the gist of what I told him, although by this time I had also many political differences which frankly I hadn't had before. I had felt all through the thirties that this was a good thing and that this was really a leading force against fascism and that it should be supported. After that pact I didn't feel the same way about it and I told him. He asked me to at least come back and in a sense make a clean break, to present my various reasons, and so at that time I attended some meetings. I don't believe that I paid any dues at that time. I think I simply came back and was presenting my point of view. At that time I had the distinct impression that the group had changed in about the year or 9 or 10 months that I had been away in Vermont; that the group had changed its character; in other words, that it was no longer a youth group. All through that time it had been a study group and then a Young Communist League group of young people, and now it was a mixture more or less of people of varying ages. The youth nature of it had been dissolved.

I believe that somewhere in here the young Communist group—the Young Communist League—came into the Communist Party. I don't want to say it was while I was away because that might look as though I am trying to be only in the Young Communist League and not in the Communist Party. I am not trying to do that because I think it well might have come before I left to go to Vermont. But I don't remember any discussion about the Young Communist League group becoming a youth group of the Communist Party.

However, when I came back I do remember well that the nature of the group had changed and that there were many older people in it, although still a few of the people I had seen before, but now two or three or four older persons as well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe Herbert Biberman was in that group. I say believe because he had come to meetings before of the Young Communist League group, and he might have come to this group especially because of me; I am not sure, but he was there. Lester Cole was in that group and somebody by the name of Kelly. Kelly, I don't remember having seen before I left California. Incidentally—no, sir; very definitely it was not Gene Kelly.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't mean to indicate that it was. I wanted you to make certain that it was not.

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; it was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You meant that it was not.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I meant that it was not Gene Kelly. Someone called Kelly who, with Collins seemed to be the most active or the most responsible in the group. Beyond that I thought that Kelly was a person of some authority on some administrative level beyond that group. But I don't remember his actual position in the industry or ever having been introduced to him before.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is no way by which you can give any further identification of him as to where he lived, his approximate age?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I could give a vague description and that is all. He seemed to be in his early thirties.

Mr. TAVENNER. A vague description would not be of any value.

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is all I could do, sir. I didn't know where he lived or exactly what he did. I gathered he had some job in the film business, but I had never seen him before.

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

Mr. Schulberg, during this period of time did you know an individual by the name of Wirsic?

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

Mr. JACKSON. Von Blatt?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; I never heard that name.

Mr. JACKSON. That is all.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Was that all one name?

Mr. JACKSON. No; those are two names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Albert Maltz?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I knew Albert Maltz, and my one distinct memory of him is during the time of the attack on my book by the party. I couldn't definitely identify him in the party, as he was never in a meeting with me, but he called me one day at a time when I was telling everybody how I felt about what was happening. He asked me to drop over and see him if I was ever going by.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there others whose names you can now recall?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Should I finish with this?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I thought you had finished.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Mr. Maltz said that he heard that I felt very strongly about the attack that had been made on my book by Lawson and by all these people, and that he felt rather sympathetic, that he felt there was too tight a control of writing by the Communists and that I was somewhat on the right track, but much too impulsive and wanting to solve the whole thing overnight. He gave me the impression that he agreed with me, but felt that it could be done possibly in a more gradual way. That is why, very frankly, I was extremely interested when I heard about the testimony of Mr. Dmytryk because when Mr. Dmytryk was under the same sort of attack 6 or 7 years later that I had been and strangely enough by much the same people, I believe I forgot now, but I think John Lawson and I think Richard Collins were also involved in that. I am not sure. I believe he said it was Albert Maltz who was more or less the voice of reason there who tried to get them to ease off. That did interest me very much because that was much the same kind of conversation that I remembered having with him that day.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there outside speakers who attended your group meetings?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In the Young Communist League days the two that I definitely remembered were Herbert Biberman and Lester Cole, but they did come in and speak—also John Howard Lawson—on various issues, such as world events. Mostly in the case of Biberman he seemed to specialize in that, or the Screen Writers' Guild and since local issues seemed to be more Lester Cole's province, just the general approach, the over-all approach, I would say, seemed to fall to John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke this morning of the great proletarian novel. You used that term.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, so I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any individual within the Communist Party whom you can identify with reference to the so-called great proletarian novel?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I think as far back as 1937 when I was still—at that time I felt split. On the political side I was completely in agreement with the other members. I don't remember having any differences there. But I always had differences on the literary side. Even for a short story as early as 1937 I was criticized very severely along the lines that I stated this morning. About this time a writer known to me as a Communist writer by the name of Harry Carlisle called on me just in a social way, just called on me at my home and talked to me somewhat about the Communist approach to writing and told me that there was a young Communist writer living in Santa Monica not far from Hollywood who had just written some very effective labor stories, for one of the Communist periodicals at the time. He said he thought if I talked more with her and got more of her approach to this and got a better understanding of what a Communist writer's responsibilities were, I might be able to strengthen my own work. I did go to see her and had several meetings with her.

Mr. TAVENNER. With whom?

Mr. SCHULBERG. With a young writer by the name of Tillie Lerner. She was then writing a proletarian novel, I think an extension of a series of short stories that she had written. I think at that time I had the feeling that maybe I could learn how this proletarian novel was done.

I have yet to see one that really pulled the trick. I feel the so-called proletarian novel is a kind of museum piece myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you further identify Harry Carlisle, that is, as to his position?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; I can't. The only time that I saw him was this one time, and I don't know what position he had. I don't know if he was told to come and see me about my deviations and the rest. He must have heard about it, of course, so I gather he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of any other persons who became associated wth your group from time to time, particularly after your return in 1940?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Beside those I have tried to tell you, there was Kelly, Biberman, Cole, I believe—I am almost sure that Gordon Kahn was there. When I say almost sure, it may seem strange at times you can't remember exactly who was in a group, but I think he was there also. Then I believe I did tell you about my final talk with Jerome, at which time—I hadn't known exactly what his position was, but from what everybody said I gathered very much that he was—

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you to repeat your experience with Jerome. You did tell us this morning that in connection with your difficulties with the Communist Party relating to its efforts to bridle you in your work, you also came into disagreement with the party on political grounds and that the two things combined to result in your disaffection with the party. So now will you tell us more in detail just how you became disaffected with the party and how you left the party, if you did.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I definitely did, sir, and I will try to tell you how, though it does repeat much of what I said.

Mr. TAVENNER. Try not to repeat what you have already said. Just make reference to it in a general way.

Mr. SCHULBERG. In a way not to repeat it is to say that when I returned in 1940 after the completion of my book, my first book, and had these sharp disagreements first with Collins, then the group, then with Lawson and finally with Jerome, that parallel with the talk about the book went my disagreements on these other things. In fact, I brought to the meeting my actual points, which I do still have in my files, for objecting strenuously to the Nazi-Soviet pact. I also objected—I think I had just finished at that time or it was shortly after that—to the invasion of Finland. It does become repetitious because all of these things together were treated as simply the final result that I refused to accept any of the discipline that you are expected to assume as a member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result you broke with the party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Notwithstanding this break with the party which you have described, you did continue from time to time, did you not, to make contributions of writings to the Communist press, such as

New Masses. I think I am aware of several contributions you made to that publication after the time of your break.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Well, sir, I suppose you would call them writings. I would hardly dignify them as such. They weren't articles or anything. But on two specific occasions I was asked specifically by the New Masses to make some comment on a particular event. I believe the first time was when Germany invaded Russia. They said that they were canvassing opinion of various people, various points of view. I did send them a statement in which I believe I said that in a sense by force—I can't remember the actual wording of it by now, but my feeling was that by German force in the invasion the collective security policies which England and France at first and then Russia had ducked out on finally had come to pass. I don't remember the actual wording of it, but I do remember sending it to them.

The other one was about a year later, some sort of controversy between a Republican Congressman, I think it was, and Mrs. Roosevelt over the appointment of Melvyn Douglas. I believe the particular objection had been that Melvyn Douglas had changed his name and was not using his own name, in other words, and that therefore this was not quite a proper thing. This was used as a reason for feeling he shouldn't have this office. It was some sort of civilian office. I was queried directly by them, and I answered them in a short statement, saying that I felt, especially in the film business, that many people changed their names, that it was almost a common practice. That Robert Taylor had changed his name, that Cary Grant had changed his name, and so forth, and that I didn't feel that the changing of a name was really a reason for criticizing any man as long as he acted honestly, and so forth. I believe that Senator Downey also made some comment on the same thing at that time. I didn't feel in either case that I was endorsing the New Masses as a magazine.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information indicating that you either joined or continued your affiliations with several organizations which have been referred to generally as Communist-front organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe I have joined—in most cases not joined but lent my name to specific issues in which these organizations were canvassing. I remember lending my name to a kind of circular letter put out by the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions in favor of the candidacy of Henry Wallace. At that particular time I was in favor of Henry Wallace.

Mr. VELDE. Do you remember the approximate date of that, Mr. Schulberg?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It must have been sometime, I guess, just before; it must have been sometime early in the campaign.

Mr. VELDE. 1948?

Mr. SCHULBERG. 1948. At that time I felt I was doing this as an independent liberal. I wasn't unaware of the ways that the Communists had used Mr. Wallace. As the campaign went on, I became increasingly sure that this was being done. I spoke about it to people, not that I didn't feel that Mr. Wallace was an honorable and also an independent man, and a pretty good American. Finally after the campaign, however, I did write to Mr. Wallace and tell him that I thought that he might have had some kind of chance to win some sup-

port from the American people if he hadn't lent himself completely to the line of the Communist Party, which seemed to increase as the campaign went on.

Since we are on this particular subject, at the time of the final break between Mr. Wallace and the Progressive Party I think over the issue of Korea when he couldn't quite convince himself that the South Koreans had invaded the North Koreans, I wrote the Progressive Party that I wasn't sure if I was still on their rolls as I had told them that I wanted to have no further part after the campaign was over, but if I was I wanted to have my name removed and I have this letter with me if you wish to hear it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask that it be introduced in the record, Mr. Chairman. Let's refer, first of all, to your letter addressed to Mr. Wallace. Do you know the date of that letter and do you have it?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; I don't, but they were just about the same time. This letter to the Progressive Party is dated October 1, 1950, and I believe that the other was some time before that, approximately the same time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will offer the letter in evidence and have it marked Schulberg Exhibit No. 6.

Mr. WALTER. That will be received.

(The document referred to, marked "Schulberg Exhibit No. 6," is filed herewith.)¹

Mr. WALTER. Read any part that you feel is relevant.

Mr. SCHULBERG (reading) :

Since I have not been active in Progressive or any other political circles since the 1948 campaign, I do not know whether my name is still carried on the rolls of the Progressive Party. But if it is, I must ask that it be removed for I find that my own political convictions are no longer adequately represented by the policies of your party.

My feelings in this matter reached a crisis in the Wallace controversy of some months back. It seemed to me that Henry Wallace was right in pointing out that aggression of any kind, in these precarious days, is a more immediate threat to world peace than the potential use of the atom bomb. The Progressive Party stand struck me as ambiguous and on the basic issue of aggression suspiciously skittish.

Therefore, while continuing to believe in the constitutional right of all minority parties to remain free from political persecution, I myself can no longer lend my name or my activities to the Progressive Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you were associated with certain activities of the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, such as the signing of a letter requesting the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I am not asking you about your views as to this committee, but I would like to know the manner in which your endorsement of the letter or your joining in the letter was secured and what you know about the formation of the plan to abolish this committee.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I will gladly do so and give you any of my views that you would care to hear. This came to me in the form of a letter, as all of these things would that I would sign. Incidentally, letters like this do pour in every day, and I suppose you sign 1 for 10 that you either say "No" or toss in the wastebasket. This one I did sign, and I remember doing so. I think it was late in 1948, although the date might have been 1949. As far as I recall, it simply came to my desk in the general mail and I signed it. If you are interested in

¹ Retained in the files of the committee.

knowing why I did feel that way, why I should sign it, I will be glad to tell you.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will be glad to hear aynthing you have to say about it.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Unless you are extremely interested—I did sign it, I remember signing it, and I will tell you why if you wish.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WALTER. No; it isn't satisfactory. Please state your reason.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I will be glad to, sir.

When you see a name on a letter or on any petition, it is really a question of yes or no. I feel that these things are much like a vote. When you vote, you vote "yes" or "no." I feel that you must sometimes say you are 55 or 60 percent in favor or 40 or 45 percent against, and you vote "yes," and the 40 or 45 percent doesn't show. I felt somewhat that way that day. I felt that there was to my mind a definite concern that had nothing to do with my love for the Communist Party and the fact that people should be called in and their political views should be inquired into. I honestly felt that there was a great danger in that. I didn't feel it was 100 to nothing. I felt there was also on the other side information, say, about the Communist Party and the Communist operation that could be of no value to the American people. I tried to decide which is the greater danger. To me it was like a balance, like this. That was my reason in principle.

I also had a kind of personal reason which I have never told anybody to this moment anywhere, but if you are curious I will also tell you that.

Mr. WALTER. Please do.

Mr. SCHULBERG. In 1940 this committee under a different leadership came to Hollywood at just about the time I believe I had broken with the Communist Party. I believe it was under the chairmanship then of Martin Dies. On the day he arrived an announcement was made in the paper that there were six leading Communists in Hollywood, I think it was, and I was named as one of the six. The statement also said that anybody who didn't feel that he was being treated quite fairly or justly or had anything to say about this was invited to come down to the committee room, which was at the Hotel Biltmore, and present himself. I was a good deal younger then. I didn't feel like asking anybody's advice. I just hopped in the car and drove down to the Hotel Biltmore. I telephoned upstairs to the investigator, whose name I remember, but it is not necessary to mention I suppose any longer. I told him, "My name is Budd Schulberg. I am downstairs. I saw the note in the paper. I feel that there is something that isn't quite just about making an announcement in the paper about people before they have had a chance to come down and at least talk with you." I said, "I can't prove it, but I just have a strong hunch that that list is a faulty list."

Mr. WALTER. At that time you were no longer a member of the Communist Party; is that the fact?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is right, sir. I was told, "Well, we are very busy now, but call back in half an hour or so and we will see." I did. I called back in half an hour. I remember the date very well. I don't know why these things end up with my going to a bar, but I went to a bar in Hotel Biltmore and listened to a speech by Wendell Willkie.

In about 35 or 40 minutes I called back again and I was told, "We can't see you again, but call back in another half hour." At 5 o'clock at the end of the day I called again and I was told, "We are going to San Francisco on the next train. We have to leave and we are sorry we can't see you."

Frankly, that didn't give me the most favorable impression of what the treatment was. Maybe it was wrong. Maybe I should have been more reasonable later. But, as I say, it was first on one side a matter of principle, and on the other side a sense of personal pique and a sense that I hadn't been treated fairly that induced me to sign that letter in 1949.

Mr. WALTER. If your expressed views at that time had been followed, then there wouldn't be in existence today a vehicle to give to the American people and to the world the very valuable information you have given concerning the insidious attempts that are made to control the thought and writing.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Schulberg, wasn't most of this agitation to eliminate this committee started by Communist groups that realized that sooner or later this committee would expose some of their machinations?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Undoubtedly Communists would join for that reason; yes. I do think that others joined for other reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you in 1941 become a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Not to my knowledge, sir. That seems to conflict with what I was doing and saying at that time. I remember very distinctly lending both my name and my presence to, I believe it was, the William Allen White Committee to Defend the Allies. I know I talked to innumerable people about the fact that I did not believe in this kind of neutrality; that I didn't think that would be any kind of peace that I find it very hard to believe that I would sponsor such a meeting.

Could I ask, sir, is there any index of that, a general index that would carry my name as being a member of that, not as a sponsor of that meeting but as a member of that organization?

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a flyer under date of April 5, 1941, of the American People's Meeting held at Randalls Island, N. Y., and I notice at the bottom of the page that your name is used as a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization. Will you examine it, please [handed to the witness].

Your name appears at the bottom of the second page.

Mr. RHETTS. May I inquire, Mr. Tavenner, whether you have the—is this all there is to this document, or is this merely an excerpt from it?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is an excerpt from the document.

Mr. RHETTS. I wonder if you have the—

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you now one of the original pamphlets [handing pamphlet to the witness].

Mr. RHETTS. Thank you.

Mr. SCHULBERG (after examining the document). I don't remember this meeting, and also I don't remember lending my name to it. I think I was out of the country at the time. I feel sure I was opposed

to the policies that this represented. All I can say is that I strongly doubt that I authorized this. Anything that has been brought up I would be glad to admit, no matter how objectionable it might seem, if I am sure I did it.

Mr. WALTER. This is the first knowledge you have of this?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have never seen this before I came down here, sir.

Mr. RHETTS. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I note that this photostatic excerpt lists Mr. Schulberg's name on one page, which would indicate he is one of nine sponsors, a rather small group. I note from the original that that is simply one of a large number of pages here which finally run over on to the back page. There seem to be well over a couple of hundred names listed here as including sponsors, for whatever value that may be.

Mr. SCHULBERG. That particular mention seems to me absolutely inconsistent with my position at the time. I remember quite well—I think it was just about then or shortly before—attending and buying tables for the committee to aid the Allies. I remember signing petitions to aid the Allies and talking with many people about it. It also happens to be almost exactly the date of the attack of the Communist meeting on me and my book. This meeting at Randalls Island was April 5, 1941. As I say, I have no memory of that meeting. I have no memory of anybody having asked me to do that. This particular thing I feel unauthorized and it seems inconsistent with everything I was doing and saying there.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Schulberg, prior to June 22, 1941, were you aware of the nature of the organization, American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have some recollection, sir, on the west coast, of saying that I did not wish to join that organization.

Mr. VELDE. Were you also aware that after the attack by Hitler on Russia the name of that organization was changed to American People's Mobilization?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; I wasn't aware of that, but it sounds familiar.

Mr. VELDE. What were you aware of about the American Peace Mobilization, the one prior to June 22, 1941?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was aware that the American Peace Mobilization was isolationist and doing everything it could to keep us from aiding the Allies against the Nazis, and I felt that in that way it was actually aiding the Nazis.

Mr. VELDE. You were opposed to their position regarding the peace pact between Russia and Germany at the time, as I understand it.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I was. Also this meeting seems to have taken place almost exactly the time, as I say, that my first book was published, and at a time when I was, to the best of my knowledge, in Mexico. I doubt very, very strongly that I lent my name to this particular organization at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, excuse me. Were you going to say anything else?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No. It just seems that I can't conceive of having done that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schulberg, your name appears as one of the signers of a brief amicus curiae which was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case against John Howard Lawson and

also in the case against Dalton Trumbo. You recall that, I suppose?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I do, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which your signature was obtained to that brief?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It was sent to me in the mail at my farm; I believe from the office of the principal signer. I think it was Max Radin. I think it was his office. I am not sure. I wouldn't want to say whose office, but it came there. I read it I suppose not too carefully. I am afraid my ability to read any kind of brief—I have been told by some lawyers that this was not a very good one legally, but I did sign it. I believe I signed it for somewhat the same reasons as I signed the others, although in this case I had an additional feeling at the time that possibly this was something that should be tested in the courts, and once it was that also affected my attitude that this was a law and that we should abide by it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything further you desire to say in regard to the subject of our inquiry?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Just one or two brief things. I do feel the questioning has been very fair and that possibly there isn't time always in gathering material to gather it on all sides. In other words, every one of these things that you mentioned, except for one of these things that you have mentioned, except for one which I don't think I did, of course I did and believed in for some reason at the time. I honestly feel that certain other activities that people do take part in should also be part of these files so that you are able to get a clear and balanced picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me suggest in that connection, if you have any information of a documentary character which you desire to be considered along with your testimony here, that you send it to us.

Mr. RHETTS. All right.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes; I will.

Mr. TAVENNER. If there is anything further, proceed.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Anything further?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, anything further you desire to say. I don't know whether that completed what you were about to say or not.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Schulberg, you stated that you withdrew from the group against the urging of Mr. Lawrence, I think. Did any members of the group themselves other than he try to get you to stay in the Communist group? In other words, was it a one-man affair so far as trying to keep you in, or did other members come to you and try to urge you to stay in with them?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It wasn't Lawrence, sir. It wasn't one man. It was rather a somewhat extended process. It was first Mr. Collins. It was secondly the group that Mr. Collins represented. It was then John Howard Lawson, and it was finally V. J. Jerome. This covered some period of time.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, I am to understand, then, that the group itself actively, other than just its leaders, the membership of the group itself, 7 or 10 or a dozen, you were aware of the fact that the group did not want you to retire from it; is that correct?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe that some thought that I should be argued back in and some thought that I should be kicked out.

Mr. DOYLE. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Schulberg, is this: As you look back in retrospect, was it the conviction of the rank and file of the group that their Communist activities were good and important for them, or was it just the leadership of the group, two or three? In other words, was the group itself imbued with the communistic principles to the extent that they tried to get you to stick by them?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Sir, I feel they were or they would also have left the group in this way. I might add that in a sense I feel it is a hopeful sign. Sometimes you think of a Communist group as being very rigid, once you get into it you can never get out of it. I think there is a certain fear of that. I think it is interesting to find ways to help people to get out of it. People can and do get out of it all the time. I feel one of the hopeful things is that there are so many people who have come into the thinking that it is something idealistic, leave it for the same reason. Once they leave it, there are, of course, efforts to bring them back, but they can get out and can stay out. I do think that it is interesting in this investigation, lest people think, which I am sure you wouldn't want the American people to believe, either, that Hollywood is just teeming with Communists. Of course as some people have been able to tell you better than I, who have been in it in the forties, they can reach positions of real power. Yet the turn-over I feel is constant, and people are getting out of it all the time. Sometimes I honestly expect to see a meeting in the Gilmore Stadium in Hollywood of all the ex-Communists. It can be done, in other words, it can be done.

Mr. DOYLE. You mentioned the word "fear." Do I understand that there is anything done directly or indirectly in these young Communist groups such as you were in to instill in the members a fear of something happening to them if they withdraw, or is there fear of some discipline that might harm them, that it would be bad for them if they withdrew from the Communist group? Is that the sense in which you used the term "fear"?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Not exactly, sir; no. I have heard of that, and I think in groups which are really revolutionary groups, which these at that time really didn't consider themselves, there obviously was some fear of physical violence. In my case I can't say that that was so. There are two kinds of fears, I think. Once before the step is taken you don't know quite how to make it. I know that is true. You sit there for a long time wanting to get out and you can't find the words to say it. One day you are sitting there—many people seem to have the same fears: You go on maybe for a year in which you think about how to get out and not really agreeing with it, but still in it. One day you say what am I doing here, I am not a Communist and finally you go. I happened to read an interesting book the other day by the editor of the British Daily Worker. It is called I Believed. He said for 2 years he edited the Daily Worker of England and was one of the top men in the Communist Party of England and at the same time he was taking instructions, planning to join the Catholic Church. Every day in a sense he was doing both. This might seem the behavior of a very dishonest man, of a hypocrite, but I don't think it really was in that case. I think sometimes these things break slowly. That is all.

Mr. DOYLE. Did I understand you just now to say "I can think of some revolutionary groups"?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have read about revolutionary groups.

Mr. DOYLE. I see. You have read about them?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You are not personally acquainted with any of them?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I can't say that I am. I honestly cannot.

Mr. DOYLE. I misunderstood the words you used.

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. One more question. I just assume that you haven't had an opportunity to read Public Law 601, the part of it under which this committee operates, which refers to the Committee on Un-American Activities. I wish just to read to you three or four lines and call your attention to the last line and ask you if you have anything you can suggest to us that would be helpful. It provides that this committee shall investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States," and "the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda * * *."

Let me call your attention to this line expressly—

that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution, and * * * all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

I am sure that I as a member of the committee would not want to lose the opportunity to give you every opportunity to give us any suggestion you might have, if you have any, any processes or any action, any attitude that we should take with reference to any possible remedial legislation to meet the present subversive misconduct of people.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Like any other citizen these days I do think a good deal about that. I feel there is no doubt that it has been brought out in the last few years that there has been a very serious phase of the Communist Party work which is devoted to espionage and which is really not in the interest of the American people. I think that the large percentage of the people who join the Communist Party do so without honestly knowing that, that there are people in it today who don't know that, who in some way are deeply misguided. I feel that somehow this is going to help peace on earth and good will to men. These people I feel definitely are being used. The problem to me falls into two parts. One is to check in every way the manipulators and conspirators of this, who do use these other people who are, I would call, innocents. I think personally the best way to do that is to tighten up in every way the laws on espionage and sabotage, which probably is being done. If they aren't airtight, they should be improved.

On the subject of actually outlawing the Communist Party, my mind itself is not made up. I think there are some reasons for that. As long as some line can be drawn between simply political action and all this other business that goes on. I feel if the thing is outlawed it will probably spring up under some other name. That part is the problem which begins to come more in my province frankly than the other, which is how do you get people not to join these other groups,

whichever they are, that come out under this name. I feel that that is a question of finding an American organization, American activities which will give American people the ability that they have always had to protest, to talk up for the underdog, to have humanitarian impulses and so forth without falling into the hands of these people who use these causes, and the Civil Rights Congress I am convinced is an example of that. Those are good causes often. Those are people often who really are suffering some injustice and they attract people who don't like injustice and they fall into the hands of the Communists.

I simply hope that on one side everything can be done to check sabotage and to cut off and cut out this conspiratorial side, and on the other that these democratic efforts be really taken away from the Communists, that people do them themselves and they will find that they won't need communism because they can still talk and act on their own.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Schulberg, did I understand you to say you attended Dartmouth College?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. FRAZIER. What year did you graduate if you did graduate?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was graduated, sir, in 1936.

Mr. FRAZIER. Then did you go with the TVA?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Never, sir.

Mr. FRAZIER. You never did?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Never did. I don't know what they were doing.

Mr. FRAZIER. I thought you went from Dartmouth down there.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I didn't; no, sir. I never had anything to do with it ever.

Mr. JACKSON. That was Mr. Remington; was it not?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Schulberg, have you now given us all the names of the people who were associated with you in the study group which you mentioned, the Marxist study group prior to your entrance into the Young Communist Party or the Young Communist League?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I believe so, sir. I have given you all the names of those who passed on into the Communist Party; yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You feel that you do recall all those who were associated with you in that study group? If you should recall at a later date the names of others, would you give this committee or our investigators their names?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir. I would say all except certain things which I have discussed fully with your investigators.

Mr. VELDE. Have you also given us all the names of the members of the YCL that were in your particular group?

Mr. SCHULBERG. To the best of my memory, I have.

Mr. VELDE. At any time during that time did you carry a Communist Party membership card?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have wondered about that. I don't remember having one. I think it is possible, but for some reason I don't remember having one. Whether they didn't have them in those days I am not sure, but I just don't remember having a Communist Party card. However, I might have.

Mr. VELDE. Do you recall what the amount of the dues was that you paid to the Communist Party, the Young Communist League?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In the study group I don't think there were any. I believe there might have been just a pittance for the books, the pamphlets, or something. It was very small. In the Young Communist League the dues were very, very minimum because I don't think anybody was making very much money. In this later stage there was a percentage of the dues. If I had been asked I would have had no memory of it. I understand Mr. Collins—I think when I left California he was the treasurer, so I feel I know nothing about—said it was 4 percent.

Mr. VELDE. That was in the nature of a special assessment?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That struck me as being high. I thought maybe in our time it was lower, 2 percent or something like that. Possibly it was raised at some later date. I do remember that there was a percentage of your income taken as dues. It seems to me it was 1 or 2 then.

Mr. VELDE. Would you mind telling the committee what your particular income was at that time?

Mr. SCHULBERG. It would be somewhat difficult for me to figure it out because I had jobs at short periods. When I worked at that time as a screen writer I was paid \$350 a week. However, in 1938 I wrote the Screen Writers' Guild that I was going to devote the majority of my time to magazine writing, and from that time on it was catch-as-catch-can depending upon the stories I was able to sell. So I don't remember exactly what my income was, but I think around that time I was selling possibly one magazine short story a month.

Mr. VELDE. Can you give us an approximation of the amount that you paid in special assessment, just a general figure? I realize it is difficult for you to remember exactly.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Sir, I honestly don't think I could. I don't remember the special assessment apart from the dues or anything. I just remember that we paid some. I do remember that we paid some percentage of our dues. I thought that is what you meant by the special assessment. I am not quite clear.

Mr. VELDE. I am not quite clear, either, on what you mean. I believe Mr. Collins or someone testified here that the Communist Party assessed 4 percent of your income, of your weekly or monthly income, as a special assessment, other than the regular party dues which went into the Communist Party fund, and on some occasion it was collected by the national committee of the Communist Party directly. That is what I am referring to. Did you make any such payments of special assessments on your income?

Mr. SCHULBERG. The payment I remember making is more like the one that you described than a regular dues. In other words, I don't remember paying two different kinds, dues and a special assessment: I do remember—

Mr. VELDE. I believe, if I am not mistaken—and maybe the investigators or Mr. Nixon knows about this—it seems to me that the YCL charged only very nominal dues, maybe 25 cents a month or something like that. You refer to a larger payment than that, do you not?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. So it more than likely was a special assessment on your income.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes. That probably came when the young Communist League evolved into the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. I see. You have no independent recollection of any amounts that you paid in by check or by cash or whom you paid it to?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I paid them by cash, and I believe around 1938 into early 1939 I do believe Mr. Collins was the treasurer then. It seems to me I remember giving him certain cash payments, but I don't remember how large.

Mr. VELDE. Since you left the party and made a complete break with the Communist Party itself, you testified that you were associated with a few what are now known as Communist-front groups. Have you given the committee all of the Communist-front groups with which you are associated since your break with the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. As far as I know, I have, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Are you connected in any way with the Committee to Defend Harry Bridges? Did you have anything to do with that committee?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In 1940 there was some kind of open letter, I believe to Attorney General Biddle, I think in the latter part of 1942, signed by some 600 people.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a signer of that letter?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was one of the signers of that letter which asked him at that time not to deport Harry Bridges; yes, sir. I recall no funds being contributed. In fact, in all these cases that I have mentioned I lent my name I agreed at that particular time with the specific issue if not with the organization, and I never attended any of these meetings. As far as I know, I gave no funds.

Mr. VELDE. Were you associated with a committee known as the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes, sir; I have been. I believe that was mentioned.

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry. There is no other front group or Communist-controlled group that you can think of at the present time with which you have been associated since your break with the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHULBERG. There may be others that I have signed calls for. I tried my best to remember the ones that I was sure of, yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Thank you kindly, Mr. Schulberg, for your cooperation with this committee. I think you have given a lot of valuable information which we have not heretofore had.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Schulberg, I join heartily in the sentiments expressed by Mr. Velde. I feel that you have made a substantial contribution to the knowledge of the committee as to the physical operators of the Communist Party. I have several questions I should like to ask.

You testified this morning regarding an organization of writers in the Soviet Union which more or less controlled the output of writers, or more control rather than less of the writers of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. You could not recall the name of the organization at that time. Was it by any chance the International Union of Revolutionary Writers?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. That is the name of it?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That is the name of the organization.

Mr. JACKSON. Was that an organization that had an American offshoot called the League of American Writers, do you know?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That I did not know.

Mr. JACKSON. You were never associated with any organization by that name?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I was associated with the League of American Writers from 1937 to I believe 1939.

Mr. JACKSON. Was that organization an organization with definite Communist influence?

Mr. SCHULBERG. In 1939, at that time I didn't think that it was dominated by Communists. I imagine I would think so today, but I didn't think so then.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you done any movie scripts?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have done a few; yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. What were they?

Mr. SCHULBERG. None that I am very proud to talk about.

Mr. JACKSON. That is true of some of the movies I have seen, but would you mind mentioning the names of these scripts that you did that were made into pictures?

Mr. SCHULBERG. One was called Winter Carnival. Another was called City Without Men. Another one was—not that I wrote a script for it, but just wrote a story from which the film was made, called Week End for Three. I can't remember any others.

Mr. JACKSON. Who made those pictures respectively?

Mr. SCHULBERG. One was made by Walter Wanger, one by Columbia Pictures, and one by RKO.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the date, the approximate date?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I will have to try to figure that out, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Just generally, within a year or two.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Oh, I would say from '38 to '40. I believe they were all pretty much in that period.

Mr. JACKSON. Was there any indication at any time that your association in the Communist Party was an assistance to you in selling scripts in Hollywood?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. In association with John Howard Lawson and any others within the industry?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I honestly can't say, sir, that I ever had much assistance from that source.

Mr. JACKSON. You at no time were referred by any member of the group to any specific agent, or was it suggested that any specific person in the studio might be of assistance to you?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir; it really wasn't. My employment was quite brief at that time, as I say. In 1939 I worked a few months, at which time I wrote a letter to the Guild saying I was leaving. In 1939 I worked for 3 or 4 months, and then went to Vermont. So honestly my screen work has been limited to a short time. During that time I don't remember anybody from that source saying that they would help me to get any better job or any assignments, possibly because I wasn't very interested, either, in getting them.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was your agent in Hollywood?

Mr. SCHULBERG. The Myron-Selznick Agency.

Mr. JACKSON. Who handled your account in the agency, do you know?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I do know that, of course.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you mind, and I should say this has no necessary connotation.

Mr. SCHULBERG. My only hesitation—at times through no fault of your own, sir, people read things in papers and say, "I saw your name in the paper. You must be in some kind of trouble." That was my only hesitation.

Mr. JACKSON. I think with that preface it will be all right.

Mr. SCHULBERG. My agent at that time was Collier Young, who at no time was ever associated with the Communist Party in any way.

Mr. JACKSON. During the time that you were associated with the youth group or the Young Communist League, did you know of any activity on the campus of the University of California at Los Angeles? You are familiar with the university. You know where it is.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Of course.

Mr. JACKSON. You knew of no activities and had no members who came from the campus?

Mr. SCHULBERG. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Generally, in summation, Mr. Schulberg, your testimony has gone directly to the point that there were very definite efforts made by the Communist Party, by individuals within the Communist Party, to direct your writing efforts. In that case they were unsuccessful in that you broke with the party. Further than that, that there were other efforts made in other cases by the Communist Party or by individuals in the Communist Party which achieved a greater measure of success than in your own case. I think that is the thing we are trying to establish beyond any doubt.

I am glad that you mentioned the fact that Hollywood is not teeming with Communists. I have a personal interest in that. I see a great many of my constituents sitting right where you are sitting, and I hope if that Gilmore thing ever develops you will move it over to Wrigley Field.

Would you suggest in light of your own experience, both as a member of the Communist Party and also as one who has appeared before this committee, that others might be well advised who have sincerely broken with the party and want to make a clean breast of it to come before this committee as you have? Would that be your advice?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Sir, it would be my own personal advice. May I add one suggestion.

Mr. JACKSON. Please do.

Mr. SCHULBERG. I feel that there are some people who might come forward more readily. I don't know who they are. But just judging some of the experiences I have read about, I think that there is a fear, the fear that I talked about before, the fear of retribution by society, the fear that this is something that you might never be able to live down. I think that since many of these people obviously in a sense are in nowise really subversive, they got into something they really didn't understand and once they are out, they should help in every way. Industries should not be encouraged to crack down on them. I think the people in Hollywood still are frightened about hiring some of

these people. I have less fear about it, quite frankly, because I am more self-employed. I wouldn't mind working in Hollywood again some time. If I write a book and they want to make it, I have no objection and I would be rather shocked if they did make it because I have appeared here. However, I feel I will get by if they did do that. I think everything must be done to help those particular people. I did read a headline last week which said something like, "Wait and see attitude on ex-Reds," I think it said. I think it is that sort of thing, this reluctance or hesitation which naturally will make people think twice, because if you say, "Come up and make a full disclosure," and then they are hurt for it, they are going to be more reluctant. So I hope you will be able to do everything that you can to help those people.

Mr. JACKSON. You have expressed yourself so far as those people are concerned who voluntarily come forward or who come forward under subpoena and disclose the nature of their activities in the party. What is your feeling with respect to those who come forward and refuse to cooperate with the committee? Do you think that that same amnesty should be extended to them by industry or by the American people at the box office?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Frankly I haven't quite decided that problem myself. I don't feel it is the same as the other. I do feel there is some difference, but I haven't quite made up my own mind. I can understand certain hesitance on the part of the industry and the American people. It is something I would like to think more about.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you mind giving the committee your personal reaction upon reading that such and such an individual has come forward or a number of individuals have come forward and refused to testify and have taken refuge behind the first or fifth amendments? Several of the witnesses, notably Mr. Dmytryk, said that they draw the conclusion that they are not sincerely devoted to the Constitution but are rather taking that refuge because it is either take that or possibly conceivably be cited. What is your feeling? What reaction do you obtain when you read of noncooperative witnesses taking their undoubted right to retire under the umbrella of the Constitution? What is your reaction? What is your feeling?

Mr. SCHULBERG. My reaction is somewhat along the line of Mr. Dmytryk. I would say that the majority of those were not completely sincere. However, I might entertain the thought that in a case here and there are people who without being Communists might possibly for some matter of principle do that.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean out of deep conviction?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Out of some deep conviction.

Mr. JACKSON. Thought control, and so forth?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I do think it is possible.

Mr. JACKSON. I assume you have read of those who have deep convictions which do not extend to the Silver Shirts or the Ku Klux Klan, but who have very deep conviction when questioned on the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHULBERG. If I had the same conviction, obviously, I wouldn't have broken with the party.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that a member of the Communist Party can at the same time be dedicated to a free America as we understand it and to the dignity of the individual?

Mr. SCHULBERG. Not if he knows the whole story of what communism and the Communist Party is. I think there are innocents in there that might fit that category; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean at the present time there are Communists who could be Communists and at the same time loyal Americans?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I think there might be some who are not presently in the process of getting out who might become loyal Americans; I do, yes; although I wouldn't make a strong point of that. It is something I haven't really thought through. I would think by this time every member would see exactly how it was run and who it was run for. I would think that.

Mr. JACKSON. You have terminated, of course, your association with the various fronts to which you lent your name on occasion or do you still retain membership in any of them—not membership, but do you still attend any of the meetings of those groups?

Mr. SCHULBERG. I have never attended any of the meetings, ever. I don't think I ever attended any of the meetings of any of these organizations that have been named. I don't think one. I don't believe I am a member of any of them now.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one more question just in conclusion? Knowing the Communist Party line, what would your reaction be to a set of principles which I will enumerate here?

Washington is a very unhealthy place.

These are from minutes.

The Un-American Committee is a modern inquisition. The committee members are self-centered tyrants. Parks, Hayden, and Collins are mentally ill—

Mr. VELDE. I think there is something added to that one line which modesty forbids your reading.

Mr. JACKSON. It says—

The committee members are self-centered tyrants, especially a man named Jackson.

Pressure of people for peace is greatly retarding the war. * * * We demand immediate peace negotiations with People's China. * * * We must demand immediate withdrawal of troops from all nations. * * * We must demand immediate recognition of People's China in the United Nations. * * * Our goal is to work for peace. * * * We have never deviated from the aim of working forces. * * * The role of the Dance Division is to entertain labor and minority groups. * * * The present task is to cooperate with the Marine Cooks and Stewards in the fund-raising campaigns. * * * Our duty is to enlighten people who read the Washington investigations and liken the investigations to the inquisition. * * * The newspapers all slant to testimony of the witnesses, and people are losing their sense of direction. * * * We must assume the leadership.

Does that strike a familiar chord?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That does; yes.

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

Mr. JACKSON. What is the song? What is the music?

Mr. SCHULBERG. That sounds like a very familiar line.

Mr. JACKSON. The Communist Party line.

Mr. SCHULBERG. It sounds like the Communist line.

Mr. JACKSON. This is a report of the membership committee of the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in Los Angeles, Stanley Hall, 1057 North Stanley Avenue, approximate attendance 250, on April 12, 1951, and I merely insert it in the record so people who attended and others may know the words and the music.

Thank you again for your testimony.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Schulberg, this committee is indebted to you for making one of the most constructive statements that I have heard since I have been a member of this committee. It can only come through the lips of people who have had the experiences that you have had, the information that the American people should have, so as to bring home to everybody in every community of America an awareness of the menace of this world-wide conspiracy, and in our efforts to enlighten our people you have made a very fine contribution. We thank you.

Mr. SCHULBERG. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will stand adjourned, to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the hearing recessed until 10 a. m. the following day.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:20 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter and Harold T. Velde.

Staff members present: Frank E. Tavenner Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; William A. Wheeler, investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show that a subcommittee consisting of Messrs. Velde and Walter has been designated by the chairman to conduct the hearing this morning.

Who is your witness this morning?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Frank Tuttle.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Tuttle, will you stand, please. Do you swear the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TUTTLE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF FRANK WRIGHT TUTTLE

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

Mr. TUTTLE. Frank Wright Tuttle.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. TUTTLE. I was born in New York City, August 6, 1892.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. TUTTLE. My present place of residence is in Vienna, Austria, where I directed a picture last summer and have been working on a story there since. Do you want the address?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I think you have already indicated your profession by your answer. That is, you are a director in the moving-picture industry?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct, sir.

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

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir. I went to public school in New York City. Then I went to a preparatory school, the Hill School, in Pottstown, Pa.; then I went to Yale University, where I was graduated in 1915, taking an A.B. degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your professional experience?

Mr. TUTTLE. When I was graduated I was first an assistant editor of a magazine which is now defunct, called *Vanity Fair*. After that I was a press agent for several years, mainly for the New York Philharmonic Orchestra. During World War I, I was with the Committee on Public Information; then I returned to Philharmonic as its press agent. I arranged at that time to be able to do all my work in half a day, as I was interested in playwriting and moving pictures; but about this time I was a member of a club, a lunch club, at which I met Mr. Walter Wanger. I suggested to him that, as I had half my time free, I would like to submit to him the possibility of his giving me assignments at Paramount, with which he was connected, to read material that was under consideration by them and to submit my ideas of moving-picture treatments.

He thought this was a good idea. When I met him a few days later, a director had come from the coast looking for a writer with no experience whom he could train. I met this man at a luncheon, showed him some things I had done, and was signed on a trial basis as a writer.

I worked several months in the trial period, when he was shooting a picture at the old Biograph Studio on Seventieth Street. In the meantime, I had been reading all the stories I could, and I told him I was beginning to write a screen play for his new picture. He said "Go ahead."

At that time the option was coming up, and Mr. Wanger asked him how I was. He had not at that time read a word I had written. He said I was fine. He took up my option for a year. They actually shot the screen play which I wrote with very few changes.

I then worked at the Paramount Studio in the East as a writer, and the studio eventually closed down.

At this time a cameraman came to me and asked if I had a story of my own—

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify the year in which that occurred, approximately?

Mr. TUTTLE. I should say approximately 1919 or 1920.

This cameraman came to me and we made an independent picture, which I wrote, directed, and cut. We made a series of little pictures in which the star was Mr. Glenn Hunter, who later became famous as the original Merton of the Movies. Glenn left us after a few years. We did some pictures for the Yale Historical Society; then our company, the Film Guild, folded, and I went back to Paramount as a writer, but with the understanding they would only use me as a writer for a short time, then I was to be permitted to direct my first picture for them. I had already directed the few pictures in which Glenn Hunter was the star.

I came to Paramount as a director in the early twenties. I worked at their eastern studio several years, until it closed down. I went

to the coast to make one picture in 1925, a sound picture with Eddie Cantor—Kid Boots. I returned to the East; the studio was closed down, and we were all sent to the west coast. I worked there, mostly for Paramount, until late 1947, when I came to New York to work on a play.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then from 1947 I believe you went abroad, and at the time that you learned of this hearing you were in Vienna?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct. I was in New York for a while working on some stories, and then I went abroad in 1949, in November. I went to France and then to Vienna, where I directed a picture last August, starting last August for an independent American concern.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many pictures do you judge you have directed?

Mr. TUTTLE. I imagine I have directed pretty nearly 70 pictures, feature pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you name some of the feature pictures which you directed?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. Probably best known is This Gun for Hire, which was Alan Ladd's first starring picture. The last picture I directed in Hollywood was called Swell Guy, which I did for Marc Hellinger. I did a picture called Suspense for King Bros. I did a picture for Fox—Don Juan Quilligan. Then, going back, I did several of the Bing Crosby musicals and Roman Scandals for Samuel Goldwyn, starring Eddie Cantor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tuttle, you are aware of the fact that Mr. Richard Collins appeared before this committee and mentioned your name as one of those who were members of the Communist Party in Hollywood?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time the investigators of the committee had a subpoena for service upon you to appear here as a witness, but at the time of the issuance of that subpoena it was not known that you were in Austria. When your participation as a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood was made public through the testimony of Mr. Collins, or very shortly thereafter, the chairman of this committee received a telegram from you in which you stated that you had seen from the press that your name had been made public through the testimony here, and that you wished to testify.

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then you received word from the committee fixing a date for your appearance?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it is pursuant to that arrangement, initiated by you, that you are here today?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I assume from those circumstances that you are willing to tell the committee frankly and fully all that you know about Communist Party activities in Hollywood, including your own participation?

Mr. TUTTLE. I am, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us begin by your stating in your own way how you became a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. In the middle thirties—I am not sure of the exact dates here, but sometime in the middle thirties—the Anti-Nazi

League was formed in Hollywood, and another organization called the Motion Picture Artists' Committee. At this time it is difficult, I imagine, for anyone to remember this. There was not a great deal of interest in the rise to power of Hitler, and these committees were attempting to interest the people in the fight against the growing power of nazism and Hitler. I joined these committees.

In the course of my participation in their activities, I met a fellow named Stanley Lawrence. Stanley Lawrence told me that he was a Communist, and he pointed out to me that the Communists had been instrumental—had been behind the formation of these committees. The great majority of the people in them were, of course, not Communists, and I think at this time there were very few Communists in Hollywood.

As I worked with these committees, he more and more impressed me with the idea that the Communists were responsible for this work, which I considered good. He gave me literature to read, and I was asked to join the party. I didn't join it, I think, for about 2 years. I finally did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there an intermediate step between the time that he first approached you on the subject and your joining, in which you attended group-study courses?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about that.

Mr. TUTTLE. Well, Mr. Lawrence met with a few people at that time at my house, and we were given Marxist literature to read. I can't remember now definitely how many of these study-course meetings there were; not very many, I should say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then after a period of time you united with the party?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us more in detail the circumstances under which you first became an actual member of the party; that is, who solicited you at the time you joined?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. Mr. Herbert Biberman did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that, you say, was about the year 1937?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is my memory of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I left the Communist Party when I left New York in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period that you were a member, were you assigned to any one particular group, or were you associated with various groups within the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I was assigned to no particular group beyond the fact that—no; that is not correct. I misunderstood the question. Yes; I belonged during that time to perhaps five groups, I imagine.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did these groups have names?

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe they did toward the latter part of my membership. At first, I think there were no names for the groups at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before we discuss each of those groups, I would like to ask you about one particular group, and that was the group alleged to be within the Screen Directors' Guild.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a screen director by profession?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a cell or group of the Communist Party within this Screen Directors' Guild?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed that group?

Mr. TUTTLE. Perhaps I should state it this way: There was a group in which all the directors were participants, and there were other people in the group. A great many of these other people were small people in the sense that they had clerical jobs, and in many cases I can't even remember their names, because they were known as Harry or Ed or whoever they were. Some of them were wives, and so forth. But, if you would like me to, I shall be glad to tell you who the directors were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before doing that, apparently there was no separate cell confined in membership to directors?

Mr. TUTTLE. No; because there were too few.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean too few directors?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many directors were there?

Mr. TUTTLE. Including me, there were seven.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, seven who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. If you will name for the committee who they were.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. I have already named Mr. Biberman, who was a director; Mr. Dmytryk; myself; Mr. Michael Gordon; Mr. Jules Dassin. These two gentlemen, I think, left the party. I am not sure when. Mr. Bernard Vorhaus.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. V-o-r-h-a-u-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. That makes six, I believe.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. I believe I have the list here. [Referring to list.] And Mr. John Berry.

Mr. WALTER. What was the last name?

Mr. TUTTLE. John B-e-r-r-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to inquire a little about how this group functioned in connection with the Screen Directors' Guild.

Mr. TUTTLE. I would say this: The work of the directors in the Screen Directors' Guild was very ineffectual as far as any real Communist angle was concerned. About all they were able to do was to propagandize for liberal candidates and the candidature of our own people during guild elections to the board of directors. I think only Mr. Biberman, Mr. Dmtryk, and I were ever elected to the board. As you can see, there were so few directors who were Communists that the Communists were content to have elected as many liberals as possible.

Mr. VELDE. About how many directors are there in Hollywood?

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe the total guild membership is something like 500 people. I am not absolutely sure whether that includes the assistant directors, who are junior members of the guild, or not. That is approximately the number.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I would like you to compare this membership with the membership in the Screen Writers' Guild, if you recall.

Mr. TURTLE. I am sorry, sir, I don't recall the number of writers. I imagine it is many more.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall special meetings which were held by the Communist members of the Screen Directors' Guild on this subject of propagandizing for the election of your own members or certain liberals to the board of directors of your organization?

Mr. TURTLE. Yes. The procedure was something like this: The way people are elected to the board in the guild, there is first a nomination time at which the people who receive the most votes are then voted on again as to the exact members. It is a rotation system. The seven directors met and discussed the possible people who could be advanced, and we talked to other guild members and suggested they would make good members of the board.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any time when this small group of Communists within your particular guild were given directions from above, from some higher level in the Communist Party?

Mr. TURTLE. No, sir, there never was; nothing that I ever heard of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the head of the Communist Party in Hollywood at that time, as far as you know?

Mr. TURTLE. As far as I know, Mr. John Howard Lawson was. In this connection, perhaps you would like me to tell you the people who in my opinion were functionaries of the Communist Party in Hollywood. Would you like me to do that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TURTLE. Mr. Lawson. Madeline Ruthven—

Mr. TAVENNER. In naming each of those persons, will you state just what you know about the particular functions that they carried out?

Mr. TURTLE. Yes. Mr. Lawson was the general head of the party, to whom everybody went for advice when there was any problem of any kind. He was considered to be the last word in discussing problems of all sorts. I heard it said that he had been a functionary in New York before he came to Hollywood, and was part of what I believe they called the central committee of the Communist Party in New York before he came to Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall when he first came to Hollywood?

Mr. TURTLE. No, I don't. I heard of his being there in the thirties, just about the time I joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know nothing about the exact nature of his employment at the time that he first came to Hollywood?

Mr. TURTLE. No. He was a writer. He had written plays, and he was hired as a writer in Hollywood and wrote there for several pictures that I remember.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Go ahead.

Mr. TURTLE. Madeline Ruthven had been a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. TURTLE. R-u-t-h-v-e-n. She was a sort of organizer in charge, sort of a second lieutenant, you might say, to Mr. Lawson, in a sense. She stopped writing, as I remember, and was also someone whom Communists consulted in the case of problems.

Then there was Mr. V. J. Jerome, who was a New York Communist, a high Communist, I believe, in the party there, who came to Holly-

wood sometime in the thirties. I remember seeing him two or three times at Communist-front organizations, where he was more or less in the background, and at parties, et cetera, and other Communists told me he had come from New York and he was now pretty much in charge of things from the New York angle as far as the Communists in Hollywood were concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the front organizations at which you saw Jerome present?

Mr. TUTTLE. I am afraid I wouldn't be very accurate about this, but I think he was there during the Anti-Nazi League times and the Motion Picture Artists' Committee that I have spoken of. Those are the two organizations that I seem to remember his having been at.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any occasion to confer with Mr. Jerome yourself?

Mr. TUTTLE. No, I think I never did. I was introduced to him and I think I spoke to him once or twice.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you continue?

Mr. TUTTLE. I also heard mentioned, as a downtown Los Angeles Communist, a man named John Stapp and a man named Nemmy Sparks. These two men I never met, but I heard their names mentioned frequently.

Mr. VELDE. How do you spell their names?

Mr. TUTTLE. Stapp is S-t-a-p-p. Sparks is S-p-a-r-k-s. His first name, which I think must have been a nickname, was N-e-m-m-y.

Then there was a man named Carl Winter, who was in Los Angeles for a while and I think also belonged to the big Communist hierarchy. He was also, I think, taking someone's place, and was there for a while. It may have been when someone else was away or something of that sort, but I remember his being there.

And the writer, Waldo Salt, who was a high functionary during the later years when I was a member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Charles Glenn?

Mr. TUTTLE. I met him also at several parties. He was, when I knew him, conducting the subscription drives for the People's World.

Oh, yes; I am sorry; I have forgotten someone. His wife, Elizabeth Leech Glenn, was, I think, a functionary in the party in Hollywood. I think she had to do with membership drives and things of that sort, as I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, are there any other Communist Party functionaries whom you can recall?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. I find another name I recognize, a woman named Eva Shafron, who is now dead, I believe.

Mr. VELDE. Will you spell that name, too, please?

Mr. TUTTLE. Surely. E-v-a S-h-a-f-r-o-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any of these Communist Party functionaries have anything to do with the collection of dues or assessments from you?

Mr. TUTTLE. Not directly. I never held any position in the party. I never had anything to do with dues collecting. But, as I said, I think Mrs. Glenn, Elizabeth Leech Glenn, had something to do with this, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall making payment of dues to her, or assessments to her?

Mr. TUTTLE. No; I don't. The way that worked out in the group was that you paid your dues at the beginning of the meeting, and usually the treasurer was a person of no great importance, one of the Joes, Bills, Harrys, or Marys that I spoke of, and you paid your dues before the meeting started.

Mr. TAVENNER. By referring to those names, you mean people you knew by their first names only?

Mr. TUTTLE. By their first names, and I can't remember who they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. What dues or assessments did you pay?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think I read in Vienna Mr. Dmytryk's description of this, which I thought was excellent. I am a pretty bad businessman, but I will do the best I can. I think Mr. Collins said something about it too. I will do the best I can.

Under ordinary circumstances, and during the early part of my membership in the party, the dues were very nominal, a certain amount if you were working, and a very tiny amount if you were not working.

Later they evolved a system whereby the high-salaried people paid something like 4 percent of their income while they were working, eliminating, of course, the 10-percent fees for agents. In my case, I was working under contract only for about, I should say, a year at a time when this system was in force, and I was on a 42-week contract. After that, while this system was still in force, I was an independent director, that is, I was free lancing, and my salary would have had tremendous variety, because the contract called for a 10-week minimum, and I hardly ever ran more than 12 weeks at the most.

I believe the percentage was something like 4 percent. I should say in my case I paid something like 9 or 10 thousand dollars to the party during this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of time when you were paying the greatest percentage to the Communist Party, what was your weekly salary?

Mr. TUTTLE. My weekly salary was \$3,000 a week, usually, as I say, with a 10-week minimum.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were those payments made and what disposition was made of the money, as far as you know?

Mr. TUTTLE. In my case I simply gave the money in cash and made no account of it at all and took the loss so far as my income tax was concerned. My understanding was that a certain percentage of this money went to the party in Los Angeles, and a certain amount went to New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything about the percentage of distribution between the local and the national organization?

Mr. TUTTLE. No, I couldn't tell you that.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you make your remittances, and to whom? You said you paid in cash, but to whom?

Mr. TUTTLE. To whomever was the treasurer of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who the treasurer was at any particular time?

Mr. TUTTLE. No, sir; I am very sorry, but I don't. I just don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Returning now to the Communist Party meetings held of the group of seven in your guild, who usually acted as chairman of your meetings?

Mr. TUTTLE. My memory is that a chairman was elected at each meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean there were different chairmen?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right, a different chairman every time.

Mr. TAVENNER. There were occasions, then, when you were chairman of the meeting?

Mr. TUTTLE. I imagine I must have been; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other schemes or devices used for the raising of money for the benefit of the Communist Party, beyond the matter of payment of dues and assessments?

Mr. TUTTLE. Not that I am aware of. The money-raising campaigns were usually for the separate Communist-front organizations, for their publications, for things like the People's World, things of that sort, and certain front organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Suppose while we are on the subject of money that we discuss this matter more fully.

Mr. TUTTLE. How this was done?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TUTTLE. Parties would be given, usually with some sort of entertainment of a very mild nature, and speeches would be made, and these attempts to raise money were made among all kinds of left-wing and liberal people. Parties would be given and refreshments would be served, and perhaps a few people would entertain, and the hat would be passed.

Mr. TAVENNER. New Masses is a publication which is recognized as being a Communist Party organ.

Mr. TUTTLE. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any benefits given for that publication?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. I gave one.

Mr. TAVENNER. And were there others?

Mr. TUTTLE. I imagine there were. I naturally remember this one more specifically because it was given at my house. We sent out invitations, and my memory is that someone in the party asked me to do this.

Mr. VELDE. Can you fix the date of the party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I can't definitely. Have you a date on it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I have.

Mr. TUTTLE. It was in 1945, I guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was an occasion on June 9, 1945, according to our information, at which William Gropper, cartoonist for New Masses, was a special guest of honor.

Mr. TUTTLE. That was the one at my house.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the one you are speaking of?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. TUTTLE. My memory is that, as usual, the people who were preparing for the party sent out invitations after combing the list of all the liberals and fellow travelers and members of the front organizations; and my memory is that this particular party was quite successful. I am not absolutely sure of the amount of money raised, but I think it was quite successful. I know that New Masses was always in trouble financially, and was never terribly successful on its own merits.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you issued invitations?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Written invitations?

Mr. TUTTLE. Written or printed. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the invitations express the purpose of the meeting?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think they did.

Mr. TAVENNER. That it was for the New Masses?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. And I think they said Mr. Gropper would be there.

Mr. TAVENNER. If the invitations specified it was a benefit for the New Masses—

Mr. TUTTLE. How would I explain the position of non-Communists who would come? Is that it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; that is exactly it.

Mr. TUTTLE. I am getting bright. I think that is fairly easy to explain. During all this period there were people who were not Communists who were liberals, and who read magazines like the Nation and the New Republic, and they knew that a magazine existed like the New Masses. I think they felt, "Well, we should know what they are doing, too, and read it occasionally," or they might have felt, "We should keep up with this in order to answer the arguments," and for whatever reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. But from the standpoint of people interested in New Masses?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And people interested in the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were willing to accept donations from people not members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. The Communist Party was always interested in getting money from anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that some member of the Communist Party talked to you about this project?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is my guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us more information about that, as to how the matter originated?

Mr. TUTTLE. I can give you in a general way, but I can't remember specifically who was the person who did this. I imagine perhaps it was brought up at one of the meetings, and someone said, "Who has a house?" That is usually the way it was discussed.

Mr. TAVENNER. These benefits would be discussed in a Communist Party meeting?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to the occasion?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; and I imagine I was the sucker that time. Please don't misunderstand me. At that time I was very willing to be a sucker.

Mr. VELDE. Why was the New Masses always having trouble financially? Why couldn't they make their magazine pay?

Mr. TUTTLE. I can't answer that, sir. I imagine because the subscriptions and readers were not large enough to support it. I once was assistant editor of a magazine, and I think the magazine business is

one of the most difficult in the world. It depends largely on advertisements, and it is pretty difficult to get advertisements for a Communist paper, as you can imagine.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is informed there was another benefit of a different type held for New Masses in July 1944, at which various articles were auctioned off as a method of raising money. Does that refresh your recollection of that occasion?

Mr. TUTTLE. I seem to remember such a party, but I am vague on it because I am not sure whether Mr. Gropper's original drawings were auctioned off at that one or the one at my house. I remember I went to both parties. I even went to the one I gave.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were both the same type of benefit?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other benefits that you recall where the money went either directly to the Communist Party or to Communist-front organizations or publications?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. There were always parties for People's World, for front organizations, and so forth. It would be difficult for me to be too specific about it without some help, because there were so many, and I don't remember the order in which they came.

Mr. VELDE. While counsel is conferring, Mr. Tuttle, let me ask you this question: On occasions when there were benefits for New Masses, did you meet Richard Bransten? I believe he was a writer on the staff of New Masses during the early forties. Did you meet him?

Mr. TUTTLE. I may have, but I don't remember the name at all. There were a great many people at both these parties.

Mr. VELDE. Or Bruce Minton. Did you meet Bruce Minton?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think I did; yes. I seem to remember that name. I think he was a writer on New Masses, wasn't he?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; I met him.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. No; I didn't; not specifically. I assumed he was.

Mr. VELDE. Wasn't it generally true that those who wrote regularly for New Masses were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I would hesitate to say that, sir, because I know several people who were not Communists who did write for them. I think it is a little difficult to answer that question specifically.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have asked you about a particular group of Communists, those who were associated with you in your own guild, the Screen Directors' Guild. I would like now to ask you to go back to the time that you became a member of the Communist Party and define for us more in detail, if you can, the different groups to which you were assigned, and to give us the names of all persons who were members of those groups, and by groups, if you can identify them.

Mr. TUTTLE. For anyone who was a member as long as I was, for nearly 10 years, it is difficult to be chronological or orderly about the exact group. I can name people who were associated with me in the various groups. It is pretty hard to separate them at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to do that, and it is relatively unimportant as to the chronology, but I would want you to be very certain and definite about the individual's participation and connections with the Communist Party.

Mr. TUTTLE. Right.

Mr. Alvah Bessie was in one of the groups I was in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Alvah Bessie?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. He was at one time a writer on New Masses, and came to Hollywood and was a writer there. He was also a veteran of the Spanish War.

Mr. VELDE. Belonged to the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe so.

Mrs. Meta Reis; Mr. Collins.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Meta Reis is the same person as Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe so. I knew her as Mrs. Meta Reis.

Mr. Richard Collins.

Mr. Robert Lees.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. TUTTLE. L-e-e-s.

Mr. Fred Rinaldo.

Mr. Ring Lardner.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is Ring Lardner, Jr.?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right.

Mr. John Bright.

Mr. Robert Tasker, who is now dead. I think he died in Mexico.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John Bright, what was his occupation?

Mr. TUTTLE. He was a writer. He and Mr. Tasker were both writers at one time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. TUTTLE. Mr. Edward Biberman and his wife, Sonia Dahl Biberman.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Dahl?

Mr. TUTTLE. D-a-h-l.

Mr. J. Edward Bromberg and his wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Mr. Bromberg's occupation?

Mr. TUTTLE. He was an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his wife's name?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. Her name was Goldie Bromberg. I don't know if that is her real name or a nickname.

Mr. Hugo Butler.

Mr. Lester Cole.

Mr. VELDE. May I suggest that you give the occupations of each of these?

Mr. TUTTLE. Thank you, sir. Mr. Cole was a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was Mr. Butler's occupation?

Mr. TUTTLE. Mr. Butler was a writer.

Mr. Huebsch, H-u-e-b-s-c-h, a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his first name?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think it was Eddie. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say he was a writer?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you are not certain of his first name, can you identify the person to whom you are referring by any other information so that there will be no question about a confusion of names?

Mr. TUTTLE. I can't identify him other than the fact his name was Huebsch. He was in one of the groups I was in and he was a writer.

That is all I know. I don't know that there was any other writer by that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reason I am asking that, we discovered even in connection with your own name that there is another person by your own name, and we were about to subpoena the wrong person.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. He is an art director, I think.

Dorothy Tree Uris and Mickey Uris. The former is an actress and the latter is a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the last name?

Mr. TUTTLE. U-r-i-s.

Mr. Maurice Clark and Paul Trivers, both writers. Clark is spelled without an "e" and Trivers is spelled T-r-i-v-e-r-s.

Those are the only names I can give.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been giving study to that question since you realized you would appear before this committee?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; I have, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What impelled you to be willing to give to this committee the benefit of your knowledge regarding these individuals or any individuals who were associated with you in the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe that there is a traditional dislike among Americans for informers, and I am an informer, and I have thought about this constantly. I believe all decent people who share this dislike for informers, if they think about this carefully, will agree with me that at this particular moment it is absolutely vital. In a case like this, with ruthless aggression abroad in the world, the aggressors, I believe, are as ruthless with their own people as they are with those they consider their enemies; and I feel that today it is absolutely necessary for Americans to be equally ruthless.

Mr. WALTER. If you weren't of that opinion when you went to Vienna, I am sure you would be now?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The time spent by you abroad probably has increased and strengthened your views on that subject?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. Since I went to New York I had a very healthy experience of meeting a lot of very liberal Americans who were as anti-Communist as they were anti-Nazi and anti-Fascist, and I have talked to a great number of them. Of course it strengthened my growing resolution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, these persons whom you have identified as members of the Communist Party, are they persons connected one way or another with groups with which you have been connected?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, they are.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you are basing your statement here upon knowledge?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your own personal knowledge?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of your experience within the Communist Party, did you find other persons to be members who were not members of your particular groups, or of the groups to which you were assigned?

(Representative Harold H. Velde left hearing room.)

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; there are a few of whom I have heard it said they were Communists by other Communists a sufficient number of times for me to agree that they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. I probably should not ask you to state the names of those that you have learned were members of the Communist Party by that method, but if there are any other persons whom you can identify by any other method, such as their attending Communist Party meetings with you or their discussing with you Communist Party matters, or their engaging in Communist Party activities, upon which you could base your judgment that they were members of the Communist Party, as distinguished from pure hearsay, I would like for you to state their names.

Mr. TUTTLE. I think there are a few. I believe Mr. Albert Maltz; Mr. Trumbo; and a woman named Nora Hellgren.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. I think it is H-e-l-l-g-r-e-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. What occupation does she have, or did she have?

Mr. TUTTLE. I don't know her as having had any occupation. I perhaps should have included her as a party functionary, because I think that is what she was. I saw her only during the very early days of my party membership, but I remember her very well.

Mr. WALTER. Didn't you realize at any time during your membership in the Communist Party that communism is a conspiracy for world domination, controlled and dominated entirely by a foreign power?

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

Mr. WALTER. Didn't any of the members of these groups—apparently you were all intelligent people—realize you were the tools, wittingly or unwittingly, of the nation who is bent on world domination?

Mr. TUTTLE. I can't answer for them. I can only answer for myself, naturally.

Mr. WALTER. It just doesn't seem possible to me that a person of your intelligence, and persons of the apparent intelligence of others who have come in here and testified, didn't realize that the Communist Party is a conspiracy to overthrow the democratic form of government under which you live and under which you are receiving many benefits.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; I appreciate that. I appreciate it is difficult to understand. I think it would be cowardly to beat my breast and say I understood that, because I didn't.

Mr. WALTER. Sitting here, I have, of course, come to the realization why many people became members of one of the only organized anti-Hitler groups in the world, but it is inconceivable that, after attending all these meetings at which intelligent people discussed communism and what it means that there would not at some time have come to them the appreciation that they were not good Americans.

Mr. TUTTLE. I think, sir, that the growing events of history will more and more impress this upon many who still remain so. That is my earnest hope, sir.

Mr. WALTER. In the light of present-day world conditions, don't you feel that those well-meaning but misguided idealists who have been members of this conspiracy will find it necessary to sever their ties immediately or run the risk of being branded traitors?

Mr. TUTTLE. I agree, sir.

Mr. WALTER. I express the fervent hope that as a result of what you have done and others have done who have done the same thing, namely, come in here and explained the ramifications of this conspiracy, eventually the only persons remaining members of the Communist Party will be the leather-jacket hard-boiled politicians, hard-boiled Communists who would resort to sabotage and every other means to prevent us from defending ourselves from this aggression. I can't imagine any professors or teachers remaining even members of Communist-front organizations after the evidence that has been adduced in these hearings.

The committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Short recess.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tuttle, I endeavored to make it clear in my questioning of you that in the identification of any of the individuals whom you have named, that we should not rely upon pure hearsay testimony to establish that fact.

Mr. TUTTLE. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I would like for you, out of an abundance of precaution, to examine the list which you have prepared of persons who were named by you to be members of the Communist Party, and state whether or not, in any instance, you were relying solely upon what some other person told you in order to fix their identity as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir. I think in the case of Mr. Dalton Trumbo I told you that he was not in any group I was in. My reason for believing that he was a Communist is due to the fact that I remember Mr. John Bright telling me that he—that is, Mr. Trumbo—had joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, as far as he is concerned, you do not intend to state from your own knowledge that he was a member of the party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think that would be more correct; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now is there any other person whose name you mentioned who would be in the same category?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think that is also true of Mr. Albert Maltz. I assume that he was because I remember the article which I think one of the other witnesses remarked upon, in which Mr. Maltz said he felt that writers were being directed too definitely by the party, and which he recanted and wrote another article for the New Masses. I would judge from that that this was almost evidence that he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other instances?

Mr. TUTTLE. I don't remember any, sir. I am looking over the list here. If you recall any?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I do not know.

Mr. TUTTLE. I find the list almost completely either functionaries or people who were in groups with me. I don't think I missed anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to your participation, Mr. Tuttle, as a member of the Communist Party, information has come to our attention that you were associated with a number of organizations which from time to time were cited as Communist-front organizations. I would like to ask you several questions relating to some of these organizations.

The Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers took action in a number of matters, one of which was the sending, on March 29, 1938, of a cable to Leon Blum, in care of the French Embassy in Washington; to President Roosevelt; and to Secretary Hull, demanding that France abandon its nonintervention policy and allow Loyalist Spain to purchase some supplies from France. This cable was drafted by the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers. Your name has appeared in connection with it.

Mr. TUTTLE. In reply to that, it is my memory that I was not a member of the League of American Writers, but that I sponsored such a cable. I imagine I was written to and asked to, and I did. That is my memory of it.

Mr. TAVERNER. Now, the idea back of the cable was in full accord with the Communist Party line at that time?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVERNER. I wanted to ask you in particular how that Communist Party line was injected into this organization to the extent that it resulted in the formulation of this cable, if you knew about that?

Mr. TUTTLE. I didn't know about it, but I think it is evident, as the Communist Party supported Loyalist Spain throughout the conflict. On the other hand, I believe this was common with a great number of non-Communists at the time. And I would like to say that in many Communist-front organizations, the way they attracted people, and the way the Communist Party used the fronts, was to support a cause which had common support with many people, which was popularly supported.

I imagine that the people who were members of the front organizations in Hollywood were told, as the method of glorifying the work of the Communist Party, that the Communists were in the organizations and were responsible for the good, popular ideas.

I imagine this was used as a method of recruiting people. I say I "imagine" advisedly, because during the entire time I was a member of the Communist Party, I myself never recruited anyone.

Mr. WALTER. All the members of these front organizations knew, when they were participating in some popular movement, that the Communists were sponsoring that movement; is that correct?

Mr. TUTTLE. I say in some cases I think they did; yes.

Mr. TAVERNER. You will recall, Mr. Tuttle, that it was the Communist Party line in September of 1942 to wield an influence upon officialdom in this country, as well as upon the public, for the immediate opening of a second front in World War II?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. TAVERNER. Well, now, the same organization, in fact, Mr. Dashiell Hammett, president of the League of American Writers, released a public statement, according to the Daily Worker of September 14, 1942, wherein it was stated that the League of American Writers was behind President Roosevelt for the immediate opening of a second front, and that was sponsored by that method through this organization. Do you know anything about the circumstances?

Mr. TUTTLE. No. I can't tell you about the circumstances. I can make some comment on it, however. I believe a great many people supported the President in this movement for the opening of a second

front, because they thought, very obviously and perhaps correctly, that this was the quickest way to win the war. Furthermore, I am sure the Communists had an additional bias in that they thought this would help our then ally, Russia.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to ask you about another project of the same organization, the League of American Writers. I believe they formed and supported a school in California to teach courses in the motion-picture industry, and this later became the People's Educational Center. You are familiar with that?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct. Would you care for me to make a statement now about that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe—at least this is my memory—that the course which I participated in, which was a course in motion-picture direction, was started while the organization was still a part of the League of American Writers, and when it later became the People's Educational Center, this and other courses continued.

The course in direction was a perfectly legitimate course, an attempt to tell people already in the industry who were interested perhaps in becoming directors, what the experience of directors had been in making moving pictures, from a director's point of view.

Practically all the people who gave these lectures were non-Communists, and there was no propaganda of any kind that I was ever aware of in connection with this course.

Once again, I think this follows the pattern I have already spoken of. The People's Educational Center also had courses in politics and economics which were of a very left-wing nature, and I think it was their hope that people who found the course good and liked the lectures in direction, passing through the halls and talking to other people there would perhaps enroll for these other courses.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the work of that school discussed, to your knowledge, at Communist Party meetings?

Mr. TUTTLE. I imagine it was. I don't remember specifically.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent, if any, do you think the school was influenced by members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I imagine it was considerably, in the method I have already mentioned. I think perhaps among the names which I or other people have identified as being Communists there were several in the organization itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you about several other organizations with which we are informed you were connected at one time. The American Peace Mobilization is one of them.

Mr. TUTTLE. I don't remember that name specifically, but I think this was at the time when Communists were against our participation in the war; is that correct, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TUTTLE. I should like to say something specifically about myself, if I may, in this connection. Like all the Communists of that period, I backed this stand. In other words, the stand was that at the time of the pact the war was an imperialistic war; and the Communists didn't do a complete flip-flop supporting it until Russia was attacked.

There was quite a lot of fast talk in Communist circles at the time of the pact. I remember my own experience in this very well. I was working in a studio, and news came over the radio while we were working that the Russians had marched through Poland and had joined Hitler and shaken hands with the Hitler troops; and I remember a worker on the lot saying, "I will never trust those Russians again."

I was tremendously disturbed at the time. The answers given me did not satisfy me at all. If I may make a few comments, I would like to tell you what convinced me.

The Hearst papers at that time carried an article by George Bernard Shaw, and his explanation of what had happened was this: He said that the then Government of Poland had fled; that there was no real representation of Poland; and that the Russians had quite correctly marched through Poland and had, in effect, said to Hitler, "This far and no farther," and used this as a method of gaining time to build up their own defenses. This explanation of George Bernard Shaw's was the one that convinced me.

Mr. WALTER. In view of the fact a great many people became Communists in order to take part in one of the only organized resistance groups against Hitlerism, I can't understand why, when the pact was made, they didn't see through it.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. It is difficult to understand now. I tried to give you an explanation which is a personal one.

Mr. WALTER. How could they embrace the very thing that caused them to become members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. I agree with you. The explanation given at the time was that they were not embracing it, but that they could not lend themselves to support an active fight in a war which they considered could very easily turn out to be a war that would turn against Russia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't you believe that essentially it was a matter of the Communist Party in this country accepting the dictation from a foreign power?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; although I would like to say very honestly I think there was no dictation in the sense of instructions being sent, because their obvious confusion when there was a switch would lead me to believe they had no direct instructions. I think it was a form of osmosis; they absorbed it automatically.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you learned at the time of the Duclos letter that that was the accepted method in the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want to go into the Duclos letter at this time.

Mr. TUTTLE. All right. I would like to talk about it later, if I may.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. According to information of the committee, you were affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. I remember that. I lent my name to this. I never worked with the organization. I think I lent my name in response to a letter setting forth the objectives of the organization, which at that time I approved of.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you did not attend meetings of this organization. Did you attend meetings of any of the other front organizations to which we have referred?

Mr. TUTTLE. No; unless I have specifically said that I did, like the People's Educational Center, and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you were rather active in the Hollywood Democratic Committee at one time?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that organization?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. This was, I think, the first organization which was used as a front organization on the national and local political scene, and its object was to support what were called progressive candidates. This later developed and changed its name various times, and finally became, I think, the Arts, Sciences, and Professions group.

Mr. TAVENNER. First, did it not become the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. The name was changed, I believe, about the time or soon after the citation of the original committee as a Communist-front organization by the Tenney committee?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is very likely. I can't tell you whether that was the reason for it, or whether the reason was that there was an organization of a similar name formed in New York, and also, I believe, there was a wish to include other people besides Hollywood people into the organization. I think those are the two reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you leave California for New York?

Mr. TUTTLE. In the late summer of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any experience with any of these Communist-front organizations to which we have referred after leaving Hollywood?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir, I did. I had an experience that was very healthy for me. When I was in New York—I am not exactly sure when this was; I think in 1948—I had never resigned from the Arts, Sciences, and Professions organization, and my present wife answered the telephone one day and a functionary of the New York branch was asking me to sign—

Mr. TAVENNER. Branch of what?

Mr. TUTTLE. Of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Thank you. (Continuing.) To sign a telegram of protest to the American State Department for refusing to allow certain people to enter this country who were supposed to participate in a peace conference.

I asked my wife to ask the functionary who was talking on the telephone please to give me the history of some of these people who had been refused, because I didn't know if I agreed or did not agree that permission should be refused.

The functionary was very nasty and said I should accept the explanation of the committee at its face value and not question it, and should automatically lend my name. I was very angry and refused to lend my name, and they never sent me the information.

Mr. WALTER. Actually, the people being excluded by the State Department were well-known Communists, leaders in the Communist Party; isn't that right?

Mr. TUTTLE. I don't know because I, as a matter of fact, didn't know their names. In any event, I refused, and I shall not forget my reaction at the time I hung up. I remember thinking, very, very definitely, "Well, I have reassumed a very sacred right of Americans to

think for themselves," and I realized I had lost that right while I had been a Communist.

Mr. WALTER. Did you ever learn who this functionary was who called you?

Mr. TUTTLE. No, sir. I imagine it was the secretary of the New York branch, but by the time I got to the telephone I wasn't interested in who it was, I was so mad.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you a few moments ago about the Duclos letter, and you stated you had something you would like to say about it.

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes. Duclos, as I am sure you know, was a functionary of the French Communist Party. He wrote a letter criticizing the then leader of the Communist Party of the United States, Earl Browder, because Earl Browder had stated that the American Communists' collaboration with capitalists in this country would continue ad infinitum after the war, and that socialism would come about without revolution. et cetera.

At this time there was, of course, in the party record, the fact that any member of the Communist Party who advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence would be expelled from the party.

Browder was, in fact, the idol of the Communist Party at that time. As a result of the Duclos letter the party line changed, Browder was expelled from the party, and it was a tremendous shock to all of us. It was a lasting shock to me, and I think it was then I began thinking of what later became a definite decision of mine to leave the party.

I felt that there were two things about this. First, obviously there was a tremendous change which was being advocated by someone from abroad. And secondly, if the new policy were followed it would actually mean that the party was an advocate of violent revolution.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say this letter and the action that was taken had a definite effect upon your decision ultimately to break with the Communist Party?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that break occur?

Mr. TUTTLE. I didn't leave immediately. I had stopped paying dues, which automatically takes you out of the party, from the time I left, but it took me a long time to make up my mind. I am sure that is hard for a non-Communist to understand, but it was necessary with me. There is, in the first place, a kind of mental incest in the Communist Party groups. You see and talk only to people for the most part who are either Communists or close to the Communist way of thinking. Many people bring up problems that are straw men, because they knock them down with a stock answer. It was not until then I was able to reestablish myself as an independent thinker.

Mr. TAVENNER. You made a very significant statement a while ago. You said when you arrived in New York you associated with liberals who were neither Communists nor Fascists, and that they strengthened you in the position you took?

Mr. TUTTLE. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. When do you consider that your break became final?

Mr. TUTTLE. Well, that is difficult to say. I would say some time in late 1948 or 1949. About this time I had already considered that

such an instance as this might come up, and I had already made up my mind how I would answer it.

As a matter of fact, quite a while before this did come up, the Directors' Guild sent me an absentee ballot asking me to vote on whether or not the members of the guild should sign a loyalty oath. I voted in favor of the loyalty oath, and when it arrived several months later I took it to the consulate in Vienna and signed it. That oath stated I was not a member of the Communist Party or any other group advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Aside from sending the chairman of this committee a wire, or a cable, requesting permission to appear here and testify, what action did you take when you learned that your name had been mentioned in the course of this investigation?

Mr. TUTTLE. I think I have already covered that. I took no action except to release a statement in which I said I had been a Communist, no longer was because I completely disagreed with its aims and tactics. I released that to the press at the time I sent the cable.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed at that time?

Mr. TUTTLE. I was not employed. I had been employed the previous summer, making a picture for an independent producer. I was to make this summer two more stories with him. Shortly after the story broke, he arrived in Vienna and said that his money people and release people would no longer accept me. Simultaneously, Columbia Pictures asked permission to take my name off the previous picture, *The Magic Face*.

I would like your permission to read a letter I wrote at that time to the Screen Directors' Guild. May I read it, sir?

Mr. WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. TUTTLE (reading) :

As you know, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has accepted my request to testify and I shall appear in Washington on May 21.

Some time ago Columbia Pictures asked my permission to withdraw my name as the director of the picture, *The Magic Face*. At that time I told them through Lou Wasserman of MCA, my agents, that I would grant the permission if (1) they arbitrated the matter with you and you decided that my name on the picture would hurt its sale; (2) if they immediately paid me the \$5,000 due me after the picture's release; and (3) if they subsequently discovered that my name on the picture would not hurt its sale that they would publicly announce that I was, in fact, the director of the picture. That was nearly 3 weeks ago and I have heard nothing from Columbia.

Meanwhile the House committee accepted my offer to appear and testify. Last night I cabled Lou Wasserman of MCA, as follows:

"Committee has accepted my request to testify May 21. Confident reaction of committee and public will be just. Therefore, please inform Columbia I refuse withdrawal my name as unjustified and dishonest."

In the first instance I naturally turned to my guild, of which I was one of the founders, to arbitrate the question. And I want you to know about my present stand.

As I shall testify, I was a Communist during the fight against nazism and fascism. The Communists as a legal political party had written into their record that they would expel anyone who advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. When the world political situation changed, I left the party and today I completely oppose its aims and tactics.

I am sure you will understand that only the absolute truth about myself offers me any comfort today. I have thought constantly about every action of mine during my membership in the past. I submit, with all humility, that I can find nothing in anything I did or thought that was worse than a monstrous error in judgment as to the method I chose to promote peace and security and the well-being of my fellow men. I am confident that after my testimony, the committee, the public, and you, will agree with this.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Tuttle, it wasn't easy for you to do what you have done here at this hearing, I am sure.

Mr. TUTTLE. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. But you have rendered a great service to us, to this committee, who are determined to bring home to the American people a full realization of what communism is; and I hope, because of this great service, your future employment will in nowise be impaired. I just don't think it is fair, and I am afraid if employers resort to that sort of thing—by that I mean withholding employment—it will discourage those people who I am sure today are waiting for the opportunity to make their contribution to the work of this committee.

I thank you for your contribution.

Mr. TUTTLE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. The committee stands adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 12:20 p. m., on Thursday, May 24, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Friday, May 25, 1951, at 10:30 a. m.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

FRIDAY, MAY 25, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:30 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. Francis E. Walter presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler and Courtney Owens, investigators; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order.

Who is the witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer was requested to return this morning. I had completed my examination of the witness, but members of the committee had not had an opportunity to ask such questions as they desired to ask. However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire about one other matter.

Mr. WALTER. You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF JOSÉ FERRER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ABE FORTAS AND EDWIN REISKIND—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ferrer, you testified about the information made available to actors from Theater Authority. Now, was there any separate service maintained within the organization of which you were a member, Actors' Equity, which supplied the same service?

Mr. FERRER. What service is that, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. That of screening organizations which actors could appear before, or otherwise giving the actors advice regarding organizations before which they were likely to receive invitations for appearances?

Mr. FERBER. As I understand your question: Did Actors' Equity have such a service within its own organization?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. FERRER. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I assume that you did not at any time receive any information in the way of advice from Actors' Equity as to these various organizations before which you were requested from time to time to make appearances?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Ferrer, I believe that shortly after the subpoena was served upon you, you issued a statement of some kind, or at least there appeared in the press some quotation from a statement that you had made. Will you explain to the committee just a little bit about that?

Mr. FERRER. Why I made the statement?

Mr. VELDE. What the statement was.

Mr. FERRER. Well, as soon as I find a copy, sir, I will read it to you. The statement to which you refer, I believe, reads as follows:

I attest and will so swear under oath that I am not, have never been, could never be, a member of the Communist Party, nor, specifically, am I a sympathizer with any Communist aim, a fellow traveler, or in any way an encourager of any Communist concept or objective.

Mr. VELDE. Did anyone accuse you of being a Communist Party member or sympathizer prior to the time you issued that statement?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Why did you issue the statement?

Mr. FERRER. I issued the statement because in the minds of a great many people the implication behind what was published about me in Red Channels, and then the issuance of the subpoena and the publication of the issuance of the subpoena, was that I was a Communist or Communist sympathizer, and I wanted flatly—

Mr. VELDE. But you didn't get any such implication from any member of this committee or from the staff?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. And I think sometime later there appeared a statement in the paper concerning your vindication. Did you issue a statement concerning a vindication of any charges of communism?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember any such statement, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. If the gentleman will yield, I believe the statement he refers to was contained in a newspaper article and was that the action in awarding you the Oscar had vindicated you.

Mr. FERRER. I never issued the statement.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you make the statement?

Mr. FERRER. I spoke it.

Mr. KEARNEY. What statement did you make?

Mr. FERRER. I don't have a copy, but to the best of my recollection I said that I considered being awarded the Oscar an act of faith and a vote of confidence.

Mr. KEARNEY. As I remember reading the statement that Mr. Velde questioned you about, I remember reading, in words or substance, that the action in presenting you the award of the Oscar was a vindication in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. FERRER. I don't know where you read that, sir. I never said any such thing.

Mr. VELDE. You were quoted in the newspapers as saying you felt you had been vindicated. Were you misquoted?

Mr. FERRER. I certainly was. I never said I was vindicated. There was nothing to vindicate.

Mr. WALTER. As I understand it, you merely expressed your own opinion that having been awarded the Oscar was a vindication?

Mr. FERRER. My exact words, sir, because I remember them very clearly, were that I considered being awarded the Oscar an act of faith and a vote of confidence.

Mr. KEARNEY. By whom?

Mr. FERRER. By the people who awarded me the Oscar.

Mr. VELDE. Well, of course, you realize that there are a great many witnesses who are subpoenaed before this committee who attach no particular significance to it. They are asked to come here to give information.

Mr. FERRER. That they themselves attach no significance to it?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. Certainly, I realize that.

Mr. VELDE. There are a lot of witnesses called here to testify—merely to give information to the committee.

Mr. FERRER. I realize that, Mr. Velde. I don't think everybody else does, though, and when I was served a statement was made by Ward Bond in which Ward Bond said if I was willing to swear I was not a Communist, then I was perjuring myself. This appeared on the front page of Variety.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, that has nothing to do with this committee.

Mr. FERRER. No; and I don't think my statement on receiving the Oscar has anything to do with the committee, Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. I am glad you made that clear.

Mr. FERRER. I am sorry I didn't make it clear sooner.

Mr. VELDE. I don't recall your exact testimony concerning your college education and the other phases of your life that followed your education. When did you leave Puerto Rico?

Mr. FERRER. I first left at the age of 7 months and returned within a month or two; I am not sure.

Mr. VELDE. Were returned.

Mr. FERRER. I am told I left. But I know that I did leave at the age of 6 and came to New York to live.

Mr. VELDE. Did you make any trips back to Puerto Rico?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; very frequently.

Mr. VELDE. Very frequently?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Were you aware of any Communist Party movement in Puerto Rico?

Mr. FERRER. When? I am not trying to be funny, sir. When?

Mr. VELDE. During the time you were there, any time.

Mr. FERRER. I shall explain that the last time I went back to Puerto Rico, until very recently, was in 1933. At that time I was 21 years old, I had graduated from college, and had not been back for many years. The time of my frequent returns to Puerto Rico was when I was 8, 10, 12. I was not aware of any Communist Party movement at that time; no, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Were you aware of any Communist movement on the campus at Princeton University?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. VELDE. I believe you said you were also at Columbia?

Mr. FERRER. For 1 year after I graduated from Princeton; yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You had no idea there was a Young Communist League organized in the various institutions, or schools, you attended?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I certainly did not. I am aware now, of course, that there is Communist activity in Puerto Rico, and in fact I once took a stand against it. If you would like to hear about that I shall tell you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. FERRER. In the spring of 1949, when I was closing my season in Silver Whistle, the University of Puerto Rico cabled me that they were offering me an honorary degree of doctor of philosophy at the graduation exercises in June 1949. I said I would be very proud to accept the degree, and I would fly to Puerto Rico to do so.

Then I began receiving messages, cablegrams, from Puerto Rico, and from Habana, Cuba. In one instance a couple of young men called on me at the theater, urging me, as the cablegrams had urged me, not to accept the degree because the University of Puerto Rico was a tool of American imperialism, and that the Government of Puerto Rico, which had a direct bearing on the University of Puerto Rico, was the enemy of Puerto Rican freedom.

Another gentleman was offered a degree at the same time I was, Mr. Romulo Gallegos, who had once been President of Venezuela. I am informed that he then refused the degree and did not appear in Puerto Rico. I did, and I have here an affidavit from the chancery of the university which describes those events.

Mr. VELDE. What particular significance did you attach to the telegrams saying that the American Government was imperialistic?

Mr. FERRER. The only significance I could attach was that I was in complete disagreement with any such concept.

Mr. VELDE. Did you get the idea that they came from Communist sources in Puerto Rico?

Mr. FERRER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. VELDE. Were they sent under the name of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No; but there had been a Communist-led strike at the university the year before, and this affidavit will bear that out.

Mr. VELDE. How did you find out they were Communist-inspired?

Mr. FERRER. Because I immediately got in touch with the chancery of the university and I said, "I am receiving these messages. What is it all about?"

Mr. VELDE. When you were appearing at these Communist-front organizations, lending your name to them, you did not ask if they were Communist fronts?

Mr. FERRER. I did not, because in almost every case I was appearing with persons who were not Communists, whom I did not regard as Communists, and I used them as signposts. I was interested in re-electing Roosevelt in 1944, and in fighting fascism, and that includes Stalin and the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. Did you make any inquiry as to whether these organizations at which you were appearing were Communist fronts?

Mr. FERRER. Not if I saw the name of Fiorello LaGuardia or Mrs. Roosevelt or William Allen White or Dorothy Thompson, or other people I trusted.

May I offer this in evidence?

Mr. WALTER. It will be received.

(The affidavit of the chancery of the University of Puerto Rico, above referred to, is filed herewith.)

Mr. VELDE. When did you first become aware there was a Communist movement in New York?

Mr. FERRER. I guess I dimly became aware of it since right after World War I. All the cartoons indicated that. I was never personally, actively aware of it until recent years.

Mr. VELDE. You probably were aware that there was a Communist Party movement, but you say you didn't know the purpose of the movement or the—

Mr. FERRER. Oh, no. I know the purpose of the movement, sir.

Mr. VELDE. At that time did you know the purpose of the Communist Party movement; that is, as early as you can remember? I am not trying to pin you down.

Mr. FERRER. I had a vague impression, sir, from drawings of Bolsheviks and unshaven men carrying bombs, that the purpose of the Communist Party was to overthrow the American Government, which I still consider it to be.

Mr. VELDE. Can you place the time for the recognition of that fact? I know this is hard to do, and I am not trying to pin you down.

Mr. FERRER. It goes back quite a ways, Mr. Velde. There is no "and" or "if" about it. The Communist Party and communism, and largely, I suppose, the Russian connotation, goes back quite a ways.

Mr. VELDE. Did you realize at that time, too, that the Communist Party of the United States was a part of the whole international Comintern set-up?

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

Mr. VELDE. When did you first become aware of that, if you did become aware of that?

Mr. FERRER. I became aware of that positively very, very recently, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Within the last 2 or 3 weeks?

Mr. FERRER. No. I would say within the last year.

Mr. VELDE. Within the last year. And how did you happen to come to that conclusion?

Mr. FERRER. I came to that conclusion because when the lists in Red Channels appeared, and it became clear that I had been associated with what we will call Communist-front organizations, I went about making inquiries, and among the people I consulted were my lawyers, Mr. Reiskind and Mr. Fortas, and people whose judgment I trusted.

Mr. MOULDER. Could you elaborate on your use of the term "associated with"?

Mr. FERRER. People I associated with?

Mr. MOULDER. You said you associated with Communist-front organizations. What did you mean by "associated with"?

Mr. FERRER. I mean I appeared at benefits for organizations I did not know at that time were Communist fronts.

Mr. MOULDER. But that since have been revealed to be?

Mr. FERRER. Since have been revealed to be.

Mr. MOULDER. You were not a member of these organizations?

Mr. FERRER. I never was a member of the organizations. I was used as an entertainer most of the time, or to introduce entertainers, with the exception, of course, of the ICC, where I was chairman of the Theater Division.

Mr. VELDE. Did you ever meet a person you knew to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. Not at that time I did not; no, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Were you ever asked by anyone, in this country or elsewhere, to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I believe you stated you have never cast a vote in any of our elections?

Mr. FERRER. That is right, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you consider it a part of your citizenship, a part of your duty as a good citizen, to vote?

Mr. FERRER. I do; yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I believe you gave as your reason for not casting a vote that you were playing in summer stock?

Mr. FERRER. No. I can be very specific. In 1932 I was too young. In 1936 I just didn't care to vote. I did nothing about it. In 1940, when I wanted to vote for Mr. Roosevelt, I was living in New York and preparing a new play, Charley's Aunt, and my residence was in Ossining, and I would have had to go to Ossining, interrupt preparations, to get an absentee ballot to vote.

In 1944 I was on tour with Othello.

In 1946 I was on tour with Silver Whistle. I let the days slip by when I could have gotten an absentee ballot until it was too late.

Mr. VELDE. Do you mean you have never cast a ballot in any election, city, State, or national?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Yet you were interested in politics, were you not?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. And you were interested in the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and the other organizations mentioned in a political way, I assume?

Mr. FERRER. In joining the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, I was interested in the political sense of helping to fight Franco.

Mr. KEARNEY. You were also at the same time politically interested in sponsoring the candidacy of Benjamin Davis for reelection as councilman of New York City on the Communist Party ticket?

Mr. FERRER. Mr. Kearney, I have never been interested in sponsoring the candidacy of anybody on any Communist Party ticket knowingly and intentionally.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, you were sponsoring the candidacy of Mr. Davis, were you not?

Mr. FERRER. Sir, I admitted under oath Tuesday that I did not remember sponsoring his candidacy, but that I probably did. I cannot state under oath that I did sponsor him. I am willing to accept the responsibility for it.

Mr. KEARNEY. You also said the other day that you did not know Mr. Davis was a Communist.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. How many years have you lived in New York City?

Mr. FERRER. Off and on since 1918.

Mr. KEARNEY. Benjamin Davis was quite a prominent figure in New York City, wasn't he?

Mr. FERRER. Not to the best of my knowledge; he wasn't prominent.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you still persist in your answer here the other day that when you acted in the May Day celebration you didn't know it was Communist-sponsored?

Mr. FERRER. I certainly do.

Mr. VELDE. Have you been able to recall in the last 2 days since your appearance here Tuesday the names of any persons who called you in behalf of the various organizations mentioned, one of which was the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. FERRER. I have had my secretary go through my files, and in the time which I had, which was limited, I did a certain amount of research. I have three names to submit. I would like to point out I have already mentioned the name of Margaret Webster in connection with the Moscow Art Theater. I have here a letter—

Mr. VELDE. I think, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that no unusual significance should attach to these names.

Mr. FERRER. I have here a letter dated March 16, 1948. This letter invites me to attend the meeting on March 23, 1948, in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Astor at 9 p. m. May I refer to the testimony of Tuesday in connection with this?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. FERRER. Thank you. On page 102¹ of Tuesday's testimony, Mr. Tavenner said:

On March 23, 1948, about 1,000 writers and actors had a meeting at the Hotel Astor, at which was formed, so we understand, an Anticensorship Committee, which was instructed to carry out a strong campaign on a national scale against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, against the Tenney committee of California, and to fight against what was known as the Dewey plan of establishing a similar committee in New York State. You were alleged to be one of the speakers at this gathering.

And I answered:

I introduced several people, sir.

Now, I have here the letter inviting me to attend this meeting, which I would like to submit for the record. It is signed by Edward Choate, secretary-treasurer of Stop Censorship. In this letter—

Mr. WALTER. Read the letter.

Mr. FERRER (reading):

DEAR JOE: On February 24 more than 250 leaders in literature, music, theater, radio, press, and films met at the Savoy-Plaza Hotel in response to a telegram summoning them to consider the rising menace of censorship which is threatening to engulf and stifle freedom of expression in every field of the creative arts in America.

Nine leaders from different branches of the arts and letters had sponsored the meeting by signing the telegram of invitation, and other equally concerned individuals had lent their energies to the mechanics of providing a hall and preparing a program for the conference.

The Savoy-Plaza conference adopted a declaration and action resolutions giving expression to the marked determination of American artists to join together, plan together, and assert themselves together—to stop censorship.

¹ See p. 570, this publication.

An All-Arts Stop Censorship meeting to take action on the decisions reached at the Savoy-Plaza has been arranged for Tuesday evening, March 23, in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Astor at 9 p. m.

Plans for permanent Stop Censorship organization to spearhead a drive against suppression of freedom of thought and expression will be presented.

We count on your active participation in this movement.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD CHOATE.

Mr. WALTER. Who is Edward Choate?

Mr. FERRER. Edward Choate is listed here as secretary-treasurer of Stop Censorship.

Mr. WALTER. You knew Edward Choate?

Mr. FERRER. Yes. Edward Choate is a theatrical manager on Broadway. I wanted to point out that there is no mention in this letter of action against the House Un-American Activities Committee. I went to the meeting as a meeting against censorship and no other movement. I was against censorship.

Mr. WALTER. Does that have a list of other sponsors?

Mr. FERRER. Yes. It doesn't say sponsors, It just has a list of names: Jay Gorney, Moss Hart, John Hersey, Christopher La Farge, Richard Lauterbach, Minerva Pious, Howard Taubman, Hudson Walker, and Margaret Webster.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know any of those people?

Mr. FERRER. I know quite a few of them.

I know Moss Hart, who is a playwright and director.

I know John Hersey, a novelist.

I have heard the name of Richard Lauterbach in connection with Life magazine.

I know Minerva Pious, who is an actress.

I know Howard Taubman, who is a prominent music critic, on the Times, I believe. He is the author of a biography of Toscanini.

And I know Margaret Webster, a director. She directed Othello.

Mr. VELDE. So, when you went to the meeting, you had no idea of signing a petition to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. The only thing I knew about the meeting was what the letter said.

Mr. VELDE. Did you do anything along that line?

Mr. FERRER. I don't believe so.

Mr. VELDE. You never have participated in any movement of any kind to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. FERRER. I am not certain, sir. I have no recollection of participating in any such movement.

Mr. VELDE. I believe you testified the other day—if I am wrong, please correct me—that a number of times when you made these public appearances you were called on the telephone and subsequently you got permission from a man named Corelli. Can you recall now the names of any of the persons who called you on the telephone?

Mr. FERRER. My testimony, sir, to the best of my recollection, was as follows: That in most cases I was not contacted directly; that I either was called or received a letter, and that since I very seldom go to my office, and since almost all my mail and telephone calls are received at the office, what happens, I call my office and my secretary will tell me so-and-so called, and I have a letter inviting

me to this or that organization, and I say "Yes" to this and "No" to that.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have any record in your office of such telephone calls?

Mr. FERRER. I was going to bring up two other names I discovered in my files between Tuesday and today. I discovered that Helen Bryan communicated with me with reference to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee on several occasions.

I discovered that Adele Jerome of the ICC—Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions—communicated with me relating to plans for a city center.

Mr. VELDE. It has come to my attention and to the attention of other members of the committee that oftentimes Communist Party members do not carry cards, nor do they attend Communist Party meetings, and there is no way of identifying them as actual Communists, yet they are more in favor of the Soviet Union and in favor of the Communist Party than many who carry Communist Party cards and participate in Communist functions. I wonder if that has come to your attention?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir; I have heard that.

Mr. VELDE. Most of the Soviet espionage agents I have had anything to do with do not carry Communist Party cards. Don't misunderstand me. I am not accusing you of any espionage.

Mr. FERRER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I am just explaining. I am a little bit discouraged about your failure to cast your political ideas into the more concrete form of a vote, but I understand some people do not consider that an important part of his citizenship.

Mr. FERRER. I consider that a very important part of my citizenship, Mr. Velde, and I repeat, on most of the occasions when I would have voted—the 1940, 1944, and 1948 Presidential elections—I was unable to do so because I was not in my home town.

Mr. VELDE. You didn't know you could cast an absentee ballot?

Mr. FERRER. Yes; but in a small town like Ossining you have 2 or 3 days to do it, and if you haven't been home for weeks and months—you have to go in person and register.

Mr. VELDE. That is true, but you said that you were registered.

Mr. FERRER. That I was registered? No; I never said that, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You have never registered to vote?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I am not familiar with the laws of the State of New York. I think it has a law to do with this. You are not now a registered voter?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. You have to register in person for each election.

Mr. WALTER. It is 20 minutes after 11. Anything further, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. No.

Mr. WALTER. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. For the record, probably this has been all gone over before, but I am going to ask you, Mr. Ferrer, if you were a member of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

Mr. FERRER. I was never a member of that committee, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you affiliated with it in any manner?

Mr. FERRER. I was invited, if I recall correctly, to attend a dinner. I did not attend the dinner, but I believe—and I am saying this without refreshing my memory—I believe my name was used as a sponsor for the dinner. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. KEARNEY. I believe that is so. Are you a member of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom?

Mr. FERRER. No. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the American Society for Russian Relief?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the Artists' Front To Win the War?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you connected with the artists, writers, and professional division of the Citizens Non-Partisan Commission for the Reelection of Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., to the City Council of the City of New York?

Mr. FERRER. Was I what?

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you connected with the artists, writers, and professional division of the Citizens Non-Partisan Commission for the Reelection of Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., to the City Council of the City of New York?

Mr. FERRER. I do not remember any such connection, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you remember the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you remember the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. FERRER. I was not a member; no, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the Spanish Refugee Appeal?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the theater committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

Mr. FERRER. I think I was, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, there have been a number of organizations that your name has been connected with, as being associated or affiliated with, and most of them you deny?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. I am sorry. You asked if I was a member. That is not the same as associated or affiliated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you associated or affiliated with them?

Mr. FERRER. I was associated or affiliated with some.

Mr. KEARNEY. Not all of them?

Mr. FERRER. No, not all.

Mr. KEARNEY. Which ones were you not associated or affiliated with?

Mr. FERRER. If you will repeat them I will say if I was or was not.

Mr. KEARNEY. I will ask the stenographer to repeat them.

(The reporter repeated as follows: "American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.")

Mr. FERRER. I was affiliated in the sense that I think my name was used, probably legitimately, as a sponsor of that dinner. I was not a member of the committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever disaffiliate yourself with that committee?

Mr. MOULDER. Sponsor of what, did you say?

Mr. FERRER. Of a dinner. In my mind I was never affiliated with it. I sponsored a dinner for it.

Mr. KEARNEY. As to any of the organizations I have mentioned that you have been affiliated with or associated with, have you ever disaffiliated or disassociated yourself from any of them?

Mr. FERRER. I do not believe so, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think that is all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Ferrer, in your testimony on Tuesday you stated that you had endorsed the candidacy of Benjamin J. Davis for city councilman of New York City?

Mr. FERRER. I do not believe I did.

Mr. JACKSON. You did not say that you had lent your name to the use of his campaign committee? I am asking that from my memory of your testimony. What did you say?

Mr. FERRER. May I look it up, sir?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I don't think it will be necessary. I think you said in a letter to the chairman of this committee that you had permitted the use of your name.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir. That was covered in the testimony.

Mr. JACKSON. You said that at the time you permitted the use of your name in the Davis campaign you did not know he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. Excuse me. Because I am under oath here, I would like to remind you that I said under oath Tuesday—and I would like to quote so I won't double-cross myself unintentionally. Mr. Tavenner asked me, at the bottom of page 42:¹

Do I understand you are in doubt as to whether you permitted your name to be used in support of the candidacy of Benjamin J. Davis for councilman or not?

And I answered on page 43:²

I said I did not recollect giving permission to use my name, but after seeing the document submitted, with the list of names on it, I told Mr. Kearney, and I told Mr. Wood, that the chances were I probably had authorized the use of my name.

Then Mr. Tavenner referred—well, that is the end of that.

Mr. TAVERNER. I referred at that point to your letter to the chairman of this committee, in which you categorically stated that you had permitted the use of your name for that purpose.

Mr. FERRER. That is right, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. At the time your name was associated with the candidacy of Mr. Davis, I believe you said you did not know that Mr. Davis was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you discover that Mr. Davis was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. I am not sure, sir. I think probably when the 11 were indicted and his name became prominent in the newspapers.

¹ See p. 550, this publication.

² See p. 550, this publication.

Mr. JACKSON. What was your reaction at the time you discovered that you had been used, possibly as a tool, in the campaign for Mr. Davis' reelection? What was your personal reaction?

Mr. FERRER. My personal reaction was anger that I had been misused and taken advantage of.

Mr. JACKSON. Did your anger and disillusionment lead you to take any positive action to disabuse the public's mind as to your position with respect to Mr. Davis' political philosophy?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you repudiate your support?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have any knowledge of communism, organized or on an individual basis, in your particular field?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know of your own personal knowledge a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps I should suggest to you that you may know some of the people who have come before the committee and admitted Communist Party membership. I don't know that you do, but in fairness I am suggesting that you may know some Communists or former Communists through their own admissions.

Mr. FERRER. In the theater?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; and this is not in any way a trick question. Your answer is you do not know anyone in the theater who is a Communist?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know whom you have had here, Mr. Jackson, but I cannot truthfully say—I do not know anyone to be a Communist in the theater.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe you testified that you could not recall any association or connection with the Artists' Front To Win the War; is that correct?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. When, if at all, did you learn of the Communist nature of the Artists' Front To Win the War?

Mr. FERRER. Within the last few months, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. What action, if any, did you take to disabuse any misconception the public may have entertained as to your political philosophy? Did you repudiate the Artists' Front To Win the War?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I did not, because my name was linked with that organization in 1942, I believe, just as my name was linked with Davis in 1945. The one thing I felt was incumbent upon me to do, when I was subpoenaed and a lot of people were apt to believe that I was a Communist, I made a public statement that I was not a Communist. That was the only public repudiation I made, but I tried to make it as all-embracing as I possibly could.

Mr. JACKSON. In all frankness, is it any great wonder that the American public might entertain some doubts concerning your record, considering the number of Communist-front organizations and activities with which your name has been linked?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know if it is a great wonder or not, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. You do realize that a great deal of harm can be done to the United States by lending your name to these Communist-front organizations?

Mr. FERRER. Definitely, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you conclude that by lending your name to these Communist-front groups, possibly you have done some harm to this country?

Mr. FERRER. If these groups to whom I have lent my name have done harm to the country, then I undoubtedly did. I never lent my name knowing they were Communist fronts or Communist controlled. If I had known that they were, I would not have lent my name.

Mr. VELDE. But you did become acquainted with the fact they were Communist-front groups, and you did nothing to disassociate yourself from those groups?

Mr. FERRER. I have been completely inactive with these organizations for many years. The Artists' Front To Win the War, my last connection with that was in 1942.

Mr. VELDE. I believe Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, testified that a person might join one or two Communist-front organizations without realizing that they were subversive influences; but that when you join five, six, seven, or more you certainly do have some knowledge of what they stand for. Do you agree with the conclusion of Mr. Hoover, if I am quoting him correctly?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know, sir. That is not true in my case.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you a sponsor of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace?

Mr. FERRER. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you have any knowledge of your name being used in that connection?

Mr. FERRER. I probably did after the event, or at the time of the event, or a few days preceding.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you have?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know.

Mr. JACKSON. You don't know that your name was used in connection with this event?

Mr. FERRER. I know now, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you first discover that your name was used?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know when I discovered it.

Mr. JACKSON. Let's fix it a little more definitely than that. Did you know it today when I asked you the question?

Mr. FERRER. If I had learned it today or the other day I would have told you I found out today or the other day, but I don't know when I found out. I may have found out through Red channels months ago.

Mr. JACKSON. A number of people listed as having been sponsors of the Waldorf conference took exception to the listing and protested such use of their names to this committee. As a result their names were removed from the report of this committee; is that correct, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, these individuals took positive steps to protect their names and characters.

Conversely, no protest was made by you with respect to a meeting which had gained so much adverse and critical publicity in the press and over the radio networks of this country. The State Department for many, many weeks was in a hubbub and furor over the question of granting or refusing visas to known Communists who proposed to attend the conference. Some were denied, and others were admitted. That was a matter of public knowledge to everyone who read the newspapers.

To illustrate the fact that many of these organizations were post "cold war"—that is to say that they were not organizations into which individuals stumbled by mistake or through ignorance—here is a partial list of the sponsors of the conference, which I believe should be inserted in the record. Their insertion does not necessarily mean that any or all of them are Communists. The fact is that most of them have been substantial adherents of the Communist philosophy:

Stella Adler, Michael Blankfort, Marlon Brando, J. Edward Bromberg, Edward Chodorov, Jerome Chodorov, Lee J. Cobb, Lester Cole, Norman Corwin, Howard da Silva, Jules Dassin, Jo Davidson, Paul Draper, Howard Fast, José Ferrer, Will Geer, Uta Hagen, Garson Kanin, Howard Koch, Millard Lampell, Ring Lardner, Jr., Joseph Losey, Arthur Miller, Sam Moore, and Linus Pauling.

I say again, Mr. Ferrer, that this is a question of Communist activities in the post cold-war period. Some of these activities have occurred many, many months after the American public became rightfully concerned over the Communist conspiracy. Quite naturally, good and loyal Americans look with suspicion upon individuals who lend their names to Communist-front organizations and who participate in functions staged by these groups. It appears to me a natural suspicion.

In your testimony you said you did not recall having attended a meeting of the Artists' Front To Win the War held on October 16, 1942. Is that correct?

Mr. FERRER. If I so stated, it is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Would it refresh your memory of this meeting if I said that Mr. Charles Chaplin flew from the west coast to be a speaker?

Mr. FERRER. It certainly would.

Mr. WALTER. Where was it held, Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I believe it is in the testimony here.

Mr. KEARNEY. Carnegie Hall.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, if your memory is refreshed in that connection, perhaps you can give us some information?

Mr. FERRER. It is refreshed to the extent that I am perfectly certain I did not attend the meeting.

Mr. JACKSON. You know Mr. Paul Robeson?

Mr. FERRER. I am trying to remember, if I may interrupt, whether I was even in New York on October 16, 1942. If I was not, it would make that clear. I am certain I did not attend the meeting.

Once more, if I may interrupt you again, Mr. Jackson, in connection with the Waldorf conference, I would like to remind you that although I did not publicly repudiate the use of my name, I stated on Tuesday that on the opening day of the conference I attended a party given in honor of Ed Sullivan as the guest of Mr. Rutgers Neilson of RKO; and I submitted a telegram from Lawrence Langner in which he stated I had expressed my distaste for what happened to artists in the Soviet

Union. So if I did not publicly repudiate, I did privately repudiate the use of my name.

Mr. JACKSON. Don't you realize that in the absence of a repudiation you lay yourself open to suspicion by the American public?

Mr. FERRER. That is why I made the statement denying Communist membership.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Paul Robeson?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever discussed with Mr. Robeson his political philosophy or beliefs?

Mr. FERRER. We have had a number of discussions in connection with the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt in 1944; the candidacy for Vice President of Mr. Truman; the importance of Mr. Willkie, who died that year. That was the kind of political discussions I had with Mr. Robeson.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you have reason to believe, as a result of those discussions, that Mr. Robeson was a Communist or Communist sympathizer?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You were associated with Mr. Robeson in the Davis campaign to the extent that your name was used in that campaign; were you not?

Mr. FERRER. To that extent; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know that Mr. Robeson has long been associated with Communist fronts and Communist-front activities?

Mr. FERRER. I do know it now; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe Mr. Robeson would support, say, a Republican for public office?

Mr. FERRER. No; I don't think he would.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't mean to be facetious. I am trying to put as much distance between the two as I can. Do you believe he would, seriously?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Not many people do.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that Mr. Robeson, by his activities in these various front organizations and on their behalf, has aided the cause of the Soviet Union as opposed to the cause of the United States?

Mr. FERRER. Well, I think he has done the Soviet Union much more harm than he ever intended to.

Mr. JACKSON. That, of course, is a matter of opinion. You believe, then, that he has not aided the Soviet Union, or has not attempted to?

Mr. FERRER. I apologize for my answer. I think he has attempted to aid the Soviet Union; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. I take no exception to your answer. Perhaps he has done more harm to the Communist cause among American Negroes than he has rendered service to the Soviet Union. I think your answer is quite correct in that regard.

You have never to this date repudiated the use of your name in the Davis campaign?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever disavowed sympathy with the political beliefs of Mr. Paul Robeson? You and he were close personal friends; were you not?

Mr. FERRER. I have not seen him since 1946.

Mr. JACKSON. You were closely associated with him in Othello for some time?

Mr. FERRER. We played in Othello together 2 years, yes. I have not seen him for over 5 years.

Mr. JACKSON. The Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was declared by the Committee on Un-American Activities to be a Communist front in 1944. Were you a sponsor of or associated with the committee?

Mr. FERRER. I do not have any definite recollection, but it is quite possible I did permit them to use my name as a sponsor; that was in 1943.

Mr. JACKSON. You were listed as a sponsor of this organization?

Mr. FERRER. Sponsor of the dinner, Mr. Jackson. That was before it was declared to be subversive.

Mr. JACKSON. Following the declaration of its subversive nature, did you take any steps to repudiate your sponsorship of the dinner?

Mr. FERRER. No, I did not. In the first place, I am not sure I knew it had been cited as subversive. In the second place, I sponsored a dinner; that was the extent of it. I have never considered myself to be a member of the committee or to have any ties with the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. In your testimony it is indicated you made several public appearances on behalf of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. I believe you appeared for that committee in San Francisco in 1945; is that correct?

Mr. FERRER. I don't believe I appeared, sir. I did not appear.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you appear for the same organization at the University of Wisconsin?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir. To clarify my statement on the San Francisco appearance, Mr. Jackson, I was in the hall that day. I remember hearing Mr. Walter Huston make a speech.

Mr. JACKSON. You were present?

Mr. FERRER. I was present but I did not appear.

Mr. JACKSON. March 5, 1945, was subsequent to the time the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee had been declared subversive or communistic in nature. Did you know at the time of the Wisconsin meeting that the organization had been proscribed as a Communist front?

Mr. FERRER. Had I known it, I would not have appeared.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you first know that it had been?

Mr. FERRER. I am not sure when I found out.

Mr. JACKSON. You did find out prior to these hearings?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you take any action at that time to disassociate yourself from the organization?

Mr. FERRER. No. I don't know if it exists today.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to touch again on the Frank Fay affair. It is my understanding that Mr. Fay was—probably "put on trial" is not the proper term, but given something in the nature of a kangaroo court before Actors' Equity because of the attack made by Mr. Fay on the nature of a meeting at Madison Square Garden by and on behalf of the Spanish Refugee Appeal?

Will you explain the procedure followed by Actors' Equity in calling the meeting to pass on Mr. Fay?

Mr. FERRER. The procedure followed by Equity was the standard procedure. Some person or group of persons brings charges against a member of Equity, and the charges are heard before the Equity Council. Both sides are argued and the council determines what course of action shall be taken.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you recall how many people participated in the council meeting in the Frank Fay hearing?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir; I don't.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you recall what the decision was, by any chance?

Mr. FERRER. I do not; not accurately.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Vincente Lombardo Toledano, one of the foremost Communists in the Western Hemisphere and a leader of the radical forces in the Mexican labor movement?

Mr. FERRER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. You have never to the best of your knowledge met Mr. Toledano?

Mr. FERRER. I don't believe I have ever met Mr. Toledano.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever been at a social affair where he was present?

Mr. FERRER. I seem to remember he may have been present at the birthday party for Paul Robeson. That is a hazy recollection.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. He was present. Did you introduce Mr. Toledano to the audience that day?

Mr. FERRER. I doubt it. I don't remember that I introduced anybody. I doubt it.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you realize at that time that a number of persons in attendance at the birthday party were either Communists or individuals with long records of Communist affiliations, associations, or activities?

Mr. FERRER. I do not believe so.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you realize the political complexion of the group which attended this birthday party?

Mr. FERRER. No. If I had known that the political complexion was Communist, I would not have attended. There were 8,000 people present that day.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to introduce into the record an article from the Daily Worker of April 18, 1944, entitled "Happy Birthday, Paul Robeson," with a photograph captioned: "Ben Davis, city councilman, being introduced by José Ferrer, the Iago in Othello and one of Robeson's dearest friends. Ferrer acted as chairman during part of the festivities."

Mr. WALTER. Mark it and let it be received in evidence.

(The article from the Daily Worker of April 18, 1944, above referred to is marked "Ferrer Exhibit No. 1" and filed herewith.)¹

Mr. JACKSON. Upon how many occasions would you say that you have checked with Theater Authority as to the nature of organizations or activities at which you were asked to appear?

Mr. FERRER. I don't think I ever checked as to the nature of activities.

Mr. JACKSON. You have never checked?

Mr. FERRER. Not as to the nature of activities.

Mr. JACKSON. Has Theatre Authority ever suggested voluntarily that you not appear at any given meeting or function?

¹ Retained in committee files.

Mr. FERRER. What one does, to answer your question, you call up Theater Authority and say, "I have been invited to appear at such and such a meeting. Is it all right for me to do so?" They say "Yes" or they say "No" or they say it is outside their jurisdiction.

Mr. JACKSON. From what source does Theater Authority draw its authority to screen or classify organizations or activities?

Mr. FERRER. I believe I said Theater Authority was organized by several actors' and performers' unions to protect the actors and the performers whose services might have been used incorrectly.

Mr. JACKSON. I think you mentioned Mr. Corelli was the head of Theater Authority during your knowledge of it. Do you know whether or not Mr. Corelli is still there?

Mr. FERRER. I am certain he is no longer head of it.

Mr. JACKSON. You don't know who the new head is?

Mr. FERRER. I am not sure they have a head. I am under the impression they have an acting executive secretary.

Mr. JACKSON. You know the Daily Worker to be the official organ of the Communist Party in this country, do you not?

Mr. FERRER. I assumed that it was, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. On what did you base that assumption?

Mr. FERRER. On what everybody said about it.

Mr. JACKSON. I imagine the content influenced your opinion?

Mr. FERRER. Undoubtedly, except that I have never seen a copy of the Daily Worker, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Just for your information, Mr. Ferrer, I might say that you obtained considerable space from time to time in the Daily Worker, and quite favorable notices in many instances.

Mr. FERRER. Quite unfavorable in other instances, too, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I know nothing of your notices from the professional standpoint, but from the political standpoint—

Mr. FERRER. From the political standpoint quite unfavorable. Would you like me to submit from the Daily Worker some unfavorable notices.

Mr. JACKSON. If you desire.

Mr. WALTER. I think it might be well to include them in the record at this point.

Mr. FERRER. I think it is unfair to leave the implication that the Daily Worker carried only favorable notices.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no objection to your submitting them.

Mr. FORTAS. May we have permission to submit the Daily Worker articles later?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. They will be included at this point.¹

Mr. FERRER. I have a copy of the resolution showing that:

Theater Authority was organized in 1934 by the Actors' Fund of America, Actors' Equity Association, National Variety Artists, Episcopal Actors' Guild, Catholic Actors' Guild, Jewish Theatrical Guild, Stage Relief Fund, League of New York Theaters, and American Federation of Actors.

And among the aims of Theater Authority was:

To sanction and approve meritorious theatrical benefit performances in which members of the theatrical profession shall appear either without compensation or without adequate compensation.

¹ Retained in the files of the committee.

Also:

To withhold its support and approval from theatrical benefits given for improper purposes and unworthy causes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you submit that document also?

Mr. FERRER. I will be glad to.

(The document above referred to is filed herewith.)

Mr. JACKSON. Don't you feel that the notices in the Daily Worker which were favorable in nature—that is not to say you did not have some critical ones; I am prepared to believe that—they were put in the Daily Worker because it was felt that you—and I am not saying by deliberation—were lending aid and comfort to the end goals of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. I don't know what the end goals of the Daily Worker are.

Mr. JACKSON. The same as the goal of the Communist Party: To overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, if necessary. I think it is high time that fact be recognized by all.

Mr. FERRER. I know that is the goal of the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Ferrer, did it ever occur to you, in such things as the Waldorf conference and others in the post cold war period, to look around and see where you were going and in whose company?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Still there were no repudiations on your part of the sponsorships or activities in which you participated?

Mr. FERRER. Most of these I did not consider myself connected with.

Mr. JACKSON. You are connected with anything in which your name is used. You are as much connected with the Waldorf conference as you were with Othello in the public mind. Your name, as late as 1949, was linked with the names of self-admitted Communists in many cases, and in other cases with the names of persons who came here before this committee of the Congress and refused to testify. It is almost unbelievable to some of us—I can only speak for myself—that it would be possible to sit on the same platform with and lend your name to Benjamin J. Davis for election to the New York City Council, and be unaware of the fact that Mr. Davis was one of the most prominent Communist members and functionaries in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MOULDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. What witnesses do you refer to who have appeared before this committee?

Mr. JACKSON. Take the Waldorf conference for example. The first name that strikes the eye is that of Will Geer, who refused to answer questions bearing on Communist Party membership or Communist-front activities. Howard da Silva is another. Almost all of the 10 who went to jail are listed here as sponsors.

Mr. MOULDER. How is he associated?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Ferrer's name was linked with others in this group and no repudiation has ever been made. I would be the last person in the world, Mr. Ferrer, to say you are a Communist. I don't believe you are.

Mr. FERRER. I can assure you that I am not.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't believe you are a member but I do believe that you have given aid and comfort to the Communist Party.

Mr. FERRER. That may be so. The only platform I was on with Benjamin Davis was in April 1944 at a birthday party, at which point, to my mind, he was linked with the Democratic Party.

As to my link with Da Silva, in testimony at this hearing and before, my position has been diametrically opposed to his. I wrote a letter to this committee offering all my records and checks. I had an informal hearing before appearing formally, at my request. I have done my very best to help you. I believe in what you want to do. I am against the Communist Party. I don't want it. And however negligent I may have been, my actions have never been other than anti-Communist and pro-American.

Mr. JACKSON. I think that is a splendid statement.

Mr. FERRER. It is also true, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Splendid and probably true. It would have carried twice as much conviction a year ago as it carries today, when your presence before this committee follows service of a subpoena. I very frankly cannot place credence in some of the statements that you have made.

Mr. FERRER. That I have just made?

Mr. JACKSON. No; in your testimony.

Mr. FERRER. In other words, I perjured myself?

Mr. JACKSON. That I do not say. I say I can't place credence in some of the things you have said. That is as much my constitutional right as the constitutional privilege claimed by some of the witnesses in refusing to testify.

Mr. FERRER. I am not questioning your constitutional right.

Mr. JACKSON. That is all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Ferrer, have you ever known an individual who was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. I didn't know him to be a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Anyone?

Mr. FERRER. At the time I did not know him to be.

Mr. KEARNEY. Have you ever known anyone to be?

Mr. FERRER. I now know Mr. Davis is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. Any others?

Mr. FERRER. I can't think of any at the moment. There may have been. If you tell me Mr. Da Silva is a member of the Communist Party, I know him. I know Mr. Geer. I know these men, but I never knew them as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the record should show I did not say that Mr. Da Silva and Mr. Geer were members of the Communist Party. I said they refused to testify.

Mr. FERRER. I said if you did say.

Mr. MOULDER. This may be repetition. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you ever been sympathetic to Communist or subversive activities?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you permitted the use of your name as a sponsor, or have you appeared personally, at an organization knowing at the time it was a Communist-front organization?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Kearney mentioned several organizations and asked whether you had disassociated yourself from those organizations, and I believe you said you had not. Would you care to explain that reply?

Mr. FERRER. In most cases—not in all, but in most cases—I never considered myself associated with them.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you meant you never were associated with those organizations; is that what you mean?

Mr. FERRER. In most cases I was not.

Mr. MOULDER. I ask whether your appearance at those affairs was in the spirit of professional entertainment or as a sympathizer with the aims and objectives of the organization?

Mr. FERRER. Very often I was in sympathy with the avowed purposes of the organization, such as "Stop censorship," the avowed purpose of which was to stop censorship.

Mr. MOULDER. Was it ever in the spirit of being in sympathy with the Communist Party?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir. If I had known it was a Communist organization I would not have appeared.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you care to elaborate on what action you could take to repudiate your activities along that line?

Mr. FERRER. At this point I have publicly repudiated any and all Communist links and sympathies. I never had any, and I would like to say my statement was issued in the spirit of a complete repudiation and to clarify all positions along that line.

Mr. MOULDER. When it was brought to your attention you did take action to repudiate it; is that so?

Mr. FERRER. When the subpoena was served on me; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. The repudiation followed acceptance of the subpoena?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Was that the first occasion you had to repudiate it?

Mr. FERRER. This is the first time I have taken a public stand that I never was a Communist or Communist sympathizer.

Mr. MOULDER.. After you were informed of Davis' Communist affiliation, did you repudiate your action in favor of his candidacy? What action did you take on that?

Mr. FERRER. I did not find out Mr. Davis was a Communist, to the best of my knowledge, until he was indicted. That was many years after 1945, and I took no action.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you actively campaign for his reelection?

Mr. FERRER. I did not.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you vote for him?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you a member of any church?

Mr. FERRER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Ferrer, earlier in the day you testified that you received some correspondence or wires on the occasion when you were to receive an honorary degree, I believe, from the University of Puerto Rico?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you at that time or previously give to the committee the names of the young men who wired you or communicated with you urging you not to take that degree?

Mr. FERRER. I have never given those names but will be glad to supply them.

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish you would supply them to the committee.

Mr. FERRER. I will be glad to.

Mr. WALTER. I think this is very important, because apparently, according to this affidavit from the University of Puerto Rico, the movement to prevent you from accepting an honorary degree was Communist-inspired, and all part of the plan to keep alive the anti-American feeling; and the Communists unquestionably felt if you would appear it would make a contribution towards bringing about better relations between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. You said that two young men had called at your home?

Mr. FERRER. In the dressing room at my theater.

Mr. WALTER. Called upon you requesting that you do not accept the degree. Do you know who those two young men were?

Mr. FERRER. I do not. I refused to see them.

Mr. WALTER. Did you know the purpose of their visit?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. You don't know for whom they spoke?

Mr. FERRER. No. I knew they were linked to the group that had sent me cablegrams urging me not to attend.

Mr. WALTER. Were those cablegrams signed?

Mr. FERRER. I think so.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think you could find them?

Mr. FERRER. I think so. I would like to say, in connection with this affair, I have always done the very best that I could to promote good relations between Puerto Rico and the United States of America. I am completely against Puerto Rican independence.

Mr. WALTER. What did you do to promote better relations between Puerto Rico and the United States?

Mr. FERRER. I have tried, the best I could, to present Puerto Ricans in their best light. I think there are many unhappy Puerto Ricans in New York, and I have done what I could for them in the way of financial contributions, lending my name, and so on. This was a very important blow to be dealt to the enemies.

The Academy of Arts and Languages gave me an award for good speech on the stage in 1949, and in my acceptance speech I said that one of the sources of my pride in accepting the award was that I accepted it not only as an individual but as a Puerto Rican, and

that the island of Puerto Rico was extremely proud of me on that occasion.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call your attention to this "Stop censorship" meeting of March 23, 1948. Who is Jay Gorney?

Mr. FERRER. I have no idea.

Mr. WALTER. His name is the first name on the list.

Mr. FERRER. I have heard his name, but don't know who he is.

Mr. WALTER. Were you ever associated with him in any way?

Mr. FERRER. Not that I know of.

Mr. WALTER. You were never engaged in any activities with Mr. Gorney?

Mr. FERRER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. WALTER. Who is Minerva Pious?

Mr. FERRER. A radio actress.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know her?

Mr. FERRER. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Have you been associated with her in any of these movements referred to?

Mr. FERRER. I believe so.

Mr. WALTER. Which ones?

Mr. FERRER. I believe the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Mr. WALTER. What censorship did you feel should be stopped when you agreed to participate in this movement?

Mr. FERRER. Any possible threat to control plays that might appear on Broadway through outside sources. My main concern has always been with the theater.

Mr. WALTER. What threats had been made?

Mr. FERRER. There was one very serious one where the play *Trio* had to be closed because the license would not be renewed if it was not closed.

Mr. WALTER. When was that?

Mr. FERRER. I don't remember. We were all alarmed over signs of censorship in the theater.

Mr. WALTER. What signs of censorship were there that caused you to be concerned?

Mr. FERRER. I can't answer that question specifically as to what signs there were except this *Trio* affair. There must have been signs if people like Moss Hart were sufficiently aroused to lend their names and attend the meeting.

Mr. WALTER. Just on the strength of the statement that there was a "rising menace of censorship which is threatening to engulf and stifle freedom of expression in every field of the creative arts in America," you were willing to participate in this movement?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Without having any evidence whatsoever that there was an attempt on the part of anybody or any agency to impose censorship?

Mr. FERRER. I thought by going to the meeting I might find out. Censorship is a continual threat which does not always manifest itself promptly in the theater.

Mr. WALTER. I was wondering if the purpose was to stop this committee.

Mr. FERRER. If it were, Mr. Hart and I would be two who would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. WALTER. Anything further?

Mr. TAVENNER. The criticism of Trio arose out of the question as to whether the play was decent?

Mr. FERRER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was an entirely different type of censorship from that implied by the criticism of this committee, the Tenney committee, and the plan in New York to set up an Un-American Activities Committee. It was an entirely different field?

Mr. FERRER. According to that letter I am sure it was different.

Mr. TAVENNER. The play Trio to which you referred is an entirely different thing from the film Trio which is now being played in motion picture houses?

Mr. FERRER. Entirely different.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will appreciate it if at the conclusion of your testimony you will give the cables or telegrams to which you referred to Mr. Nixon, including any additional information you may have regarding the identity of the individuals who sent them.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. The committee now stands adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 12:15 p. m. on May 25, 1951, the committee adjourned.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

MONDAY, JUNE 25, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Messrs. Walter, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Wood.

Before proceeding in this hearing I would like to make this announcement: Gen. C. A. Willoughby has requested that the time of his appearance as a witness before this committee, which was previously fixed as Thursday, June 28, be postponed temporarily. General Willoughby is on sick leave and is under medical care. His appearance as a witness will be postponed to a date mutually satisfactory to him and to the members of the committee. Four or five days' public notice will be given of the date of his appearance.

Whom do you have, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robert Rossen.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Rossen, will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ROSEN. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT ROSSEN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, SIDNEY COHN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. ROSEN. Robert Rossen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I am, sir.

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

Mr. COHN. Sidney Cohn, 1776 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state for the committee your educational background?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes. I was educated in the public schools of New York City. I went to several high schools in New York City, and I attended New York University for several years.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete your work at New York University?

Mr. ROSSEN. I am not quite sure of the date. I think it was around 1929 or 1930.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. ROSSEN. New York City, March 16, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go from New York to Hollywood and engage there in your profession?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes. I worked in the theater first for about 5 years as a playwright, and I directed several plays. I went to Hollywood in 1936 as a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe a little more in detail the nature of your employment in New York prior to your going to Hollywood?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, sir. I wasn't employed, as such, by anyone. I was more or less of a free-lance writer. I had a play produced in 1935 by a producer named Sidney Harmon. I directed a play several years before that, a play called *The Tree*. I have forgotten the name of the producer; it was Ira something or other. I wrote another play, *Corner Pocket*, which William Harris, Jr., was to produce, but he never got around to it.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the name of the play?

Mr. ROSSEN. *Corner Pocket*. I then was put under personal contract by Mervyn LeRoy, who at that time had his own unit at Warner Bros., and I came to Hollywood in July 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Richard Maibaum—

Mr. ROSSEN. M-a-i-b-a-u-m.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). The author of the play—

Mr. ROSSEN. That I directed?

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Called *The Tree*?

Mr. ROSSEN. *The Tree*, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you went to Hollywood?

Mr. ROSSEN. As I recall it, Mervyn LeRoy or his wife, I am not sure which one, had money invested in this play called *The Body Beautiful*. They always liked the writing of the play, and when the play closed they told me that a little later they would put me under contract, and they did. I then came to Warner Bros., at which Mervyn LeRoy had his unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. So, your first employment in Hollywood was with Warner Bros.?

Mr. ROSSEN. Actually, that isn't quite accurate. My first employment was for Mervyn LeRoy, but when he left Warner Bros. they took over my contract, and I stayed at Warner Bros. for a total of 7½ years, from 1936, I think, to 1944 or 1945; I am not sure of the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your work at that time was that of a screen writer; was it not?

Mr. ROSEN. At Warner Bros. it was. I just worked as a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then will you proceed?

Mr. ROSEN. Do you want me to tell you what I did there?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. ROSEN. Well, I worked on many screen plays at Warner Bros. I did pictures like *Marked Woman*, *They Won't Forget*, *Sea Wolf*, *The Roaring Twenties*, *The Edge of Darkness*. Those are the main ones I remember at Warner Bros.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at that time write on the picture *Body and Soul*?

Mr. ROSEN. Not at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was later?

Mr. ROSEN. That was later.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then will you state what you did in your profession after leaving Warner Bros.?

Mr. ROSEN. After leaving Warner Bros., I left Hollywood for a year—I think that was sometime in 1944—and did nothing. When I came back I still continued as a screen writer, but on a free-lance basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you go in 1944?

Mr. ROSEN. To New York City. I came here with my family, lived here a little less than a year, and then went back to Hollywood.

I then wrote three or four pictures. I wrote a picture, *Walk in the Sun*. I also wrote *The Strange Love of Martha Ivers*, and I think I wrote a picture called *Desert Fury* as a screen writer.

I had always wanted to be a director since I came to Hollywood, and I got a chance to direct a picture, *Johnny O'Clock*. I wrote that picture and directed it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. ROSEN. 1945, I think.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left hearing room.)

Mr. ROSEN. I then was employed by a company called Roberts Productions in connection with Enterprise.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that employment begin?

Mr. ROSEN. I am trying to remember; either late 1945 or early 1946.

I was employed as a director to direct the picture called *Body and Soul*. After *Body and Soul* I formed my own company and signed a releasing deal with Columbia Pictures to make three pictures, I think it was, originally.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were working for Roberts Productions, were you interested in the production company itself?

Mr. ROSEN. No, sir. I was an employee. I was employed on a 10-week guaranty, and actually it took 21 weeks for me to finish my employment. I was an employee of the company.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the owners of Roberts Productions at that time?

Mr. ROSEN. As far as I know, they were Bob Roberts and John Garfield. That is the best of my knowledge. I was not at all interested financially in the picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Garfield was the star of that production Body and Soul was he not?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were the director?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the cameraman?

Mr. ROSEN. James Wong Howe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Jack Berry have any connection with the production of that picture or with the company?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my knowledge. I never saw Berry on the lot.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are acquainted with Jack Berry; are you not?

Mr. ROSEN. May I advise with counsel, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly.

Mr. ROSEN (after consulting with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the ground it violates my rights under the first and fifth amendments, and may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WOOD. May we suspend a moment? The committee is without a quorum.

(Short recess.)

Mr. WOOD. Let the record show, please, that acting under the authority vested in the chairman of this committee, I hereby set up a subcommittee to continue this hearing, composed of Messrs. Kearney, Jackson, Potter and Wood. We are all present.

Mr. Counsel, you may proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you to ask you various questions relating to the picture Body and Soul, as you were describing pictures that you had participated in, either as a screen writer or as the producer.

Mr. ROSEN. Director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you continue?

Mr. ROSEN. I then went over to Columbia Pictures. As I said before, I set up my own company, and the very first picture—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of that, please?

Mr. ROSEN. I think it was in July or June. I am not sure of the date. I am sure it was in the summer of 1947 or the late spring. I contracted with Columbia to produce, direct, and write three motion pictures. The very first picture I made there, I made as a producer. It was a picture called Undercover Man. I think the star of that picture was Glen Ford.

The second picture that I made was All the King's Men. I produced, directed, and wrote that picture.

I acted individually in an executive capacity in the picture No Sad Songs For Me, in which Margaret Sullavan starred. I didn't get any credit on the picture, but I put it together. I think the late Sam Wood was to make the picture, and when he died I was called in to take over.

The last picture that I made was The Brave Bulls, made in Mexico. I produced and directed that picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you produce that picture?

Mr. ROSEN. I began the preparation for that picture in late 1949. I started to shoot in the spring of 1950. I finished the cutting in September or October, after which I took my family and went to Europe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was your director in that picture?

Mr. ROSEN. I directed the picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was your cameraman?

Mr. ROSEN. James Wong Howe and Floyd Crosby. Floyd Crosby did about 80 percent of the work. The picture was interrupted by the death of my mother. I came up to Hollywood; then when I went back we had special-effect work to do, and I took James Wong Howe with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Jack Berry connected in any way with the production of that picture?

Mr. ROSEN. May I advise with counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). No; he wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write the screen play for the picture *Prelude to Night*?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Perhaps I have the title wrong. It may be that you will recall it this way: I think it was adapted from a book written by Dayton Stoddard.

Mr. ROSEN. *Prelude to Night*. Oh, yes. This was a project that originated, I can't even remember the date, but by an agent called Arthur Lyons. He had as his partner Joe Justman, J-u-s-t-m-a-n. They asked me to write the screen play, but I didn't. I merely acted in an advisory capacity.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall when the picture was made?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I don't. I wasn't at all interested in it after I was through with my work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work with Alvah Bessie and Gordon Kahn in connection with that picture?

Mr. ROSEN. May I advise with counsel, please? (After conferring with his counsel:) I shall have to decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, thus violating my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Alvah Bessie or Gordon Kahn?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question on that grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. With regard to two of the pictures you have previously mentioned, the pictures entitled "They Won't Forget" and "Body and Soul," Joseph North, on June 5, 1948, suggested that a roll of honor order be established, and the the order include Robert Rossen for these two pictures. Do you recall that?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Joseph North?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you acquire the rights to a screen story entitled "Knock on Any Door"?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I didn't. I negotiated for them, but I never acquired them.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your plans with regard to the production of that picture?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't remember any specific plans. I remember reading the book and being kind of excited about it as a melodrama, but I think it was bought by Mark Hellinger.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it your plan to base the screen version of that book on the Sleepy Lagoon case?

Mr. ROSEN. No; it wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you presently employed, or in what profession are you presently engaged?

Mr. ROSEN. At present I have no specific plans. I still have my company, but there are no plans for further production at this particular time until I can buy some books and get into business.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time the committee endeavored to subpoena you in the early part of this year, I believe you were in Mexico; were you not?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return from Mexico?

Mr. ROSEN. I would say about the latter part of May. I think I wrote a letter to the committee. I wrote the letter the day after I returned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Promptly upon your return from Mexico you got in touch with the committee, having learned they desired your presence as a witness?

Mr. ROSEN. That is not quite the sequence of events. I received a letter written to me at Hollywood from Chairman Wood. This letter was forwarded to me. I was in Acapulco at the time. When I came back from Acapulco I wrote the committee a letter that it was hard to say when I would be back, but I would notify the committee when I got back, which I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And having done that, the committee subpoenaed you for appearance here at this time?

Mr. ROSEN. Several days later; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what work were you engaged in Mexico?

Mr. ROSEN. I had done a picture down there a year ago, as I have stated, and I had a picture project in mind. Mexico is important to me as a place for making pictures, because I can make them much more cheaply there, and as an independent producer I had made up my mind that I would no longer work under the major studios' structure if I could help it, primarily for economic reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rosen—excuse me; Mr. Rossen.

Mr. ROSEN. It doesn't make any difference. It is both.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name?

Mr. ROSEN. I was born Rosen, and I changed it about 20 years ago to Rossen.

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

Mr. ROSEN. I should like to emphatically state that I am not a member of the Communist Party. I am not sympathetic with it or its aims. I don't believe in any divided loyalty, and in the event this country goes to war I stand ready now, as I always have, to bear arms in its defense and to serve in whatever capacity the country may call on me, against any and all of its enemies, including the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state you are not sympathetic with the aims of the Communist Party. Has that always been true?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question on the grounds it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, and thus violate my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Information has come to the attention of the committee that the Communist Party may have reregistered its members on June 4, 1951. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 3, 1951?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on June 5, 1951?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you to say you are not now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I said I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you entered this hearing room?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information showing that in 1943 you held membership card No. 25111 of the Communist Party, and that you were assigned to club 1 of the northwest section of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. Did you have a Communist Party card assigned to you in 1943?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, thus violating my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony, Mr. Rossen, during the course of these hearings involving communism in Hollywood, by several witnesses relating to you. Mr. Richard Collins testified that according to his knowledge you were a member of the Communist Party. Is that true or is it false?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Mr. Richard Collins?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg also testified before this committee that you were a member of the Communist Party. Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting at which Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg was present?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party cell to which she was assigned?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an individual by the name of Sidney Benson, who lived for a while in the home of Paul Jarrico in Hollywood?

Mr. ROSEN. May I consult with counsel, please? (After conferring with his counsel:) I decline to answer that question on the grounds it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, and thus violate my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted at any time with Louise Bransten?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time attend a Communist Party meeting in the home of Ring Lardner, Jr.?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information that the Northwest Section of the Communist Party of Los Angeles County had a reception for James Ford, and that this reception was held in the home of Sam Moore May 2, 1944, and that you were in attendance at this reception. Is that correct or not?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I will decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the fact that an organization was formed in Hollywood known as the Motion Picture Alliance?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information that a meeting was held in the home of Lester Cole in 1944 concerning matters relating to the Motion Picture Alliance,¹ and that among other persons, you were present. Do you recall that?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, and thus violate my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend the People's World benefit party held at the home of E. Y. Harburg on July 16, 1941? By "benefit" party I mean a party for the benefit of the publication, People's World, and that you bought a ticket for \$10 for admission to the party.

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever contribute money for the benefit of the People's World on any other occasion?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Elizabeth Leech and Marjorie Potts, Marjorie Potts being also known as Marjorie Fiske?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to state that you progressed from the work of a screen writer to that of a producer largely for financial or economic reasons. Did you state that?

Mr. ROSEN. No; that isn't quite true.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is not quite true. Well, what was the reason?

Mr. ROSEN. My reason was that I have always held an opinion that motion pictures is a very important medium, and I felt that the only way a writer could function in motion pictures was to function as a complete entity, that is, as a writer, and he should also be able to

¹ The meeting in question is alleged to have been in opposition to the formation of the Motion Picture Alliance. From its inception the history of the Motion Picture Alliance reflects opposition to the Communist Party and movement.

direct and produce and cut his picture. And of course the money was much greater in terms of controlling profit. In other words, if the picture made a bigger profit, your share could be that much larger, and if you had faith in what you did, you felt the gamble would pay off.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you have in mind when you referred to the motion picture as being an important medium?

Mr. ROSEN. The motion picture is an important medium, sir, because it is one of the few mediums that reaches so many people and can bring entertainment to so many people. Writing short stories or poetry, you have very little audience.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the Communist Party recognized that fact too, even back prior to 1925, when the Communist International directed the Communist Party of the United States to infiltrate that medium. Are you aware of that?

Mr. ROSEN. If you are talking about 1925; no, sir, I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware at any time that that was the purpose of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, and thus violate my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony before this committee during the course of these hearings to the general effect it was a very difficult if not an impossible thing for screen writers and directors to influence the content of films, because of the supervision that was exerted over the film by the producer. Do you agree with that?

Mr. ROSEN. May I consult counsel?

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Well, I do agree with that theory. In my experience in motion pictures, I don't see how any picture can reach its final stage without the most minute, detailed scrutiny of the people in the front office.

After you have finished a screen play, it must meet the requirements of the moral code and receive the seal of approval of the censorship board. In my releasing deal with Columbia there was a clause in the contract that Harry Cohn and I had to mutually approve the material.

Mr. TAVENNER. At least under present-day regulations and the way they are enforced, you say it would be very difficult to influence the content of a film without the collaboration of the producer?

Mr. ROSEN. I would say it would be almost impossible, and to the best of my recollection, sir, in all the years I have been in the film industry, I can't recall how this would be at all possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. Having been informed of your Communist Party membership by testimony before the committee and other information in the possession of the committee, the committee, of course, desires to know to what extent these factors were taken into consideration by you in shifting from the field of that of a screen writer to that of a producer.

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I would like to answer that question, sir.

Mr. COHN. May we consult for a moment, Mr. Tavenner?

(The witness and his counsel consulted.)

Mr. ROSEN. Without conceding the validity of your statement, sir, I should like to say that my interest in becoming a director and producer was primarily one in which (1) I thought I could express

my ability; (2) I thought I could get increased prestige and whatever economic gains I could get coincident with this rise of mine in the film industry.

Mr. JACKSON. You had no political motives, then?

Mr. ROSSEN. None whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean to state, then, that the possibilities of aid to the Communist Party had no function or no place whatever in your decision to enter the field of the producer?

Mr. ROSSEN. None; none at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time while you were a producer lend your influence or support to the employment of a person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party in the work of production of pictures?

Mr. ROSSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, thus violating my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not agree that one way of influencing the content of pictures is to place in important positions in the production field those who are sympathetic with the aims of communism, or who are actually members of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I stated my position on that before, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is that, as it may bear on that question?

Mr. ROSSEN. It would be, in my opinion, almost impossible to influence the content of any picture, during my experience.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that would not be true if the producer were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSSEN. It is true in any major studio, because the ultimate control is vested in the executive producer.

Mr. KEARNEY. What about independent studios?

Mr. ROSSEN. You would have to get a motion picture release, and that is conditioned upon the final product. Up to I think 7 years ago, the control of both distribution and production was the same. For instance, I might point out, in terms of clarifying it, that my contract with Columbia Pictures calls for Columbia to release the motion pictures I make. Therefore, they act in a sense as distributor. Yet the controls over the picture are vested in Columbia Pictures. I cannot make a picture with which Columbia does not agree.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is when you are operating for Columbia?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Supposing you were operating as an independent producer?

Mr. ROSSEN. I would have the same problem. I could not get a release. If I wanted a release in terms of the major picture houses, I would have to go to a major company to release it. Otherwise it would be a very foolish and unwise project, to make a picture without having a release.

Mr. TAVENNER. But a person occupying the position of a producer is in position to aid the Communist cause in connection with the production of pictures, is he not?

Mr. ROSSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I don't think there is anything more I can add to what I have already said on this subject.

Whatever inference the committee wants to draw from it, they have that right.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question here?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Do I understand the distribution of a film is determined by the major companies?

Mr. ROSEN. The major distributors. There are only about six major companies that control the distribution of films. You would have to distribute through those companies.

Mr. POTTER. Do those companies also produce films?

Mr. ROSEN. Up to now they have. The matter is now in process of consent decrees.

Mr. POTTER. A film that you might produce, you have to get some major company to distribute that film? Is that correct?

Mr. ROSEN. May I explain it, sir?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. ROSEN. The making of a motion picture involves a great deal of money. In order for me to make a picture as an independent motion picture producer, I would have to go to financial backers and ask them to put up the money to make the film. This would involve a sum around \$1 million. No group of backers, no matter if they were private or motion picture men, would put up that kind of money unless they were guaranteed a release of that picture. The only way they could hope to get their money back would be through a major release of that film. You cannot make a film involving the kind of money I have spent on films, and not get a major release. So your controls are financial and release.

Mr. POTTER. Do the companies that release the film work with you ahead of time to know what kind of picture you are putting out?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes. The only experience I have had in this field has been with Columbia. Columbia happens to be, in addition to distributor, a financial participant in the film. I have to use Columbia studio facilities. I have to confer with the executive producer of Columbia Pictures. They must be satisfied the picture is in accordance with the code; and also, they will not approve the making of the picture until they have read the material.

Mr. POTTER. Have they ever sent a picture back for certain cuttings?

Mr. ROSEN. They always have cuttings rights ultimately. They are allowed a certain amount of cut. I am allowed to cut for two previews. After two previews, Columbia has a right to cut the film in any way they want to. This is to meet censorship board requirements. If the New York Board of Censors says, "This scene cannot be shown," Columbia has the right then to cut that picture in accordance with the various censorship codes in the various States. Columbia has the right to cut it after I am through with two previews.

Mr. POTTER. Without your permission?

Mr. ROSEN. Without my permission. That is stated in the contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of February 6, 1932, and February 17, 1932, carries an advertisement to the effect that Robert Rosser would direct a three-act play entitled "Steel" on February 17 and 18, and that this play was given under the auspices of the Workers School and the Daily Worker.

Did you direct that play?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). Yes, I directed that play.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances that led to procuring your services as director of that play?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, thus violating my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. WOOD. Do you so decline?

Mr. ROSEN. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. The February 6, 1945, issue of New Masses contains an article relating to a New Masses Cultural Awards Dinner at the Hotel Commodore on January 22. According to the article, you were chairman of the evening and accepted an award on behalf of John Howard Lawson.

Will you tell the committee who arranged for your services as chairman at this dinner?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a dinner program, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee sponsored a Free Peoples' Dinner at the Beverly Hills Hotel on July 20, 1942, at which dinner Paul Robeson was guest of honor. The names of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Rossen appear as members of the committee of sponsors.

Do you recall this occasion?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated. I do decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee who solicited your name as a sponsor of this dinner?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a letterhead dated October 24, 1945, you were a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal, which was a project of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Will you tell the committee who solicited your support of this movement?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another letterhead of the same organization, dated April 28, 1949, also reflects your name as a sponsor.

On November 24, 1947, the Attorney General of the United States, in a letter to the chairman of the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, designated the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Did you, at that time or any subsequent time, make any move toward severing your affiliations with that organization?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, thus violating my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. WOOD. Will counsel excuse me about 2 minutes?

(Short recess.)

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. The motion picture committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship arranged a reception for Michail Kalatocov, a Russian film director. I believe he represented the Russian film industry in this country at that time, was sent here on a special mission.

According to the press release Robert Rossen was one of the sponsors of this reception. Do you recall this occasion?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your assistance was sought in connection with this reception, if it was sought?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected or affiliated in any way with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the March 29, 1938, issue of New Masses, the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers sent telegrams to President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and the French Embassy, urging them to request France to open her borders to the purchase of supplies by Loyalist Spain. The name of Robert Rossen appears as a signer to this telegram.

Will you tell the committee who solicited your support of this movement and the circumstances under which you gave your support, if you did?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of April 5, 1941, the name of Robert Rossen appears as a signer of the Call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers.

Will you tell the committee who solicited your support of that meeting?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers conduct a school for writers?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. A mimeographed schedule for the summer session of 1942 reflects the name of Robert Rossen as a lecturer or speaker on dramatic action. Will you tell the committee whether or not you were engaged as a lecturer at that school, and the circumstances under which your services were solicited or acquired?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make a contribution of \$50 to the League of American Writers in June 1941, and smaller contributions in 1942 and 1943?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer those questions, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the June 24, 1942, issue of People's World, on page 5, there is an article dealing with the Writers' Workshop Conference supported by and with the backing of the League of American Writers, at which you are alleged to have been one of the speakers, and you are quoted as having stated that—

The screen can be the great propaganda medium of the war, but today techniques must be in terms of our new kinds of official thinking.

Were you a speaker at that conference, and did you make the statement attributed to you, if you recall?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are the "techniques in terms of our new kinds of official thinking"? How do you define that?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean that it would subject you, in your opinion, to criminal prosecution if you would tell this committee the new kind of official thinking referred to in this article?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. COHN. Could Mr. Rossen see that article? Do you mind my interrupting in this way, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at all. I hand you the June 24, 1942, issue of the People's World, and I refer you to the marked paragraph at page 5. This is a photostatic copy of the original.

Mr. COHN. Thank you very much (after examining document). Mr. Tavenner, that doesn't say "official" thinking. It says "social" thinking. As I read this article, it says:

The screen can be the great propaganda medium of the war, Rossen stated, because "it brings to audiences a visual sense of human beings, character, situation," but today "techniques must be in terms of our new kinds of social thinking."

Mr. TAVENNER. I stand corrected. The word is "social" instead of "official."

Mr. COHN. Do we understand your question to be unrelated to that article? I am not quite clear on your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have quoted this article, and, as I understand, he has declined to answer whether or not he made that statement. I followed that by asking what was meant by the term "techniques must be in terms of our new kinds of social thinking."

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. This article also refers to certain resolutions adopted at the closing session of a 2-day writers' conference held under the auspices of the Writers' Workshop, with the backing of the League of American Writers.

One of the resolutions referred to is a resolution supporting Harry Bridges and condemning Attorney General Biddle. Do you recall that?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another resolution relates to the immediate opening of a second front in Europe. Do you recall the circumstances relating to the passage of that resolution?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do know, do you not, that both of those matters were part of the Communist Party line at that particular time, in June 1942?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time affiliated with the League of American Writers?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated in any manner with the Artists' Front to Win the War?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a program of a meeting held in Carnegie Hall on October 16, 1942, the name of Robert Rossen appears as one of the sponsors.

Will you tell the committee who solicited your support as a sponsor of the Artists' Front to Win the War, if such support was actually given?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds it may tend to incriminate and degrade me, thus violating my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of a ballot bearing date July 26, 1944, for the election of members of the executive board of the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

Were you a candidate for membership on the executive board of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will you tell the committee how, by any stretch of the imagination, being a candidate for membership on a Democratic committee may tend to incriminate you?

Mr. COHN. May we have the list of subversive organizations?

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you mean the Democratic Party is a subversive organization?

Mr. COHN. We don't know about this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the information of the committee, this is the committee in Hollywood cited by the Tenney committee as being subversive. The name of it was then changed to the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like a little clarification of that, Mr. Counsel. In other words, then, the committee which has just been named had no affiliation with the Democratic Party? I can't reconcile the thought of any Democratic committee, or branch of the Democratic Party, being a subversive organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. A good many organizations have names which do not adequately and accurately characterize the groups. That is true, isn't it?

Mr. ROSEN. I wouldn't know, really.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you a member of this group?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds. It has been listed as a subversive organization.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Tavenner, we will suspend for 5 minutes. The committee will be in recess for 5 minutes.

(Short recess.)

Mr. WOOD. The subcommittee will be in order.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I make a clarifying statement?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mention was made of the Hollywood Democratic Committee a few minutes ago. That is on page 56 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, and in the paragraph concerning the Hollywood Democratic Committee these words are used:

* * * it had no connection with the Democratic Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct, and it also shows:

When it "faced exposure" as a Communist front, it changed its name in June 1945 to "Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

Mr. KEARNEY. That would be according to custom.

Mr. TAVENNER. It certainly would. The Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications further shows that the Hollywood Democratic Committee was a Communist front that—

.grew out of a series of fronts designed to entrap Hollywood's innocents in the motion-picture industry. Organized in 1942 for the announced purpose of re-electing Governor Olson, of California, it had no connection with the Democratic Party.

Mr. Rossen, did you make a financial contribution to the campaign of Rubin Borough, candidate for Congress? He is the husband of Madelaine Ruthven.

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I read a moment ago the citation from the California committee from which it appeared that upon exposure or threatened exposure of the Hollywood Democratic Committee as a Communist-front organization, the name was changed in June 1945 to "Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

According to the Worker of December 24, 1944, your name appears as one of the initiating sponsors of this organization, that is, the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Will you tell the committee who solicited your sponsorship of the new group and the circumstances under which you gave your support, if you did?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question on the previously stated grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated in any manner with the Jefferson School for Social Science?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of May 9, 1945, page 8, contains a notice that Robert Rossen was to be a guest lecturer at the Jefferson School for Social Science the following evening.

Did you lecture at that school the following evening?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of January 3, 1946, at page 4, contains a news item about the death of Theodore Dreiser. He was referred to as "a member in good standing of the Communist Party." Among those listed as paying tribute to Theodore Dreiser was Robert Rossen.

Did you know that Theodore Dreiser was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the occasion to which I refer?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel): I don't recall the occasion, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with Theodore Dreiser?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you affiliated with the Actors' Laboratory in Hollywood?

Mr. COHN. Will you define the word "affiliated"?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a very broad term. It means were you connected in any way with the Actors' Laboratory.

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any way with the Citizens' Committee to Aid Strikers?

Mr. ROSEN (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any part in the handling or showing of the film The Turning Point at the instance of the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. COHN. Will you give us some more identification of The Turning Point, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am certain the witness will know more about the film than I would know. The Turning Point is the name of the film. Are you acquainted with that film?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated or affiliated in any way with the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall an organization known as the Free World Association?

Mr. ROSEN. Excuse me a moment.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Of which Uhlrich Bell was the director.

Mr. COHN. May we look at that list? Is that one of the subversive outfits?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let him look at the list, please. I have no knowledge of any citation of that organization.

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not an organization that is listed as subversive by any committee or any agency of Government, if that is the matter that is bothering you.

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, it is. To the best of my recollection—that was a long time ago—I think I remember meeting Bell at Warner Bros. about 11 years ago. As far as I remember, I don't think I was ever associated with the Free World Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. I just asked if you were acquainted with the association.

Mr. ROSEN. I remember Uhlrich Bell came to Hollywood 11 or 12 years ago and had something to do with the organization of it, but I was never very active or knew Bell very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly I can refresh your recollection about one matter. In March of 1944, the Free World Association, the Hollywood chapter of it, came out with a full-page advertisement in Variety asserting the 10-point policy of the Free World Association, the first point of which was to the effect that the Free World disavowed both communism and fascism.

Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. ROSEN. No; it doesn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Here is an organization opposing both communism and fascism.

Mr. ROSEN. I am really not very clear on this organization at all except I do remember a long time ago meeting Bell, and I remember some talk in Hollywood about this organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not recall that you and Mr. John Howard Lawson attempted to organize opposition to the Free World Association, and attempted to bring pressure to discard this point No. 1 to which I referred, which was a disavowal of both communism and fascism?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, thus violating my rights under both the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an official of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was during 1941 and 1942?

Mr. ROSEN. I am not sure of the dates, Mr. Tavenner. I have an idea it was before that. I remember being elected to the executive board and also being secretary of the Screen Writers' Guild—that is, an elected secretary. I don't remember the exact dates, but if I knew the date of the agreement reached by the producers, that would help me, because I remember being secretary at that time.

Mr. WOOD. The subcommittee will stand at recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

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

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Messrs. Walter, Doyle, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Wood, a quorum of the full committee.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, at the time of our adjournment, I was asking you about your membership in the Screen Writers' Guild. Will you tell me a little of the relationship between the Screen Writers' Guild and the producers, as to what control if any this Screen Writers' Guild has over the employment by a producer of a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, I don't know what the rules have been, I really don't know what the rules have been, in the last 3 or 4 years, because my membership has been mostly in other guilds since that time. But I remember when we first wrote the Screen Writers' Guild contract I think there was a provision in it—I am not quite certain of the facts, but I think I am pretty close to them—that 80 percent of the screen writers hired by the studios would have to be members of the Screen Writers' Guild. Now, subsequently, I understand they have negotiated a new contract—this is in the past year or so—in which the percentage might have been changed. But to the best of my recollection it was 80 percent.

The only other real control that I can think of—Oh, yes. There was a minimum salary. The minimum salary agreement was \$175 a week at that time. In other words, you could not employ a screen writer for less than that. And the guild had the right to arbitrate screen credits.

Now, I don't know whether or not that was ever made a part of the agreement or whether or not that was a separate stipulation, but, for instance, if there was any dispute between screen writers over the credits that they were to get on films, the Screen Writers' Guild would set up an arbitration board, which would arbitrate that dispute. I think those are the three major points that I can remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, is there not another point also, to this effect: That in the event the board of governors of the Screen Writers' Guild should notify the producers that any individual within the guild is not in good standing, he could not be employed by the producer until that objection was removed?

Mr. ROSEN. I think that was so, but I think that only had to do with the payment of dues. In other words, the only thing that I can recollect that would put you in bad standing with the Screen Writers' Guild was if you did not pay your dues. And even then, in that case, you would have a right to come under the other 20 percent. In other words, let us assume that they threw you out of the guild. You would still be within the 20 percent of the guild membership that did not belong to the guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if a person were declared not in good standing by the board of governors for any other cause, other than the nonpayment of dues, would not the principle have applied under the clause in the contract which covered the point?

Mr. ROSEN. I think it would, to the best of my recollection. I am not really sure. For instance, I think we once had a ruling about advertising, that you were not allowed to advertise in the trade papers. But I cannot recall anybody ever not working or being declared in bad standing, for that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under the contract that the Screen Writers' Guild had, at the time you were active in the organization, with the producers, the fact that the board of governors had such a control over

who would be employed would be a very vital matter, would it not, in the event that the board of governors became dominated and controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, I really—it is a long time since I have seen that contract, and I would have to see it in order to refresh my memory on the points contained within that contract. I think it must be about 11 or 12 years since I have seen the contract, and I never really read it at that time. I do not think anybody did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You may recall a dispute that arose between the Screen Writers' Guild and the agents, that is, the Artists-Managers Guild, which was the guild under which the agents came. I understand that you and Lester Cole, Allen Scott, and Francis Faragoh were among the representatives of the Screen Writers' Guild who met representatives from the agents, at a time when there was a dispute over the amount of commissions that the agents should charge. And it is our information that the Screen Writers' Guild at that time had made demands for downward revision of the commissions by the agents, that is, commissions for handling the work of the writers. Do you recall that?

Mr. ROSEN. Will you excuse me one moment, please?

(Mr. Rossen consults with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I was on the Screen Writers' Guild committee to deal with the agents. But I think there were other people, as I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. There may be others.

Mr. ROSEN. It seems to me it was a much broader committee than the one you mention, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have the name of one other individual who was on it, I think. Mr. Harry Tugend.

Mr. ROSEN. I still seem to recollect more people, because I think this was a pretty important issue for the guild, since it involved money.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was a very live issue, was it not? And is it not true that the threat was made by the Screen Writers' Guild that if the negotiations with the agents were not successful, they would push for the establishment of a guild-sponsored agency; in other words, have their own agency, through their own guild?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't really recall that. At least I have never heard the threat. It might have been made, but not to the best of my recollection. I don't think I sat in on very many of those meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have no recollection of it?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I am trying very hard to remember it. I think I can only remember one meeting that I attended. If I am correct, it was held in Phil Berg's or Allen Berg's office, of an evening. That is an agency. I just don't remember. This might have been made on the guild floor. I don't know. I really cannot remember this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, you have testified here that you are not now a member of the Communist Party, that you were not a member of the Communist Party when you came into this room, but you would not testify as to whether you were a member yesterday or not. And then you have refused to testify about many other questions that I have asked you regarding testimony and information that the committee has relating to your alleged activities. I am certain you must

be acquainted with Frank Tuttle, who was a director in Hollywood. You are, are you not?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I am acquainted with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Frank Tuttle appeared before this committee, and he appeared voluntarily, after his name had been mentioned, just the same as yours had been, as a person who had been a member of the Communist Party, or was a member. I want to read you a part of this testimony. I asked Mr. Tuttle this question:

What impelled you to be willing to give to this committee the benefit of your knowledge regarding these individuals or any individuals who were associated with you in the Communist Party?

And this is Mr. Tuttle's reply:

I believe there is a traditional dislike among Americans for informers, and I am an informer, and I have thought about this constantly. I believe all decent people who share this dislike for informers, if they think about this carefully, will agree with me that at this particular moment it is absolutely vital, in a case like this, with ruthless aggression abroad in the world. The aggressors, I believe, are as ruthless with their own people as they are with those they consider their enemies, and I feel it is absolutely necessary for Americans to be equally ruthless.

And it was in response to that feeling and attitude on his part of extreme loyalty that he was willing to frankly tell this committee and aid this committee in every way that he could, based on his experience and his information.

Now, I am going to ask you if you haven't the same loyalty as Frank Tuttle, and if you won't cooperate with this committee. If you are not ready to do it today, we will adjourn this hearing and give you time to think about it.

Mr. WOOD. Do you and Mr. Rossen want additional time to confer, Mr. COHN?

Mr. COHN. We conferred at great length.

Mr. ROSEN. I will have to say at this time that I respect Mr. Tuttle's opinion. I have thought about this question at great length and very seriously, and I shall have to stand on the stand I have taken.

Mr. POTTER. I did not get that last.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you repeat your whole statement?

Mr. ROSEN. I respect Mr. Tuttle's opinion. I have thought about this at great length, and I shall have to stand on the position that I have taken before this committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean whether your position has been true or not?

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Kearney, I have stood on my constitutional grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. I realize that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, I regret that that is your decision. If the time comes when you change your mind about it, it may be that the committee will hear you.

But I want to ask you some additional questions.

Mr. ROSEN. May I say one word, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROSEN. If at any time in the future I do change my mind, I will communicate with this committee at that particular time.

Mr. JACKSON. Before you continue, I should like to direct your attention to the statement made by Mr. Edward Dmytryk before this

committee, a statement which I think is probably one of the most powerful that I have ever heard on this point since I have been associated with the committee. I would like to read it to you for your information. Mr. Dmytryk testified in part, and I quote:¹

There is a great deal of difference between 1947 and 1951 as far as the Communist Party is concerned, or at least as far as my awareness of what is going on is concerned.

In 1947 the cold war had not been gone beyond the freezing point. I wanted to believe that Russia was very sincere in wanting peace, and I didn't feel the Communist Party in this country was any particular menace as far as I knew, and I felt the committee before which I appeared was invading a field they could not properly invade, that is, freedom of speech and freedom of thought; and I also sincerely believed the procedures used by the committee were not completely in keeping with an honest investigation. On those grounds I refused to testify at the time.

Since that time a number of very important developments have taken place. In the first place, I had never heard before 1947 anybody say they would refuse to fight for this country in a war against Soviet Russia. I think I was in England when I first saw an article about an Australian party member who said he would not fight against Soviet Russia. Then I saw articles about American party members taking the same position; I believe Paul Robeson was one. Since then other party members in this country have stated they would not fight for their country. I think in a democracy each person takes upon himself the duty to defend his country in time of war.

Along with other people, I signed the Stockholm peace petition. I believe in peace, as everybody does. I hoped they were sincere. However, the Korean War made me realize that they were not. I think any intelligent person must realize that the North Koreans would not have attacked the South Koreans unless they had the backing of very strong forces. I can't prove it, but I believe those forces are Communist China and Communist Russia. This, too, disturbed me tremendously, and made me realize there is a Communist menace and that the Communist Party in this country is a part of that menace.

The third thing was the spy trials, the development of the Kiss, Coplon, and Greenglass cases and the Fuchs case in England. To me there is a significant thing about the spy trials. The thing that impressed me was that these people did not get any money, or not much. There are spies who work for their country, and we have respect for them. There are other spies who receive money for their work, and there may be a certain admiration for them, because they risk their necks. These people are doing it for love of the party. This is treason. I think the party that has used them is treasonable also.

I don't say all members of the Communist Party are guilty of treason, but I think a party that encourages them to act in this capacity is treasonable. For this reason I am willing to talk today.

I read that into the record in order that it may be restated again, because I think, as I say, it is one of the most powerful things that has been said before this committee.

I feel that when you leave the witness stand, for better or worse, you will have created an impression in the minds of American people, who are the final judges as to whether you have or have not been a member of the Communist Party. I think those are factors which should enter into your decision as to your course of action.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Wood. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Rossen, I would like to amplify what my colleague from California has said. I want to call attention to your testimony this morning. And without any prompting on the part of counsel, you entered into a fairly lengthy statement about your loyalty to this country, about your dislike for communism and Soviet Russia. What impression do you think you are going to leave not only with the members of this committee but, as has already been

¹ Pp. 410-411, hearings printed under this title, pt. 2.

said, with the American people, in your declination to answer practically every other question on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate you, and then make the statement, as you have, to this committee, in words or in substance, "If I change my mind, could I come back to this committee later?" You are either, in my humble opinion, telling the truth now, or you are telling untruths, with the thought in your own mind that maybe later you might come before this committee and tell the truth. I give you that for what it is worth, in order to help you make your own decision here today.

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Kearney, I would just like to make one slight correction, if I may. I didn't say "could I come back?" I think the implication there is that I asked the committee for a rehearing. I didn't say that. I said if I changed my mind I would notify the committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, if you changed your mind insofar as the testimony you have already given here today is concerned?

Mr. ROSEN. No, sir, insofar as a change of my mind about claiming my constitutional privilege is concerned.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does that not mean that at some future date you might have the thought in your mind that you might want to change your testimony?

Mr. ROSEN. No, I may want to waive my privileges at a future time.

Mr. KEARNEY. I thoroughly agree with you on that point. There is no question about that. But what I am trying to do is to assist you, and I think your counsel will say that the members of this committee are not here to persecute you. We are here to help. And we want you, under the statement that you made here this morning, as a loyal American, to do those things that now are for the benefit of your country if you are the loyal American that you claim to be.

Mr. ROSEN. In my own mind, Mr. Kearney, there is no question of my loyalty to this country or my opposition to any kind of divided loyalty, specifically in relation to the Soviet Union. This is in my own mind. This is an area I suppose that it is very difficult to get into.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it because, Mr. Rossen, you are fearful, as it has been mentioned here today, of being known as an informer?

Mr. COHN. May I consult with him for a moment?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes:

(Brief consultation between the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Kearney, I don't think it is a matter of my being fearful. At this time I really and truly feel that I want to claim my constitutional privilege, and I think there is a danger of incrimination.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understood you to say this morning that you have just returned from Mexico.

Mr. ROSEN. That is right, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know a Mexican labor leader by the name of Vincent Lombardo Toledano, I think it is?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my recollection, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. You did not meet him while you were in Mexico?

Mr. ROSEN. I didn't; no.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you attend any meetings of the Communist Party while you were in Mexico?

Mr. ROSEN. No, I didn't.

Mr. KEARNEY. I will waive further questioning, Mr. Chairman, until counsel concludes.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the June 1932 issue of New Masses, you were one of the founders of Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and I believe the first chairman. Is that correct?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate or degrade me or violate my rights under the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee about the activities of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization when you were chairman, particularly, to start off with, what disposition was made of the records of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization? Do you know anything about that?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Can you excuse me one moment, please?

Mr. COHN. Would you break your question into two, please, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I will.

Mr. COHN. Ask him about the record first, if you don't mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the disposition that was made of the records of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization at the time that the committee was holding its hearings regarding Hollywood?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you an officer of the Hollywood—

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question; same grounds.

Mr. WOOD. Do you so decline?

Mr. ROSEN. I do decline. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in a plan of writing a series of radio programs dealing with the atomic bomb as part of the project of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSEN. May I confer, please? (The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. May we hold off for a minute? (Further consultation of witness with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any program of cooperation between the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization and the Federation of Scientists, in connection with any project—

Mr. ROSEN. I decline—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any plan worked out between the Writers' Mobilization and any group of citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, either official or unofficial, for the exchange of information or material?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time send any material of any character in line with the project of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. COHN. May I ask: Was that a question as to him as an individual?

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked him if he did.

Mr. WOOD. And what was the answer?

Mr. ROSEN. The answer was: I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you as an officer of the organization send any material or exchange any material of any character with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. What date was this?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1944.

Mr. ROSEN. The answer still stands, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall an occasion when the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization invited an Italian by the name of Gatano Salvameni to speak at a seminar being held at the Hollywood Women's Club?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

May I have one second please?

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, the committee is informed through the press of that. That Mr. Salvameni had spoken prior to the time he was engaged to speak by the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and during the course of his speech he referred to the fact that Palmero Togliatti was a known Communist and had no policy of his own. He is alleged to have said in the same speech that Stalin anticipated that the more confused the situation in Italy should become, the more the Communist Party would gain the upper hand when the war was over in Italy. In other words, Mr. Salvameni was opposed to communism. And is it not a fact that as a result of that, and I may say also his criticism of the leaders in this country to some extent too, that his appointment to speak was canceled?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised by Mr. Lawson to get in touch with a radio commentator for the purpose of having him answer the charges made by the press as to the reasons for the cancellation of this speech?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised by John Howard Lawson not to stand for reelection as chairman of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Rossen, in October 1947 the National Lawyers' Guild sponsored a meeting to discuss whether the House Committee

on Un-American Activities was conducting a legislative investigation or operating as a thought control agency. The name of Robert Rossen appears on the program. Do you recall what your part was in that meeting?

Mr. COHN. May we consult for a moment?

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. COHN. Is the Lawyers' Guild listed as a subversive organization, or isn't it?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is with this committee. It has not been so listed with the Attorney General.

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Washington Evening Star of November 3, 1947, the Civil Rights Congress gave a reception the previous day honoring the 19 Hollywood writers, directors, and actors who had been subpoenaed before this committee. The tenor of the meeting was an attack on this committee. I hand you a copy of the Evening Star, a photostatic copy of the November 3, 1947, issue of the Evening Star, and ask you to look at the article entitled "Eisler in Attendance at Reception of Nineteen in Hollywood Inquiry." I will ask you to look at that article and state whether or not you were in attendance at that meeting. You will note your name appears in it.

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the article states:

Others of the subpoenaed witnesses at the reception were— naming a number, including the name Robert Rossen. Do you decline to answer?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to read to you a statement made by another person in attendance at this meeting.

Ben Margolis, one of the 5 lawyers retained by the 19, said there is "a sound legal basis for fighting this committee," and added that "what the Supreme Court does depends to a large extent on the political climate of the country." He predicted that the political climate will be wrong unless the American people unite and the committee is exposed as an enemy of the people.

Now, Mr. Margolis was one of the attorneys that represented you when you were subpoenaed before?

Mr. ROSEN. Not specifically, he didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. But he represented the group as a whole?

Mr. COHN. May we consult for just a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You were one of the 19 subpoenaed before the committee, but you were not called as a witness; isn't that true?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Margolis has indicated in this article that what the Supreme Court does in the matter would depend upon the political climate. Well, did you take part in helping to establish an artificial political climate to influence the Supreme Court in this country?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't quite understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you understand what I mean by "political climate"?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't understand what you mean when you say did I take part in creating an artificial climate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you understood the language I read from Mr. Margolis' statement, when he said that "what the Supreme Court does depends upon the political climate of the country." That meant the political attitude—didn't it?—and that that political climate would be wrong; that is, wrong from the standpoint of the 19, unless the American people, according to his language, "united, and the committee is exposed as an enemy of the people."

Now, did you join in a plan to attempt to create the public impression and feeling that this committee was an enemy of the people, in order to create this artificial climate?

Mr. COHN. May we confer for a moment?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Tavenner, I really am not responsible for what Mr. Margolis said, and I am trying my best to recollect what the events were after the previous Washington hearing.

Mr. TAVENNER. But what Mr. Margolis said set the course for what was later done; didn't it?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, to the best of my recollection, I can't remember taking part in changing the political climate, and I don't believe that the Supreme Court is subject to that kind of pressure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you read the statement of Justice Jackson a few days ago about the efforts made by the Communist Party to influence the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. ROSEN. I read the statement, but he was very firm in stating also that it just would play no part.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that is part of the political climate that we are speaking of?

Mr. ROSEN. If you are asking me about my position on this present committee, I can tell you——

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I am asking you to go back to the time that Mr. Margolis set the chart for the conduct of those interested in behalf of the 19, and at the time you were subpoenaed before this committee.

Mr. ROSEN. I am going to decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me and violate my rights under the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, now. Mr. Margolis states here that the political climate will be wrong unless the American people unite and the committee is exposed as an enemy of the people. Now, did you do anything yourself to attempt to put such a plan into effect, to make it appear as though this committee were an enemy of the people? Did you participate in any way?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds, sir.

Mr. COHN. Would you let him state his present position to the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely. If you have any different feeling or position on the subject, the committee would be glad to hear it.

Mr. ROSEN. Well, I can only speak in terms of my own experience today and my reading of what has gone on here and my observation

of this committee in relation to the committee in 1947, and I just don't think there is any comparison.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we would not want you to compare.

Mr. ROSEN. I just want to say very truthfully and honestly that I know there are differences of opinion that exist here. On the other hand, I must point out at this time that the fairness and courtesy shown to me has been very wonderful, really wonderful, and I appreciate it.

Mr. WOOD. How about some reciprocity on that subject?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you answered the question?

Mr. ROSEN. I didn't know it was a question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let me see if I can refresh your memory any about matters which might be construed as using this committee as, say, a whipping dog to accomplish the purposes of the Communist Party. The Daily Worker of November 17, 1947, page 4, contains a news item to the effect that "18 Hollywood writers and directors wrote the House of Representatives requesting that the citation against the 'Hollywood 10' be voted down." Among the signers appears your name.

Wasn't that one of the efforts made pursuant to Mr. Margolis' statement, and didn't you join in it?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you sign a brief amicus curiae on behalf of John Howard Lawson and others before the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you unite in various activities, the purpose of which was to induce the public to believe that this committee was exercising thought control over certain individuals?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information that Albert Maltz appeared before the National Civil Rights Congress, which was in meeting in Madison Square Garden, I believe in 1949, at which time the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council was attempting to organize a rally in conjunction with the Civil Rights Congress. Now, the purpose of this rally was said to be to arouse prominent people who had been mentioned by certain American Legion publication lists as Communist suspects, and certain people whose names had appeared in connection with the Judith Coplon trial. And it was the purpose that all these people whose names have been mentioned should give full statements, and that those statements should be in the way of advertisements inserted in the New York Times, in the form of an open letter to President Truman, and that the letter should demand the approval of Attorney General Tom C. Clark, and that the organization of a citizens' committee should be established to investigate the FBI. And according to our information it was requested that the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council in Hollywood should furnish certain names to be used in connection with that project. These names were forwarded, and on this list of names forwarded was said to be your name. Do you recall about that?

Mr. ROSEN. What is the date of that, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. The date is either in 1948 or 1949.

Mr. ROSEN. To the best of my recollection, I don't recall this meeting, and I don't recall anybody ever asking me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were never consulted about the use of your name for that purpose?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my knowledge. That is why I would like to know the date, if I may, the exact date; because I can then recall in relation to the pictures I was making.

Mr. TAVENNER. I cannot specify it any more definitely than I have.

Mr. ROSEN. But, to the best of my knowledge, I just don't recall it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were never an employee of OWI; were you?

Mr. ROSEN. Not that I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not?

Mr. ROSEN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been employed by any other Government agency?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my knowledge.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to apply for a passport in 1950?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, in February of 1950, when I went down to Mexico to make *The Brave Bulls*, in order to get a working permit, I had to get a passport.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you apply for a passport to Europe at any time?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I used the same passport, sir, that I used going to Mexico. It is still in existence.

Mr. TAVENNER. What countries did you visit in Europe?

Mr. ROSEN. I visited France, Italy, Switzerland, and then I went back to France. I got the boat back at Cherbourg.

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

Mr. ROSEN. Well, it was both a combination business and pleasure trip. I took my wife and my three children, and we drove through France, Italy, Switzerland, back again, and then I was interested, as I was subsequently, in flying out and talking about motion-picture production in these countries. Primarily, it was a pleasure trip. I had just completed *The Brave Bulls*.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you left New York in 1936 and went to Hollywood?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me and violate my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether you have severed your affiliation with the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, if I recollect, this morning Mr. Rosen testified under oath that he was not at present a member of the Communist Party.

Now you decline to answer?

Mr. ROSEN. No, sir. I testified under oath that I was not a member of the Communist Party when I went into this hearing room, which was the question that Mr. Tavenner asked me. And I declined to answer all other questions that he asked me in relation to the Communist Party as to past membership, et cetera.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member of the Communist Party at present?

Mr. ROSEN. Right now?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes. A few hours after you entered the room.

Mr. ROSEN. No; I am not.

Mr. KEARNEY. When did you leave the party?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the party when you entered the room?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I was not.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were you a member of the party yesterday?

Mr. ROSEN. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Rossen, do you know John Garfield?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I know John Garfield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know whether Mr. Garfield is a member of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, if I told you that John Garfield under oath here testified that he was not a member of the Communist Party and never had been, would that change your answer?

Mr. ROSEN. May I confer, please?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. If I remember John Garfield's testimony correctly, he said he would not know a Communist if he fell over one. Have you ever contributed any money to the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you acquainted with John Howard Lawson?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know where Mr. Lawson is at present?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know whether he is in jail or out of jail?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't know.

Mr. KEARNEY. He may be in jail for all you know?

Mr. ROSEN. I really don't.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it not true that John Howard Lawson was the chief functionary in the Communist Party in Hollywood?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever attend any meetings with John Howard Lawson of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever confer with John Howard Lawson about communism or the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mentioned something a little while ago in response to a question propounded by counsel that you had a change of thinking concerning the operation of this committee now. Is that true?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did that change of thinking concerning the actions of this committee today coincide with the time element in your answer this morning that you were not a member of the Communist Party at present?

Mr. ROSEN. I really don't quite understand the question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the stenographer read the question, please? (The question referred to was read by the shorthand reporter.)

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer the question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. You understand what I mean?

Mr. ROSEN. I am not too clear on it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, in other words, let me put it this way. You said, in answer to my question, that you are not now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ROSEN. I said I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. At present.

Mr. ROSEN. As of today.

Mr. KEARNEY. As of now.

Mr. ROSEN. Now.

Mr. KEARNEY. But as to whether you were yesterday or some time ago last month, you declined to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you.

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Counsel brought out in his questioning that you had some objections to the operation of this committee in the past. Is that correct? But as of now, today, your thoughts concerning the operation of this committee have changed. In other words, as you stated, as I remember, the committee was fair and tolerant and square to you as the witness here on the stand.

Mr. ROSEN. That is right, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, what I am getting at is: Did that change of thought on your part coincide with a change of thought insofar as your membership in the Communist Party is concerned? Was it as quick as all that?

Mr. COHN. Would you give us a minute?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. The answer is, General Kearney, that my opinion about this committee, I think, is pretty much the answer I gave last time, which is based on my observations today in terms of our relationship here today and is based on my own observations through what I have read in the press.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, when did your thoughts concerning the operation of this committee change, let us say, for the better?

Mr. ROSEN. I would say within the last few months.

Mr. KEARNEY. It did not change, in other words, since you have entered the room?

Mr. ROSEN. No; not based on my own personal observations.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know a motion-picture actress by the name of Constance Collier?

Mr. ROSEN. You mean do I know her personally? No; not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know whether she is a member of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. ROSEN. I really don't know anything about her.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know Alvah Bessie?

Mr. ROSEN. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. As to whether you even know him or not?

Mr. ROSEN. That is right, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know Karen Morley?

Mr. ROSEN. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you see Karen Morley while you were in Mexico?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know whether she is in Mexico or not?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. If she was not, would you so state?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that a tough one?

Mr. ROSEN. Very tough.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, again, Mr. Rossen, and I do not want to go into a long cross-examination, because I think that counsel has covered the ground very thoroughly, but again I want to bring to your attention: How can you expect me, as an individual member of this committee, in view of your protestations of loyalty to this country and your abhorrence of all that is communistic, to believe that statement, in view of the answers that you have given to counsel here today?

Mr. ROSEN. I realize, sir, that you formed certain conclusions based upon what I have said.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would you not do the same if you were up here listening to your testimony?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, it depends upon whether I were me. I think it is rather unfortunate that you reached that conclusion. I can do nothing else, sir, but to take whatever privilege I have.

Mr. KEARNEY. I realize that. You are entitled to it on the grounds that you have stated.

Mr. ROSEN. And also to reiterate as strongly as I can my loyalty to this country, my willingness to bear arms, my opposition to the Soviet Union, and my opposition to the American Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you willing to cooperate with this committee in sifting out subversive activities in this country as a loyal American?

Mr. ROSEN. Can I just take 1 minute?

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. I feel that I have cooperated with this committee and answered every question I can to the best of my ability within my rights.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean that you have answered every question not to the best of your ability, but within your rights.

Mr. ROSEN. Within my rights, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, what I am getting at, sir, you have not answered ev'ry question to the best of your ability and honestly, have you?

Mr. ROSEN. I have answered every question within my rights, asserting my rights as honorably as I can.

Mr. KEARNEY. We will leave your answer as it is. We will let it stand that way. In other words, you have answered every question propounded to you here today according to your rights as a witness before this committee?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. And that is regardless of any thoughts on your part to assist this committee in running down any subversive activities in this country of ours.

Mr. ROSEN. I will have to let my answer stand, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you refuse to cooperate.

Mr. ROSEN. I don't put it that way, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Rossen, I did not have the benefit of your witnessing this morning, because I am a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I was necessarily at that meeting instead of here. We Members of Congress find we cannot be two places at once, even though we would like to. But I gather from the discussions in the afternoon session that you testified this morning, and then I heard you this afternoon again state, that you were not a member of the Communist Party when you came into the room, and you are not now. Then General Kearney asked you whether or not you were a member yesterday, and you declined to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you. Inferentially at least, that, to me, as one man to another, infers that you were a member yesterday. Maybe that is an incorrect inference, but I just want to say to you that I cannot see the difference between your telling us that you are not a member today and your refusing to tell us that you were not a member yesterday. What is the difference? Why could it incriminate today and not yesterday?

Mr. ROSEN. I have been advised by counsel that this is a legal question. He has advised me of my rights here as a witness today, and I have availed myself of his advice, and have had to—or rather, I have stood upon these rights here as a witness.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I want to say that, of course, I am a lawyer, when I practice, and I expect my clients to follow my advice, because they pay for it.

Mr. WOOD. Would you yield at that point for an observation which I would like to make? I hope you understand, Mr. Witness, that in the event you were not a member of the Communist Party yesterday, your testimony to the effect that an answer to the question would incriminate you is not a truthful statement. So it can only leave the impartial mind under one honest conclusion, either that your statement that an answer to the question would incriminate you is not true, or you were a member of the party yesterday. That is the only inference that an honest mind can arrive at. One or the other of those is an accurate statement. So I hope you will not argue the question before me, as one member of this committee, that you want to leave the impression here that you were not a member yesterday and at the same time cloak yourself behind the constitutional privilege of immunity from answering the question. Because it just is not an honest answer.

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Wood, I have to rely upon the advice of my counsel.

Mr. WOOD. Your counsel has a perfect right to give you advice as to what your legal rights are, but your counsel does not have any right to advise you as to what to say, and I am sure he is not doing that. Because that is a matter that is entirely your responsibility.

Mr. DOYLE. I was just going to ask the young man this question.

In all these answers, when you have answered that you were refusing to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you, were those answers your answers or your counsel's answers?

Mr. ROSEN. They were my answers.

Mr. DOYLE. Your own?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Regardless of the advice of your counsel?

Mr. ROSEN. I have turned to him for advice, but the responsibility of the answer is mine.

Mr. DOYLE. How old are you?

Mr. ROSEN. Forty-three, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You said you had some children.

Mr. ROSEN. Three.

Mr. DOYLE. How old are they?

Mrs. ROSEN. Fourteen, twelve, and five.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you want them to become members of the Communist Party when they are old enough?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I do not.

Mr. DOYLE. You do not?

Mr. ROSEN. Because I don't believe in it.

Mr. ROSEN. Well, my primary reason for not believing in it is that I think basically it can only lead to one thing, or it has led to one thing in one country, and it probably, given its outlet, will lead to another thing in this country, and that is dictatorship. I am opposed to dictatorship. I am opposed to it on any level. I am opposed to it for a great many reasons. It opposes freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and it basically is against the dignity of the human individual. And I am very definitely and very positively opposed to that concept of living. I believe in the democratic way of life.

Mr. WOOD. Would the gentleman yield for one short question?

Would you mind telling the committee when you arrived at that conclusion?

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to decline to answer that question, because I think it leads into the other.

Mr. WOOD. Well, let me ask it this way: Had you arrived at that conclusion before you came into this hearing room today?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I had, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Rossen, in asking this question, I am not asking you now to neglect to follow your counsel's advice. Of course, having sat on this committee now for several months, I am beginning to realize that maybe some lawyers that may appear before this committee, without reference to your counsel, because I have never met the gentleman before—no, I will withdraw that, because I do not want to criticize my own profession, although we no doubt deserve criticism.

Mr. COHN. We have been criticized occasionally.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman continue that statement to the effect that at least some of them are sympathetic?

Mr. DOYLE. But I become convinced, Mr. Rossen, that at least some of the counsel that appear before us not trying to find

ways and means under the law by which their clients can cooperate with the committee. I have become convinced that some lawyers who have appeared before us are trying to find ways and means by which their clients may not cooperate with this committee, if you understand. In saying that, I am not referring to your counsel, because I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. TAVENNER. For the record, this is the first time this counsel has appeared before this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. You just made a glorious statement, there, about your opposition to dictatorship. As I understand the speech you just made there in answer to questioning, it was in response to a question as to whether you know what the Communist Party in America stands for, among other things. Is that correct?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't think that is quite the question, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I asked you if you wanted your children to become Communists when they were old enough, and you said "No," and I asked why, and you gave those five or six points. Then our distinguished chairman asked when you came to that conclusion, and you claimed your privilege under the fifth amendment. Now, how in the world could it possibly jeopardize you or involve you in some criminal liability or conspiracy for you to tell us how long ago it was that you came to the conclusion which you have just now announced for the benefit of the listeners and the press?

How could that embarrass you? You have told us frankly, now, what you believe in, or what you have discontinued believing, shall I say. Now, can you not tell us how long you have held that conception? Would it not be encouraging to this committee and to the American people if you came clean enough to tell us frankly that it was a month ago, or a day ago, or a year ago? I think you have some children involved in this, Mr. Rossen, your own children, if they are important, and I know they are.

Mr. ROSEN. I don't think I can state any specific date, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Approximately, sir?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't think so, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Approximately?

Mr. ROSEN. All I can say is that within my own mind this conviction has been growing for quite a while.

Mr. DOYLE. I was interested in your mention of your own observations in the press. A few moments ago you stated that from your own observations in the press you had come to the conclusion that this committee was functioning differently than the committee had, I think you stated, in 1947, to be exact.

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You also stated in answer to General Kearney that you had been treated squarely and tolerantly, that you had really been treated wonderfully, and you appreciated it. I understood that, did I not?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. That is your testimony. In view of that testimony, I want to ask you if you have ever read the law under which this committee is functioning.

Mr. ROSEN. No, not in the sense—I have a general idea, but I do not have any legal understanding of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I take it that your statement about the Communist Party believing the things that you stated it believed, and therefore you did not want your children to grow up to believe that and join that party, would mean that you feel that that sort of political philosophy or conspiratorial philosophy was subversive or is subversive toward our form of Government. Is that true? You feel that that tends to destroy our form of Government, a dictatorial political philosophy such as you have mentioned?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you have answered "Yes." I will state, without reading the whole thing, that in the law under which we are assigned to perform our duty, that which it is our duty to give life to, we are assigned to this sort of a hearing today in order to investigate the dissemination within the United States of anything that is subversive or un-American. That is part of our job. And to that extent the whole American people have given us that job, because we are a congressional committee. And our definite understanding is to investigate subversive and un-American conduct within our country. That is the law. You expect us to uphold the law, do you not?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And I presume you came into the room determined to help us uphold the law, did you not?

Mr. ROSSEN. Yes, sir, to the best of my ability and within my constitutional rights.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you believe there is a world conspiracy or a conspiracy in the United States amongst any people? Now, I am not asking you whether they are Communists or not, and I want you to note that. Do you believe there is a conspiracy among any people in the United States to overthrow our form of Government? By our form, I refer to the United States Constitution.

Mr. ROSSEN. As of today?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. ROSSEN. I think there are people who would like to overthrow our Government.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you think they are in any large number?

Mr. ROSSEN. I would not know.

Mr. DOYLE. And when I use the term "overthrow," I am referring to, if need be, a forceful overthrow, or the use of force somewhere or other if necessary, if it develops to be necessary. Would you feel there are some people, and I am not asking you, again, whether they are Communists or not at this time, who would go to that extent?

Mr. ROSSEN. On personal knowledge, as of today, I would not know that, sir. I could just infer from what I have read and from the testimony that has been given here.

Mr. DOYLE. What elements entered into your consideration in order to make you withdraw from the Communist Party as of the time you walked into the room?

Mr. ROSSEN. I shall decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds that it tends to incriminate and degrade me, violates my rights—

Mr. DOYLE. I think you have already told me once, because you said you did not want your children to grow up to be Communists.

Mr. ROSSEN. I did not state that I had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Can you not help the committee, to the extent that you would help us know the reasoning by which you came to the conclusion that you had when you put yourself in a position where you were not a Communist when you went into the room today, no matter when you were one, if ever? Now, in asking that question, I am not assuming the technical grounds that you are standing on, that maybe you were never a Communist.

Mr. ROSSEN. I think I have answered that question, sir, when I said that it took a long time to make up my mind.

Mr. DOYLE. Then you have been considering for a long time?

Mr. ROSSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You have been considering for a long time the actions you have taken.

Mr. ROSSEN. Not the actions; the belief I have.

Mr. DOYLE. The what?

Mr. ROSSEN. The belief that I have. I didn't state anything about action, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. How many years ago did you begin to be attracted to any or all of the theories of the Communist Party? How old were you?

Mr. ROSSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you do it as a result of reading, or of listening, or both?

Mr. ROSSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there not any premise upon which you feel that you could honestly, frankly, as one American to a committee of the American Congress, help us by enabling us to understand the processes which you went through, in order that we might better protect the American people from the thing you have withdrawn from?

Is there not any basis upon which you can do that?

Mr. ROSSEN. I would like to get a correction in. First, I didn't state that I have withdrawn from anything. Secondly, I think that my present position is the only position—the position that I have taken, I think, makes my stand clear.

Mr. DOYLE. Then you want me, as one American, to take the position mentally, as I go out of this room today, as a member of this committee, that your desire is to cooperate, when now you tell us that you have not even stated that you have withdrawn from the Communist Party? That is just what you stated, was it not?

Mr. ROSSEN. My position, I think, Mr. Moulder, has been made very clear today—

Mr. WOOD. This is Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. Mr. Moulder is not here.

Mr. ROSSEN. I am awfully sorry.

Mr. DOYLE. You owe him an apology, not me.

Mr. ROSSEN. Mr. Doyle, I think I have made my position clear here today. I am very sorry, I regret very much, that you draw these inferences, and I can only repeat again that I feel within me complete loyalty to this country, and I shall have to rely upon whatever constitutional rights I have in terms of the questions you have asked me.

Mr. DOYLE. Supposing I told you—and I believe it is a fact—that

every known Communist, and, of course, we know many of them—in other words, you realize that when witnesses come before this committee, generally speaking, we know more about them than they think we know. You realize that, of course?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, I wouldn't know.

Mr. DOYLE. You assume that. You have a right to assume it. Suppose I told you, therefore, that almost always when we ask a known Communist to come before this committee, whether or not he has participated in any Communist Party activities or whether or not he is a member or whether or not he attended meetings of the Communist Party, and so forth, unless he is a man who has cleaned his linens and come in here ready to defend his country and help his country against subversive misconduct without bearing arms, such as we are asking you to do now, sir, for to meet issues with patriotism in peace is just as necessary as to act with patriotism in war. Suppose I told you, then, that almost a hundred percent of the men that we already know are Communists, when we ask them a question, when we ask them if they have attended such and such a meeting—we already know what the fact is? You realize that? They answer exactly as you have, sir. They hide behind—no, I will not say "hide behind," but this is their constitutional privilege, to claim the first and the fifth amendments, and they do so. Suppose I told you that that is literally a fact, that the known Communists answer just like you have answered, when it comes to the border line of any Communist activities.

In other words, when the men that we know would use force of one kind or another to change our form of Government answer these questions, they answer just like you have. Now, I do not state that to argue with you. I am just stating it as a fact, and I think when you go out of this room you ought to realize that that is the class you have put yourself in, in my judgment. I do not think you want to be there with those children grown up, myself. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. To go back to the period of time you spent in New York, Mr. Rossen, in what plays did you participate, if you will go over them again for me.

Mr. ROSEN. It is hard to remember, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. What was your first play in New York?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, the first play that I directed—I had just gotten out of college—if I remember correctly, was a play called *The Tree*. It was written by Richard Maibaum, and produced I think in the Sixty-first Street Theater.

Mr. JACKSON. And directed by whom?

Mr. ROSEN. By myself.

Mr. JACKSON. When was that?

Mr. ROSEN. I would approximate the date at about 1931.

Mr. JACKSON. And the next stage production?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, again a series of what is known as theater stock engagements.

I directed a season at the Maverick Woodstock Players, of Woodstock, N. Y. And I directed plays there which were mostly revivals, such as Kenny Nicholson's *The Barkers* and plays of that sort.

Mr. JACKSON. Under what group?

Mr. ROSEN. I really don't remember. All I know is that under whoever's auspices it was, I remember not getting paid.

Mr. JACKSON. That is a very important consideration. And what followed on that?

Mr. ROSEN. Then I wrote a play—I sound like a songwriter—I wrote a play called *The Body Beautiful*, which was produced, as I think I mentioned earlier, I think in the fall of 1935. It only lasted about 7 days, if it lasted that long, I don't really remember.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the star?

Mr. ROSEN. A girl called Polly Walters.

Mr. JACKSON. You directed the show?

Mr. ROSEN. No. I started writing. I wrote the play.

Mr. JACKSON. You wrote it?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes. And after 2 weeks I directed it. There was a director called Bill Shore who preceded me.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to say that the use of these names does not necessarily connote any political affiliation.

Did you know Sidney Kingsley in New York?

Mr. ROSEN. Sure, I knew him a great many years ago, but not very well. I mean, as a matter of fact, when I was in New York, he was a pretty successful playwright, and to know him was to be—you know. It was kind of a rare occasion.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know Clifford Odets?

Mr. ROSEN. About on the same level, I would say, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know Paul Robeson?

Mr. ROSEN. At the time I was in New York?

Mr. JACKSON. At the time you were in New York.

Mr. ROSEN. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you subsequently know Paul Robeson?

Mr. ROSEN. I will have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you meet John Garfield during the period of time you were in New York?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I did.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you at all close to Garfield?

Mr. ROSEN. No, not very, sir; which reminds me of another play. An interim period that I forgot about. This is how I think I met Garfield. The same writer who wrote *The Tree* wrote a play—I am trying to remember the name of it—which Garfield wanted to play in. I directed the play. I will try to remember the name if I can. And I think, if memory serves me correctly, that was my first meeting with Garfield.

Mr. JACKSON. Who finally played the role?

Mr. ROSEN. Allen Butts.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know Mady Christians during the time you were in New York?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my knowledge, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you mind stating why you deem it unwise to acknowledge whether or not you subsequently met Paul Robeson?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, Robeson has been named, sir, in various capacities, either in these hearings or previous hearings, and I feel that this would tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Mr. JACKSON. I might say that several of the others I have named have also been named in the same connection.

Mr. ROSEN. I wouldn't know, really. The name Robeson I know rings a bell. I really wouldn't know about the others.

Mr. WOOD. Would you yield for just one question at that point?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Are you not leaving John Garfield under somewhat of a similar accusation when you declined a while ago to state whether or not he was or had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I do not mean to leave that impression, sir, really.

Mr. WOOD. Then why did you state that it might tend to incriminate you to answer a question as to whether or not you knew of his membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, more or less there has been talk about Garfield's connection with the Communist Party. For instance, I have read in the papers that there is a possible perjury charge against Garfield. I do not want to leave any implication against Garfield at all, because my relationship with him has been more or less on a professional level.

Mr. WOOD. You were asked a simple question as to whether or not, to your knowledge, he was or had ever been a member of the Communist Party, which you declined to answer on the ground that, according to your claim, it jeopardized your rights under the fifth and first amendments of the Constitution.

Mr. ROSEN. Can I confer a moment, please?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. Can I reanswer that other question?

Mr. WOOD. I will ask it of you again now. Do you know whether or not John Garfield is at the present time or has ever been a member of or affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. To the best of my knowledge, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. JACKSON. On the question of Roberts Productions and Enterprise Productions, are those two separate producing units?

Mr. ROSEN. I will try to explain it, sir, very simply. Enterprise was really a releasing organization that had set up a group of independent producers within it, the Roberts Production making a contract with Enterprise Productions to release that and other pictures.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know any other producing groups affiliated with this particular set-up?

Mr. ROSEN. Enterprise?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, Enterprise.

Mr. ROSEN. Well, to the best of my knowledge, I remember Ginger Rogers had a producing group there. I think André de Toth and Veronica Lake had a producing group there. I don't remember any more. Enterprise did go out of business. They also, incidentally, made their own pictures.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you in any way connected with film, *He Ran All the Way*?

Mr. ROSEN. Not in any way whatsoever, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. On the operations in Mexico, I think you have said that you had never met Vincente Lombardo Toledano.

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you met Diego Rivera?

Mr. ROSEN. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. JACKSON. With what department or agency of the Mexican Government do you negotiate to make necessary arrangements for your operations in Mexico?

Mr. ROSEN. You don't negotiate with the Government, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. With whom do you negotiate?

Mr. ROSEN. You negotiate with the studios, Churubusco Studios, C-h-u-r-u-b-u-s-c-o.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know the head of that studio?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes; I know the operating head, a man called Dick Tompkins, who represents RKO. RKO has a 49 percent interest in that studio. Then there was a general manager called Jose Noriega.

Mr. JACKSON. Did I understand you to say that you at present have your own company?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was associated with you in the company?

Mr. ROSEN. You mean in terms of—

Mr. JACKSON. In terms of artists or directors.

Mr. ROSEN. No one at the present time.

Mr. JACKSON. You simply have the framework of the company?

Mr. ROSEN. Just the framework. And it's quiescent, actually.

Mr. JACKSON. In addition to The Brave Bulls, which incidentally, was a very good picture—

Mr. ROSEN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Have you made any other pictures in Mexico, or are any contemplated at the present time?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes. I haven't made any others, but I contemplate a picture. I am in the process of buying a book. As a matter of fact, I talked to the star who agreed to play it. It is Dolores Del Rio. And I contemplate making that picture in Mexico. I also incidentally, if one may add, will say that there is another group one has to talk about, and this may relate to the question about the Government. The Mexican motion-picture industry has a bank. The Government puts up a certain amount of money, which the bank loans to motion-picture producers. And I did talk to a man. I forgot his name. But I talked to the bank in terms of a loan on the picture, because the picture that I intend to make, I intend to make in two versions, one Spanish and one English.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you now, or have you ever, subscribed to the Daily People's World?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to refuse to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you now or have you ever subscribed to the Daily Worker?

Mr. ROSEN. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you now or have you ever subscribed to the New Masses?

Mr. ROSEN. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. I will let my answer stand, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you now or have you ever subscribed to the Sunday Compass?

Mr. ROSEN. To the best of my knowledge, I have not.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you now or have you ever subscribed to the Chicago Tribune?

Mr. ROSEN. No. I really had to think, for that.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you acknowledge the existence of or do you feel that there is an international Communist movement?

Mr. ROSEN. At the present time I do, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you feel that there is an American Communist movement affiliated with the international Communist movement?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, if I were to be asked to judge it at the present time, I would have to say on the basis of the evidence that I would say that they do follow the Soviet line.

Mr. JACKSON. There is such an organization?

Mr. ROSEN. Based on what I read, and everything else.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, based on those same criteria, would you say that there is or there has been in the past a Communist movement in Hollywood or within the moving-picture industry?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever known of your own knowledge a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question. I mean, I decline to answer it.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Paul Robeson?

Mr. ROSEN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you presently, if you do not mind answering, registered as a voter?

Mr. ROSEN. I do not think so. I think I was out of the country.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever been registered as a voter?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You say you are not now a member of the Communist Party. Would you object to telling us how you were registered when you were registered?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, to the best of my recollection, I usually register Democratic.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever resigned from or publicly repudiated in any way your affiliations, real or alleged, with any of the organizations which have been named here and which are known as Communist-front organizations?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. Mr. Jackson, after conferring with my attorney, he asked me whether or not I would ask you if you would break that question.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean into specific organizations?

Mr. COHN. No, no. Into time.

Mr. JACKSON. I mean at any time in the past. There has been mention today of some 15 or 16 organizations which have been cited by this committee or by other groups of like nature as Communist-front organizations. Have you ever repudiated these organizations with which you have been associated in the past in any way?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, in relation to the past, I shall have to decline, sir. In relation to today, I think I have made my position very clear in terms of the Communist Party, and I would like to make it clearer, in terms of any other organizations which might be related to the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. That is, you are not today a member of any organization, to the best of your knowledge, which has been cited by this committee or by any other like committee as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. ROSEN. To the best of my knowledge, that is true.

Mr. JACKSON. But you decline to state whether or not you have been a member of such organization in the past?

Mr. ROSEN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I think this question has also been asked, but I am not certain of the answer. Do you consider that the Communist movement internationally is in the nature of being a conspiracy designed to overthrow other constitutional forms of government?

Mr. ROSEN. Are you asking me in terms of other Communist movements in other countries?

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, I am speaking more to the point that there is one international Communist conspiracy, in my opinion; my question is whether or not you believe that to be the case, and the Communist Party is a conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of other constitutional forms of government.

Mr. ROSEN. In my opinion, I would have to agree to the extent that unquestionably the Communist Party of either this country or any other country would be dedicated to imposing upon the other country or this country a Soviet form of government, which in and of itself would mean a new kind of constitution, a new kind of system of government.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, you do believe that the international Communist movement is dedicated to the overthrow of other constitutional forms?

Mr. ROSEN. Based on my own observations, I would say so, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. What is your understanding of the loyalty obligations of a member of the Communist Party? That question is in general, without reference to your membership or nonmembership.

Mr. ROSEN. Well, that is really a very difficult—

Mr. JACKSON. Let me phrase it more simply. Do you believe a member of the Communist Party owes his allegiance to the Soviet Union, or to the country of which he is a citizen or in which he is resident?

Mr. ROSEN. If you ask me as to his owing it, I think he can only owe it to one country, and that is the United States, on the question of owing. Whether or not that is the case, is another question.

I have been reading something about it. May I read something? I can just paraphrase it.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps later on. I do not want to unduly hold up Mr. Potter's questions.

Do you believe that a member of the Communist Party can be loyal to the United States and at the same time carry out his obligations to communism and to the Soviet Union?

Mr. COHN. May we consult for a moment?

(The witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. ROSEN. This has been said so well, Mr. Jackson. It is a very short statement. May I read it, please? It sort of sums up what I feel about it.

This is a letter from John Foster Dulles to Representative Nixon,¹ on a question I think on the McCarran Act.

¹ Now Senator Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. COHN. On the question of what Congress should do about communism.

Mr. WOOD. The question is what your belief is.

Mr. ROSEN. I believe in this statement sir. The statement reads:

I doubt the efficiency of the two bills which were sent, largely because of the fact that Communist Party is such a nebulous thing. In part it is a clearly subversive thing, subject to what Stalin calls the iron discipline of the party, with respect to policies which are largely formulated by the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow. On the other hand, the Communist Party in some countries, notably France, Italy, and to a lesser extent the United States, draws into its ranks many who in no sense seek the revolutionary overthrow of our institutions as does the hard core of the Communist Party, but who look to the Communist Party as a method of reform which will cure evils. Those who accept the iron discipline of the party are in a very real sense the agents of foreign principals and hold doctrines which partake of treason. On the other hand, many others are finding in the Communist Party an outlet for a sense of grievance. But they are not in reality either agents of the foreign principal, nor do they entertain treasonable plans. The difficulty is how to distinguish one from the other. That is the difficulty which I do not see clearly how to solve.

Mr. JACKSON. Then in essence, a Marxist, a philosophical Marxist, according to that definition, is an agent of the Soviet Union and of international communism. Is that it? The hard-core Communist?

Mr. ROSEN. The hard-core Communist is one who accepts the iron discipline of the party.

Mr. JACKSON. In that event he would, of necessity, and by definition, be a traitor.

Mr. ROSEN. According to that definition, he must be. Because obviously he does not put this country first.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you accept that definition?

Mr. ROSEN. I accept this definition here.

Mr. JACKSON. Then one who refuses for any reason to disclose members of the Communist Party, depending upon his own judgment to distinguish between hard-core Communists and simple dupes, is in effect and conceivably covering traitors?

Mr. ROSEN. I don't think that is my position, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't state that as your position, but I state it as a matter of fact, that that is quite likely to be the upshot of refusal to name those who are known to be members of the Communist Party.

Now, back to your statement with respect to the committee, your statement with respect to former committees and this one: It is one of the chief plaints of the Communists and fellow travelers, and so forth, that this committee is given to badgering witnesses and disregarding their rights. Have you sensed anything in this hearing today that would indicate that you have been badgered in any way, or that your constitutional rights have not been observed to the utmost?

Mr. ROSEN. No; I have not. As a matter of fact, I reiterate the previous statement I made. I have not felt that in the slightest way.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you approve of the United Nations action in Korea?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes, I did.

Mr. JACKSON. That would unquestionably, assuming any previous membership in the Communist Party, succeed in setting some sort of a date.

Mr. POTTER. Did you approve of it at the time that we entered it? Did you approve of our action at the time we went into the Korean War?

Mr. ROSEN. Yes. If you say, did I have any organized way of expressing my approval, I would have to say "No."

Mr. POTTER. No; just within your own opinion.

Mr. ROSEN. Within my own opinion, I approved the United Nations action.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you approve of the manner in which Albert Maltz was disciplined by the Communist Party? Do you recall the case when he was forced to repudiate statements in an article which he had written?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, we have at least gone back a little way. Do you believe, out of your own judgment and your own opinion, that a member of the Communist Party, having been defined as in that letter, should be permitted a place in the entertainment field, allowed to continue his work in an area where he might conceivably be able to propagandize?

Mr. ROSEN. I really think the law in this case, if I may be permitted to say so, is at fault. The law, I think, is at fault.

I do not think there is really a clear definition on the question of the Communist Party. For instance, in reading the McCarran Act, the McCarran Act says—

Mr. WOOD. If you will pardon me, the question that was asked, if I understood it, was whether or not you believe that a confirmed Communist who believes in adopting the Communist philosophy should be permitted a place in the entertainment field, where he could have an opportunity to spread propaganda in the entertainment world.

Mr. ROSEN. I was trying to answer the question, sir, but if you want it cut down, I will.

Mr. JACKSON. The Smith Act defines a Communist as one dedicated to the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Let us say, do you think that one who is dedicated by definition to the overthrow of the Government by force and violence should be permitted a place in the entertainment world?

Mr. ROSEN. I do not think so, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe that, by the same definition, a Communist should be permitted to work in defense plants or industries essential to the rearmament effort?

Mr. ROSEN. You are making the same definition?

Mr. JACKSON. Same definition.

Mr. ROSEN. No; I don't think that, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe they should be permitted to hold office in labor unions?

Mr. ROSEN. I wouldn't be a judge of that, sir. Really, I wouldn't; Mr. Cohn is a better one.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Rossen, I am very sorry that you have seen fit not to cooperate fully with the committee. I acknowledge the legality of your definition of cooperation—"up to the point where your constitutional rights are involved." But I feel personally that we are engaged in a mortal struggle, in which one philosophy or the other is going to be victorious. I also feel that you have in your possession information which would be of inestimable value not only to this committee but to the entire country and every citizen of this country.

I hope that you will, as the weeks go by—I hope it very sincerely—see your way clear to coming before this committee, not in the role of an informer, but in the role of a loyal American citizen, and in line with the statement that you yourself made before this committee. Because I believe that your testimony today is inconsistent with your profession of loyalty. I hope that it will come to pass that the committee can have you back at a future date, when you will go all out in an effort to do your part toward whipping this thing we are up against.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Rossen, in response to a question by Mr. Jackson, you stated that there could be two types of Communists. There could be your hard-boiled political Communist, and then there is the soft-headed misguided liberal. Since Korea, do you believe anybody can remain a member of the Communist Party without being a hard-boiled political Communist?

Mr. ROSEN. I would say not only would it be very difficult, but I think pretty idiotic.

Mr. POTTER. Your statement in response to a question by counsel as to whether you are now a member of the Communist Party, you were emphatic in stating that you were not, and you did not believe in their aims and principles. Now, what are the principles of communism which you oppose?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, I thought I stated that, but I would be very glad to restate it.

Mr. POTTER. You might have stated it; yes.

Mr. ROSEN. I stated it when Mr. Doyle asked me, but I would be very glad to restate it.

I said that I felt that communism would lead to a Soviet form of Government, which would ultimately lead to dictatorship. Dictatorship must in and of itself destroy every kind of freedom that we know under democracy. Therefore, I am opposed to it. That was in essence what I had said to Mr. Doyle before.

Mr. POTTER. You also stated, I believe, that you do not believe one can have divided loyalty.

Mr. ROSEN. That is quite correct, sir.

Mr. POTTER. Now, as an American citizen, we assume certain responsibilities with our citizenship. We are still drafting young men into the service to fight Communist forces. And yet in the little that has been asked of you to aid the American people in better understanding the Communist menace, you have failed to assume the duty and responsibility which is yours as a citizen, when at the same time we are asking these young men to make these sacrifices. They are not more desirous of getting shot at than any one else. It is probably a lot harder for them to put on a uniform and to fight than it is for you to do your duty in the witness chair. But they have assumed that responsibility as a part of their citizenship. How do you reconcile your profession of deep loyalty with your testimony today?

Mr. ROSEN. All I can say, Mr. Potter, is that I think in my own mind I have reconciled it. That does not mean that what is in my mind is the irrevocable truth. We all try to find the truth as we see it ourselves. I recognize your question, and I guess you will just have to recognize my answer.

Mr. POTTER. You do not want to leave the impression with the committee or with the American people that you still would like to ride both rails of the fence.

Mr. ROSEN. I don't want to ride both rails. I really don't.

Mr. POTTER. I have no more questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the largest annual salary that you received while being employed or engaging in your profession in Hollywood?

Mr. ROSEN. Well, it is very hard for me to answer that accurately, because in the past 4 or 5 years I have not worked annually.

Sometimes I have worked in terms of stock participation, which I cannot determine at this time. The last time I worked for a salary, it was \$5,000 a week.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not understand the answer.

Mr. ROSEN. I said I could not determine my annual salary.

Mr. JACKSON. I got that. But the amount?

Mr. ROSEN. The last time I worked as a salaried employee without any stock participation, I received \$5,000 a week.

Mr. POTTER. I would like to make a comment that there is much more economic reward in the moving-picture industry than in politics.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney has another question.

Mr. KEARNEY. Out of that \$5,000 a week salary that you spoke of, did you contribute any of that to the Communist Party?

Mr. ROSEN. I shall have to decline to answer that.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Unless there are any further questions of this witness, he may be excused.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. The witness may be excused.

I think it is too late to proceed with another witness. It is now quarter of 5.

I assume the other members of the committee are in somewhat the same position I am in. I have not had a chance to be in my office to even read my mail today.

Mr. POPPER (Martin Popper, attorney for J. Edward Bromberg). May I make a statement in connection with this? I represent a witness who was subpoenaed here this morning. After a promise made some time ago, before he was subpoenaed again, I made a request at that time on the basis of medical certificates given to this committee to be examined. I advised with him and said, "Under the circumstances, you ought to come down here anyway."

He has been here, and he has been sitting here since early this morning.

Mr. WOOD. So have we.

Mr. POPPER. I understand. But after all, the application was made by this witness. It seems to me it would only be fair and certainly consistent with every proceeding that I have every taken part in, judicial, extra-judicial, and everything else, to have the business disposed of so that he does not have the further strain that has been imposed upon him. He is here for that purpose.

Mr. Tavenner said, of course without making any promises obviously, that he would try to dispose of this business today.

Mr. WOOD. It is certainly the desire of this committee to expedite the business as rapidly as possible.

Mr. POPPER. I understand.

Mr. WOOD. The members of this committee, however, have other duties to perform.

Mr. POPPER. So have we as citizens.

Mr. Wood. We have been in session since 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr. POPPER. I am making a plea—

Mr. Wood. I am not disposed to keep the committee beyond the time when they have to go home.

Mr. POPPER. You appreciate that this is not our home. We would rather stay away.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you identify yourself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. I thought the committee knew me so well by this time—

Mr. TAVENNER. They do, but this is for the record.

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, attorney for J. Edward Bromberg.

At the moment, Mr. Chairman, all I am asking for is the indulgence on the part of the members of the committee to dispose of this today if they possibly can. I would appreciate it. I do this in the same way as I would, addressing myself to the discretion of the court.

I wonder whether in a final sense the members would not save themselves a lot of time.

Mr. Wood. I do not know of any courts that hold after 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. POPPER. On the other hand, I don't—

Mr. Wood. I am not disposed to keep the committee here any longer. I have imposed on them all day. I believe Mr. Bromberg is here at the committee's expense.

Mr. POPPER. The statutory fees of this committee hardly make up for a witness staying in Washington overnight.

Mr. Wood. The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock in the morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:50 p. m. the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 26, 1951.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 3

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Bernard W. Kearney, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Donald T. Appell, investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. J. Edward Bromberg?

Mr. Wood. Mr. Bromberg, will you stand and be sworn, please.

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

Mr. BROMBERG. I do.

TESTIMONY OF J. EDWARD BROMBERG, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

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

Mr. BROMBERG. My name is J. Edward Bromberg, born Joseph Bromberger.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. BROMBERG. I am.

Mr. POPPER. Mr. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway [New York, N. Y.]

Mr. TAVENNER. You state that you were born under the name of Bromberger?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You dropped the last two letters of your name?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BROMBERG. I was born on Christmas of 1903—1903, December 25.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. BROMBERG. In Hungary, the town of Temesvar.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter the United States?

Mr. BROMBERG. When I was about 3 years old, approximately. I don't know the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are a citizen by virtue of derivative citizenship through the naturalization of your father, I believe?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline for the committee, please, your educational background?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes. I attended the public schools of New York City, the high schools included, and I spent about a year or a year and a half in college, at the City College of New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete your college work?

Mr. BROMBERG. I did not complete my college work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I mean when did you complete what you did in college?

Mr. BROMBERG. I would have been in the class of 1928. I got out about 1925 or 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. I failed to ask you when you became a naturalized citizen by way of derivative citizenship of your father.

Mr. BROMBERG. I believe his papers carried the date of 1911. I haven't the actual date with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee, please briefly, what your employment or your profession has been since completion of your work at college.

Mr. BROMBERG. I have been an actor both in the theater and in motion pictures, and I have on occasion taught the art of acting. I think that would cover the point in question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee how you engaged in the practice of your profession—that is, in what locality and what were some of the principal plays in which you have been a leading actor.

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes. Mainly my stage work occurred—

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would divide it between your experience in New York and in Hollywood as to time.

Mr. BROMBERG. Approximately my professional career began at about 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak just a little louder, please.

Mr. BROMBERG. I thought that was very loud.

I say my professional career began just after my conclusion of my work at college, around 1926, at which point I did my first professional play, a piece called Princess Turandot. I am not at all sure of the sequence of things. After that, the order of which I don't exactly recall, I appeared in plays such as The Mistress of the Inn, Cherry Orchard, Three Sisters, The Inspector General, Both Your Houses, and so on. There are a great many. I don't have a list of them. They can be obtained.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that brings you up to what period? Is that all in New York?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes, these are all in New York. There may have been some excursions here and there, but I don't recall what those might be at the moment. Those are in New York. As I say, the exact dates of these performances or their opening or my participation in them, I am not too sure about.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, when did you go to Hollywood, or did you go?

Mr. BROMBERG. When did I go?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BROMBERG. I went, I think it was, the winter of 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about the practice of your profession there.

Mr. BROMBERG. Well, there my profession was confined to making pictures and acting in pictures as a motion-picture actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you employed?

Mr. BROMBERG. I was employed by Twentieth Century-Fox at the start—at the outset.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain employed by them?

Mr. BROMBERG. I was under a 7-year contract, which is the usual procedure, as you know, with options on their part. I think it was somewhere after the fourth or fifth year that we did not agree on terms of the contract and it was about that time that I left and became what is known as a free-lance actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be about 1940?

Mr. BROMBERG. It could be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you said 5 years.

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes, that is right. It could be. I wouldn't know as to the exact date, but it is about that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time, when you were with Fox, what were some of the principal plays in which you participated?

Mr. BROMBERG. Pictures?

Mr. TAVENNER. Screen pictures in which you participated.

Mr. BROMBERG. Well, I was in Hollywood Cavalcade, Mark of Zorro, some of the Charlie Chan pictures, a lot of what you would call B pictures, the titles of which escape me at the moment. These that I have mentioned are the main, are the large pictures, the so-called big budget pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, when you became a free-lance actor around 1940, did you continue to make your headquarters in Hollywood?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes, with occasional trips back to New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue at Hollywood? Up to the present time?

Mr. BROMBERG. No. I left Hollywood about two and a half years ago, and I make my residence in New York now.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the remaining period of time when you were in Hollywood, what were the principal pictures in which you played?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is so difficult to answer. These titles mean nothing to me, you see. In most cases the pictures that I have been in have been so meaningless in quality, but some do occur to me. A Song is Born was one of the most recent ones.

I have done pictures at most of the major studios and some of the minors. I remember one at a minor called, I believe, Song in the Wind, or Voice in the Wind. I think there was one called Tangiers. That may not be exact. I have since made one under independent auspices in New York. Maybe you can tell me what that is.

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. BROMBERG. It is the very last one I made, and its title escapes me.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long ago was that?

Mr. BROMBERG. That I made that picture?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BROMBERG. About 2 years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since that time what has been your profession or in what work have you been engaged?

Mr. BROMBERG. I have been engaged in New York—on occasion since coming to New York I have appeared in a few plays and I have also made part of my living as a teacher.

Mr. TAVENNER. A teacher?

Mr. BROMBERG. Of acting.

Mr. TAVENNER. At any particular school or just individually?

Mr. BROMBERG. My individual teaching. I have also taught for the Theater Wing, American Theater Wing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bromberg, there have been two witnesses who have appeared before this committee during the course of its hearings relating to Hollywood who have identified you as a member of the Communist Party. On April 24, Mr. Marc Lawrence testified that you and he were members of the same Communist Party cell. Was that a correct statement?

Mr. BROMBERG. As a citizen of the United States, I wish to invoke the privileges of the first and the fifth amendments and decline to answer that question, that it tends to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, you mean the answer would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, on May 24, Mr. Frank W. Tuttle, who was for years a director in Hollywood, testified that he had associated with you in the Communist Party. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you know Mr. Frank Tuttle; do you not?

Mr. BROMBERG. I refuse to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you knowingly participated in Communist Party activities in the area of Hollywood?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell this committee what you know about the aims and purposes of the Communist Party in Hollywood, if you have knowledge of such?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of or have you been active in either as a member or in the way of making contributions or in any other way assisting organizations that were known to you at the time to have been Communist-front organizations in Hollywood?

Mr. BROMBERG. My response, sir, is the same. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you specifically about several organizations of which it appears you may have some special knowledge.

According to a news item appearing in the Daily Worker of November 6, 1933, the League of Professional Groups issued a statement urging support of the Communist Party platform and candidates in

the election to take place the following day. I hand you the clipping from the Daily Worker to which I have just referred from the issue of November 6, the heading of which is: "Professional Groups Vote to Support the Communist Party."

You will note that that statement appears there and the names of those who were the signers—will you look at it, please?

Mr. BROMBERG. I was listening to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will examine it, you will see that your name appears as one of the signers. Did you sign that statement or authorize that statement to be made over your signature?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you examine the paper handed you?

Mr. BROMBERG. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before you answered it?

Mr. BROMBERG. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any manner with the League of Professional Groups which took the action referred to in this news article?

Mr. BROMBERG. Will you repeat that?

Mr. TAVENNER. I say, were you affiliated in any manner or associated in any manner with what is known as the League of Professional Groups which is referred to in this article?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, this article states further:

At a meeting gathered to greet John Strachey, now visiting this country on a lecture tour, members of the League of Professional Groups, an organization of writers, artists, university teachers, architects, engineers, and other professionals, signed a statement urging support of the Communist Party platform and candidates in tomorrow's election. This follows a similar resolution by the Queens League of the Professionals.

Now, did you attend the meeting which John Strachey attended?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949, the New York Theater Group presented a play entitled "Dimitrioff" in December of 1934 with J. Edward Bromberg in the title role. You failed to tell us about your participation in that particular play.

Did you play the leading role in that play?

Mr. BROMBERG. Will you repeat the earlier part of that statement or question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I will state it again.

(Addressing court reporter) Mr. Reporter, will you note when he confers with counsel.

(Addressing witness) Are you ready?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949, the New York Theater Group presented a play entitled "Dimitrioff" in December of 1934, with J. Edward Bromberg in the title role.

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, are there any other plays in which you took part which you have not told us about?

Mr. BROMBERG. Oh, there must be quite a few. I appeared in a play called Men in White, and in a play called Awake and Sing. Those are two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you told us all of those that you can recall?

Mr. BROMBERG. At the moment, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you refuse to tell us whether or not you played the leading role in the play entitled "Dimitrioff"?

Mr. BROMBERG. I will not answer on the grounds that it would tend to incriminate me.

Mr. Wood. I cannot understand how an admission that you played the role would incriminate you when the actual playing of it didn't appear to incriminate you.

Mr. BROMBERG. The reason that it tends to incriminate me, in my thinking, is that the auspices under which any of these things might be done could conceivably be incriminatory.

Mr. Wood. You were not caused to face any incriminating charge by the act of playing the leading role in this play, if you did; were you?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I will stand on my answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. My question does not involve an admission that you did play in it. I say, if you did play in it.

I will change the form of the question. Were you subjected to any criminal prosecution or charge at the time this play was put on as a result of any activity that you participated in?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I will stand on my previous answer, sir.

Mr. Wood. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you play a role in another play called The Quiet City?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes; I believe I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. That play was put on by the Group Theater organization; was it not?

Mr. BROMBERG. This is one of the finest theater organizations, as I understand it, in the world that has given some of the finest actors and techniques of acting to the theater. I find it unfortunate that I must decline to answer this question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you have already answered that you took part in the play, but now you are refusing to state who sponsored it or under whose auspices the play was held.

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will withdraw the question.

Were you a member of the New York Group Theater?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the grounds that it tends to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, the play The Quiet City, in which you played a role, was apparently put on there by the Group Theater. It was a production of the Group Theater. Now, was it the practice of persons who played roles in plays produced by that theater, the Group Theater, to be members of the Group Theater?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). To the best of my recollection, it is not necessary, it was not necessary to be a member of the Group Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a summer camp of the New York Group Theater at Allendale, N. Y., in 1934, which was also attended by John Garfield?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was John Garfield, to your knowledge, a member of the New York Group Theater?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know John Garfield?

Mr. BROMBERG. I know him as an actor.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. Wood. In that connection, Mr. Bromberg, I call your attention to the fact that John Garfield has been a witness before this committee, at which time, under oath, he denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had ever knowingly met a member of the Communist Party. In the light of that information, do you desire to leave your answer stand as it is now as to whether or not you knew him?

Mr. BROMBERG. Sir, I speak for myself and nobody else, and I wish my answer to stand as it was stated.

Mr. Wood. When he made that statement, when he gave that testimony before this committee, have you any knowledge as to whether or not that statement was false or true?

When he made the statement under oath before this committee that he had never been a member of the Communist Party and had never knowingly known or had an acquaintance with any person who was a member of the Communist Party, have you any knowledge as to whether or not that statement is true or false?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. Wood. I will change the form of the question and ask you whether you have any knowledge as to whether that statement is false?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. Wood. Then I will ask you if you have any knowledge that it is true.

Mr. BROMBERG. The same answer.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Bromberg, have any legal proceedings ever been instituted against you because of your participation in any play?

Mr. BROMBERG. Not to my recollection; no.

Mr. WALTER. No legal proceedings were ever instituted against you for any reason; has there?

Mr. BROMBERG. Not to my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the March 29, 1938, issue of New Masses, the Hollywood Chapter of the League of American Writers urged, by telegram to President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and the French Embassy, that France open her borders to the purchase of supplies by Loyalist Spain. The name of J. Edward Bromberg appears as one of the signers.

Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you permitted the use of your name in connection with that telegram, if you did?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to do so under the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the February 13, 1939, issue of the Daily Worker, a memorial meeting to honor the Americans killed in the Spanish Civil War was to be held at the Manhattan Center, New York City, on February 22. According to this issue of the paper, J. Edward Bromberg appears to have been scheduled as one of the speakers. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you permitted your name to be advertised as one of the speakers for that occasion, if you did?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to do so on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of January 4, 1937, there was a benefit performance for the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade to be held at the Belasco Theater on January 19. J. Edward Bromberg is listed as one of the stars to entertain for Republican Spain on this occasion. Do you recall the circumstances under which you participated in that event, if you did?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The September 1939 issue of Soviet Russia Today contains an open letter calling for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union. This was during the Stalin-Hitler nonaggression pact. The name of J. Edward Bromberg appears as one of the signers.

Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your name was used in connection with that publication and that open letter?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of May 5, 1939, J. Edward Bromberg was among those listed to appear in person at the first birthday ball of the Cabaret Theater Arts Committee. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you appeared on that occasion, if you did?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of January 6, 1939, you were the guest of honor at the New Theater League's presentation of The Cradle Will Rock. Do you recall that occasion?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated in any manner with the New Theater League?

Mr. BROMBERG. My answer is the same to that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is your answer?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds: That it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of October 25, 1947, the Civil Rights Congress sent a telegram to Attorney General McGrath requesting reasonable bail be immediately granted the 11 Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act. The name of J. Edward Bromberg appears as one of the signers. Will you explain to the committee who solicited you, if any one did, to obtain your signature to such telegram?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a program issued for the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace which was held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, in March of 1949, you were listed as one of the sponsors. How was your name procured as a sponsor for that organization?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to correct the date I mentioned in a previous question.

In the previous question when I referred to the Daily Worker of October 25, 1947, regarding the Civil Rights Congress, I should have said 1949.

Does that change your answer?

Mr. BROMBERG. It does not.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of October 19, 1948, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions issued a statement in support of the candidacy of Henry Wallace. The name of Edward Bromberg appears as one of the signers. Did you participate in the work of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in sponsoring the candidacy of anyone for President?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a printed invitation to a Free People's Dinner at which Paul Robeson was the guest of honor, the names of Mr. and Mrs. J. Edward Bromberg appear as members of the committee of sponsors. This was one of the projects of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which your name was used as a member of the committee of sponsors, the names of you and your wife?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any manner with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any manner with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the same stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily People's World of March 19, 1948, J. Edward Bromberg was a member of the board of judges at the annual Jewish People's Fraternal Order, Purim Ball, in Los Angeles, on March 20. Do you recall that occasion?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the International Workers' Order in any manner, or any of its branches, including the one I have just mentioned?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of the Artists' Front to Win the War?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name was used as a sponsor at, I believe, the initial meeting of that organization held on October 16, 1942. Will you explain to the committee how your name was used, whether it was used with your consent, and the circumstances under which you permitted it to be used, if it was with your consent?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds, that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a letterhead of the National Committee for People's Rights, you are listed as a member. Will you tell the committee whether or not you are affiliated with the National Committee for People's Rights or whether you were in any manner?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of April 8, 1948, J. Edward Bromberg was a member of the cast in an Actors' Laboratory Production entitled "Declaration." Do you recall that?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you have already stated to the committee that you did engage as an actor in the play Awake and Sing, the screen play Awake and Sing?

Mr. BROMBERG. Awake and Sing is a play. It is not a screen play.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Then you testified that you did have a role in the play Awake and Sing?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a production of the Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you tell us you also took part in a play Lust for Life?

Mr. BROMBERG. Not to my best recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in such play?

Mr. BROMBERG. I still don't recall any such play.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what you know about the Actors' Laboratory, if you know?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Hollywood Reporter of November 3, 1947, contains an advertisement contributed by the Actors' Division of the Progressive Citizens of America proclaiming that the Thomas-Rankin committee must go. Your name appears as one of those signing this advertisement. At the end of this advertisement is this statement:

This ad is contributed by the Actors' Division of the Progressive Citizens of America.

The date stated is November 3, 1947. Will you tell the committee how the placing of this advertisement was initiated?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer—

Incidentally—(conferring with his counsel)—I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you may have just as much time as you want if you want to change your mind about that answer.

Mr. BROMBERG. No; I have nothing more to say.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have changed your mind?

Mr. BROMBERG. No. I stand by my original answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you started to answer the question.

Mr. BROMBERG. I started to answer by saying that I decline to answer on my previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that what you first started to say?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is what I said, perhaps not in those exact words.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Bromberg, in connection with the questions just asked by counsel, do you, of your own knowledge, know of any official committee of the Congress known as the Thomas-Rankin committee.

Mr. BROMBERG. Known as what?

Mr. KEARNEY. The Thomas-Rankin committee.

Mr. BROMBERG. Do I know of one? I knew of one.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will you tell me what it was officially?

Mr. BROMBERG. Well, it was a committee of the House, as I understand it, the predecessor to this committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. That was the official name of the predecessor committee to this committee?

Your counsel answered "No."

Mr. BROMBERG. Well, as far as I know, this is my answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, that is the left-wing name for it?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know the name of the committee today?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). Yes. It is the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. KEARNEY. Thank you, Mr. Popper.

That is the same name we have had right along?

Mr. POPPER. That is the official name.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is the other name?

Mr. POPPER. I say that is the official name. You know, Congressman, what is known as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to this effort by the Progressive Citizens of America to criticize this committee, did you take part in any other movement that might have had the same purpose in mind?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the committee's information that you were the signer of a petition to the Supreme Court of the United States for a reconsideration of its refusal to hear the appeal of the Hollywood Ten. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you signed the petition?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bromberg, the June 7, 1951, issue of the Ann Arbor News, State of Michigan, carries a news item to the effect that you would appear before this committee if subpoenaed.

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this item you are quoted as saying:

The record of the committee has been such that its effect has been to deprive people of their livelihood. For one I resent any pressure that they bring upon people who are in a position to employ others.

You are further quoted as saying that the hearings of this committee are in the nature of witch hunts, they are calculated to scare a

lot of people beyond those who are involved in the hearings. Are these quotations substantially correct?

Mr. BROMBERG. They are.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you prepare them yourself or did you have the assistance of someone else in the preparation of them?

Mr. BROMBERG. I prepared them completely by myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any individual who has been deprived of his livelihood because he appeared before this committee and frankly responded to questions propounded by the committee?

Mr. BROMBERG. Sir, all I know is that it requires merely the mention of a name in any context before this committee for this individual to be immediately suspect in his employment. As far as the entertainment field is concerned, it is immediately abrogated.

Mr. WOOD. Now, in case you do not know, and I assume you do not in view of the answer that you have given, there have been men who have appeared before this committee during this year that have answered the questions frankly that have been put to them that are now employed in the entertainment field; did you know that?

Mr. BROMBERG. Sir, I do not associate myself—

Mr. WOOD. I said, do you know that?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes, I do.

Mr. WOOD. Then, your answer was not correct when you said that the employment was terminated?

Mr. BROMBERG. It was correct.

Mr. WOOD. How can it be correct when you do know that men have appeared before this committee this year and have answered the questions that were put to them who are employed in the entertainment field? One or the other is correct. Which is it?

Mr. BROMBERG. I know that many others, long before they received subpoenas, were immediately out of work.

Mr. WOOD. I just wanted the record to be straight about it. You testified positively that the only thing a person needed to do is to have his name mentioned in context before this committee and he automatically lost his position in employment in the entertainment field.

Now you do say you do know of instances this year where that is not true. I want you to reconcile those statements if you can.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrupt here a moment if I may be permitted. It has so frequently happened here that I feel I should call it to the committee's attention. The purpose of counsel being present with the witness, as I understand it, is to advise him but not to consult with him regarding his testimony.

Mr. WOOD. Advise him of his legal rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Now it is so apparent here from the way the questions are answered and what is taking place that the answers are not the witness' answers.

Mr. POPPER. Let me answer that. Of course, that is directed to counsel. Counsel in this instance and in all instances in which he has appeared for witnesses has done so for the purpose of apprising the witness of his legal rights. If the witness does not understand the nature of the question and therefore there is an interrelationship between what his rights are and what the nature of the question is, counsel will act in a responsible manner and advise his client.

Now the chairman of this committee knows that this counsel has not done anything else but that.

Mr. WOOD. Well, I do not know whether counsel knows or not; I do not, as the chairman of the committee. But I am powerless to control it because this committee in its effort to be absolutely fair to everybody has ordained that any witness appearing before the committee has the benefit of counsel. As to the conversation between counsel and his client, I do not take control of that; that is left up to the conscience of counsel.

Mr. POPPER. Counsel has exercised the right in accordance with the statement of the chairman.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Bromberg, you did appear in *The Royal Family* for the Ann Arbor drama season?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. POTTER. You appeared after your second subpoena had been issued?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. POTTER. Then that in itself makes your former statement false, just the fact that a subpoena had been issued, that your employment terminates. You did go through and take your part in the play, *The Royal Family*, after the subpoena had been issued?

Mr. BROMBERG. No, sir; that does not negate the meaning of my answer at all. I must pay tribute to the courage of the Drama Season, who under the greatest pressure resisted these pressures and continued to employ me. It was an act of great bravery, I believe, on their part. I myself say for your edification that the show ran for seven performances and that it was sold out at each performance.

Mr. POTTER. Nevertheless, I still think that your former statement that the mere fact that a subpoena has been issued means termination of employment, your own case denies that very fact. Regarding the tribute to the Ann Arbor Drama Season, while I don't concur in that, nevertheless, you did play in *The Royal Family* after your subpoena was issued. So I still say that your own personal case denies the fact that you stated.

Mr. BROMBERG. Let me say something at this point. You see, I am not a lawyer, and I do not employ legal language. Probably when I said in each instance I may have been in error, but certainly the committee cannot be under any illusion as to the significance of my statement when it was made.

Mr. POTTER. Do you think an entertainer—

Mr. BROMBERG. Pardon me?

Mr. POTTER. Do you think that an entertainer who has an obvious record of support of Communist programs should receive the benefit of the mighty fine salary that you received, paid for by the quarters and half dollars or whatever it might be of good loyal American citizens who, many of them, subjugate themselves to military service to fight the very forces of communism which you have identified yourself with? Do you think an entertainer has that right?

Mr. BROMBERG. I think that in the realm of the theater art in general that the American public has a right to determine whom they want to see when they see. They have a very good way of determining this by their attendance at the box office.

Mr. POTTER. At the same time the American public should have all the information concerning the individuals involved in order to

make a true evaluation of that individual to determine whether they want to see that play in which he is playing in. Then if they decide they want to see it—

Mr. BROMBERG. I agree with you, a true evaluation. No one could object to that.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you believe that there can be any halfway loyalty to this country by any individual?

Mr. BROMBERG. No; I don't.

Mr. KEARNEY. In case of war between this country and a communistic country, would you support the United States of America?

Mr. BROMBERG. I don't believe in the choice this question offers us.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wish you would answer.

Mr. BROMBERG. I am answering.

Mr. KEARNEY. All it needs is a "yes" or "no."

Mr. BROMBERG. I can't answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. Wood. You say you cannot answer "yes" or "no"?

Mr. BROMBERG. I cannot; no.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a subscriber to the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you believe that the Congress of the United States has the right to set up such a committee as is now acting here, the committee that you are the witness for, to ferret out subversive activities against this country?

Mr. BROMBERG. I believe that the Congress has that right; subversive activities; yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Then for your information that is what this committee is constituted for.

Mr. POTTER. Do you believe that the Communist Party is a conspiracy?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. Wood. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. Wood. By the same token you have indicated that the Congress is right, and I assume by your answer you mean not only right but a duty to set up agencies to ferret out and expose subversive influences designed to weaken and ultimately to control this Government. Do you not think that every individual who is a loyal American citizen owes the same right to assist those agencies of the Government in their effort to do just those things?

Mr. BROMBERG. If the record of the committee was such—

Mr. Wood. I am not asking you about the record of this committee or any other committee. You say that the Congress has this right?

Mr. BROMBERG. Has the right to set up committees.

Mr. Wood. Do you not think that every citizen owes the corresponding obligation of a loyal citizen to assist those agencies of Government in doing just that?

Mr. BROMBERG. I believe they do.

Mr. Wood. Then pray tell us why it is that you decline here to give this agency of the Government that assistance?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I do not believe that I have declined any such assistance as you outlined here, Mr. Chairman. I am merely exercising my privileges under the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Wood. Well, of course, you have exercised your privileges as you see them in the Bill of Rights, which you have a right to do, and nobody is to take away that right. I am sorry that I cannot agree with part of your statement, that you have rendered assistance to this committee. I am not going to argue with you about that, that is a matter of opinion that you embrace that conscientious belief. It is your privilege as an American citizen to do that.

Mr. POTTER. Would the chairman yield?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Bromberg, I think it wise to point out at this time that when you refuse to answer, using the fifth amendment as your reason for refusal, that your answer might tend to incriminate you, to a question as to whether you have been affiliated with certain Communist organizations, if your answer is "No," if the truthful answer is "No," you cannot use the fifth amendment for that protection because you either lead the American public to the assumption that you are a member where a "Yes" answer would commit you, or that you are committing perjury by using the fifth amendment when it does not apply.

Mr. BROMBERG. I will answer that, Mr. Potter, by saying this, that it's unfortunate that availing one's self of a privilege under the Constitution should be interpreted in the way that you say it is, and I believe that this committee has gone a great way toward creating that kind of impression.

Mr. POTTER. You are the one that has created the impression, not the committee.

Mr. BROMBERG. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. Would you yield?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. Wood. I would like a little more elucidation on that subject. Do you insist that you have a right to claim the protection of the fifth amendment to decline to answer a question?

Mr. BROMBERG. No, sir.

Mr. Wood (continuing). The true answer of which would be to negate any insinuation that you are guilty of any affiliation with any subversive activities?

Mr. BROMBERG. I am sorry. I don't understand this.

Mr. Wood. You were asked a while ago if you were a member of the Communist Party, and you declined to answer; is that true?

Mr. BROMBERG. That is right.

Mr. Wood. Now if you are not a Communist Party member and have never been, do you still insist that you would have the right to claim the protection of the fifth amendment to refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it would incriminate you?

Mr. BROMBERG (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer that question on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. Wood. You declined to answer?

Mr. BROMBERG. I wanted to put the correct legal angle to it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member of the Elks?

Mr. BROMBERG. No.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member of any Masonic organization?

Mr. BROMBERG. I am not.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member of the B'nai B'rith?

Mr. BROMBERG. I don't recall; I might be.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member of the Knights of Columbus?

Mr. BROMBERG. No.

Mr. KEARNEY. Again, are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. Wood. While counsel is interrogating, so I will not have to interrupt again, I would like to ask you this: I don't remember if you stated the date of your birth.

Mr. BROMBERG. December 25, 1903.

Mr. Wood. On December 25, 1924, the date of your twenty-first birthday, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. Wood. At any time prior to December 25, 1924, did you hold membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. Wood. Do you desire to have a little recess?

Mr. BROMBERG. No.

Mr. Wood. If at any time you should desire a recess, let us know because I understand your health has not been good.

Mr. BROMBERG. Thank you.

Mr. POPPER. Mr. Chairman, that should have been thought of before the subpoena was issued.

Mr. Wood. On that point the witness was subpoenaed many months ago and his appearance here was deferred at your request until we found that he was engaged in his usual avocation and he was served with another subpoena. There is no basis for any insinuation that this witness has been brought here under circumstances that are detrimental to his physical condition.

Mr. POPPER. I am not making an insinuation; I am making a statement that this committee promised that before subpoenaing this witness the medical certificates which I submitted would be submitted to a physician and that he would be examined before calling him.

Mr. Wood. I have no such recollection of any such promises because this committee does not make such promises.

Mr. POPPER. I have a transcript to that effect.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would the chairman yield?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. It is also true that even after the doctor's affidavits were submitted to this committee by counsel, it is also true that the witness did engage in his usual profession?

Mr. POPPER. I should think that that would be accepted as a perfectly normal thing, not the same as an appearance before a committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Normal health?

Mr. POPPER. No; not normal health, but requiring a livelihood.

Mr. Wood. Let us not enter into an argument about it. I am now stating to the witness that if any time during the progress of this examination he needs a rest, all he has to do is to so indicate.

Mr. TAVENNER. I was asking you, Mr. Bromberg, about the statements you released to the press on June 7. I want to ask you, do you

have any knowledge of this committee placing pressure upon any employer to dispense with the services of an employee?

Mr. BROMBERG. I have no such knowledge. The mere existence of the committee serves that purpose in my estimation.

Mr. TAVENNER. The inference from your statement was that this committee would use pressure on employers to terminate employment, and I want to know if you really mean it that way because this committee has never done so to my knowledge.

Mr. BROMBERG. I mean that the effect of the subpoena upon myself was such as to bring pressure to bear upon the Ann Arbor Season, Drama Season.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that is the same matter to which you referred a while ago.

Mr. BROMBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what did you mean in your statement when you referred to this committee as "engaging in witch hunts"? What did you mean by that?

Mr. BROMBERG. I think that is pretty clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you mean by that?

Mr. POTTER. Who are the witches that we would be hunting?

Mr. BROMBERG. Anyone that disagrees with the tenets of this committee, its beliefs.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you believe that this committee should not undertake to investigate Communist infiltration into Hollywood, that is what you mean to say?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other meaning could you have when you say that you object because this committee is engaging in witch hunts?

Mr. BROMBERG. This committee could be engaged in the ferreting out of subversive activities, but I don't think that it has done so.

Mr. POTTER. Who do you have in mind? What do you have in mind?

Mr. BROMBERG. It comes to my mind that I received a post card from California in which the main speaker was one Gerald L. K. Smith, who had gotten the Hollywood High School, I believe, for the use of his meeting.

Mr. POTTER. You say that Gerald K. Smith is part of an international conspiracy?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes, I do.

Mr. WALTER. Affiliated with what foreign power?

Mr. BROMBERG. I wouldn't know if he is affiliated with any foreign power.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is the Communist Party of this country subject to the discipline of any foreign power?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. In that connection do you not know that this committee has engaged in extensive investigation with reference to nazism, fascism, and organizations such as the Silver Shirts and German-American Bund that were cited by this committee as being subversive organizations?

Mr. BROMBERG. If it has done so, sir——

Mr. Wood. I said did you know it had done so?

Mr. BROMBERG. No, I didn't know.

Mr. Wood. You did not know? Do you not think it would be proper for you to advise yourself as to what activities this committee has been engaged in before leveling those charges against it?

Mr. BROMBERG. May I continue my answer?

Mr. Wood. You just answered. I am asking you another question.

Mr. BROMBERG. I would like to continue my answer, if I may.

Mr. Wood. I understood you to say you did not know that they had done this work and that was a complete answer.

Mr. BROMBERG. I didn't know that they had effectively done this work. By that I meant that I didn't know that they had succeeded in doing this work. They had made certain token moves in that direction but that their main concentration was in another direction.

Mr. Wood. For the edification of the witness I will state to you that this committee made a very exhaustive investigation into that phase of subversive activities in this country, and as a result of the work of this committee, which is the pioneer in this field, that those organizations were exposed and wilted and died just like we hope by turning the spotlight of publicity on another subversive organization about which you decline to aid this committee that they can likewise be subjected to the same fate.

Mr. POTTER. The policy of the committee to ferret out subversive activities, whether they be the extreme right or extreme left of any ideology that imposes a totalitarian dictatorship, whether it be fascism or communism, that is the policy of the committee.

Mr. Wood. Go ahead, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever used the name Arthur Anderson?

Mr. BROMBERG. Have I ever used that name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BROMBERG. No, not to my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you used any name other than your own name?

Mr. BROMBERG. Not to my recollection I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information, Mr. Bromberg, that you held in 1943 a Communist Party book No. 25093, in 1944 Communist Party book No. 48971, and that your Communist Political Association card for the year 1944 was No. 41776, and for 1945, 47347. Did you ever hold such books or were you issued such card?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

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

Mr. Wood. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Bromberg, you stated in the early part of your testimony that you taught acting?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. Did you ever teach for the New Theater League?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. POTTER. On March 14, 1935, the Daily Worker announced that the New Theater League would open a national training school on Monday, March 18, 1935, and stated:

The training school will fill a long-felt need to greatly accelerate the work of revolutionary theaters the country over,

and states that J. Edward Bromberg will teach the technique of acting. Is that statement true?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. POTTER. Now I would like to get some data concerning how plays are arranged for. I am thinking particularly of the Ann Arbor drama season. I assume that they contact a casting office in New York, is that true?

Mr. BROMBERG. I don't know what their procedure is.

Mr. POTTER. How did you get your employment first, your part in The Royal Family?

Mr. BROMBERG. An agent came to me and offered me—

Mr. POTTER. Had you been playing in The Royal Family before your appearances at Ann Arbor?

Mr. BROMBERG. Had I played in it before? Yes, I did.

Mr. POTTER. Were you a part of the set cast in the play The Royal Family when it came to Ann Arbor?

Mr. BROMBERG. I was one of four or five.

Mr. POTTER. What agent made arrangements for the appearance in Ann Arbor?

Mr. BROMBERG. You see, I shall answer this, but I wish to call attention to the fact that this is precisely what I have been speaking about before, that Miss Jane Broder, who is the agent, will now, because of the innuendo, suffer at the hands of this committee.

Mr. POTTER. No, there is no innuendo at all.

Mr. BROMBERG. Miss Jane Broder is the agent.

Mr. POTTER. Does she have—her agency is New York City, I assume?

Mr. BROMBERG. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. Under what name does the agency go by?

Mr. BROMBERG. I think by her name.

Mr. POTTER. When did you first know that you were going to Ann Arbor to play in the Ann Arbor drama season?

Mr. BROMBERG. When she called me.

Mr. POTTER. When was that?

Mr. BROMBERG. I don't recall the date of the Ann Arbor season; I am not sure, about a week or so.

Mr. POTTER. Before you went there?

Mr. BROMBERG. Something like that.

Mr. POTTER. I have no further questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. The witness spoke something about individuals who were brought before this committee suffering from, say, future unemployment. Does the witness believe the Communist Party to be a subversive organization?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the witness believe that the Communist Party has for its aims and objectives the overthrow of this Government by force or violence?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Or will the witness tell me of his own knowledge as to whether he thinks the United States of America has suffered and suffered terribly through the infiltration of Communists into Government, labor unions, and so forth?

Mr. BROMBERG. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you decline to answer insofar as the Communist Party infiltration is concerned, but you are perfectly willing to answer insofar as other organizations are concerned?

Mr. BROMBERG. I stand upon my answer, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is all.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. Is there any reason why the witness should not now be excused from further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. Very well. You may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

(Thereupon, at 11:40 a. m., the testimony of the witness Bromberg was concluded.)

X