

**INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AREA—Part 3**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

—
JUNE 30, 1955
—

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

(INDEX IN PART 4 OF THIS SERIES)



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

CLYDE DOYLE, California

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

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

CONTENTS

PART 1

June 27, 1955: Testimony of—		Page
	Paul Wright Orr.....	1440
Afternoon session:		
	Andries Deinum.....	1474
	Anita Bell Schneider.....	1498
June 28, 1955: Testimony of—		
	Angela Clarke.....	1523
	Cecil Beard.....	1538
	Diamond Kim.....	1543
Afternoon session:		
	Diamond Kim (resumed).....	1565
	Sue Lawson.....	1572
	George Hugh Murray Maitland Hardyman.....	1575

PART 2

June 29, 1955: Testimony of—		Page
	George Hugh Murray Maitland Hardyman (resumed).....	1599
	Raphael Konigsberg.....	1656
Afternoon session:		
	Sylvia Schonfield.....	1668
	Jean Wilkinson.....	1676
	Frank C. Davis.....	1679
	Irene B. Bowerman.....	1689
	Carl Sugar.....	1697

PART 3

June 30, 1955: Testimony of—		Page
	Matthew Samuel Vidaver, Jr.....	1707
	William Elconin.....	1713
	William Ward Kimple.....	1731
Afternoon session:		
	William Ward Kimple (resumed).....	1742
	Max Benjamin Natapoff.....	1761
	Tashia Freed.....	1764
	Max Appleman.....	1768
	Joseph W. Aidlin.....	1771

PART 4

July 1, 1955: Testimony of—		Page
	Stephen A. Wereb.....	1779
Afternoon session:		
	Stephen A. Wereb (resumed).....	1811
	James Burford.....	1827
	Anne Pollock.....	1837
	Margaret Vaughn Meyer.....	1844
July 2, 1955: Testimony of—		
	Stephen A. Wereb (resumed).....	1851
	John Waters Houston.....	1860
	Harry Hay.....	1872
	Martha Hard Wheeldin.....	1875
	Louis Stark.....	1882
	Robert L. Brock.....	1889

Index. (See pt. 4 of this series.)

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

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

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

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

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

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

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

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

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

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

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

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

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

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

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

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

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

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AREA—PART 3

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Los Angeles, California.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 9:30 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 518, Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle (chairman); Morgan M. Moulder, Donald L. Jackson, and Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel, and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will please be in session.

May the record show, please, that the full membership of the subcommittee is here, Congressman Scherer on my left, of Ohio; Congressman Jackson on my left, of California; Congressman Moulder, from Missouri; and Congressman Doyle, from California.

There are times when there is confusion of names and identity, and here is a good illustration of one of the circumstances that comes to the committee from time to time, and we are always glad to cooperate promptly and try to see that any person who should not be identified in any way with the Communist conspiracy or with the call of the committee as a witness, is cleared as promptly as possible.

Our distinguished counsel has mentioned from time to time in the last 2 days Peter Hyun, without including any middle initial in the name.

I received this morning, in fact, every member of the committee received the same wire, and we want to cooperate with this gentleman and read it into the record, and so that the newspapers will hear it, too.

Representative CLYDE DOYLE,
*Chairman, House Un-American Activities Subcommittee,
Federal Building, Los Angeles.*

Great harm to me, permanent and irreparable damage to the company, Jan-u-ine Foods, of which I am president, is being done through the publicity given to a Peter Hyun now under investigation by your committee. This Peter Hyun was no relation to me, not in any way connected with me, my family, or my company. Many of my customers and friends are confusing identity with me. In the name of justice may I respectfully request that you use every effort to inform each

member of your committee, the press, and the public, that I, Peter S. Hyun, Sr., am not the Peter Hyun under investigation by your committee.

If I can be of any service to you and your committee in the great work you are doing, please feel free to call upon me at my office or my home.

(Signed) PETER S. HYUN, Sr.,
President, Oriental Foods, Inc.

I am glad to read that, and I might say to the gentleman if he wants to further emphasize the fact that there is no identity in which he is involved, we invite him to come up here and appear in person if he desires to, and just so state, but I think this reading should be sufficient.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, possibly I should state in addition that the staff knows very well that this is not the same Peter Hyun as to whom we heard testimony in the past few days.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, Peter S. Hyun, Sr., president of Oriental Foods Co., Inc., is not the Peter Hyun we are interested in locating.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Counsel, prior to the receipt of this telegram, you did not know there was a Peter S. Hyun who was president of the Oriental Foods Co., did you?

Mr. TAVENNER. We knew there was a Peter S. Hyun who was an entirely different person from the Peter Hyun who is involved in the testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I say to the guests in the courtroom again this morning, we appreciated your cooperation very much yesterday. The courtroom is ordinarily full of people, and it is not altogether comfortable sometimes in the day when the circulation is not too good, so we will appreciate your continued cooperation with us, and please make no outburst or demonstration of any sort, either of approbation or otherwise, as to what any witness says or does. I mean that as an impartial instruction. We cannot countenance any disapproval or any approval by hand clapping or by laughter or by any evidence for or against what any witness says.

Before I proceed again in the matter, I want to say to counsel if there are any different counsel in the room who have not yet appeared with a client before the committee, the advice of counsel before the committee, of a client, is limited to the counsel advising his client. We regret that we do not have time or facilities to allow members of the bar to argue with us or to us, but we simply do not; and therefore we know we will have the cooperation of every lawyer who appears before us today.

Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Matthew Vidaver, will you come forward, please, sir?

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. VIDAVER. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you. Be seated, please.

**TESTIMONY OF MATTHEW SAMUEL VIDAVER, JR., ACCOMPANIED
BY COUNSEL, BEN MARGOLIS**

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

Mr. VIDAVER. My full name is Matthew Samuel Vidaver, Jr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you known by a nickname?

Mr. VIDAVER. Usually by the name of Matt.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Vidaver?

Mr. VIDAVER. San Francisco, Calif., August 4, 1913.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name, please?

Mr. VIDAVER. V-i-d-a-v-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time resided in Los Angeles?

Mr. VIDAVER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the period of your residence in Los Angeles?

Mr. VIDAVER. I first came to Los Angeles in 1919. I think we stayed here for a year or a year and a half.

I returned to Los Angeles, I was about 13 years old, 14. That would be after the depression started, so it would be about 1929, and remained in Los Angeles fairly consistently—I lived in other places for short periods of time, Santa Monica, which is an independent community, and San Diego, San Francisco, but mainly in the Los Angeles-southern California area, up until 1948, I believe. Also, some time was spent overseas during the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the period when you were overseas, or, better still, will you tell the committee, please, when you entered the armed services and when you left?

Mr. VIDAVER. I was in the merchant marine during the war. I believe it was possibly the last part of 1943 through the first part of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period between 1929 and 1948 when you lived in Los Angeles, with the exceptions you mentioned, I believe you said you lived at Santa Monica for a period.

Mr. VIDAVER. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that period of time?

Mr. VIDAVER. It is very hard to say. I lived in Santa Monica Canyon, and I am not sure but I think that is specifically a part of the city of Los Angeles, although everyone considers it Santa Monica, uses the Santa Monica shopping district, and so forth. I lived there—my son was born there—on and off, I guess for a period of 11 or 12 years; and then resided in Santa Monica and Ocean Park, I imagine altogether a period of maybe a year or two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, when you lived in San Diego?

Mr. VIDAVER. That was, I believe, in the year 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you there?

Mr. VIDAVER. Approximately a year, maybe a little over a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Vidaver, the committee has not heretofore made any extended investigation of Communist Party activities in Santa Monica. It desires at this time to learn what it can of Communist Party activities in that area.

At the time you lived in Santa Monica, the period of 11 or 12 years, or any part of that time, were you an organizer of the Communist Party in that area?

Mr. VIDAVER. Before I answer that question, Mr. Tavenner, I would like to ask the Chair for some clarification. I don't mean to make a statement. I am very serious about this.

It is my understanding that a citizen of the United States has the right to use the provisions provided in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights in a situation such as this, and that in doing so he in no way implicates himself in any question of guilt, and that not only has he the right but that he has the duty, when he considers that his constitutional privileges are being trespassed upon, when he considers that his right to his own political opinions is being invaded. Is this not so, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DOYLE. I will answer the gentleman by just saying this, briefly: The committee feels that the witness is entitled, of course, and should rely upon the legal advice of his counsel in answering any legal question. We are in no position to undertake, even if we thought we might know the answer legally, to give you any legal advice. But we will say this frankly: This committee greatly respects a witness who takes the chair where you are, and conscientiously and in good faith and honestly claims the constitutional privilege. We do not criticize, ever, any witness who does that honestly and in good faith.

Mr. VIDAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. But we also shudder at the frequency with which witnesses take the first and fifth amendments and constitutional privileges in bad faith and without any intention of being honest with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. VIDAVER. Is not the propriety of that step to be determined by the judiciary and not by the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. JACKSON. Regular order.

Mr. DOYLE. We will proceed now. I have answered your point, and I think you have gotten your point across, have you not?

Mr. VIDAVER. Thank you. I understand.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your answer to the question?

Mr. VIDAVER. What is the question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read the question.

Mr. JACKSON. I can save some time. Was the witness an organizer of the Communist Party in Santa Monica at any time.

Mr. VIDAVER. Are you asking the question?

Mr. JACKSON. I was restating it in order to save some time in going back to the record.

Is that the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VIDAVER. I wish to assert my constitutional privilege, and I refuse to answer that question based upon the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is now in the process of conducting an investigation in San Diego, where hearings are to be held next week. When you were in San Diego for the year 1942, what was the occasion for your moving to that area?

Mr. VIDAVER. I consider this an improper question. I refuse to answer it on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an organizer of the Communist Party in San Diego in 1942?

Mr. VIDAVER. I am going to refuse to answer all questions about my political activity, my political thinking. This is my private opinion, my actions, and I base my declination to reply to this question on the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Max Silver testified before a subcommittee of this committee on January 23, 1952. He attempted to give the committee information regarding the organizational setup of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County during the period that he was its organizational secretary.

I asked him this question:

Now let us proceed with your discussion of the 16th Congressional District. On page 53 of exhibit 1 I find reference to the 61st Assembly District of the 16th Congressional District. Is that one of the groups in the 16th District?

Mr. SILVER. That is right. That is what is known as the West Adams group, a large active branch.

Question:

Do you recall the name of the organizer of that district?

Parenthetically, I should say we are discussing there the Communist Party.

Mr. SILVER. Well, there were various, unless you ask me for a specific one. Matt Vidaver was the organizer of the 16th Congressional District for a time, and later went to San Diego to become the section organizer out there.

Mr. Silver also testified that you were at one time a member of the county committee of the Communist Party.

Will you tell the committee, please, whether the statement of Mr. Silver was in error in any respect insofar as it related to you?

Mr. VIDAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated that I am not going to answer any questions in this area based upon my constitutional rights, and I understand the Chair is very anxious to expedite matters at this hearing. Mr. Tavenner knows that I am not going to answer any such questions. What is his purpose in asking the question at this time?

Mr. SCHERER. To get it in the record, show who you are and what you are.

Mr. DOYLE. You can exercise your constitutional privilege if that is what you feel you can honestly do.

I might state that we understand your position, so there is no need of your making any more preliminary remarks.

Mr. VIDAVER. Isn't this already in the record? Aren't you reading from the record, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. DOYLE. Will you answer the question, please, or stand on your privilege. Do you refuse to answer? If so, on what grounds?

Mr. VIDAVER. You have the statements of a paid—an informer, anyway, I don't know if he was paid or not, and I don't wish to dignify this person, who for some reason of his own wants to become an informer, with an answer.

Mr. SCHERER. All right, now. As an informer, did he lie about you?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. VIDAVER. I read a book by Harvey Matusow which is pretty indicative of the situation informers find themselves in today.

Mr. SCHERER. You have an opportunity——

Mr. VIDAVER. He asked me a question. I am elaborating on the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Will you please answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me finish.

Mr. JACKSON. There is a question pending.

Mr. SCHERER. I asked him a question. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question whether this man, whom he attacks as an informer, lied about him. He has an opportunity right here and now to say whether this man told the truth or whether he lied. I want to see him take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer it, Mr. Witness, one way or another.

Mr. VIDAVER. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning I asked you on a question of clarification about utilizing constitutional privilege, and you stated that, if I get you correctly——

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead. You heard my answer. We understand your position. You are as anxious to save your time as we are to——

Mr. VIDAVER. I am. But I want the situation to be cleared.

Mr. DOYLE. It is as clear as crystal, and you know it is. Now don't be facetious about it, please.

Mr. VIDAVER. I am not here to conceal anything.

Mr. DOYLE. Why do you not answer honestly?

Mr. VIDAVER. Because I believe by utilizing these constitutional privileges, I help to expose something.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the witness please use them, and let us get along. All that is necessary is to decline to answer. The witness knows that. All the committee is asking you to do, is to answer or decline to answer.

Mr. VIDAVER. What question is this?

Mr. DOYLE. The question is Mr. Scherer's question.

Mr. SCHERER. We have asked him. He has been directed. If he does not want to answer, let the record stand.

Mr. VIDAVER. What is the question again?

Mr. SCHERER. The question was whether this man who you call an informer, who you attack, lied about you. You have the opportunity to now say whether he lied. Did he lie in anything he said about you?

Mr. VIDAVER. Mr. Scherer, you know very well the situation that exists today.

Mr. SCHERER. I know it very well.

Mr. VIDAVER. On this basis, I am going to decline to honor this question with an answer based upon my constitutional rights of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. So that the record will be clear in connection with Mr. Max Silver, whose testimony Mr. Tavenner read, Mr. Max Silver was one of the top, leading Communist functionaries in Los Angeles County for several years, not paid by this committee a nickel, but he got his belly full of the Communist conspiracy and came forward and is trying to make up for some of the damage he did when he was a Communist leader.

I just want the record to show he is not a paid informer, but he is an American citizen who got his belly full of the rottenness and garbage of the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. VIDAVER. I said I did not know whether he was paid or not.

Mr. DOYLE. I want the record to show he was not. He is not in a class with Matusow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Vidaver, I take it from your testimony you are unwilling to give the committee any facts that may be within your knowledge regarding Communist Party activities in Santa Monica or in San Diego.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. VIDAVER. I understand. I am glad that fact has penetrated Mr. Tavenner. Maybe it will help to shorten this thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

I hand you two documents, photostatic copies of affidavit of registration, and will ask you to examine both of them.

(Documents handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the signature, the name of Matthew Vidaver on both the documents, and state whether or not they are your signatures?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. VIDAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw my previous remark. Apparently it didn't penetrate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer?

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the answer to the question?

Mr. VIDAVER. Isn't it satisfactory?

Mr. JACKSON. If it is satisfactory to you, it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. VIDAVER. If it is satisfactory to the committee, that is the answer.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. VIDAVER. Mr. Jackson said it was satisfactory.

Mr. JACKSON. Evidently it is not satisfactory to the rest, and on second thought, in light of the Supreme Court decision, it is not satisfactory to me, and I join in requesting the direction.

Mr. DOYLE. We do not accept that as a sufficient answer, and I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. VIDAVER. I refuse to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what the documents are, if you know?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. VIDAVER. I think the documents speak for themselves, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I do so direct you, Mr. Witness.

Mr. VIDAVER. I refuse to answer, based upon reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the documents in evidence, and ask that they be marked "Vidaver Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively, for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. So received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the first document is a document signed by the name Matthew S. Vidaver, sworn to on September 24, 1936. It is an affidavit of registration in which paragraph 9 states:

I intend to affiliate at the ensuing primary election with the Communist Party.

The document, Vidaver Exhibit No. 2, bears a signed name of Matthew S. Vidaver, and is sworn to on the 27th day of September 1938 and states the same as the previous document in item 9, namely:

I intend to affiliate at the ensuing primary election with the Communist Party.

I hand the witness a pamphlet compiled and published by the secretary of state of the State of California for the year 1942, entitled "Members of Democratic, Republican, Townsend, Prohibition, and Communist State Central Committees."

Will you examine pages 31 and 32 of that document, please.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. After examining page 31, will you state whether or not the caption shows—

Mr. MARGOLIS. We have not completed examining it, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand. I am asking the question.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Do you mind waiting until he finishes?

Mr. TAVENNER. I want him to have it in mind while he considers it.

Mr. MARGOLIS. We can't do 2 things at 1 time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you show the witness the document?

Mr. MARGOLIS. We will do one thing at a time. We will listen to the question or we will look at it, not try to do both.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Margolis, you are not in a courtroom. Can't you courteously comply with counsel's question to facilitate his asking the question?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Does he want us to read and listen at the same time?

Mr. DOYLE. He is not asking you the question. He is talking to your client.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand all counsel asked is that the document be handed to the witness.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I will hold it while we look at it. I don't know what the fuss is about.

Mr. TAVENNER. You put the document where the witness couldn't see it when I wanted him to look at it. Hold it where he can see it, and it is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Is this satisfactory?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is if your client is looking at it.

With page 31 of the document before you, do you see at the top a caption stating "Members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party"?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. VIDAVER. I think this document speaks for itself, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. We do not accept your answer, witness, as sufficient, and I direct you to answer that question.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. VIDAVER. I refuse to answer this question based upon reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you want any further time to examine the document?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Vidaver, will you now look at page 32, the last page of the document, and state whether or not you see in alphabetical order a list of names?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you?

Mr. VIDAVER. I have already refused to answer any questions similar to this or based upon this document.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. We do not accept your answer as sufficient, and I direct you to answer. You have looked at the page.

Mr. VIDAVER. I refuse to answer based upon reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you observe under the "V's" the name of Matthew Vidaver as a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party for the year 1942?

Mr. VIDAVER. I refuse to answer this question based upon reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer in evidence the frontispiece of the document and pages 31 and 32, and ask that it be marked "Vidaver Exhibit No. 3" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. It may be received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have one more.

Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. VIDAVER. Evidently it didn't penetrate.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your answer, please?

Mr. VIDAVER. I refuse to answer this question based upon reasons previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. That penetrated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. You are excused, Witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William Elconin.

Mr. DOYLE. Please raise your hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ELCONIN. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Please be seated.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM ELCONIN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, DAVID SCRIBNER

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

Mr. ELCONIN. My name is William Elconin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name, please?

Mr. ELCONIN. E-l-c-o-n-i-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. SCRIBNER. David Scribner, S-c-r-i-b-n-e-r, 11 East 51st Street, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Elconin?

Mr. ELCONIN. I was born December 19, 1914, in the city of Cleveland, Ohio.

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

Mr. ELCONIN. Yes. I came to the city of Los Angeles at the age of 4; went to elementary school and junior and high school in the Los Angeles city school system; proceeded then to California Institute of Technology, and graduated in 1936 or 1937 with a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your record of employment has been since 1940?

Mr. ELCONIN. I have been an employee of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America as a field organizer up until, I forget just when, 4 or 5 years ago, when I became international representative of that union.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt? When did you first become a field organizer?

Mr. ELCONIN. In 1940. I don't know the exact month. I think it was in March.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a field organizer until about 5 years ago?

Mr. ELCONIN. Well, I continued continuously in employment. I simply was promoted, so to speak.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not understand you.

Mr. ELCONIN. I have always been in employment with this union from that time until now except for the time I spent in the service, but the title of my position changed from field organizer at one stage to international representative now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us when it changed?

Mr. ELCONIN. I can't remember the exact date. I think I mentioned it was 4 or 5 years ago, but I am not exactly certain.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be in 1950 or 1951, then?

Mr. ELCONIN. I told you I am not certain. I just don't know. I can check my paychecks if you say.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is sufficiently accurate.

I understand you to say you were field organizer continuously from about 1940 up until you were promoted to the position of international representative, with the exception of the time you were in the military service.

Mr. ELCONIN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period of time that you were in the military service?

Mr. ELCONIN. I was in the military service approximately 3 years and 3 or 4 months. Do you want the dates?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I would like to know when you entered the service.

Mr. ELCONIN. I entered the service the first time, I think, in June of 1942, and was an officer as a second lieutenant; and then I was relieved from active duty in, I believe, December of the same year; returned to the service in October of 1943 and continued then until March of 1946 when I was honorably discharged as a first lieutenant.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you were relieved from active duty in December 1942. Weren't you discharged as well as being relieved?

Mr. ELCONIN. No. I received no such papers of discharge. I simply received orders to be relieved from active duty.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you not separated from the service on December 13, 1942?

Mr. ELCONIN. Well, I was told I was relieved from duty, relieved from active duty, and I was told I could sit the rest of the war out if I chose to, but I didn't. I don't know whether that means separated from the service or not. I didn't receive any official document that I can recall, indicating any kind of separation other than the order saying relieved from active duty. That is the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for the action taken by the Government in relieving you from active service or giving you a discharge, whichever may have been the fact?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. I think I would like to tell you this in some detail. It won't take too long.

I was relieved from duty, as you say, December 13—I am not questioning the day; I said it was in December. I am not sure of the time—and no explanation was given to me at that time, none whatsoever. As a matter of fact, I recall inquiring of the adjutant on the given post, I think it was at Fort Monmouth, what the reason was, and he said he didn't know. He said he thought it was a matter of mistaken identity or something.

Thereafter, when the orders were confirmed, I checked with him again, and he said he did not know and would seek to find out. He was unable, apparently, to do so, but he never communicated with me again.

I went to New York—Monmouth is very close to New York—and took this matter up with my union, and we took it up in turn through our Washington legislative representative with the War Department, and the War Department communicated with our Washington office, indicating that they were separating me from the service because I had supposedly been a. w. o. l.—absent without leave—on a given date, and I can't recall the date. The facts, however, were, I wasn't a. w. o. l., as they later admitted in another communication that I was, at the time they claimed I was a. w. o. l., I was actually in conference with the lieutenant colonel who was responsible for this corps area, clearing up a false accusation made against me by a member of a company union. At least, as far as I know he was a member of a company union or a management representative of a given company. The company's name was Cannon Electric Co.

We were engaged, before I went into the service, in organizing that plant. I was active in that campaign, and went directly from there into the service. At the beginning of my service, I was over at Cal Tech for a refresher course in electronics of various types, and word came to me through my friends in the union where they were continuing their organizational activity at that plant, that 4 or 5 people were being discharged by the company for union activities, and that the union was—

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. That goes out of the area, I think, of your own individual case.

Mr. ELCONIN. I told you what they told me.

Mr. DOYLE. This is no place for you to make a tirade against any union or against any company. We are asking for your military record.

Mr. ELCONIN. It so happens these false accusations—

Mr. DOYLE. We are interested in your military record.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am trying to give it to you, but I think I have a right to explain my reason for separation from the service.

Mr. DOYLE. We are interested in your own military record; not a question of controversy between you and the union or employer.

Mr. ELCONIN. I want to explain.

Mr. DOYLE. We will give you an opportunity to explain your own military record.

Mr. ELCONIN. This has to do with that, very much.

Mr. DOYLE. There is a good deal of hearsay, and you ought to know what your own military record is.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am talking of my military record the best I can recall it.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't go into the area of your union troubles.

Mr. ELCONIN. It so happens because I was an officer in the service I went to this given plant to prevent a strike, because this was a plant producing defense parts; and instead of the authorities being informed I was there to prevent a strike, somebody maliciously told them I was there to incite a strike, and as a result of the investigation being conducted around me and when I was conferring with the lieutenant colonel, whose name I can't recall, of this area, they cleared it up and found out it was completely wrong, that the charge was false; and because of that reason I arrived in Fort Monmouth 1 day later than the order originally called for my getting there.

This information came out in the course of our investigation, or rather, our discussion of the matter with the War Department, and it has all been confirmed in writing.

That was the reason we finally found out for my separation from active duty.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you have confirmation in writing?

Mr. ELCONIN. I don't have it here.

Mr. DOYLE. Where is it?

Mr. ELCONIN. I have it at home.

Mr. DOYLE. Why did you not bring it?

Mr. ELCONIN. You didn't tell me what I was to be questioned about. I had no knowledge what you were going to talk to me about at all. (Representative Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead.

Mr. ELCONIN. I want to make clear one last point on the military service. When I went back into the service, it was with the understanding from the War Department, I also have in writing, signed by a brigadier general of the Under Secretary of War's office, there would be no further discrimination against me or prevention of my activities in the service as far as promotion was concerned. I rewon my commission, and I came out as a first lieutenant.

Those were the facts, and that is the situation. I gave you the dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any question of Communist Party activities on your part involved in your discharge from the United States Army on December 13, 1942?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. That question was never mentioned to me by anybody at any time I was in the service, and I tried on more occasions than one to find out what it was that was in any way interfering with my

activities in the service as far as my being an officer was concerned, and I was never able to get anyone to tell me anything.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. ELCONIN. I want to refuse to answer that question, very naturally. I think you know I am employed by the United Electrical Workers. I have already made that clear. I think you know that our union was just involved in the recently historic case of Emspak and Quinn which the Supreme Court ruled on May 23. Sitting with me is the distinguished counsel of our union who won that case, and this committee was involved in attacking our union in that case.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. Answer the question, please.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am about to tell you why I am going to refuse to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. You are entitled to plead your constitutional privilege. You are fully advised by your legal counsel you know, and we do not have the time for you to make a record here for the purpose of your own publications.

Mr. ELCONIN. You do have time to make records smearing people's names. I should have a right to explain why I refuse to answer this question. If you want to ask the question, I will answer it in my way.

Mr. DOYLE. We will not have time for you to entirely answer it in your own way, you might as well understand it.

Mr. ELCONIN. If you are willing to withdraw the question——

Mr. DOYLE. We are not willing.

Mr. ELCONIN. Then I will answer it my own way.

Mr. DOYLE. You will not have time to write a book before this committee. Please continue.

Mr. ELCONIN. If you wish to ask questions and answer them, both, ask yourself the questions. If you want me to answer the questions, give me a chance.

Mr. DOYLE. We are going to have you observe the rules of the committee the same as every other witness is required to.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am familiar with the fact there are rules of the committee, and I don't know what they are. If you ask me questions, I understand I am entitled to answer them my own way. I am trying to explain why I will refuse to answer this and similar such questions before this committee. I would like to make a request, if I may——

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question without further speech.

Mr. DOYLE. I so direct you.

Mr. ELCONIN. May I ask you one question first?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. You are being asked a question by our counsel.

Mr. ELCONIN. I realize that, but I am trying to explain that this case which our union was just involved in specifically recites and directs itself to this type of question.

Mr. DOYLE. We are familiar with that case.

Mr. ELCONIN. I wish you would practice some of the decisions involved in that case.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. You are not going to make a mockery out of this committee although you are trying to. We understand your methods and your reasons for using them. If there are any more out-

bursts from anyone in the room, we will clear the courtroom, and if 5 or 6 of you people want to be responsible for everybody being put out of the courtroom, then continue that sort of outburst. That is fair. That is my statement. If 5 or 6 of you want to be selfish enough to make everyone lose out on the information from sitting in the courtroom, then you do that again; and if we can identify the 5 or 6, the 5 or 6 will be put out and not the rest.

Mr. ELCONIN. Mr. Doyle, I would like to request that my counsel have an opportunity to explain where this particular decision bears on this type of investigation.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not a court. You know that and your counsel knows it. He has been before our committee before at Washington. He knows he is not allowed to address this committee, and so do you. Our time is not sufficient to permit legal counsel to argue with the committee.

Mr. SCRIBNER. Since you are referring to me, do you mind if I speak for myself?

Mr. DOYLE. No. You well know our rules do not permit it, and you know our rule is reasonable.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I realize actually sitting here does not make me counsel for the witness, because I have no rights in that respect.

Mr. DOYLE. You have a right to address the committee through your witness, and you know it, and that is the only way we can permit. We are questioning your client, not you; it is his answers and not yours which we are entitled to receive at this hearing.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I appreciate that, having had that experience many times, and by sitting here I am participating in a fraud in that sense.

Mr. DOYLE. You came clear from New York to appear with this witness, and we want you to have that privilege, but you have been before us many times at Washington, and you know the rules of the committee and so does your client. It is not a fraud in any sense. Your use of that word is highly inappropriate.

Mr. SCRIBNER. Have they changed in respect to cross-examination?

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute—you again deliberately violate our rules.

Mr. SCRIBNER. This is a fair question, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. You know the rules of the committee. You have a copy of them. I assume you read them.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I know the rules up to the time the witness appeared, and I am asking a civil question as to whether or not there has been any change in the rules to permit my cross-examination of any witnesses.

Mr. SCHERER. Counsel is in contempt.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. Attorney Scribner, you are again deliberately violating a reasonable rule of this committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Contempt of this committee.

Mr. SCRIBNER. That is a complete absurdity, if I may be permitted to say.

Mr. DOYLE. You soon will be if you are not careful. If this were a court, you would not dare persist in violating the court rules.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I happen to be familiar with the rules and the law on this subject matter, and merely frightening counsel for a witness is not going to serve any particular purpose, I promise you.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct counsel to desist from further talking to this committee.

Mr. ELCONIN. I don't know whether that is fair, Mr. Scherer. He is my counsel, and I would like to have him sit right here with me where I can talk with him, not out in left field where I can wave hand signals at him.

Mr. DOYLE. You have now made a page of your book for publication. Let us proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am not trying to make a book. That is the function of the committee, to try to get all publicity.

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead.

Mr. ELCONIN. Since my counsel is prohibited from acting as counsel, I will have to act as my own.

Mr. DOYLE. He knows the rules of the committee, and so do you. Your statement that he has been prohibited from being your legal counsel is plainly false. He has, however, learned that he cannot continue to deliberately violate our rules.

Mr. ELCONIN. You may call that counsel in your opinion, but it is not in mine.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not going to permit you to read a legal decision in this case. We know those court opinions and repeat them. Your counsel sits by you at all times.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am going to state my grounds for refusing to answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I am going to state them my way.

Mr. DOYLE. You are not going to take the time of the committee to read a legal decision with which we are already familiar.

Mr. ELCONIN. Are you ashamed of the decision?

Mr. DOYLE. Proud of it.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am also proud of it, very much so.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we have had enough of this.

Mr. ELCONIN. Maybe you do. I would like to state my grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. We have had enough of this.

Mr. ELCONIN. I have several specific grounds for refusing to answer that question and that type of question.

Mr. DOYLE. Those grounds are your constitutional grounds, and you are entitled to plead those when you feel you can honestly do so. We respect honest use of constitutional grounds.

Mr. ELCONIN. My understanding is I can use any grounds I think valid. You may judge them invalid later, but I may use them.

I would like to refer, if I may, since I don't think I can state this any better than Governor Warren stated it in this decision——

Mr. DOYLE. We are perfectly familiar with that. We have the decision and text right before us on our desk. Here are the copies of it.

Mr. ELCONIN. I heard Mr. Moulder——

Mr. DOYLE. You can refer to the decision, but I will not permit you to take time to read that long decision.

Mr. ELCONIN. I don't intend to read that long decision. I heard Mr. Moulder make reference to this decision and the question of having to direct witnesses to answer with respect to the fifth amendment. There are other portions of this decision valid to this matter and explain why I refuse to answer this kind of question, and I would like to point them out one at a time, and they are very brief, and explain how they refer to my refusal to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. Point of order. He has had ample time to comply with the chairman's ruling. He can invoke his constitutional privilege

if he wants to. He has not seen fit to do that. If he wants to make a speech and read a decision, I ask that we proceed and ask the next question.

Mr. ELCONIN. You haven't permitted me to state my reasons yet. I would like to do that.

Mr. DOYLE. If you are going to state your constitutional reasons, do so, but I am not going to permit you to read that decision. You can refer to it if you want, but we have the decision right here in printed form. We are familiar with it.

Mr. ELCONIN. I know, but I don't think the people are necessarily familiar with it.

Mr. DOYLE. You are not here to make a speech for the benefit of this audience or for your publication.

Mr. ELCONIN. I realize that.

Mr. DOYLE. You are here to answer decently and cooperatively the questions in a dignified, honest manner.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am trying to, but you are not permitting me to.

Mr. DOYLE. I will not permit you to write a book or make a record to suit your publication out of this hearing. Answer by giving your constitutional grounds if you honestly want to.

Mr. ELCONIN. May I say that my first reason for refusing to answer that question is that the powers of this committee to investigate are subject to recognized limitations.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. You are reading from the court decision, and I said we are not going to permit you to do so. Now please desist, because we will not permit you to do so. Do you understand?

Mr. ELCONIN. May I ask a question?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. ELCONIN. All right.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't be reading the decision, however.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am not going to answer—

Mr. DOYLE. You are reading the court decision again.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am not now. I glanced at it.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your question?

Mr. ELCONIN. My question is, this decision was made as a result of activities of this committee, and it directs the type of thing that this committee cannot do.

Mr. DOYLE. We are familiar with that. We have been informed by our legal counsel also.

Mr. ELCONIN. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the best thing the committee could do is pack up and go home, as far as these decisions—

Mr. DOYLE. You now have this for your publication. Now go ahead and answer the question, because you are not going to take much more time of this committee on this occasion, I can assure you of that.

Mr. ELCONIN. It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, you seem to be frightened by this language here.

Mr. DOYLE. You have something else for your publication. What else do you want to get in? Our courts are a bulwark of freedom and justice.

Mr. ELCONIN. Do you want to know what I want in the publication? I will be glad to tell you.

Mr. DOYLE. I am directing you to answer Mr. Tavenner's question. It is a simple valid question. I hear you now admit you want to make a showing for your publication.

Mr. ELCONIN. I said, Mr. Chairman, that I refuse to answer the question. It is not a simple question.

Mr. DOYLE. Whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party while in the military uniform of the United States, is a very simple question. The Communist conspiracy is not friendly to the national security or defense of the United States.

Mr. ELCONIN. You know what happens when people get accused. Tremendous damage done to reputations by all this sort of thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. You have gone far enough in being unreasonable about answering reasonable questions.

Mr. ELCONIN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And I mean that, sir.

Mr. ELCONIN. I understand what you mean.

Mr. DOYLE. Then cooperate as an American citizen with the committee by not making speeches for your publication.

Mr. ELCONIN. If you treat me as one, I will cooperate as one. That is, I think, proper.

Mr. DOYLE. I will give you the opportunity to exercise your constitutional privilege, and we do not object to that at all where a witness thinks he is doing it honestly and fairly, but again I am telling it to you frankly, I am not going to permit you to monopolize the time of this committee in doing what you came here planning to do, to abuse this committee.

Mr. ELCONIN. Mr. Chairman, if I were to do what you wanted me to do, you would let me stay here all night.

Mr. DOYLE. No, indeed, we would not. You are wrong again.

Mr. ELCONIN. You would if I became a friendly seal here. You would be glad to let me stay here and spiel out names. You would encourage me.

Mr. DOYLE. Now you have that for your publication, also.

Mr. ELCONIN. It is true; isn't it?

Mr. DOYLE. No. We would also expect a friendly witness to stick to the subject matter before us.

Mr. ELCONIN. That is the way it has been in the past, that is all I know about it.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. Now will you answer Mr. Tavenner's question? I direct you to answer. We are not accepting your answer so far given as sufficient.

Mr. ELCONIN. I haven't finished it yet.

Mr. DOYLE. I am telling you we have not accepted your answer so far, if you intend it as part of an answer, any part of an answer. I am directing you to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. I understand the witness has refused to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. MOULDER. He desires to give his reasons for refusing. I agree with him that he is entitled to give his reasons.

However, I do not think you should read the argumentative portion of a court decision. I mean by that, I do not think you are limited for your reasons for refusal to answer by limiting you to certain

provisions of the Constitution. If you have other reasons that you think are reasonable, you are entitled to express them.

Mr. ELCONIN. I think so, too. I am trying to do that.

Mr. DOYLE. My ruling is you are not entitled to read that decision. You are entitled to give your constitutional reasons.

Mr. ELCONIN. If I refer to it for the purpose of refreshing my memory as to my constitutional rights—

Mr. DOYLE. You are familiar with the decision, and so are we.

Mr. ELCONIN. How do you know I am familiar with it? I will decide what I am familiar with, and you decide what the questions are.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not going to permit you to read that long decision. You manifestly show familiarity with the decisions, and I am glad you are. You clearly have no need of refreshing your memory.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am not going to read it. Let me go ahead with my reasons.

Mr. DOYLE. Don't read the decision, please, if you are not referring to it.

Mr. ELCONIN. I didn't say I wasn't referring to it. I said I wasn't reading it. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this committee has no right to inquire into any of my private affairs or beliefs which are unrelated to any stated purpose.

I think further this committee is misusing its power; that it has no right whatsoever to engage in actions as if it were a court or a police force of any sort. And I think this committee has been doing that, and I cite this as one reason for refusing to answer this kind of question.

I think further that this committee has established by its record and by its personal treatment of me in the past, not just today, a record of bias and prejudice against me and the organization I represent so that it makes it impossible for me to get any kind of fair hearing here whatsoever.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I clearly disagree with the witness in that.

Mr. ELCONIN. I will explain that.

Mr. MOULDER. That is not a reason for refusing. That is your opinion of the committee.

Mr. ELCONIN. If you don't like it, you can discount it, but this is a reason. I don't feel I have an opportunity here to get a fair hearing whatsoever, and I will tell you why.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not interested in why. You have made your statement, and that is all right. Please proceed promptly.

Mr. ELCONIN. I would further like to state that I took an oath to defend this country when I was a soldier, against all enemies, whether foreign or domestic, and in my opinion this committee has acted as one of the most serious enemies of our constitutional rights, and therefore is acting in a lawless manner.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I object to the statement.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute, witness.

I will move to strike that out of the record, that kind of baloney and misrepresentation. Our courts uphold the functioning of this committee under Public Law 601.

Mr. ELCONIN. I can prove it.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not going to burden the printed record with that sort of statement. You might as well understand it.

Mr. ELCONIN. I thought I was going to be permitted to state my grounds. I am taking very little time.

Mr. DOYLE. They are not grounds; merely an attack on the committee.

Mr. ELCONIN. The chairman has been busily attacking other people. I have a right to defend myself here. I certainly have that right; do I not? If you deny this to me, what else do I have left?

Mr. DOYLE. I am telling you I am not going to let that sort of junk go into the record for printing purposes by your publication or anybody else. It is not a valid statement of fact before this committee. It is another false statement of yours for the purpose of your publication.

Mr. ELCONIN. My further reasons for refusing to answer the question is that this committee cannot inquire into the mind, personal affairs, my political beliefs or associations, because of the provisions of the first amendment of our Constitution.

My last ground for refusing to answer this question is that I refuse to be put in a position, by questions such as this, of appearing to be or being a witness against myself. This is one of the provisions of the Bill of Rights to which I refer, and I cite that as one of the reasons for refusing to answer this question, and I emphasize in citing that—

Mr. SCHERER. He has answered. He has refused to answer.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am still answering, Mr. Scherer. You are interrupting me.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute, Witness.

Mr. Chairman, he has answered the question. He has invoked the fifth amendment. He has invoked it properly. He has responded to the question.

Mr. ELCONIN. Mr. Moulder said I should have an opportunity to explain briefly my reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. You have had an opportunity to explain. I know what you are doing.

Mr. ELCONIN. Maybe you do.

Mr. SCHERER. Let's go ahead with the next question.

Mr. ELCONIN. I want to emphasize the statement that the fifth amendment is for the purpose of defending the innocent people of this country.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you pleading the first and fifth amendments?

Mr. ELCONIN. I have mentioned those among many other grounds, yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead, Mr. Tavenner. He has frankly answered the question.

Mr. SCHERER. He has refused to say whether he was a Communist while in the Army.

Mr. ELCONIN. Is the member of the committee there permitted to make all these offhand comments?

Mr. DOYLE. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am asking a question.

Mr. DOYLE. He is a member of the committee.

Mr. ELCONIN. What does that mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Elconin, you stated you were a field organizer in the UE from 1940 up until 4 or 5 years ago. During that period of time was the law construed in such a manner, as far as the UE was concerned, as to require field organizers to sign the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. SCRIBNER. That is a legal question. Do you prefer I answer it?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. SCRIBNER. You are asking for construction of the law, and you are a lawyer and he is not.

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute.

Mr. SCRIBNER. May I appeal to you. He is asking for construction of the law.

Mr. DOYLE. If you want to talk to the committee counsel when not before the committee, you may.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness was a field organizer, and he knows whether he was required to file.

Mr. SCRIBNER. That is not——

Mr. ELCONIN. You asked if the law required it. It is not the same.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will put it this way, if there is any doubt about what it is. Were you required to sign a non-Communist affidavit during the period you were a field organizer for the UE?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. As a matter of record, I did not file such a non-Communist affidavit and wasn't required to do so. I was advised I was not required to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period you were a field organizer, you were not employed in the shop or in the industry. That is true, isn't it?

Mr. ELCONIN. I would think that was more or less self-evident. A field organizer is an organizer. A worker in the shop he represents works in a shop. Is there much question about that?

Mr. TAVENNER. You are aware of the fact, are you not, that this committee has inquired into the reasons for the act being construed in such a manner as to relieve officials of the union from qualifying under the Taft-Hartley Act in the sense of signing a non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. ELCONIN. I am not aware of any such thing. When did you start this inquiry?

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not aware the committee started it in 1949?

Mr. ELCONIN. I have never heard of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have never heard of that?

Mr. ELCONIN. I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me explain it to you. because the committee found that the Atomic Energy Commission was construing the law in such a way as to require officials of the union who were not employed in the shops to sign non-Communist affidavits, on the theory that it was considered just as important to watch the security of a plant where officials were members of the Communist Party, that is, officials of the union were members of the Communist Party, as it was to see to it that those working actually in the shop were not members of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCRIBNER. May I disagree with you as to the facts. I am fully familiar with this situation. I was involved in a court case——

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute.

Mr. SCRIBNER. It is completely misstating the fact. I am familiar with it, and if you want information I will be delighted to give it to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has evidence on that subject, and that is a matter which this committee has investigated and made reports to the Congress about. I am inquiring of you about the same thing.

Mr. ELCONIN. I never heard of this committee's investigation. I read a lot of lurid stories on this committee, but that wasn't one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said you were not required, as field organizer of your union, to sign a non-Communist affidavit.

Mr. ELCONIN. The law did not require that. It never has, doesn't now.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you, during the period of time you were field organizer for the UE, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ELCONIN. I mean, do you want to play cute? Go ahead. I have given you my answer to that kind of question. It should be apparent to you by this time, no matter how obtuse you try to appear on this, I am not going to answer that kind of question.

Mr. DOYLE. We don't think that answer is sufficient. Do you state the same grounds you did before?

Mr. ELCONIN. I certainly do. I state exactly the same grounds for refusing to answer this kind of question. You have absolutely no right to ask it.

Mr. DOYLE. You are entitled to stand on the same constitutional grounds if you state them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, after you became an international representative in 1950 or 1951, if you signed a non-Communist affidavit?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. It so happens I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. ELCONIN. I signed a non-Communist affidavit, I believe—I am not positive of the date, but it was early in April of this year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Although you had been an international representative for 4 to 5 years, you did not sign the affidavit until this year?

Mr. ELCONIN. I was not required to sign the affidavit as an organizer or international representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that because of the change in the law?

Mr. ELCONIN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why didn't you sign it—

Mr. SCRIBNER. Do you want to discuss the law with me? There is a history behind this legal proceeding which has just been determined by the National Labor Relations Board which handled exactly that problem. If you want information on it, I am the one person in this country that can give you that information. I was directly acquainted with it, that is all. I am directly acquainted with it.

Mr. SCHERER. You are the only person, Counsel?

Mr. SCRIBNER. I handled the case. I did. If you want information, I will give it to you. I was at the last hearing. I offered to give you information and you refused to accept it.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you to please comply with the rules of the committee, Attorney Scribner.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I will be delighted to, sir, if there are no legal questions involved where I should answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Counsel is talking with your witness, not with you.

(Representative Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. If I understood you correctly, you stated you did sign the non-Communist affidavit in May of 1955.

Mr. ELCONIN. I think I said April. I am not sure of the date, but early April, April 18, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not required to sign it prior to that time?

Mr. ELCONIN. I wasn't required to sign it then, legally, because the Taft-Hartley board later admitted that itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. ELCONIN. I voluntarily did so for the sake of our organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you signed the non-Communist affidavit, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ELCONIN. The same answer, Mr. Tavenner, to obviously the same question, and for the same reasons.

Mr. SCHERER. When you signed that affidavit, when you made that affidavit, were you telling the truth?

Mr. ELCONIN. The affidavit, Mr. Scherer, speaks for itself.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. We do not accept your answer. I direct you to answer.

Mr. ELCONIN. I am going to refuse to answer that question on the very same grounds, Mr. Chairman, and I resent the innuendo.

Mr. SCHERER. You will not say now whether you told the truth when you swore to that affidavit?

Mr. ELCONIN. All the implications you seek to put in that question are unjustified. You have no right to question me on the affidavit. It is filed with the United States Government, and it stands and speaks for itself.

Mr. SCHERER. All I am asking you is whether or not you told the truth when you signed the affidavit, or did you swear falsely?

Mr. SCRIBNER. If he did, you could prosecute him, sir. The Department of Justice could prosecute him, couldn't they, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. ELCONIN. If you have any evidence I did anything wrong, take care of it through a legal agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to call your attention to the violation of the rule with regard to taking pictures while the witness is on the witness stand. That man right there [indicating].

Mr. DOYLE. I did not see any violation.

Mr. TAVENNER. I saw it.

Mr. DOYLE. Did he take pictures?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, moving pictures from behind the post.

Mr. DOYLE. I ask that the camera be taken and unloaded and the film destroyed.

From the AUDIENCE. I understood you couldn't shoot pictures with lights.

Mr. DOYLE. You did not ask any such permission.

From the AUDIENCE. All right. It is O. K. with me. I will give the marshal my film.

Mr. DOYLE. Please. We cannot permit any deliberate violation of the rules.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry for the interruption.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. It is a violation of the rules. I am sorry it occurred. Probably it was from a misunderstanding.

Mr. SCRIBNER. We were discussing whether or not there should be a prosecution by this committee or prosecution by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SCHERER. We will get around to that. Many prosecutions arose after people testified before this committee.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I would like to engage in discussion with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. DOYLE. Not here, please. Do it when not in violation of our rules.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking him whether or not when he signed the Taft-Hartley affidavit—

You took an oath, did you not?

Mr. ELCONIN. You have gotten my answer to that question. You have asked it three times.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. We cannot accept your answer in the present form in which it is.

Mr. ELCONIN. You accepted my answer on the same grounds each time, and I give it again.

Mr. DOYLE. Under the Supreme Court decision, I make it perfectly clear I am directing you to answer.

Mr. ELCONIN. You are refusing to accept the previous grounds? That is what I said.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to ask you a few questions regarding the Canadian seamen's strike that occurred in 1949. The committee had extensive testimony on this subject at Albany, N. Y., by a very prominent Canadian, and the committee has made an effort in the past and it is still making an effort to obtain what knowledge it can regarding the strike.

I have run across a reference to it in the Daily People's World issue of June 29, 1949.

The occasion for the reference was the printing in that paper of an article entitled "Violence Denounced—CIO Chiefs Score Terror Used Against Canada Seamen," and there is an article here from which I will read as follows, and then I will hand it to you to see if it refreshes your recollection.

The Canadian seamen's strike has some 80 vessels tied up in ports throughout the world. They are demanding retention of their union hiring hall and wage increases.

The steamship *Argobec* is struck in this port.

The CSU claims the AFL Seafarers International Union signed a "backdoor" agreement during negotiations between the shipowners and CSU for renewal of contract.

As a result of some violence that occurred, it appears that a petition was filed, and among the persons signing the petition was you.

I hand you the document for the purpose of refreshing your recollection, and will ask you to tell the committee what aid or assistance

was given the Canadian seamen's strike from the State of California in general, and in Los Angeles in particular.

(Document handed to the witness. The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. If your question is directed toward the matter of union affairs, international matters within the union, that, of course, is not relevant and you have no right to ask the question.

If you intend, however, to try to use this to in some way involve me and the activities of people involved in that situation in connection with the inquiry you are talking about now, then of course I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. So there will be no uncertainty about your position, I will restate the question.

I desire to know to what extent aid was given to the Canadian seamen's union strike in 1949 from the west coast by anyone, and so that is my question. Do you have any knowledge of that?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. In response to your question, it would appear that you must have some idea in mind of some way linking this thing up with other matters that are supposedly involved in this investigation you are talking about, this inquiry. In view of that fact, since you have something like that in mind, obviously I have to refuse to answer that same question on all of the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the circumstances under which the Canadian seamen's strike was initiated or have any knowledge on the subject?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. I lived in Los Angeles at that time, and the Canadian seamen were in Canada, and I knew nothing about any strike whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was a strike in which 80 ships were tied up all over the world.

Mr. ELCONIN. You know more about it than I do. I don't know how many ships were tied up.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article appearing there in which a record of your petition was made—

Mr. ELCONIN. Petition against strikebreaking. It didn't say how many ships.

Mr. TAVENNER. It said 80 ships.

Mr. ELCONIN. Maybe it did.

Mr. SCHERER. Does that article show that this man signed that petition in connection with the strike?

Mr. TAVENNER. It shows that he signed a petition, along with others, against alleged threats of violence that occurred here in connection with the ship that was tied up. That was what the petition apparently relates to, but in the same article there is a discussion of the Canadian seamen's strike which has tied up 80 vessels, of which one of them was in this port.

Mr. Patrick Walsh—as you will recall, Mr. Scherer, because you were present at the hearing—played a very important part, in fact was one of the key figures in that strike. He testified at Albany that this strike was a political strike which had no bona fide trade union principles involved whatsoever, and that it was being ordered by the Cominform.

Mr. DOYLE. By what?

Mr. TAVENNER. The Cominform, which is the international organization and which faithfully carries out the dictates of the Soviet Union; that this strike was being organized with the end in view of tying up shipping in ports all over the world so that the Marshall plan shipments would not be delivered in time or the cargoes would rot, and at the same time it was expected to deal a crippling blow to the Atlantic Pact which the Communists were vigorously opposing at that time all over Europe.

Mr. Patrick Walsh had been a member of the Communist Party and was used by the Communist Party in that strike. He testified as to his attendance at a meeting of the Maritime Commission of the Communist Party in Europe where the plans for this strike were discussed, and where the *Beaver Brae* ship on the Canadian Line was to be the key ship, and its docking in the port at London would be the signal for the beginning of the strike.

We have followed that matter very closely, and the reason for asking about the interest being taken in it here is this, or one reason: On the west coast of the United States, Harry Bridges' Longshoremen's Union cooperated in Seattle and in San Francisco entirely with the Canadian Seamen's Union. Crew members of ships who happened to be at that time in Seattle and in San Francisco were fed by Harry Bridges' Union, and donations were being raised every day by the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union.

It is a historical fact that the Marine Cooks and Stewards also openly cooperated and donated financial assistance to the Communist-led crews in these two ports.

Mr. SCRIBNER. What has all that to do with him, that he filed a petition charging police brutality?

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask that counsel be directed to desist.

Mr. ELCONIN. I would like to ask the same question. I signed a petition against police brutality.

Mr. DOYLE. Our counsel has not finished.

Mr. ELCONIN. I thought he had.

Mr. TAVENNER. You knew pretty well I had not.

Mr. ELCONIN. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. In light of this newspaper statement of the activity in Los Angeles, I want to know to what extent—it is the same question I asked you in the beginning. You didn't seem to understand it, as to why I was asking it.

Mr. ELCONIN. You made clear why.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

I think now you should understand. I want to know to what extent, if any, there was any assistance given in Los Angeles or any other place in California, if you know, to this Canadian seamen's strike.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. ELCONIN. According to what you have just asked, the assistance which I apparently am accused of giving these people is to try to defend them against force and violence.

Mr. TAVENNER. I haven't accused you of anything.

Mr. ELCONIN. That is what the petition I signed was supposed to be. I am against force and violence, even if it is used against pickets and picket lines, and the fact I signed it, I don't know insofar as

other questions are concerned, since my original suspicion of your intent was cleared by what you said, I reassert the same answer and for the very same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to answer whether or not you know of any assistance given in this port to the Canadian Seamen's Union?

Mr. ELCONIN. That is absolutely right. I refuse to answer anything about that topic at all. I think it is apparent you are trying to trap me in something.

Mr. SCHERER. I heard counselor here give him an answer—"It is apparent you are trying to trap me."

Mr. SCRIBNER. Do you want me to tell what I said to him? I am the one to know that. I told him, "They don't have to entrap you—you don't have to permit them to entrap you." Is that wrong?

Mr. DOYLE. No effort to entrap him was made and you know it.

Mr. SCRIBNER. If ever I saw it, it was this moment right here.

Mr. SCHERER. There is a rule of this committee which prevents counsel from putting into the mouth of the witness his answer. Please observe it.

Mr. ELCONIN. I would assume, Mr. Scherer, there is general understanding that what the counsel says to me, however, is something confidential between him and me, and your reading his lips doesn't help me any.

Mr. SCHERER. I do not have to read his lips.

Mr. JACKSON. Everything was audible here.

Mr. ELCONIN. You must have read his lips.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I will be glad to do it all the time. I want you to hear it.

Mr. DOYLE. I will be striking your observations from the record pretty soon so they will not appear.

Mr. SCRIBNER. It would not be a public hearing. It would stop being a public hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. You are also apparently trying to make a record for publication, showing attacks by you upon this committee.

Mr. SCRIBNER. I have no interest in that. I am here to defend my client.

Mr. JACKSON. The counsel for the witness is either deliberately or without deliberation violating the rules of the committee, and I will insist, Mr. Chairman, that at the next outburst he be asked to remove himself from the room. Either counsel for the witnesses are going to take over this hearing or the Congress of the United States is going to run it; and so far as I am concerned, the congressional committee is going to run the hearing.

Mr. SCRIBNER. If you don't refer to me, sir, I won't answer anything; but if you say anything that refers to me, I must answer it, and common decency requires it.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us start from scratch.

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

Mr. ELCONIN. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds already given, as I think you know I would have done.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions.

Thank you, Witness, and Mr. Scribner.

The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

(Brief recess.)

(Members present were Representatives Doyle, Jackson, and Scherer.)

Mr. DOYLE. May the committee reconvene, please.

I will appreciate the cooperation of you men of the professional photographers. We appreciate the cooperation you have already given us. I am sorry the incident occurred wherein a moving picture was being taken of us which was in violation of the House rules as interpreted by our Speaker. I simply could not permit a violation while testimony is being taken. I know you photographers will not take pictures of the committee or the witness while testimony is in process.

Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call Mr. William Kimple, please.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please raise your right hand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KIMPLE. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please take the witness chair.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM WARD KIMPLE

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

Mr. KIMPLE. William Ward Kimple, K-i-m-p-l-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimple, it is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. You are familiar with the rule that you are entitled to have counsel with you if you desire?

Mr. KIMPLE. I swore to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and for that I do not need legal counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Kimple?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was born the 29th day of January 1901, in Chambersville, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in Los Angeles?

Mr. KIMPLE. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Los Angeles?

Mr. KIMPLE. I first arrived in Los Angeles in about 1920 or 1921, and except for about a year in 1922 at which time I was in Portland, Oreg., I lived in Los Angeles continuously until 1945, and then I went to San Diego County until about 1952, and returned to Los Angeles and have been here continuously ever since.

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

Mr. KIMPLE. Grammar school, high school, and 2 years in college, Bethany, W. Va.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your occupation since 1923 or 1924?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was a police officer in the Los Angeles Police Force from 1924 until 1944, at which time I retired and have been retired ever since.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you first became a member of the police force, were you given any special type of training?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was sent to a police school for 3 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. After returning from your course in police training or schooling, what assignment did you receive as a member of the police force?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was assigned to the Intelligence Squad of the Los Angeles Police Department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you remain on assignment to that squad for a considerable period of time?

Mr. KIMPLE. For the entire duration of my time in the police department.

Mr. DOYLE. How many years was that?

Mr. KIMPLE. Twenty years, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, without going into detail, what your first assignment was?

Mr. KIMPLE. To investigate the activities of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Mr. TAVENNER. In order to perform that function were you advised to try to become a member of it?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you become a member of it?

Mr. KIMPLE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Time does not permit me to ask you further questions regarding the activities of that organization, but were you subsequently required by the police department to seek membership in another organization?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What organization was that?

Mr. KIMPLE. The Communist Party. At that time it was the Workers Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that assignment begin?

Mr. KIMPLE. July 1928.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did it end?

Mr. KIMPLE. I believe in September 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. So for a period of 11 years, you were in the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was a member of the Communist Party for 11 consecutive years; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say you were a member of the Communist Party, do you mean to say that you were a member in the sense that you joined the organization at the instance of your superior, but that you were not an ideological member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what positions you reached in the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was unit literature agent; I was unit educational director; I was unit organizer; I was the assistant to the Los Angeles County membership department; I was an alternate on the disciplinary committee on the county level.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say your activity in the party continued until September 1939. What was the reason for its termination?

Mr. KIMPLE. At that time I was informed that I was under suspicion of being a police spy.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were informed that by whom?

Mr. KIMPLE. By Mr. Paul Cline, the organizer of the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did he tell you to do?

Mr. KIMPLE. Stay away from all Communist Party activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the suspicion of your connection with the police department made known to the rank and file members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir; not at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee a reason for it?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir. Because of the position which I held, it would have been very demoralizing to the membership of the Communist Party if they knew that the man who had all of their membership records was in fact one of the Hines Red squad.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before I come to the question of your knowledge of Communist Party records by virtue of your position as assistant membership director, if I understood you correctly—

Mr. KIMPLE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe I should ask you certain other questions regarding the activities of the Communist Party while you were in it.

Will you tell the committee, please, what the first organizational effort was of the Communist Party after you joined it in 1928, I believe you said? What was the first activity that they engaged in; do you recall?

Mr. KIMPLE. I do not recall at that time any definite activity other than the usual Communist Party work such as sale of literature and attempting to recruit other people into the Communist Party and to get into mass organizations and put over the Communist Party line where possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time, back in your early experience in the Communist Party, what was the total membership of it when you first became connected, as far as you could determine?

Mr. KIMPLE. I believe it was just a little over 100 members.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1939 when you were suspected of being connected with the city police department, and at the time when you were assistant membership director, will you give us your estimate of the membership at that time?

Mr. KIMPLE. My recollection is that for the 1939 Communist Party membership registration, the total was 2,886. So I would estimate about 3,000 at the time I left in September 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the interest and the activity of the Communist Party in various mass organizations, and their efforts to recruit members. Will you tell the committee, please, what means the Communists used to recruit their members in the early days of your membership?

Mr. KIMPLE. Through personal association and through the conducting of mass meetings, educational meetings, and contact with the factory worker, your shopmate in the factory.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with an organization or organizations known as Unemployment Councils?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what way were they used by the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. At the time of the depression, the Communist Party organized the Unemployed Councils as a mass organization in which the Communist Party members were assigned to work, and they would recruit unemployed workers into the Unemployed Councils and go before the relief organizations, and so forth, and try to get better relief for them. And to impress upon the people the militancy of their organization, they would turn on the gas and electricity after the constituted authorities had turned it off; they would move the furniture of evicted workers back into the houses after they had been legally evicted; and they would stage picket lines and mass demonstrations in front of relief organizations.

Mr. JACKSON. Would they also do these things for one who resisted recruitment into the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. If they would join the Unemployed Council, they would.

Mr. JACKSON. The reason I asked that question is because there was testimony in San Diego, last year, to the effect that all went well with the party or with the party line; but that in other instances where the need was equal, if there was resistance, say, in the organization, if anyone spoke out against the Communist Party as such, it was impossible for him to get relief baskets or anything of the sort.

I wondered whether there was a parallel here or not.

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, sir, I was not a member of the Unemployed Councils, and I cannot give you firsthand information on that.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to observe the work of the Communist Party within the Workers Alliance in that period?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir. That organization was an organization which was an outgrowth, outcropping, from the Unemployed Councils. It was the same program, same policy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party use those organizations as a base for recruiting membership into the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. It was done to a great extent; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent was that means of recruiting successful?

Mr. KIMPLE. It was very successful, sir, as the figures which I have just quoted would indicate, because many of the recruitments came through the Workers Alliance, and the Communist Party in Los Angeles grew by leaps and bounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party also expand its organizational efforts to the persons who had served in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that organization known as, the resulting organization?

Mr. KIMPLE. It was an organization here in Los Angeles known as the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League, which attempted to recruit servicemen from the Armed Forces.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was responsible or what group was responsible for the initiation of that movement—the organization?

Mr. KIMPLE. In Los Angeles, the Communist Party was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee just what was done in the way of activity in that organization?

Mr. KIMPLE. The Communist Party assigned certain of its Communist Party members who were ex-servicemen into the forming of this organization. The organization met regularly and carried on considerable propaganda in favor of the (Workers) Ex-Servicemen's League, and there were many of them recruited into the Communist Party, and they carried on work within the Communist Party to the extent of drilling Communist Party members in Army tactics to be used in combating the constituted authorities.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you mean the Cossacks?

Mr. DOYLE. Do you mean right here in Los Angeles?

Mr. KIMPLE. In Los Angeles, yes, sir; Boyle Heights Cooperative Center, 2706 Brooklyn Avenue.

Mr. DOYLE. When you say "constituted authorities" do you mean the Communist Party drilled citizens who were members of the Communist Party, if need be, to resist the police?

Mr. KIMPLE. I mean the police, yes, sir, in Los Angeles.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean drilled them in military formation?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that?

Mr. KIMPLE. That was, I believe, in the early 1930's.

Mr. DOYLE. Were the drills in secret or out in the open?

Mr. KIMPLE. They were in the building, the Cooperative Center, in the auditorium; drilled both men, women, and children.

Mr. DOYLE. And were they equipped in any way with ammunition?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Imitation guns?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Who were they drilled by?

Mr. KIMPLE. Members of the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League.

Mr. DOYLE. Were those men, any of them, using ex-military uniforms when they drilled them?

Mr. KIMPLE. Not that I can recall, other than many people at that time were using the Army shirts and trousers, but they did not—

Mr. DOYLE. You say drilling people. How young were the children?

Mr. KIMPLE. In the teen ages, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Junior and senior high school?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many hundred of them would be drilled that way?

Mr. KIMPLE. Do you mean of the children?

Mr. DOYLE. The total.

Mr. KIMPLE. They had various drills at different times when different Communist Party members would be present, and I would say maybe 150 to 200 people at that time would attend.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they receive any oral instructions as to what to do to resist the constituted authorities? In other words, they were drilling for what purpose?

Mr. KIMPLE. For the purpose of forming defense for the Communist Party activities.

Mr. DOYLE. What were they instructed to do, if you know, against the constituted authorities?

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, sir, slightly aside from this drilling in the Cooperative Center, at the times of demonstrations which were

organized by the Communist Party here in Los Angeles, defense squads were organized and they were instructed to surround the speaker and to attempt to keep the constituted authorities from enforcing the laws, which is telling them to move on or not to hold meetings where they are not authorized to do so; and the women were instructed, I remember times, to carry umbrellas and to use them against the "red squad."

The men said if they were carpenters, to wear their carpenter's uniform and to have a hammer in the position where a carpenter usually carried a hammer, and to have any means of defense that they could do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimple, I hand you an original document and ask you to examine it and state whether or not you can identify it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Tavenner, before he answers that question, may I ask one more question on that?

What were the children instructed to do, if anything, these junior and senior high school children—the teenagers? What was their part in resisting constituted authorities?

Mr. KIMPLE. The children, sir, received their instructions through the Young Pioneers and the Young Communist League, and I was not there and did not hear their direct instructions, so I would rather not comment on it.

Mr. DOYLE. We just want what you know of your own personal knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was, can you identify that document; and if so, will you tell us what it is?

Mr. KIMPLE. This is an outline which was presented to the unit organizers in the functionary meetings of the Communist Party, to be taken to the Communist Party units to give instructions to the Communist Party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you transmit that copy to your superior?

Mr. KIMPLE. I believe I did. I received these copies, and I gave my superior officer copies of everything I obtained. Whether or not I gave him this particular one, I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Kimple Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. DOYLE. It will be received and marked as the exhibit described.

(The exhibit referred to is as follows:)

Mr. TAVENNER. At the end of this outline for discussion, Mr. Chairman, appears an information blank which is called to the attention of all unit organizers, and in which it is said on the blank—

Please give full details here about servicemen who are friends or relatives of party members or party sympathizers; make duplicate blanks for other contacts. This information will be carefully guarded and steps taken immediately to contact these men.

I understood you to say that that was discussed in your organizers' meetings with direction of the organizers to take that back to their various groups or cells of the Communist Party.

Mr. KIMPLE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know to what extent the suggestions in there were carried out or attempted to be carried out?

Mr. KIMPLE. I know that committees were sent to visit the ships in the harbor at San Pedro, and I know that there were assignments of Communist Party members to join the National Guard. I know that

KIMPLE EXHIBIT No. 1

Discussion Outline: WORK IN THE ARMED FORCES

W.F.HYNES 3-4-44

I. Relation of armed forces to Working Class (3)

- A. Come from ranks of workers (workers, poor farmers, small middle class)
- B. Many joined because of economic crisis, unemployment, insecurity.
- C. Have families at home suffering, struggling for existence.
- D. Have own grievances similar to those of other workers.
- E. Potential revolutionary role of armed forces.
 1. Armed uprising of workers must have support of armed forces.
 2. Workers must win support of soldiers and National Guard for all strikes and demonstrations. (Example---Petrograd garrison of 110,000 men revolted and joined workers demonstrations on first day of February Revolution 1917. Potemkin revolt of sailors in Revolution of 1905.
 3. British naval mutiny at Invergordon, Scotland, 1931, against payouts.
 4. Strike of sailors on De Zeven Provinciën, Dutch cruiser, Feb. 1933, against wage-outs.
 5. Recent mutiny on HMS Hood en route to North Sea.

II. How the government uses the armed forces.

- A. To suppress strikes, demonstrations, etc. (Nat. Guard used in strikes in Illinois; army used against Bonus Army in Wash.) Threat of sending militia against California cotton strikers.)
- B. To enforce imperialistic rule in colonies; acquire new colonies.
- C. To serve as cannon fodder in imperialist war.
- D. To protect property of imperialists in foreign countries.

III. Armed forces in our section.

- A. Bulk of U.S. Navy concentrated around Long Beach, San Pedro.
- B. Marine base, Naval Training Station, Air Station, San Diego.
- C. Fort MacArthur, San Pedro, important coast artillery post.
- D. Marsh Field, Riverside, 1000 men, air corps.
- E. National Guard in L.A., Long Beach, San Pedro, San Diego, etc.
- F. ROTC in high schools and colleges.

IV. Essential facts, on Navy. (For N.G. & army see future outlines.)

- A. Enlisted personnel--79,700
 1. Ages -- under 25, 38,797. Over 25, 42,000
 2. Color -- White, 76,018. Filipino, 4,133. Negro, 441.
 3. In Sept. 1932, 448 ships in commission
 - 148 combatant ships
 - 107 fleet service or special duty
 - 120 shore activities
 - 28 training naval reserves
 - 45 combatant, in reduced commission, being modernized.
 4. In active service 11 battleships, 19 cruisers, 3 aircraft carriers, 78 destroyers, 56 submarines.
 5. New ships now under construction 4 heavy cruisers, 1 aircraft carrier, 2 destroyers.

V. Conditions of men.

- A. Since crisis less men leaving service because of less chance of getting job on outside, more men re-enlisting than ever.
- B. Government cut out re-enlisting bonus thru act of Congress. (Bonus is 4 months extra pay given for immediate re-enlistment after first term is up.) This was biggest single cut ever given men.
- C. Men doing work of higher rate without promotion or raise in pay.

Armed Forces discussion outline.... page 2

(3)

- B.
1. Must make 94% on examinations for promotion instead of 75% as before. Years in service do not count for promotion.
 - E. Cash awards for rifle sharpshooting abolished; clothing allowance reduced (for Marines, from about \$97 to about \$27.)
 - F. Sailors do work of civilians (repairs, etc.) at sailors pay.

VI. Our tasks.

- A. Mass visiting of ships, army posts, by workers organizations.
- B. Familiarize ourselves with armed forces and their problems.
- C. Make contacts.
 1. Approach servicemen as workers in uniform, make friends, find out conditions of their families; find out if man or his family have any connection with labor movement.
 2. Have group of comrades maintain continual correspondence and personal contact with servicemen.
- D. Form groups of men to initiate struggles against grievances.
- E. Organize study groups of class-conscious servicemen to study theory of revolutionary movement; invite men to our meetings, affairs, etc. (not in uniform)
- F. Get news of grievances, news items, for Western Worker, Young Worker, and other papers in workers press.

INFORMATION BLANK

Attention unit organizers:

Please give full details here about servicemen who are friends or relatives of Party members or Party sympathizers. Make duplicate blanks for other contacts. This information will be carefully guarded, and steps taken immediately to contact these men.

NAME _____ Branch of service _____

Address of ship, post or reserve headquarters _____

How long in service ? _____ Present rating _____

Any knowledge of labor movement? _____

Family background _____

Name of comrade who knows him _____
 (This is most important. It is impossible to get acquainted with servicemen unless we can refer to a mutual friend.)

Is there anyone in the unit whose previous experience especially fits him for contact work among servicemen, or for joining National Guard?

Name _____

Address _____

when the National Guard was entraining to leave for camp, that the Communist Party had literature there to distribute to the men. Those are instances that come to my mind right now of activity along that line.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall who was in charge of the enforcement of this general program within the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. I remember a man by the name of Harry Buchanan as being one of the leaders in that ex-servicemen's group, or was that the intent of your question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know or can you recall the name of the person who was in charge of infiltration, of which you spoke just a moment ago, in the National Guard and other military groups?

Mr. KIMPLE. I do not recall any commission having charge of that other than the organizational apparatus of the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were referring a moment ago to this program in the Armed Forces being submitted to the unit organizers. Now I have before me what purports to be a report of a meeting of unit organizers held on July 12, 1932, as to this one. I hand it to you and ask you if you can identify it as a report of a meeting of organizers.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir, I can.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice that this report bears the name of units by numbers. For instance, unit 17 and unit 32. Does it contain the names of the organizers of these various units?

Mr. KIMPLE. The names of the organizers of the units, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice unit No. 32 has as its organizer a person by the name of Ward. Can you identify that person?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; that is myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that your party name?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir, William Ward. Pardon me. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How is that?

Mr. KIMPLE. I said that was not my party name. William Wallace was my party name. William Ward was the name I was known by in public.

Mr. TAVENNER. As far as the Communist Party was concerned, they thought this was your true name, "Ward"?

Mr. KIMPLE. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. But your party name was Wallace?

Mr. KIMPLE. William Wallace; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to offer this in evidence at this time, but I would like for it to be marked for identification only as "Kimple Exhibit No. 2." (See executive exhibit No. 4.)

Mr. DOYLE. While you are getting ready to ask the next question, may I ask the witness one question.

The contents of Exhibit 1 worries me. That was the Communist direction and information with reference to the American military and the National Guard, giving the Communists secret information or through secret channels telling them to get in touch with American military and giving the number of Negro members, four hundred-some-odd, and 76,000 whites, and so forth. What was the Communist Party interested in distributing that sort of secret information for?

Mr. KIMPLE. Sir, the Communist Party—

Mr. DOYLE. Was that right in Los Angeles?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What concern was it of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. The Communist Party, sir, was endeavoring to influence the Armed Forces of the United States to revolt against the United States and join the forces of the Communist Party-inspired revolution and fight against the capitalist system in the United States.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean to use force and violence as they had in Russia to overthrow our constituted government?

Mr. KIMPLE. We were told in the Communist Party, sir, that that was the only way that we could achieve communism in the United States.

Mr. DOYLE. You were told that right in Los Angeles?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that?

Mr. KIMPLE. Those instructions were, I believe, in 1934, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. One reason I ask that, it is manifestly for the benefit of you people who have been here today and yesterday and heard some of these known Communists, that is, some known to us, plead the amendments, and so forth.

Mr. SCHERER. I think another observation that might be made in line with what you say, Mr. Doyle, is to recall that some of these members who have admitted membership in the Communist Party say that they never knew that the Communist Party was dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Or some of the apologists for the party to contend that to be true.

Mr. DOYLE. I cannot help but notice by expressions on faces, and so forth, from time to time in these meetings when your friends visit us while at work, that some of you condemn our committee and some of you are cynical about what we are doing, some of you do not think it is cricket, some of you think we are wasting taxpayers' money. I can tell by evident expressions on faces, and otherwise, by demonstrations, some of you are in sympathy with some of these people that we identify as Communists. But may I say to you, I think probably I have as much reason as any person in this room to feel this way. When it affects your own family with death in the Armed Forces you feel differently, if it is the result of Communist aggression. This committee is not only in possession of sworn testimony like this, of reputable citizens, all across the country, but for years we have had this sort of sworn testimony, and this committee is not after the past or present Communists who are on the periphery of the thing. We and the FBI are after those who are advocating force and violence to overthrow your constitutional government and ours.

That is the danger of the Communist conspiracy. That is why this committee is working hard to try to cooperate with the other segments of the Government, your Government and mine, to expose the conspiracy. Right here in your own city is this condition of where the Communist Party right here under your nose, was circulating secret material to try to influence the American military—that is, those who might be susceptible—to think in terms of doing what they did in Russia to overthrow constitutional government.

Thank God we have no reason to try to do that here like they did over there.

I felt I should make this statement in view of this sworn statement from this respected police officer.

May I say one more thing. I think I mentioned it yesterday or the day before. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, when I went to Asia last time and Europe, we questioned the highest American officials there and foreign intelligence. They said the same thing this man said on the stand. In Europe, Asia, the Philippines, China,

Korea, this underground conspiracy in the United States today that you have heard some testimony about, emanates from over there and is part and parcel of the same conspiracy.

I felt that your friends in the audience should have that statement from me as chairman in connection with this sort of testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you another document entitled "Special Instructions." Will you examine it, please?

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state what it is?

Mr. KIMPLE. That is a set of instructions which were issued to the same channels as I mentioned before, through the unit organizers, functionaries' meetings, and it was for the protection of the Communist Party members and apparatus while they were functioning as such, and for the protection of the Communist Party records against seizure by constituted authorities.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence, and ask that it be marked "Kimple Exhibit No. 3." (See executive exhibit No. 27.)

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. This document is entitled "Special Instructions for Efficient Party Apparatus, Protection of Comrades, Preparations for Illegality, Conduct of Comrades."

Mr. DOYLE. Is that right here in Los Angeles?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. [Reading:]

Our unit meetings can be made alive and interesting if 90 percent of the time is used for Marxist-Leninist education and discussion of party campaigns, and no time of the meeting is spent on doling out to each comrade endless amounts of tickets, Western Workers, leaflets and other assignments. These practical steps are vitally important and they can be handled easily as follows: I.—

section (a) deals with the division of the Communist Party unit into squads of 3, 4 or 5 each. I shall not read that.

III. Functionaries are instructed (a) to keep all membership lists in a safe place and in cipher or code (see attached for simple methods of cipher).

By the way, did you have charge of the membership lists yourself? Did you have the membership lists of the Communist Party in your own possession?

Mr. KIMPLE. During the years of 1936, 1937, and 1938, and 1939, I did; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The next instruction:

No records of any kind to be kept in headquarters offices. Whatever is needed for work there during the day should be taken away at night.

I assume you lived up to that requirement.

Mr. KIMPLE. I did, sir, and kept them in a safe place, the police department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then the last page is a simple type of cipher or code to be used in the form of a code for communication which I shall not attempt to describe.

Was it the practice of the Communist Party to issue what was known as organization letters?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe they usually called them org. letters.

Mr. KIMPLE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to present an organizational letter to you and ask if you can identify it as one issued to you.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, I recognize that as a Communist Party organizational letter which was issued through the organizational apparatus of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Kimple Exhibit No. 4." (See executive exhibit No. 31.)

Mr. DOYLE. It will be received and marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. It deals with the subject of hunger marches, election campaigns, Western Worker Weekly, recruiting drive, and the AFL convention in 1932.

I would like to read, for the purpose of showing what efforts the Communist Party was endeavoring to make, the section relating to the AFL convention.

What to do: The convention takes place in Modesto on September 19.

(1) Send us the names and addresses of delegates who are sympathetic to us immediately.

(2) Check up on every possibility for electing sympathetic delegates from A. F. of L., and do not forget to rush in their names so it will be possible to organize a caucus for our insurance bill and other points.

Comradely yours,

SECRETARIAT.

What was meant by "Secretariat"?

Mr. KIMPLE. That was the organizational committee of the State.

Mr. DOYLE. Let us stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m., of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—JUNE 30, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will please come to order.

Again this afternoon the hearing room is occupied by more citizens than in the morning, and I know we will have your cooperation in keeping as quiet as you may, please, with no outbursts of either approbation or disapproval of anything that is said.

Let the record show that the full personnel of the subcommittee is here, Congressman Scherer, of Ohio; Congressman Jackson, of California; Congressman Moulder, of Missouri; and Congressman Doyle, of California.

Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM WARD KIMPLE—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimple, during the course of your testimony this morning you made reference to the Young Pioneer group. Will you tell the committee, please, what you meant by Young Pioneers?

Mr. KIMPLE. The Young Pioneer organization was that organization which was organized by the Communist Party for the children at about high-school age, about I would say 10 to 14 or 15 years of age. They were under the direct supervision of the Young Communist League.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general function of the Young Pioneers?

Mr. KIMPLE. That was sort of the Communist organization to counteract the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. They would hold the regular meetings, attend the Communist demonstrations, and then their summer schools and picnics, et cetera.

Mr. DOYLE. Why in the world would the Communists want to counteract and oppose the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts? What is wrong with the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America?

Mr. KIMPLE. They opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat as advocated by the Soviet Union and that is against the Communist theory, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand you to say that the Young Pioneer group had their picnics? Did they also have summer camps?

Mr. KIMPLE. They did; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee or do you recall where any of the camps were conducted?

Mr. KIMPLE. I recall one in particular, sir, which was at Yukipa, I believe was the name of the place. It is up in the San Bernardino area. As I recall, there was a raid on this camp where they found they were teaching the youth allegiance to the Red flag. I believe several young Communists were held to answer for that in the courts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall about when that was?

Mr. KIMPLE. It was early in my period in the organization, sir. I would say late twenties or early thirties.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have no knowledge of activities within the Communist Party since 1939; do you?

Mr. KIMPLE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please how the Communist Party was set up organizationally speaking from the time you first became a member of it?

Mr. KIMPLE. When I first joined the Communist Party it was in language branches and then they changed. As the party grew they dropped the language branch and took it on a street basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many language branches were there at the time you became a member when you said there were I believe about a hundred members?

Mr. KIMPLE. As I recall, sir, it was a Russian branch, an English branch, a Jewish branch, and I think there was one other, I don't recall. As I recall, there were four branches that come to my memory now.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did the Communist Party continue to function through these four branches?

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, sir, practically immediately after I joined in 1928 they began changing into street units.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall now how many units were organized?

Mr. KIMPLE. I am sorry, sir, I couldn't tell you that because it fluctuated so. I believe by the time I left the party that—I am going to have to be excused from giving that exact number, but I believe there is a document that tells how many units there were at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there an additional type of organizational set-up in addition to the units?

Mr. KIMPLE. As the Communist Party grew here in the Los Angeles area they divided the Los Angeles subdistrict into subsections. We had I believe maybe as high as 18 or 20 subdivisions and then each subsection was divided into units and then later they changed the setup to congressional districts and each congressional district would have assembly district branches and that was the setup at the time I left. About that time, too, or just a little earlier than that, an industrial section was set up which was for the workers in the industrial districts of the city. Then there was a special section for Hollywood and then there was a professional section.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you speak of a section for Hollywood, do you mean a section in which the talent elements were members or are you speaking of trade groups in the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir; the Hollywood District as a geographic district was set up in street units but then they had the units of the prop men and various trades and the talent groups in a separate section.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the hearings here in 1952, we heard testimony relating to Communist Party membership in units such as J-6 or J-5. What did that mean in the form of an organizational setup?

Mr. KIMPLE. That was the designation of a street unit in Hollywood. The J signified the Hollywood subsection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how many J subdivisions there were?

Mr. KIMPLE. That again fluctuated, sir. There was J-1, J-2, J-3, J-4, J-5, J-6, J-7, J-8, J-9, J-10. That is all I can recall for sure right now, but they were not all in force at the same time; that is, up until the last period.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that they were street sections or street units?

Mr. KIMPLE. They were street units; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the section organizer of the Communist Party in charge of the J units, do you recall?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes. Mike Shanchig.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name, please?

Mr. KIMPLE. It would be phonetic, S-h-a-n-c-h-i-g, I believe. I am not sure. Then Arthur Strange was organizer for a short time and Davida Franchi became organizer and she held that job for several years.

Mr. TAVENNER. D-a-v-i-d-a?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; F-r-a-n-c-h-i.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who was the organizer in charge of the talent groups in Hollywood?

Mr. KIMPLE. I believe that was Jeff Kibre who started that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what units of the Communist Party you were assigned to by the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. My first one was unit 32, which I held until the Hollywood section was formed and then when the Hollywood section was formed in, I believe, about 1934 I was assigned to unit J-6 and then later to unit J-9 and then after I left the units because of work in the Communist Party and became a member at large in 1938. A member at large is a Communist Party member who is not assigned to functions in any given unit.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the meaning of the term "member at large"?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any assistance furnished by the police department for the work that you were doing within the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that individual?

Mr. KIMPLE. Clara Oswald, O-s-v-a-l-d.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she become your wife?

Mr. KIMPLE. She later became my wife; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she employed by the police department?

Mr. KIMPLE. She was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe she is now deceased?

Mr. KIMPLE. She is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what duties were assigned you by your police department? What was it you were supposed to do in the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. To keep the police department informed to the best of my ability of the "who and what and when" and the "where and the why" of the Communist movement and activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what duties were assigned you by the Communist Party to be carried out in your position as assistant to the membership director?

Mr. KIMPLE. My duties as the assistant to the membership director were to keep the membership records of the Communist Party in order to assist in the annual registration of the Communist Party members, to assist in the annual issuance of Communist Party membership books, to assist in the midyear control of the Communist Party membership books. That was an activity taken about the 1st of July to check on all Communist Party members to see to it that they were paid up in dues and when they were, when their book was inspected and found to be paid-up members, then a control card was detached from the membership book and sent back to the membership commission.

Then I, as assistant membership director, would check against the records and show that they were Communist Party members in good standing. I would assist also in transfer of Communist Party members from one unit to another, one section to another; see to it that their Communist Party cards were kept in place so that at all times we knew where each Communist Party member was and where he was functioning and what his duty was supposed to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then it would be correct to say that you had in your custody or under your control at one time or another the record of memberships in the Communist Party in the Los Angeles area?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you performed the duties assigned to you by your superior in the police department in furnishing the information to the police department?

Mr. KIMPLE. I kept the police department informed at all times to the best of my ability of the activities of the Communist Party here in Los Angeles. I furnished him all documentary evidence that I could possibly secure, I gave written and oral reports on activities, and I furnished him copies of the Communist Party membership records and, where possible, I furnished him copies of the Communist Party membership registration and, where possible, I turned in to him

the Communist Party membership books which were picked up at the end of the year when the new books were issued, and the old books I turned over to him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it supposed to be the practice of the Communist Party to destroy the old books when the new year began?

Mr. KIMPLE. My instructions were to destroy the old books and the method I used was to turn them over to the police department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you follow that practice with regard to the entire membership of the Communist Party during the period that you were the membership director? I mean, did you furnish the department with the records of membership of all of the members?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you said at the time that you left the party in 1939 the number of Communist Party members was 2,880.

Mr. KIMPLE. I said that that was my recollection of the number at the beginning of 1939 when we made the 1939 registration, but there was recruiting and I believe it was about 3,000 by the middle of 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Incidentally, you said when you began the work in the Communist Party, the membership was 100.

Mr. KIMPLE. In round figures; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How quickly was it after you became a member that the party grew in substantial numbers?

Mr. KIMPLE. About 1930, sir, it started growing with great rapidity.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you attribute that to any particular thing?

Mr. KIMPLE. I would definitely attribute it to the depression; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Coming back to the question of the records, you said you had some assistance in this work from another person employed by the police department. In what way did she assist you in that work?

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, sir, we worked as a team all the time and she was the Los Angeles County dues secretary for the Hollywood subsection, dues secretary at the time she was in the new unit.

She was also secretary of the Los Angeles County disciplinary committee of the Communist Party. And working together we kept the police department pretty well informed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you recently been in a position to review the reports and records which you and the person whom you later married turned over to the police department?

Mr. KIMPLE. I have, yes, sir; many of them, not all of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discover the original records which you had prepared yourself?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discover the reports of the disciplinary committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Incidentally, did you serve on that committee, too, at times, the disciplinary committee?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was an alternate on that committee, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of that disciplinary committee?

Mr. KIMPLE. The disciplinary committee was the committee in the Communist Party which acted as a court to enforce Communist Party

discipline upon its members. If any person violated the Communist Party dictates they were called before the disciplinary committee and they were given a hearing and the disciplinary committee then would make a finding.

Mr. JACKSON. Did they ever plead the fifth amendment?

Mr. KIMPLE. In the Communist Party, sir, there is no fifth amendment and no freedom of speech, either, may I say, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. If they are in this country they still live under the United States Constitution. Why don't they plead the fifth amendment?

Mr. KIMPLE. Because the chairman of the disciplinary committee would not be as lenient as you are, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course the difference is that the United States Congress recognizes the right of any American citizen to plead the fifth amendment or any other amendment or section of the Constitution, if they can do it in good faith and honestly. We are as anxious to protect the right as any one because it affects our rights, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether a person by the name of Virginia Farmer appeared before the disciplinary committee or commission for any purpose?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; she did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the incident well enough to describe it to the committee?

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, it is rather hazy, sir. She was one of a group who was in the Federal Theater projects, I believe, one of the relief agencies.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say one of a group. Are you speaking of a Communist Party group or some other group?

Mr. KIMPLE. Communist Party group; yes, sir. And there was disagreement among the Communist Party fraction in that theater group as to the correct activities and behavior of the various Communist Party members, and I remember we had a hearing in which she was involved, and several others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the names at this time of any of the witnesses that appeared against her in that hearing?

Mr. KIMPLE. I can recall the names of 2 or 3 of the other people who were in that hearing. I do not recall just exactly for sure what their various functions in there were. Naomi McGenty was one, I believe Howland Chamberlin was another, and a young fellow who used to be in my unit in Hollywood there, too, Carl Brant was another one. That is all I can recall right now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us anything else about Carl Brant?

Mr. KIMPLE. Carl Brant was a member of the unit to which I was an organizer for a while. He was a young fellow who was in the motion-picture industry. He was a struggling young actor. That was my knowledge of him at the time that he was in the Communist Party when I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the result of the action against Virginia Farmer?

Mr. KIMPLE. I am sorry, sir, I am a little hazy on that. I do not recall for sure just what the results of that hearing were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you from your own recollection know that she was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. I know for a fact that she was a member of the Communist Party, yes, sir, because when you came to that hearing you had to bring your membership book and give an account to the secretary of your standing in the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. I am quite confident that the witness has been advised with respect to the introduction of names into the hearing, but I should like to have it affirmatively stated in the record that in the introduction of names the witness is not to give the name of any individual of whose membership he does not have personal knowledge, either from attendance in meetings of the Communist Party, by virtue of personal knowledge of Communist membership cards or the presence of the name on a membership list—that is, some positive means of further identification beyond that of the name itself. You understand that?

Mr. KIMPLE. May I ask one question along that line? Does attendance to closed Communist Party membership meetings constitute that?

Mr. JACKSON. That I would say would be the No. 1 method of identification.

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; I understand that very well.

Mr. JACKSON. I thought that should be in the record.

Mr. KIMPLE. I understand that clearly.

Mr. DOYLE. I am sure our legal counsel has stated the same thing to you.

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have now located a notice in handwriting relating to the disciplinary hearing which we have mentioned. I desire to hand it to the witness and ask him to refresh his recollection as to the result of the hearing of Virginia Farmer.

Before doing so, I want to ask you whether you recognize the handwritten notes which have been presented to you?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; those are the handwritten notes of my former wife. From the notes here I see she was censured.

Mr. TAVENNER. She was not expelled from the Communist Party but was censured?

Mr. KIMPLE. Not from this hearing; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show that Virginia Farmer was subpoenaed as a witness here in one of the early hearings in Los Angeles and refused to testify about her knowledge of Communist Party activities, relying on the fifth amendment. Do you recall the nature of the complaint against her? I think I should read, out of fairness to her, what is said about her activity. This is a charge made by Franchi—

WPA unit made up of all WPA workers on cultural projects, Farmer made certain decisions. Meanwhile it came to our attention that a plan had been laid down by Virginia Farmer aided by a man representing himself as representative of CEC. Virginia Farmer did not consult FR—

which presumably means the Franchi woman.

Mr. KIMPLE. No; Fred Franchi.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

At any time, acted individualistic. Her plan did irreparable damage to the unit.

As I understand, the decision was that she was censured for the action that she took, but not expelled.

Mr. JACKSON. Isn't giving information like that usually referred to by the Communists as being a stoolpigeon? It is if it is a Government witness passing on tidbits of information, especially the serious crime of being an individualist. That is a very serious matter, is it not, being an individualist within the Communist Party?

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

She was a definite individualist.

Mr. SCHERER. She only was suspended?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; suspension means she is given certain tasks to perform and she must abide by the decisions for a given length of time.

Mr. SCHERER. Placed on sort of probation.

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; on probation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with a man named Matt Pelman?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you what appears to be 2 original Communist Party books and 2 other documents, and I will ask you to identify them and state what they are and also to explain the documents to the committee.

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, sir, two 3 by 5 filing cards are the filing cards which the membership department of the Communist Party in Los Angeles kept their membership records. One of these cards was kept for each Communist Party member with the information on it as was taken from either his blank that he signed when he joined the Communist Party or from the annual registration.

This one blank here which says—

Matt Pelman, Los Angeles, transfer YCL, c—M Mill—

shows me Matt Pelman was transferred from the Young Communist League to the mill unit of the Good Year subsection. The next card shows me he was a member in the Good Year subsection, his Communist Party membership book is in the upper left-hand corner and the date that he joined the Communist Party is in the upper right-hand corner with the word "millmen" in the center which means that he was in that unit. His real name, Matt Pelman, party name is the same, address 224 South Spring Street, which was the Communist Party headquarters, sir. His occupation was cabinetmaker. He was a member of the United Brotherhood of Masons and Carpenters, I believe it is, local 884 of the AFL, also a member of the Young Communist League. He was born in the United States of America in 1910 and the word "by" there was put in in cases when we knew who recruited them, we put that on but that is not on there.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of his joining the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. This says 1928, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the date of the card, or is it—

Mr. KIMPLE. That is the date of his joining. This next book is the 1937 Communist Party membership book issued to Matt Pelman with the book No. 75471, which, may I add, is the number in the upper left-hand corner of the filing card. The State of California and county of Los Angeles, city of Los Angeles, district 13, Good Year section. This book was issued on the 22d day of December 1936 with the Communist Party seal and the signature William Schneiderman on here.

That signature William Schneiderman is in the handwriting of my former wife. She was instructed by the Communist Party executive committee here in Los Angeles to sign the Communist Party membership books for the year 1937.

On the following pages are the Communist Party dues stamps showing he paid 10 cents a month for the first half of the year, including his international solidarity stamp of the same denomination. That international solidarity stamp was an assessment that was levied against the Communist Party members every 4 months and the money collected was to go to aid the Communist Party in other countries of the world.

It shows that his book was checked in midyear and the midyear control stamp was placed there. The July, August, September, October, and November dues stamps are in place. The second international solidarity stamp is missing. The last international solidarity stamp and the December dues stamp are missing but an "O. K. 10 cents" pencil written note is there. That is a practice which dues secretary frequently used in the case of where they did not have a dues stamp to put in at the time the Communist Party member paid his dues. And a stamp was issued for that dime.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to introduce those four documents in evidence.

Mr. KIMPLE. There is one more.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

Mr. KIMPLE. Two more. The next is a 1938 Communist Party membership book No. 60958 made out to Matt Pelman, California, district 13, city Los Angeles, section Youth, unit Youth; book was issued on the 1st day of December 1937, with a Communist Party stamp and William Schneiderman's name stamped in with a rubber stamp.

Again the dues stamps for the first half of the year is 10 cents, and the international solidarity stamp and the midyear control stamp are in place.

The last half of the year 1938 penciled notation "Pd." meaning paid was marked in all the places for dues stamps.

Also in the back pages is the assessment for the 10th convention of the Communist Party.

(Representative Scherer left the hearing room.)

Mr. KIMPLE. The next is 1939 Communist Party membership card receipt. This little blue receipt is the first page inside the Communist Party membership book when it is issued to the Communist Party member. As he receives the membership book he is supposed to sign the receipt card saying that he has received the membership book. Then the receipt card is detached from the book, the book given to the Communist Party member and the receipt card goes back to the membership department.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the five documents in evidence and ask that they be marked "Kimple Exhibits 5, 6, 7 and 8 and 9," respectively, for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. They will be so received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with Max Natapoff?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you three documents and I will ask you to identify them and explain them. The spelling is N-a-t-a-p-o-f-f.

Mr. KIMPLE. The first I have here is a 3 by 5 filing card which was the Communist Party membership record of Max Natapoff, the address 900 North Hazard Street with the Party name of Mac Roth, R-o-t-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does both his true name and party name appear on the card?

Mr. KIMPLE. It does here, yes, sir. However, may I add that to my knowledge that was not his correct party name. His correct party name was Max Roth. That was in later years. I see here this other card verifies my statement. He was listed as a technician and the mass organization to which he was assigned was the ILD, which is the International Labor Defense. There are three book numbers on here which are his Communist Party membership book, shows he was assigned to B-11, that would be the Boyle Heights section which is the east side section of the Communist Party here in Los Angeles.

And he joined the Communist Party in the 9th month, 23d day, year 1933, shows he was Jewish, age 27, shows he paid 60 cents for his initiation.

Mr. MOULDER. May I suggest that these exhibits could be referred to by counsel in such a way as they could be identified and offered in the record at length so as to expedite proceedings without the witness reading them all?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. I will do that with the next one.

Mr. KIMPLE. Do you wish me to go on explaining this one?

Mr. TAVENNER. If it is satisfactory to complete this one.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. KIMPLE. The next is a 3 by 5 filing card which was the Communist Party membership record of Max Natapoff, showing his 1937 Communist Party membership book number, showing that he was assigned to the east side section unit B-1, which is the Boyle Heights area, as I said a moment ago, showed he joined the Communist Party in 1932, real name Max Natapoff, party name Max Roth, address 900 North Hazard Street, a laboratory technician, a member of the hospital workers union No. 19986 of the AFL. He was assigned to the International Labor Defense as a mass organizer, and was born in the United States of America in 1905.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he held a position in his union?

Mr. KIMPLE. That I do not know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. KIMPLE. The next is a 1938 Communist Party membership book receipt card made out to Max Roth, State of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles City, east side section unit 1, on the 9th day of December 1937, signed Max Roth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the three documents in evidence and ask that they be marked "Kimple Exhibits 10, 11, and 12" respectively, for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. They will be so received and so marked.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you recognize or know any of the individuals you have referred to in your testimony and whose membership cards you have identified?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir. I can recognize Mr. Natapoff.

Mr. MOULDER. As I understand, they all have been subpoenaed as witnesses here?

Mr. TAVENNER. Those two have.

Mr. KIMPLE. I have seen Mr. Natapoff in this room since the hearing started.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question? Subsequent to your leaving the Communist Party, have you from time to time, as might conceivably be the case, discussed the Communist Party with others whom you knew during their period in the Communist Party and who themselves left for one reason or another?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. In general relating this to the operations as you have described them, the structural organization of the party, is there any consideration given aside from the movement underground, are there any substantial changes in tactics or procedures which you have discussed with others, which varied from your own experience, if you recall at the moment? There are no more membership cards, I presume?

Mr. KIMPLE. I have not had opportunity to discuss the activities of the Communist Party in late years with anyone. All those whom I knew that I have talked with since were also in the party at the time I was and we are in complete accord on the activities of the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

(Representative Scherer returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to present one other card here for the witness to identify.

Mr. DOYLE. Very well, proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with Tashia Freed?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a card and ask you to identify it.

Before doing so, do you know whether or not she was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. She was. She was a functionary in the Hollywood section of the Communist Party at the time I was in there.

Mr. DOYLE. How do you know that?

Mr. KIMPLE. I have sat in many closed Communist Party functionary meetings with her, I have been in closed Communist Party meetings in her home, I have sold her Communist Party membership dues stamps.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. KIMPLE. This, sir, is a transfer card, transferring a Communist Party member from one unit to another as was the policy in the Communist Party in the late thirties.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that an original document?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed in your description of it.

Mr. KIMPLE. This shows that the Communist Party member by the right name of Anne Pollock, party name Anne Burton, of 6530 Maryland Drive, transferred from the Hollywood section unit J-5 to the 57th assembly district branch, showing that the Communist Party member and Pollock's dues were paid up to January 1938 and was assigned by Tashia Freed, the unit membership director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it signed in handwriting?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Kimple No. 13" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. So received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Mary Aidlin?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her name prior to marriage?

Mr. KIMPLE. Mary Raiden.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. She was.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your knowledge?

Mr. KIMPLE. She was a functionary in the Hollywood section of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. I attended many functionary meetings which were closed to Communist Party functionaries only with her, I have been to her home and sold her Communist Party dues stamps. She was a Communist Party dues secretary at the unit level for a while.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know her husband's name?

Mr. KIMPLE. Joseph Aidlin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what Communist Party information you have with regard to him, if any?

Mr. KIMPLE. I have sat in on 1 or 2 Communist Party meetings in their home which was on Randall Court in Los Angeles, at which he was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. When who was present?

Mr. KIMPLE. Joseph Aidlin and Mary Raiden and we knew her as Mary Raiden in the Communist Party, sir, always referred to her by that name. And then later, about 1938, I believe, or maybe 1939, I saw Joseph Aidlin's membership record in the professional section of the Communist Party. That is about the extent of the knowledge I have of his activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date of the records that you referred to as showing that he was a member of a professional cell or group of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. My best recollection, sir, is about 1938.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask, these meetings at their homes, were there any persons in that room who were not Communists to your personal knowledge?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was every person there, including Mr. Aidlin, to your personal knowledge a member of the Communist Party? May I ask it this way: Was that a closed meeting?

Mr. KIMPLE. That was a closed meeting, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us whether or not Mr. Aidlin took any part in the meetings, if you can recall?

Mr. KIMPLE. I recall his presence, sir, but I don't recall now whether he took any part.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know who owned the property in which the meetings were held which you referred to?

Mr. KIMPLE. I do not know who owned that property, no, sir. It was just a little short street about one block long, dead end, in back of

Ralph's grocery store on Santa Monica and Vermont. The street entered in from Santa Monica to the north.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Harold Ashe?

Mr. KIMPLE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Harold Ashe had ever lived at that same address?

Mr. KIMPLE. He lived in that court, sir. I am not positive it was the same house, but he lived in that same area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been able to find from records that Mr. Wheeler, the investigator, gave you to examine any record of membership of Joseph Aidlin in the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. I do not believe I saw any cards or documentary evidence pertaining to his membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you find cards relating to the membership of his wife, known to you as Mary Raiden?

Mr. KIMPLE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me discuss whether or not you were personally acquainted with James Burford.

Mr. KIMPLE. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir; he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to comply with the suggestion of a member that I read the material to the witness on these cards but I am afraid I may misdescribe them because I am not fully familiar with the meaning of the things I see on them. I should let the witness describe them rather than attempt to do it myself.

Mr. DOYLE. Very well, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you three documents and ask you to state what they are, please, and describe them.

Mr. DOYLE. Under the circumstances, you can't comply with the valuable suggestion Mr. Moulder made.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish I could, but I am afraid I would make a mistake about it.

Mr. KIMPLE. One is a transfer card written in pencil, handwriting, shows that Ron Hillyer (Burford) transferred from Oakland 6-24-35, Holly. That is a note from the membership department showing that Ron Hillyer, which was the Communist Party membership name for Jim Burford, that he had transferred into Los Angeles from Oakland and had been assigned to the Hollywood section.

The next is a Communist Party membership record, a 3 by 5 filing card showing real name Jim Burford, party name Hillyer, occupation office worker, member of the Office Workers Union Local No. 15251, born in 1910, with Communist Party membership book numbers on it, and a note Hollywood, meaning Hollywood section, and penciled under, "Industrial," meaning he transferred from the Hollywood to the industrial section.

Next is a Communist membership book receipt card for the year 1938 in the name of Ron Hillyer, signed in pen, section Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the three documents in evidence and ask they be marked "Kimple Exhibits 14, 15, and 16" respectively for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. They will be received and so marked.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you have custody of those cards you have identified?

Mr. KIMPLE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have they been in your possession since that period of time?

Mr. KIMPLE. In my possession just for purposes of identification. I have not kept them all these years if that is what you mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir. They were in the hands of the police department.

Mr. TAVENNER. They are the same as you had when they were in your custody?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What means did the Communist Party use to raise funds necessary to advance its projects and pay its operating expenses?

Mr. KIMPLE. From the sale of Communist Party dues stamps, a certain percentage was kept by the unit, a certain percentage was kept by the section, and a certain percentage was kept by the district and the balance sent to the national office.

There were public meetings held at which admission was charged, there were financial contributions, and various drives to finance special drives, special activities. Those are some.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive substantial contributions from time to time?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any substantial contributions that were made by persons that you knew to be members of the Communist Party? Now if they were made by persons you did not know to be members of the Communist Party we do not want to hear it in open session.

Mr. MOULDER. You mean, Mr. Tavenner, that you wouldn't want to hear in open session contributions made to the Communist Party—

Mr. TAVENNER. By a person that he did not know to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. I think any one who makes a contribution—

Mr. JACKSON. If a contribution is knowingly made to the Communists it would be entirely proper.

Mr. DOYLE. If there is evidence that the contributor knew that he was actually putting it into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the point exactly, and if we have not had an opportunity to make some type of investigation, I wanted that privilege before making it public.

Mr. JACKSON. The point is if the witness approached Mr. A and said "We want a contribution for the Communist Party," and Mr. A gave it to him, with that knowledge, it should be read into the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. I agree.

Mr. KIMPLE. I recall that there were financial contributions made to the Communist Party through my wife and I in the amount of \$50 by Tess Schlesinger each month for several months and the man she married, Mr. Davis, whose first name has slipped my mind. He is a motion-picture cutter, I believe. He was a very highly paid technician in the motion-picture industry at the time. He also gave us a pink slip to a Ford automobile, which was turned over to the Communist Party for the Communist Party's use and he contributed a hundred dollars

for 2 or 3 or 4 months, and then upped it to \$500 a month and then that went on for 2 or 3 months and then we were relieved of the assignment of collecting their money and somebody else took it up.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did those individuals know the purpose for which the money was being given? That is, that it was for the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Who was this individual?

Mr. KIMPLE. Mr. Davis and Miss Schlesinger.

Mr. MOULDER. Five hundred dollars a month, you say?

Mr. KIMPLE. By Mr. Davis.

Mr. MOULDER. Who was Mr. Davis?

Mr. KIMPLE. He was a film cutter, I believe, a technician in the industry, and as I recall, he was supposed to have been one of the best in that field at that time.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that, approximately?

Mr. KIMPLE. That I believe was about 1933, I believe it was a 1932 Ford V-8 that he gave and so it followed right after that so it would have been 1933.

Mr. MOULDER. My question was directed to what year did he give you that money, from one to five hundred dollars a month.

Mr. KIMPLE. That, as I say, follows from the fact that I remember it was a 1932 Ford and it was right after that, so it would have been 1933.

Mr. MOULDER. You stated in answer to Mr. Tavenner's question Mr. Davis knew where this Ford was going, that it was going to the Communist Party and that this money he gave you and your wife was going to the Communist Party. How did he know that? On what do you base your statement that he knew the Ford was going to the benefit of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. Well, we were introduced to him as Communist Party members and he was introduced to us as a Communist Party member and he was informed that we were authorized by the Communist Party to take up his contribution and that we were to turn it in to the organizer of the Communist Party here in Los Angeles, which we did.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the circumstances under which he gave the Ford to you? Why did he make a contribution of the Ford car? Was there anything about that that might help to identify him or where he was?

Mr. KIMPLE. About that time he was leaving for Soviet Russia. He was going to go to Soviet Russia to get firsthand information, to see for himself what conditions were like in the Soviet Union, and he and Nora Helgren and one other made that trip.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Nora Helgren?

Mr. KIMPLE. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. She was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you seen him since that occasion, this man, Davis?

Mr. KIMPLE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you are unable to recall his first name. I think I could refresh your recollection about it but I want to be certain to see whether you can do it without any aid or refreshing first.

Mr. KIMPLE. I believe his name, sir, was the same as the name of this professor who testified here a day or so ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. But he was not the same man as the professor?

Mr. KIMPLE. Not the same man.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what the professor's name was?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir; it slipped my mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the name Frank?

Mr. KIMPLE. That sounds familiar.

Mr. TAVENNER. At any rate, the description that you have given of that individual is definite enough that the committee can certainly ascertain who the person was that you have identified.

Mr. DOYLE. You just said that Miss Helgren was known to you to be a Communist. On what do you base that statement?

Mr. KIMPLE. She was in the unit of the Communist Party to which I was the organizer, sir. She was a Communist Party member who had been entrusted with many Communist Party assignments. She had been in the Soviet Union and had been the secretary to Molotov or Litvinof. Litvinof, I believe, and she was on the Ford Peace Ship which went over to Sweden at the end of the First World War and there she met a young man by the name of George Helgren, she married him, and the two of them were in the Soviet Union and while they were in the Soviet Union they had their clothes stolen and didn't have shoes to wear for a while, and then the Communist Party sent them to Germany and they were working in Germany. One of them, I believe it was George Helgren, was in an office where United States mail pouches were being received with diplomatic mail and her confessions to me were that they used those mail pouches for furthering Communist Party messages and intercepting Communist Party messages, and they came to this country and he was employed by the Fox Motion Picture Studios in the credit union and there he distributed considerable Communist Party literature at the bidding of the Communist Party although at that time he himself was not a Communist Party member, but she was.

Mr. DOYLE. That is a pretty picture. I mean without the shoes.

Mr. JACKSON. This is perhaps not apropos, but there were several Members of Congress who lost their trousers traveling through Spain. It is nice to know Communists and Fascists have something additional in common. Neither is above stealing your pants.

Mr. TAVENNER. I should advise you, Mr. Chairman, an investigation by the staff has shown that this man at the time of the occurrence related, this man Davis, was a producer rather than a cutter.

Mr. Doyle. Do you want a recess?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Before the committee recesses, I think it is appropriate for me to say at this time, that this Los Angeles police officer, for 20 years in the field of intelligence before he retired, has named several individuals and has undertaken to identify them. He certainly has named them and given an identification record. I want to say for the press and for you folks present that we have a standing rule, and invitation, and I am giving it now, that if any of these people who have been named during this hearing as a Communist wants to come forward under oath, like the witness that has identified them, or any

witness who has identified them, they are welcome to come to this committee and say whatever they may want to say. That is our standing procedure and I am making it clear now.

Mr. JACKSON. You mean in denial or affirmation and to to say whatever they want to say propagandawise.

Mr. DOYLE. I stand corrected. Either in denial or affirmation or explanation. That is our standing procedure and I am making it clear now so that if any person named before this committee either today, yesterday, or the day before or tomorrow is named, they are invited to come promptly and put themselves under oath like the witness who named them and deny or affirm or explain, but not make a speech. We believe that is fair.

We will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

(Brief recess.)

Mr. DOYLE. Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kimple, I feel certain that you have made it perfectly plain in your testimony that the individual identified by you as Frank Davis and the one who made the contribution of the Ford car and substantial sums of money to the Communist Party was not the same person as the witness who appeared here yesterday by the name of Dr. Frank Cornelius Davis.

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I just wanted to be certain there could be no misunderstanding.

Mr. KIMPLE. They are not the same, no, sir.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions. May I make a brief statement?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to express my thanks to the witness. It is by virtue of informed testimony such as his that it has been possible to piece together across the years the nature and the extent and the objectives of the Communist Party in the United States. Of course, as anyone who serves on this committee is automatically a heel in the eyes of the comrades, your future status will unquestionably be that of a stool pigeon.

Mr. KIMPLE. I have been so labeled many times.

Mr. JACKSON. However, I feel that that will reflect a very small vocal minority viewpoint and that by and large the people of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., in general, and of the Nation, owe to you and other people who have been willing to take on assignments of this kind in the line of official duty, separating yourself in large part, as I know you must have, from family associations, social, things you would much have preferred to do, a debt of gratitude. As one member of the committee—and I am sure that I express the sentiments of all of us, and of all our colleagues in the House of Representatives—I should like to express my appreciation for your testimony today.

Mr. KIMPLE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I certainly would like to endorse everything Mr. Jackson has said.

Mr. KIMPLE. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. I join in that, too. I do wish to refer back to Kimple Exhibit No. 1 and ask Mr. Kimple one question about it. That, Mr. Kimple, was the Exhibit 1, entitled "Discussion Outline: Work in the Armed Forces," and I will only refer to subdivision (e) thereof, this typewritten outline which you identified as a discussion course used in Los Angeles when you were a phony member of the Communist Party, as an intelligence officer for the Los Angeles Police Department for 11 years.

Let me read you just a section of this to remind you, and then I want to ask you a question:

(e) *Potential revolutionary role of Armed Forces.*—(1) armed uprising of workers must have support of armed forces; (2) workers must win support of soldiers and National Guard for all strikes and demonstrations. (Example: Petrograd garrison of 110,000 men revolted and joined workers demonstrations on first day of February Revolution 1917, Potemkin, revolt of sailors in Revolution of 1905.)

Now that, together with other documents that you have produced as original records of the Communist Party in Los Angeles in those years, refers to armed revolution, armed uprising against constituted authorities and the winning of armed support for the Communist program by trying to win over the American military, isn't that true?

Mr. KIMPLE. That's true; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Was this the year 1934?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. That is quite a few years back.

Mr. KIMPLE. May I make a supplement there, sir, that we were told as early as 1928, to my knowledge, that this was the aims and purposes of the Communist Party and the necessary procedure for a successful revolution. So it had been going on for at least 6 years prior to that document.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. You left the Communist Party in what year?

Mr. KIMPLE. 1939.

Mr. DOYLE. In Los Angeles?

Mr. KIMPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. At any time prior to 1939 when you left the Communist Party, as a Los Angeles Police Department intelligence officer, were you ever told by any Communist functionary superior to you that this line of armed force revolution was changed and was no longer the policy of the Communist Party?

Mr. KIMPLE. No, sir. I was never told and I never saw in print that that policy was changed. It was always advocated as a necessary step to a successful revolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask one last question?

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I had not conferred with counsel on the extent of your testimony, Mr. Kimple. I assumed that because of time limitations we have not gone into all of the matters which are within the purview of the committee at this open hearing. I believe you have given the committee the names of 10 or 12 persons known to you to have been members of the Communist Party.

Are you in a position to give the committee additional names?

Mr. KIMPLE. I am in the position, sir, to positively identify the Communist Party membership of close to a thousand people.

Mr. JACKSON. A thousand people?

Mr. KIMPLE. In Los Angeles, yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the committee in possession of that information?

Mr. KIMPLE. They are.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. DOYLE. One more question. In view of my question to you, Mr. Kimple, I just want to make a brief observation here. I think it was after you left the party, because I believe it was about 1945 that Mr. Earl Browder was ejected from leadership in the Communist Party in this country, one reason among others according to the record, because he preached and advocated and wrote that it was possible for the Soviet Communist theory and the capitalistic system theory of the United States of America to get along in the same world. That was April 1944 or 1945.

Then Mr. William Foster was put in.

I have come to feel that very likely a good many American citizens got into the Communist Party when we were allies of Russia and prior to the time of the Duclos letter, which came to this country, April 1945. My colleagues have heard me say often that I make allowance in my own thinking of a year or 2 or 3 sometimes for thinking Americans to see daylight and to have gotten out of the Communist Party after 1 or 2 or 3 years from April 1945, if they needed that long, if they were nonreaders or not with a source of information; but for the life of me, I cannot understand how any patriotic American citizen after the Duclos letter and after about April 1946, 1947, could have stayed in the Communist Party, because the lines were drawn in April 1945 very clearly. They stayed in the Communist Party with their eyes open for some reason if they did stay.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the chairman yield?

I think another very definitive line was drawn last year in the Congress of the United States when the Communist Party was outlawed. It is no longer now a matter of simply belonging to some cloak and dagger outfit where you can go around with a different name and meet your cohorts in an alley or back room. It is now membership in a proscribed organization under the laws of the United States of America.

That even more I think, Mr. Chairman, than the Duclos letter, even more than any of the other milestones or the war in Korea, is the significant thing which should impress itself upon any law-abiding citizen of this country.

Mr. DOYLE. But Mr. Jackson, as long as we are speaking a minute for the record and by way of informing our colleagues at Washington what has occurred here, certainly it is clear in my book that there may have been many hundreds of American citizens—I want to repeat it—who went into the Communist Party in the interest of world friendship and such other factors and as a matter of philosophical research; and how in God's name any adult desiring to be a patriotic American could have stayed in the party after the date I have indicated, I do not understand.

Furthermore, I do not now understand how any patriotic American who desires to help his country more than to protect those who are still in the Communist Party or were conspirators, and who went into the party under misguidance or misinformation or mistake, can come and plead the first and fifth amendments. I just have not seen it, and I do not understand it now, how they can claim those amendments if they went into the party, as I have stated, prior to April 1944 and 1945 and did not get out.

Let us proceed. Are you through with Mr. Kimple for this time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to continue this witness under his subpoena, and I so recommend.

Mr. DOYLE. I will direct, Mr. Kimple, that you are under the subpoena. That's rather powerful and will give you all the protection you need, I think, if you need any, so that you won't be interfered with. You will continue definitely and clearly under the subpoena of this committee of the Congress of the United States until further ordered.

Mr. KIMPLE. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. I have joined already with my colleagues in expressing appreciation.

Mr. KIMPLE. I thank you all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Max Benjamin Natapoff.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MAX BENJAMIN NATAPOFF, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, ROBERT KENNY

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman, I might want to address myself to the physical condition of Mr. Natapoff. He is not too ill to appear, but he has been off of his employment for the last 2 months and his doctor has urged me to ask that his questions be confined; he can answer, but not a prolonged thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Kenny.

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

Mr. NATAPOFF. Max Natapoff.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Natapoff?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I was born in the city of New York, State of New York, November 5, 1906.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in California?

Mr. NATAPOFF. Since 1927.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or business or trade?

Mr. NATAPOFF. At the present time, for the last 2 days, I am unemployed, having lost my job 2 days after I was served a subpoena by this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your position at that time?

Mr. NATAPOFF. At the time I was working I was a surveyor working for the county of Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of an oath and affidavit and ask whether it was presented to you as a county employee and whether or not you refused to sign it as indicated by the stamp on the first page, the language of which—will you examine this, Mr. Wheeler? What is that language?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I must decline—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a minute.

Mr. WHEELER. "Refused to sign form."

Mr. TAVENNER. Which is stamped, "Refused to sign form"?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I must also refuse to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you wish to state any grounds for refusal?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse on the grounds of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt? Did your refusal to sign that form have anything to do with the loss of your job?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I must again refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you advised by the Communist Party or any Communist Party functionary not to execute that oath?

Mr. NATAPOFF. That question is in the same area, and I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. At a later date did you change your mind and in fact on the 29th day of April 1948 execute a similar oath?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. NATAPOFF. Do you want me to look at this before I answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I think you should look at it to see whether you signed it. A signature is on the last page. I withdraw my question and place it in another way.

Will you examine the document which I hand you and state whether or not the signature appearing on the last page was made by you?

(Document handed to witness.)

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. NATAPOFF. I must refuse to answer that question for the same reasons, same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Natapoff Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. DOYLE. What about the first affidavit which was not signed? You have not offered that yet.

Mr. TAVENNER. I change the marking and offer the first exhibit presented as an exhibit and ask that it be marked "Natapoff Exhibit No. 1" and the latter marked "No. 2," for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. As to Exhibit No. 1, it has been handed me, and across the face of it in rubber stamp is "Refused to sign form," and as I read it, I recognize it quickly as the oath that the person to whom it is submitted has never been or is not now a member since December 7, 1941, of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States or the State of California or the county of Los Angeles by force and violence. That is the affidavit that the witness refused to sign.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on the 29th day of April 1948, the date of the signed oath?

Mr. NATAPOFF. It must be evident that by this time I refuse to answer any question of this nature on the grounds of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that you are refusing then?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I am refusing.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you Kimple Exhibit No. 12 and ask you to examine it and state whether or not it is a receipt signed and delivered by you?

Mr. NATAPOFF. Do I have to touch it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not if you can see it otherwise.

Mr. NATAPOFF. What is the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this: Have you touched it before?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I would not know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was not your Communist Party name Roth?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse to answer that question for the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the document and state whether you have ever seen it before?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons, same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on December 9, 1937?

Mr. NATAPOFF. Before I answer, I just want to say that remark I made previously about touching that card. I did not want to touch it after a certain individual had handled it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly it was just as obnoxious for him to touch it in the first place after he obtained it.

Mr. SCHERER. Obviously he is referring to Kimple. I have a question. Was anything that Officer Kimple said about you untrue?

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that everything he said was true, isn't it?

Mr. NATAPOFF. Are you asking me a question?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Who do you think we are going to believe, Witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not certain that you understand the question that I asked you as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party on the 9th day of December 1937.

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse to answer any question in this area for the same reason.

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

Mr. NATAPOFF. I refuse to answer that question, same grounds.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Kenny and witness. You are excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Tashia Freed.

Mr. JACKSON. May I direct a question to the clerk of the committee?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Did the previous witness use the same pen?

The CLERK. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. There was no hesitation in signing the voucher.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FREED. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. TASHIA FREED, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, MRS. VAINO SPENCER

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

Mrs. FREED. Tashia Freed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mrs. FREED. Very able counsel.

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

Mrs. SPENCER. Mrs. Vaino Spencer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of California, Mrs. Freed?

Mrs. FREED. I am a citizen by derivation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. FREED. In Russia.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mrs. FREED. 1918.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you naturalized and where.

Mrs. FREED. In Los Angeles in 1921.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mrs. FREED. I give service in a small variety store.

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

Mrs. FREED. Grammar school and high school.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other occupations or employments have you had since 1937?

Mrs. FREED. I worked as a saleslady in a bakery.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I worked as a laboratory technician in a lab.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mrs. FREED. 1942 to November 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment since 1944?

Mrs. FREED. I did not have any employment until just recently.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of William Kimple?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I decline to answer. I don't want to test my veracity against statements that were made on the stand by a police informer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me present to you—

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt? Was anything that "police informer" as you call him—anything said by him about you untrue?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer that question. It is the same question put by you instead of Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. JACKSON. Upon what grounds do you refuse to answer?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I don't want to put myself in the position to test my veracity against the informer here. I don't want to go into the expense of trying to prove myself not guilty or, since I feel I am innocent, I don't want to get into the same predicament Owen Lattimore

got in and was just vindicated yesterday, and on that basis I feel I don't have to answer the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the reason you are giving for not answering the question? If so, the committee is not satisfied with the answer.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I certainly will claim the fifth amendment if that is what you want me to say.

Mr. JACKSON. That is a constitutional legal ground for refusing to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You seem to place a great deal of stress upon your unwillingness to testify because of the testimony of Mr. Kimple. I hand you a document, which has been introduced in evidence as Kimple Exhibit No. 13, and I will ask you to state whether or not you, yourself, signed that document?

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And that the signature of Tashia Freed was made by you?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer this question on the first, supported by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will note there is a title under the signature of the name Tashia Freed. It is unit organizer. Were you unit organizer at the time that card was executed?

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer on the same grounds as previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Anne Pollock?

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. The witness' reason that she did not want to test the testimony of Officer Kimple now vanishes into thin air.

Mrs. SPENCER. She claimed the first and the fifth, and those were the grounds we are referring to.

Mr. DOYLE. You may not have been in the hearing room, Madam Attorney, but we do not allow counsel to address the committee. We simply do not have the time nor facility. So please address the committee, if you want, through your witness. I am sorry we cannot hear members of the bar, but we simply do not have time. Our rules clearly so state.

Mr. JACKSON. I wanted the record to be clear as to all of the questions to which declinations have been entered and as much for the witness' protection as for the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. It was just an observation because she answered the previous question. One of the reasons she gave was she did not want to subject herself to a possible charge of perjury in testing the testimony of Officer Kimple, and I said that—

Mr. JACKSON. I thought she followed that with the fifth and first.

Mr. SCHERER. She did, but that reason now vanishes in thin air because we have before us now the documentary evidence and she refuses on the basis of the fifth amendment to tell whether that is her signature and whether she executed the cards, so one of her reasons at least for not answering the previous question as I say does not carry any weight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Anne Pollock known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer this question on the first, supported by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Anne Pollock use the Communist Party name of Anne Burton, to your personal knowledge?

Mrs. FREED. That would be the same question. I will answer it in exactly the same words. I refuse to answer on the first, supported by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write on this card in your own handwriting that the dues of Anne Burton, party name, Anne Pollock, real name, were paid to January 1938?

Mrs. FREED. Mr. Tavenner, I think it is the same question, and we could save a lot of time here if you will know that I am going to claim the privilege on the first and fifth on any questions that you ask me.

Mr. SCHERER. You have made up your mind in advance to claim the first?

Mrs. FREED. No.

Mr. SCHERER. How can you tell whether the question might incriminate you before it is asked?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. You certainly are not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith then, madam.

Mr. DOYLE. That is pretty clear evidence.

Mrs. FREED. If the question is relevant, I will claim the first and fifth, and I see that the questions are following in exactly the same pattern, and on that basis, I—

Mr. SCHERER. Your attorney advised you properly and saved you from the bell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you transfer Anne Pollock from unit J-5 of the Hollywood section of the Communist Party to the 57 assembly branch section of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer on the same grounds. I stand on the first supported by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a sponsor's certificate on behalf of the candidate for partisan office sponsoring Emil Freed for the Communist Party nomination in the office or to the office of Representative in Congress for the 15th District to be voted for at the primary election to be held on the 27th day of August 1940, and I will ask you to look at the second signature appearing in the document. Will you state whether or not the signature appearing there is your signature?

(Document handed to witness.)

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. FREED. I refuse to answer the question on the same grounds, on the first, supported by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Freed Exhibit No. 1" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy in two pages of another sponsor's certificate on behalf of candidate for partisan office in which it is stated:

I, the undersigned, sponsor for Anita Whitney for the Communist Party nomination to the office of member of the United States Senate to be voted for at the primary election to be held on the 27th day of August 1940.

And I will ask you to examine the last signature appearing near the top of page 2 and state whether or not that signature is your signature.

(Document handed to witness.)

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I refuse to answer the question on the first, supported by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and request that it be marked "Freed Exhibit No. 2" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. So received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a third photostatic copy of a sponsor's certificate on behalf of candidate for partisan office, on the second page of which you will see a certification "deputy's affidavit." This affidavit reads as follows:

I, Tashia Freed, solemnly swear that I have been appointed according to the provisions of sections 2610 and 2611 of the elections code as a verification deputy to secure signatures of sponsors in the county of Los Angeles to the nomination paper of Anita Whitney as a candidate for the nomination of the Communist Party for the office of State comptroller, that all of the signatures on this section of the nomination paper were made in my presence and that to the best of my knowledge and belief each signature is a genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be.

(Signed) TASHIA FREED.

Subscribed and sworn to on the 18th day of June 1942.

Will you examine your signature or the signature to the affidavit and state whether or not it is your signature?

(Document handed to witness.)

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. FREED. I decline to answer on the first supported by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Freed Exhibit No. 3" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. It will be received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on the last day indicated in 1942?

Mrs. FREED. I decline to answer on the first supported by the fifth.

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

Mrs. FREED. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

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

Mrs. FREED. I decline on the same grounds.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Witness and Counsel.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Max Appelman.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. APPELMAN. I do.

(Representative Jackson left the hearing room.)

TESTIMONY OF MAX APPELMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
A. L. WIRIN

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

Mr. APPELMAN. Max Appelman.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. WIRIN. I am identified by the name A. L. Wirin, attorney, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Appelman?

Mr. APPELMAN. I was born on January 1, 1910, in White Russia. I was brought here when I was a year old.

Mr. TAVENNER. You now reside in Los Angeles?

Mr. APPELMAN. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Los Angeles?

Mr. APPELMAN. I don't remember whether it was 1934 or 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived here continuously since that time?

Mr. APPELMAN. To the best of my recollection except for the time I was in the armed services I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. What period of time were you in the armed services?

Mr. APPELMAN. I was taken into the Army in February 1942 and was discharged from the Army, I think it was 1945. If you want the exact date, I have it.

Mr. TAVENNER. The exact date is unimportant.

Mr. APPELMAN. It was between 1942, the early part of 1942 and probably the early part of 1945.

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

Mr. APPELMAN. I have a high-school education.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

Mr. APPELMAN. I don't believe I can answer that question about occupation, I don't think that it is the concern of this committee what I do for a living.

Mr. DOYLE. We cannot accept the answer. We believe the question is pertinent and I direct you to answer.

Mr. APPELMAN. I say again I don't intend to discuss how I earn a living for myself and my family with the committee. I have here in my possession a newspaper clipping, Los Angeles Times, with direct quotation from Mr. Doyle. I am telling you why I can't answer that question and I quote:

There is no doubt that these people—
paragraph above refers to Communists—

are now trying to infiltrate political parties, both Republican and Democratic, churches, schools, labor unions, and business firms.

It is obvious from this—

Mr. DOYLE. I stand by that statement. There is ample evidence to the fact. That is a true statement.

Mr. WIRIN. He is stating his reasons.

Mr. DOYLE. I just want to state I stand on—

Mr. APPELMAN. I am not contradicting you. I am quoting you. The scope of this illegal inquiry is so broad that Mr. Doyle has made it very clear to me that I cannot even answer a question regarding my

occupation without fear of possible incrimination. I want to say that I am suspicious of this committee. I think that this committee is out to trap me with some incriminating——

Mr. DOYLE. Witness—

Mr. APPELMAN. My last sentence is my constitutional claim. All right. So it is on this basis that I am compelled to claim the rights guaranteed me in the Constitution and particularly those of the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has your occupation in part included employment by the Communist Party?

Mr. APPELMAN. I have already said that I am not going to discuss this matter with this committee for the grounds I have already stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a document entitled "Two Decades of Progress," and ask you to examine it, particularly the first page. Will you state the caption at the top of the page?

Mr. APPELMAN. I don't think I am required to read any of this document. I decline to do so on the grounds already stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Doesn't it state "Twenty Years of Progress of the Communist Party"?

Mr. APPELMAN. You can read as well as I can, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the fourth or fifth line from the caption and state whether or not there appears there the name of the secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. APPELMAN. I say again you can read just as well as I can. I am not going to read any document which may possibly incriminate me or possibly subject me to unwarranted prosecution. I want to make that very clear.

Mr. SCHERER. Or warranted prosecution?

Mr. APPELMAN. That is what you say, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. DOYLE. On what grounds, Witness?

Mr. APPELMAN. On the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the frontispiece and page 1 of the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Appelman Exhibit No. 1" for identification only.

Mr. MOULDER. Is this witness named as the secretary in the document?

Mr. SCHERER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. DOYLE. The document will be so received and so marked.

Mr. WIRIN. I don't find the word "secretary" on that sheet.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am afraid I am wrong. That is why I want to read it.

Mr. SCHERER (reading):

Twenty Years of Growth and Progress of the Communist Party, USA, Communist Party, Los Angeles County.

It has the hammer and sickle on it.

Pettus Perry, chairman; Paul Cline, secretary; Max Silver, organizational secretary; Mat Pelman, educational director; Al Bryan, legislative director; and Helen Gardner, membership director.

He is educational director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the educational director of the Communist Party of Los Angeles County in September 1939?

Mr. APPELMAN. I wonder if we can't have an understanding that I cannot in good conscience become an informer for this committee

and will not in my own self-interest against possible incrimination and unwarranted prosecution, answer questions concerning the Communist Party or anything even remotely related to it on the grounds previously stated, if that is what you want.

Mr. DOYLE. May this be understood to save your time: Instead of reading a prepared statement, each time, even though it is a brief one—

Mr. WIRIN. He isn't reading a prepared statement each time.

Mr. DOYLE. I saw him. It is in front of him.

Mr. APPELMAN. In order to be sure to give the committee the right answer.

Mr. DOYLE. A constitutional claim honestly made is always the right answer. That is all you need make. It will save your time in reading those statements. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you Kimple Exhibits Nos. 7 and 8 and I will ask you whether or not they were your Communist Party books issued to you on the dates indicated on each.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. APPELMAN. Did you ask me a question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. APPELMAN. Would you repeat the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Read him the question.

(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

Mr. APPELMAN. This question falls in the same province and so I must give the same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time known by the name of Mat Pelman?

Mr. APPELMAN. I give you the same answer, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer for the same reasons?

Mr. APPELMAN. I decline to answer for the reasons I have previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you labor director of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County?

Mr. APPELMAN. I decline to answer for the same reasons.

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

Mr. APPELMAN. I again decline to answer for the same reasons.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. May I make this one observation: If you were active in the Communist Party at any time and you are out of it, why don't you help your Government by helping us to understand how best to meet the problem of the subversive activities, whether it is in the Communist Party or in other elements of our society? I make that suggestion to you. If you are out of the party, no matter if you were in in 1939 when this book was published, if you are out of it and learned things of value to your country, about subversive activities or how the Communist Party here and there, if it did when you were in it, and you are out of it, engages in any way in subversive activities, why don't you give that benefit to your Congress?

I didn't suggest that to get into an argument with you. You are a young man, evidently an important young man, with fine training.

I don't mean to impose on you or put you on the spot, sir. I just want to leave that thought with you.

Thank you, Mr. Wirin and the witness.

Mr. WIRIN. May the record show my good behavior?

Mr. DOYLE. Very good.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Joseph Aidlin.

Mr. WIRIN. May this last contribution go to the Red Cross?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. AIDLIN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH W. AIDLIN

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. You are familiar with the rule of the committee, I assume, that you are entitled to counsel if you desire?

Mr. AIDLIN. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Aidlin?

Mr. AIDLIN. April 28, 1910, in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. AIDLIN. I reside in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of Los Angeles?

Mr. AIDLIN. Since 1920.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. AIDLIN. I am an attorney.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you practiced in the city of Los Angeles?

Mr. AIDLIN. Since 1933, latter part of 1933.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly what your formal educational training has been for your profession?

Mr. AIDLIN. I am a graduate of UCLA and the University of California School of Law.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this witness was subpenad to appear before this committee at the hearing conducted in Los Angeles in September 1951. He was called at that time on the basis of the identification of him as a member of the Communist Party by Harold Ashe, who was the first witness I believe that we heard in the Los Angeles area. It came to the attention of the committee at that time that Mr. Aidlin denied that he was actually a member of the Communist Party and for that reason the staff undertook additional investigation and he was not actually called under his subpoena to appear.

You have heard testimony here today which I assume the witness has also heard, I believe he was here.

Mr. AIDLIN. I did not hear the testimony relating to me but the testimony has been reported to me generally.

Mr. TAVENNER. And having obtained that information the committee desired that he be resubpenaed at this time.

Do you recall the nature of the testimony of Mr. Harold Ashe before this committee?

Mr. AIDLIN. I recall it in a general way; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ashe proceeded to name persons known to him to be members of the Communist Party. He had explained the organization of a professional cell of the Communist Party. My recollection is he stated that you attended meetings of the Communist Party and that you went to the professional cell of the Communist Party.

His wife also testified to the effect that you attended closed Communist Party meetings and I understand you are familiar with the testimony given here today.

Mr. AIDLIN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has made a great deal of effort to determine the character of the professional cells of the Communist Party in Los Angeles, a great deal of emphasis has been placed by the committee upon that type of a Communist Party group. We desire to know whether or not you were a member of such group and if you were, we want you to tell the committee any knowledge you have about its activities and its character and its membership.

Mr. AIDLIN. I want to state candidly to the committee that I have absolutely no recollection of any such group or any such meetings as those mentioned by Mr. Ashe in his testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. You say you have no such recollection?

Mr. AIDLIN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. You don't deny, however, that there were such meetings?

Mr. AIDLIN. Congressman Scherer, this is a problem when we deal with matters that go back many years. I am prepared here to deny that I am or ever have been a member of the Communist Party and I am so denying.

With respect to particular meetings or activities that is a very difficult thing. If I may be permitted, I would like to state to the committee something of my past history, which might give an indication of why there might be persons who might make the statements that they have made.

In my youth—and while I am not an old man now during the last 5 years I feel much older than I used to—I did have political aspirations and I had them as a young idealistic person might have. I attended many meetings. There must have been hundreds and thousands of meetings, literally, and I have always had a feeling and a sense of independence about myself, probably more so than is good for a person, but at the same time that is the way I am. I have never been afraid to meet with anybody whether I agree with him or not, I have never felt that I would be contaminated and I don't think I have been. I cannot in good conscience recall categorically matters that go back many years.

As a matter of fact, I had a very disconcerting experience here just the other day. I met a man at the cigar stand in a building downtown and he didn't even introduce himself to me, he said, "hello, Mr. Aidlin," and began to talk to me about a matter and I didn't recognize the man or the matter and I had apparently handled a matter for him 7 or 8 years ago. Lawyers will appreciate that, I am sure.

If I may, I would like to state further that in the middle thirties the attitude which people had about members of the Communist Party who were self-professed, public members, was quite different. It is

only in retrospect that we see a history unfolding, and I think many, many good people have no fears about meeting, even if there were known members of the Communist Party there, and even if they spoke, and in that way many people became entangled with hazy notions and recollections which in later years are not always accurate.

I might also state that in the testimony of a Mr. Charles Dagget in relation to the Ashe testimony, as I recall reading that testimony about a year or so ago, I think that he stated he attended this very meeting that Mr. Ashe was talking about and I think he said that I was there and I think he also stated that he was not a member of the Communist Party at the time.

Now I don't even recall having known Mr. Dagget until quite a few years after the period referred to. I may have, I don't know, but I don't recall that.

Mr. TAVENNER. The testimony given here today by Mr. William Kimple is that he attended one or two closed party meetings at the address of a place which was occupied by you and your wife whom he knew as Mary Raiden. It is not my purpose to ask you any questions regarding your wife.

Mr. AIDLIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was in the house occupied by you that these meetings occurred, that they were closed Communist Party meetings, and that you were present although he was not clear as to the extent of your participation in the meetings.

Does that refresh your recollection as to your having attended closed Communist Party meetings in that home?

Mr. AIDLIN. Let me say this in all candor, again: I do not have any recollection of any such meetings. I would say that if I had attended any such meetings there must have been non-Communist Party members present because I was not a member. As a matter of fact, I ran for the State legislature from my home, a little place that I first lived in after marriage, and there must have been hundreds of meetings in that place. That was the first baptism I had in running for office and there were people in and out all the time, incidentally, I notice that most candidates today do not make their home their headquarters and I can see why.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the address of the place that you occupied?

Mr. AIDLIN. The place where we originally lived was on Randall Court.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1124?

Mr. AIDLIN. 1124.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ashe testified that that was the premises which he had moved—he testified as follows:

I might add that Joe Aidlin and Mary Raiden later moved into my home which I had at 1124 North Randall Court.

Mr. AIDLIN. After testimony, when I read it in the paper, I endeavored to try to reconstruct. Now I am going to give you the best of my recollection after making a very serious effort to reconstruct it.

Those were the depression days as you will recall, and certain things about that transaction have in a sense certain humorous aspects of the thing have in a sense remained with me.

As I recall, we looked in the newspapers for a place to rent and I think it may have been the Hollywood Citizen News or some papers,

maybe it was only the News or the Citizen, I don't really recall. And he was moving out. I don't believe we ever knew it was his basement, we rented the place from the landlady, I don't remember what the rent was but I am sure it was very low, and as I recall, I think we bought some of his furniture for \$25 or \$35 or something, but this was a renting of a house which happened to have been occupied by Mr. Ashe. I might say that I don't recall having known Mr. Ashe any more than on a very casual basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know Mr. Ashe as organizer for the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. AIDLIN. If he was organizer for the Communist Party at that time I probably would have known that he was, because in those days they were making speeches all over the place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend meetings, that is, meetings in homes or we will say in your home, attended by Mr. Ashe?

Mr. AIDLIN. I don't recall any. Now I might have attended some meetings where Mr. Ashe attended which had to do with some particular issues or some particular campaigns. I was involved in a number of issue campaigns in those days, I believe. There were a lot of things going on. Almost every place you went there were Communist Party officials around and it is very possible that I might have been at some meetings where he might have been, but I don't recall any.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of the existence of a professional group or cell of the Communist Party in 1938 or, say from 1936 to 1939?

Mr. AIDLIN. I have no personal knowledge. I mean I have read the testimony and there is that information out, but I have no personal knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a meeting of a professional group of the Communist Party?

Mr. AIDLIN. None that I know of. None that I can recall at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any Communist Party meeting which was not open to the public?

Mr. AIDLIN. If I did, Mr. Tavenner, I would not have attended considering myself a member of the Communist Party. Now, if I attended or was invited I would not have consciously attended as a member. In other words, the meetings would not have been known to me as being limited solely to members of the Communist Party. I think that one thing is important that we must bear in mind, and that is that what appears to be a very tight group today, according to all the information at hand, was obviously not such a tight group in the thirties and I think that there didn't seem to be the same security programs that seem to exist now, I mean among the Communist Party themselves, you see. And it is very possible, I can't say yes or no, that I might have attended meetings without actually having been a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know William Kimple?

Mr. AIDLIN. I saw the gentleman on the stand. I recall when I saw him on the stand that I had a nodding acquaintance with him as some other name, not that name, I had a nodding acquaintance with the man. I think he has gained a little weight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know him as William Wallace or Bill Wallace?

Mr. AIDLIN. It might have been Bill Wallace.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was his Communist Party name.

Mr. AIDLIN. It might have been that and I don't—

Mr. TAVENNER. You would not likely have known him by his Communist Party name without having attended Communist Party meetings with him, would you?

Mr. AIDLIN. Not necessarily. I might have. I might have known him by that name. I might have been some place where his name was used, where that name was used. I think it is important to bear in mind that these were more open days, you see, and names were of no real—I imagine these people used their names, that is all. He might have been called Wallace by somebody in my presence or something.

Mr. SCHERER. May have, but as far as the testimony I have heard is concerned, they only called them by their Communist Party names in closed Communist Party meetings.

How did you gain that casual acquaintance with Wallace?

Mr. AIDLIN. I attended many meetings, Congressman Scherer, and in many of those meetings there were Communist Party people. Communist Party officials, they were known as Communist Party officials. But these were not meetings which as I now recall were other than issue meetings.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know Wallace as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AIDLIN. If I knew him at all I would have known him as an official or member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all the questions I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Aidlin, I have known you for many years, you have known me for many years, we have both lived in Los Angeles County many years, both members of the bar. I don't remember though the years in which you were a candidate for State assembly.

Mr. AIDLIN. 1938.

Mr. DOYLE. Is that the only race you made for public office?

Mr. AIDLIN. No; I subsequently aspired to run for Congress in 1944, but finally I didn't run and I did run for city council in 1945.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you run for any public office prior to 1938?

Mr. AIDLIN. No, I did not.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't think I have seen you since you have added a mustache to your decorations, so I hardly recognized you.

Mr. AIDLIN. Gray hair, too, Congressman Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. You have said these were issue meetings. I am thinking back to the early days in southern California myself. What years would you say that you attended, if you did, Communist meetings where issues were being discussed?

Mr. AIDLIN. Well, after 1938 when I got the Democratic nomination I became very active in the Democratic county committee. I was defeated by the Republican candidate but I became a member of the county committee by virtue of my nomination as an assembly candidate and from that point on I devoted most of my time to intra-Democratic party matters.

During the period from that epic moment in 1934 to a number of years later, the State was full of different issues, pension movements, labor legislation, things like social security.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't think there is any question about that. I remember those of course, because I lived here, the problems, confusion. But I want to ask you frankly, are you able to help us now for the purpose of our report to Congress, to learn anything about the functioning of the Communist Party during those days about which you may have knowledge or experience. That is our purpose in asking you to come and these other witnesses, hoping that they will contribute to the knowledge of Congress in the field of subversive activity whether it is in the Communist Party or any other group.

Mr. AIDLIN. Well, it occurs to me, Congressman Doyle, that in retrospect the only time when the Communist movement had any influence of any kind was when it identified itself with popular movements and that is of course the key problem in this problem of the Communist movement, because it is extremely difficult to attack a popular movement because of the involvement of an undesirable group in it. That is the problem that Congress always has to face. My own feeling is that it is a foreign philosophy which will never make very much headway, I don't think it really has made any substantial headway and never will make very much headway.

In fact, if it were possible, I don't know whether it is probable, but if it were possible to create a condition where the Communist Party could publicly disclose the true nature of its principles and objectives and brought out into the area of public debate, I think that the decision of the people would be so overwhelming as to be crushing and perhaps that may be the ultimate solution. Because basically as Herbert Hoover put it—I am not a clipper, I don't clip things—but I did, as you get older you get more mellow and—

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't mean to ask you to give us a dissertation.

Mr. AIDLIN. Excuse me.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any knowledge of any Communist function or a functioning in the Los Angeles area since 1938 or 1939?

Mr. AIDLIN. I have no personal knowledge.

Mr. DOYLE. You have never signed any membership application or card or paid any dues or had any one else pay any dues for you?

(The witness shook his head negatively.)

Mr. AIDLIN. I might state that during the course of my activities in the Democratic Party I have very frequently taken positions which were at variance with the official publications of the Communist Party and I am quite sure at times have come in for denunciation.

Mr. DOYLE. How many people as you recall now would have attended the meetings in your home which may have been Communist Party political meetings, at which you were present?

Mr. AIDLIN. I couldn't say except it was a very small place. It was a very small little house.

Mr. DOYLE. Would there have been as many as a dozen?

Mr. AIDLIN. I just, I really couldn't say.

Mr. DOYLE. Any other questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. I would say this: So far as you know, there has never been any record or card issued to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AIDLIN. I can state categorically I have never held any membership card, I have never considered myself a member, as a matter of fact, on a principle basis I could not tolerate anything which has any basis of any kind in violence to accomplish a political objective.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask the witness one more question.

Do you now recall any time or occasion during your political campaigns or speaking efforts on issues—as I remember, I can remember reading about you speaking at different places, I didn't live in Los Angeles then, as you know, I lived in Long Beach most of the time, but I do remember you as a younger lawyer—can you now think of any time when you recall that you were invited by citizens whom you knew to be Communist leaders or who said that they wanted you to come to speak to a Communist Party meeting?

Do you recall any such occasion? If so, when might it have been and where? As I remember, you were one of the younger members of the bar and you were speaking frequently all over on issues.

Mr. AIDLIN. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, can you think of any occasion when you did accept an invitation to speak to a group which frankly said they were Communists or which later you discovered to be a Communist meeting?

Mr. AIDLIN. I couldn't at this moment, it has been quite a number of years and I couldn't really at this moment pinpoint any of these occasions, Congressman Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. May I say, Mr. Aidlin, to you as an American Congressman, you may not think that the Communist situation is very serious, but I want to say to you it is more serious, evidently, than you realize and with your ability and resources I hope you will open your eyes wider than they apparently are on the hazard involved. There is the decision right in the Federal court by a distinguished Federal judge that you know very well, made in this very building on June 4 of this year, in which he in substance relates that the advocacy of the Communist Party in America has never changed from the Marx line which advocated force and violence.

Mr. AIDLIN. I recognize the seriousness of the movement, Congressman Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to urge you with your ability and financial resources and those things to help Congress and your own State to get at it more than you have every before.

Mr. MOULDER. May I express myself along that line, Mr. Chairman. So far as the evidence that has been produced before this committee, I can see nothing that should have any unfavorable reflection upon you. Perhaps it is unfortunate you have been subpoenaed before the committee. I don't think there is any evidence, material evidence, that would indicate that you were a Communist or disloyal American citizen. That is my opinion as one member of the committee, so far as I know.

Mr. AIDLIN. Thank you, Congressman Moulder. I appreciate that very deeply.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any other question?

Thank you, Mr. Aidlin, for coming.

Mr. AIDLIN. I might say, if I may, Congressman Doyle, that I have been treated most courteously by Mr. Tavenner and Mr. Wheeler and by this congressional committee.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, but you were under subpoena. You mean you were treated well even though you were under subpoena?

Mr. AIDLIN. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. You can get your fee here at the clerk's desk.

Mr. AIDLIN. No, thank you. If it may be contributed to the YMCA, I am behind in my contribution. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will stand in recess until 9 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:15 p. m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 9 a. m. the following day, Friday, July 1, 1955.)

×