

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 5

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

SEPTEMBER 20, 21, 24 AND 25, 1951

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



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1951

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania
MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri
CLYDE DOYLE, California
JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois
BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York
DONALD L. JACKSON, California
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED To SIT IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF., To HOLD HEARINGS
UNDER THIS TITLE

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

¹ FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania DONALD L. JACKSON, California
CLYDE DOYLE, California CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*
LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*
JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*
RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

¹ Acting chairman in the absence of Representative John S. Wood.

C O N T E N T S

September 20, 1951:

Testimony of—

	Page
Robert L. Richards.....	1640 ^b
Ann Roth Morgan Richards.....	1650 ^b
Ellenore Abowitz.....	1654 ^b
Marguerite Roberts.....	1666 ^b
Michael Wilson.....	1674 ^b
John Sanford.....	1680 ^b
David Raskin.....	1682 ^b
William Blowitz.....	1696 ^b
Herta Uerkvitz.....	1699 ^b

September 21, 1951:

Testimony of—

Max Howard Schoen.....	1703 ^b
Elizabeth Wilson.....	1716 ^b
Jeff Corey.....	1733 ^b
Mary Virginia Farmer.....	1736 ^b
Louise Rousseau.....	1739 ^b
Dr. Murray Abowitz.....	1742 ^b

September 24, 1951:

Testimony of—

Carl Foreman.....	1753 ^b
Reuben Ship.....	1771 ^b
Bernyce Polifka Fleury.....	1775 ^b
Donald Gordon.....	1785 ^b
Josef Mischel.....	1793 ^b
Lester Koenig.....	1905 ^b

September 25, 1951:

Testimony of—

George Beck.....	1817 ^b
Karl Tunberg.....	1834 ^b
Sidney Buchman.....	1856 ^b

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 5

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:10 a. m. in room 518, Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator; and John W. Carrington, clerk.

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order, please.

Let the record disclose that the entire subcommittee is present.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Who do you have first?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ellenore Abowitz.

Mr. Wood. Mrs. Abowitz.

Mr. KENNY. I am representing Mrs. Abowitz. She doesn't seem to have arrived yet. She will be here shortly, I'm sure.

Mr. Wood. Does it interfere with your program, Mr. Counsel? If so we will take a short recess until she comes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your judgment of the time she will arrive?

Mr. KENNY. I talked to her earlier this morning and she lives quite a distance out and she was on her way down. I expect her any moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. If that is so then, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we wait a few minutes.

Mr. Wood. Very well. The committee will stand in recess for 5 minutes to see if she will arrive in that time, and if not we will proceed with something else.

(A short recess was here taken.)

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the witness has had transportation difficulties and it may be as much as a half hour before she arrives. In light of that I think we may as well proceed with another witness.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. Whom do you call?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robert L. Richards.

Mr. WOOD. Are you Mr. Robert Richards?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Raise your right hand, sir, and be sworn. You do solemnly swear that the evidence you give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT L. RICHARDS, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT KENNY

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat, sir. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am.

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

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, of Los Angeles.

Mr. WOOD. You may proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Robert Richards?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to raise a question. I don't know whether I am being on television here or not, but I see the television cameras here. Are they in operation?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is assumed that they are. I never know when they are and when they are not.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is there any question as to my privilege of being on this television or not?

Mr. TAVENNER. I should think if you have any objection to it, the chairman and the committee will consider your objection and act upon it.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I think I do, if you have no objection to my objection.

Mr. WOOD. That is a qualified objection. If you object—

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I do.

(Discussion off the record among members of the committee.)

Mr. WOOD. It is the decision of the committee that your objections will be respected—

Mr. RICHARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. And you will not appear on any television that is in the room.

Mr. RICHARDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you instruct them that the television be cut off?

Mr. WOOD. The television people are instructed not to televize this witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Richards—

Mr. WALTER. Just a minute, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. WOOD. In view of the fact that television facilities are—may I have attention, please?

Mr. RICHARDS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. WOOD. That the television facilities are permitted in the hearing room through the courtesy of the committee I am sure that it isn't necessary for me to caution them with respect to the directive that has been given now that the witness is not to be shown on television.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hadn't understood, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. This means, then, that my face will not appear on television but my voice will; is that correct?

Mr. WOOD. Your voice will appear whether the television is in here or not.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is true. I understand.

Mr. WOOD. There is no difference in the character of the testimony that you will give here now than it would be if these television cameras were not in the room.

Mr. RICHARDS. I understand perfectly, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, indeed. By all means.

Mr. WOOD. You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state your full name, Mr. Richards.

Mr. RICHARDS. Robert Loring Richards.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I was born in New York City, March 1, 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a writer?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have been a writer since about 1936.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. I attended the Horace Mann School in New York City—high school—and graduated from Harvard College in 1932.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly what your record of employment has been?

Mr. RICHARDS. I worked for Time, Inc., for about 7 years. I was a writer for and subsequently producer of the March of Time radio program. I was an associate producer of the March of Time on the screen. That is, the documentary—the newsreel. I left Time magazine and worked in an advertising agency for about a year, in radio. I came out to Hollywood about the end of 1942, did some radio, joined the merchant marine, subsequently went into motion pictures. I have been employed for about—I am a little vague on dates—about 4 years quite steadily, writing screen plays in the motion-picture industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you state that you came to Hollywood?

Mr. RICHARDS. I think it was the end of 1942. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in 1942 the Communist Party line, as it was recognized in this country, was the establishment of a second front. Of course, anyone had the right to sponsor the establishment of a second front. We are interested now in learning the extent to which the Communist Party line, which had consisted of that principle, was advocated by organizations influenced by the Communist Party. If you have any information on that subject the committee would like to have it.

Mr. RICHARDS. I must—I shall—I will decline to answer that question on the grounds of possible incrimination and claim my privileges under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States to so deny—to so decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, there appeared an article in the September 14, 1942, issue of the Daily Worker to the effect that the League of American Writers was sponsoring the immediate opening of a second front, and I hand you the article in question. It appears from this article that your name was endorsed to this plan as sponsored by the League of American Writers. I am interested only to the extent of your participating in it as a member of the League of American Writers.

Mr. RICHARDS. Your question, then, is—

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether or not you did take part in that publicizing as indicated by the press.

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the November 3, 1947, issue of the Hollywood Reporter, there appears an advertisement contributed by the Actors' Division of the Progressive Citizens of America.

Mr. RICHARDS. I beg your pardon, sir, I did not hear the date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. The date was November 3, 1947.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will hand you the article referred to so that you may have it before you. Now, this advertisement proclaims that the Thomas-Rankin committee must go. Now, I raise no objection to anyone criticizing this committee or its predecessor, but we are anxious to know the extent to which the Communist Party imposes its thought, if any, upon other organizations in opposing the work of this committee or its predecessor, so after having looked at the article will you identify it as an advertisement in which you participated as one of the signers.

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Richards, the committee is in possession of information indicating that you were transferred from the Communist Party—as a member of the Communist Party in the city of New York in 1944 or 1945 to membership in the Communist Party in Hollywood, and at the time you were transferred your book number was 41786. I would like for you to tell the committee whether or not you were transferred as a Communist Party member from New York to this area.

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds that I have previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Carl Winter?

Mr. RICHARDS. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was an individual whose name was mentioned either yesterday or the day before by the name of Harry Appleton, of whom it was said that he was an executive member of the Bay Cities Communist Club of the Los Angeles County Communist Party during the year 1944. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. RICHARDS. I, of course, shall decline to answer this question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting at which he was present?

Mr. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that question, also, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live in 1944?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is a tough one. 1944?

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it at 607 Ocean Front?

Mr. RICHARDS. I believe it was, yes. In Santa Monica, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you renting the property at the time?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether any meetings of the Communist Party were held at 607 Ocean Front while it was being rented by you?

Mr. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of possible self-incrimination, relying upon my privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution to so do.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you named some of your screen plays—

Mr. RICHARDS. No, sir. You never asked me about my screen plays.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not?

Mr. RICHARDS. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think we should know just the general type and character of your work, if you will let the committee have that information, as to the major screen plays with which you have been accredited.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will be glad to. I wrote my first—my first screen credit was a picture called One Sunday Afternoon, for Warner Bros. It was a musical. My next screen credit was a picture called Act of Violence for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. That was about an informer. My next credit was a picture at Universal—

Mr. Wood. Will you pardon me just for a moment at this point.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. Wood. There may be those in the audience who have not been here previously, so I announce again that this committee will not condone or countenance any sort of demonstration, favorable, unfavorable, or otherwise, in this hearing room during the conduct of these hearings. I hope that I won't have to repeat that admonition again.

Mr. RICHARDS. Do you wish me to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would be very glad for you to do so.

Mr. RICHARDS. By a curious coincidence my next screen credit for Universal-International was a picture called Johnny Stoolpigeon. My next credit was, I believe, written in collaboration, a picture called Winchester '73, a western. Let me see, there were others. There was a picture called Air Cadet, there was a picture called Kansas Raiders.

I have worked on several others that I didn't do enough work on to get credit, if you understand what I mean. That is a pretty representative list of my credits.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have been informed in the course of our investigation that virtually all of those who worked as writers were members of the Screen Writers' Guild. I assume the same thing was true in your case?

Mr. RICHARDS. I was a member of the Screen Writers' Guild; yes. I still am, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1949, which was some time after the first hearings before this committee in 1947, I believe there was a contest of special interest in the guild regarding the election of officers. At that time, Albert Maltz, who has been identified a number of times in the course of this investigation by witnesses as having been a member of the Communist Party, was a candidate for membership on the executive board. This was in 1949. Of course, every member had the

right to the free expression of his choice in the election of officers, and I am not attempting to criticize, by inference, you or any other person for exercising that right.

Mr. RICHARDS. Are you asking me, sir, who I voted for in this election?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am going to ask you a somewhat similar question. We are anxious to know whether or not Mr. Albert Maltz was sponsored in that election for that position by a fraction of the Communist Party or by members of the Communist Party who were members of the guild. In that connection we have noted that you have signed a petition nominating Mr. Maltz for that position. With that knowledge, it occurred to us that you could inform us about that.

Mr. RICHARDS. I must decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds that I have previously stated.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, do you have any questions of the witness?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. Richards, are you a member, or were you a member, of the actors' division of the Progressive Citizens of America?

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. WALTER. You are a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I am a member of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. WALTER. Why do you very frankly admit your membership in the Screen Writers' Guild and decline to answer the question of whether or not you are a member of another organization?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am informed, sir, that—

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDS. I am under no compulsion to give my reasons for declining to answer any questions.

Mr. WALTER. I don't know where you got that information, but if your lawyer has given you that information I think you ought to get another lawyer, because you can't decline to answer any question that you just don't feel like answering.

Mr. RICHARDS. I did not say that.

Mr. WALTER. That is exactly what you said.

Mr. KENNY. In justice to myself, Mr. Walter, since my advice has been taken into question, I advised him that no witness who has declined to answer a question is under any compulsion to give his reasons for that declination because the reasons are the same in effect as the question itself, or rather an answer to the question itself. If you do suggest that I was wrong in representing him—

Mr. WALTER. Distinguished counsel from California is well aware of the circuit court decision, in your own circuit, which held that where a witness decided he was not going to answer a question innocent on its face, if in fact that question could not incriminate him, then he, of course, is responsible for the consequences of his failure to answer that instant question.

Mr. KENNY. I am afraid we will bore other people with a discussion, but it goes to reasons.

Mr. WOOD. Let's don't enter into any legal discussions, gentlemen.

Mr. WALTER. I notice on this Hollywood Reporter of November 3, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities was described as the Thomas-Rankin Committee. Now, of course, Mr. Rankin never was in a position where this committee could bear his name, and the fact

that this propaganda sheet—that you will not admit that you had anything to do with—contains the name indicates to me, and I ask you whether or not this is a fact—whether you know anything about it—Mr. Rankin, coming from Mississippi, and with the kind of legislative record, which is a matter of record, which he has, his name wasn't used only for the purpose of trying to inflame minority groups against the activities of the committee directed by the Communists of the United States.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am afraid, sir, that the question might tend to link me to an exhibit which is considered to be subversive.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure linking your name with that of Thomas-Rankin would in no wise incriminate you. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle? Any questions you have?

Mr. DOYLE. You stated, Mr. Richards, that you were and still are a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. RICHARDS. That's right, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Were you ever a member of the board of directors thereof?

Mr. RICHARDS. To the best that I can recall, and I am sure I can recall it, I never held any office in the Screen Writers' Guild. Never. I never stood for election and never was elected.

Mr. DOYLE. You say you never—

Mr. RICHARDS. I just never ran for any office. I am afraid I wasn't a very good guild member. I didn't go to many meetings.

Mr. DOYLE. You attended the meeting—

Mr. RICHARDS. I attended some of the meetings; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What is there, if anything, in your judgment about membership in the Communist Party, if you ever were a member thereof, which might incriminate you if you admitted or stated you were?

Mr. RICHARDS. Is that the question, sir?

Mr. DOYLE. Quite correctly so.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thought you were going to say something further. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know whether or not the Communist Party is listed as a subversive group by the Attorney General or by this committee?

Mr. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever read the statute or the text of the statute under which this committee is functioning here this morning?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not read it, sir, but I have heard it mentioned several times, and I think, in a general way, I am familiar with it.

Mr. DOYLE. What have you heard about it and when and where?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have heard about it here in this committee room.

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, yesterday?

Mr. RICHARDS. I believe it was yesterday. I am not sure. I really don't remember, but I have heard you speak of it, and I have heard you—

Mr. DOYLE. What do you remember me speaking of it?

Mr. RICHARDS. I remember your saying that Congress had empowered this committee to investigate subversive activities. I believe that is approximately the gist of it.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct. Well, now, assuming that you agree with Mr. Webster, that "subversive" indicates uprooting and upturning, complete overthrow and destruction, would you say whether or not you have an opinion, and if so, what is your opinion? Don't you think that is a good definition?

Mr. RICHARDS. This is a question of opinion, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, and I am asking your opinion.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. Well, I will try to give you my opinion as best I can on this rather complex question.

Mr. DOYLE. There is nothing complex about it.

Mr. RICHARDS. To me it seems so.

Mr. DOYLE. It is very simple.

Mr. RICHARDS. To me it seems so. The Congress of the United States has passed that law. It is the law of the land. I will at all times obey the laws of my country, and that is why I am here before this committee. I happen to disagree with that law. Nevertheless, it is under the law certainly your right and duty to conduct this investigation which you are doing. Does that answer the question?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; and I wish to assure you that we are not trying to embarrass anyone that does disagree with the law.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I say something here on this question of opinion?

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. RICHARDS. I may have opinions, some of which may be unpopular, unorthodox, or even totally erroneous. I must strongly maintain, sir, my right to hold these opinions, and I further believe it is the sacred duty of everyone in this room to maintain my right to hold those opinions.

Mr. DOYLE. This committee would not disagree with that patriotic duty of anyone to hold their own opinion; but, in like manner, young man, I believe as a Member of Congress and as a fellow citizen of yours that it is also your duty, as an American citizen, when Congress enunciates a law, to help carry that law into effectiveness; and I just wanted to state to you frankly that when you hide behind the fifth amendment, which you have the right to do under your constitutional rights, you are not cooperating with this committee in trying to put into effect the law, in my judgment. Now, you gave your opinion, I have given you mine. My time is up, and therefore I will yield back to the chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson, I will yield to you. Any questions you may have?

Mr. JACKSON. I think in your opening statement you made mention of or used the word "informer" in several of your answers. What is your definition of "informer"?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Jackson, I merely said in connection with the picture that it was about the informer.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, I might add, the informer in this picture was treated quite sympathetically.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know what an informer is?

Mr. RICHARDS. An informer, I would say, by definition, is a man who gives information.

Mr. JACKSON. An informer, according to the dictionary, is one who gives information with respect to a criminal conspiracy or criminal

activities. That is to say, no one has ever given information regarding the Knights of Columbus, The B'nai B'rith, the Girl Scouts, or the Boy Scouts. Do you believe that in informing on Communists and Communist activities one is giving information with respect to criminal activities?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sorry, sir; I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe the Communist Party to constitute a conspiracy?

Mr. RICHARDS. I must decline to answer that question, sir. I shall decline. I beg your pardon.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you oppose any method of changing the Constitution of the United States except those that are set forth in that Constitution?

Mr. RICHARDS. I most certainly do, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you oppose the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

Mr. RICHARDS. I most certainly do, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you served in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not served in the Armed Forces of the United States; no, sir. I was in the merchant marine.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you serve in the Armed Forces of the United States if, conceivably, such service meant taking arms against the Soviet Union?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would defend my country, sir, in the event of an attack from any source whatever.

Mr. JACKSON. Including the Soviet Union?

Mr. RICHARDS. Including the Soviet Union; yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. You, Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Richards, in reply to a question by my colleague Mr. Doyle, we are greatly concerned about the freedom of opinion of individuals. Now, it is interesting to me to note that persons who are members of the Communist Party are greatly concerned about individual opinions, while those same members are denied, within the party, the expression of those opinions. Now, I have here a document which I have read from many times during the course of this investigation. It is the manual on the organization of the Communist Party which many members have—many former members of the party have—informed the committee has served as more or less of a bible for membership in the party. Now, I would like to read you one paragraph of this manual of the Communist Party concerning the every expression of opinion, and I quote.¹

We cannot imagine a discussion, for example, questioning the correctness of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, or the necessity for the proletarian dictatorship. We do not question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism. We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

Now, that is the end of the quotation. Now, when the party, itself, limits even the discussion which will question the basic principles of the party as mentioned here, to claim that this committee in some way

¹ See appendix printed in a separate volume.

might hamper the expression of an opinion is—it puts the person in a contradictory position. That is no question. It is just a statement which I wish to relate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Counsel, any further questions of the witness?

Mr. TAVERNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. I am not sure I got the full import of the witness' answer to the question as asked him with reference to whether or not he would willingly bear arms on behalf of the Government of the United States in the event of an armed conflict.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I repeat my answer, sir? I beg your pardon.

Mr. WOOD. I am going to ask you a question. I understood you to say that you would do so in the event of an attack on the United States.

Mr. RICHARDS. From any source whatsoever; yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Any source whatsoever. Let me go a little further with it. Suppose such a conflict conceivably was brought about by a declaration of the constituted authorities of America in order to withhold world-wide aggression. Short of an attack, what would be the attitude you would take?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would assume, sir, that the only way that the United States could become involved in war is by a threat, an attack, an aggressive threat against the territories of the United States, and so my answer stands. I don't see—I don't get the distinction. I really don't.

Mr. WOOD. Maybe I can simplify it by asking you this simple question: Do you approve of the present conflict that is being waged in Korea?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is a matter of opinion, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Do you care to express one?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. Yes; I think I had better. This seems to me an extremely difficult—

Mr. WOOD. I would rather you answer the question and then if you desire to make any explanation of your answer, all right.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Wood, this is a matter of opinion. If you don't mind I must answer it in my own way.

Mr. WOOD. Let's have a direct answer first and then you can explain it.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Wood, unless I can answer this question of opinion in my own way I shall not choose to answer it from this forum at all.

Mr. WOOD. In other words, you would not give a simple answer as to whether or not you approve—

Mr. RICHARDS. It is not a question of a simple answer. This is not a simple question. The whole business of the Korean thing is a big question and there is a vast difference of opinion of all kinds on this question.

Mr. WOOD. By that do you mean you approve part of it and disapprove other portions?

Mr. RICHARDS. Do you want a yes or no answer to that? I cannot give you a yes or no answer, sir; I cannot.

Mr. WOOD. I have no objection to you going into a dissertation except in the interest of time. We don't want to furnish a forum here for a stump speech about it. I was simply seeking to ascertain

whether you are in opinion with the United Nations forces in its efforts to suppress Communist aggression in the world. That is a simple question and it ought to have a simple answer.

Mr. RICHARDS. Let me say that I believe that it was an error—an error.

Mr. Wood. That is a simple answer.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. I think that this opinion is shared by a great many people. I am heartily in favor, I hope, that this conflict will be settled under the present peace negotiations.

Mr. Wood. We all devoutly hope that, sir.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I am sure we do.

Mr. Wood. I am not sure that I understood what you meant when you said that it was an error. I assume that you meant it was an error on the part of the United Nations forces.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; I think it was. I think there is still room for dissenting opinion in this country, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that one is subversive because one holds a dissenting opinion. I think it is our right to hold a dissenting opinion.

Mr. Wood. That is true, because there are a lot of people in America who have some misgivings on the subject.

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes, there are, and I am among them. I think it is a tragic thing. I feel that the sooner it is over the better. I sincerely trust that it will lead to nothing further. I cannot imagine anything more calamitous for not only this country or for the entire human race than the extension of this conflict.

Mr. Wood. I think Mr. Jackson has another question he would like to ask.

Mr. RICHARDS. I don't want to make speeches.

Mr. JACKSON. Has any effort been made by counsel or by this committee to alter your opinions or to stifle your opinions or change them?

Mr. RICHARDS. No, sir; no effort has been made that I can see here.

Mr. JACKSON. Have your constitutional rights been observed?

Mr. RICHARDS. My constitutional rights have been observed.

Mr. JACKSON. Nothing further.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter, do you have additional questions?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; just one short question. Do you contend that the Communist Party is dedicated to defend the Soviet Union?

Mr. RICHARDS. I shall decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. POTTER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Counsel, do you have additional questions for the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. Wood. Do you know of any reason why the witness should not be excused from further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. It is so ordered.

Whom do you have next, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ellenore Abowitz.

Mr. Wood. Has Mrs. Abowitz come in yet?

Mr. KENNY. Apparently not yet. She lives way out in West Los Angeles and she said 45 minutes. I suppose almost momentarily she will arrive.

Mr. WOOD. Is there another witness that you can use at the moment, or would you—

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ann Roth Morgan Richards.

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Richards, will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? You do solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I do, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat, please.

TESTIMONY OF ANN ROTH MORGAN RICHARDS, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY

Mrs. RICHARDS. I am not very photogenic and I don't want television, either.

Mr. WOOD. You do not want television?

First I will ask you if you are represented here by counsel.

Mrs. RICHARDS. I am, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Richards, do you object to the still photographs here before you begin your testimony?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Not before, but not during, because it blinds you.

Mr. WOOD. Then I will have to ask the photographers to take what pictures they desire now.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Richards has indicated a disinclination to be televised in the giving of her testimony so I issue the same instruction and direction to the operators of the television cameras that I did a moment ago, and that is that she is not to appear on the television screen at any time during the progress of the testimony.

You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Ann Roth Richards, also known as Ann Roth Morgan. Roth is my —

Mr. WOOD. I don't believe the witness was interrogated as to whether or not she has counsel.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mr. KENNY. Yes. The lady is represented by Robert W. Kenny, of Los Angeles.

Mr. WOOD. You have the right, Mrs. Richards, at any time during the progress of your interrogation to confer with your counsel as fully as you desire and to obtain from him any advice or information that you may seek or be in need of. And, of course, your counsel, Mr. Kenny, having been before this committee many times previously, is aware of his privileges in connection with representing you here.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Thank you very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside, Mrs. Richards?

Mrs. RICHARDS. In Sherman Oaks.

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Oh, about 25 years now, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time where did you reside?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I was born in Minneapolis, Minn., and lived there until I came to California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever reside in the city of New York?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I spent 8 months there, I believe, during 1936 and 1937, and I have made one visit there since. I have never lived there permanently.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would raise your voice a little bit more. It is very difficult for us to hear you over here. I understood that.

Mrs. RICHARDS. I don't realize because I couldn't see that you had to see my face. I thought you heard me through the mike.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will just speak as if you were speaking to me, we can all hear.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Thank you. I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation, Mrs. Richards?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I am a housewife, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any profession or occupation other than that of being a housewife?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I, prior to my marriage, worked as an administrative secretary for several organizations for many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that? When were you married?

Mrs. RICHARDS. 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your marriage what organizations did you serve in a secretarial capacity for?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that, Mr. Tavenner, for fear of incrimination, and I invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed at any time by the Screen Writers' Guild in a secretarial capacity?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that on the same grounds, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to state that you consider that employment by the Screen Writers' Guild constituted a type of employment that might subject you to criminal prosecution if you divulged that fact?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that on the same grounds, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have here before me a pamphlet, a 1938 pamphlet, entitled "Who's Who In Defense Of Democracy."

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On page 40 of this pamphlet there appears the names of the officers of the several New York chapters. When I say "chapters," I mean chapters of the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, which was an organization. The name of Ann Roth appears as chairman of the Benson Hurst chapter in Brooklyn. Will you examine page 40 of this pamphlet and state whether or not you were the chairman of that organization?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that on previous grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of the testimony of Mr. Martin Berkeley, reference was made to Ann Roth Morgan as being a person known to him to be a member of the Communist Party here in Los Angeles. If you were such a member I would like to ask you questions relating to such information as you may have, or within your knowledge, regarding the activities of the party here and the extent

of its infiltration here. Was his testimony, in which he named you as a member of the Communist Party, true or false?

Mrs. RICHARDS. I decline to answer that on previous grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name is Ann Roth Morgan?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Well, I like to think of myself as Ann Roth Richards. Roth is my maiden name. Morgan was the name of a previous husband who is dead. So I really am Ann Roth Richards.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you have been known as Ann Roth Morgan, also, of course?

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. Until I married Mr. Richards.

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

Mr. WOOD. Might I inquire the approximate date? I believe you have given the date of your marriage but I don't think you designated which one, the first one or the second one. What was the date of your marriage to Mr. Richards?

Mrs. RICHARDS. December 25, 1949.

Mr. WOOD. I yield to Mr. Walter for any questions he may have.

Mr. WALTER. Mrs. Richards, the Screen Writers' Guild has never been designated as a subversive organization by the Attorney General of the United States, by this committee, or any other organization, so far as I know. That being the fact, why do you decline, or did you decline, to answer the question as to whether or not you were employed by that organization?

Mrs. RICHARDS (after conferring with her counsel). I decline to answer that question, Mr. Walter, on the same grounds.

Mr. WALTER. On the grounds it might incriminate you to answer the question I have just propounded?

Mrs. RICHARDS. On the previously stated grounds and under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Then you consider—

Mr. WOOD. Please answer a little louder so I can hear you.

Mr. WALTER. I can understand her.

Then you are of the opinion that the fifth amendment permits people to select whatever questions they feel like refusing to answer; is that it?

Mrs. RICHARDS. That is a legal question, Mr. Walter, and I prefer you discussed it with my legal counsel. I refuse to get into any legal discussions.

Mr. WOOD. You have the privilege of discussing it with your counsel.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Did you ask a question? I didn't think you asked a question; I thought you asked for an opinion. If it is a legal opinion I will consult with my counsel, but I would have to give it to you second-handed.

Mr. WALTER. No further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. It may not have been plain from her testimony as to whether or not she is the wife of Mr. Robert Richards who just preceded her on the witness stand.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Yes. I am very proud to say so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. That's all.

Mr. WOOD. Any reason why the witness shouldn't be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered.

Mrs. RICHARDS. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Kenny, has your witness arrived?

Mr. KENNY. The only thing I can do is telephone again, or perhaps by the time you have another witness she should be here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I will call another witness. In the meantime, Mr. Kenny, would you mind checking on the progress she is making?

Mr. KENNY. Assuming that the next witness is not also a client of mine.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to give you time now to check up on the itinerary.

Mr. WOOD. If you are going to do so we are going to have a break in the hearings anyway, so what about taking 15 or 20 minutes recess.

We will stand in recess for 20 minutes. (A recess was here taken.)

Mr. WOOD. Let the committee be in order. Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand Mrs. Abowitz is here now.

Mr. WOOD. Are you Mrs. Abowitz?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Yes, I am, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. Hold up your right hand, please, ma'am, and be sworn. You do solemnly swear the evidence you give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel, Mrs. Abowitz?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. KENNY. Yes; I am Robert W. Kenny of Los Angeles.

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Abowitz, be seated, and I would like to inform you that under the rules of this committee of long standing you have the right to confer with your counsel at any time during the progress of your interrogation and obtain any advice or suggestions which you find yourself in need of.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Counsel having been before this committee on frequent occasions is familiar, of course, with his rights under the rules of the committee.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Does one speak into any special microphone here?

Mr. WOOD. I can't hear you.

Mr. KENNY. I tell you, just speak at Mr. Tavenner over there and everybody will hear you and the mechanics will be taken care of.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you can speak so I can hear you they will all hear you.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, I can hear you, Mr. Tavenner. I first want to say that I am very sorry to have inconvenienced all of you gentlemen this morning. However, television is a very fine medium. At least five people called me up because they were watching the session here, and a neighbor called me up and said, "Ellenore, you better get down there immediately. You are going to be arrested." So I told her

my problem, and she offered to drive me down the hill. I live on a very high hill, and it is 3 miles from the closest public transportation, so I wish to thank the television station, and I am sorry if I have inconvenienced any of you.

**TESTIMONY OF ELLENORE ABOWITZ, ACCOMPANIED BY HER
COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY**

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

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Ellenore Abowitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell both names?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. E-l-l-e-n-o-r-e A-b-o-w-i-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mrs. Abowitz?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I was born in Boston, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you followed a profession?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I beg your pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you followed a profession?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I don't think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you occupied a position of employment of any kind?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, I have had—frankly, I haven't had very much gainful employment, and when you ask me about employment, I don't know exactly what you mean. The first job I had was when I got out of Long Beach Polytechnic High School; for 2 hours I was once working in a dime store and I was fired because I couldn't make any change. That was during the depression, and jobs were hard to get, so I don't remember at this point the next time that I had a paid job.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if your positions of employment have been few, you should not have any difficulty describing them to us.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, perhaps if there is something you are particularly interested in, Mr. Tavenner, I could be helpful.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am interested in general background information relating to all the witnesses who appear before our committee in order that the committee may properly understand and appreciate and evaluate the testimony of the witness.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, perhaps I better tell you about my education, then.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. I was coming to that, but we will take that first, if you like.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Fine. It is very short. I went to grammar high school at the Marengo Grammer School in Alhambra, Calif., and I went to the Franklin Junior High School in Long Beach, Calif. I went to Polytechnic High School in Long Beach, and I went to what is now the Long Beach State College, and that is the extent of my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now if you will return to the question of your employment.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I think that I was employed for about a year by the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I believe it was between 1939 and 1940—I think. I'm not very good at dates.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had employment since that time, that is paid employment?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. May I consult with my counsel, please?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, you may.

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with her counsel). Yes, I have had paid employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry, I couldn't hear you.

Mr. ABOWITZ. I said, yes, I have had paid employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did that consist of?

I mean by that, how were you employed?

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with counsel). I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but may I consult with counsel?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. You have that privilege any time you desire.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I don't like to delay this.

Mr. WOOD. That's all right.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will be patient.

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with her counsel). I am sorry. Will you repeat the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was: What other employment have you had since the time you were employed by the WPA, and which I think you said was about 1938 or 1939?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I am sorry, I am getting a bit rattled here.

Mr. TAVENNER. It seems to me it is a very simple question.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Perhaps it is simple to you, Mr. Tavenner, but it isn't to me.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it the question or the answer that is complicated? If it is the question I will try to ask it in another way.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I wish you would.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position of employment have you had in the past 5 years? What positions, if any?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. What year would 5 years be, 1945?

Mr. TAVENNER. If it is a question of time then I think I will have to return to my former question and just ask you, What employment have you had since 1939?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. (after conferring with counsel). I think that at some time since that time I have been a secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. A secretary employed by whom?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Abowitz, the committee has information that you were at one time a witness before the California Committee on Un-American Activities—that is what is known as the Tenney Committee—and that it appears from page 294 of the records of that committee that you were questioned as to whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party and that you replied that you had not been. Am I correct in that?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I don't remember, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not remember what your answer was?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. May I consult counsel, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with her counsel). May I see the transcript, please, if you have one?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will try to look it up. While we are looking for it may I ask you if you recall having appeared as a witness before the committee?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Yes, I do recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that in 1947?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. I refer to page 294 of the 1947 report, which is known as the third report of the committee, where there appears this question by Mr. Combs:

Q. Mrs. Abowitz, are you a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, I am not.

Q. Did you affiliate with it?

A. No.

If you would like to examine the record to refresh your recollection about it I will be very glad to hand it to you.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. (after conferring with her counsel). It says that in the book, Mr. Tavenner, so I might have said that.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is in the book just exactly as I read it, is it?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Oh, I had no doubts about your reading it, no.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't get the answer to the question as to whether or not she gave that testimony before the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. She really hasn't stated yet. She stated it was in the book.

Mr. WOOD. Was that your testimony before the committee?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. It might have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any doubt in your mind about that?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I don't know. I can't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does not the printed record made in 1947 of your appearance before the committee refresh your recollection as to your appearance there and your testimony?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Frankly, Mr. Tavenner, I am not even sure about the year, and I am not even sure that it was 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the matter of whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party is a matter which one would not ordinarily forget, it being questioned before an investigating committee. It is a little hard for me to understand how you could possibly not remember having been asked the question of whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party, particularly after having been shown the record of it.

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with her counsel). I don't want to vouch for the transcript, Mr. Tavenner. That is one of my problems, incidentally.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking you to vouch for it. I am asking you if you do not recall having been asked the question of whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party and that you answered, "No." I have merely given you the record to help you to refresh your recollection.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, I want to say again, if I may, that I am not—I am neither vouching for the transcript nor for the record in that book. Strange things have happened—I think that strange things could happen in those particular transcripts and that particular book—

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Abowitz, the question that is asked you now, irrespective of what is in the book, is: Did you appear before that committee and give the testimony that you have been asked about?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Having read what is supposed to be the transcript in the book which Mr. Tavenner had sent over here, I would say that probably I might have answered that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any uncertainty whatever in your mind about that?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. It has been a long time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh, 4 years is not very long.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Four years?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, 1947.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, I am not sure, Mr. Tavenner, that it was 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, whether 1946, 1947, or 1948, it is an insignificant matter as compared with the question of whether or not you were asked a question of that character and that you gave a categorical answer. Now, I am asking you to tell the members of this committee whether or not you were asked that question and whether or not you answered it.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You can't remember?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I beg your pardon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall—

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Tavenner, I'm sorry. I don't want to be a recalcitrant witness, and I don't want to take up too much time, but I don't find myself here feeling very comfortable, and I think you can understand that, and if I have an inclination to get a bit rattled, please forgive me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; and for that reason I do not want to hurry you. I want you to have every opportunity to recall this matter, because it is important.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. And consequently, I will have to ask your indulgence and discuss this matter with my counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest that you may feel perfectly at ease. If you need time to consider, if you need time to refresh your recollection, we are happy to have you have that time.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Thank you.

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. Wood. Are you prepared now to give an answer?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I think so.

Mr. Wood. All right.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I remember substantially giving that testimony, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you very much. Now, do you recall also that it was suggested at that hearing that you were known in the Communist Party by a name other than your full name?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I think you have misunderstood me. I haven't asked you what your Communist Party name was. I asked you if you recall whether or not you were asked a question during that hearing regarding the use by you of a Communist Party name, other than your name.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, I will have to—rather, I desire to claim my privilege.

Mr. Wood. Well, do you?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I beg your pardon?

Mr. Wood. Do you claim your privilege?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Will you excuse me, please? I'm sorry.

Mr. Wood. You say you desire to do it. The question is whether or not you do claim your privilege.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Will you excuse me, please, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

(The witness confers with counsel.)

Mrs. ABOWITZ. May I see the transcript, please, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean in order to refresh your recollection?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Tavenner, as I recall, when I was on the witness stand before the so-called Tenney committee, I believe I was there for a long time. Mr. Tenney and I got into a slight ruckus, and this went on for several hours. I was also quite excited at the time, and if you—you can't possibly think that testimony covering several hours is fresh in my mind at this point. Frankly, I don't have too clear a recollection of what the questions and answers were, because the whole thing developed into a rather personal feud between Mr. Tenney and me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, then, let me refresh your recollection from the record. The record of this hearing, the same hearing, at page 295, which is the page just following that which you saw before, there appears this:

Q. Is it a fact or is it not that your Communist Party name was Margaret Petros, P-e-t-t-o-s?—A. I am sorry, the name is unfamiliar to me.

Q. That is not a fact, then?—A. I say, the name is not familiar to me.

Q. Yes; but I have to get a categorical answer into the record, either affirmative or negative.—A. Oh, no.

Will you hand the record to the witness that she may examine what I have read, and I will ask you now, after having heard what I read to you and after seeing it in the record, yourself, whether or not that refreshes your recollection.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

(Document was handed to witness.)

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I'm sorry, Mr. Tavenner, and I want to say again that I don't want to be recalcitrant and I don't want to draw this thing out, but I frankly don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you examine that page at the time I handed you the record the first time?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Oh—

Mr. TAVENNER. And point out the reference that I have just made to you?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. No; I didn't. I am a—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, aside from that, does not the examination of that record and my having read it to you refresh your recollection about the question concerning your Communist Party name?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. It is in the book, Mr. Tavenner. I don't know. It might have—it possibly did happen. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't know?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if it was correctly transcribed—that is, the question and the answer—was your answer correct and truthful?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the privilege granted me under the fifth amendment and decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were asked the question as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party and you gave the answer, "No; I am not," were you telling the truth?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is the answer?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment and refuse to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were asked the question, "Did you affiliate with the Communist Party?" and the reply is alleged to have been made, "No," if that reply was made, was it truthful?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. The same question, same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee, Mrs. Abowitz, is in possession of information that at a meeting of the Los Angeles County Communist Party Committee on October 26, 1945, there were various commissions appointed of the party. That is, commissions to represent the Los Angeles County Communist Party in various activities, and one of such commissions was that known as the political relations commission. The committee is in possession of information that Charles Gladstone, at that time a prominent labor official in the International Ladies' Garment Workers, was a member of that commission, and Philip M. Connelly, at that time executive secretary of the Los Angeles CIO Council but who left that office and then became editor of the Daily People's World, and Dorothy R. Healey, who was known as organizational secretary of the Los Angeles County Communist Party, a person by the name of William O'Neal, who had been a prominent leader in the Communist Party, having occupied a position on State committee of the Communist Party, and Nemmy Sparks, who at the time was chairman of the Los Angeles County Communist Party, were members, and that you were also a member of that commission.

It would be extremely helpful to this committee, if you were a member of that commission, that you advise the committee regarding the part it played in the infiltration of the motion-picture industry in Hollywood—

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Are you—

Mr. TAVENNER. So I will ask you first whether or not you were a member of that commission.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer, Mr. Chairman, on the ground that the answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were meetings of the political relations commission of the Communist Party held in your home?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Abowitz, there has been testimony taken in the executive session before this committee, the testimony of Dr. Mendell Morton Krieger, in which he makes a reference to your alleged membership in the Communist Party, and I want to read that portion of it to you and obtain from you a statement as to whether or not it is true or false, or to have you make any explanation that you desire to make of it. These questions and answers were made and given in referring to Communist Party meetings and these questions were asked:

How many individuals were in attendance at these meetings?

Dr. KRIEGER. Offhand, it is hard for me to honestly answer you.

This question was asked:

Where did these meetings take place, do you recall?

Dr. KRIEGER. Various houses.

Do you recall the names of any of the people who owned the houses?

Dr. KRIEGER. I recall one whose house we met at a few times and then there were a couple of others and I very honestly cannot recall their names at the present time. They didn't strike me as anything outstanding and I can't remember their names.

What is the name of the one individual you do remember?

Dr. KRIEGER. It was a physician by the name of Murray Abowitz.

Was his wife Ellenore present?

Dr. KRIEGER. That's correct..

You knew both Ellenore Abowitz and Murray Abowitz as members of the Communist Party?

Dr. KRIEGER. I did.

Do you recall who was chairman of this cell?

Dr. KRIEGER. At one time Ellenore Abowitz was.

Is that testimony true or is it false?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the year 1945—I mean to say in the year of 1944 or 1945, did you have any official position in a political party?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. (after conferring with her counsel). Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In permitting that answer to stand, I do not want to leave the inference that I consider the Communist Party a political party. I was not addressing my attention to that and possibly my question was misleading to you, so I will put my question in another way. I will put it more direct so that there can be no misunderstanding of it:

Were you a member of the California State Central Committee of the Democratic Party?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. May I consult counsel, please?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with her counsel). The difficulty that I am having here seems to be a good example of what this kind of investigation leads to, that I am puzzled about answering a question, the answer to which is a matter of public record. I think—

Mr. TAVENNER. Maybe I can help you with that, if you will permit. It isn't my purpose to criticize your membership in any political party, but this committee will be interested in knowing whether or not while serving in such a capacity the influence of the Communist Party was brought to bear upon it and how it was done, if such be the fact.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Tavenner, I don't know that that is a question at this point. I was about to say, I am frankly puzzled, but I really don't think I am. I have been sitting here for a few days and I have noticed a strange sort of thing developing here, and it would seem to me that the Democratic members of this committee would see that this is really a way of finally deciding that the Democratic State Central Committee of the State of California could be a most bad influence.

Mr. Wood. Let me at this point interpose this observation, that this is not a political committee. There are no politics in this committee and I hope that there won't ever be. With that information, I do hope that you will spare us any lecture of your views on what the duties of the members of the committee are, because I think they are

all cognizant of them thoroughly. You were asked one simple question here and that is the question of your official connection with a certain committee that has been designated. Will you answer that question or not?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Are you asking me the question now?

Mr. Wood. Yes, I am asking you if you will answer the question that counsel has propounded to you.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Well, he answered one question and then he said he was going to clarify it or something, and he said something else.

Will you please ask me the question again?

Mr. Wood. I think I can phrase it for you and couch it in the same language he did, and that is whether or not you were a member, and if so, in what position, of the California State Central Committee of the Democratic Party at the time indicated in the question.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. The secretary of State publishes a list every 2 years of the members of the State central committee.

Mr. Wood. We are not concerned about that. We are asking you the direct question whether or not you were.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I intend to answer the question, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. How's that?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I intend to answer the question, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Let's do it without comment. Would you or not?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. It is a matter of public record that I was a member, for a long time, of the State Democratic Central Committee.

Mr. Wood. At the time indicated in the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1944 or 1945.

Mr. Wood. 1944 or 1945?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I believe so.

Mr. Wood. Is that your best recollection on the subject?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the same time did you hold any position of employment?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a secretary for the attorney general of the State of California at that time?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. May I consult counsel, please?

Mr. Wood. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. ABOWITZ (after conferring with her counsel). No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a secretary in the attorney general's office of the State of California at any time?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed by the attorney general of the State of California at any time?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I beg your pardon? I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. I say, were you employed by the attorney general of the State of California at any time?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know who the attorney general was for the year 1944?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. 1944? It was Robert W. Kenny, my counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me; I didn't hear you.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I think it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't hear you.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Am I not speaking loudly enough?

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't hear you. Maybe it was my own fault.

Mrs. ABOWITZ. The attorney general in 1944, I am quite sure, was Robert W. Kenny, a Democrat, who is presently sitting at my left. He is my counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you served as a member of the California State Central Committee of the Democratic Party were any efforts made by the leadership of the Communist Party to influence your action in obtaining positions of appointment for people, or in any other way to influence the course of action of the committee?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on previously stated grounds. This is really—I will withdraw that.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You have indicated—

Mr. KENNY. May I say something? I received a note, I don't know who from in the audience, and it says, "From telev viewers—"

Mr. WOOD. Let me see the note, please.

Mr. KENNY. Yes. It shows the problem of counsel and the witness.

Mr. WOOD. In that circumstance I think counsel understands what precaution he should take about it.

Mr. KENNY. Yes; I understand. But it is unfortunate that the privity of consultation between attorney and client gets over the network.

Mr. WOOD. I agree with you partly about it.

Mr. KENNY. It may be due to my resonant voice. I will try to do the—

Mr. WOOD. I know of no way the committee can control it. It is a matter that counsel and his client can control, if they decide to do so.

Mr. KENNY. We may have to consult either further away from the microphones or—I hate to give free legal advice over the air. I think it might violate a canon of ethics of the bar association.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure you wouldn't object to having people hear your advice.

Mr. KENNY. Not at all. Not at standard rates for lawyers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you ready, Mr. Chairman, to resume?

Mr. WOOD. Proceed; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having consulted John Howard Lawson regarding a suggested change in the bylaws of the constitution for the establishment of new bylaws and constitution for the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer that question on previously stated grounds.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an active member in the work of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. That organization, I gather from the last couple of days, is now an organization which is considered subversive by this committee. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been connected in your various activities with the People's Educational Center?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is another organization which I would like to ask you some questions about, one which we have observed has been

very much in public view here in the last few days. It is the Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. I have before me a letter which someone has sent in to the committee on the letterhead of that organization, signed by the executive director, Sarajo Lord, addressed to the doctors in the community. Do you know anything about the formulation and distribution of that letter among the members of the medical profession?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Sarajo Lord?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think we should introduce this letter in evidence. It is a letter from this presently existing chapter addressed to the doctors of the community, highly criticizing this committee, urging the members of the medical profession to follow closely the proceedings of the committee so that they can see for themselves its un-American, antidemocratic conduct, and in which it urges the members of the medical profession to write their protests to the chairman of this committee and to Representatives Jackson and Doyle who are the California Congressmen on this committee, and also to request financial and moral support in the fight to defend these men and women, and in so doing to protect rights of all.

Mr. WOOD. I will permit its inclusion in the record. However, in that connection, I think it is appropriate to state that so far as the chairman has been advised up to this moment, no letter has been received by this committee from any doctor endorsing the sentiments set forth in that communication but, on the contrary, scores of letters and communications have been received by the committee from members of the medical profession in this vicinity denouncing the letter and advising the committee of their wholehearted support of this investigation. I think it is fair to the medical profession, generally, in this locality that the record disclose that fact.

(The instrument in question was received by the chairman as Ellenore Abowitz' exhibit 1, and is as follows:)¹

DEAR DOCTOR: The House Committee on Un-American Activities is coming to Los Angeles on September 17. Ordinarily, such an event would not bring forth a letter to you. However, in this instance, we feel you will be concerned, because the committee has subpoenaed a large number of professional people of this city, including writers, actors, physicians, dentists, as well as others.

This House committee has an infamous record. Its first chairman was the notorious Martin Dies, who initiated this committee's partisan-political smear technique. Its next chairman, J. Parnell Thomas, recently served a prison sentence for misuse of Government funds. The present chairman, Congressman Wood, reveals his contempt of Americanism with the observation that the threats and intimidations of the Ku Klux Klan are an old American custom.

The committee, at the cost of over \$1,000,000 to the American taxpayer, has concerned itself almost exclusively with intimidating, smearing by innuendo, and depriving of their livelihoods liberal-minded people whose views run counter to those of the committee. At no time has the professional competence and integrity of the subpoenaed people been questioned.

This committee is not an impartial investigating body. It has prejudged ideas, organizations, and people, as shown by its listing as subversive over 200 publications, and over 600 organizations without proper investigation or hearing.

The committee has spent 4 years investigating Hollywood. As a result, many fine people have lost their jobs for refusal to cooperate in what they consider to be the destruction of our democratic rights. It is common knowledge that these actions have led to a deterioration of motion-picture content. Fear pervades

¹ Retained in committee files.

the entire industry—fear of acting in, or writing, or producing, or directing anything that in the remotest way might be considered “subversive” by this committee.

In conducting its “investigations” this committee has consistently violated the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution. These amendments guarantee not only the right to speak, write, and think freely, but also the right to remain silent about one's beliefs. The fifth amendment, which provides that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself, is fundamental to our democracy. It was intended to protect the individual from being forced by the Government to reveal his political or religious views, and thus subject himself to persecution and prosecution, as indulged in by this committee.

Any person who does not insist on this right before the committee would actually be helping to open the way for political and religious persecutions and thus destroy the foundations of democracy.

We urge you, therefore, to follow closely the proceedings of this committee when it comes here, so that you may see for yourself its un-American, anti-democratic conduct. We urge you to write your protests to the chairman, Representative Wood, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and to Representatives Jackson and Doyle who are the California Congressmen on this committee. We welcome your financial and moral support in the fight to defend these men and women, and in so doing, to protect the rights of all.

Sincerely yours,

Executive Director—Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that here is a letter which we have not had an opportunity to bring to your attention, which is of an official character from the medical profession, which I would like to read into the record.

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I am familiar with it, but I will permit you to read it into the record, if you desire.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is a letter from J. M. de los Reyes, M. D., chairman, public relations, Los Angeles County Medical Association, and it reads as follows:

It has been alleged by the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council that a facet of the Communist investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities constitutes an attack against the medical profession. The Los Angeles County Medical Association, representing nearly 5,000 doctors of medicine which constitutes the majority of the doctors of medicine in the county of Los Angeles, welcomes any investigation of communism or Communist-front activities regardless of where they exist, and do not feel that this or similar investigations are now and can conceivably become an attack in any way upon the medical profession. The American Medical Association, the California Medical Association, and the Los Angeles County Medical Association, by their actions and loyalty oaths, have shown unequivocally their support of the American way of life.

This letter is signed at the bottom of it:

Approved, Paul D. Foster, secretary-treasurer, Los Angeles County Medical Association.

Now, Mrs. Abowitz, at the time of the consideration of the sending of the letter with which the medical profession was circularized, information has come to the attention of the committee that a question arose within that organization—that is, the Southern California Chapter of National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions at a meeting on August 23, 1951, as to whether that letter should be signed personally by Dr. Abowitz, Dr. Bigelman, Dr. Schoen, S-c-h-o-e-n, and that you charged Dr. Schoen with deviating from the policy of the organization with reference to the signing of that document by the three doctors. Is that correct?

Mrs. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is all I desire to ask the witness.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, I yield to you for any questions you have.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I don't think I have anything further.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any reason why this witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered, and the committee will stand in recess for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 12:30 p. m. a recess was taken in the above hearings until the hour of 1:45 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 1:50 p. m. of the same day, Thursday, September 20, 1951, at the same place, the same parties being present, the hearings were resumed.)

Mr. WOOD. Let us have order, please, and let the record disclose that the full subcommittee is present.

Are you ready to proceed, Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Whom will you call?

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Marguerite Roberts.

Mr. COHN. May I respectfully request, Mr. Chairman, that there be no television, in accordance with the practice that has been followed this morning?

Mr. WOOD. Who are you, please?

Mr. COHN. I am her counsel.

Mr. WOOD. I would rather have the witness make her own request, if she will come forward.

Mr. COHN. Thank you. Will you come forward?

Mr. WOOD. Will you be sworn, please? Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Miss ROBERTS. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat. Do you object to testifying before television?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes; I do.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. Your wishes will be respected. Have a seat. The same injunction that has been invoked with respect to other witnesses who have objected is invoked here. Are you represented by counsel at this hearing?

Miss ROBERTS. I am.

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

Mr. COHN. Sidney Cohn, New York State.

Mr. WOOD. Do you object to being photographed?

Miss ROBERTS. I would rather not, but—

Mr. WOOD. If you object I will ask the photographers to get their picture immediately and desist.

Mr. TAVENNER (addressing photographers). Whatever pictures you desire to take, please take them.

Are you ready, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Wood. Yes. Proceed now, and in the light of the wishes of the witness I will have to ask the photographers to refrain now from taking pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand there is some difficulty about the amplifying system. The press cannot hear.

Mr. COHN. Will you tell us what you would like, Mr. Tavenner, and we will try to accommodate you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Miss ROBERTS. I will try to speak loudly.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you speak as though you are speaking to me without the aid of the apparatus before you—

Miss ROBERTS. All right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe it will be all right.

TESTIMONY OF MARGUERITE ROBERTS, ACCCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, SIDNEY COHN

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what is your full name, please?

Miss ROBERTS. My name is Marguerite Sanford. My professional name is Marguerite Roberts.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your maiden name?

Miss ROBERTS. Smith.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Miss ROBERTS. I was born in Clarks, Nebr.; C-l-a-r-k-s, Nebr.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state that Roberts is your professional name?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what is your profession?

Miss ROBERTS. I am a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a screen writer?

Miss ROBERTS. About 19 years, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time have you engaged in your profession here in Hollywood?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to Hollywood?

Miss ROBERTS. Late in 1926 or early 1927.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly what your educational training for your profession has been?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes, I will. I went to grade school in Clarks, Nebr., Pilger, P-i-l-g-e-r, Fullerton, F-u-l-l-e-r-t-o-n, and a year's high school in Fullerton, Nebr., and then I finished high school in Kersey, Colo., K-e-r-s-e-y. Then I had about 6 months at business college and that's all.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your record of employment, briefly?

Miss ROBERTS. I have been working summers since I was 14; that's kind of long.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us take since 1926 when you came to Hollywood.

Miss ROBERTS. I worked as a secretary for a couple of years, then I worked as a reader in the story department of Fox Film Corp.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you employed as a reader?

Miss ROBERTS. About 6 months. I sold a story and they gave me an opportunity to do the screen play, which I did, and I have been a writer since then.

(At this point Representative John S. Wood left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What are some of the screen credits you have received as a screen writer?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, there are very many. May I confine myself to the last 12½ years, when I have been at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer?

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not intend to ask you for all of them. Some of the principal ones.

Miss ROBERTS. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just those that you choose to name, that we may have a little more information with regard to you.

Miss ROBERTS. The last 12½ years at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer: Escape, Ziegfeld Girl, Somewhere I'll Find You, Dragon Seed, Sea of Grass, Desire Me, If Winter Comes, The Bribe, Ambush, and they have just finished shooting Ivanhoe.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss ROBERTS. I have been continuously employed at the studio for 12½ years and naturally I worked on other things that I did not receive screen credit on.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is the desire of this committee to investigate and to look into the matter of Communist infiltration in Hollywood. You have been prominently identified with the industry over a considerable period of years and the committee would very much like for you to tell it what you know about Communist infiltration in Hollywood, if you will.

Miss ROBERTS (after conferring with counsel). I decline to answer that question on the ground that it violates my rights under the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Miss ROBERTS. However, may I say something else?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, proceed.

Miss ROBERTS. I am not a member of the Communist Party. I believe in the constitutional form of government of the United States. I will fight for my country against any other country. I wish to make that clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you are not a member of the Communist Party from your statement.

Miss ROBERTS. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of the testimony here yesterday Mr. Martin Berkeley stated that you were a member of the Communist Party and belonged to a cell with which he was connected, or rather a group of the Communist Party with which he was connected.

Mr. WALTER. When was that, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. The year was not exactly fixed by the testimony.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. But when Mr. Berkeley was testifying regarding that matter he was speaking of fraction meetings with minority groups which meant Communist Party members who were in organizations relating to minority groups. If you will just wait a moment I will try to identify that a little more fully. In the course of his testimony, relating to you and others about attending fraction meetings, Mr.

Berkeley said that these fraction meetings ran over a period of time. Jerome Chodorov, one of the authors of *My Sister Eileen*, was a party member, Lester Koenig, who is now an associate producer, Roland Kibbee and Marguerite Roberts, wife of John Sanford, a writer, Morton Grant, Melvin Levy, Allen Boretz, coauthor of *Room Service*, and Hy Kraft were members. Now, I think that sufficiently identifies the group that would enable you to answer the question as to whether or not Mr. Martin in so testifying was telling the truth, so far as you were concerned.

When I said "Mr. Martin," I meant to say "Mr. Martin Berkeley."

Miss ROBERTS. Well, I decline to answer on the grounds stated before, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that you state you are not now a member of the Communist Party.

Miss ROBERTS. My exact words were, "I am not a member of the Communist Party."

Mr. TAVENNER. You are speaking in the present tense.

Miss ROBERTS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you will not answer the question as to whether or not Mr. Martin Berkeley was correct in his testimony?

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to answer on the grounds stated before, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on Sunday, the day before the committee went into session?

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to answer on the grounds stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to answer on the grounds stated before, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is this position that you now take, namely that you are not a member of the Communist Party now, just merely a cloak or a new dress that you are wearing today, especially for this occasion, your appearance before this committee?

Miss ROBERTS. Definitely not, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you cease to become a member of the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated, sir.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

And I have given no testimony that I ever admitted being a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. But there is evidence here by Mr. Berkeley that you were a member—

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to comment—

Mr. TAVENNER. Which you have not denied.

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to comment on Mr. Berkeley's testimony on the grounds stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think in the light of your explanation that you are not willing to testify as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party yesterday, though you are maintaining that

you are not a member of the Communist Party now while you are sitting there, that I should ask you—I think it is fair that I should ask you whether you propose to be a member of the Communist Party when this committee has ceased its investigation here in Hollywood and has returned to Washington.

Miss ROBERTS. Definitely not.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle, any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party or any fraction thereof?

Miss ROBERTS. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds stated above.

Mr. DOYLE. You have had a very distinguished career and prosperous career in your profession. Have you ever had called to your attention the Federal statute under which this committee is charged with making an investigation of subversive conduct in America?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes; I understand you are a legal committee, a legally constituted committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that wasn't quite my question. Naturally, your attorney will tell you that, because he knows it is. I assume that you are giving the answer that he told you.

Miss ROBERTS. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. That is, that he has advised you it was a legal committee, but now I am not asking you that question. Do you know the purposes of this committee which is questioning you today?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, I believe the stated purposes are to show subversive influences in Hollywood and on the screen; is that it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your—

Miss ROBERTS. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean that our job is to show that?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, or to investigate it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that is substantially correct, but not limited, I assure you, to Hollywood.

Miss ROBERTS. Well, that is the place that touches me.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not particularly aiming at just Hollywood. We are aiming at subversive people and programs wherever they exist in our country. We are not picking on Hollywood, except that we have plenty of evidence that there have been and maybe are now dangerous elements in Hollywood. For instance, we had testimony the other day that there were fat cows in Hollywood from whom money was being taken, and now just to give you that—

Mr. COHN. You are not implying that Miss Roberts is a fat cow?

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, no.

Mr. COHN. I didn't think so.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't think you have been in the hearing room before today, have you?

Miss ROBERTS. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. So I thought I would make it clear to you that we are not undertaking to pick on Hollywood. That was never mentioned in the bill. The statute, Miss Roberts, even goes to the point of saying we shall investigate subversive and un-American propaganda that might emanate from some foreign country into our country, as well as domestic. Did you ever read the constitution of the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever read the by-laws of the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever see in any literature of the Communist Party, if you ever read any, any pledge of allegiance to the United States of America?

Miss ROBERTS. I am not familiar with that sort of literature; I'm sorry.

Mr. DOYLE. I know you must be widely read, because you have had such success in your own profession, and, naturally, when you claim the benefit of the fifth amendment, for which claim we do not criticize you—I want you to realize that—nevertheless, when you claim that protection on the theory that you might incriminate yourself, I, as a lawyer and a member of the bar—you have a very able lawyer by your side—

Mr. COHN. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. I have come to inferentially, at least, accept that which shows in our records that, generally speaking, a person who claims that privilege either at that time is a Communist or shortly prior thereto was.

I am not saying now or I am not inferring that you are or were, but I will say to you that our records show that, generally speaking, the persons that claim that privilege at the moment they claim it are Communists. Now, therefore, I want to ask you, if I may, a couple of other questions. Are you in sympathy with any of the objectives of the Communist Party in America?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, I don't know much about them, I must confess. I am really not a political student. I am a writer and I am not a political student.

Mr. DOYLE. I realize that.

Miss ROBERTS. But I have told you that I believe in the Constitution of the United States, and if any Communist beliefs run contrary to that, then I would be against them; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Then I take it that you approve the purposes of this committee in uncovering subversive attacks against our form of government?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, sir, I think you have done quite a bit of harm to us.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, I don't think you really have uncovered any subversive acts, and no one has seriously alleged that there has been any Communist propaganda in the pictures, and a lot of people really have suffered a lot by this. I honestly think that the bad outweighs the good. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, of course, that answer indicates to me that you have been following very closely the course of the hearings, or else you wouldn't feel qualified to give an opinion; is that correct?

(At this point Representative John S. Wood returned to the hearing room.)

Miss ROBERTS. Well, in Hollywood—I am listening to the radio. We haven't a television, but I listened to a few of the questions.

Mr. WOOD. I will inform my distinguished colleague that he has violated the rule of 5 minutes—7 minutes, in fact.

Mr. DOYLE. I will have to desist further questioning. Thank you.
Miss ROBERTS. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Miss Roberts, are you currently employed?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes. ,

Mr. JACKSON. Where?

Miss ROBERTS. At Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. JACKSON. What was your last screen credit, Miss Roberts?

Miss ROBERTS. The last one was Ambush—oh, no. Soldiers Three. I forgot that when I was giving the list. I kind of wanted to.

Mr. JACKSON. You have stated, I believe, that you are not now a member of the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS. I have stated that I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. But you have declined to answer the question as to your possible previous membership in the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS. That is true.

Mr. JACKSON. Proceeding on the knowledge that the Communist Party has in the past not issued membership cards, I should like to ask you if you will be a Communist when you leave this room or tomorrow?

Miss ROBERTS. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You have no intention—in other words, you repudiate communism as a political concept?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, yes, I do, because I am, as I have stated, a believer in this form of government, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You do not believe that one can be a believer in the constitutional form as practiced in the United States and still be a practicing Communist?

Miss ROBERTS. Well, you know, that is a question that puzzles me, because I think that if that were true, Congress would pass a law outlawing the party, which it has not done.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I might say that I imagine a great many Members of Congress have something of that sort in mind.

Miss ROBERTS. They have not yet done it.

Mr. JACKSON. That's correct. Now, you say that a lot of people have suffered as a result of this investigation. I should like to submit to you that a lot of people have suffered because of their activities on behalf of the Communist Party that brought them before this committee.

Miss ROBERTS. I really—

Mr. JACKSON. I say, rather than blaming your present appearance before the committee on the committee, because I am certain that no member or no distinguished member of this committee has ever recruited anyone into the Communist Party, I submit to you that most of the witnesses who appear here are here not because of anything the committee has done but rather because of their own activities on behalf of the Communist Party. Don't you believe that is the case?

Miss ROBERTS. That is your opinion, sir; it isn't mine.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, it is an opinion that is shared in many quarters by a great many Americans. This business of trying to blame all of one's griefs, so far as the witness chair is concerned, upon the committee completely is blinding one's self to the fact that their ac-

tivities are what have brought them here to the committee, not anything that the committee has done. That is the same as a murderer pleading that the judge and jury have brought him into disrepute. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter, any questions?

Mr. POTTER. Miss Roberts, you stated that the Communist Party has not yet been outlawed, and that is true, to a certain extent. However, the courts have upheld the so-called Smith Act where, as you are familiar, I'm sure, some top Communist leaders, the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States, have been found guilty of advocating the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. This advocacy was done through their work in the Communist Party. It is based upon that, and it is certainly the general conception, that the Communist Party is not a political party and the Communist Party, rather, is an arm of an international conspiracy which is dedicated not only to the overthrow of our form of government but dedicated to the overthrow of all existing governments until communism is the ruling government, ruling ideology in all countries.

I regret that you seek not to cooperate with the committee. When stating that you are not now a member of the party, it leaves the committee and American people—it puts them in sort of a contradictory position, as far as your testimony is concerned. I have nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counsel, do you have any further questions of the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

I understood you to state that this committee, so far, has not been able to disclose any actual act of subversion in Hollywood, and I understand that was a criticism of this committee, that it would undertake to investigate a matter of this kind.

Miss ROBERTS. No criticism, sir; comment only.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a comment?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I would like, in that connection, for you to consider the fact just as pointed out by one of the members of the committee, that there has been considerable evidence before this committee over a long period of time of the aims and objects of the Communist Party with regard to its purpose and its intention of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by use of force and violence, if necessary, and the fact that it has been shown through numerous witnesses during the course of this investigation that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been contributed by persons in your industry who are members of this party, and that that was one reason why the Communist Party has endeavored to infiltrate your industry, to tap this great source of revenue for the purposes of the Communist Party.

Now, do you not think, and will you not be fair enough to state, that that is a matter of vital interest to the people of the United States?

Mr. COHN. May we confer for a moment, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly.

Miss ROBERTS. I wish to make clear that I do not intend criticism of the committee, and I think you brought out in your testimony that

there has been no Communist propaganda in pictures and that's what I was saying. And I feel that you have been doing the job you have been sent here for, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you not think that it is and should be the duty of this committee to advise the Congress of the United States if such a thing is going on in the industry, as I have just mentioned, that of making large contributions, possibly into the millions, for the advancement of the cause of the Communist Party in this country?

Miss ROBERTS (after conferring with her counsel). Yes, sir, if you find that, I think you should tell them.

Mr. TAVENNER. That has been developed in the course of this investigation and we would like your help in connection with it. I would like for you to tell this committee what you know about the tapping of this great source of wealth here by the Communist Party for Communist Party purposes.

Miss ROBERTS. I have no knowledge of it, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take any part in it, in the sense of making donations or contributions, or the payment of dues to the Communist Party?

Miss ROBERTS (after conferring with her counsel). I decline to answer on the grounds stated before, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Does any other member of the committee have any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. One short question.

Mr. Wood. I yield to Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe you said this committee has, to the best of your knowledge, not uncovered any evidence of subversion during the course of its investigation.

Miss ROBERTS. Subversive acts.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you consider the removal from the top secret files of the United States Government, their photography and transmittal to Soviet agents to be an act of subversion?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever heard of an individual called Alger Hiss?

Miss ROBERTS. Yes; sure.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you know that Alger Hiss was before this committee, that much of the work that went into his trial and conviction came as the result of work done in this committee?

Mr. COHN. May we confer a moment, Mr. Jackson?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Miss ROBERTS. I wasn't referring to any of your activities outside of Hollywood, sir. I know very little about them.

Mr. JACKSON. The nature of the Communist Party is subversive. Whether that subversion takes the form of subverting the minds and souls of men, or whether it consists of transmitting secret files, the nature of its work is still in my humble opinion subversive.

I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Does any other member have a question that they would like to ask the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. No further questions.

Mr. Wood. Is there any reason why the witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. It's all right to dismiss her.

Mr. WOOD. It is so ordered. Whom do you have?

Mr. TAVENNER. Michael Wilson.

Mr. WOOD. Is Michael Wilson in the courtroom? Are you Michael Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? You do solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WILSON. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Be seated.

TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILSON, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel, sir?

Mr. WILSON. I am, sir.

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

Mr. KENNY. Robert W. Kenny, Los Angeles.

Mr. WOOD. You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Michael Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Tavenner, may I introduce a statement for the record?

Mr. TAVENNER. You will address your remarks to the chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Is it in writing?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Hand it to the clerk. It will be received by the committee.

Before proceeding I would like to remind you, Mr. Wilson, that following the well-established custom of this committee you have the right and privilege of conferring with your counsel at any time you may desire in connection with your interrogation here and obtain from him such advice and suggestion that you deem you are in need of, and your counsel, having been before the committee on frequent occasions, is familiar with his rights and privileges under the rules of the committee.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a request? I don't object to the pictures, but during the course of my giving testimony it is rather disconcerting.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is why I am waiting until they are finished.

Mr. WOOD. In that circumstance I will ask the photographers to please complete their pictures as quickly as they possibly can with efficiency.

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

Mr. WILSON. My name is Michael Wilson.

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

Mr. WILSON. I was born on July 1, 1914, in McAlester, Okla.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a resident of California?

Mr. WILSON. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived here?

Mr. WILSON. I believe since the time I was 8 or 9 years old.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

Mr. WILSON. I am a writer and I intend to continue being a writer despite any attempt to black-list me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee—

Mr. Wood. Just a moment. If by that statement you seek to leave the inference that anyone here is seeking to black-list you, I want to take exception to it at this point and remind you, sir, that as far as the activities of this committee are concerned there is no attempt to black-list anybody.

Mr. WILSON. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Wood, that in view of the fact that 3 days after I announced to my employer that I had a subpoena from your committee, despite the fact that I had been accused of nothing, I was taken off the payroll.

Mr. Wood. Under those circumstances, sir, I hope by your testimony here you will convince your employer that your removal from the payroll was without justification and we are giving you the opportunity to do just that on the best forum that I know of. So far as your critical remarks are concerned with reference to this committee, I might point out to you that from time immemorial it has been the custom of people who are accused and charged with things that are in violation of a constitution and laws and custom, to denounce the investigating authorities. Indeed we had an exemplification of that doctrine as far back as the early days of the history of English jurisprudence. One of the great legal commentaries made use of the expression, "No man e'er felt the halter drawn with good opinion of the law."

Mr. WILSON. I can't see how any reasonable man could say that. Without this committee there would be no black list.

Mr. Wood. I don't see how any reasonable man can say that there would ever be a black list except by the actions and conduct of those who are black-listed, if there are such.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your training for your profession, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. My education, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Just in brief.

Mr. WILSON. I attended the Catholic schools in Oklahoma City, Catholic and public schools in California. I went to high school in Berkeley, I was graduated in 1936 from the University of California with honors in philosophy; I had 3 years of postgraduate study, one as a teaching assistant in English, one as a Thelan Fellowship of Creative Literature, one as the Gayley Fellowship in American History. This is pretty much my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the practice of your profession as a writer have you been engaged in screen writing; is that the type of writing?

Mr. WILSON. I have, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What have been your principal screen credits as a writer?

Mr. WILSON. I believe my first credit was a picture called *The Men In Her Life*. This was before the war; I believe in about 1940, 1941. I then did a number of Hopalong Cassidy pictures, which are those that are now corrupting our children on the television screens of the Nation. I then entered the service of my country, and after the war, 3 years later, I was again employed. I contributed to a pic-

ture called *It's a Wonderful Life*. I was the coauthor of a picture called *A Place in the Sun*, based on Mr. Theodore Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*, which has recently been released.

I wrote a picture called *Five Fingers*, which is now in production at Twentieth Century-Fox. I also wrote a couple of screen plays which have not yet been produced, one on Thomas Wolfe's novel, *Look Homeward, Angel*, and a second called *The Friendly Persuasion*, which was about the Quaker people.

I might add, Mr. Tavenner, that I feel that this committee might take the credit, or part of it at least, for the fact that *The Friendly Persuasion* was not produced, in view of the fact that it dealt warmly, in my opinion, with a peace-loving people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, this committee has no knowledge of the intimate details of your contract or your relationship with your employer. I see from this very fine record of production of work that you have been engaged for a very substantial period in the industry, the moving-picture industry. You should be in a position to help this committee, if you will, regarding the subject of its inquiry, and that is the nature and the extent of Communist Party infiltration into the moving-picture industry. Are you willing to cooperate with the committee in that manner?

Mr. WILSON. Have you posed a question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I asked you if you are willing to cooperate with the committee in giving it any information which you may possess regarding the subject of its inquiry, which I announced.

Mr. WILSON (after conferring with his counsel). I wish you would put the question more specifically, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a very plain and simple question.

Mr. WILSON. I see nothing simple about it because it seems to cover the whole world.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you want me to ask you the question as to whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party before asking you whether or not you can cooperate with this committee in its efforts to—

Mr. WILSON. You ask the questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. In its efforts to seek information regarding the Communist Party? If you do, I will ask it that way.

Mr. WILSON. Is that the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you.

Mr. WILSON. You are asking the questions, sir. I will attempt to be responsive.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Then will you be responsive to this, please, sir: What knowledge have you of the activities of the Communist Party in the moving-picture industry?

Mr. WILSON. Since that is a question designed to link me with an organization that this committee has called subversive I shall invoke my privilege and my right under the fifth article of the Bill of Rights and decline to answer that question, and in so doing I wish also to protect the rights of every American citizen to the privacy of belief and association.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Marshal, I again request that the next time there is a demonstration started, if you can determine who started it, eject them from this room peremptorily.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, Mr. Wilson, you are unwilling to give this committee the benefit of any information you may have regarding the subject of this investigation?

Mr. WILSON. I didn't say that, Mr. Tavenner. I said I decline to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I see no distinction.

I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, I yield to you for any question you desire to ask.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Wilson, in this prepared statement that you handed to the committee a moment ago, this is contained:

Peace is a word of purity that I have seen this committee try to defile. —

I would like you to explain to us how this committee has tried to defile peace.

Mr. WILSON. Because it is my opinion, sir, that this committee is beating the drums of war. It seems strange to me, and I know that this committee has stated it is in favor of peace—it seems strange to me that you are always asking people whether or not they are willing to bear arms to kill other people. Why don't you ever ask them if they are willing to fight for peace? I believe that is my highest, the most sacred patriotic duty I have at this time, sir.

Mr. WALTER. I think that opinion is shared by everybody in the United States. We all have a different idea about peace. There are some people, and fortunately they are in a very, very small minority, who feel that peace means yielding to the Communists so that they can continue the aggressive steps that have been taken with the resultant subjugation and extinction, if you please, of other nations. Our interest in calling you wasn't to embarrass you or humiliate you. We know you were a Communist. We know much about your activities. But we were hoping that you would give us some information with respect to the setting up of these front organizations which collected so much money for the Communist movement in the United States. That's why you were subpoenaed.

That's all.

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I hardly know how to direct this question to you, Mr. Wilson, when you charge this committee with defiling peace, because my own son was a war casualty in the Air Force in the interests of peace.

(Representative Charles E. Potter left the hearing room.)

Mr. WILSON. I heard you say that yesterday, Mr. Doyle, and you have my deepest sympathies.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Potter, just walking out of this committee room, has two wooden limbs—look at him walk—as a result of his fight for peace. I can't help but resent the implications that known Communists come here and refuse to cooperate with this committee and come clean and help us uncover the subversive influences in this country, when they charge us that we are defiling peace.

We are not interested, Mr. Wilson, in getting at people or programs that are anything less than subversive. You know Webster's definition, it's to overthrow, to overturn. We are not interested in questioning you as to any other people that are not interested in doing that.

Mr. WILSON. But I think subversion is being committed against the Bill of Rights here today. That is my opinion, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way?

Mr. WILSON. I think you are invading the right of American citizens.

Mr. DOYLE. We are asking you merely were you ever a member of the Communist Party. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party? I will ask you that. Why don't you tell us honestly? Is there anything subversive about the Communist Party that would involve you in possible criminal prosecution if you ever were a member?

Mr. WILSON. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course you do. I understand that. That is your privilege. But I, as a father of that boy and a colleague of Potter, can't sit here and listen to you say that we are defiling peace.

I was in Alaska for several days 2 weeks ago, on a committee from Congress, and I heard the Russian radio at Nome and Anchorage say to us over their broadcast that the United States were warmongers, imperialists, that Catherine had been imposed upon when the United States paid \$7 million for Alaska, that we had stolen Alaska, and it really never was part of the United States. And you expect me to sit here—

Just one second; in closing, Mr. Chairman, there are some of us in Congress, and I am one of them; that wouldn't stay there 30 minutes if my life wasn't dedicated to world peace. You folks that are known Communists, and the records of the committee indicate that you are one of them, Mr. Wilson, even though you hide behind the fifth amendment, when you known Communists blast forth that we are destroying peace—how would you fight for peace? Would you give your life for peace?

Mr. WILSON. I certainly would, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. How would you do it; how would you form an army for peace?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I will try to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. I want you to. I am inviting you to.

Mr. WILSON. I don't believe that we prepare for peace by preparing for war, and in my humble opinion, if the profits were taken out of war, I believe there would be a lot less war hysteria in this country today. If American boys have to die to prove their devotion to their country, it doesn't seem to me to be too much to ask of the war profiteers that they surrender their profits as a patriotic duty, and I think it might be good and patriotic legislation for this committee to propose that.

Mr. DOYLE. Listen, Wilson, you may be surprised at this answer. I, too, would take profits out of war.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I am glad to hear that.

Mr. DOYLE. Listen to me. But when the United States of America, through the United Nations, offered to place the atomic energy under an international commission so we could be assured that the atomic bomb wouldn't be used to destroy civilization, who refused to do it? Russia—Soviet Union. What chance have we got to have an army for peace when aggressive Soviet communism is on the march over the world? Your philosophy would end in Soviet aggression coming in over the Arctic Circle where I was 2 weeks ago at Point Barrow and

Nome, coming in over there and capturing Alaska because we were unprepared to resist Soviet aggression.

Mr. WILSON. I simply think that a third world war, Mr. Doyle, is simply unthinkable.

Mr. DOYLE. So do I.

Mr. WILSON. It would be mass annihilation of peoples.

Mr. DOYLE. This committee is a darned lot harder than Communists are. They are fighting in favor of Soviet aggression capturing the world for the sake of communistic ideology. I wish you would give your wonderful philosophical training to world peace on the highest plane instead of backing it through the Soviet mouth. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish we had more time, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. So do I.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Wilson, it appears to me that during the late war when the Communist Party and all of its satellites in it or by it were screaming for a second front, that they were not unduly concerned at that time about peace. Is this a relatively recent development in the philosophy of the party?

Mr. WILSON. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. That is a very difficult question to answer, because it goes to the basis of the whole thing. The Soviet Union doesn't want peace. The Communists don't want peace unless it is a peace on Soviet terms, which would be absolutely impossible for any decent, liberty-loving person.

Winston Churchill once said, "I would rather die on my feet than live on my knees," and I think that is what the American people are saying today.

Mr. WILSON. I don't think they should die at all, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Somebody is going to die because Mr. Stalin has said that these two orders cannot exist side by side in the same world. This is a mortal fight to the finish if Mr. Stalin persists in pursuing the course of action he has pursued since the conclusion of World War II. We have leaned over backward, we have signed treaty after treaty in good faith, only to see them broken at the whim of a dictator, one who is every bit a dictator, as much a dictator as Mr. Hitler or Mr. Mussolini. Now, I fought against fascism for 5 years; Mr. Potter lost two legs. We didn't do it from a soap box. We did it out where deeds were being performed against fascism. We are ready to do it again if the need arises, and all of us hope that we can bring peace about through peaceful means, but to impugn the motives of this committee, to impugn the motives of the Congress, to say it is not seeking peace is a lie.

Mr. WILSON. I believe in the peaceful coexistence, Mr. Jackson; you do not. Therefore you say that war is inevitable.

Mr. JACKSON. I made no statement so far as coexistence was concerned. I was quoting the head of the Soviet Union who says that only through violent revolution can these two systems be brought into harmony. I am not quoting my statement or your statement. I am quoting the head of the Soviet Union, the man who dictates policy to every Communist in this room and every Communist in southern California.

Mr. WILSON. Well, this is not my forum, sir, and I might debate a lot of matters with you at some other time when I have equal rights.

Mr. JACKSON. Your rights have not been infringed upon. You have used the Constitution, which every Communist will destroy if he had his own way.

Mr. WILSON. No, sir. I am here under compulsion.

Mr. JACKSON. You have come here under compulsion, but have you been compelled to answer any questions before this committee?

Mr. WILSON. In a legal sense, no.

Mr. JACKSON. In a legal sense. We are talking in legal senses. You are talking about your constitutional rights, which are legal.

Mr. WILSON. You bet, and if we didn't have the fifth amendment you would compel me to answer it.

Mr. JACKSON. If we didn't have the fifth amendment we probably would find out where a lot of people are at work trying to destroy the rest of the Bill of Rights and the rest of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WOOD. Have you any other questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Mr. Wilson, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILSON. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member?

Mr. WILSON. I decline to answer, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Any reason why the witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. So ordered. Call your next witness, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John Sanford.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Sanford in the hearing room?

Are you Mr. John Sanford?

Mr. SANFORD. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please. You do solemnly swear the evidence you will give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SANFORD. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Sanford, are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. SANFORD. Well, in a sense I am. I happen to be an attorney myself.

Mr. WOOD. I see.

Mr. SANFORD. They say that an attorney who has himself for a client has a fool, but I will take that chance.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN SANFORD

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

Mr. SANFORD. John Sanford, S-a-n-f-o-r-d.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you used a professional name?

Mr. SANFORD. Well, in a sense.

Mr. TAVENNER. Different from your own?

Mr. SANFORD. The name John Sanford is a professional name, but since 1942 it has been my legal name. The name under which I was born was Julian Shapiro; J-u-l-i-a-n S-h-a-p-i-r-o.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you known as Jack Shapiro?

Mr. SANFORD. Well, a few people call me by the name of Jack. Not many.

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

Mr. SANFORD. I was born in New York City on May 31, 1904.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. SANFORD. At the present time I am a novelist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mr. SANFORD. Where do I reside?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; in what community?

Mr. SANFORD. In Encino, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mr. SANFORD. Fifteen years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time, where did you live?

Mr. SANFORD. In New York City.

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

Mr. SANFORD. I went to the public and high schools of New York City, and thereafter I attended Lafayette College, Lehigh University, Northwestern University, and Fordham University.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you then known by the name of Shapiro at that time?

Mr. SANFORD. Julian Shapiro.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Shapiro, will you—

Mr. SANFORD. No, my name—excuse me, Mr. Tavenner. My name is Sanford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sanford now. Excuse me. Mr. Sanford, will you tell the committee what your record of employment has been since you came to California.

Mr. SANFORD. Well, I came to California at the behest of Paramount Pictures in 1936. I worked for 1 year as a screen writer for Paramount. Thereafter my only other connection with moving pictures has been a 6-month term at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer in 1941. That is the only connection—those are the only connections that I have had with motion pictures. I have not been associated with them since 1941. I have practiced my own profession as a novelist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, during the period of time when you were associated with the moving-picture industry, you should have had knowledge of the existence in Hollywood of an effort to infiltrate the Communist Party, if such existed, and the committee, as you know, is conducting an investigation into those matters, endeavoring to ascertain the extent of infiltration, the purposes of the Communist Party in the organizing of the motion-picture industry, and how it proposed to and how it has carried out its projects here. The committee would like for you to tell it all you know regarding the infiltration of communism in Hollywood.

Mr. SANFORD. Under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, no man is compelled to give evidence against himself. I therefore decline to answer the question.

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

Mr. SANFORD. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any reason why the witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance on this committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. So ordered. The committee will stand in recess for 15 minutes.

(A short recess was taken.)

Mr. WOOD. The committee will come to order, please.

May I have the attention of the audience. We have been operating here under rather difficult conditions, acoustically speaking, and the room is a little difficult because of the ventilation. It becomes rather unpleasant for members of the committee, as well as the staff and the witnesses. I am going to ask the marshal to eliminate standing in the room, and particularly sitting in the windows from which the only air we can get must come. Please do not block the windows.

Mr. Counsel, who will you have?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. David Raksin.

Mr. WOOD. Are you Mr. Raksin?

Mr. RAKSIN. I am.

Mr. WOOD. You do solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RAKSIN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID RAKSIN

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. RAKSIN. I have had the advice of counsel and I do not require him at this time.

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

Mr. RAKSIN. My name is David Raksin, R-a-k-s-i-n.

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

Mr. RAKSIN. I was born in Philadelphia, Pa., August 4, 1912.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. RAKSIN. I reside in Northridge, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mr. RAKSIN. I have lived in California since 1936, with one previous trip out here for a short 7 or 8 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. RAKSIN. I am a composer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly for the committee what your educational training has been for your profession.

Mr. RAKSIN. For my profession?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I say your general education in brief.

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, my general education began in the public schools of Philadelphia. I then went to Central High School in Philadelphia and I then went to the University of Pennsylvania, from which I graduated. I also studied music almost all my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee a little about your professional experience. By that I mean, what has been the nature of your work?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I have done everything from playing in dance bands to arranging and orchestrating music for dance bands to musical shows, to radio programs. I have written music for all kinds of things from the serious theater to ballet. I have conducted. I also, in the last 15 years or so, have composed music for films.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are some of the principal productions with which you have been connected in your work?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I have worked on so many. But Smokey, The Secret Life of Walter Mitty, Forever Amber, The Magnificent Yankee, The Next Voice You Hear, Whirlpool.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is sufficient. Mr. Raksin, at the close of the session yesterday, Mr. Martin Berkeley was called before the committee in executive session and in the course of his testimony in executive session he informed the committee that for a period of time you had been a member of the Communist Party. I would like to ask you whether or not that advice to the committee is correct.

Mr. RAKSIN. It is, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. In the summer of 1938. I date it from around my birthday, which is in August.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. I remained there until either February or March 1940. I take that from several facts, among which is by the time the attack into the Lowlands, the Netherlands, came about, I had been out for some time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee the circumstances under which you were recruited into the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. I will, sir. I would like to avoid making a long pious speech of the things in which I believed, but I will say simply this, that those times were heartbreaking times to anyone who wished to see integrity and decency abroad in the world. Specifically, I will say that to stand by and watch the terrible thing that was happening in Spain and the equally terrible things that were happening in other countries, made one wonder about the whole world. Again I think I should cut this short. I don't want to moralize.

I had belonged to several organizations, such as the Musicians Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, and another medical committee which I think gave concerts in order to raise money—it was called the North American Committee or something—to raise money to send ambulances and medical things to Spain.

In such groups as this there are always some Communists and these Communists being aware of one's liberal sympathies and feelings are not slow to exploit any opportunity they can find. I think I was asked several times if I would join the party, but I did not wish to.

Finally things got worse and worse and I said to myself that the individuality and the integrity that I thought I was protecting was possibly just being unwilling to work with other people on other terms. It was a time, as I say, of heartbreak and despair, because all of these well-intentioned committees did no good. Perhaps they

saved lives and ameliorated pain, but they didn't stop any wars. Nobody seemed to be providing any leadership of the kind which might be able to stop wars.

Somewhere around that time somebody asked me if I would join, and failing the actual memory of exactly what happened, I say that that is when I finally joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand from your statement that you are unable to recall the individual who actually recruited you into the party?

Mr. RAKSIN. I think I recall the individual who recruited me now.

Mr. TAVENNER. You think you do?

Mr. RAKSIN. I think I do; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would be glad for you to tell the committee.

Mr. RAKSIN. His name was Mischa Altman, A-l-t-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your admission to the Communist Party were you assigned to any particular group or cell?

Mr. RAKSIN. I was assigned to a class which was a group of people, I presume, who were getting their first information about the way the Communist Party was supposed to work, and who were taught by a teacher and who met, I think, once a week.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did those meetings take place?

Mr. RAKSIN. They took place in a small house which was west of La Brea and somewhere between Hollywood Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the meetings always take place at the same address?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, the meetings of this class did, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. After attending these classes did you meet in group meetings with members of the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, this class was made into a group after a time. I don't know. I think some people may have drifted in and somebody left to go into another group.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed this group to which you refer?

Mr. RAKSIN. I don't know. I think about five or six.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the number in the beginning?

Mr. RAKSIN. I think that was the number just about throughout. Somebody, as I say, left the group and when it became no longer a class, and actually a group, somebody went into another unit in which I later encountered that same person.

Mr. TAVENNER. After this group developed into the cell of the Communist Party to which you have referred, did other persons unite with it and become members of it?

Mr. RAKSIN. To the best of my recollection nobody actually united with this group and remained there. I remember that somebody might come in, but I am not sure whether it was a guest or just somebody coming in to see how things were going.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the Communist Party lecturer who instructed your group?

Mr. RAKSIN. This was a Dr. Lee, and I presume he is the man who appeared here yesterday. He was a small man, he was a doctor, he had a moustache, he was slight, had a balding head and he was a very quiet man who just said what he had to say.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of a witness who appeared yesterday. Did you see the witness to whom you are referring?

Mr. RAKSIN. I did not. Maybe he didn't appear yesterday. His name is Dr. Lee Bigelman.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't understand the last name.

Mr. RAKSIN. Bigelman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the spelling of the name?

Mr. RAKSIN. I am not sure. I don't really know. All I know is that I knew him as Dr. Lee, and I subsequently found that it was indeed Bigelman.

Mr. Wood. They are having a little difficulty hearing you. Would you mind speaking a little louder, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am having a little difficulty hearing you.

You referred to the individual by his first name?

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes. I said that he was known then to me as Dr. Lee. Everyone called him Dr. Lee. In fact, nobody called anybody by any last names. But later he became known to me and I gather that he was the same man who was known as Dr. Lee Bigelman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether his first name was Lee or Leo?

Mr. RAKSIN. That I don't know, sir. I heard that a man had been called Dr. Leo Bigelman, who was here the other day, but since I do not wish to testify about anything that I cannot really say I know, I will say that we called him Dr. Lee. And, as I say, I presume this is the same man.

Mr. TAVENNER. In reading of the daily press did you see the picture of the person who appeared yesterday by the name of Dr. Leo Bigelman?

Mr. RAKSIN. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will try to procure it and see if you can make a more positive identification, because I understand that there is more than one Dr. Bigelman in the city.

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes; I know that. Well, I can say this, that this is not the man who is an eye specialist because I visited this man once in about 1937 or so and he gave me eyeglasses. And this is certainly not the same man at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the first name of the Dr. Bigelman who furnished you the eyeglasses?

Mr. RAKSIN. I don't, but I always thought it was the same man. I always thought that his name was Dr. Leo Bigelman, or something.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the names of those who were associated with you in this group of which you were a member?

Mr. RAKSIN. There was a girl named Billie, there was an old lady—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. Do you know the last name?

Mr. RAKSIN. No; I do not. As I have said before, these people were known probably for reasons of not wanting anybody to know who they really were, as first names only. Unless you knew someone outside a group you did not know the second name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. RAKSIN. This was a girl named Billie, there was an old lady whose name was Bessie, she was a small and red-haired, rather fragile woman. There was a tall, bald fellow named Harold, who didn't

stay very long, and there was a man named Bernard, who I was told had formerly been a Catholic priest. And these were the members of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of your Communist Party membership did you meet other persons who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. I met some. I changed groups after having been in this one for a while. Exactly how long I don't know. But I asked to be moved into another group for the reason that I wanted to be somewhere where problems more akin, or questions more akin to my kind of thinking were discussed, and I felt that these would certainly be one of the groups where there were writers. I asked to be put into such a group and for a little while I was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the members of that group?

Mr. RAKSIN. Richard Collins, Budd Schulberg, Waldo Salt, Paul Jarrico, and I can't think who else.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Collins was a director, I believe—no, Mr. Collins was a writer.

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes, Richard Collins.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether there was a director in your group?

Mr. RAKSIN. In this group, as far as I know, there was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn to know within the Communist Party any director of the studio—

Mr. RAKSIN. I did indeed. This was Frank Tuttle, who is a motion-picture director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend Communist Party meetings in his home?

Mr. RAKSIN. I did attend a couple of them at his home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there other directors known to you to be members of the Communist Party, that is of your own personal knowledge?

Mr. RAKSIN. There was a man named Herbert Biberman who was there, and there were certainly no other directors that I knew there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Bernice Fraser?

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes. Bernice Fraser was an old woman who was in ill health and she was in a group to which I was subsequently transferred, but to which I really did not go, inasmuch as when I went to this group I said that I didn't want to be a part of its deliberations, that I would help in any larger group work that was involved, and do anything I could, but that I did not wish to sit in any of those little deliberations where tiny points are discussed endlessly and practically forever. She was a member of that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with any of the functionaries of the Communist Party whose names you can now recall?

Mr. RAKSIN. There is one who I believe to have been a Communist Party functionary, and another I have heard named as a Communist Party functionary, who was certainly a teacher. The Communist Party functionary I recall was a woman named Madelaine Ruthven, who has been previously identified here. The other was John Howard Lawson, who used to come and lecture occasionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the extent of your acquaintanceship with Madelaine Ruthven?

Mr. RAKSIN. I went several times to her house when I was requested to do so after something I said in the course of some meeting or other had been taken exception to by someone. In other words, I said something of which, apparently, they did not approve, and I was summoned, and she spoke to me about this.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you had deviated from the accepted policy in your thinking?

Mr. RAKSIN. Apparently so.

Mr. TAVENNER. At least, in the expression of your thoughts?

Mr. RAKSIN. Quite so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as a result of your having deviated from the accepted line of thinking at the time, you were reported to the leaders of the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, apparently somebody told Miss Ruthven that I had taken some position which was considered to be wrong by them or to be at variance with their point of view.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what that related to?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, there were two or three. One was—I don't know the chronological order, but one was when I became very incensed over the disciplining of certain composers in the Soviet Union, men like Shostakovich and Prokofieff for whom I had great admiration.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell those, please.

Mr. RAKSIN. Shostakovich is S-h-o-s-t-a-k-o-v-i-c-h and Prokofieff is P-r-o-k-o-f-i-e-f-f. Another time—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment before leaving that. Tell the committee more about what you objected to with regard to these composers.

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I felt that they were men of great talent and that if they chose to explore paths which led off the beaten track and if they chose to indulge in experiments as artists which were not immediately comprehensible to people who were not schooled in listening to music, that they should not be disciplined therefor, and that they should be permitted to do this, and that this was the very breath and blood of art, and the position of the Communist Party at the time seems to have been that these men were servants of something and, at all costs, had to be made to toe the line.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it was the view of the Communist Party that these individuals, these noted men, should use their art as a weapon?

Mr. RAKSIN. Oh, I wouldn't say as a weapon, but that they felt that they should be—that they should submerge any desire to do anything special or extremely personal which might not be understood by everybody, and that my own feeling was that this is not possible to a composer of any kind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who was it that exerted this form of censorship or thought control upon these artists?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, the censure of these men was printed in Soviet newspapers and it was written by several men. I am not exactly sure who they were, nor did I read very much of the actual terms of the articles censuring them, but they were very strong, and I objected to them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what became of those artists after that?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, they continued to work. The one in whom I am most interested, if it is of any interest at all to anyone, is Prokofieff and to the best of my knowledge he is now a very ill man with a heart ailment, struggling to write as much music as he can before he is no longer able to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you came to the defense of those artists who were endeavoring to apply their own genius to their profession?

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That did not meet with the approval of the Communist Party group to which you were assigned, so that you were disciplined for it?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I would scarcely call it exactly disciplined, sir, but I will say that probably what bothered them most of all was that I said at one point in the argument, which was a hot argument, that if the economic directors and commissars of the Soviet Union had as much ability at their jobs as Mr. Prokofieff had at his, there would be no economic problem in the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the expression which brought down the ire of your associates upon you?

Mr. RAKSIN. I would say it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you were reported to the functionary, Madelaine Ruthven?

Mr. RAKSIN. I was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that was that instance. Will you give us other instances in which you were criticized or censored or reported for disciplinary action?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, liberals are forever having an inner argument about the ends and the means. Things like this were subjects of discussion. Another thing that apparently got me into trouble was that we began to discuss the ends and the means, and it was my feeling that sometimes, in pursuit of noble ends, ignoble means were necessary, but I said, "Whenever the means arrive at a point where they, themselves, are so terrible that they debase the man that does these deeds, it is time to examine not only the substance of the means but the end, itself," and I was told that this was bourgeois thinking, to which I subscribed.

Mr. TAVENNER. And as a result were you again reported to the functionary?

Mr. RAKSIN. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Madelaine Ruthven?

Mr. RAKSIN. I was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you censured for that?

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes. Miss Ruthven told me that she thought I should be more prudent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, were there other instances?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, the only other one I can remember is that in a discussion of the novel, I held—it was not my original view but one which I respected—that in endeavoring to instill the consciousness of social events into works of art, those men who did this deliberately at the expense of the work of art, itself, were making a great mistake and producing neither something which would affect people, nor something which would be a good work of art, and I submitted as an example the *Comedy Humane* of Balzac, which I seem to have known better at the time than I appear to now, principally because

I was then reading it, and I said that the effort to be socially conscious had hampered certain works of literature. I am certainly no critic of literature, but this was my feeling, and again I was told that my judgment was certainly questionable.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what action was taken as a result of your expression of your own judgment regarding the novel?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, nothing terrible happened. I just went to see Miss Ruthven and we talked about this.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean, were you reported to Miss Ruthven?

Mr. RAKSIN. Oh, apparently somebody went to Madelaine Ruthven and said, "This fellow has been at it again," and I am sorry to say that people like me quibble over points like this all the time, and I felt that I had to hold to this point, and I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were endeavoring to express your own independent thought and opinion?

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was considered dangerous?

Mr. RAKSIN. It wasn't considered dangerous, sir, if I may say so. It was just thought and expressed to me that other people, who were perhaps less capable of making such "fine"—and I put that word in quotes—differentiations would perhaps be thrown off the path of possible action in some cause or other.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you submit to this type of thought control?

Mr. RAKSIN. If I may say so, sir, I never submitted to it at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how long did you endure it by remaining a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I began not to go very much in the late spring of 1939, and in 1940—no 1939, and into the summer, and into the fall. When there is something you don't want to do, you find ample excuses, I suppose, not to do it, and I had a very valid one, which was that in my work it was frequently necessary for me to work all day and most of the night, and a 140-hour week was not unknown to me, and I have worked it many times, and I said, "I can't come," so I didn't, and sometimes I went to meetings and sometimes I didn't go, and at the end of—I don't know for sure whether I am answering the question you asked me, but if you are asking me how and when I got out, Mr. Tavenner—is that your question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I am just wondering how long you were willing to stay in the Communist Party under the circumstances which you have described.

Mr. RAKSIN. I was in the Communist Party altogether about a year and a half, of which in the beginning I went fairly regularly and at the end hardly at all. In fact, the last few months I went once, perhaps twice. The once I remember was when I went to say that I was not coming any more, and that was after a considerable period of not having gone any more, because I was in New York for about a month and a half—I don't know—and before that I had been working on a day and night job for 5 or 6 weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any other statement you desire to make regarding the severance of your connection with the Communist Party? I would like for you to state it if you have.

Mr. RAKSIN. If I can say it briefly, I would like to say simply this: That I left the Communist Party after my sentiments had undergone a

considerable change. When the Russo-German Pact was signed I was very much disturbed by it, and I felt it to be a very cynical and opportunistic piece of business but, certainly, no more cynical or opportunistic than was to be found in other places in the world, but when the fruits of this pact began to show themselves in the position that arms were not to be sent to England and that convoys were not to accompany—armed ships were not to accompany these ships, I said that this was our war and that if we were not in it now we were due to be in it shortly, and that arms should be sent to England; that ships should be sent, instructed to fire upon anyone trying to stop the ships, and it was naturally impossible for me to continue with this point of view, so I left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, notwithstanding you left the Communist Party, as you described, the committee has information that after that time you were affiliated in one way or another with certain activities which have been called to the attention of the committee from time to time and which the committee, from its investigation, considered to have been instigated by members of the Communist Party, so I think I should ask you about that and ask you to tell us the circumstances under which you did affiliate in those movements, if you did. For instance, there appears in the Daily People's World of November 6, 1948, a column headed "Notables condemn witch hunt." In the article, it is urged that contempt charges against 10 political prisoners be dismissed and dismissal of the grand jury which subpoenaed the 10 persons is also demanded. Now, among the names appearing as being persons signing this appeal or letter, appears your name. We would like to know how your support of that movement was secured or how you entered into it, if you did.

Mr. RAKSIN. I can't be sure that I did, but I will certainly not say that I deny it, since I don't know whether I did or not. All I can say is that if you will tell me the name of whatever committee it was—probably some committee which said, "Give us five bucks; we want to do something about" this or that, and I could have signed. I didn't cease to be a liberal, sir, when I left. In fact, I left because I was a liberal.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand, and it is no matter of criticism that a person may disagree with the work of this committee or that they criticize it, if that is what you are referring to, but we are interested to know to what extent that emanates from the Communist Party and to what extent it is a Communist Party line that has been impressed upon other organizations. I hand you the article in question and ask you to look at it, and it may refresh your recollection about it.

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes. Well, all I would say from this is that this would have impressed me at the time as an effort of the liberal party of this community. To whatever extent its origin is in the Communist Party is no part of my personal knowledge, sir, and I signed it because, among other things, the make-up of this committee and its actions at that time were quite different from the committee which now exists.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has heard testimony regarding the Hollywood Quarterly which, according to my recollection, was a publication of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. I have before me excerpts from the Hollywood Quarterly, volume 2, April 1947,

which reflects that you appeared on the frontispiece of the magazine as being a member of the advisory committee on music. We would like to know just how your services were procured in connection with that enterprise.

Mr. RAKSIN. First, sir, may I say that there were no services, but I would like to say that I am on that masthead because when this magazine was formed, those who had participated in the various panels of the Writers' Congress, and I, myself, was on the panel of musicians—

Mr. TAVENNER. That was back in—when, 1943?

Mr. RAKSIN. I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. October.

Mr. RAKSIN. My memory for dates, sir, is not notable.

Mr. TAVENNER. In October 1943.

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes; but the members of the various panels wound up on the advisory committee. I, myself, felt that this magazine was an attempt by the Writers' Mobilization and the University of California at Los Angeles to form a magazine of scholarly—a scholarly magazine, I would say, that would come from out here, and I was honored to be on that board with other people, but I must say that we never, to my knowledge, held a meeting of any kind at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it was just a question of putting on that masthead the names of prominent people who never had functioned, never performed a service?

Mr. RAKSIN. There were some people who—there was a small committee—I think they are set apart on the top, or something like that, of the masthead, and these were the people who edited the magazine. They were professors.

Mr. TAVENNER. But as far as these special committees were concerned, it was just a question of window dressing, wasn't it?

Mr. RAKSIN. I suppose so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has your connection with the Communist Party been terminated completely and definitely?

Mr. RAKSIN. It has, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that is all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Raksin, you have testified that you left the Communist Party because you were a liberal. Do I understand you to mean that the Communist Party is not a liberal party organization—

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, sir, I don't know.

Mr. WALTER. Or movement?

Mr. RAKSIN. I don't think—it is a liberal movement, but it is not an organization of liberals. A liberal organization to my mind is one which encourages freedom and even dissidence of thought on the theory that it is better for such thought to be heard and refuted or justified than to lie festering somewhere.

Mr. WALTER. I want to say to you that with a 20-year record in the Congress of the United States as a liberal, these people that have affixed themselves to the Democratic Party are making it ever increasingly difficult for we liberals to accomplish what we have set out to accomplish. Who is this Madelaine Ruthven?

Mr. RAKSIN. Ruthven?

Mr. WALTER. Ruthven; yes.

Mr. RAKSIN. She was just a woman who had a position of some sort, and she was a very mild woman, and I found her quite reasonable.

Mr. WALTER. What do you know about her background?

Mr. RAKSIN. I know nothing about her except I heard she was a poetess.

Mr. WALTER. It was she who undertook to censor you because of the position that you took in matters that she probably knew nothing about—

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, sir—

Mr. WALTER. Or very little?

Mr. RAKSIN. Willing to be honest, I can only say that, since I have no knowledge of what she really knew, I don't know whether she knew better than I or not, but having—

Mr. WALTER. Did you ever have any voice in placing her in this position of censorship that she occupied?

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

Mr. WALTER. Did any of the rank-and-file members of this group have anything to do with her selection?

Mr. RAKSIN. Insofar as I know, they certainly did not.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, she was just assigned to a job?

Mr. RAKSIN. Quite right.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to supplement Congressman Walter's statement about these folks attaching themselves to the liberal movement, destroying it. I think that is literally true. When these Communists secretly infiltrate into liberal movements, they do it partially with the purpose of setting up a dictatorship instead of liberalism, but I want to ask you, sir, because of the number of years now you have been voluntarily out of the Communist Party, whether or not you have any suggestions to this committee and through this committee to the United States Congress as to any legislation which should be considered part of the text of the statute under which we operate, Public Law 601, which expressly charges this committee with recommending to Congress legislation for remedial legislation in the field of subversive un-American activities. Can you help us?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, sir, I don't know that I can help.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, try to.

Mr. RAKSIN. I know this, that if you are asking me whether I think laws should be passed outlawing the Communist Party I would say "No," and the reason I would say "No" is this: That I think that when it comes to an overt act of any kind, or something which is really dangerous to the welfare of the United States, there are plenty of things to cover this, such as Mr. Hoover. And my own feeling, as I have just said—I don't wish to appear to think of myself as a social scientist or something, but I would rather hear people talk and say all kinds of things out in the open and be in a position where by free expression of thought against any error, that error can be brought down to earth, than have that thought lie somewhere, as I said before, festering.

Mr. DOYLE. Possibly you heard this morning one witness, or perhaps it was early this afternoon, state that this committee was destroying peace or defiling peace; is that your appraisement?

Mr. RAKSIN. I do not feel that that is so, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your judgment, as you have looked back these several years, of the functioning of this sort of a committee by Congress? Is it of benefit or otherwise?

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, sir, if you will give me permission to limit what I think to this committee—

Mr. DOYLE. That is what I am asking.

Mr. RAKSIN. This which examines me today, I would say this, strange as it may sound coming from me, I think this committee has done one extremely beneficial thing, and that is that heretofore there has been a notion abroad in the United States that Hollywood is infested, it is often overrun—you may choose any verb—with Communists.

I think that this investigation has proved and will continue to prove that at the most there were not more than a couple of hundred, and that only a very small few were zealots who have remained, and that the notion is for once and all dispelled that subversive doctrines were insinuated into films. I never heard of one being in a picture.

Mr. DOYLE. You would feel then that this committee, without knowing what the ultimate answer would be, has been diligent in getting at the facts and the truth, whatever it was?

Mr. RAKSIN. I think that the truth has come out and that this truth is that the people in this film business, for which I am not an apologist, that there people are like practically everyone else, you might say, only more so, since they work at greater concentration, and that whatever they did was done out of human impulses, that there were never more than a few. I myself cannot conceive of anyone I met putting the interest of any other country before his own.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Raksin, I would like to say in connection with service on this committee that it is sometimes a very thankless task, sometimes a very difficult task, but that it is simply a task, it is a duty that is imposed upon the members of the committee by the Congress of the United States acting as the representatives of the American people. We do not seek out the assignment; the assignment is given to us. It is as much a duty as any of the other many things that we are required to do as a part of our official duties.

I don't think that that is commonly understood.

I think you said during the course of your testimony that you joined the Communist Party because of a desire to see a restoration of decency and integrity throughout the world. I think that is one of the reasons you gave.

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, it is something like that, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you, out of your experience, find that the Communist Party was a vehicle which was dedicated, or which gave any promise of bringing about the restoration that you, as an artist, were seeking?

Mr. RAKSIN. I don't wish to rephrase your question, sir, but it was I as a human being who was seeking this thing. This was not justified; I did not find this in the Communist Party; and when in time I came to measure what I sought against what I found, I had to leave.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you, Mr. Raksin, discussed your appearance before this committee with any person other than your attorney?

Mr. RAKSIN. I have discussed it; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Have any attempts been made to dissuade you from making an appearance and testifying before the committee?

Mr. RAKSIN. No one has endeavored to dissuade me at all. In fact I have discussed it with only a very few people, because when a thing like this happens and everything is so long ago in the past it's a difficult thing to hold onto all by yourself.

Mr. JACKSON. Referring back to the case of the convicted 10, and the article to which counsel called your attention, do you feel in light of what has transpired with respect to the 10, with further respect to identifications that have been made with respect to most of them if not all of them as active members of the Communist Party, that they were in truth and in fact political prisoners of the United States of America?

Mr. RAKSIN. I wouldn't say they were political prisoners, sir. My own feeling would be that I am very sorry for any man who has all his life pursued an art or a craft and finds himself in prison.

Mr. JACKSON. I can understand your sympathy. But, of course, they were not in prison because of any pursuit of their arts or crafts, simply because they were found guilty of contempt of the institutions, the ideals, the traditions, and the laws of the United States. That is quite a different matter. I think as far as their arts and crafts were concerned they might be deserving of some sympathy; but, as far as their contempt is concerned, I certainly can find no reason or any grounds for sympathy.

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, Mr. Jackson, I have made it clear, I think, that I am not in opposition to anything concerning—I think I put this badly—but anything concerning the welfare of the United States. But I have never made a differentiation of any kind. I don't want to sound pious about people who are in trouble. You see, I must say this, some of these people I knew, some I didn't. And I couldn't conceive of some of those fellows doing anything really to harm anybody.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand your feeling, and that feeling was held very close to the hearts of very many of the liberals—I quote that as you quoted the word a while ago—a very many of the liberals, the Communists, the fellow travelers, the intellectual pinkos, in the case of Alger Hiss, whose only error was a little matter of taking top secrets from the United States Government and transferring them to a foreign power. Now, he, too, was a great liberal. He was connected with the board of the Carnegie Foundation for World Peace. A man to whom this Nation had given every possible opportunity, and still there were those, and there probably still are those, who consider that he was just a poor, misguided boy who never had a chance.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Raksin, you stated that you joined the Communist Party because you were a liberal. Mr. Edward Dmytryk, who was a member, or one of the Hollywood 10, testified before our committee after serving his sentence and he made a statement that the same liberalism that took him into the party took him out of the party. Would you care to comment on that as it affected you?

Mr. RAKSIN. Yes. The same liberalism which took me in took me out.

Mr. POTTER. As a liberal, as you have stated you are, that is a term that is very hard to define nowadays, you believe in freedom of discussion, freedom of utilizing your own ideas. And it is interesting to note that in the Communist Party, the very organ that many liberals fall into at times, that freedom of discussion, according to their own doctrine, is not permitted. Now, I wish to quote again—

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. POTTER. From a photostat of a pamphlet that I have referred to many times through the course of this investigation. This is The Communist Party, a Manual on Organization, and testimony has been given before the committee that this has been used as more or less of a Communist Party bible in many areas. Let me quote you a paragraph from the section on party discussion and freedom to criticize. I wish to quote just this one paragraph, and I quote:¹

We cannot imagine a discussion, for example, questioning the correctness of the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, or the necessity for the proletarian dictatorship. We do not question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism. We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. We do not question the counterrevolutionary nature of Trotskyism.

Now, that is a part of their own manual where you cannot question so-called basic principles of the party. And I assume you probably weren't a very good member of the Communist Party because you did question certain principles and it took you out of the party and you were at least censured for them.

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I just don't think that most of the people I knew were good members, because they used to question them all the time. I questioned them; most certainly I questioned them.

Mr. POTTER. From what experience you have had in the party, and knowing world conditions today, would you say that a person that is active in the Communist Party of today and subject to party discipline can at the same time be a loyal American?

(At this time Representative John S. Wood returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. RAKSIN. Well, I would say that anybody who accepts that word for word cannot be a loyal American, but I just don't see anybody accepting anything like that word for word, sir, if I may.

Mr. POTTER. We have had testimony after testimony, and you well know how when the party line switches they all flip over. Some drop out; some can't take it. But others do that. And they will talk one way today, and when the party line switches they will talk another way tomorrow. Those people are subject to party discipline and accept party discipline.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. This doesn't apply to the witness, but yesterday, when Martin Berkeley, the witness, concluded his testimony, I was absent, and at that time did not have an opportunity to compliment him on his vigorous cooperation with this committee. I want the record to now show that I do so at this time. I was in conference with the deputy attorney general of my State on the tidelands oil matter.

¹ See appendix printed in separate volume.

I also wish at this time to read into the record, if I may, a letter addressed to Mr. Berkeley from the Verdugo Hills Post, No. 288, American Legion, Post Office Box 288, Montrose, Calif.

Mr. MARTIN BERKELEY,
*Care of House Un-American Activities Committee,
 Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif.*

DEAR MR. BERKELEY: Verdugo Hills Post, No. 288, of the American Legion, unanimously voted to extend to you our deepest appreciation.

Your appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee, at sacrifice to yourself, on behalf of your country will greatly assist the forces of freedom throughout the world.

We are asking other patriotic organizations to join us in this expression of thanks.

Sincerely,

EUGENE JACK POTTER, Commander.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to have this filed with the records.

Mr. Wood. It will be filed.

Any further questions from counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Permit me to join the other members of the committee in expressing to you the committee's very deep appreciation for your cooperation and the information you have given the committee. I feel that it has been most helpful to us in our work and you have made a very valuable contribution to the American people and you have our sincere thanks.

Mr. RAKSIN. Thank you.

Mr. Wood. We have only 30 more minutes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe we can finish with this witness in that time.

Mr. William Blowitz.

Mr. Wood. Are you Mr. Blowitz?

Mr. BLOWITZ. Yes, I am.

Mr. Wood. Raise your right hand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BLOWITZ. Yes, I do.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM BLOWITZ

Mr. Wood. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I am not.

Mr. Wood. Do you desire to be?

Mr. BLOWITZ. No, I do not.

Mr. Wood. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will wait until the photographers finish their chores.

What is your full name, sir, please?

Mr. BLOWITZ. William Frank Blowitz.

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

Mr. BLOWITZ. Kansas City, Mo., July 1915.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I suggest that you talk as if you were talking to me and then the microphones will do the rest. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BLOWITZ. Van Nuys, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mr. BLOWITZ. 16 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I am a publicist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe a little more the nature of your work?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I am a man who is hired by corporations, motion-picture companies, to publicize their products through newspapers, magazines, radio, or any other media available.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much of the period of time since you have been in California have you been employed in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BLOWITZ. In a cumulative sense, the bulk of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee briefly a statement of your educational background?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I was educated in the public schools of Missouri, Illinois, and Pennsylvania; graduated from the University of Pittsburgh in 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Blowitz, at the close of the session yesterday, Mr. Martin Berkeley appeared in an executive session of the committee and in the course of his testimony there he named you as a former member of the Communist Party in this area. I would like you to tell the committee whether or not that testimony was correct.

Mr. BLOWITZ. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and over what period of time have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I was a member of what was called the Communist Political Association from the spring of 1944 until that organization was dissolved, and then briefly I attended Communist Party meetings. To the best of my knowledge I have no card and had no card. The fact that I attended the meeting and paid whatever small dues that was involved was sufficient for me.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long a period of time did you remain in the party?

Mr. BLOWITZ. Approximately 15 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you became recruited as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BLOWITZ. Well, briefly, I was invited to what was an open forum discussion at the home of John Lawson, who lived just a few blocks from me, and whom I had met. I went to this meeting and several others of the same nature, and then accepted participation and membership in the Communist Political Association, which was at that time, as you know, an open political party with open meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who invited you to become a member of the party?

Mr. BLOWITZ. John Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee names of others who were members of the party along with you?

Mr. BLOWITZ. Well, this is, as you know, extraordinarily difficult. I can name a few people who themselves told me that they were members, or some spoke to me as to indicate mutual membership. There was, as I said, a considerable floating population, some of whom I met and some of whom I did not, and some of whom I know and some of whom I knew, and some of whom I no longer know.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I want you to confine yourself to evidence within your own knowledge.

Mr. BLOWITZ. To the very best of my knowledge at that time Mr. and Mrs. Lawson were also members, Mr. and Mrs. Lester Cole, Alvah Bessie, a Morton Grant. There were a couple of others. As we go through it and you mention their names it is conceivable that I will recall them and I will if I can.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a Communist Party meeting in the home of Mortimer Offner?

Mr. BLOWITZ. No, I don't know the name. I attended meetings in several homes that were completely strange to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you terminated your relationship with the party?

Mr. BLOWITZ. It was a matter of a difference of opinion on my part, certainly, during the course of the Hollywood strike in 1945. I attended a meeting at the home of a trade-union member, whose name I do not know. There were two meetings during this period, shortly after the strike started, and I attended two meetings at the home of a Hollywood labor leader. At the second meeting a woman by the name of Elizabeth Leech and a man named John Stapp, S-t-a-p-p, came out and in the course of the discussion I was in considerable disagreement as to the Hollywood strike of 1945, as the result of which I felt my interests were no longer allied with the party and I stopped.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know those persons, Elizabeth Leech and John Stapp, to be functionaries in the Communist Party?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I had not—I do not know them other than as of that meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a fraction meeting of the Communist Party which you were attending?

Mr. BLOWITZ. That is conceivable. I attended, I would say, a total of no more than 12 or 14 meetings during my entire period. And it is conceivable it was a fraction meeting. I have just recently had that defined for me since the course of the hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part did Elizabeth Leech and John Stapp, the functionaries of the Communist Party, play in this strike dispute or argument which you have mentioned, or conference?

Mr. BLOWITZ. I don't recall the exact circumstances, but I felt that it was a correct strike and one that should be won by the ordinary methods of labor union, which you understand what the ordinary methods of labor unions are in winning a strike. I don't recall what point they took, I don't recall what point I took, except this was the second meeting that this had occurred and I felt that I wanted to go my own way. I do recall that the party was opposed to Herb Sorrell all through this period.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why the witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. It is so ordered.

Is that all?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no other witnesses that we could complete in anywhere near the time that you mentioned. I suggest that we adjourn.

If you will just wait one moment.

I think I can call another witness.

Mr. Wood. Who do you call?

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Herta Uerkvitz.

Mr. Wood. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn. You do solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss UERKVITZ. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HERTA UERKVITZ, ACCCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY

Mr. Wood. Are you represented by counsel?

Miss UERKVITZ. I am.

Mr. Wood. Will counsel identify himself for the record.

Mr. KENNY. Robert W. Kenny of Los Angeles.

Mr. Wood. During the progress of your interrogation, Miss Uerkvitz, you are permitted to confer with your counsel as often as you deem necessary and to seek such advice and information and suggestion from him as you think you need for your examination.

(Representative Charles E. Potter left the hearing room.)

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

Miss UERKVITZ. Herta Uerkvitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please spell it?

Miss UERKVITZ. H-e-r-t-a U-e-r-k-v-i-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you mind sitting a little bit closer to the table?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you. Are you a native of California?

Miss UERKVITZ. I am not. I was born in Wisconsin.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Miss UERKVITZ. Since 19—in California?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Miss UERKVITZ. Since 1922.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

Miss UERKVITZ. Architectural research.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in that profession?

Miss UERKVITZ. Since 1936, I believe, in the same studio.

Mr. TAVENNER. What special training did you have for that work, and in that connection state what your general education has been.

Miss UERKVITZ. My general education was in the public schools of Everett, Wash., and a business college there, and a 2-year extension course in UCLA after I came down here. Now, I have no special training for the job, I worked into it by a set of happy circumstances.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in that work?

Miss UERKVITZ. As I said, I have been in the motion-picture industry steadily since 1922, and in this particular architectural field, specifically in charge of a department since 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was at one of the studios in the moving-picture industry, I assume?

Miss UERKVITZ. I have been at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer since 1929. Previous to that I was in several other large studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. Having been an employee in the moving-picture industry over the period of time you have indicated, you are in a position to have learned a great deal regarding the subject of the inquiry which this committee is interested in, namely the extent of Communist infiltration into the moving-picture industry in Hollywood and the extent of it and the general purposes of it and the method which the Communist Party may have used to promote its projects. So I would like to ask you if you have knowledge regarding the activities of the Communist Party in the moving-picture industry, whether it be in your field, that of the screen writers, the directors, or any other field.

Miss UERKVITZ. Mr. Tavenner, I will have to call upon my privilege under the first and fifth amendments and refuse to answer the question, because the organization which is in the question as being—

Mr. TAVENNER. There were several organizations mentioned. Are you referring to the Communist Party?

Miss UERKVITZ. I will still have to stand on my fifth amendment privilege.

Mr. Wood. Miss Uerkvitz, please, as far as this committee is concerned, there is no compulsion. You don't have to invoke anything. It is just a question of whether you do or not.

Miss UERKVITZ. I will have to stand on that ground.

Mr. Wood. You mean that you do stand on it, that you do claim the privilege of the fifth amendment?

Miss UERKVITZ. I do, sir.

Mr. Wood. All right. Well, you don't have to, you know, here.

Miss UERKVITZ. I do, if I don't want to get myself in hot water.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't understand that remark. This committee is not engaged in the prosecution of anyone. It is simply an investigation of facts, and I would like to give you the opportunity again to tell us what you know about this subject, if you will.

Miss UERKVITZ. Again, I will have to rely upon my privilege of the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. Wood. Well, do you so rely on your privilege?

Miss UERKVITZ. I certainly do rely. It is the only thing I have left to rely upon.

Mr. Wood. Well, the statement that you have to do it is not literally true, because this committee doesn't put you under any compulsion. It is a question of what you do.

Miss UERKVITZ. Well, the committee has put me under compulsion to this extent: The naming of so many dozens and dozens and dozens of organizations as subversive—I noticed that in the United States circuit court of appeals a couple of weeks ago they describe the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations as based purely upon hearsay.

Mr. Wood. I am afraid—

Miss UERKVITZ. Now, this may be true and it may not be true, but I don't want to jeopardize myself, and that is why I use the fifth amendment.

Mr. WOOD. I am afraid you don't understand my situation about it. What I am trying to say to you is that when you say you have to rely on the fifth amendment, it is not an answer to the question at all.

Miss UERKVITZ. Well, I'm sorry, sir, I will have to consider it so for me.

Mr. WOOD. Well, do you?

Miss UERKVITZ. I do decline; yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Very well, and for the reason that you have stated, under the protection of the fifth amendment?

Miss UERKVITZ. Protection against possible incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. It will simplify the procedure with us and with yourself if, instead of saying you have to say, that you do do it, if you do.

Miss UERKVITZ. I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the hearing room yesterday during the period that Mr. Martin Berkeley was testifying?

Miss UERKVITZ. I was here in the afternoon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, while you were here did Mr. Martin Berkeley describe you as a former member of the Communist Party?

Miss UERKVITZ. He didn't mention me at all while I was in the room.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, during the course of his testimony, probably while you were absent, he did state that he knew you to be a member of the Communist Party. I would like to ask you whether or not that was a truthful statement or whether it was false.

Miss UERKVITZ. Well, that reminds me of a tale on witch hunts where a 5-year-old child was condemned because a man testified that he saw devils running out of her mouth. However, I will stand upon my right of the fifth amendment and refuse to—decline to answer the question.

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

Miss UERKVITZ. I will again have to rely upon the fifth amendment.

Mr. WOOD. Do you so rely?

Miss UERKVITZ. I do so rely upon it.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, do you have any questions?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. You have stated that "I will get in hot water unless I rely on the fifth amendment." What did you mean by that?

Miss UERKVITZ. I explained myself earlier, but I don't want to discuss it further, if I may so not discuss it.

Mr. WALTER. You just decline to answer that question, is that it?

Miss UERKVITZ. I just do not care to discuss it further.

Mr. WALTER. I can understand that, of course.

Miss UERKVITZ. I am sorry.

Mr. WALTER. That is all right. Now, you have answered the question. Do you know that under the law nothing coming from the lips of any witness in this hearing can be used in any case against them? Do you know that?

Do you know it, Mr. Kenny?

Mr. KENNY. Yes; and I disagree heartily with you.

Mr. WALTER. You do?

Mr. KENNY. The law is exactly the contrary to that which you stated.

Mr. WALTER. Then I shan't pursue it further, but I will mail you the statute so that you are aware of the situation. That is all.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Counsel, any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. Any reason why the witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. So ordered.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman, I do have a client here under subpoena who is a dentist, and if he is not to be heard today he will run into considerable problems because he is a one-man office and has many appointments for tomorrow. Is there any opportunity that this doctor can be heard today?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his name?

Mr. KENNY. Dr. Schoen, or he could come at some later time.

Mr. Wood. We only have 5 minutes until we have to adjourn.

Mr. KENNY. Yes; I realize that.

Mr. WALTER. It is Mr. Kenny's client. It will be very short.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will endeavor to help you out by fixing a time during tomorrow that will be convenient to him.

Mr. KENNY. I will try to work out—

Mr. TAVENNER. Within reason.

Mr. KENNY. A time certain when he could appear; yes.

Mr. Wood. Until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, the committee stands in recess.

(Whereupon at the hour of 4:35 p. m. an adjournment was taken in the above hearing until the hour of 10 a. m. of the following day, September 21, 1951.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 5

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Subcommittee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:15 a. m., in room 518 Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman) Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator, and John W. Carrington, clerk.

Mr. Wood. Let us have order, please.

Let the record show, please, that the subcommittee is in session and that all members thereof are present.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Who do you call first?

Mr. TAVENNER. The first witness this morning is Dr. Max Howard Schoen.

Mr. Wood. Are you Mr. Schoen?

Mr. SCHOEN. I am Dr. Schoen.

Mr. Wood. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn. You do solemnly swear that the evidence you do give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. SCHOEN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MAX HOWARD SCHOEN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. Wood. Dr. Schoen, are you represented by counsel?

Dr. SCHOEN. I am.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat, please, sir. Will counsel identify himself for the record.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis, of Los Angeles.

Mr. Wood. Dr. Schoen, under the established rules of this committee you are at liberty to confer with your counsel at any time you desire

during the progress of the interrogation and obtain from him such advice, information, or suggestion as you think would be helpful to you. Of course, your counsel has been before this committee on frequent occasions and is familiar with the privileges that he is entitled to.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe we are ready to begin. You are Dr. Max Howard Schoen?

Dr. SCHOEN. That is correct.

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

Dr. SCHOEN. S-c-h-o-e-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where and when were you born, Dr. Schoen?

Dr. SCHOEN. I was born in New York City, February 4, 1922.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a resident of Los Angeles?

Dr. SCHOEN. I am.

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

Dr. SCHOEN. I believe since approximately the summer of 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Dr. SCHOEN. I am a dentist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee, briefly, your general educational background.

Dr. SCHOEN. I received my public-school education in New York City, then graduated from DeWitt Clinton High School, attended the College of the City of New York for 1 year, after which my family moved out to the west coast. I continued my predental education at UCLA and then got my B. S. and D. D. S. degrees at the University of Southern California in 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since that time you have been engaged in the practice of your profession in Los Angeles?

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, not exactly. Immediately, or within a very short period after graduation, since I was an officer in the Reserve, I went on active duty and practiced dentistry for approximately 3 years in the Army, of which approximately 20 months were spent overseas in the Pacific theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you still hold a Reserve commission?

Dr. SCHOEN. I am not sure what the technicality of this is. I have not signed up for the Organized Reserves, but I believe I am considered to be on inactive status. I am not sure of what the situation is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Schoen, I think by this time all those who have been subpoenaed before this committee understand the purpose of this investigation.

Dr. SCHOEN. I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to tell the committee what you know regarding Communist Party activities and Communist Party infiltration into the moving picture industry, if you have any knowledge of same.

Dr. SCHOEN. This question, Mr. Tavenner, contains within it the name of an organization which has been considered subversive, particularly in front of this committee. Therefore, I decline to answer this question on the basis of the fifth amendment which was, as I understand it, originally placed in the Constitution of the United States in the Bill of Rights in order to protect the people from persecution and prosecution on the basis of their political and religious beliefs and associations.

Mr. TAVENNER. The organization to which you referred, I believe, was the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHOEN. I believe you mentioned that organization in the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is that the organization to which you referred?

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, you referred to it and then I also did in answering the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a question relating to an organization which has been known as a Communist front or, at least, it has been said that it has, the Worker's School. The committee has information that a class of the Worker's School was held on June the 18th 1943, at the Unitarian Church here in the city of Los Angeles, and at that lecture, Communist Party literature was brought there to the church by John Howard Lawson and was distributed by you. Now, I am not raising any question at all about the propriety of your attending such a lecture, but I am anxious to know the circumstances under which Communist Party literature was delivered there and distributed, if you know.

Dr. SCHOEN. This is a similar question. Therefore, I also decline to answer it on the basis of the fifth amendment which, incidentally, I consider to be closely related to the first amendment, which protects the right of free speech. The right of free speech doesn't mean much without also the right to remain silent in regard to one's political beliefs and associations.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee understands that a similar meeting was held on July 4, 1943, at the same church and that you engaged again in the distribution of Communist Party literature. Is that true or not?

Dr. SCHOEN. That is substantially the same question; therefore, although I regret having to repeat myself, the same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the People's World of May 13, 1943, a meeting was to be held on the 15th of May at the Danish Auditorium in Los Angeles, publicizing I Am An American Day. According to information in the possession of the committee, the meeting was addressed by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a national committee member of the Communist Party, and by Steve Nelson, who, at the time, was the Communist Party organizer for Alameda County, Calif. Did you attend that meeting, and, if so, did those two persons address that meeting?

Dr. SCHOEN. Mr. Tavenner, this, I believe, is still more or less the same question and, as I hope I have indicated by now, my answer is also the same. This, I believe, represents questions again relating to beliefs and associations, and on the basis of the fifth amendment I refuse to answer on that basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with an organization known as the Dewey Davis Club of the Communist Party which, we understand, was a group within the Communist Party to which doctors and dentists were invited to join?

Dr. SCHOEN. We are still being repetitious. Same question; same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time, particularly and especially in 1946, a member of the Dewey Davis Club of the Hollywood section of the Los Angeles County Communist Party?

Dr. SCHOEN. Again, same question, same answer. I regret to be wasting the time of everyone here, but, Mr. Tavenner, you are asking more or less the same questions.

Mr. Wood. Just a moment. We will be the judge about wasting time, sir, and we desire not to waste any. You will be very helpful to us by answering the questions but since you decline to do so the only thing we can do is to ask them.

Mr. TAVENNER. The People's Daily World of April 27, 1951, devotes page 11 to May Day greetings. Among those listed as having sent May Day greetings appears your name. Will you examine the document and state whether or not your name appears there?

Dr. SCHOEN. Mr. Tavenner, the People's World has been deemed subversive, therefore I decline to answer this question on the basis of the fifth amendment. Although it seems unfortunate that newspapers find their way onto lists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wouldn't that depend entirely upon the actual conduct of the newspaper? Is there such a thing as immunity for newspapers which extends beyond that of the rights of other people and other organizations?

Dr. SCHOEN (after conferring with counsel). I believe that the Constitution guarantees freedom of the press, regardless of whether any group or individuals agree or disagree with the material that is contained. Freedom of the press is guaranteed under the first article of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Wood. Now, having delivered yourself as to the Bill of Rights, will you answer the question?

Dr. SCHOEN. (after conferring with counsel). I have answered. I decline to answer the question on the basis of the fifth amendment. And I, also, was asked for my opinion, which I gave.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you an issue of the Independent, a newspaper publication of Long Beach, Calif., which carries a full-page advertisement in the November 22, 1948, issue. This advertisement was paid for by the Long Beach Friends of the Civil Rights Congress and is in form and context a protest against contempt proceedings involving witnesses who appeared before a grand jury in Los Angeles. Your name appears as a signer, and I would like to ask you to state to the committee the circumstances under which your signature was obtained and who obtained it.

Dr. SCHOEN. (after conferring with counsel). Does this advertisement refer to the case here in Los Angeles where subsequently the decisions were reversed by the Ninth Circuit Court? I believe I have some recollection of this. Is this what this ad refers to?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, the decision was reversed by the Ninth Circuit Court and the people were freed.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is true.

Dr. SCHOEN. This advertisement has within it the name of an organization which has been deemed subversive. therefore I decline to answer the question on the basis of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the organization referred to?

Dr. SCHOEN (after conferring with counsel). You, and also the advertisement, or the photostatic copy which I just looked at, has in the corner of it the name "Civil Rights Congress."

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you, in April 1951, chairman of a meeting of the Hollywood West Side Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress?

Dr. SCHOEN. This question also refers to the same organization, therefore I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Schoen, the committee is in possession of information indicating that you attended a meeting of the Medical Council of the Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on the evening of August 23, 1951, and at that time it was decided to circularize the doctors and the dentists of this community with a letter relating to these hearings, and that during the course of the discussion of the matter a disagreement arose between you, Dr. Murray Abowitz, and Dr. Leo Bigelman, as to whether or not you three doctors should sign that letter. You disagreed with the other two and Mrs. Abowitz charged you with deviating from the policy; is that correct?

Dr. SCHOEN. This question also refers to an organization which has been deemed subversive, therefore I refuse to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment. I wish to add, however, that you appear to be referring to activity in relation to public opinion, and that some of these alleged subversive activities, subversive lists, contain many, many organizations and have not been arrived at, as I understand it, through due process but have just been set up on the basis of one group or another, or someone's say so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give this committee the benefit of any information that you have which you think it should consider on the question of whether or not the organization known as the Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions has been infiltrated by the Communist Party, or is in any sense under the influence or the control of the Communist Party?

Dr. SCHOEN (after conferring with counsel). You have again referred to an organization which has been deemed subversive. Therefore, I refuse to answer the question on the basis of the fifth amendment. However, I think that no lists should be compiled about organizations to which people belong to in a manner in which they have been done. This is my opinion—which has been done by this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Well, counsel, sir, is giving you the highest possible opportunity now in this forum to give us any information you have on the subject as to whether or not this organization has been correctly labeled as a subversive organization. You are being given the opportunity now to give us any information you have on that subject in this forum. Do you still decline to do it?

Dr. SCHOEN. I decline to answer the question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. WOOD. All right.

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

Dr. SCHOEN. This question is similar to one asked before. Therefore, I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

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

Dr. SCHOEN. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

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

Mr. Wood. I yield to you, Mr. Walter. Are there any questions you may desire to ask?

Mr. WALTER. Earlier in your testimony, in speaking of the Communist Party, you said that it was an organization considered subversive by this committee. I assure you that this committee isn't the only group that considers the Communist Party subversive. I think that even Communists, and even those who refuse to answer the question as to whether or not they are Communists, realize that the Communist Party in the United States and the Communists in the United States are part and parcel of the conspiracy to gain control of the entire world and included in that group is yourself and your lawyer.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Are you attacking me, Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. I am not attacking—

Mr. MARGOLIS. Will you give us an opportunity to make speeches, the same as you have, sir?

Mr. WALTER. You have an opportunity, sir, at any time.

Mr. MARGOLIS. You take the liberty of using this forum to make speeches, sir, and I would like to have the liberty of doing the same thing.

Mr. Wood. One at a time.

Mr. WALTER. You will be given any opportunity you seek to deny the charges that have been made that you, too, are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I don't consider it an opportunity to appear before this committee. I consider it a denial of constitutional rights to be forced to appear before this committee.

Dr. SCHOEN. And Mr. Walter—

Mr. WALTER. Just a minute. I am going to ask you a question, young man. You have stated that in your opinion the first amendment gives to you the right to remain silent as to one's political beliefs. I think that is true, but why do you remain silent if you are not afraid to let us know what your associations are?

Dr. SCHOEN. Mr. Walter, the right to speak or remain silent and the time at which one or the other should be done, I think, is something which I believe should be left to the individual. I do not consider this hearing to be the proper place to exercise the right to speak. I believe that this hearing is more or less of a public trial and that I—

Mr. WALTER. Nobody is on trial for anything. We are seeking information.

Dr. SCHOEN. I have been reading the newspapers the past few days, following these proceedings, naturally—they certainly concern me, since I was subpoenaed—and, believe me, it appears as though the witnesses who have sat here in this chair have been tried before the public, and I don't think that the technicality is as important as the actual fact. I know just recently of a case in Florida where, I believe, two Negroes—where the press inflamed the community against them to such an extent that the appellate court reversed a conviction for a crime because the press incited the people of the community and the jury to—

Mr. WALTER. You never miss an opportunity to appeal to minorities, do you?

Dr. SCHOEN. I believe that the minority groups in this country have the right—

Mr. WALTER. Never mind that. We have been trying for many years to correct a lot of things, and it is becoming increasingly difficult because of your ilk. I want—

Dr. SCHOEN. I hate to be put in the position of—

Mr. WALTER. All right. Just a minute. I want to ask you a question, and I might suggest that you stick to your class. After all, you are not a lawyer. Don't advise us on the Constitution. If we want advice about dentistry we will come to you.

Dr. SCHOEN. I am a citizen of the United States and, as such, have a right to discuss such things with Congressmen, I believe.

Mr. WALTER. All right. You have mentioned organizations that have been classified as subversive, without being given an opportunity to be heard. I would like to inform you that this committee has, on every occasion when organizations have come forward and demonstrated that a mistake has been made, corrected that mistake, and the information that we have concerning the organization that you are now afraid to discuss comes to us as a result of very thorough investigation made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Now, if the Communist Party is not subversive I suggest that somehow or other you communicate with the people in that organization, and I think you can reach them, and we will be very happy to give them the same opportunity we have given every other organization that feels that it hasn't been dealt with fairly. That is all, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle, any questions you desire to ask the witness?

Dr. SCHOEN. First, I am not—I do not use my right under the fifth amendment because I am afraid, except afraid of an atmosphere of persecution and hysteria which might lead to prosecution, and the atmosphere—

Mr. WALTER. Would you answer these same questions in executive session? Would you answer under oath these same questions if, at the conclusion of the hearing this morning, we put everybody out of the room and talked to you privately without any atmosphere of any sort?

Dr. SCHOEN. I do not feel that this would appreciably change the atmosphere.

Mr. WALTER. It wouldn't change your testimony; of that I am convinced.

Mr. WOOD. Any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, please.

Doctor, I think I understood your answer to our distinguished legal counsel when he asked you if you held a Reserve commission now in the American military forces and you said, "I am not sure." Is that correct?

Dr. SCHOEN. I know that I have not signed up for the Active Reserves, but I am not sure of the ins and outs of the law concerning whether I am or am not still on inactive status.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you made any effort to find out in the last 2 years?

Dr. SCHOEN. I was told when I left, or I was given the impression, that this is something I do not have to worry about or concern myself with, so I have not done so.

Mr. DOYLE. You are within the age bracket which might be called, though, are you not, under the present emergency with Soviet communism in Korea?

Dr. SCHOEN. In terms of the part of the question as to age bracket, I believe that I am young enough to be called; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. But you are not worrying about it. Have you traveled abroad in the last 5 or 6 or 7 years?

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, I have been—

Mr. DOYLE. I mean, outside of any military duty.

Dr. SCHOEN. I was going to try to figure whether my military duty occurred within that time, but other than that, I believe on vacations or week ends—I believe on some week ends I went to Mexico across the border, and, also, I took one trip to Canada, just a trip, and I was in Canada for 1 day.

Mr. DOYLE. At any time since you graduated from USC, from which I also graduated, and I am proud of it, have you traveled to Europe?

Dr. SCHOEN. I have not.

Mr. DOYLE. Other than military—

Dr. SCHOEN. My military service was in the Pacific so I have never been to Europe.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you traveled to Russia?

Dr. SCHOEN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Or any of the Soviet Union countries?

Dr. SCHOEN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you familiar with the statute under which this committee is operating at all, do you know what our assignment is by the United States Congress?

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, in general terms, I believe it was established to investigate subversive activities in the United States.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you think that is a worthy objective?

Dr. SCHOEN. This, I think, depends on the approach one has. This is my opinion.

Mr. DOYLE. This committee is assigned to investigate subversive people and propaganda. How would you indicate or recommend that we investigate it? Give us your recommendation, Doctor. We have been informed that you are a member of the Communist Party. We believe you are today, to be frank with you. You have exercised your right under the Constitution, the first and fifth amendments, to refuse to tell us whether or not you are. That's all right. We want you to stand on your constitutional rights at all times.

Dr. SCHOEN. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. That is important, and it is the American way of life, contrary to the rights of Soviet Russia and other countries which are backed by the American Communists.

But how would you recommend that this committee of the United States Congress investigate this? It is your Congress, Doctor, we represent your Congress, whether you claim us or not. We are under an express assignment and the text says we shall investigate subversive propaganda. How would you have us investigate it? We are investigating the Communist Party, for instance, of which we believe you are a member. How shall we go at it?

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, you ask me what recommendations I might have as to how this committee should investigate subversive activity and propaganda, and offhand I could suggest investigating, for instance, the recent riots which took place in Cicero, Ill., where a young Negro couple was by force and violence prohibited, or they were not able to occupy an apartment which they had rented. There was force and

violence which occurred to prevent them from doing so. This, I believe to be extreme subversion of the Constitution of the United States and the democratic way of life. I might make this recommendation—

Mr. DOYLE. Is there any connection with that unfortunate riot and with subversive propaganda instigated by a foreign government, for instance, Soviet communism?

Dr. SCHOEN. You asked me whether—

Mr. DOYLE. That's right.

Dr. SCHOEN. Whether I had any suggestions in regard to subversive activities.

Mr. DOYLE. That's right.

Dr. SCHOEN. And I have made such a recommendation.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any other recommendation?

Dr. SCHOEN. Well, I might have many of them. I could for instance, recommend that I feel that the continued existence of the poll tax which prevents large sections of the American people, primarily Negro people and poor white people in the South, in many Southern States, from exercising their constitutional right to vote, and that this prevents free exercise of this right. This I feel to be subversion. I feel that the conduct of certain Congressmen and Senators in attempting to block this by filibustering is in a sense subversion, because it doesn't permit the American people to express their feelings on it.

Mr. DOYLE. No doubt, Doctor, you will recognize that the Congressman who is asking you these questions is not in that group, nor at any time during the 5 years I have been in Congress. I have deliberately given you a chance to give recommendations to this committee, and I am glad to see that you are anxious to protect the rights of the minority, in other words, the Negroes and the Jewish people and the poor whites. But, of course, that is the Communist line, to appeal to that group, and we understand that. But now have you any suggestion about the Communist Party which has been declared as subversive by J. Edgar Hoover, for instance, or his organization? In other words, it has been declared subversive. Now, give us your thought on investigating the Communist Party, please. You have given us two recommendations. I am asking you to talk about the one now that I am suggesting.

How shall we do that?

Dr. SCHOEN. This question relates to an organization which has appeared on your list and is considered subversive by this committee; therefore I refuse to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. You are not a very good sport, are you?

Dr. SCHOEN. I don't think this is a sporting situation, actually.

Mr. DOYLE. It certainly is not. I gave you two chances and you wouldn't even give me one to get any help from you.

One thing more.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. I anticipate a colleague of mine is going to ask you a question along the lines directed to you because you were a member of the military forces, and so I will not ask that question. What is there about the Communist Party, or about any of your affiliations with any group, Doctor, which makes you feel that you would be subject to prosecution in a criminal proceeding if you frankly helped

this committee by helping us to understand how the groups you are a member of, subversive groups like the Communist Party, function?

Dr. SCHOEN. This question also relates to the same organization mentioned before—

Mr. DOYLE. That's right.

Dr. SCHOEN. Therefore I refuse to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. I am a much older man than you are, Doctor, and I just want to say to you that I pray to God that you get on your knees and see if you can't clean up some of your thinking and get out of this subversive outfit, and get over to the American line.

I was in Alaska for 10 days and I heard the Moscow radio blasting the American people as being warmongers and charging that we stole Alaska from Catherine.

I want to say to you again, why don't you get wise and get out of it and fight for the protection of the rights of all the people in the world instead of trying to direct your Government into Soviet communism?

That's all I have to say.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Dr. Schoen, would you take an oath to protect the United States against its enemies, foreign and domestic?

Dr. SCHOEN. Mr. Jackson, I was here yesterday and I have followed the hearings closely in the past few days—

Mr. JACKSON. I am willing to stipulate that you have been here for a long time. I simply want to know would you take such an oath to protect the United States against its enemies, foreign and domestic?

Dr. SCHOEN. I feel, since this is a question of opinion, I don't believe that this is a simple question directed to me here on the witness stand by this committee. I don't think this is an open forum. However, I just wish to state that I think that this question, and what it might lead to, are questions which tend to inflame and to increase the war hysteria which is prevalent in this country today.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you telling the committee, Dr. Schoen, that it is inflammatory to state one's loyalty to one's own country?

Dr. SCHOEN. I think that I have demonstrated my loyalty to this country in my acts as a citizen sufficiently so that we don't have to go into—

Mr. JACKSON. Would you enumerate the acts which you have contributed toward a greater and a finer and stronger nation? Just briefly.

Dr. SCHOEN. I, first of all, have voted with regularity—

Mr. JACKSON. The obligation of any citizen.

Dr. SCHOEN. Unfortunately many citizens do not.

Mr. JACKSON. Unfortunately they do not. I do, however.

Dr. SCHOEN. And cannot.

Mr. JACKSON. I exercise it all the time. We have that in common.

Dr. SCHOEN. I also served in the Armed Forces and volunteered for overseas duty.

Mr. JACKSON. So did the majority of the members of this committee. We have that in common.

Dr. SCHOEN. I am not arguing this.

Mr. JACKSON. I am merely pointing it out because I don't think I will have a chance to go back and retrace it.

Dr. SCHOEN. Offhand I think that the kind of dentistry I practice, both in my private practice and also that I attempted to practice in the Army, some of the things I attempted to initiate in the way of public health talks to the soldiers in the Army in terms of their teeth—this happens to be my field, dentistry. I think that this on a continuing basis has been proof and indication of this.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, so far as your lectures to the soldiers were concerned you were receiving a very good stipend, and that was your duty for which you were being paid. I don't consider that as any great obligation.

Dr. SCHOEN. This was a new lecture series which I participated in, initiating it. It had not been done before some of us initiated it.

Mr. JACKSON. Back to the oath. Have you ever taken an oath to defend and protect the United States of America against all of its enemies, foreign and domestic?

Dr. SCHOEN (after conferring with counsel). I think that I have taken an oath more or less embodying that. Yes; I believe that I have.

Mr. JACKSON. Was that oath taken in good faith?

Dr. SCHOEN (after conferring with counsel). I am sorry that I have to refer to counsel, this is not—

Mr. Wood. You have that privilege, sir, and there should be no comment about it.

Dr. SCHOEN. I always take my oaths in good faith.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you take such an oath today?

Dr. SCHOEN (after conferring with counsel). Of course.

Mr. JACKSON. I am amazed with the speed with which you responded after consultation with counsel.

Dr. SCHOEN. I believe I have the right to consult.

Mr. JACKSON. No one is questioning your right to consult with counsel. You have been making quite a point of your rights. I don't think any of your rights have been infringed upon whatsoever.

Dr. SCHOEN. I think my being here is an infringement.

Mr. JACKSON. Your past activities, which must be assumed to have been free and voluntary, have brought you to the stand. Mr. Potter didn't recruit you into the Communist Party, nor did any other member of the committee. I say that very frankly, because the evidence is very plain and very clear that you were and probably are at the present time a member of the Communist Party and I think the record should show that very, very clearly.

I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter, do you have any further questions?

Mr. POTTER. Doctor, what has been your average income since you got out of the service?

Dr. SCHOEN. This is a question which is rather difficult for me to answer.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. POTTER. Approximately.

Dr. SCHOEN. I am trying to answer it. I want to tell why I am vague in my answer. I happen to be a bad businessman, and I think, also, that I can't quite see the pertinence of this. However, I think that my average income probably has ranged—the maximum that it

has been was \$7,000, or approximately so last year. I am not quite sure—this year it might be approximately \$8,000, I am not sure.

Mr. POTTER. Doctor, you have had the benefit of enjoying a fine formal education. Under our form of government you have been able to meet a normal success in a very honored profession. I would say that the American way of life hasn't shackled you; that you have enjoyed the fruits of freedom that could not be received in any other country on the face of this earth. I say that you should be grateful to live in a society of free people in this country. And you are part of an organization that would overthrow the very thing that has made you a successful man and given you an opportunity to enjoy a way of life that you otherwise wouldn't have enjoyed if you were a part of a system behind the iron curtain.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. POTTER. I say, Doctor, that you are a very ungrateful person and a very dangerous man.

That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SCHOEN. I would just like to say, since Mr. Potter directed his remarks at me, that there is a difference of opinion here.

In my opinion, it is the committee which is helping to destroy some of the things which Mr. Potter mentioned.

Mr. Wood. What, for instance?

Dr. SCHOEN. I think that by conducting what I characterized earlier, what I believed was more or less of a public trial, that this committee is helping to destroy some of the rights of free speech and free—

Mr. Wood. By that, do you mean, sir, that it is your opinion that the Congress of the United States should permit, unhampered, the practice of the Communist philosophy in this country, the spreading of an ideology that is designed to overthrow the very Government that you have been successful in your business and living under, and it should permit it to be done without raising a hand to investigate it or expose it? Is that what you mean to say?

Dr. SCHOEN. Your question relates to an organization which has philosophies which have been deemed subversive. Therefore, I refuse to answer the question.

Mr. Wood. Don't you think you are being extremely unfair to me when you raise that question, yourself, and say that we are engaged in an investigation that you yourself are criticizing—

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. Wood (continuing). And then, when I ask you to elucidate on the subject, you take shelter behind a provision of the very Constitution that the people who belong to the organization that you are said to belong to believe in overthrowing and destroying?

Dr. SCHOEN. I don't believe that one can use the term "taking shelter behind the Constitution." I think the Constitution protects the rights of individuals and that by utilizing it one is helping to defend the Constitution. In terms of opinion, I also feel that investigations into ideas is also prohibited by the Constitution, and that is why I have voiced criticism.

Mr. Wood. But there is no duty on you to take shelter behind the fifth amendment. It is a privilege that is extended to you. If you want to exercise it, nobody requires you to take that shelter. I grant you the perfect right to do it. Nobody gainsays that right. The Con-

stitution gives you that privilege, but it never was the intention of the lawmakers of this land to require anybody to take advantage of it. It is put there for their protection but not for their shelter against an accusation that doesn't incriminate them, and when a man says that to answer a question would tend to incriminate him, when, in fact, it wouldn't, he speaks falsely.

Dr. SCHOEN. I think you are implying certain things which you have no right to imply in relation—

Mr. Wood. Namely, what?

Dr. SCHOEN (continuing). To my testimony.

Mr. Wood. Just name one of them.

Dr. SCHOEN. When a witness used the fifth amendment to the Constitution, I believe that there is no implication that may be drawn from the use of this fifth amendment. I am not an attorney. However, I believe I know this much, and I refer you to my counsel for further discussion of that.

Mr. Wood. Let's put a page right down there and see if there isn't. When a man says to answer a question would incriminate him but that he is not guilty of the charge or accusation or implication involved in the question, then he is either guilty of one or two things: If, in fact, to answer the question truthfully would not incriminate him, then his statement that it would is false. Now, there isn't any escape from that conclusion. If I say that to answer a question whether or not I am a member of the Baptist Church would incriminate me, I obviously speak falsely; but, if I am not a member of the Baptist Church, to say that I am not a member of it certainly would not in any way or degree incriminate me. You have been asked whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party. If you are not a member of that party, then the correct answer would be that you are not and, certainly, no incriminating implications can be involved there, but when you say that to answer it would tend to incriminate you, and follow that up with an insinuation that you are not a member of it, is just simply plain double talk.

Dr. SCHOEN. Mr. Wood, I think you are misinterpreting the Constitution of the United States. I have stated that an answer might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. Wood. I understood what you said.

Dr. SCHOEN. As I understand the law, you have no right to draw any implication whatsoever from that. However, since I am not a lawyer, I do refer you to my counsel for this discussion. It is a kind of legal discussion. However, I do believe that you have misinterpreted the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Wood. Well, to answer the question of whether you are a Communist or not would incriminate you or it wouldn't. If you say it would incriminate you, it leaves one conclusion in my mind and in the mind of every other fair-minded person within sound of your voice. Now, if, in fact, you are not a member of it, then your statement that it would tend to incriminate you isn't a true statement.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Mr. Wood, you have asked a legal question. May I comment on it?

Mr. Wood. I don't care to be involved in any legal discussion with counsel.

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is what it has been up to this point with a layman.

Mr. WOOD. I am sure that counsel's opinion on the subject and mine could never be reconciled with respect to this particular subject we have under investigation, and we couldn't accomplish any good purpose by entering into a discussion about it.

Mr. MARGOLIS. That is quite right, but I will cite authorities to support my position.

Mr. WOOD. Yes. Mr. Counsel, have you any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason that you know why he shouldn't be excused from further attendance on this committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. So ordered. Who do you have now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson.

Mr. WOOD. Are you Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes; I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will you put up your right hand and be sworn, please? You do solemnly swear that the evidence you give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. WILSON. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Mrs. Wilson, are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. WILSON. I have been advised of my legal rights and—

Mr. WOOD. And you do not desire the presence of counsel?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. If at any time during the progress of your interrogation you should determine that you find yourself in need of counsel, you will be given an opportunity to procure it.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will wait until the photographers are finished.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Counsel.

TESTIMONY OF ELIZABETH WILSON

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. Will you state your name, Mrs. Wilson?

Mrs. WILSON. Elizabeth Wilson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you any relation to Michael Wilson, who testified here a few days ago?

Mrs. WILSON. No; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mrs. Wilson?

Mrs. WILSON. I was born in Tulsa, Okla., in 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you hear?

Mrs. WILSON. I will sit closer.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will try to speak as though you were speaking directly to me, I believe everyone will hear you.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you live in Los Angeles?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived here?

Mrs. WILSON. For most of my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what your general educational training has been?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. Public schools in Los Angeles, ending with high school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have a profession or occupation?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes; I am a screen writer, a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in that work?

Mrs. WILSON. I have been engaged as a screen writer for a little more than a year. Before that I sold magazine stories.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any film credits for screen writing?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes; I do. Because I am a woman they are, naturally, westerns. The last one was an unentitled western treatment at Fox, and the one before that was a screen play from my own original, *The Cave*, at Universal, and this was really my first movie job.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been connected with the moving-picture industry in Hollywood?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, you see, my mother was employed by the industry; so, I have had an indirect relation to it all my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Wilson, during the course of the testimony in executive session of Mr. Martin Berkeley several days ago you were identified as having been a member of the Communist Party under the name of Betty Anderson.

Mrs. WILSON. That was my maiden name, and that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period of time were you a member?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, from the period adjoining and approximating 1937, with many years in total inactive, during which I did not sever the affiliation but was inactive, a period of reactivity in late 1946, ending late 1947.

Mr. Wood. Will you please suspend here just a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(A discussion was had off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I am certain you understand the objectives of this committee in its investigation of the extent of Communist infiltration into the moving-picture industry.

Mrs. WILSON. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to aid the committee in such manner as you can by giving the benefit of your information regarding Communist Party activities or Communist-front activities during the period that you have been associated with the party. I believe I should ask you first, however, to tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a member of the party.

Mrs. WILSON. I think it springs from school and the fact that in school, by virtue of having close personal friends who were of minority groups, I very early developed a strong feeling against discrimination against minority groups, and this was sort of the basic common denominator which I think led through a series of steps, and, I think, finally into the party.

I left high school to hold a job. It was in a book store, and I worked there for the better part of 2 years, and while I worked in the book store someone offered me a job in the newly opened offices of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. The book store that you spoke of, was it connected or affiliated in any manner with the Communist Party?

Mrs. WILSON. None whatsoever. It was most bohemian, but it was not—it was a Hollywood book store and in no way—

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. If you will continue. You spoke of having become active in the Anti-Nazi League.

Mrs. WILSON. Somebody, perhaps, knew my feeling in the matter, felt that I would be interested in working for an anti-Nazi organization, and I was, very. The organization had been in existence for some months before it opened offices, and I became one of several secretaries initially employed at the point when it opened offices. I should say that was in mid-1936, and the organization was very exciting and I liked working there very much. I remember my first official act very well. I sat in an empty office and a gentleman I had never seen before, Herbert Biberman, opened the door and said, "Are you Miss Anderson?" And I said, "Yes," and he said, "Take a letter." And he said, "Adolph Hitler, The Reichschancellery, Berlin: In the name of humanity, I protest outrages," and so on and so on. And this was the first of—literally my first act on the job in the organization, and it was a wire, actually, that was finally sent, and it was a good one, and I began, in other words, in a secretarial capacity and as is the history of all well-meaning organizations with boards busy elsewhere, many jobs devolved upon us in the office. We were really engaged in tremendous activity, and I found it all very exciting and constructive, and I believed in it. Decision did not often devolve on us. I might add that it was probably as the result of my enjoyment of this work and my agreement with it that a few months after I started working there I was invited to join a Marxist study group.

It was pointed out that Marxists were active in the fight against fascism and I was very casually curious and more than willing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in the course of your work with the Anti-Nazi League, did you come in contact with persons whom you later learned to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Mrs. Beatrice Buchman was active in the work of the Anti-Communist League?

Mrs. WILSON. It was an anti-Nazi league.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean, Anti-Nazi League. Excuse me.

Mrs. WILSON. She was very active; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to learn whether or not she was a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, inasmuch as I never did see her in a formal group or on any other terms than what might be personal deduction—you can have that, if you want—it would be a matter of personal deduction because I was—our relationship was marked by the absence of any contact in formal party activity.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I would rather for you not to state just a personal conclusion. If you have any facts that you can give to the committee so the committee could draw its own conclusion, why, it would be, I think, satisfactory, but it would only be facts that you know of first-hand.

Mrs. WILSON. On this subject?

Mr. TAVENNER. As to the Communist Party membership of anyone.

Mrs. WILSON. Oh. Well, yes. Perhaps—I mean, eventually, after several steps I came to know, through a formal party group, many people who were active in the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. May we do it that way?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. WILSON. This followed a year in the Young Communist League group, the year of 1937—I should say following a little study group to which I belonged, and finally I don't remember the circumstances, but I was transferred into the Communist Party itself, somewhere early in 1938, I should judge, into a branch whose concentration was the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, and this branch included names, some of which you are terribly familiar with. Madelaine Ruthven, Jack Lawson—John Howard Lawson, that is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you go a little more slowly, please, and raise your voice a little. I am not certain that I understood those names.

Mrs. WILSON. Madelaine Ruthven, John Howard Lawson, Herbert and Gale Biberman, Sonja Dahl, Lou and Vera Harris, Herta Uerkvitz, I believe, Jessie Burns.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. What was the name?

Mrs. WILSON. Jessie Burns. I think she was a part of this group. I at least saw her at Mrs. Ruthven's house on an occasion, as I remember a party occasion. And Sam and Sadie Ornitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the name of Sonja Dahl. Do you know her married name?

Mrs. WILSON. Biberman, Mrs. Edward Biberman.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was during the course of what meetings you became acquainted with those persons?

Mrs. WILSON. These were—by the way, I might add that these are the only faces that I can establish beyond guesswork as having seen them at Communist Party branch meetings. You will remember that this is some years ago and that the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League was an explosively growing organization. In 1 year it obtained between six and seven thousand members and it was infinitely subdivided into commissions and committees and subcommittees, and all of these met, and I seemed to be meeting with all of them. This is a matter of record. These people, however, I am sure, or I would not have said so, were present at branch meetings whose concentration, while I was in the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, was the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would tell us a little more about the functioning of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Was it engaged in the raising of funds?

Mrs. WILSON. It was engaged—in the beginning I understand it was ambitious to really raise funds beyond its own functioning, to send for the relief of refugees and to the aid of the underground fight in Germany against Nazis. In effect this was accomplished a few times. Large contributions of—I don't have the records in front of me—but they must have been in the several thousands of dollars, were finally sent and were sent through—divided three ways and sent through three agencies, if my memory is correct, and these were a Jewish organization, a Catholic welfare organization, and a Protestant organization. However, very quickly the Anti-Nazi League became financially engaged in a fight to perpetuate, you know, in work to perpetuate itself. It became an educational organization rather than an aid organization primarily, and published a newspaper and was on the radio, and had mass meetings and was generally an educational instrument in the fight against Nazis.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it developed into an organization which had propaganda purposes?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. And I agreed and do agree with them. I might add that I found my period with it, several years, from 1936 probably through 1938, perhaps two, perhaps $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, and during my experience with it it was a very healthy and effective explosive, but effective organization which would have existed, I think, with or without Communists in membership. I believe it was the sort of expression of the times, and I—for instance, although my attendance at branch meetings was spotty because of my extensive activities with broader meetings, I don't recall, in the years that I was with it, a real divergence, or any conflict in it, an area of real conflict between the branch and the board of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, which was by all means, I should have said, non-Communist in its majority. This may just have so happened, but I thought it was a pretty good organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the circumstances under which the league became inactive, or dissolved?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, no. I know that by hearsay, and I know them rather recently by hearsay, because at this point I had left the league and I was very active in another organization which reflected a certain period that I could speak of in first-hand terms.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before I ask you about that I would like to ask you if there was a person by the name of Otto Brada.

Mrs. WILSON. Otto Brada. I heard of him, I never met him. I was told that the league may have been touched off by a large banquet given to him in Hollywood some months before the opening of offices, or before I was connected with it. He was supposed to be a German underground fighter and I only know him second-or third-hand, you know. I never met him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you acquire knowledge with regard to—well, if you did not know him yourself I doubt if you are in a position to state whether within your knowledge he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. WILSON. I could make a guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want you to guess.

Mrs. WILSON. O. K.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you withdrew from your activity in the Anti-Nazi League and became active in another organization. Will you tell the committee about that?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. I was invited, to the best of my knowledge this was very unrelated to a party directive or move, but Philip Dunne, who is a non-Communist and anti-Communist was vice chairman of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee and conducted what he called a raid on the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League and asked me to become secretary of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee when their own secretary left for the East.

I was probably, without knowing it, very tired of meetings and organizations but I thought that what I needed, inasmuch as I had to earn a living, was a change of pace. I eagerly accepted the offer and became for a few months full-time secretary of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee and then for many months a part-time secretary, half days.

Mr. TAVENNER. You entered into your secretarial work with that committee very soon after its organization, I assume from what you stated.

Mrs. WILSON. No. I believe that—I would say it was early in 1939 that I went with the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, but it must have been in existence all throughout 1938, because it was, as I recall, very effective, for instance, and very energetic in sponsoring the recall which put Bowron in office. It also was effective in election activity that year.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the purposes of the formation—I should change that question. What were the purposes of the Hollywood Democratic organization as you understood them?

Mrs. WILSON. The Motion Picture Democratic Committee was—must have been formed—I believe its primary purpose was election work, was to use the sort of talents and special abilities of motion picture people in effecting the election of candidates that they agreed represented their best interests.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that organization become interested in propaganda matters which had no relationship to the purpose which you mentioned?

Mrs. WILSON. It did. In several steps—they took several steps to accomplish this.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that is rather a long story and as the chairman has indicated he would like a recess at 11:30, I believe it would be better not to start discussion of that matter at this time.

Mr. Wood. Recess now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. Wood. The committee will stand in recess for 15 minutes.

(At this point a 15-minute recess was taken.)

(Following the recess, all members of the committee being present, with the exception of Representative Donald L. Jackson, the hearing was resumed.)

Mr. Wood. Let's have order, please. Are you ready to proceed further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Wilson, at the time of our recess we were talking about the Motion Picture Democratic Committee. You have stated the general purposes of the committee, namely, the objective of electing various people to office. I understood you to say that as the work of the committee progressed it became interested in projects that were not akin at all to the original objectives of the committee. I believe the best way to develop that, probably, would be for you to tell your experience, generally, in connection with that organization.

Mrs. WILSON. Well, it was not an election year when I went to work there—

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. Would you raise your voice a little higher, please. Can you?

Mrs. WILSON. I will try. It was not an election year when I went to work there. It was 1939, and I, in a period of a few months, familiarized myself with the board, with its meetings, and in the spring of 1939 Russia invaded Finland, and this was an immediate source of conflict and contention within the Motion Picture Democratic Committee. Our chairman, Melvyn Douglas, and vice chairman, Philip Dunne, sponsored a resolution jointly to present to the membership and the board condemning the invasion of Finland. The

board refused to endorse the resolution on the grounds that the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, up to that point, had not concerned itself with international issues and this was—that such a resolution was inconsistent with this stand, and the members who felt this way were eloquent, and very eloquent at membership meetings and the resolution failed to carry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that not a striking example of the statement we have heard so often before this committee, that in the establishment of Communist-front organizations the Communist Party has opposed bitterly an organization taking a position on any issue which is, in any way, in conflict with the aims of the Communist Party or the Soviet Union?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, the Communists within the organizations do, but I am sure that in the beginning, the Motion Picture Democratic Committee was a fairly broad organization—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. WILSON. Or it wouldn't have had Douglas and Dunne as its officers.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the issue that had arisen here was whether or not there should be a condemnation of the Soviet Union for its attack on Finland?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the Communists were very bitter—

Mrs. WILSON. The Communists were.

Mr. TAVENNER. On that issue, and opposed the organization taking a stand on the issue?

Mrs. WILSON. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it opposed, on the ground that it was not within the purposes of the committee to create issues of that kind.

Now, what was the situation where the issue was one where the Communist Party, itself, was interested? Was there a situation that developed in which the facts were just turned around the other way, where the Communist Party was interested in behalf of the Nation—

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which had nothing to do with the purposes for which the organization was formed?

Mrs. WILSON. Such an issue occurred and was a source of very great personal disturbance and puzzlement to me at the time. Very easy to hindsight it, but I wasn't so—I just knew that I was uneasy and that—

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered the hearing room.)

Mrs. WILSON (continuing). I was uneasy on practical terms, because its effect on the organization was disastrous. Shortly after the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed, a national organization called the American Peace Mobilization came into being, and the American Peace Mobilization invited organizational affiliation from all over the country, and I can't recall whether at this point Douglas and Dunne had resigned—they were at least inactive—and the board decided to urge this affiliation on invitation from the American Peace Mobilization, and it was accomplished.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, those two illustrations which you have given are most striking because they demonstrate just what the Communist Party has attempted to do in the establishment of the front organiza-

tions, to oppose the organization making an issue out of something which is unfavorable to the Communist Party, and yet fighting desperately for the creation of issues in which the Communist Party was involved.

Mr. WALTER. More than that, I think it demonstrates beyond any question the insincerity of their loud proclamations about peace today, because here they are actively opposing a resolution condemning a cowardly act of aggression.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you move just a little closer to the microphone, please.

Mrs. WILSON. Almost impossible.

Mr. TAVENNER. And raise your voice just a little more, please. Will you name for the committee persons in that group, in the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. When I left the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League and I was transferred, a branch concentrating on its work to one concentrating on the work of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, and this branch included many board members. I can't state—I am sure it wasn't a majority but I couldn't state this without reference to the letterhead. These members were Robert Tasker, John Bright—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. You are going a little too fast. Will you spell the name of Tasker?

Mrs. WILSON. Robert Tasker, T-a-s-k-e-r; John Bright.

Mr. TAVENNER. B-r-i-g-h-t?

Mrs. WILSON. Right. Dick Fiske, F-i-s-k-e; Maurice Murphy, Harold Buchman—

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Harold Buchman hold any official position in that organization?

Mrs. WILSON. I believe he was treasurer. Allen Matthews.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a person by the name of Victor Shapiro connected with the work of that committee?

Mrs. WILSON. He was a member of the board and I fail to establish him as a member of the branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. You personally of your own knowledge do not know whether he was a member of the Communist Party or not?

Mrs. WILSON. My personal memory is not serviceable on this issue.

Mr. TAVENNER. He has been identified as a member of the Communist Party—

Mrs. WILSON. I understand that.

Mr. TAVENNER. By Mr. Martin Berkeley.

Mrs. WILSON. And it may have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any other experience you had in connection with that group which you can give the committee the benefit of, which may be of interest to it?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I think that I found a matter—because I was interested in the organization and believed in it, I found very disturbing, and although I was slow to understand its significance, the organization deteriorated and ceased to exist, oh, within a year after its affiliation—I mean within months after its affiliation with the APM, American Peace Mobilization. Members ceased to pay dues, to support it actively. It became very narrow and sectarian, fell into debt and closed its offices.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you state is the basic reason for that?

Mrs. WILSON. I feel that the affiliation with the American Peace Mobilization obviously didn't meet with the agreement of the majority of its members.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the non-Communist members of the organization would not go along with the Communist Party line?

Mrs. WILSON. This could be a conclusion drawn from the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. With the result that the organization withered and died?

Mrs. WILSON. It did die.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of any other organizations which you can now recall which functioned as Communist fronts?

Mrs. WILSON. No. I attended, however, when the American Peace Mobilization had a conference in Chicago. It had been achieved, you know, from my bird's-eye view at such severe cost to my organization that I was very curious and I went as a delegate of the defunct organization, is what it amounted to, and it was overwhelming. It was attended by thousands of people and I could not assess it. I could only—in the realm of my immediate personal experience knew that it had been partially—that my own organization in affiliating had ceased to be, and this seemed to me to be something wrong with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you go back now to your first entry into the Young Communist League and tell us just how your membership developed, first from one group to another.

Mrs. WILSON. A few months, as I said, after joining the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League as secretary, I was approached by someone, possibly Dick Collins, who suggested that I join a Marxist study group because the people attending the group, he felt, had the same strong feeling against discrimination that I did. I went somewhat socially, curiously. It was conducted by a furniture worker whose first name was Arthur, last name long since vanished.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. Will you state that over again, please?

Mrs. WILSON. It was conducted by a furniture worker, I remember, a young man whose first name was Arthur. And attending it were Budd Schulberg, Bob Lees—who were most of us, you see, second-generation picture people, young people. Fred Rinaldo, Ambur Dana, Dick Collins, Leon Becker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. I believe you are going a little too rapidly. Will you give those names over again and spell the last names, if the name is unusual at all.

Mrs. WILSON. They are not unusual to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I couldn't hear them. But nevertheless we must have them correct from the standpoint of the record. You may be giving us credit for more knowledge than we have.

Mrs. WILSON. Budd Schulberg, S-c-h-u-l-b-e-r-g.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are well acquainted with Mr. Schulberg. He has testified before this committee and made a full disclosure of his Communist Party experiences, which were very distressing to him.

Mrs. WILSON. Bob Lees, L-e-e-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. He hasn't appeared before the committee, and that is all.

Mrs. WILSON. Fred Rinaldo, R-i-n-a-l-d-o; Ambur Dana, A-m-b-u-r D-a-n-a.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is her married name?

Mrs. WILSON. I understood she was at one point married to Waldo Salt. That's all I know. I don't know where she is now. Dick Collins, C-o-l-l-i-n-s; Leon Becker, B-e-c-k-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occupation of Mr. Leon Becker?

Mrs. WILSON. I don't remember; I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he resided?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I don't. I barely remember him—I have a bare visual memory of him, as a matter of fact. Maurice Rapf, R-a-p-f; Louise Seidel, S-e-i-d-e-l; and myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you tell the committee how you progressed to membership in the Communist Party itself.

Mrs. WILSON. At the close of the study group Budd Schulberg, very casually—so casually that I am sure he doesn't even remember it—asked me to join the Young Communist League, and equally casually, although out of a genuine curiosity and a conviction that the young people that met in this study group shared many of my convictions, I accepted. I was a member of this Young Communist League group for most of the year 1937, I should judge.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you to refer again to those persons who attended this Marxist study group with you. Were there any of those persons named by you who were not known by you to be members of the Communist Party or to have joined at a later time or have been members at some time?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, they weren't—I would have assumed that they were all in a sort of novice status like myself, with the possible exception of Budd Schulberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. So I think for that very reason we should examine it at this time to determine whether or not there was any name in that list which was not affiliated with the Communist Party, to your knowledge, at a later time, so that the record may be perfectly clear about that.

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I can state immediately that to my knowledge Ambur Dana was never, in my experience, present at any party meetings that I attended, nor Louise—oh, no, that is not true. I'm sorry. Leon Becker was never part of a party group that I was part of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any others?

Mrs. WILSON. No; I think that's it.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue in your activity in the party?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I was—as I say—

Mr. TAVENNER. You were just in the Young Communist League?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. Excuse me. I was a member of this group for about a year, and then I was apparently transferred to a group whose concentration was the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League within the Communist Party, itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who composed that group?

Mrs. WILSON. The YCL group?

Mr. TAVENNER. No; the group—

Mrs. WILSON. I have given that to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the first group that you gave us?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I see. Will you give us the names of those who were members of the Young Communist League?

Mrs. WILSON. The names that I recall, the faces I recall as being present there rather than at Browder meetings which I was then attending of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, were Paul and Sylvia Jarrico, J-a-r-r-i-c-o; Virginia Schulberg. I do not recall Budd in that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. She was the wife of Budd Schulberg?

Mrs. WILSON. Budd Schulberg. Dick Collins, Maurice Rapf, Bob Lees, Ring Lardner, Louise Seidel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee what further experiences you had within the Communist Party and bring it on up until the time that you—

Mrs. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Severed your connection with the Communist Party.

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. Well, after the APM convention, I returned to Hollywood very tired and eager to remove myself from organizational work, which I did, using some very real, personal, financial, and otherwise reasons. I held bread-and-butter typing jobs outside of organizational work. There was a branch which I attended more and more rarely, which, in effect, watched my winging away from the party during the latter part of 1940 and 1941, I should say, and the war came, and in 1942 I married a man who never has been in nor could be a member of the Communist Party. He was drafted and I spent the war years as a camp follower in very fine and very varied experiences, from my point of view, afflicted with Hollywood claustrophobia, away from Hollywood and far away from the party. I had a child and learned to take care of it, which is very occupying, and I never, however, formally severed relationship with the party, which is the key, perhaps—I mean, this is an emotional act and a rather necessary one, in a way, because it is an intellectual decision, too, and I never accomplished it, although I was absolutely inactive, and I think that led to what happened in 1946 on my return to Hollywood, because I came back after—it must have been 4 years away, and I renewed acquaintances, and, necessarily, because of the nature of my years in Hollywood, the kind of work I had been in, so on, many of these friendships were friends within the party, and they were most urgent in suggesting that I reestablish an active connection with the party, and I—it took many months to even allow my curiosity to be active to this extent. I was quite resistant, but not thinking about it very much. I made many protests that I had had a very unhappy experience with the Motion Picture Democratic Committee and the APM and that I had many unresolved questions, and the suggestion was made that the removal of Browder in leadership had cured all ills, or had, at least, wiped out the source of many mistakes. This, in effect, was a contradiction in terms, but you must remember the year.

The war was just over, the horizons looked clear. Curiosity was a very personal thing and didn't seem to jeopardize my family or—you know, my country. On a personal basis, in terms of its having helped me to crystallize many dormant doubts and reservations, I can't regret that year, 1947, in the course of which I attended a half a dozen to a dozen party meetings, and this was the last group with which I was associated in the party, and saw my—the group which accepted my formal disaffiliation, I should say, in the early part of 1948, if it wasn't in the latter part of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of those who were in this group that you reaffiliated with?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. Jack Lawson, a very omnipresent gentleman in my party history; Lester Cole, Morton and Betty Grant, Melvin Levy, L-e-v-y; Arnold and Marge Manoff, M-a-n-o-f-f; Peggy Gruen, G-r-u-e-n; Tom Chapman, C-h-a-p-m-a-n; Mortie Offner, O-f-f-n-e-r; George Beck, B-e-c-k; John Sanford, S-a-n-f-o-r-d, and Sue Lawson, Jack Lawson's wife. It was a very large group, and a very, very small part of them were in attendance at meetings, and these were the ones I happened to see.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to a person by the name of Tom Chapman. Do you know what his occupation was, or can you identify him further?

Mrs. WILSON. Employed by a studio—

Mr. TAVENNER. Sorry—

Mrs. WILSON. As a reader, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, during the course of your party experience, did you become acquainted with any functionaries of the party whose names you have not mentioned?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. You know, they often visited branches in which I was involved. Some of them were teachers conducting spaced lectures. The teachers that I recall were Dr. Leo Bigelman and Harry Carlisle.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Leo Bigelman is the same gentleman who appeared before this committee a few days ago?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes. The functionaries were John Stapp, S-t-a-p-p, Elizabeth Leech, L-e-e-c-h, who is connected—who is the functionary of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee branch. All I remember, offhand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Elizabeth Leech's married name?

Mrs. WILSON. I am not sure. I have heard it. I heard it, you know, by virtue of the committee hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we don't want you to testify regarding matters you heard in here. Were you acquainted with Charles Glenn?

Mrs. WILSON. I have met him, but I don't recall linking him at party meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you state to the committee, please, the circumstances under which you left the party?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, first of all, I take some of the dignity out of my decisive act by having to admit that if I hadn't had a reason, it would have happened anyway, because my husband insisted, but there was a reason, and it was the fact that 1947 was a year of—well, you know, at the beginning of it things seemed clear, and by the end of it they no longer seemed such smooth sailing. This was reflected possibly within the party in terms of party literature, by an emphasis on the necessity for supporting a third party, should it be formed.

I was interested in the development of this—I was really quite fascinated by it, because quite apart from my own feeling about the efficacy or the need for a third party, there was a fallacy in the party, the Communist Party approach to this whole issue, because, first of all, party literature stated that a third party would be an impracticality unless it were supported by a number of large unions. It gave the number—I don't recall—and named them—I don't recall. Then the year rolled around, and I suppose it was necessary to file, and these

unions still did not support a third party, but somewhere a third party came into being and the Communist Party threw its support behind the third party. At least, as reflected in the branch I was a member of, and this seemed to me, as I say, in their own terms very fallacious thinking again, my own terms, and again, in the course of that year, or all through it, I had been differentiating in this, the way they and me, which, I suppose, was the sort of show-me basis on which I had returned to the party, but on my own terms. Well, the third party, the Independent People's Party, had as a slogan "a peace party." It was called the Party for Peace, and this last year in the Communist Party branch had crystallized, as I say, many, many doubts and feelings for me. I stopped attending meetings before I formally severed affiliation, although there was only a lapse of a month or so, I should say, because I decided that I want peace very much as all other Americans want it, but I would have to think very hard and realize particularly and independently about the terms and associations on which I want peace, and no one else can do the thinking for me. I believe that this isn't necessary, you know, perhaps for some people within the Communist Party, but it certainly was necessary with me. It is a cliche, but it happened to me.

I stopped believing, for instance, that the ends ever justified the means. I stopped believing in the infinite good will or will for peace of the Soviet Union, or that the sacrifice of the personal liberty is ever justified anywhere, and I think that these are the bases on which I accomplished the formal severing of relationship with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. The severance of your connection with the Communist Party was final and complete?

Mrs. WILSON. It was. It took the form of a visit after some months had passed without my attendance, a visit to me by Arnold Manoff, who is a writer, who said that if I had stopped attending meetings because I was finding it difficult to write as a Communist Party member, the party was taking steps to alleviate this difficulty, which was a matter of time and convenience, and I said, "No," that, "my differences are much more fundamental," and I explained them as I have explained them to you, and he said that he would relay this information to the branch and that I could consider myself no longer a member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever live in the State of Michigan?

Mrs. WILSON. Never at any point.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you reside there temporarily in 1946?

Mrs. WILSON. Never.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am referring particularly to Flint, Mich. The reason I am asking you that is that the committee has information that a person by the name of Elizabeth Anderson lived in Flint Mich., and signed a Communist Party nominating petition in 1946.

Mrs. WILSON. Categorically, it was not I, but I have been haunted by my name, you know. There were three Elizabeth Andersons in high school when I was there.

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

Mr. WOOD. I will yield to the members of the committee for any questions that they may desire to ask at this point. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Mrs. Wilson, you perhaps don't realize how great a contribution you have made to our work. Your testimony, for example, with respect to the division of the money collected by the Anti-

Nazi League has thrown some light on something that we have been concerned about, particularly those of us who also participated in that, what we thought was a very fine, lofty, undertaking.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. WALTER. I congratulate you. I think the people in this country owe you a deep debt of gratitude. That's all.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I, too, wish to join with my distinguished colleague and adopt his complimentary words as mine.

I noted you twice referred to Douglas Fairbanks as vice chairman and another gentleman as chairman.

Mrs. WILSON. No. Melvyn Douglas—

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, Melvyn Douglas.

Mrs. WILSON. Melvyn Douglas was chairman and Philip Dunne, D-u-n-n-e—

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, yes.

Mrs. WILSON. I do hope that what happened to some people that Mr. Berkeley named as non-Communists doesn't happen to them, because they are distinctly in action and belief not Communists.

Mr. DOYLE. I wanted to make sure that I participated in emphasizing that which you emphasized.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. That is why I am bringing it out. I had always understood that Philip Dunne and Melvyn Douglas were not Communists.

Mrs. WILSON. That is entirely true.

Mr. DOYLE. Is that from your own personal knowledge?

Mrs. WILSON. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. DOYLE. You mentioned a number of young people, and included yourself at that time, and said that you were second-generation motion-picture people.

Mrs. WILSON. Many of us were, perhaps most of us.

Mr. DOYLE. Does that mean we are to understand that the motion-picture artists affiliated with the motion-picture industry at that time, I mean as parents, were encouraging their own children to participate in the Young Communist League?

Mrs. WILSON. Not at all. I am sure that the reverse is true. I am sure that it is a pattern that you will find in any part of the United States, it is a very youthful pattern. I was 20 or less. And we unquestionably were drawn to this because it represented an infringement on authority, you know, with its faintly conspiratorial aura. I am convinced that none of the parents involved were responsible, and, in fact, distressed to know about it.

Mr. DOYLE. My distinguished colleague to my left reminds me that I am trying to question you within 3 minutes. Did you ever read any Communist literature or hear any Communist lecturer expound in support of the United States Constitution as written, emphasize that the Communist must be loyal to the Constitution of the United States and its system of Government?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, certainly I heard the Bill of Rights specifically cited.

Mr. DOYLE. I refer now to the balance of the Constitution and the rest of the amendments.

Mrs. WILSON. This is a matter—I can't—I do not recall one thing or the other, I really don't, you know. I mean it may be conspicuous by—

Mr. DOYLE. Was there ever any constitution of the Communist Party submitted to you for signature?

Mrs. WILSON. Never that I remember. It was submitted to me for reading, for my own information, and I never read it.

Mr. DOYLE. In fact, you have never yet read it?

Mrs. WILSON (indicating by shaking head from side to side).

Mr. DOYLE. We have a copy of it—

Mrs. WILSON. I don't want to read it.

Mr. DOYLE. And for your information I will say that there is no declaration of loyalty to the United States Constitution or the Declaration of Independence in it. It is not found. But there is a pledge and an oath, substantially, of allegiance to the Soviet Union, as is so vigorously always brought out by my distinguished colleague from Michigan. I hope he brings it out again. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to join with my colleagues in thanking you for your testimony, which I think has added something to the sum of the knowledge of the committee.

Tell me, in a closed session, in a branch meeting where only Communists were present, was it customary to open that meeting as the Elks, Rotary, Kiwanis, and a lot of other organizations which happen to believe in the United States of America do—was it customary to open the meeting with a pledge of allegiance of any sort?

Mrs. WILSON. No; it was not.

Mr. JACKSON. Or to the Constitution?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Or to the flag?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Was the American flag displayed at those meetings?

Mrs. WILSON. No.

Mr. JACKSON. It was not displayed?

Mrs. WILSON. Not as a matter of established—

Mr. JACKSON. Were the pictures of the great American patriots displayed—for instance, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—at party functions?

Mrs. WILSON. You know, they were in hired halls for the most part, and they could have been present or they could not have been present. But not by—

Mr. JACKSON. Were you ever present when any pictures of any great Soviet leaders were displayed prominently?

Mrs. WILSON. Actually, I was not.

Mr. JACKSON. You never saw them?

Mrs. WILSON. No; I never did.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I made a trip as an observer for the Elks lodge—which, incidentally, in the text of these hearings should not be considered subversive, for it is a great and loyal American organization—sent me as an observer one time. You could hardly see the stage for the pictures of Mr. Lenin. The American flag was conspicuously absent, as was any pledge of allegiance to any institution, any ideal, or tradition of the United States of America.

I hope that your break is final and definite, and I congratulate you on your courage in coming forward to tell what you know about a conspiratorial device.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Mrs. Wilson, when you were a member of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, I assume that the Communist work within that organization operated as a fraction; is that true?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I suppose. I have always been vague about the literal meaning of the word "fraction," but in your usage of it, I think possibly it is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Did you ever have meetings prior to the regular set meetings of the committee, did the Communist members ever have meetings of their own to plan the strategy of what action should be taken to influence the policy of the entire committee?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, whether they were special meetings or not, certainly in the moments—in the times of crisis that I refer to over the Russian invasion of Finland and the APM, there was extensive discussion within the party of the necessity for and defeating one and supporting the other.

Mr. POTTER. Did the members of the Communist Party, who were in the committee, did they work in unison, did they vote in unison?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes; I would say they did, with an exception.

Mr. POTTER. Would you care to discuss the exception?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I believe that Maurice Murphy, whom I recall as a very seldom attendant at branch meetings of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, had the survival of the body as an election organization very much at heart and was very vocal in feeling that the affiliation with the APM would be inimicable to its survival.

Mr. POTTER. Mrs. Wilson, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues and hope that in your little capacity as a wife, mother, and writer you will have a very happy future and a successful future.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No further questions.

Mr. WOOD. As I previously pointed out in these hearings, it has been said on high authority that to admit a mistake and honestly seek to rectify it requires the highest degree of moral courage. I join with my colleagues on this subcommittee in extending to you the very deep appreciation of the committee for the valuable contribution that you have made to our work and to the American people. I, too, feel that the people in this area and the entire United States are sincerely indebted to you for your courage and your willingness to come here and give us the benefit of the information which you have given us today. I wish to extend the sincere thanks of the committee.

You are excused from further attendance on the committee.

The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., a recess was taken in the above hearings until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(Whereupon, at 2:05 p. m. of the same day the proceedings were resumed, the same parties being present with the exception of Representative Charles E. Potter.)

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order.

Before proceeding further with the hearings of witnesses I desire at this point to read into the record a letter of correction which I have received special delivery from Mr. Irwin L. DeShelter, regional director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations for this region. This is written on the stationery of that organization and directed to the chairman of this committee, and it is in the following language:

I note from press reports of your subcommittee's present hearings on Communist activities in Hollywood, that witnesses have mentioned the name of Jeff Kibre as one of those who belonged to a Communist Party unit. Kibre also was identified as "presently head of a CIO fishermen's union in San Pedro." It is this second point which here concerns us.

Please be informed that Kibre is not a member of a "CIO fishermen's union" or any CIO union. Kibre, we understand, is an official in a fishermen's union which is now part of the independent International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, of which Harry Bridges is president.

The fishermen's union with which Kibre is identified was thrown out of the CIO some 2 years ago after it was found guilty of charges that it was dominated by Communists. Bridges' ILWU was also ejected about the same time for the same reason. The two organizations have since merged.

If Kibre has been identified in your official records as belonging to a "CIO fishermen's union," we respectfully request that a correction be entered to make it clear that CIO has nothing to do with the likes of Kibre.

Sincerely yours,

IRWIN L. DESHELTER,
CIO Regional Director.

Who do you call, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Murray Abowitz, please.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Tavenner, I explained to you that the doctor is on call at his office. This is his day at the hospital. If you want him this afternoon I can phone him and have him down here—

Mr. TAVENNER. How long will it take for him to be here?

Mr. KENNY. I think a half hour.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest you call him right away, sir.

Mr. KENNY. Yes, I will.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jeff Corey.

Mr. WIRIN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Corey is an actor and he feels television will hurt him. He does not want to be televised.

Mr. Wood. Is Mr. Corey present? Let him come forward and urge his own objection.

Mr. COREY. I urge, Mr. Chairman, that television not be used on my visit.

Mr. Wood. Very well, if you object to it the same directive will be given as has been previously given.

Mr. COREY. I, too, would find the still photographers during the process of testimony disconcerting, so I am sure we can dispense with that during the course of the testimony.

Mr. Wood. In that case I will ask the photographers to make whatever pictures they desire now.

Mr. COREY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Wood. And then they will desist until the testimony is finished.

Mr. WIRIN. May I assure the photographers Mr. Corey isn't that important, but that's for them to decide.

Mr. WOOD. That is a matter I can't pass on.

Mr. COREY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WOOD. Do you object to being photographed at all?

Mr. COREY. Oh, no. It is unavoidable. I was just going to explain my attitude with regard to television, if I may.

Mr. WOOD. If you will just wait a minute, we would like to get you under oath.

Now, Mr. Corey, if you will stand and be sworn.

Mr. COREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Hold up your right hand, please, sir. You do solemnly swear that the evidence you give this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COREY. I do, sir.

TESTIMONY OF JEFF COREY, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, A. L. WIRIN

Mr. WOOD. In the light of the fact, sir, that you have entered your objection to being televised and the directive has been given that you not be televised, I can't see that your views on that particular subject would be material any longer. It couldn't affect you because you are not being televised.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Jeff Corey?

Mr. COREY. That's right.

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

Mr. COREY. I was born in New York City, August 10, 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. COREY. I am an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you engaged in your profession in California?

Mr. COREY. I am really not, sir. My name was brought up at an earlier committee hearing and since then I have been gray-listed, if not completely black-listed. Hitherto I had been quite busy as an actor, but my professional fortunes have waned considerably, coincident with the mentioning of my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say your name was mentioned in connection with the work of this committee, are you referring to the testimony of Mr. Marc Lawrence given in Washington—

Mr. COREY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which, I believe, was April 24, 1951. Do you know Mr. Marc Lawrence?

Mr. COREY. I know him as an actor who played an informer; with great verisimilitude, in a picture called Asphalt Jungle.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated with him in a Communist Party cell or group?

Mr. COREY. Mr. Chairman, I am cognizant of my privileges as a citizen, and I will stand on the first and fifth amendments of the United States Constitution and on article 18 of the Declaration of Human Rights as passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations, which reads in part, if I may paraphrase it, that everyone shall have the right to freedom of conscious thought and religion, the right to change his belief or religion in private or alone, in public or on community with others to so manifest his belief.

Mr. WOOD. Well, the directives of the United Nations are not as yet the law of this land and offer no protection to the witness for refusing to testify. If you base your declination to answer that question upon the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that is in force and is respected.

Mr. COREY. Yes; specifically in regard to the prior question, I am very proud to use my privileges, as I understand them, according to the first and fifth amendments of our noble Bill of Rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting with Marc Lawrence?

Mr. COREY. Mr. Counsel, that is approximately the same question, I am sure you will agree with me, and my answer remains the same.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not necessarily the same. You may have some explanation if such a thing occurred.

Mr. COREY. Specifically, I decline, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. If you decline to answer, that is the end of it as far as we are concerned, sir. That is a sufficient answer here.

Mr. COREY. Sir, I was trying to facilitate matters.

Mr. WOOD. You will facilitate by answering the questions. We will get along a lot faster.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. COREY. For some desire, ironic, strange reason, I believe, Mr. Counselor, that name has been put on a subversive list by the Attorney General and possibly by other groups who have cataloged organizations and periodicals and as a consequence I stand on my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WOOD. And decline to answer?

Mr. COREY. Yes; I decline to answer. If I said I decline to answer in regard to all future questions, can we come to an agreement that I base it on the fifth amendment for purposes of economy?

Mr. WOOD. It will be so designated and it will save a lot of time, unless you designate otherwise.

Mr. COREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Southern California chapter of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council?

Mr. COREY. Well, that organization, too, has merited acceptance on a number of lists, and I decline to answer that on these same grounds as now revised, sir.

Mr. WOOD. By the way—

Mr. COREY. Yes, sir?

Mr. WOOD. We might also expedite the hearing by simply making your reply without recounting the status of the organization mentioned, because I believe the committee is fairly familiar with the status of these organizations.

Mr. COREY. I don't want to sound like a parrot repeating these things. I have a great sensibility toward sounds and words, being an actor of some sensitivity. I will try to restrain myself. I just hate repeating a thing again and again, particularly when I think there is some importance to what I say, and there have been so many misapprehensions as to its use, hiding behind, cloaking yourself. I stand on the fifth amendment very proudly.

Mr. WOOD. You have already said you do on that question. That is sufficient.

Mr. COREY. I was rather surprised to have this—

Mr. Wood. It is very embarrassing having to listen to a stump speaker.

Mr. COREY. I am not running for office.

Mr. Wood. Not here.

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

Mr. Wood. I yield to a member of the committee, Mr. Walter. Any questions?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle, have you any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. I notice, Mr. Corey, in answer to the first declination which you made—

Mr. WIRIN. You say declination or declamation?

Mr. DOYLE. Declination.

Mr. WIRIN. I thought you said declamation.

Mr. COREY. I was guilty of both declinations and declamations, apparently.

Mr. DOYLE. I heard you in both. I noticed you said that you stood upon your rights both as to the first amendment and the fifth amendment.

Mr. COREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I wondered what the first amendment had to do, if anything, with your declining. I don't understand that that involves the question of possible incrimination.

Mr. COREY. Well, I just—I do feel, and I—apparently you and I might be in opposition to this point of view—that my rights of freedom of conscious thought, as embodied in the Bill of Rights, are violated by my being summoned and interrogated in front of this hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, but you don't claim—

Mr. COREY. So I mention it.

Mr. DOYLE. I see.

Mr. COREY. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. That answers my question.

Mr. COREY. I feel that—

Mr. DOYLE. No, that answers my question. I didn't ask you for a stump speech.

Mr. WIRIN. Now, Mr. Doyle. I say, now, Mr. Doyle, is that the prerogative only of Congressmen?

Mr. Wood. Let the witness answer the questions.

Mr. WIRIN. I wasn't referring to Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is all.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Has your freedom of speech been abridged in any way, Mr. Corey?

Mr. COREY. Well, it isn't—I think that probing into one's thoughts and conscience—I will put it this way. I believe that no one can bargain for the key to my brain wherein is stored multitudinous attitudes about life, religion, politics, and art. You may try to ferret it out against my consent, but—

Mr. JACKSON. You are afraid freedom of speech is going—

Mr. WIRIN. May he continue to answer the question?

Mr. JACKSON. No, I have heard the speech 50 times.

Mr. WIRIN. Not this one, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. The same one, with variations. That's all.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. I have no questions.

Mr. COREY. I seem to have worn you gentlemen out successfully.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. I have no questions, sir, but in response—I can't let it go unchallenged—to your opening statement here that your employment has been interfered with by some vague reference to blacklisting on account of the activities of this committee, let me call to your attention the fact that if there is any obstruction in the path of your future employment by reason of your appearance before this committee, we have given you as good a forum as you can possibly find to relieve yourself from the effect of the implication that is now in everybody's mind by reason of your declining to answer the question that you are a member of the organizations about which you have been interrogated, and I just wanted to make this little observation, sir, and I am speaking now for myself, only.

I don't want to speak for the remaining members of this committee, but if, by any action of this committee, we could be instrumental in eliminating from the field of public entertainment the views of people—particularly the youth of this country being moved to a large extent—people who decline to answer a question as to whether or not they are members of the Communist Party, it would make me extremely happy.

Mr. COREY. May I—

Mr. JACKSON. May I associate myself with that?

Mr. COREY. Sir, may I make—

Mr. Wood. With that, you are excused from further attendance on this committee, sir. That wasn't a question, that was a statement.

Mr. COREY. Thank you.

Mr. Wood. Who are you calling?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mary Virginia Farmer.

Mr. Wood. Come forward, please.

Miss FARMER. May I ask for the privilege, as I am an actress, not to be televised, either in motion pictures or in still pictures? Just press photographs.

Mr. Wood. Do you object to being photographed?

Miss FARMER. Not for the press.

Mr. Wood. Would you gentlemen withhold your pictures just a moment and let me administer the oath.

You do solemnly swear that the evidence you will give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss FARMER. I do.

Mr. Wood. Will you have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF MARY VIRGINIA FARMER, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, ROBERT KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

In view of the fact that this witness, Miss Farmer, has registered her objection to being televised while she is testifying before this committee, the injunction heretofore made with reference to other witnesses who have evidenced a like desire is invoked with reference to her.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

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

Miss FARMER. Mary Virginia Farmer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss or Mrs.?

Miss FARMER. Miss.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Miss FARMER. In Van Nuys.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Miss FARMER. Since 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Miss FARMER. I am an actress.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged as an actress in the State of California?

Miss FARMER. I think that I began my acting in motion pictures in 1940, possibly. About 1940, 1941—I'm not sure which.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time how were you employed?

Miss FARMER. My first professional engagement as an actress was in 1921, in stock with Jess Bonstelle, in Buffalo. My first professional Broadway engagement was, I think, in 1925 in a play called Stone and Fruit, produced by Mr. A. H. Woods. I played for various Broadway engagements after that.

I came to California in 1936, as I said, through the Federal theater project, for which I was engaged in the East by Mr. J. Howard Miller, the regional director of the 11 Western States, to direct, to assist in production, and to establish a training and retraining system for the actors on the project.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee briefly what your general education has been.

Miss FARMER. Yes. I went to the public schools in Montclair, N. J., graduated from high school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the place of your birth?

Miss FARMER. No. I was born in Indianapolis, Ind. I was living in Montclair, N. J., with my parents and went to the public schools, graduated from high school there. I then traveled in the West with my mother, the West of this country, with my mother for a year and came back and went for a year to the Baldwin School, in Bryn Mawr, Pa., a girls' boarding school. In New York—Bryn Mawr is near Philadelphia, and I also studied singing in Philadelphia at that time.

In New York, in the next several years, I added to my education by 2 years' study in many aspects of the drama in the extension systems of Barnard College and Columbia University. I also studied acting with Mildred Holland at that time, a well-known retired American road star, and at the studio in Carnegie Hall of the great German naturalistic actor, Emanuel Reicher.

Subsequently I finished—I won't say finished my educational background, but to bring it somewhat up to date, I did 2 years' study in psychology in the extension system of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the fact that you came to California in connection with the Federal theater project.

Miss FARMER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that date, please?

Miss FARMER. That was September. I went to work—I was assigned on the project and I think I went to work the day after Labor Day, 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold a position of importance with the Federal theater project?

Miss FARMER. I don't know that it was of particular importance. I was what is known as an administrative supervisor. That, however, was a general title. I didn't do any kind of administration whatsoever. I suppose that related to salary, that title. I did what I was brought out for. I directed plays, I instituted and taught and supervised some training work, actors' work, the technique of acting. And I assisted in production—in the supervision of productions, that is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any other duties in connection with your assignment to the Federal theater project other than you have just described?

Miss FARMER. Not that I can remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain an official of the Federal theater project?

Miss FARMER. I think it was April or May 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear the testimony of Mrs. Ashe who testified on the first day of the hearings here in Los Angeles?

Miss FARMER. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Mildred Ashe.

Miss FARMER. I heard her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ashe, as you recall, testified that there was a fraction meeting of the Communist Party within the Federal theater project on one occasion to her knowledge which you attended. Do you recall that?

Miss FARMER. Mr. Tavenner, to this question—on this question I invoke my privileges under the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution and I decline to answer it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ashe testified in substance that she was surprised and that she complained about the fact that you had been permitted, a person of your importance had been permitted to attend a fraction meeting of that type because of the possibility of disclosure of your connection with the Communist Party. Have you any comments you desire to make about her testimony with regard to that?

Miss FARMER. This seems to me to be the same question from another angle and I decline to answer it on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Martin Berkeley, in the course of his testimony, identified you as a member of the Communist Party within the moving picture industry. Was he truthful in that statement or untruthful?

Miss FARMER. I decline to answer this question on the same grounds that I have previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of the functioning of the cultural commission of the Communist Party within the moving picture industry?

Miss FARMER. I decline to answer this question on the same grounds and for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you reside in 1937?

Miss FARMER. In Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the address?

Miss FARMER. No, I don't think I can give you the number. I think that has escaped me. I believe it was Montana Street, or something of that sort.

Mr. TAVENNER. Montana Avenue?

Miss FARMER. Yes, it could be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could 1350 be the correct address?

Miss FARMER. This I really don't recall. It might be.

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

Miss FARMER. Mr. Tavenner, as in all such questions relating to that organization I decline to answer, and I stand on the fifth amendment.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, any questions?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why this witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, the witness has given the committee a statement.

Miss FARMER. May I submit a statement?

Mr. WOOD. It will be received, yes.

The witness will be excused from further attendance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Louise Rousseau.

Mr. WOOD. Witness Rousseau, will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please.

You do solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give this sub-committee shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Be seated.

TESTIMONY OF LOUISE ROUSSEAU, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. WOOD. Are you represented here by counsel, Miss Rousseau?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will counsel please identify themselves for the record.

Mr. KENNY. Robert W. Kenny and Ben Margolis, both of Los Angeles.

Miss ROUSSEAU. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a statement, if I may.

Mr. WOOD. Very well, the statement will be received.

Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir, I am.

Mr. WOOD. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Apparently the photographers have not yet completed their chores.

What is your name, please?

Miss ROUSSEAU. My name is Louise Rousseau.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss or Mrs.?

Miss ROUSSEAU. Miss.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession, please?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a writer engaged in the moving-picture industry?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I was until I received my subpoena.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name. I understand there is some discussion.

Miss ROUSSEAU. R-o-u-s-s-e-a-u. It's an old French name.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you worked in the moving-picture industry as a writer?

Miss ROUSSEAU. Since 1943 or 1944. I'm not sure which. Somewhere in there.

Mr. TAVENNER. What have been some of your screen credits?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I write westerns as a whole. The other day I tried to remember them all but I found it impossible. Mostly they are written by a number, since they come under a series. I have written for Jimmy Wakely, Monte Hale, the Durango Kid, the Lone Ranger, and the Cisco Kid. I might say that most of these stories are based on actual incidents in the past relating to the struggles of the little people to overthrow the bigger people who try to stifle them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you make a brief statement to the committee of your general educational background, please?

Miss ROUSSEAU. Yes. My general educational background began at the knee of my grandmother, who taught me to read and to write, and to have—

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not necessary to go into that detail. We have all gone through that experience.

Miss ROUSSEAU. This particular period happens to be the most important educational training of my life. She taught me family history. We were very proud of family history, my grandmother and I, because our ancestors came to this country in the year 1670 and they brought with them a great dream of freedom for the people of all beliefs.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are going rather far afield.

Miss ROUSSEAU. This is rather extremely important in my education, because my ancestors also signed the Constitution and fought for the Bill of Rights.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness' answers are covered in the statement.

Mr. WOOD. Will you please answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. It would take a very long time to answer the question so I will ask you another question.

Miss ROUSSEAU. It will take a very brief time.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information that you were a member of the Hollywood section of the Los Angeles Communist Party in May 1947, and that your 1947 Communist Party book was No. 49869.

Miss ROUSSEAU. Under the first amendment of the Bill of Rights this committee nor any other committee of Congress has the right to ask me that question, because—

Mr. WOOD. We pass on the question of our right to ask it. The question is your right to answer it or not, as you see fit. What is your answer?

Miss ROUSSEAU. My answer is that I stand on the fifth amendment, which was originally written to implement the first amendment.

Mr. Wood. We know what it was written for. Do you stand on the fifth amendment?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I do.

Mr. Wood. Under that, do you decline to answer the question?

Miss ROUSSEAU. I decline to answer the question.

Mr. Wood. That simplifies the matter.

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

Mr. Wood. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. Is that the incorrect number of your book?

Miss ROUSSEAU. This is a question which I consider the same as the other question and I decline to answer it.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Any other questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir, there are not.

Mr. Wood. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. It is so ordered.

The committee will stand in recess for 15 minutes pending the appearance of the witness that was called a little while ago.

(Whereupon a recess was taken at this point.)

Mr. Wood. Let us have order. Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call Dr. Murray Abowitz.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Abowitz, would you raise your right hand and be sworn, please, sir. You do solemnly swear the evidence you give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I do.

Mr. Wood. Dr. Abowitz, are you represented here by counsel?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Mr. Kenny.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Kenny of the Los Angeles Bar?

Mr. KENNY. Right.

Mr. Wood. During the progress of your interrogation, you are privileged to confer with your counsel as often as you may desire.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Thank you.

Mr. Wood. You may seek any information or advice that you deem available to you. Your counsel is familiar with the rules and will give you his advice.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, may I request that I not be televised?

Mr. Wood. Yes, sir, and your request will be respected.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Wood. The television cameras are requested to refrain from televising Dr. Abowitz during his testimony. Do you object to the pictures, Doctor?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Well, they are very annoying.

Mr. WOOD. I will ask them to suspend a little bit. All right, proceed now.

**TESTIMONY OF DR. MURRAY ABOWITZ, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY**

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

Dr. ABOWITZ. Dr. Murray Abowitz, A-b-o-w-i-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Dr. Abowitz?

Dr. ABOWITZ. In New York City, 1911. That is, in Brooklyn, New York City, 1911.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I am a physician; M. D.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a specialist in any field?

Dr. ABOWITZ. In internal medicine.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are engaged in the practice of your profession in Los Angeles?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Yes, sir, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you practiced medicine here?

Dr. ABOWITZ. About 9 years; possibly 10. Between 9 and 10 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time where did you live?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Here in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Los Angeles. Are you a native of California?

Dr. ABOWITZ. By adoption, only; not by birth. Having been born outside of California, I can be a native only by choice, and I have so chosen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, thank you for reminding me of that. Are you the husband of Mrs. Ellenore Abowitz who has testified here yesterday?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Yes, sir, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us very briefly your educational background.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I was educated in the city of New York public schools, high school, and college, and I had my medical training in the University of Vienna in 1932 to 1937, and after that I came out here to Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Abowitz, you are acquainted with the purposes of this investigation, I think?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I am, but I can't say that I agree with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand. During the course of the testimony here we have learned that you were a member of the Communist Party, and if that is true you should be in a position to give this committee valuable advice and information relating to the extent of Communist infiltration into the moving picture industry and in this community. I refer you to testimony which was introduced in executive session before this committee a few days ago. Dr. Krieger—M. Krieger testified in executive session and was asked about the homes where Communist Party meetings were held or, at least, homes in which he had met with Communist groups and, according to his testimony, he recalled the name of one. He was asked this question, "What is the name of the only individual you do remember?"

Dr. KRIEGER. It was a physician by the name of Murray Abowitz.

Then he proceeded to state that Mrs. Ellenore Abowitz was the chairman of the particular group or cell. Now, with regard to yourself, I would like to ask you first the question whether or not Dr. Krieger was telling the truth when he stated he met in a Communist Party meeting in your home and knew you as a member of the Communist Party.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Mr. Tavenner, because the Communist Party has been listed by this committee as a subversive organization I must claim the privilege of the fifth amendment and decline to answer that question.

Mr. Wood. You don't have to do that. You are under no compulsion. The question is whether you do do it or not, not whether you must.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I have an inner compulsion to do so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. Acting under that, do you do it?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I so do.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you married, Dr. Krieger?

Dr. ABOWITZ. The name is Abowitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Abowitz.

Dr. ABOWITZ. August 14, 1945. Yes, I remember because it was VJ Day, and for other reasons I recall it, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you also remember whether or not your wife, Mrs. Abowitz, was employed in any capacity by counsel who is now representing you?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I have no such recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information, Doctor, that a prospectus for the 1944 winter term of the People's Educational Center, and also a prospectus for the 1947 winter term of the same school listed you as one of the school instructors. I would like to ask you some questions relating to your connection and service there, if it be a fact that you were an instructor. Were you such an instructor?

Dr. ABOWITZ. For the same reasons, that this organization has also been listed by this committee, I must decline to answer that question, also.

Mr. Wood. Dr. Abowitz, that isn't a complete answer, because we are entitled to an answer unless you decline to do so, for any reason you may give. To say you must do it is not an answer. It is a question of what you do do.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I think the record would show, Mr. Chairman, that I decline.

Mr. Wood. You said you must decline.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Well, it is a choice of words. I feel compelled to do so out of necessity to avoid testifying against myself.

Mr. Wood. Then you do do it?

Dr. ABOWITZ. And also to avoid destroying what I think are some of the sacred things in this country.

Mr. Wood. Nevertheless, from the standpoint of legal procedure this committee is entitled to an answer or a declination to answer. Now, which do you do?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question for the reasons stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of, or have you been affiliated with the American-Soviet Medical Society?

Dr. ABOWITZ. For the same reasons I must decline to answer the questions, and I so do decline, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a letterhead of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, dated December 10, 1946, you were listed as a member of the executive council of that organization; is that correct?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate for election to the executive board of the southern California chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America in 1947?

Dr. ABOWITZ. For the same grounds I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a ballot for the election of officers for the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council of September 1947. The first candidate listed for election to the executive board there appears to be Dr. Murray Abowitz. Will you examine the document and state who is listed?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I beg your pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. I say, will you examine the document and state who is listed on it as the first candidate for election to the executive board?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I see my name there for alphabetical reasons, apparently.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate for election?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I am afraid I must give you the same answer for the same reasons, Mr. Counsel. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a circular of the medical council executive board of the Progressive Citizens of America. On this circular you are listed as the executive secretary. Do you see your name listed there as executive secretary?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the executive secretary of that organization?

Dr. ABOWITZ. For the same reasons I must give you the same answer, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of an article that appeared on page 3 of the People's Daily World of November 6, 1948. In this article it is said that a number of people urged dismissal of contempt charges against certain persons, referred to as political prisoners. Among those listed as urging the dismissal of the contempt proceedings is Dr. Murray Abowitz. I would like to ask you this question: If you were properly listed as being one of those who urged the dismissal of the contempt proceedings, will you state the circumstances under which the listing of your name was secured?

Dr. ABOWITZ (after conferring with counsel). Because of the fact that the Civil Rights Congress, which apparently sponsored that item, has been listed by your committee as a so-called subversive organization, I must give you the same answer, Mr. Counselor, and decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Civil Rights Congress?

Dr. ABOWITZ. That is a similar question, and the answer is the same, Mr. Counselor.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a program of a conference on the subject of thought control in the United States presented by the Hollywood Arts, Sciences and Professions Council of the Progressive Citizens of America. According to this program Dr. Murray Abowitz was a member of a panel on health and medicine. I would like to ask you, if you did serve on such a panel, who it was that solicited you to do it and the circumstances under which you were solicited.

Dr. ABOWITZ. For the same reasons, the same answer, Mr. Counselor.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of a call to a bill-of-rights conference held at the Henry Hudson Hotel, New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, by the Civil Rights Congress. You are listed as one of the sponsors. Would you advise the committee the circumstances under which your sponsorship was solicited and obtained?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Because this was sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress I must give you the same answer. I think the bill-of-rights conference, however, would be most appropriate. We still have a part of it left.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. According to a photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Conference of Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated August 21, 19—

Dr. ABOWITZ. It must be 1950, Mr. Counselor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Forty-nine, you are listed as one of the signers. Will you examine it, please, and state the circumstances under which your signature was obtained.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Has that organization been listed by this committee, or smeared by this committee, as subversive? Most organizations that have worked for peace in the past few years have been so listed.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you are asking me whether it has been smeared by this committee, I will not hesitate to say it has not.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I am sorry. I will withdraw that. Has it been so listed? I really didn't mean that.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been cited as a Communist-front organization.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Counsel. Therefore, for the previously stated reason, I must withdraw—

Mr. WOOD. At this point, isn't it proper to observe that it has been cited as such by the Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; I think not.

Dr. ABOWITZ. And decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a photostatic copy of page 2 of the Daily People's World of June 19, 1951. In the left-hand column there is a news item to the effect that a number of persons have signed a brief to be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, urging a rehearing of the conviction of the 11 Communist Party leaders. The article further says that a number of individuals had written President Truman letters on behalf of the convicted Communist Party leaders. Dr. Murray Abowitz is listed as one of those who wrote the President. Now, please do not misunderstand me. I am not undertaking to criticize by inference or otherwise any person who writes the President on matters which he has in mind, but what the committee is interested in is whether or not the writing of such letters was promoted by a particular line of the Communist Party and the extent to which this is part

of the Communist plan, so I would ask you that if you did write the President as indicated in that news item to tell the committee the circumstances which led up to your writing it.

Dr. ABOWITZ. That is a loaded question similar to the one which I had used and I withdraw it and, for that reason, I must decline to answer it on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. WOOD. Do you so decline?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I so do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate for election to the executive board of the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council in 1951?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you made a contribution of money to the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council within the past 60 days?

Dr. ABOWITZ. For the same reasons I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a check dated August the 3d, 1951, purportedly signed by Murray Abowitz. I ask you if that is your signature.

Dr. ABOWITZ. It resembles it strongly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify that as your signature?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is there any doubt in your mind but what that is your signature?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Well, I usually have an M. D. after it, but sometimes I perhaps omit it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I wish you would examine it carefully and see who the payee is on the check and any notations that appear on it that might refresh your recollection as to whether or not it is actually your check. Who is the check payable to, as shown on its face?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I will show you the photostatic copy and you can read it, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have seen it. I am asking you to do it.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you turn the check over and read the endorsement stamped on the back.

Dr. ABOWITZ. It has a large "11" on there and "Pay to the order of Security-First National Bank of Los Angeles, Arts, Sciences and Professions Council."

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that represent a donation to the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council made by you?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Because that information has been listed by you, unfortunately, as a subversive organization, I must decline to answer that on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the photostatic copy of the check in evidence and ask that it be marked "Exhibit Murray Abowitz No. 1," please.¹

Mr. JACKSON. To whom was the check made out?

Mr. WOOD. That will be so entered.

¹ See appendix printed in separate volume.

(The check referred to appeared in words and figures as follows:)

Murray Abowitz, M. D.
6333 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles 48, Calif.
York 8233

No. 1714
8/3/51

Pay to the order of ASP----- \$25. 00
Twenty-five and no/0----- Dollars

Wilshire-Crescent Heights Branch 16-329
6301 Wilshire Boulevard.
Bank of America
National Trust and Savings Association
Los Angeles, Calif.

(Signed) Murray Abowitz.

[The following words and figures appeared on the back of said check:]

11 Pay to the order of 11
Security First National Bank of Los Angeles
Art, Sciences and Professions Council

Mr. TAVENNER. The check bears date of August the 3d, 1951, payable to the order of ASP, in the amount of \$25, signed by Murray Abowitz and an endorsement which has already been read.

Will you state to the committee the purpose for the raising of funds by that organization? That is, the Southern California Chapter of the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the same ground, Mr. Counselor.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information, Dr. Abowitz, that you attended a meeting of the Medical Division of the Arts, Sciences and Professions on August 12, 1951, at the home of Dr. Alexander Pennes, P-e-n-n-e-s, in Los Angeles; that Dr. Leo Bigelman, Dr. Max Schoen were present along with a number of other members of the organization. Do you recall that meeting?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Inasmuch as it again relates to ASP, I must decline on the same grounds.

Mr. Wood. And do you so decline?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I do so decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information that there was held, also, at that same address, another meeting on August the 17th of 1951, the purpose of which was to discuss matters relating to this hearing, and that at this meeting it was agreed that a picket line around the building should be maintained, that a crowded hearing room should be maintained, that the witnesses would stand on the fifth amendment, that letters should be sent to all members of the medical and dental associations showing that this committee's investigation is not an attack on individuals but an attack on the entire medical and dental professions; that the services of competent counsel should be secured and that a sizable sum of money be donated for the purpose of defraying the expense of newspaper advertisements, leaflets, pamphlets, brochures to show the members of the ASP appearing before this committee in a favorable light, and to take care of counsel fees. Will you state whether or not that action was taken at the meeting to which I referred, or any other meeting of that organization?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment. I think, Mr. Counsel, if I may state at this point, that it is becoming obvious that a shameful piece of espionage and spying has been going on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then there must be some basis.

Mr. JACKSON. This is called counterespionage.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I resent that insinuation.

Mr. JACKSON. That is no insinuation.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Well, it is an insulting remark.

Mr. WOOD. If you will just confine your answers to the questions asked it will simplify the hearing considerably.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Communist-front organizations, by the very terms under which they are described, denotes that they are composed of persons who are both members of the Communist Party and nonmembers of the Communist Party. Many instances have been shown where people have been induced, either as the result of their own culpability or their own carelessness, into organizations which otherwise they would not have joined, so in referring to that I am going to mention—I am not intending to infer that any of them are members of the Communist Party other than those who already have been shown to be by the evidence introduced at this hearing, but I would like to ask you whether or not the following-named persons are members of the Southern California Chapter of the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council.

Mr. John Howard Lawson?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to answer that on the same grounds, Mr. Counselor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Abraham Isserman, I-s-s-e-r-m-a-n?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William Esterman?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Herta Uerkvitz?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. U-e-r-k-v-i-t-z. Now, Sarajo Lord, whose name appeared as the executive secretary on the letters with which the medical and dental associations were circularized—

Dr. ABOWITZ. I'm sorry, I didn't hear that last question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sarajo Lord, whose name appears as executive secretary of the organization at the foot of the letter with which the medical and dental professions were circularized.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Well, the reason that you are trying to link me with an organization which you have labeled "subversive," I must continue to decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. P. Price Cobbs?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Drusilla Baetache?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Jane Dawson.

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ann Wallace?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lee Bachelis?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Charles Glenn?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Elaine Glenn?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Herbert Biberman?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Annette Kalish?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lee Blank?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. June Fields?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Manuel Concepcion?

Dr. ABOWITZ. Same answer.

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

Dr. ABOWITZ. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment and for the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Do you so decline?

Dr. ABOWITZ. And I so decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. I yield to the members of the committee now. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. Doctor, do you know Dr. Krieger?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I was asked that question previously, sir.

Mr. WALTER. No, you weren't.

Dr. ABOWITZ. I must decline to answer on the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. WALTER. Dr. Krieger is not a Communist. Why do you think that an admission of knowing him would in any wise implicate you in criminal proceedings?

Dr. ABOWITZ. I decline to state my reasons, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WALTER. But you decline to answer the question of whether or not you knew him?

Dr. ABOWITZ. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. That's all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Only one request, but no questions, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that this might be a good place to insert the letter which was circularized among the doctors and dentists of the county at this point in the record, together with the repudiation of the county medical association of any connection with the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I did that in connection with the testimony of another witness, his wife Ellenore. We have several of them. If you would like to put it in again—

Mr. JACKSON. I don't think there is any necessity of duplicating it, but it seems to me it would—

Mr. TAVENNER. It is already on exhibit.

Mr. JACKSON. It seems to be more apropos to the testimony of this witness than that of his wife.

Mr. WOOD. I will direct that it be inserted in both instances.

(The letter above referred to, written by the Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions is as follows:)

DEAR DOCTOR: The House Committee on Un-American Activities is coming to Los Angeles on September 17. Ordinarily, such an event would not bring forth a letter to you. However, in this instance, we feel you will be concerned, because

the committee has subpoenaed a large number of professional people of this city, including writers, actors, physicians, dentists, as well as others.

This House committee has an infamous record. Its first chairman was the notorious Martin Dies, who initiated this committee's partisan-political smear technique. Its next chairman, J. Parnell Thomas, recently served a prison sentence for misuse of Government funds. The present chairman, Congressman Wood, reveals his contempt of Americanism with the observation that the threats and intimidations of the Ku Klux Klan are an old American custom.

The committee, at the cost of over \$1 million to the American taxpayer, has concerned itself almost exclusively with intimidating, smearing by innuendo, and depriving of their livelihoods liberal-minded people whose views run counter to those of the committee. At no time has the professional competence and integrity of the subpoenaed people been questioned.

This committee is not an impartial investigating body. It has prejudged ideas, organizations, and people, as shown by its listing as subversive over 200 publications, and over 600 organizations without proper investigation or hearing.

The committee has spent 4 years investigating Hollywood. As a result, many fine people have lost their jobs for refusal to cooperate in what they consider to be the destruction of our democratic rights. It is common knowledge that these actions have led to a deterioration of motion-picture content. Fear pervades the entire industry—fear of acting in, or writing, or producing, or directing anything that in the remotest way might be considered subversive by this committee.

In conducting its investigations this committee has consistently violated the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution. These amendments guarantee not only the right to speak, write, and think freely, but also the right to remain silent about one's beliefs. The fifth amendment, which provides that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself, is fundamental to our democracy. It was intended to protect the individual from being forced by the Government to reveal his political or religious views, and thus subject himself to persecution and prosecution, as indulged in by this committee.

Any person who does not insist on this right before the committee would actually be helping to open the way for political and religious persecutions and thus destroy the foundations of democracy.

We urge you, therefore, to follow closely the proceedings of this committee when it comes here, so that you may see for yourself its un-American, antidemocratic conduct. We urge you to write your protests to the chairman, Representative Wood, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. and to Representative Jackson and Doyle who are the California Congressmen on this committee. We welcome your financial and moral support in the fight to defend these men and women, and in so doing, to protect the rights of all.

Sincerely yours,

SARAJO LORD,

*Executive Director, Southern California Chapter of the National Council
of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.*

(The following letter from J. M. de los Reyes, M. D., chairman, Public Relations, Los Angeles County Medical Association was sent in reply to the letter immediately preceding, and reads as follows:)

It has been alleged by the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council that a facet of the Communist investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities constitutes an attack against the medical profession. The Los Angeles County Medical Association, representing nearly 5,000 doctors of medicine which constitutes the majority of the doctors of medicine in the county of Los Angeles, welcomes any investigation of communism or Communist front activities regardless of where they exist, and does not feel that this or similar investigations are now and can conceivably become an attack in any way upon the medical profession. The American Medical Association, the California Medical Association, and the Los Angeles County Medical Association, by their actions and loyalty oaths, have shown unequivocally their support of the American way of life.

Approved:

PAUL D. FOSTER,

Secretary-Treasurer, Los Angeles County Medical Association.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. Any reason why this witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance on the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. It is so ordered.

The subcommittee will now stand in recess until 10 o'clock, Monday of next week.

(Whereupon at the hour of 3:45 p. m. an adjournment was taken in the above hearings until the hour of 10 a. m., Monday, September 24, 1951 at the same place.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 5

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:15 a. m. in room 518, Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter (chairman), Clyde Doyle, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Tavenner, who is your first witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Carl Foreman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Foreman, will you raise your right hand. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. FOREMAN. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Be seated.

TESTIMONY OF CARL FOREMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, SIDNEY COHN

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Carl Foreman?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I was born on July 23, 1904, in Chicago, Ill., 1914, I beg your pardon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. FOREMAN. I reside in Los Angeles.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I believe that I have lived here since 1937 or 1938, sir, with the exception of the time that I was in the armed services.

Mr. WALTER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. WALTER. Will counsel please identify himself.

Mr. COHN. Sidney Cohn, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee in a general way what your educational background has been?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir. I was educated in the public schools of Chicago. I attended high school there. I attended Crane Junior College, which was a city college, where I majored in journalism. I attended the University of Illinois, where I majored in journalism. I also attended the John Marshall Law School for a brief period, and Northwestern University.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. FOREMAN. I am a writer, sir, basically for motion pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you engaged in that activity?

Mr. FOREMAN. Since 1940, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief statement of your record of employment or association since you became a writer.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir. I entered the industry, I believe, in 1940, when I sold a motion-picture story to the Monogram Studios for Bela Lugosi and the Dead End Kids, and it was called Spooks Run Wild, I think, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little bit.

Mr. FOREMAN. It is now being shown on television. Surely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you.

Mr. FOREMAN. I had a very difficult time entering the industry. It is very difficult to become a writer in Hollywood or become anything else in Hollywood. I had been here for some 2 or 3 years previously, trying very hard to become a motion-picture writer, learning how to get in. At the time I sold this story, I think I was working at Technicolor, and I was run over on my way to work, and it was while I was in bed recuperating that another writer came to me and told me they were looking for this type of story. I had written one some years previously, and having the time, lying in bed, we were able to work it out into something acceptable, and we received \$425 for the original story and the screen play, to be divided among ourselves. I did two more pictures for Monogram. I got \$300 for the next one, and I decided that perhaps in order to make a living, since it was very hard to make a living working for that kind of independent, I had best try something else, and I then went into radio, did several radio shows as a writer of comedies. That is, comedy radio shows. In 1942 I felt that I couldn't be happy in radio. It was very hard to be a gag man. I was losing my hair, and I was able to get back into motion pictures at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. I remained at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer until 1943 when I went into the Army. I was in the Army until late 1945 or early 1946, when I returned.

I worked at RKO, and then, with some other young men who owned another company, formed a company of our own, and I have since been employed and a member of that company. It is the Stanley Kramer Co. Would you like to know what I have written in recent years?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I would like to know what your principal screen credits have been.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, within recent years I have written a picture called Champion, Home of the Brave, The Men, Cyrano de Bergerac, Young Man With a Horn, and I am currently engaged in writing

and I am an associate producer of a picture called **High Noon**, starring Gary Cooper. I am a little bit embarrassed about this because you had some young ladies on the stand last week who said they wrote westerns and this is a western.

Mr. TAVENNER. You shouldn't be embarrassed about that.

Mr. FOREMAN. I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. There are many very good lady writers.

Mr. FOREMAN. Oh, of course. No, no. It was just that everybody up here Friday, you know, was a lady engaged in the writing of westerns, and this happens to be a western. It is the story of a town that died because it lacked the moral fiber to withstand aggression. It is a suspense story, and I hope it will be a good one. Would you like to—would you care to know of other duties I have at this time, sir, what else I am doing?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. What are your duties?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, in addition to, as I say, writing **High Noon** and being an associate producer, I am also a producer or will produce several other motion pictures through our company at Columbia Studios. These are **The Happy Time**, a Broadway play by Samuel Taylor, to be directed by Richard Fleischer; a novel by John Fante called **Full of Life**, which will be directed by a member of our company, Edward Dmytryk, and one or two other stories.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Foreman, during the course of this investigation Mr. Martin Berkeley appeared here as one of the witnesses, and in the course of the testimony he referred to you as having been a member of the Communist Party. This is what he said in regard to you:¹

And Carl Foreman—

referring to you as a member of the Communist Party—

I believe he wrote the screen play of **Cyrano de Bergerac** and the **Champion** and other very fine pictures.

Then I asked this question:

Let me ask you a question here. Does Mr. Foreman hold any position, to your knowledge, with the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BERKELEY. I am glad you asked me that, sir, because that is very important. I said before that there was only one Communist—let me rephrase that. There is in the guild today only one man I know who was ever a Communist. This man has never, to my knowledge, disavowed his communism. His name is Carl Foreman, the man I just mentioned. He is the only one left on our board. I hope he appears here, sir, and clears himself, because it will help me to clear the guild, and that is a job I want to do.

Now, I would like to ask you whether the statement of Mr. Berkeley is correct, first, that you were at one time a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds it violates my privileges under the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution. However, if you wish me to go on with Mr. Berkeley's statement I should like to say this—

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. I asked you no further question.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Tavenner, I don't think—

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner?

¹ See p. 1599.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I should give you an opportunity to answer most any question relating to your activities and if I have failed to ask you any question which would bring forth any fact regarding you I shall not object to your statement.

Mr. FOREMAN. Then may I go on to say that on September 11, 1950, I voluntarily signed an oath as a member of the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild that I was not a member of the Communist Party, nor of any party dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. That statement was true at that time, sir, and is true today.

Mr. WALTER. When was that?

Mr. FOREMAN. On or about—I am pretty sure it was September 11, 1950, sir. I have said that the statement was true then—it was a voluntary statement—and it is true today, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any time between 1945 and 1950, the time of the taking of the oath which you mentioned, when you were not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. Would you repeat that question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any time between 1945 and September 11, 1950, when you stated you took the oath that you were not a Communist, when you were not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. I decline to answer that, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you went into the Armed Forces, I believe, in 1943.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been testified here by Mr. Leo Townsend that he was a member of the Communist Party prior to entry into the service, but that the Communist Party had a regulation which eliminated them or dropped them from membership while in the armed services. Did that regulation apply to you?

Mr. COHN. May we confer for a moment, please?

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). Mr. Tavenner, I have already told you that I am not a Communist, and I am not prepared to comment on Mr. Townsend's testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you whether or not the regulation which Mr. Townsend referred to applied to you, that you were dropped. In other words, that you were dropped from the Communist Party during the period of your service in the Army.

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). I don't have any knowledge of any such regulation, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time while you were in the armed services?

Mr. FOREMAN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. Tavenner, you stated a moment ago that you would be very happy for me to give you any information that might help the record, and I wonder if I could at this time, for your information, and for the information of the committee, read to you two commendations which I received while I served in the Army, which testifies to my services in the Army.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think it would be perfectly proper for you to state that you were commended while in the armed services, if that occurred.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, they are so short, and they make such good reading, I think in fairness to me you might possibly let me read them.

I have a commendation here, sir, from Maj. Gen. F. H. Osborne, which reads as follows:

1. One of the most effective and consistent activities in the motion-picture program produced for this division of the Army Pictorial Service has been the production of Private Snafu and Quick Fact series of animated cartoons released through the Army-Navy Screen Magazine.

2. Warmest commendation is extended to all of those officers and men who had a part in developing and carrying through this film program, including Sgt. Carl Foreman.

3. Sergeant Foreman may be justly proud of his part in our common victory. As a soldier assigned to tasks far from combat areas, he sometimes may have felt that his general contribution to the general effort was less than he would have wished it. His has been the thankless job of working on projects whose results he could not see or measure for himself. He has done that job magnificently. The motion pictures that he and a handful of his fellow soldiers have produced have entertained and instructed millions of soldiers all over the world—an achievement that few soldiers can match.

I have a very brief commendation, sir, which reads as follows:

1. During the past 2½ months Sgt. Carl N. Foreman has been detailed to the undersigned officer in connection with the feature-length project No. 3803, entitled "Westward Is Bataan."

2. Sergeant Foreman's services, in connection with assisting the production with this feature picture, has been outstanding. He has, at all times, performed his duties with exceptional zeal, initiative, and skill.

3. It is felt that Sergeant Foreman deserves special commendation for his services and it is further recommended that Sergeant Foreman be promoted to the next higher grade.

This is signed by Col. Howard W. Mixon.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the date?

Mr. FOREMAN. September 5, 1944. The date on the other was the 16th of October 1945. I later received the Army Commendation Ribbon on the basis of the commendation from General Osborne.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I have already declined to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return from the armed services?

Mr. FOREMAN. I am not quite sure, sir. I think it was late 1945 or early 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Upon your return from the armed services in 1945 did you affiliate with the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. I decline to answer that, Mr. Tavenner, on the grounds stated prior.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1947 the committee is informed, or has ascertained from a leaflet of the People's Educational Center, that you were an instructor at the spring term; is that correct?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I decline to answer that because, as you know, the People's Educational Center has been mentioned in these hearings. I would like you to know for the record, however, sir, inasmuch as I had such great difficulty becoming a motion-picture writer, that I have devoted myself to teaching screen writing wherever and whenever I can at a great many kinds of schools and wherever I can. I felt that this was the least I could do. It is very hard to become a writer at the studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you engaged in the conducting of those courses that you made reference to were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds stated above.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Martin Berkeley, in the course of his testimony, stated that you had not, so far as he knew, made a public renunciation of your Communist Party membership. Had you at any time publicly renounced your membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, may we confer for a moment, my counsel and I?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, without commenting on Mr. Berkeley's testimony in any way, and on the grounds that I have mentioned before, but in order to get the record clear, if I may, I think you will remember that this portion of Mr. Berkeley's testimony he also said that people like Adele Buffington, Allen Rivkin, Leonard Spiegelgass, and Karl Tunberg deserve a vote of thanks for cleaning out the guild, for helping the guild, and so forth. So I think it highly germane, if you will allow me, sir, to read to you a letter which I received on May 24, 1951, from Miss Adele Buffington, whom I am sure is known to you and the committee.

Do I have your permission, sir?

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead and read the letter.

Mr. FOREMAN. She writes:

DEAR CARL—

I should explain that this letter was written at a time during our contract negotiations with the major producers and, as you know, during contract negotiations spirits run very high with possible excitement and everybody is worried about their just rights being protected. Miss Buffington writes as follows:

DEAR CARL: Attached is a copy of my Notes and Analysis on the contract situation which you said would help you, now that you realize what has happened, beyond your own board experiences in the matter.

If it seems like a long document, it is because of the necessary, clarifying detail involved. Also, I have made it a rule to document my guild activities and my relative opinions as expressed openly on account of an awareness of how vulnerable to intraguild attack my personal position continues to be.

Thanks again for assisting my guild efforts before the board in the past, and for anything you can now do to help the "little guy" in the guild in this incredible situation. Personally I am discouraged as hell and worn out carrying this torch. I suppose I ought to get smart and pitch it overboard before I starve to death myself or someone does "poison" me, per the fervent wish of one certain board member.

It doesn't mean me.

Perhaps I will.

Anyway, please know it is gratifying to realize that it's possible for individuals like you and me to ignore political and personal difference in mutual concern for the welfare of the guild.

Sincerely,

ADELE BUFFINGTON.

And this Mr. Tavenner—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date?

Mr. FOREMAN. May 24, 1951, sir.

And I have here a memo from Allen Rivkin, who is the president of the Motion Picture Industry Council, an organization I know you are familiar with, which is dated November 22, 1949, and Allen writes as follows—this was in connection with a public-relations program for the guild:

CARL: I can't tell you how pleased I am that you will be on the public-relations pitch with us. I told Gielgud this morning and he was overjoyed. He will call you to get together with himself and Frank Nugent between now and next Monday so we can get the rest of the committee organized for the board's approval. I have some ideas of a newsletter monthly to the membership that Irwin will tell you about. Nugent will tell you what ideas we have on the awards affair for the last of January. Those are our two immediate projects—plus picking a hot special programs subcommittee with a vice chairman on it that has some ideas. Again, my appreciation for your offering to come in and help.

ALLEN.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of that, please?

Mr. FOREMAN. It was 1949.

Mr. COHN. November 22, 1949.

I would just like to say another word or two.

Mr. WALTER. Before you proceed, may I see that first letter?

Mr. COHN. You want the original?

Mr. WALTER. I think they should be marked as exhibits.

Mr. COHN. Would you like to see the original and have it marked?

Mr. WALTER. No. I would like to look at the copy.

Mr. FOREMAN. Can I continue, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. WALTER. All right; proceed.

Mr. FOREMAN. Thank you, sir. I understand that Karl Tunberg, the president of the guild, has asked for a voluntary subpoena before the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I can't hear you.

Mr. FOREMAN. I said, I understood that Karl Tunberg, who is the president of the guild, has asked for a voluntary subpoena before this committee in order to tell the committee about the guild in connection with the things that have—

Mr. TAVENNER. I may say to you that during the course of our hearings in Washington, a telegram was received from the president of the guild who stated that inasmuch as the name of the Screen Writers' Guild had been mentioned so frequently during the hearings there he desired the opportunity to appear before the committee.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir; I know, because I was on the board.

Mr. WALTER. I think it is only fair that he be permitted to come in and make a statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think so, too.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, as I say, I don't know whether he will or not, and that is up to you, but if he does, I feel very confident that Mr. Tunberg will tell you that my actions as a board member have only been in the best interest of the guild. I was elected for a 1-year term in 1949 and reelected for a 2-year term in 1950. I am very concerned with the good name of the guild. It is a very good guild. I told you when I started that my first screen play was sold for \$425, less agent's fee, and that was divided among two fellows, and the second one for \$300. That was because the guild was not strong, and we little fellows had no chance. The amount of—I just can't tell you what went on, and I am very proud of being a guild member,

and I want nothing but the best for the guild. It has some very fine people in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, will you please answer my question, which was whether or not you have ever publicly renounced membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I have never admitted that I was a member of the Communist Party. I decline to answer your questions on that subject. However, the Hollywood Reporter, shortly after September 11, carried a story about the loyalty oath of the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild and carried the names of the members of the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you deny that you were ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. I decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds I stated above.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, the first letter that you read, that of May 24, 1951, referred to a personal difference. What was the personal difference referred to?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, actually, there was none, to my knowledge, because—

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

Mr. FOREMAN. I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes; I will try, sir. I assume that the personal and political differences that Adele mentions were the fact that she was in support of slate candidates and I ran as an independent. This is interguild politics. This is my assumption; as to the personal differences, there were none because we hadn't yet met up until shortly before this.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, there had been a very distinct cleavage within the Screen Writers' Guild, had there not, between two groups; isn't that true?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, I must tell you that if I say it is true, it is not from personal knowledge, necessarily, because up until the time I went into the Army I was a very unimportant guy in Hollywood and in the guild, as well. Now, I would go to meetings and listen to speeches. It was wonderful, because some writers can speak very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think probably you are overmodest.

Mr. FOREMAN. No, sir; I am not. I went into the Army, and when I came back from the Army I was told that there was a middle-of-the-road element in the guild, and I have never been concerned with any cleavages or anything in the guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you—

Mr. COHN. Would you excuse me a minute?

Mr. FOREMAN. My counsel wants to talk to me.

(Conference between the witness and counsel.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, my counsel feels it is important for me to tell you that when I ran for the board, I ran without supporters and without a campaign, and my first campaign, I sent out two letters, two personal letters written by myself, as I remember, having mostly to do with the contract situation and the independent writer, and my second running for the office. I think I should also tell you that the nominating committee of the guild wished me to run for president,

or some office like that, and I declined. I just didn't have the time. I ran without any support, no letters, no campaign. I just had my name on the list of candidates.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of an independent group within the guild known as the progressive caucus?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. FOREMAN. The progressive caucus was, as I recall it, a very loose kind of thing, and I can't say that I ever was a member or was not a member. It had a very broad representation in the guild. People of all kinds with political ideas. It may be, Mr. Tavenner, that I attended one or two meetings of the caucus, but it wasn't very important to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make financial contributions to that group?

Mr. FOREMAN. I don't think so, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it a fact that the members of that group, the progressive caucus, were in opposition to what was known within the guild as the anti-Communist all-guild group?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, I don't think the all-guild coalition ever called itself the anti-Communist all-guild—

Mr. TAVENNER. Anti-Communist is merely descriptive.

Mr. FOREMAN. I see. You said it was called that. Pardon me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to correct that. That was merely descriptive of the group that was known as the all-guild group.

Mr. COHN. May we confer for a moment, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir?

Mr. FOREMAN. All I can tell you is that in connection with guild matters, voting on guild matters and voting on slates, I voted for the candidates right down the line on the political ticket on the basis of the men I thought would make the best men and on the issues that faced the guild. I acted as a board member to the best interests of the guild, according to my lights, and I am too busy—

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not answering my questions.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, I really can't answer your question. I may not be clear as to what it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm sorry, I could not understand you. If you will just raise your voice a little?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir; I will try.

Mr. TAVENNER. It gets down to a point lower than the microphones in front of you and I am unable to hear you.

Mr. FOREMAN. I'm sorry, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I may suggest it, if you attempt to talk to me directly rather than concentrating on talking into the microphone, I think we will have less difficulty.

Mr. FOREMAN. Thank you. You know, you are much more experienced than I am at this and it is a little bit—

Mr. TAVENNER. I doubt that.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I wonder if you would mind repeating the question about the progressive caucus and the all-guild coalition, because I just don't remember it now.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you whether or not the group known as the progressive group within the guild was in opposition to what is generally referred to as the anti-Communist group known as the all-guild committee?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, as I recall, there was opposition on matters that affected guild policy and, as I also recall, I talked to people on all sides of any questions in the guild, on any matters relative to the guild, so that I would know how to act about the guild. I hope that answered your question. I always make up my own mind. Does that answer your question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, it doesn't; but I will let it go at that.

Mr. FOREMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Except that I would like to ask you whether or not you were affiliated in any manner with the group known as the progressive caucus.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, sir, other than attending a meeting or two that I have already described, the answer is "No." Can I tell you why, sir, if I may? May I—well, I mean—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your question?

Mr. FOREMAN. May I elaborate on this for a moment? I have been so busy since 1947 that, actually, even being a member of the board has been a tremendous chore. I just haven't had the time to get involved in many things, so, as a guild member and as a board member, I have done the best I could, but I just haven't had time for meetings and things like that.

The way we make pictures, it is a kind of a 23-hour-a-day routine, and I happen to love to make pictures, and I give it everything I've got.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you referred to the fact that you sent two personal letters in the campaign for the position that you occupied. I believe this was back in November 1949.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you send those letters to the entire membership of the organization?

Mr. FOREMAN. I don't remember, Mr. Tavenner. I sent them. You know—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, isn't it a fact that you did obtain a mailing list from Albert Maltz?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. FOREMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you obtain the mailing list?

Mr. FOREMAN. Frankly, I don't recall. It is my understanding—it was my understanding at the time—that the mailing lists were open to all candidates from the guild office, and it was only on that basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. If it was open to all members, how did you obtain it?

Mr. FOREMAN. Actually, I don't remember. It may be that I walked in and asked for it. I couldn't—I just don't remember. There were plenty of lists floating around, anyway. I just don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in the event that the mailing list was not open to the membership, generally, as I have had it indicated to me that it was not, what explanation would you make or do you desire to make of your obtaining the mailing list?

Mr. FOREMAN. Then I couldn't make any explanation, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of having taken a loyalty oath. Was that in connection with the performance of your duties as a member of the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, it was a voluntary oath, Mr. Tavenner. There was some feeling on the part of some members of the board that it would be good for the guild if the board members did so voluntarily.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was not that the subject of a long dispute and rather bitter fight?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, it sure was; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you not violently oppose the taking of such an oath?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, I was in opposition to a great deal of some of the discussion going on and I was not the only one, I want to assure you. A great many people, including, I believe, Mr. Spiegelgass, George Seaton, F. Hugh Herbert, Oliver Garrett—I am sure these names are all well known to you—opposed the loyalty oath for the membership on principle. I opposed it, too. Writers, as you know, are prone to be unorthodox in many of their political opinions—

Mr. TAVENNER. Pardon me. I didn't ask you any question—

Mr. FOREMAN. Oh, sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. About loyalty oaths by members. I asked you about loyalty oaths by persons who were members of the executive board.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir, and the record will show that I voted in favor of the resolution as passed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you register your opposition to it until you found you were the only one who was in opposition?

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, it might seem that way. There were other members of the board who were not present. The point was that when the resolution was finally written to my satisfaction, I voted in favor of the resolution.

Mr. TAVENNER. What amendment was there made to the resolution that brought you around to the point where you were willing to sign it?

Mr. FOREMAN. I wish I had the resolution here, and maybe you have it there. I don't know, but as I recall the final form of the resolution that I voted in favor of went something like this: "I am not a member of the Communist Party or any party dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence and by"—and I can't give you the connective that went, but it went on to say that the executive board of the guild would resist any efforts to impose a loyalty oath on the membership of the guild, itself. In essence, that was the—

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that clause the amendment to which you referred?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that had nothing to do with you signing the loyalty oath as a member of the executive board. I fail to see the importance of the amendment with respect to your willingness to sign the oath, yourself.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, sir, I will try to clarify that for you. It seemed to me at the time that there were certain people within the guild who were very anxious to impose their own particular standards upon what they thought was loyalty on the other members of the guild.

This is a pretty broad field of opinion, you know. It also seemed to me this was not necessary. I may not agree with you, sir, or any other member of the committee, but I do agree with a great many other people, and there was a difference of opinion whether or not loyalty oaths are a good thing or a bad thing in principle, whether they are American or un-American. I felt this: I had the feeling that a loyalty oath brought to the membership of the guild, itself, might well split the guild wide open, and I wanted to keep the guild together, and it was on that basis that I acted as I did. I had no objection to signing the oath, itself, but I didn't want to be pushed into anything by anybody. I like to do things on my own.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, how many members of the guild at that time were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. I decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did that matter have anything to do with your holding out?

Mr. FOREMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, did your knowledge of, or possible knowledge of, the identity of Communist members in the group have anything to do with your action requiring this amendment before you would support it?

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Absolutely not, sir. I was very much concerned, because what had happened out at the University of California, the big smell in the papers—I didn't want the guild to get involved in anything like that any more, if I have made myself clear, and I hope I have. In other words, sir, you probably remember that about that time the University of California board of regents had fired a great many professors that refused to sign loyalty oaths, and it was a big newspaper story, and I certainly don't know whether it did the university any good or any harm, but I felt that the Screen Writers' Guild had probably been in the papers enough and we ought to get down to guild business.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as the result of all these matters, the procedure was adopted for the officers of the guild to sign the loyalty oath, that that was the loyalty oath that you referred to in the early part of your testimony as having been signed by you on September 11, 1950; is that correct?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you whether or not you were the last person of the group to sign the loyalty oath?

Mr. FOREMAN. I don't know. Now, I don't know. I don't think I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party the day before you signed that oath?

Mr. FOREMAN. Since I am—I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You decline to answer?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive instructions from the Communist Party to the effect that you would not be considered a member of the Communist Party as a device which would permit you to execute such an oath?

Mr. FOREMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of the Communist Party the day after you signed the oath or at any subsequent time?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Tavenner, when I mentioned the oath, I told you the oath was true when I made it and has been true and is true today and at all times. I mean, in reference to any of this.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Foreman, assuming that you are not familiar with Public Law 601, which is the law under which this committee functions, I wish to state that our definite assignment by Congress, which is your Congress the same as it is mine, is that we shall investigate subversive and un-American activities. In that investigation our attention has been called to the fact that the Communist Party in America, in its membership, has subversive people. In other words, people under Webster's definition who are willing to overthrow, to overturn, to use forceful means to overthrow our Government. We have evidence by FBI agents, undercover agents in Communist cells to the fact that it was actually discussed in certain Communist cells, ways and means of getting firearms to use when and if the forceful revolution was directed from Communist Russia.

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I have made that statement to you as one man to another so you will have the background of my next question. With that statement by me, your statement that you took a loyalty oath on September 11, 1950, you signed it voluntarily as one of the directors of the Screen Guild, coupled with your refusal to tell us how long before that, if at all, you had been a Communist, inferentially leaves in my mind that there was a time when you were a Communist. I am not charging you with any bad faith or lack of good faith when you signed the oath, understand, but inferentially at least in my mind it leaves a vacuum there about which you are unwilling to discuss whether or not you were a Communist. Now, sir, believing that you are just as anxious to protect our form of government and our democratic way of life as I am, why can't you come to the step and help us in our study of subversive people and programs? I am not asking you to tattle-tale or snitch, but how about yourself, can't you help us from your experience to make this study? Is that an unfair question? I don't mean it to be.

Mr. COHN. May we confer for a moment?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). Mr. Doyle, I think that is a fair question. As much of the hearing as I have followed I think you are a very fair man. However, I have already answered questions of this nature to the best of my ability. You know my position. I believe that this committee knows far more about Communist activities than I ever could. But for your information, sir, I hope you will believe this, if I knew anyone who now or ever has treasonist intentions toward the United States of America and its form of government or its Constitution, I would consider it not only my duty but my privilege to report it to the nearest authorities.

I am afraid you will have to draw any inference you must. However, I also ask you to judge upon my particular contributions to Americanism and in the pictures that I write and produce.

Mr. DOYLE. I, of course, as the father of a boy who gave his life in the same war that you were in, honor you for any service that you performed while you were in uniform. But I know so much now about the activities of the Communist Party in America and in Russia that I can't honor men and women who were in the Communist Party. Knowing that its purposes are subversive and knowing that they take no pledge of allegiance to other than the Soviet Union I just can't come to the point of understanding, shall I say, the position that you take inferentially at least, in my mind, when you have rendered such great service in uniform. And yet in civilian clothes you don't come to the point of helping your United States Congress to uncover subversive programs. I want to urge you, Foreman, we know of your great ability and your splendid service to the Armed Forces—we know this voluntary pledge—but I want to say again that inferentially when you don't at least tell us what you know about the Communist Party—leave names out if you will, as far as my questions are concerned, leave all names out of any Communists that you know for the purpose of my questioning. What do you know about the functions of the Communist Party, if anything, that would help us get at the problem? Is that a fair question? I am not asking you to use any names of any of your associates.

Mr. COHN. You don't mind if we confer?

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead.

Mr. DOYLE. We always want every witness to have counsel and use it.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, Mr. Foreman?

Mr. FOREMAN. First, I have never taken an oath of allegiance to any other country but the United States of America.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank God for that.

Mr. FOREMAN. Well, sir, I am an American, I was born here and I love this country. I love it as much as any man on this committee. It is very difficult to prove it. There is one way to prove it, and it is to go out and get killed, because talk is very cheap, or you can wrap yourself in the American flag. I love this country, I have always supported its Constitution and the American way of life.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Foreman, you are not on trial for anything, we are seeking information.

Mr. FOREMAN. I beg your pardon.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle, you have violated the 3-minute rule.

Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Foreman, are you still a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, I am, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. How many known or self-admitted Communists are members of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. FOREMAN. I wouldn't have any idea, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know any self-admitted members of the Communist Party, or others who are members of the Communist Party?

Mr. FOREMAN. I don't, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. On the question of the oath which was proposed to be taken by all members of the Screen Writers' Guild, do I understand the original oath as proposed would have extended to all of the members of the guild?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Jackson, this goes back to this last year. I really couldn't tell you the whole content of the meeting. Maybe you know more about it than I do, but I can't give you the whole content.

Mr. JACKSON. I will give you my understanding of the oath controversy, and that was that it hinged largely on whether or not the phrase should remain in the oath to be taken by the members of the Screen Writers' Guild that they had never been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. FOREMAN. I think you have been misinformed, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. That is possible. There is a lot of misinformation available for anyone who wants to take advantage of it.

Mr. FOREMAN. That is quite true. Mr. Jackson—

Mr. JACKSON. Just a moment, let me ask several more questions here. It is my further understanding that you personally opposed loyalty oaths.

Mr. FOREMAN. Would you like an answer?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, please.

Mr. FOREMAN. My feeling is that we are now engaged in a war of ideas at this time, that ideas should and must find their way into the common market place and will be accepted or rejected by people. I have faith in the American public and I have a feeling that the imposition of oaths somehow smacks of police state methods and I kind of don't like it.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you realize, sir, that every one of the 80,000 casualties in Korea has taken an oath of loyalty to this country and that every man who has served in the Armed Forces of this country has taken a loyalty oath, that everyone who goes abroad for travel takes a loyalty oath, every member of this committee at the beginning of every Congress raises his right hand and takes a loyalty oath? As far as I personally am concerned I would just as soon take one every morning with a vitamin pill. The matter of the oath, you are quite right, is a matter of personal conscience. Would you take an oath of loyalty as a condition of employment?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, of course.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you take a loyalty oath as a condition of obtaining a passport for travel abroad?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, sir. If it is the law of the land, of course I would.

Mr. JACKSON. But you would still object to taking an oath unless it was literally crammed down your throat as the law of the land?

Mr. FOREMAN. That isn't an exact statement, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. You yourself made the "law of the land" statement. You would take a loyalty oath because it was the law to take it. Would you take an oath of loyalty to the United States voluntarily and out of a deep pride in our institutions?

Mr. FOREMAN. Sure; yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You would?

Mr. FOREMAN. I certainly would.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I have read the oath that was proposed for the Screen Writers' Guild and I find nothing in it that would in

any way limit the scope of your artistry, that would in any way affect your religious rights, or any right that is guaranteed under the Constitution. I personally fail to see the objection to the oath proposed.

Mr. FOREMAN. I took the oath, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. But you also interposed objections to having anyone else in the membership take the oath.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. JACKSON. Did the membership itself vote on the question of whether or not a loyalty oath should be taken by the membership or was this an action of the board?

Mr. FOREMAN. You know, I don't quite remember that. It seems to me that prior to this board meeting a resolution was brought up before the guild membership at a late hour, and I think I had left before the resolution came up. The general feeling I got, both from members or from everybody—that includes the members of the all-guild coalition—that they were very much against the submission of a resolution for a loyalty oath to the general membership. And I can swear to that. So if you say, "Was it ever proposed to the membership on that basis?" it was. It was never brought up again.

I must tell you that I voluntarily signed an oath. I am in favor of voluntary oaths for people who want to make them.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the ultimate test of the credibility of a witness before the committee, as far as I am concerned, is the extent to which he is willing to cooperate with the committee in giving full details as to not only the place of activities, but also the names of those who participated with him in the activities within the Communist Party—and I am not relating this to your membership or nonmembership, Mr. Foreman—I personally will place no credence in the testimony of any witness who is not prepared to come before this committee and fully cooperate with respect to the activities within the Communist Party.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert in the record at this point an editorial from the Herald Express of Saturday, September 22. Shall I read it, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. It says:

Let's not forget the loyal Americans.

As Hollywood and the motion-picture world is rocked and shocked by revelations of the activities of Communists and fellow travelers who seek the destruction of America, it would be well to pause and to pay tribute to those loyal Americans who dared to sacrifice their very livelihood in the films in an effort to fight back the Red menace when first it reared its ugly head.

Today the House Committee on Un-American Activities is doing a splendid job of bringing Red traitors out of hiding—and exposing the stooges of those who are taking their orders from Moscow. Good Americans everywhere are cooperating fully with the investigation.

But we should not forget the sacrifice of the few who did their best to fight communism in the industry from the very start.

We should remember Jim McGuinness, who really gave his life to the cause. We should remember Morrie Riskind, Richard Macauley, Jack Moffitt, Fred Niblo, Jr., and half a dozen others who knew that their jobs in the movies were at stake—and who didn't hesitate to do what they felt was their patriotic duty.

So it is that today as we cooperate, approve, and join in the long-overdue housecleaning in the motion-picture industry, let us not forget those who saw the danger long ago—and dared to fight it to the best of their ability.

Mr. WALTER. I have been very much disturbed by reports that I received over the week end that some of the men who came forward

in 1947 and testified, in addition to which they gave us very valuable information, have apparently been blacklisted, which would indicate to me that either the producers or the employment agencies are punishing these people for doing what in their judgment is the American thing to do. And it is very, very disturbing.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Walter, please don't be disturbed because that information is absolutely incorrect. Now, don't take it from me, take it from Allen Rivkin, the head of the Motion Picture Industry Council; take it from any witness you like, it is not so.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, I intend to pursue the matter.

Mr. FOREMAN. Forgive me for raising my voice.

Mr. WALTER. That is quite all right. I intend to find out whether or not that is the fact, and if it is, why, of course, we are going to have to subpoena some of the employers and find out whether they are punishing loyal Americans.

Mr. COHN. Forgive us for one moment, sir.

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). Mr. Walter, just this. Writing for the movies is an extremely unsteady profession, the competition is very keen, and you know about the unemployment. But again I have made my statement on that. Please investigate it more fully. It is not true. All I can tell you now, at least, in terms of my company, I have told you that I am producing a picture that Edward Dmytryk will direct, Adolphe Menjou, a member of the Motion Picture Alliance, is going to appear in that picture of ours. I know Gary Cooper is doing it, and he is doing it because it is a good picture and a good, honest, American picture. But, really, sir, you have been misinformed.

Mr. WALTER. Any further questions, Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Just one more question.

In connection with Mr. Dmytryk, whose testimony was among the finest and most complete ever received by this committee, do you think that Mr. Dmytryk was doing the American thing, the right thing in coming before this committee and giving us the benefit of his knowledge regarding communism and Communist activities?

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). I don't think it is very important as to what I think, Mr. Jackson. I think it is important to Mr. Dmytryk, what he thinks.

Mr. JACKSON. I think it is very important what you think, but I shan't press the matter.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Potter, do you have any questions?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Foreman, you have by your testimony here this morning endeavored to give the impression that since the day that you took your loyalty oath you are a good, loyal, American citizen and that we are now in a war of ideas. While it is true it is a war of ideas, it is also a war of bullets, as many men are being drafted today to fight international communism abroad. You have information which would be helpful to us in fighting a portion of the international conspiracy here at home and we are asking you for intelligence information. As an American citizen you have certain duties and responsibilities and I feel that you are not carrying out your obligations as a citizen when you fail to aid not this committee, not Congress, but the American people in better understanding the Communist menace for which we are drafting men to put their very life in jeopardy in Korea to combat that menace today.

Mr. COHN. May we confer?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). Mr. Potter, I want you to know that I listen to you with great deference and respect, and I know what your war record is, in addition to your being a Congressman, an official of the Government.

I try to be a good American in my daily life and in my work. I think that my Americanism is reflected in my work. Perhaps you know I wrote a picture called *The Men*, about paraplegic veterans, the men who lost the use of their legs and arms in action. The proudest moment of my life, Mr. Potter, was when those men made me an honorary member of the Paralyzed War Veterans of America. You must judge me, or infer by what I do, sir. I can only tell you once more than if I knew of anyone thinking or committing treason against this country I would get down to the FBI just as quickly as I could.

Mr. POTTER. In deference to the paraplegic men who so honored you, and you honored them in writing the story for their picture, I am afraid, Mr. Foreman, that they are disappointed in your testimony today.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabor the point.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Foreman, you have testified that if you knew anyone who was engaged in any activities looking to the overthrow of the Government through force and violence, you would consider it not only your duty but your privilege to report that immediately. When did you come to that opinion?

Mr. FOREMAN. All my life, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Didn't you realize at any time at all that the Communist Party was part of a conspiracy to obtain control of the world?

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). Mr. Walter, I followed some of the testimony of this hearing and it seems to me that most of the voluntary witnesses who appeared here and who were formerly Communists themselves did not ever seem to feel that they had been engaged in any kind of conspiracy.

Mr. WALTER. I think that is true, and that is just exactly what I am getting around to. There must have come a time when you reached the conclusion that you reached. If you had seen the 11,000,000 people who have been expelled from behind the iron curtain, who are now in the British and American zones in Germany, as I saw them writing the displaced-persons' legislation, and talked with them, you would understand it. It is too bad that these American Communists, these bleeding hearts, these well-meaning people who have an idea that they can't, within the framework of our Constitution, bring about the social corrections that are so obviously needed, can't understand just exactly what the score is. Now, you at sometime or other must have reached the conclusion that being a member of the Communist Party wasn't going to amount to anything and I would like to know when it was, because actually you were subpoenaed not because we wanted to ask you whether or not you were a Communist, not because of the desire on the part of any member of this committee to place people in a position where they might be sent to jail for contempt of the committee, but every witness who has appeared before this committee was subpoenaed because he had certain information that we thought would be

of value in our deliberations. We had an idea that you might explain to us how the factions in your guild operated before the election, because we are interested in knowing how far the Commies went in an attempt to control the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. FOREMAN (after conferring with counsel). Mr. Walter, I have tried to make it clear that I wasn't a member of any faction of the guild. You see, up until very recently in Hollywood, Mr. Walter, the matters of importance to a writer were his last credits. And up until a few years ago there was nobody interested in getting into any faction of the guild or anything. Since I have become inactive in the last few years I have gone my own way, and I think if you get testimony from people on the board of the guild they will tell you that.

Mr. WALTER. You testified that you were too busy to pay much attention to the activities but still you weren't so occupied that you didn't have time to make a fight on this question of the loyalty oath.

Mr. FOREMAN. I didn't make a fight about it, Mr. Walter. It came up at a board meeting and I was present at the board meeting. I do the best I can. I go to as many meetings as I can. I am on leave of absence now because I am shooting a picture.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know anything about the efforts that the Communists made to take over the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. FOREMAN. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Did you participate with any other people in an attempt to place members on the board of the guild?

Mr. FOREMAN. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. There is not.

Mr. WALTER. The witness is excused.

Who is your next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Reuben Ship.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Ship, will you raise your right hand, please.

Do you swear the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SHIP. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Are you represented by counsel, Mr. Ship?

Mr. SHIP. Can we get the photographs over?

Mr. KENNY. I think I can fill in the record in the meantime. Mr. Ship is represented by myself, Robert W. Kenny, and Ben Margolis. (Representative Charles E. Fotter left the hearing room.)

TESTIMONY OF REUBEN SHIP, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

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

Mr. SHIP. My name is Reuben Ship, R-e-u-b-e-n S-h-i-p.

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

Mr. SHIP. I was born on October 18, 1915, in Montreal, Canada.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. SHIP. No, I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter the United States?

Mr. SHIP. I entered the United States on a permanent visa in July 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, where do you reside?

Mr. SHIP. I reside in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of Hollywood?

Mr. SHIP. Since July 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mr. SHIP. I am a writer; primarily a radio writer.

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

Mr. SHIP. I was educated in the public and high schools of Montreal and I received by B. A. degree at McGill University in Montreal.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what has been your record of employment since arrival here in Hollywood in 1943?

Mr. SHIP. Well, when I first came here I spent a few short months trying to get started in motion pictures, without much success, so I went into the field of radio and, starting in December 1944, I believe, I have been employed, writing the Life of Riley radio program, and I was continuously employed on that program for a matter of some 8 years, until this last June 1951. I wrote approximately 300 programs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ship, have you filed your declaration of intention to become an American citizen?

Mr. SHIP. Yes. That is known as first papers?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SHIP. Yes. I did file such a declaration in June, I think, of 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you file it?

Mr. SHIP. I filed it here in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you followed the naturalization procedure by applying for naturalization?

Mr. SHIP. No; I did not pursue it any further.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why have you changed your view about becoming a citizen of the United States or your desire to become a citizen?

Mr. SHIP. No; I still have a desire to become a citizen of this very fine country.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you filed your declaration of intention to become an American citizen?

Mr. SHIP. Well, inasmuch as you are now attempting to link me with an organization which you have labeled as subversive, I am going to stand on my privilege under the fifth amendment under which I cannot be compelled to testify against myself and, therefore, I decline to answer your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, were you a member of the Communist Party when you entered the United States?

Mr. SHIP. Again, sir, this a related question, and I decline on the previously stated grounds.

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

Mr. SHIP. Again I decline, same grounds.

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

Mr. WALTER. The fifth amendment to the Constitution offers to aliens as well as to American citizens the kind of protection that doesn't exist in many other countries in the world, Mr. Ship.

Mr. Doyle, any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. Do you deny that you were a Communist at any time since you entered the borders of our great country as you stated, comma quote?

Mr. SHIP. Mr. Doyle, at the risk of being repetitious, although I think that even if I were repetitious I would be performing some slight service to the American people in informing them that when one stands on the fifth amendment, one neither affirms nor denies anything, one merely refuses to answer on the grounds that an answer might tend to subject the person to prosecution and that no inference except this stated one can be drawn.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am glad you have apparently been very thoroughly informed as to your constitutional rights under the Constitution of the United States. Is it a fair question for me to ask why you haven't prosecuted your second papers? You filed your first papers in 1944. Let's see, that is how many years ago? You have been here in Los Angeles all these years. I think it might cost then \$10 or \$12 more to complete your papers. Why haven't you done it?

Mr. SHIP. Well, Mr. Doyle, I have witnessed a shocking and a frightening change take place in this country since the death of President—that great, liberal President, Franklin Roosevelt. Hundreds of aliens, foreign-born men and women, have been thrown in jail, in many cases held without bail or with excessive bail, and have been persecuted because of their beliefs, because of their opinions. Now, when the alien—I have sat—

Mr. DOYLE. Now, just a minute. I am not asking you to take my time to recite a speech that you are prepared to make.

Mr. SHIP. Mr. Doyle, I can't answer your question yes or no.

Mr. DOYLE. But I am interested—well, you can't answer it? You can tell us why—

Mr. SHIP. Can I answer? I can't answer that yes or no.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that doesn't call for a speech. Be as brief as you can, because our time is limited.

Mr. SHIP. Very well, being as brief as I can, in specific reply to your question as to why I did not apply for citizenship, I decline under the fifth amendment to answer it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, assuming that I know enough about the foundation of the speech that you started to make, I was going to ask you, if you find so much fault with my country, why don't you go back to yours, if that is a fair question? I understand you are very critical of this country since President Roosevelt died, and I always supported President Roosevelt and I am sorry he died, but I would invite you, sir—

Mr. SHIP. Sir, I am not critical. I did not say I was critical of this country, only critical of certain aspects that have been happening in this country. I tell you, I am critical of this committee. That is one aspect.

Mr. DOYLE. You get in and make this country better by becoming a citizen.

Mr. WALTER. Let's not engage in argument, gentlemen.

Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. To pursue the same question, Mr. Ship, you are critical of this committee—you so state. You realize, of course, that this committee is a legally constituted body of the United States

Congress, expressing the wishes and the will of the vast majority of the people of the United States. Do you acknowledge that?

Mr. SHIP. Well, the witch-hunting things in the time of Cotton Mather were legally constituted bodies.

Mr. JACKSON. If so many witches wouldn't leave their brooms laying around we wouldn't be falling over them.

Mr. SHIP. Are you now accusing me of being a witch?

Mr. JACKSON. I am not accusing you of being anything. Whatever you are is in your own mind and on your own conscience, but I would join with my colleague, Mr. Doyle, in saying to you, Mr. Ship, that if you don't like the United States of America, if you don't like the way the Congress runs the country, if you don't like the institutions and the ideals, available transportation is still operating between this country and Canada, and I would suggest, for one, that you go back to Canada.

Mr. SHIP. But I do like the United States and I am going—

Mr. JACKSON. Then act like an American citizen that you hope to become.

Mr. SHIP. I would like to—

Mr. JACKSON. I have no further questions.

Mr. SHIP. Stay in this country, and I will.

Mr. JACKSON. I hope if you do you will act like a citizen—

Mr. SHIP. I am acting like a citizen.

Mr. JACKSON. And accept some of the responsibilities of a citizen.

Mr. SHIP. I am upholding the Constitution.

Mr. WALTER. Gentlemen, gentlemen, gentlemen.

(At this point Representative Charles E. Potter returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Ship, you said hundreds of aliens have been thrown into jail. Who are these aliens? What have they been charged with?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. WALTER. You don't need your attorney to give you the answer.

Mr. SHIP. It is almost impossible to pick up the paper without, in the past year, having read of some aliens who, because of their alleged opinions and beliefs, have been subjected to some kind of persecution. I don't know their names, specifically, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Well, what persecution have they been subjected to?

Mr. SHIP. Today, if they stand for peace, peace is made synonymous with communism.

Mr. WALTER. You mean to say that anybody that stands for peace has been put in jail?

Mr. SHIP. No; but I think this committee is attempting to make anybody who stands for peace out to be a subversive, you see, so that the net result is going to be that people who have sincere desires for peace are going to be afraid to speak about peace, and I think that is a terrible thing, and that is a very dangerous thing, because then you are preparing a net climate here that is conducive to war, and, as a result of that, the war that we all dread, the war that can destroy the world, may happen. Now, I would rather risk—I think Thomas Jefferson said that if there is anybody among us who would dissolve this union or try to overthrow this form of government, let them stand—I am quoting roughly—let them stand, he said, as monuments

to the safety with which error of opinion can be tolerated, where reason is left to combat it, and I am for reason.

Mr. WALTER. Who do you think you are kidding, Mr. Ship?

Mr. SHIP. Well, I am not trying to kid Mr. Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. WALTER. Well, what you have told me is the Communist line, and if there was any doubt in my mind before you took this witness stand as to why you failed to apply for your second papers it has been eliminated now. Any reason why this witness should not be discharged?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Who is your next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury.

Mr. WALTER. Mrs. Fleury, will you raise your right hand, please. You swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. FLEURY. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Be seated, please.

TESTIMONY OF BERNYCE POLIFKA FLEURY

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

Mrs. FLEURY. My name is Bernyce Polifka Fleury, and I also go under the name of Bernyce Polifka, professionally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the names, please.

Mrs. FLEURY. B-e-r-n-y-c-e P-o-l-i-f-k-a F-l-e-u-r-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mrs. Fleury?

Mrs. FLEURY. I was born in Sacramento, Calif., in 1913, May 13.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now live in California?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mrs. FLEURY. Off and on, I would say, all my life, except for a year in the East and almost a year in Europe.

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

Mrs. FLEURY. Elementary and high schools in California; 3 years of it at the Sacramento Junior College; 2 years at the Art Center School and 1 year of the Choinard Art Institute.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mrs. FLEURY. I am an artist, designer, instructor—artist and designer and instructor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly what the nature of your work has been in art designing?

Mrs. FLEURY. I have been a—when I first got out of the school I was a free-lance designer for several years, which entailed package designing, designing of all kinds of products—not all kinds, but quite a few different kinds of products; a little bit of advertising design, and it has also entailed work as a motion picture background artist, layout artist and art direction; also mural designing.

My life's big job—public job, as a matter of fact, were wall decorations and mural designs for the Hollywood Race Track. Does that cover it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I think so. Are you married?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your husband's name?

Mrs. FLEURY. Eugene Fleury.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he engaged in the work of art, himself?

Mrs. FLEURY. He most certainly is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just what is the nature of this work?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, I would say exactly the same as mine; artist and designer and instructor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury, it came to the attention of the committee through its investigation that both you and your husband were at one time members of the Communist Party.

Mrs. FLEURY. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee when, and the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; and if I may, I would like to preface it with one short statement. I don't know whether this is a preface. I think it is a part of it. That is, that the time when my husband and I became members—not active members in the Communist Party—the Communist Soviet Russia was our ally, and the Communist Party was, I believe, also in the—

Mr. POTTER. Ballot?

Mrs. FLEURY (continuing). Ballot. Thank you. On the ballot. At no time have we ever been un-American or subversive. My husband and I have talked about this a great deal. I believe—we think it was around 1942, we think now, that we became interested in a group of artists which got together in a very casual manner to talk about art and how we could become better artists. As a matter of fact, as I recall back, I don't believe the term "communism" or "Marxism" was named at the first couple of meetings. I would say that we went to about—now, I am guessing on this, sir—a half a dozen meetings before my husband went in the Army. At that time, he, of course, had nothing more to do with the Communist Party. I continued going to meetings. Now, not regular meetings, may I say, because my pattern of living had changed quite a great deal. Most of these meetings—as a matter of fact, most all the meetings at which I went to were very casual meetings. They were informal, and I hate to bore the committee, but they were also the coffee-and-doughnut kind, too.

(At this time Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mrs. FLEURY. A lot of them were very open meetings. Would you like me to go on?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; we would like to have the full benefit of your knowledge.

Mrs. FLEURY. I can personally recall no talk of politics, with the exception of current events, at the meetings which I attended. The main concern of the people was about how we could be artists, how we can be better artists, art in industry, fine arts, the problems of the artist, in other words.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, this was a group of artists?

Mrs. FLEURY. I would say, sir, that the majority of the people in the group were artists; yes, to the best of my knowledge. To the best of my knowledge, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall what arrangement there was in this group for the payment of dues?

Mrs. FLEURY. No, sir; I don't. I do know that dues were paid, again in a very casual manner. Who collected them, I do not know. I do know that dues were collected, though.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not there was any percentage of salary assessed your husband or you?

Mrs. FLEURY. I vaguely remember, sir, that the dues were based on a percentage, and it seemed as I recall, it was a very low percentage in our group, considering on a salary basis. I mean, the percentage was quite low in our group, as I recall, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you recall any outstanding Communist in the Hollywood industry, the moving-picture industry, who attended those meetings?

Mrs. FLEURY. Sir, I think it would be impossible for me to say "Communist." I can say some people were there, but whether—I cannot say positively that they were Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Biberman?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which of the Bibermans was it?

Mrs. FLEURY. Mr. Edward Biberman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Edward Biberman?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you play any particular part in these meetings which you attended?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; I think that both Mr. Biberman and I played a part in these meetings. You see, Mr. Biberman had very decided ideas about art, and I also had very decided ideas about art, and I am afraid we didn't agree most of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the ideas about art which Mr. Edward Biberman sponsored?

Mrs. FLEURY. To talk about his ideas about art, Mr. Tavenner, I also have to talk about my own ideas about art.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I can understand that.

Mrs. FLEURY. It seemed to me that my difference in opinion—my main differences in opinion were that it is not the problem of the artist to concern himself with, shall we say, social content, propaganda, et cetera; that that is not the artist—I am probably saying this very badly. I am an artist, I am not a talker.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are doing very well.

Mrs. FLEURY. That the artist—it is not his medium—it is not the medium of an artist to do any kind of documentation or even journalism, such as we have in the Life magazine. In other words, painting is not the medium for—

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were speaking of art, you were speaking of the field of painting?

Mrs. FLEURY. I was speaking of the field of painting, yes, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not agree, as I understand with Edward Biberman, that your art—

Mrs. FLEURY. That is quite right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). That your art of painting should necessarily carry a social message?

Mrs. FLEURY. That is correct. I don't believe that it should.

Mr. TAVENNER. That, you say, was the outstanding difference between you?

Mrs. FLEURY. That was the outstanding difference. We went around on it several times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any literature, both you and the other members of this group?

Mrs. FLEURY. I can tell you the literature which I was given. I was given a pamphlet on art, and I was also given a book on art—loaned a book on art, I should say.

(At this time Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the character of these books on art which you were given to study?

Mrs. FLEURY. I can only briefly—I can't go into detail about it because I honestly cannot remember the entire content of the books. The one pamphlet was about the artist David, a French Revolutionary artist whom I consider a very dull painter and not a very good painter, and I could see no reason that he should be considered a great painter simply because he had some connection with the French Revolution. There are many other artists before his time and after his time in France who, in my estimation, were much greater painters, much better painters than he was. The second book—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, just one moment.

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that particular artist rather sponsored by the Communists as the ideal which should be followed in the practice of your art?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, considering that the pamphlet was given to me at a meeting, I would assume that it was one of the artists.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Now, I interrupted you. What did you have in mind to state?

Mrs. FLEURY. The book?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. You were discussing the artists from the period of the French Revolution.

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, and then I think I was going to mention—you asked me what literature had been given to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. FLEURY. The book. Now, I wish I could—I wish I did remember the name of it. I don't remember the name. I don't remember the author. It was a book on art and the artist's place—now, as I recall—in society. I was to give a report on this book. I found it very difficult to give a report on a book which I did not agree with, which I certainly did not. I made a half-hearted attempt at giving a report, but I absolutely do not remember the name of the book, the author of the book. All I know is that I disagreed with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you express those beliefs in meetings?

Mrs. FLEURY. I think that was pretty obvious, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us who met with you in these groups? First, I want to make certain that the persons you have mentioned were persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party, if they were. What persons who were members of the Communist Party met with you in these meetings?

Mrs. FLEURY. I believe, sir, there are only two persons—I beg your pardon?

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead. Proceed.

Mrs. FLEURY. I believe there are only two persons which it would be at all possible for me to connect with the Communist Party. One of them is Mr. William Pomerance and one is Mr. David Hilberman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the names, please?

Mrs. FLEURY. The first names, too?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes—no; not the first names.

Mrs. FLEURY. P-o-m-e-r-a-n-c-e. H-i-l-b-e-r-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Mr. Hilberman's first name?

Mrs. FLEURY. David.

Mr. TAVENNER. David. What were the circumstances under which you met with them in the Communist Party matters?

Mrs. FLEURY. At the same meetings about art, same—

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these meetings held?

Mrs. FLEURY. They were held at various houses. I remember going to meetings at Mr. Hilberman's. I remember going to meetings at Mr. Pomerance's. I remember going to meetings at other houses who, believe me, I cannot remember whose house they were or where they were. I understand, also, that my husband, in his previous testimony to this committee, mentioned that there was a meeting at our house. I do not remember that meeting at all. We have discussed it since and evidently I either was out of town or—evidently, the only thing we can think of is that I was out of town.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how did you learn when and where meetings were to be held?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, it was a very vague thing. Somebody would say, "Well, let's meet 2 weeks from today at such and such a house." Perhaps you would get a phone call putting it over for a couple of weeks, or perhaps someone would say, "Well, we are going to get together at" somebody's. There was no regular routine at any time on where we were to meet.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, how did you go to the places of these meetings? What means of transportation did you have?

Mrs. FLEURY. When my husband was in the Army, I was very often picked up by either Mr. Hilberman or Mr. Pomerance, inasmuch as we lived in the same district of the Los Angeles area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, can you tell the committee the names of any of the persons present at those meetings which were attended by Mr. Edward Biberman and which Mr. William Pomerance, for instance, took you to?

Mrs. FLEURY. That is very difficult, and I'll tell you the reason why, Mr. Tavenner. I am going to try to answer to the very best of my ability as honestly as I can and to the best of my ability. I had met a great number of people during that time with my work in the studios. I have met a great number of people since that time. There were many parties, and the thing begins to overlap in my mind to the point where I am afraid I would be guessing, and I don't think you want me to guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct. Now, you spoke of the fact that your interest in art, that of both you and your husband, was what led you into joining the Communist Party.

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir. I think that was the main reason that we went into the Communist Party. Certainly we had no political interest.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Your entire life and that of your husband is centered around the field of art?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; both of our lives.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that groups discussing art made a special appeal to both you and your husband?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir; very much so. We will talk art 25 hours a day. I know there is only 24, but we will talk 25.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, as time went on, what was your reaction to the literature, the Communist Party literature that was given to you and the principles that were discussed by Ed Biberman in the field of art?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, of course, as far as the principles discussed by Ed Biberman in the field of art, as I think I stated previously, from the very beginning I did not agree with him. As far as any other discussions about communism, Marxism, and so forth, frankly, it worried me at first, and I did not agree with it again, but I still—my interest being mostly in art, as I think so many of us in that group were, that the other thing kind of slid by and the political end of it caught up with us a little bit later. In other words, we became aware of its political—not influence, but wrongness—

Mr. TAVENNER. You became aware of the political implication on it as you proceeded?

Mrs. FLEURY. Implications. That is the word, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what did you do when you became aware of the political implications?

Mrs. FLEURY. I stopped going to meetings. As a matter of fact, I became—when I became aware of it, I began going less and less often. It is kind of a drift-out, if you know what I mean, until I ceased having anything to do with the Communist Party, and I believe, sir, that that was in—now, again I am not very good at dates. I believe it was in 1944. To the best of my recollection or remembrance, it was in 1944, possibly the early part of 1945. I am almost convinced, though, it was 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury, during the course of this investigation, it has developed from the testimony of a great number of witnesses that the Communist Party sought to mold the thought of writers that they brought within their groups; that when those writers ceased to write as members of the Communist Party they were made to account for it. I have reference particularly to Budd Schulberg, which is a very famous example of it, and also to Albert Maltz. In your description of the method by which Ed Biberman endeavored to explain to you the importance of carrying a social message in your painting, were you aware of the fact that your own ideas were being, in any way, led into that realm or that area of carrying a social message in your painting?

Mrs. FLEURY. I don't believe, sir, that I realized it at the time, no. I have thought about it since, and I think that perhaps there possibly might have been an inference, shall we say, that I might contribute more as an artist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, with reference to the books and the literature which was furnished to you, do you consider that the literature constituted the Marxist line or the Marxist thought on art?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes. There is nothing else I can think but that it was the Marxist line and thought. Of course, it may have changed by now, too. At that time it must have been the Marxist idea on art.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what was it specifically which led you to sever your tie with the Communist Party?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well I think possibly the same thing that took me into the party took me out of the party, perhaps in some respects. That is, you see, when you want to be a better artist, it also means you want to be a better person and, also, all artists at all times have a terrific curiosity. They are constantly students, and they are constantly trying to find out something new, something which will, shall I say, help them in their beliefs as artists as well as what they actually put down on canvas or on paper. I do know this, and very, very definitely, that when I went into the party, I was not aware of its political implications, not in the slightest, and the longer I stayed in the party, I became more and more aware of the political implications, and so plus the fact that I simply didn't agree with it, I would like to say that I do not agree with any of the concepts, any of the aspects of communism in any form whatsoever. I don't agree with what the Soviet Union is doing today, I don't agree with the so-called Communist Party in this country, I don't agree with—plus, I don't agree with what they say about art.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you believe, as an artist, that you could successfully practice your art—

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you haven't heard the rest of my question, whether you could successfully practice your art if you were told by Ed Biberman or anyone else within the Communist Party how you should conduct it.

Mrs. FLEURY. Mr. Tavenner, in the field of fine arts, I do not believe that any artist can be told how to paint, how to draw or what he should draw or what he should paint. In the field of commercial art you have a job to do, whether it be advertising or illustration or wall decoration or motion pictures. Then I think your art must fulfill the function of that job need. Does that answer your question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Is this a good place for a break?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just one minute. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will stand in recess until a quarter of 2.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 12 noon, an adjournment was taken in the above hearings until the hour of 1:45 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(Whereupon at the hour of 2 p. m. of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, the same parties being present.)

Mr. WALTER. The meeting will come to order. Mrs. Fleury, will you please resume your seat.

I would like to admonish the audience that thus far we have had very fine order. There is a lot of audible conversation over to my right and I trust that you will continue with the cooperation that you have shown thus far and refrain from audible conversation.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

TESTIMONY OF BERNYCE POLIFKA FLEURY—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Fleury, when you received a subpoena to appear before this subcommittee, did you confer with your employer?

Mr. FLEURY. Yes, I did. And his advice was to be honest and cooperative with the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you given the committee in closed session the benefit of such information as you had relating to the persons you thought may have been present at the meetings?

Mrs. FLEURY. I believe I honestly have; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has a record of that for use as investigating leads?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned in the course of your testimony this morning a Mr. David Hilberman——

Mrs. FLEURY. Correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. As being a person who took you to a number of these Communist Party meetings.

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Mr. Hilberman's occupation or profession?

Mrs. FLEURY. He was in the animation business. I believe he was a lay-out man at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he was employed at that time?

Mrs. FLEURY. I believe he was at Warner Bros. Cartoons. It was known at that time as Leon Schlesinger, which is now Warner Bros. Cartoons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your husband also cooperate with the committee and appear before it?

Mrs. FLEURY. To the best of my knowledge, he did; yes sir.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. To what extent, if any, did you feel that the Communist Party in America, so far as fine arts were concerned——

Mrs. FLEURY. The influence of the Communist Party on fine arts?

Mr. DOYLE. To what extent did you feel the Communist Party in the United States so far as fine arts was concerned, as distinguished from commercial art——

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes?

Mr. DOYLE. Was trying to educate you that the subject of the artist, or the subject which the artist should take and paint should be dictated by the state rather than by the initiative and resourcefulness of the artist himself?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, I feel that—I can't say that they used the word "state," but I feel that they would very possibly have liked me to use my talent as an artist for social content, shall we say, for propaganda purposes; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you come to the conclusion that the policy of the Communist Party would not only have gone to the point of liking to have you use it for propaganda in fine arts, but they actually felt that the province of an artist was to paint whatever the ruling body and government might dictate, or might feel was——

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, I do.

Mr. DOYLE. You get my point, do you, Mrs. Fleury?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't know how to word it.

Mrs. FLEURY. It is very hard to word it. It is kind of an intangible thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you come to the conclusion that the policy of the Communist Party in the United States was to say to the artist, "You shall paint this"?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And that is what you would paint?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, that was repugnant to you as an American artist?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir, Mr. Doyle. And I feel it was repugnant to a lot of other artists besides myself.

Mr. DOYLE. I hope the time will never come, and I am sure it will never come in our country, when that is the thinking.

Mrs. FLEURY. I hope so, too.

Mr. DOYLE. One more question, Mr. Chairman.

Because you are a woman I am asking you if you saw any effort of the Communist Party in America to mobilize the children and young people of our country under the Communist banner. Did that happen to come to your attention at all?

Mrs. FLEURY. Inasmuch as I am not a mother, and that I am a wife and an artist, no, sir. I was always approached from a professional viewpoint.

Mr. DOYLE. You stated the same things that took you into the party took you out of the party. I noticed particularly this statement by you, and I wrote it down, "If you are an artist you want to be a better person."

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What did you mean by that?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, I think that to be good in any profession that you, too, have to be good. I mean, I am getting a little bit soulful, but I believe in it, that if you want to be a better doctor, if you want to be a better singer, if you want to be a better actor, if you want to be a better lawyer, that you, too, have to improve yourself, be better, yourself. I know it sounds quite vague. I hope—

Mr. DOYLE. No; it is not at all vague for me, and I want to compliment you on making that observation. In other words, if you want to be the highest and the best artist, you have to put something on the canvas besides paint?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And that came from within yourself.

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mrs. Fleury, I would simply like to add my word of thanks for the testimony you have given. It has been very helpful to the committee. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mrs. Fleury, the Communist Party has made great efforts to recruit and appeals to artists of all kinds—

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POTTER. And I, too, am most happy that you, as an artist, have taken the opportunity to appear before our committee and tell the committee the reasons why you, as an artist, couldn't remain in the Communist Party, and I think that all true artists, if they should ever fall victims to the Communist organization, that their true artistry will take them out the same as it has you.

Mrs. FLEURY. I hope so.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend you for your fortitude that it has taken to appear before this committee, and I wish you every success.

Mrs. FLEURY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Mrs. Fleury, you have testified that the meetings were held at irregular times. Was there ever any notice published of the time and place of the meetings?

Mrs. FLEURY. Published, sir? You mean in a paper or—

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mrs. FLEURY. No, sir. No; it was always by word of mouth, whether by telephone or—

Mr. WALTER. Very quietly and cautiously?

Mrs. FLEURY. Well, I am afraid that considering the people that were within our group, I don't think it was too cautious, sir. Casual.

Mr. WALTER. You have made it a point—

Mrs. FLEURY. Casual, I would say, is more the word.

Mr. WALTER. But you did make it a point to keep the public from being aware of times and places of meetings, didn't you?

Mrs. FLEURY. That's correct.

Mr. WALTER. Why?

Mrs. FLEURY. Sir, I couldn't answer that.

Mr. WALTER. Was it because there was a feeling that perhaps you were doing was something that didn't bear the light of publicity?

Mrs. FLEURY. I think possibly it might have been treated such as children treat secret societies. Several times I had that feeling.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. I think a great many people had or shared those views up to a point. We used to laugh at these comics, as we called them, not Commies, until people became aware of the fact that there was something more to this movement and that it was no longer a joke.

Mrs. FLEURY. That is quite correct.

Mr. WALTER. You said that you drifted out of the party because of the political discussions that took place. What were those discussions?

Mrs. FLEURY. I am afraid that I may not have made myself clear this morning; that I became aware of the political implications of the party, and that in the group which I was in, we had very few political discussions. We did talk about current events, but as far as we did, also, talk a little bit about Marxism, and that awful word—how do you pronounce it—dialectical materialism, but we had very, very little talk about politics, as such, but I began to realize the political implications of the Communist Party, which I was not aware of when I went into it. I knew I was going to become a Communist.

Mr. WALTER. Was literature distributed?

Mrs. FLEURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. That was Communist literature, wasn't it?

Mrs. FLEURY. I assume it must have been, yes.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. So that you were fully aware, up to that time, of what you were doing?

Mrs. FLEURY. That's right.

Mr. WALTER. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. There is not.

Mr. WALTER. The witness will be excused. I would like to at this time state that the members of the committee have been simply inundated by the mail and it is going to be a physical impossibility to answer all of the letters that have come to us, but I do want to state publicly that we are very appreciative of this correspondence, 99 percent of which expresses approval of the work being done by this committee.

Who is the next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, we had subpoenaed the husband of Mrs. Fleury, Mr. Eugene Fleury. He appeared before the committee, and his testimony was in line with that of the previous witness.

Mr. WALTER. If it is merely cumulative, I think, to save time, we can—

Mr. TAVENNER. It would be, and unless you insist, I would not call him.

Mr. WALTER. Is he here?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir, he is here, and he may be excused.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Fleury is excused from attendance under the subpoena. Who is your next witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Donald Gordon.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Gordon.

Will you raise your right hand, please. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GORDON. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Sit down, please, Mr. Gordon.

TESTIMONY OF DONALD GORDON

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Donald Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

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

Mr. GORDON. May I say just a word on the question of counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh, I beg your pardon. Do you have counsel?

Mr. WALTER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. GORDON. I wanted to say this, if I may. I was present in this room last Friday morning. I heard what seemed to me an improper and shocking attack upon another witness' attorney. At that point I felt that the right to have counsel was being invaded and I made up my mind that I could not subject any human being to another such attack, so though I do not waive any rights to counsel, I am here without counsel for that reason.

Mr. WALTER. Principally for the reason that you wanted to make the speech you just made; isn't that the reason?

Mr. GORDON. No; the thought had not occurred to me until the incident had occurred, because I had intended to have counsel.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I want to say this to you, sir, that it is becoming annoying—and that is a gross understatement of fact—to members

of this committee to see members of the bar not advising their clients but instructing them as to their answers. There is a vast difference, particularly when we happen to know that certain members of the bar who have appeared for witnesses here and in Washington are members of the Communist Party and we have their own Communist Party cards, so perhaps I may be excused for expressing my opinions. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

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

Mr. GORDON. Bridgeport, Conn., November 21, 1903.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. GORDON. Los Angeles.

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

Mr. GORDON. Since 1912.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived here constantly since that time except for temporary travel?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you briefly outline for the committee your educational background, please, sir.

Mr. GORDON. I attended the elementary and high schools of Los Angeles and University of California at Los Angeles, and graduated from Pomona College in 1923 with a B. A. degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. GORDON. I am an editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. An editor? In the moving-picture industry or in newspaper work?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, I am an assistant in the story department at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Describe briefly what the duties of an editor are.

Mr. GORDON. It is rather difficult to describe them briefly, but the major part of the work consists in reading manuscripts and mainly synopses, analyzing them and assisting the studio in finding the kind of stories it wants to produce.

Mr. TAVENNER. And selecting the writers for stories, does that also come within your duties?

Mr. GORDON. No. I have nothing whatever to do with the hiring of writers.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you review the scripts which are presented?

Mr. GORDON. I read them and write comments upon them and they are passed on to other people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do those comments constitute a recommendation either for or against the acceptance of the story for use in screen exhibition?

Mr. GORDON. No, they are not concerned with the question of acceptance. They are concerned with the question of advancing them to a higher stage. I do not myself determine in any way the purchase of any story.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand. But do you recommend in regard to acceptance?

Mr. GORDON. I recommend further consideration to someone else, usually.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that is a recommendation either for or against the particular story which you have reviewed?

Mr. GORDON. Well, it is not necessarily a recommendation to buy a story, it is a recommendation that other people should see the story.

Mr. TAVENNER. Meaning, of course, that it has met with your general approval as being a product which was worthy of acquiring?

Mr. GORDON. Worthy of further consideration.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in the work of an editor?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I have been in my present position for a little over 3 years. Is that what you meant?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. Prior to that time what was your particular work?

Mr. GORDON. I was head of the reading department at Paramount for 6 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe briefly what the duties of a reader are.

Mr. GORDON. Of a reader?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The primary work of a reader is to read literary and dramatic material and to synopsize it and to comment upon it. This is the first stage in a consideration of literary material.

Mr. TAVENNER. For how long a period of time did you engage in the work of a reader?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I don't know how to put it because I have been a reader at various times and assistant at various times, head of reading, and back and forth. I have been engaged in this work for approximately 25 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gordon, a witness, Mr. Martin Berkeley, who appeared before this committee, identified you as a member of the Communist Party and in so doing stated:

I met with him with the Screen Writers' Guild. I attended a meeting of the Screen Writers' Guild at which I met Don Gordon and subsequently later met him at the meetings of the writers' fraction.

Was that testimony by Mr. Berkeley true or was it false?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I have never been a member of the Screen Writers' Guild, except possibly at one point when the Screen Readers' Guild was in a sense affiliated with it. As to this testimony, or any response to your question, I claim the privilege under the fifth amendment which states that a witness may not be required to testify against himself.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it that the Readers' Guild was affiliated with the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. GORDON. It was a long time ago, but I think it was somewhere in 1933 that that affiliation began and it terminated somewhere in the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you reside in 1932; did you tell us that?

Mr. GORDON. 1932?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GORDON. I have lived in the same house for about 18 years. I'm not sure of the exact date. It was either 1932 or 1933 that I moved into it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present address?

Mr. GORDON. 6853 Pacific View Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time what was the place of your residence?

Mr. GORDON. Well, for about a year or so I lived on a street called, I think it was, Cumberland, but I don't remember the address.

Mr. TAVENNER. Cumberland Avenue?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it 3961½?

Mr. GORDON. I don't remember. As I say, it was more than 18 years ago. I really couldn't remember that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand. You have no reason for believing that that was not the correct number, have you?

Mr. GORDON. I just don't recall the number. No, I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a copy of a Communist Party petition to participate in primary election. I will read part of it:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

County of Los Angeles:

TO THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

We, the undersigned, registered, qualified voters of the State of California, county of Los Angeles, present to the secretary of State this petition and declare that we represent a political party, the name of which is Communist Party, which party said electors desire to have participate in the next primary election to be held August 30, 1932.

I will ask you to look at this petition and ask you to consider the sixth name from the bottom of the page, which will be handed to you, and I will ask you to read whose name appears there and the address. The sixth name from the bottom of the page.

Mr. GORDON. It is a typewritten name there which is the same as mine, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the address?

Mr. GORDON. 3961½ Cumberland, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign that petition?

Mr. GORDON. Frankly, I have no recollection of it. I just don't remember it at all. It is dated, you say, 1932?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1932, yes, sir.

Mr. GORDON. I'm sorry, I have no recollection of it. It's possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1932, the time of the filing of this petition?

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1938, or 1939, your residence was 6853 Pacific View, according to your testimony of a few moments ago?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1938 or 1939 were you a member of Unit Shop No. 5 of the Communist Party and did you use the name of John Sherwood as your Communist Party name?

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee, in the course of its investigation, has ascertained that you made a number of contributions, literary contributions, to New Masses. I have in mind particularly a poem which appeared on April 9, 1939, issue, and articles appearing July 2, 1940; August 24, September 28, July 27, October 19, 1943; January 4, 1944; October 12, 1943. Would you mind stating to the committee the circumstances under which you made those contributions to the New Masses, if you did so?

Mr. GORDON. You say they were articles?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer the question in any case, but I just don't understand what you are talking about, frankly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us not pass it—

Mr. GORDON. You said a poem?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us not just pass it off quite that freely. I recognize that magazines such as New Masses might publish an article written by the most conservative of individuals, if they chose to do it. But what I am asking you is to state the circumstances under which your contributions were used, if they were.

Mr. GORDON. I claim the privilege of the fifth amendment and decline to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a financial supporter of New Masses?

Mr. GORDON. I claim the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any meetings which were beneficial parties—that is, parties organized for the purpose of raising money for the New Masses organization?

Mr. GORDON. I claim the same privilege and decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of the American-Russian Institute?

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. WALTER. When you say "I decline to answer on the same grounds," you mean in every instance that you decline to answer because of your privileges under the fifth amendment?

Mr. GORDON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. So we can get the record straight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any closed Communist Party meetings held in your home?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a club of the Communist Party known as the Meltzer, M-e-l-t-z-e-r, Club?

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer on the same grounds and I claim the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of this investigation the committee has learned that a secret or private fund was raised for the benefit of the so-called white-collar strikers in the moving-picture industry in 1945. Do you know anything about the circumstances under which those funds were raised?

Mr. GORDON. Would you describe that a little more specifically, because I really don't recognize anything about that. Describe it, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you make any contribution to a strikers' fund which was supposed to be a secret fund used for the benefit of the strikers in 1945?

Mr. GORDON. I have no such recollection. I have made some contributions to a welfare fund. Is that what you are getting at? For the aid of families of people who were in need; is that what you are referring to?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I don't know.

Mr. GORDON. It was a public corporation.

Mr. TAVENNER. I know.

Mr. GORDON. I am very happy to tell you that I contributed small sums of money during those strikes to a public corporation organized to do charitable work for families in need during that strike.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was an open fund which the public generally, was invited to make donations to, was it not?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the fund that I am talking about was a secret or closed fund.

Mr. GORDON. I see. Well, I decline to answer, and I claim the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Nora Hallgren?

Mr. GORDON. I claim the privilege of the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Rube Lambert?

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer and claim the privilege of the fifth amendment.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No doubt, Mr. Gordon, you are familiar with the Federal statute under which this committee which is before you now is directed to investigate subversive propaganda in the United States. Are you?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I have been sitting here for 3½ days and I ought to have become a little familiar with it; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, also, therefore, that you have heard me give Mr. Webster's definition of the word "subversive."

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What would you say as to whether or not the United States Congress had acted wisely in directing this committee to investigate subversive and un-American people and propaganda in line with Mr. Webster's definition of what subversive means?

Mr. GORDON. Well, Mr. Doyle, I don't know if any comment by me on the wisdom of Congress would be particularly pertinent. I am no authority on it. I have no particular opinion to express.

Mr. DOYLE. I asked it because I recognize you as a very brilliant gentleman with quite a history of able authorship, and I think a person who could help this committee if you so desire, and I thought perhaps in that particular field you might help us by your considered opinion. I think you indicated you had written some other books. What name do you use, what other names, Mr. Gordon, than just Donald Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. My writing has all been under the name of Don Gordon just because it is shorter.

Mr. DOYLE. Don Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever used in any of your writings or articles the name John Sherwood?

Mr. GORDON. Not that I recall. I wrote a few short stories under various names at one time, but I think that was not one of them.

Mr. DOYLE. What would you recommend, if anything, that this committee do other than it is doing to uncover subversive propaganda in this country that emanates from Soviet Russia or domestically? What recommendation have you to give us as an American citizen? What further should we do?

Mr. GORDON. Well, Mr. Doyle, you have asked my opinion, and my complaint is really more concerned with the methods used than anything else, frankly. My own experience with this committee is, as I say, the last 3½ days, and I have observed certain actions of the

committee that I thought were quite improper. I am not questioning the legality of any statute or any legal question, but I have observed—there was the incident I mentioned before in regard to an attorney who was not a party to these hearings, was not subpoenaed or who was not a witness who was, himself, attacked, which I think undermines the right to have counsel. Second, I have heard and read statements made by members of this committee on television, on radio, and before the press challenging the fifth amendment, itself. I consider this improper conduct on the part of this committee. I consider—

Mr. DOYLE. May I—

Mr. GORDON. Just a moment. May I finish? You asked my opinion.

Mr. WALTER. Let him finish.

Mr. GORDON. You asked me for my opinion. I am very disturbed on this point, because I feel quite strongly on it. I am only a witness now at this moment and yet, for a week, the public has been listening to the opinions of this committee on the question of the fifth amendment and other questions, which means that informative and denunciatory statements have been made about me before I even had a chance to appear here. The stand that I had not yet taken was already challenged by this committee. I consider that improper conduct on the part of this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, a Communist—at least, one who was formerly a Communist came in and gave your name as a fellow-Communist, and then we gave you an opportunity, and that is why you are here, to come in to defend yourself, and you refused to defend yourself hiding or claiming the privilege of the fifth amendment, and we don't criticize you for claiming the fifth amendment. That is one of the major differentiations between this country and Soviet Russia and other Communist nations. It is quite surprising to me, sir, that you should claim the fifth amendment privilege when you offer to give advice to this committee. Why don't you come clean like some other men have? Inferentially or, may I say, that we are informed that you have been a Communist. We are informed that you now are. If you are not, why don't you say you are not? I invite you to say you are not. Do you deny that you were a Communist and now you are?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Doyle, you also invited me to express my opinion of this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. That's right.

Mr. GORDON. When I expressed it, you criticized me for expressing it.

Mr. DOYLE. No; I am not criticizing you.

Mr. GORDON. And you again attack my right under the fifth amendment, which I still consider improper conduct for a Congressman and a member of this committee to do. If the fifth amendment has any validity, then I have a right to use it and no one has any right to question my use of it, including you.

Mr. DOYLE. You were here without counsel—

Mr. GORDON. I explained why I was here without counsel.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask you again, do you deny that you are now a Communist?

Mr. GORDON. I refuse to answer, claim the privilege of the fifth amendment which you are attacking.

Mr. DOYLE. No; I am not attacking the fifth amendment and don't you say that I am.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Doyle, you said I was hiding behind it. That is an attack.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you are hiding behind it, sir.

Mr. GORDON. I am not hiding behind anything.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you are hiding behind the fifth amendment, because I think you are now a Communist.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Gordon, were you ever a member of the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. GORDON. I was not.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you ever a member of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. GORDON. I was not.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GORDON. I decline to answer. I claim privilege of the fifth amendment.

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

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Gordon, as a story editor—I believe that was the title of your work?

Mr. GORDON. I am an assistant in the story department.

Mr. POTTER. If I recall your testimony, you pass on script—that is, to see whether that script should be recommended for further study by some other person; is that right?

Mr. GORDON. I make suggestions for the further consideration of literary material.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, if you should make the suggestion that this material was of no value the writer of that script would be out?

Mr. GORDON. That is not true.

Mr. POTTER. I am asking you. I don't know.

Mr. GORDON. Well, I realize you do not know. I realize the question, itself, and the previous question when I didn't go into it with Mr. Tavenner—really, after 4 year's investigation it reveals an astounding lack of familiarity with the way studios operate.

Mr. POTTER. We are asking for your advice.

Mr. GORDON. I will be very happy to give it to you. There is a complicated process involving a number of people in every story department, and, certainly, at least in the one I am in, to say that one individual's opinion is a determining factor in the recommendation to consider material is wrong, least of all to purchase it.

The story department does not purchase material; it merely passes it on to producers and executives who then decide what they want to purchase.

Mr. POTTER. Did you ever receive instructions to deny a favorable recommendation to a person that you considered not friendly to Communist cause?

Mr. GORDON. Well, this is a very complicated and loaded question. I will say this: If anyone had made such a recommendation to me I would have ignored it on the grounds that it would have been simply idiocy to do any thing of that sort. It couldn't possibly be accomplished and you wouldn't hold your job more than 24 hours if you tried it.

Mr. POTTER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Gordon, you were asked the question as to whether or not you were a Communist in 1932 and you refused to answer the question. That was before the Smith Act was enacted into the law. It is certainly more than 5 years, which is the statutory period provided for in the Smith Act. Why do you feel that you would be incriminated if you would answer a question as to whether or not you were a Communist in 1932?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I wasn't asked that question, I believe.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; you were asked that question.

Mr. GORDON. I was asked about some document there.

Mr. WALTER. You were asked a question, were you a Communist in 1932?

Mr. GORDON. Is that the question?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I thought it was about that petition, of which I have no recollection. Well, I don't think that I am required to give reasons for using the fifth amendment.

Mr. WALTER. You are not required to give a reason, but I was just curious about it because, under the law, you could not be prosecuted for committing anything short of murder and treason that was done in 1932.

Mr. GORDON. Well, sir, I heard yesterday, I think it was, a brief controversy between Congressman Walter and eminent local attorney on the subject. Since opinion was so sharply divided, really, I don't feel qualified to pass upon the subject at this point.

Mr. WALTER. You have testified that you contributed to a fund for the relief of families of strikers; which fund was it that you contributed to?

Mr. GORDON. It was called the Hollywood welfare fund.

Mr. WALTER. Then you declined to testify as to another fund. What was the name of that?

Mr. GORDON. No name was given. I don't know what he was talking about, to tell you the truth.

Mr. WALTER. All right. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVERNER. No further questions.

Mr. WALTER. The witness may be excused.

Mr. TAVERNER. Mr. Josef Mischel.

Mr. WALTER. Will you raise your right hand? Will you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MISCHEL. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Mischel, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Robert Morris of Los Angeles.

Mr. WALTER. M-o-r-r-i-s?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEF MISCHEL, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT S. MORRIS, JR.

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

Mr. MISCHEL. Josef Mischel, M-i-s-c-h-e-l. J-o-s-e-p-h.

Mr. TAVERNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm sorry, I didn't recall that counsel had been identified.

Where and when were you born, Mr. Mischel?

Mr. MISCHEL. On March 2, 1899, in what was then the Austrian province of Galicia.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mr. MISCHEL. I believe it was in November 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you naturalized?

Mr. MISCHEL. In October 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. MISCHEL. In Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where have you lived since 1941?

Mr. MISCHEL. In Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live between 1935 and 1941?

Mr. MISCHEL. I believe it was about 8 months in New York, 1 year in San Francisco, and then I moved down here and I have lived here ever since.

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

Mr. MISCHEL. I went to grammar school in the town where I was born, I was then sent to a gymnasium, g-y-m-n-a-s-i-u-m, in a nearby city. Then my family moved to Vienna, Austria, and there I finished gymnasium. Upon which I was drafted into the Austrian Army.

The early part of 1918 I was pulled out of a front regiment and sent on a government scholarship to study medicine at the University of Lwow. After three semesters my sponsor died, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy collapsed. I found myself in the midst of another war which lasted, if I am not mistaken, up to the middle of 1919. When communications were opened I went back to Vienna and enrolled at the University of Vienna at the Academy of Foreign Trade. I finished my formal training at about 1922 or 1923. However, I must say that around 1935, upon arrival in this country, I went through a completely new school of thought, upon which I would like to comment if the committee will let me. It was not formal schooling.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have no objection.

Mr. MISCHEL. Gentlemen, when a man at the age of 36 virtually discovers America he goes through a process similar to the pioneers of the days when the American democracy was born, because for the first time that he truly gets in contact with it he learns of the lives, the works, and the deeds of these men who have formed and molded the thoughts and the face of this great country.

I came here at that time with a contract to write articles for a European magazine. I did not know the language, I did not know the country, I did not know the people. I have heard of people who traveled in America for 6 months and wrote a definitive work on America. I found myself in a position where I could not even write five words on America. I realized that unless one becomes a part of this country and these people one cannot write about them. And I spent nearly 5 years in studying the language, learning of the literature and of the history of this country, and whatever makes up a man, his thoughts, his conscience, his sense of responsibility, where

I believe it deeply is influenced by the reading of the writings of the men, some of whom have been mentioned here and some not, Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Mischel, I didn't know when you were given permission to tell about your education in the United States that you were going into a long dissertation. Did you go to school after you came to the United States?

Mr. MISCHEL. Mr. Chairman, I said it was not a formal education, I made that statement.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner, and ask the questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. As part of your studies did you engage in the study of Marxism, in addition to Jefferson and the others you mentioned?

Mr. MISCHEL. In those years?

Mr. TAVENNER. Any years.

Mr. MISCHEL. Mr. Chairman, I studied economics, and the history of economics, and of economic thought at the Academy of Foreign Trade in Vienna and the Academy—

Mr. WALTER. You were asked the question of whether or not you studied Marxism after you got to the United States. You can answer that. Did you or did you not?

Mr. MISCHEL. May I ask counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. It is certainly not a crime to study Marxism. I have a daughter, a sophomore in college, who is studying it now.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. WALTER. Did you or did you not study Marxism after you came to the United States?

Mr. MISCHEL. Gentlemen, that opens a can of beans. It is getting into the question through the side door.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, it isn't. It is proceeding directly to the point in issue here. It is no side door.

Mr. MISCHEL. I have mentioned when I was talking about my education in America, I was talking about the early years of my presence here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. And I asked about your later years. So will you please answer the question? Have you studied Marxism in the United States?

Mr. MISCHEL. In view of the implications contained in the question, sir, and without denying or affirming any of the allegations contained in the question, I shall at this point claim the privilege and the protection of the fifth amendment, specifically the section which says that no man shall give testimony against himself.

Mr. WALTER. In any criminal matter.

Mr. MISCHEL. In any criminal matter.

Mr. WALTER. That's right.

Mr. MISCHEL. That is in any matter which might lead to criminal prosecution.

Mr. WALTER. What criminal matter are we engaged in prosecuting at the moment, and what criminal charge are you afraid will be preferred against you in the event that you answer the simple question of what you studied in 1935 or 1936?

Mr. MISCHEL. Sir, I shall stand on my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. MISCHEL. I am a film writer and for the past year or so I was also working as a story editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. As what?

Mr. MISCHEL. Story editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you worked as a film writer and a story editor?

Mr. MISCHEL. I began to write for films around 1943. I believe it was in the latter part of the year. As a story editor, as I have stated, I have been working for approximately 1 year. I do not remember the exact date on which I was employed in that capacity.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are the principal screen credits which you have received as a screen writer?

Mr. MISCHEL. As well as I can remember, and I may leave some out, there was a picture called *Mademoiselle Fifi*, *The Isle of the Dead*, *My Own True Love*, *Dangerous Woman*, something about *Bowery Boys*, some musical comedy. That is as far as motion pictures are concerned. I have written a considerable amount of screen plays for television.

Mr. TAVENNER. The investigation that the committee has conducted shows that there was held in October 1943, a writers conference under the auspices of the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

According to a program for that congress, you, Josef Mischel, were a member of the general committee and chairman of the Committee on Writers in Exile. Is that correct?

Mr. MISCHEL. In view of the fact that the Writers' Mobilization was cited as subversive, I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. David Raksin testified before the committee that he, too, occupied a position with the Writers' Congress which was held in 1943 and that then the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization sponsored a pamphlet or magazine known as the *Hollywood Quarterly*, and without consent or approval on his part carried his name on certain committees appearing on the frontispiece or on the editorial page, I have forgotten which, of that quarterly. I would like to ask you if your name also appeared as a member of the advisory committee of the *Hollywood Quarterly* and whether it was used in the same way that Mr. Raksin testified his name was used, or whether you actually had any function to perform in connection with that quarterly?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. MISCHEL. I have no function to perform with that quarterly, as far as I can remember. I had no editorial function at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you do recall that your name was used as a member of the advisory committee on motion pictures in that quarterly, do you not?

Mr. MISCHEL. I don't recall right now. You might want to show it to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask that the April 1947 issue of that publication be shown the witness for the purpose of refreshing his recollection. Do you see the appearance there of your name as a member of the advisory committee?

Mr. MISCHEL. I see the appearance of my name.

Mr. TAVENNER. On motion pictures?

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee the circumstances under which your name was so used?

Mr. MISCHEL. In view of the fact that the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization is one of the sponsors of that program I will decline to answer the question—of that magazine, I mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information that you were appointed to a committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization to help bring about an alliance of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization and an organization in Moscow called VOKS, V-O-K-S, whereby there would be cultural material exchanged between the two groups. Do you recall that?

Mr. MISCHEL. Inasmuch as this is a related question I shall decline. But may I also remind you that there have been, during the period of war, many attempts at bringing about some sort of an understanding between cultural groups of all countries—of all allied countries.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let us understand a little more about the meaning of VOKS, V-O-K-S. Will you tell the committee what you understand was the purpose of that organization?

Mr. MISCHEL. I don't even know what V-O-X stands for.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you know the purposes—you know that V-O-K-S was an abbreviation of the Russian name by which the organization was known?

Mr. MISCHEL. I do not recall anything of the sort.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you ever heard of VOKS before?

Mr. MISCHEL. I have heard of FOX, but I do not recall ever having heard of VOKS.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name that you have heard? I am not certain I understood you.

Mr. MISCHEL. F-O-X studio.

Mr. TAVENNER. I assume we have all heard of FOX.

Mr. MISCHEL. Well, the other one I misspelled when I repeated it the first time, because I said V-O-X and you corrected me by saying it is V-O-K-S, if I am not mistaken.

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I misunderstood you again. I thought you said F-O-X. You said V-O-X; is that it?

Mr. MISCHEL. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's get together on this one.

Mr. MISCHEL. Let's get that straight. When you asked me for the first time and I answered you, I said, "I have never heard of an organization, to the best of my knowledge, that was called V-O-X." Now, in coming back at me you said it is V-O-K-S, which was news to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MISCHEL. Now, when you again repeated the question I said I knew of FOX but I didn't know, to the best of my recollection of VOKS.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, outside of describing FOX as one of the animal kingdom, what did you understand by VOKS?

Mr. MISCHEL. Studio. A man who lives in Hollywood always thinks of studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am speaking here of an organization in Russia, which I am certain you understand.

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, by this time I understand. I have said that I have no recollection of any such organization. However, inasmuch as the activities were—or any activities with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, or any subsection is connected with it I have claimed the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your privilege of the fifth amendment, I feel certain, is waived when you stated you do not know anything about it. So let me question you a little further to see if I can refresh your recollection about the meaning of VOKS and the part it played. VOKS is an abbreviation, an abbreviated reference—

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. That's all right if you desire to consult your counsel.

Mr. MISCHEL. May I have one clarity—may I get one thing clear? In saying that I do not recollect knowing anything about VOKS you said I have waived the privilege. I waived the privilege of what?

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that you claimed the privilege of the fifth amendment, that is that you would not testify relating to the term "VOKS" because to do so might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. MISCHEL. I am sorry, I did not say that. I said I would not testify to anything relating to Hollywood Writers' Mobilization or any of its subsections.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I am entirely wrong. I am asking you about VOKS, so will you tell us what you know about VOKS?

Mr. MISCHEL. Sir, I know nothing about VOKS.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then let me see if I can remind you or refresh your recollection. VOKS is the abbreviated reference to the All Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreigners. That is a Russian organization, an organization with headquarters in the Soviet Union, created for the sole purpose of setting up branches in all countries for the purpose of establishing closer cultural relations with Russia. You told us a moment ago that you recall the activity that existed at this time about cultural relations with Russia.

Mr. MISCHEL. Sir, I did not say that. I did not say that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your reference?

Mr. MISCHEL. As far as I remember, I said I should like to remind you that there had been at that time many attempts at—

Mr. WALTER. During the war.

Mr. MISCHEL. During the war—at understanding each other in some sort of an exchange of cultural knowledge. That I cannot document, I am not referring to anything specific. I am referring to a rather dim memory of times that have passed quite some time ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is why I am addressing this matter to your attention, to see if you do not recall the exchange of cultural information between a committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization committee, to which we had understood you had been appointed, with this organization in the Soviet Union.

Mr. MISCHEL. I have already stated that I shall not answer questions relating to the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, or any of its subdivisions. As far as I personally am concerned I have no recollection of having had any direct personal relationship to VOKS, or whatever the name may be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me go a little further to see if I can refresh your recollection. As stated a moment ago, it was the purpose of this

organization, established in the Soviet Union, to have branches in all of the countries of the world. The American branch of that organization, the name of the American branch has been changed from time to time and the first organization or branch founded in the United States was back as early as 1924 and was known as the Friends of Soviet Russia. This was followed by the Friends of the Soviet Union, American Council on Soviet Relations, American Friends of the Soviet Union, Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Now, those were the branches formed in this country of the All Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreigners established in Moscow. Now, my question again is: After this definition and recital of the organization whether or not you had any connection with the exchange of cultural information with the Soviet Union.

Mr. MISCHEL. May I?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. MISCHEL. If I am not mistaken, all the organizations that you have mentioned in this country as being affiliated with VOKS are on the list of subversive organizations. I, therefore, claim the privilege on that matter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever use the name Peter Warner, W-a-r-n-e-r?

Mr. MISCHEL. Not to my recollection. The only Peter Weiner I know is a little boy that goes to school with mine.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does what?

Mr. MISCHEL. I say, not to my recollection. The only Peter Weiner I know is a little boy who goes to school with mine.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the name that you were referring to?

Mr. MISCHEL. I'm sorry I even said it. I shouldn't have been dragging in a 6½-year-old boy in here.

Mr. WALTER. Now, will you answer the question?

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, I will answer it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I think we should clear that up.

Mr. MISCHEL. I should not have tried to be facetious. Sorry. W-e-i-n-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the name that I have referred to was W-a-r-n-e-r. If you misunderstood my pronunciation, I'm sorry.

Mr. MISCHEL. Well, my original answer still stands. I have no recollection of ever using a name like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a name other than your own which you have used at any time?

Mr. MISCHEL. To the best of my knowledge—

Mr. TAVENNER. Other than a pen name, let us say.

Mr. MISCHEL. To the best of my recollection, I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with John Howard Lawson?

Mr. MISCHEL. I decline to answer on the ground stated previously.

Mr. WALTER. By that, you mean that you feel that the fifth amendment offers you some protection so that you don't have to answer that question; is that right?

Mr. MISCHEL. I do not have to answer the question if there is a possibility of self-incrimination.

Mr. WALTER. Now, let me read the fifth amendment to you, and then I will ask you to tell me what part of it you think is applicable:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger—

That theory does not apply?

Mr. MISCHEL. No.

Mr. WALTER (reading) :

nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb—

That does not apply?

Mr. MISCHEL. That's right.

Mr. WALTER (reading) :

nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law—

Mr. MISCHEL. It is the first part of it.

Mr. WALTER. Oh. And you feel that you are now testifying in a criminal case and that you are being asked to testify against yourself; is that right?

Mr. MISCHEL. Mr. Walter, that is not the case.

Mr. WALTER. Well, if it isn't the case, why don't you answer the question?

Mr. MISCHEL. I am not in court.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. MISCHEL. I am testifying under oath.

Mr. WALTER. That's right.

Mr. MISCHEL. And I may have reasonable apprehension that this testimony may lead to prosecution, even though not to conviction.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure I can't follow your reasoning, but that is beside the point. Proceed, Mr. Tavernner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time advised or directed to organize a fund, a private fund to be kept secret, the proceeds from which were to be used in the Hollywood strike of 1945?

Mr. MISCHEL. May I answer that with a certain fullness? I should like to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pardon me. I don't understand you.

Mr. MISCHEL. I have not been advised, directed, or whatever else you mention to organize any secret fund for anything, let alone for the strike that you mentioned. I have, however, contributed and solicited funds for a charitable welfare organization that was established under the laws of the State of California that was tax-exempt in California and also tax-exempt for Federal taxes.

Mr. WALTER. What was the name of it, please?

Mr. MISCHEL. I believe—I don't remember exactly. It was either Hollywood Welfare Association or Hollywood Welfare Fund. I find myself in a very curious position, testifying to that. You see, to a man of my experience, past experience, it is strange to be called before this committee to testify on matters of welfare and charity, because before I came to this country, I would say that one of the outstanding qualities known abroad, as far as the American Nation is concerned, is the charity and welfare.

Mr. TAVENNER. But not as a secret fund?

Mr. MISCHEL. I did not speak of a secret fund, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. But I did.

Mr. MISCHEL. I was speaking of an open fund. I denied any knowledge of a secret fund, as far as this particular matter is concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. My only question related to the existence of a secret fund.

Mr. MISCHEL. I'm sorry. That was the only one that I knew, and that is the one I wanted to testify to. I do not know of any other.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Howard Lawson—did John Howard Lawson ever confer with you about soliciting funds to be handled secretly in connection with the strike?

Mr. MISCHEL. Sir, I have already declined a question concerning John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Mischel, in the course of the testimony of Mr. Martin Berkeley you were mentioned as a person known to him to be a member of the Communist Party. Now, was he truthful in that statement or not?

Mr. MISCHEL. I shall decline to answer that question on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you were naturalized in 1941.

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. MISCHEL. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

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

Mr. MISCHEL. May I confer with counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. MISCHEL. Mr. Tavenner, you failed to ask me one question that has been asked before of other witnesses, and I will start with the answer to that, but I will lead up to the answer of this present question, if I may, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Answer Mr. Tavenner's question and then you can make any explanation you care to.

Mr. MISCHEL. It is related. That is why I wanted—

Mr. WALTER. Answer the question and then you can make any explanation you care to make.

Mr. MISCHEL. I am not a member of the Communist Party, but what I wanted to tell you is this: when I received a subpoena, within 2 or 3 days of receiving it I resigned my position with the company in which I held the job as a story editor. I did it voluntarily. I had reasons that were personal, which I would not mind telling you if you should so desire. In that conversation or, rather, the conversation previous to that, I made a voluntary statement to my employers, in which I said that in taking employment as a story editor for that program or at the time of taking the employment as story editor of that program, and I am not aware of the exact date—it was some time in September or October—that at that time—

Mr. WALTER. What year?

Mr. MISCHEL. Last year. That at that time I was not a member of the Communist Party, and I have not been been a member of the Communist Party from that day on.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date?

Mr. WALTER. September or October of last year.

Mr. MISCHEL. September or October 1950. I don't remember the exact date. I have purposely repeated the statement here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I am very glad to know that you are not at this time a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MISCHEL. Sir, I said I am not a member of the Communist Party. That was my answer to your original question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. How were you employed immediately before accepting your employment which began in September or October of 1950?

Mr. MISCHEL. I was a free-lance writer since—let me start with the early part. I became a reader at RKO some time in the early part of 1942; I believe it was in February. I stayed on in that job for approximately a year and a half. I am not aware of the exact time any more. I was then made a writer and stayed in that job at RKO for approximately a year and a half. On leaving RKO I entered upon a career as a free-lance writer in Hollywood. That means a few weeks work and a few weeks out of work. Sometimes you work longer and sometimes the intermittent periods are longer than the times to work. For about 2 years I was under contract to Paramount. Those were the years, if I am not mistaken, of 1946 or 1947. Then again I started free lancing, and so I did up to the time that I became story editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, I was impressed by your statement that you were no longer—that you were not a member of the Communist Party beginning with your employment in September or October 1950, as a screen editor.

Mr. MISCHEL. Story editor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Story editor, I mean.

Mr. MISCHEL. It may be a euphemism, but that was the title.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you why it was that you ceased to become a member of the Communist Party at that particular time?

Mr. MISCHEL. Sir, I did not say I had been before.

Mr. TAVENNER. So what is your purpose in telling your employer that you had not been a member of the Communist Party since September 1950?

Mr. MISCHEL. It may be strange to you, but my working relation with the people in the company was a very happy one, which is one of the reasons why I resigned when I received this subpoena. I did not want to leave that job with any implications or inferences that, by the way, may be drawn here from whatever my testimony will say. I did not want those men with whom I worked closely to believe that I had withheld information from them. I know you are going to try to trip me over on that. I simply did not want to leave that job with any doubts in their minds as to what my attitude had been while I was working with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that was very commendable, and I am not at all attempting to trip you in any manner. I am only after the facts.

Mr. MISCHEL. I will tell you as many facts as I can, and I shall decline answering wherever there is danger of self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you were not a member of the Communist Party from September or October 1950, when you became employed as a story editor, were you a member of the Communist Party immediately prior to your employment?

Mr. MISCHEL. I decline to answer this question on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, had there been any change in your ideological thinking at the time of your employment as a story editor from what it had been in the past?

Mr. MISCHEL. Now you are beginning to probe my mind. Well, I still must decline—I still will decline any questions pertaining to the period previous to the one I have mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe I asked you the question which you have not yet answered as to whether or not Mr. Martin Berkeley was telling the truth when he said he knew you to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MISCHEL. As far as I remember, I declined to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Mischel, you have taken your stand upon the fifth amendment and during the course of your testimony it has been read to you. I assume you are familiar or you were familiar with it before you came in. Are you also familiar with the fourth and sixth amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. MISCHEL. Mr. Jackson, I was questioned as to my knowledge of the amendments when I became a citizen.

Mr. JACKSON. Then that makes it very simple for you to answer the question. Are you familiar—

Mr. MISCHEL. May I answer—

Mr. JACKSON. Are you familiar with the contents of the fourth and sixth amendments immediately preceding and following the fifth?

Mr. MISCHEL. Mr. Jackson, one does not study up on the legal document until it comes up in one's own life. I am quite sure that among the audience here you would find very few who would also be able to answer that question and yet by sitting here they knew what the fifth amendment means.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, the people who are sitting in the audience have not taken their position upon the fifth amendment and, therefore, have had no necessity to go to the Constitution and determine which one covered their particular case.

Mr. MISCHEL. That is perfectly true.

Mr. JACKSON. The point I make is that it is of more than passing moment that your interest seems to have centered entirely on the provision of the fifth amendment which covered the activity upon which you anticipated you would be questioned.

Mr. MISCHEL. The last few days I must admit that was so.

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

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Mischel, it is difficult to understand your testimony, which is much like a witness, I believe, we had earlier this morning who now at the present time denies any membership in the Communist Party. We, as an instrument of Government, are seeking information in order to aid us in better understanding an enemy which we are sending men to fight today. It is a matter of securing intelligent information. Now, with your citizenship, you assume certain obligations as a citizen. The boy next door to you is being

drafted and sent to Korea to fight international communism there. We are asking you to tell us what little information you might have concerning the Communist menace as you might know it in the United States.

Mr. MISCHEL. Is that a question?

Mr. POTTER. Now, I am thinking—I am just bringing it to your attention as fairness among citizens. One boy is being drafted and you are sitting there hiding behind the fifth amendment.

Mr. MISCHEL. I will not enter into an argument about hiding behind the fifth amendment or standing on the fifth amendment, but let me tell you this, Mr. Potter: I have spent long four sleepless weeks probing my conscience and my mind and my intelligence and my experience to find an answer to the dilemma which I am facing. It was not an easy thing to do, and it was a responsible thing to do. I feel a responsibility toward this country as much as I feel a responsibility toward myself. To explain why I have taken the stand of giving the answers would take a rather long time, because reasoning of 4 weeks cannot be brought down to the level and expressions of a magazine, of a magazine like Quick. I doubt that this committee would be patient with me to explain at all. However, I could give you a shorter answer. I have—and I know that the name has been looked upon with a certain amount of suspicion lately when his name came up. I don't mean the name, but when the name came up. I have a quotation from Thomas Jefferson. If you want me to, I will read it.

Mr. WALTER. Don't bother. We are probably well acquainted with Jefferson.

Mr. MISCHEL. Very well, sir, but it would have given the answer to Mr. Potter in a very shortened manner.

Mr. POTTER. The boy that has been drafted and sent to Korea would also like to make an explanation. He doesn't get that opportunity. He goes. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Mischel, you stated that when you took the last employment you had in September or October of 1950 you were not a Communist.

Mr. MISCHEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Were you a Communist on the 26th of June 1950?

Mr. MISCHEL. I decline to answer, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Were you a Communist on the 27th of June 1950?

Mr. MISCHEL. I decline to answer, sir.

Mr. WALTER. That was the day after the attack in Korea.

Mr. MISCHEL. I was well aware of the date, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No questions.

Mr. WALTER. The witness will be excused.

Mr. MISCHEL. Thank you.

Mr. WALTER. At this point the committee will take a recess of 10 minutes.

(A short recess was here taken.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order.

Mr. Tavenner, who is your witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Lester Koenig.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Koenig, will you raise your right hand. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KOENIG. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. KOENIG. I am, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. ROSE. Edward M. Rose, Beverly Hills, Calif.

TESTIMONY OF LESTER KOENIG, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, EDWARD M. ROSE

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

Mr. KOENIG. Lester Koenig, K-o-e-n-i-g.

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

Mr. KOENIG. I was born in New York City, December 3, 1917.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. KOENIG. In Los Angeles.

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

Mr. KOENIG. Thirteen years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived here continuously during that period of time other than temporary trips?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, with the exception of some temporary trips overseas during the war; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in the armed services?

Mr. KOENIG. Three years, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period of time? What was the year when you went into the service and the year of your discharge?

Mr. KOENIG. October 1942 through December or November 1945, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee briefly what your education has been.

Mr. KOENIG. I was educated in the public schools of New York City; I went to the Horace Mann School for Boys, which is a prep school in New York City; and I graduated with a degree of bachelor of arts from Dartmouth College in 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mr. KOENIG. I am under contract as a writer and/or associate producer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean screen writer?

Mr. KOENIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by associate producer?

Mr. KOENIG. Associate producer of motion pictures, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been engaged in that type of work?

Mr. KOENIG. I signed that contract just about the time of my discharge from the armed services, sir, in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a screen writer what are the principal screen credits you have received?

Mr. KOENIG. Actually my name doesn't appear on the picture because the Army didn't have the policy of crediting its writers, but it is listed in the record books that I wrote a film called The Memphis Belle, of which I am very proud.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the time you were in the service, then, you were engaged in moving-picture production?

Mr. KOENIG. Yes, sir. For the Army Air Forces.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other pictures during that period of time when you were in the service which you produced?

Mr. KOENIG. I made numerous films for the Army Air Forces and another film which was released to the general public was called Thunderbolt, the story of the P-47 fighter bombers in Corsica, Italy, during the Italian campaign of 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are your duties as assistant producer?

Mr. KOENIG. Associate producer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Associate producer, excuse me.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, my duties are very, very numerous and hard to define. They pertain to all the phases of making a motion picture from start to finish. In other words, I am assistant or associate to a producer and as such I must concern myself with whatever problems he has, and whatever he tells me to handle, whatever chores come up, whatever situations arise during the making of the picture, and I assure you they can be very many and unexpected.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I assume your position is equivalent to that of the top executive of a production concern.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, if you have an assistant I would say your relationship to your assistant would be the relationship that I would have to a producer. He would assist you in various matters.

Mr. TAVENNER. I assure you that is very important.

Mr. KOENIG. Yes, sir. I am not denying that it can be important, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of the performance of your duties did you hire or discharge individuals in connection with the productions you were interested in?

Mr. KOENIG. No, sir. That was not my function, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you required to pass upon contracts with writers?

Mr. KOENIG. No, sir. We have a legal department—

Mr. TAVENNER. What are some of the duties that you perform?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, a picture starts in many ways. Some one has an idea that it might be good to make a film about a certain subject, or someone presents a book to the studio, or a play, or writers who are on the staff at the studio come up with something which the front office thinks might make a good film. One can't say exactly how it happens, but one day you find you are assigned, by a mutual agreement with the front office of your studio, to work on a certain picture. Then you consult with writers as to the preparation of the script.

Mr. TAVENNER. Aren't you in the front office yourself?

Mr. KOENIG. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. KOENIG. Then you advise and counsel with the writers and with the director and you work with the casting office in the casting of the picture, and they bring people to you and you perhaps may think of some people that might be good to play the various roles. You work with the art department in the construction of the sets, and you work with the production office in planning the production, work with them in procuring the services of cameramen and technical per-

sonnel such as may be needed. You work on the preparation of budgets of films in an effort to keep the costs down and with the film as it goes on the floor of the stages to be shot, and you have numerous duties in connection with that to see that the production rolls smoothly from a technical point of view. Then the film is finally shot and you participate to a certain degree in the editing of the film in collaboration, of course, with your producer, the director, your editors and so forth and so on, which would include the various executives of the studio who are concerned with the editing of the film. Then, of course, it is taken away from you and shipped to New York and that is the last you see of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily People's World of January 21, 1941, at page 5, carried a news item to the effect that Les Koenig, L-e-s is the way it appears there, had been elected to the board of the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers. Is the "Les Koenig" referred to there the same person as yourself?

Mr. KOENIG. May I see the—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have used or been known as Les Koenig, which is a diminutive of Lester. In regard to the question which you have asked me about the organization named, in view of the fact that it has been listed as a subversive organization, I shall have, and do decline, to answer the question, claiming my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of April 5, 1941, at page 7, carries an article entitled "In Defense of Culture." This article is a call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers. Among the signers of this call appears the name of Lester Koenig. Will you examine the article, please, and state whether or not you signed the call for the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you participate in any of the American Writer Congress sessions at any time, any of the sessions of the American Writers Congress?

Mr. KOENIG. Is that the organization—

Mr. TAVENNER. The same organization I have been asking you about.

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the development of the American Writers' Congress, that is the various congresses which were called in the United States?

Mr. KOENIG. Would counsel please refresh my recollection?

Mr. TAVENNER. The call to the First American Writers' Congress was issued in 1935—

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, at that time I was not a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. And there was a suggestion that there be formed a League of American Writers and the organization to be formed was to be affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers. In other words, the League of American Writers was affiliated from its very inception with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers. Now, among those who signed this call, that is for the first group, were such well-known Communists as Earl Browder, Theodore Dreiser, Joseph Freeman, Michael Gold Clarence Hathaway, Joseph

North, M. G. Olgin, Isadore Schneider, Alexander Trachtenberg, Ella Winter, and Richard Wright. The first chairman—I am doing this to refresh your recollection—

Mr. KOENIG. Sir, I think you've identified the organization sufficiently for me.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first chairman was Waldo Frank. At the third congress held in 1939 the name of Waldo Frank was absent in the record of all the proceedings. Waldo Frank had committed the unpardonable sin of doubting the wisdom of the Soviet Union. He had written a letter to the New Republic suggesting an international labor and social socialist inquiry into the Moscow purge trials. Do you have any knowledge of your own that you may have acquired regarding Waldo Frank's purge from the League of American Writers because of his desire to look into and investigate the Moscow purge trials?

Mr. KOENIG. In view of the fact that the question implies, or would imply, knowledge of that organization, and since I have already declined to answer questions about my possible connection with that organization, I do decline to answer under the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with a magazine by the name of the Clipper, which was published under the auspices of the Hollywood Chapter of the League of American Writers?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not a fact that you were a member of the editorial board of that magazine?

Mr. KOENIG. Decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated with the Committee for the First Amendment?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to show you a statement issued by the Committee for the First Amendment appearing in the People's Daily World of October 29, 1947, and at page 3, wherein the signers say they are "disgusted and outraged by the continued attempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to smear the motion-picture industry."

You will note there that your name appears as a signer of this statement. Will you identify the fact that the name Lester Koenig appears there?

Mr. KOENIG. Yes, sir; it does so appear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you sign that statement?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not a fact that in your knowledge that that action was taken by the Committee of the First Amendment in part, at least, for the reason that by the criticism you leveled at this committee, that that criticism might tend to in some way delay or maybe prevent entirely the disclosure to the public of persons who were members of it and who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of this hearing, Mr. Martin Berkeley has appeared as a witness and has testified regarding certain

fraction meetings. You understand the meaning of fraction meetings, do you not?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have been under subpoena here since Wednesday and I have heard it described and defined in this committee room.

Mr. TAVENNER. By "fraction meetings" is meant meetings of members of the Communist Party who were members, say, of an organization like the Screen Writers' Guild or any other organization known as a Communist front, and in the course of his description of these fraction meetings, Mr. Berkeley testified that Lester Koenig, who is now an associate producer, attended those meetings with him as a member of the Communist Party. Now, was Mr. Berkeley telling this committee the truth about that matter?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the previously stated grounds. However, I will say that I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not a member now?

Mr. KOENIG. I am not a member of the Communist Party, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that means now, doesn't it?

Mr. KOENIG. That means today I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Today? What about yesterday?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What will it be tomorrow?

Mr. KOENIG. I have no intention of joining the Communist Party tomorrow, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any other business or occupation besides that of being a moving-picture producer?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have certain investments and certain outside interests; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are they related to the moving-picture industry?

Mr. KOENIG. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or the radio or entertainment field?

Mr. KOENIG. In general, in the entertainment field; yes, sir. I have been in show business for a long time. Most of my interests are in show business.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then as we are investigating the extent of Communists activities in the entertainment field, of which—

Mr. KOENIG. I concede your right to ask the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Motion pictures is only a part, I will ask you—

Mr. KOENIG. I have no objection to answering any questions, sir, about that. I have a record company and I make jazz records, and my leading artists are the Firehouse Five Plus Two, a very red organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will have to ask you to repeat that.

Mr. KOENIG. I say, I have a record—phonograph record company, sir, and my leading artists are the Firehouse Five Plus Two, a very red organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I will have to take your word for it. I am not acquainted with them.

Mr. KOENIG. It is quite apparent that you have seen them, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I thought just the contrary. I don't think I have. Now, what do you mean by that?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, they wear fire uniforms, and the color of fire uniforms are red. There are no political implications intended, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I was anxious to know whether you were serious or not.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, it is a rather humorous enterprise on my part and I have a lot of fun with it, and it is hard for me to take it seriously.

Mr. TAVENNER. That probably displays my ignorance of some of the recent moving pictures.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, if you were dancing the Charleston you would probably—

Mr. TAVENNER. You said it was jazz, I believe.

Mr. KOENIG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am a little too old for that.

I would like to ask you more about your statement that you are not now a member of the Communist Party when you will not tell the committee as to what you were yesterday. Have you changed in your views and in your loyalties in any manner since yesterday?

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the previously stated grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly you have heard some witnesses testify that when men were called into the armed services during the war that the Communist Party considered they were not members of the Communist Party during the period of their service. Has the Communist Party in Los Angeles adopted any such a view regarding the appearances of witnesses here? Has that anything to do with your statement?

Mr. KOENIG. No, sir; it has not anything to do with my statement, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee why it is you are not a member of the Communist Party today.

Mr. KOENIG. I am not a member of the Communist Party because I am not in sympathy with the aims or the objectives of the Communist Party, sir, as I understand them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I am very glad to hear you say that, but I am anxious to know whether you agreed with their aims and purposes yesterday.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have already declined to answer that question in another form.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is this matter of membership in the Communist Party a thing like a cloak that can be worn today and cast aside tomorrow?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have sat here and listened to various testimonies on that, and I am not so sure that can be taken on and off like a cloak, sir; no, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Having seen the witnesses that appeared here, I can understand why you no longer care to be affiliated with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed, Mr. Koenig, almost your last answer was—and I wrote it down. I think I have it exact: "I am not in sympathy with the aims of the Communist Party as I understand them." What aims of the Communist Party—can you help us—that you are not in sympathy with?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I don't know that I can help any in—

Mr. DOYLE. Because we are making a study—

Mr. KOENIG. But to explain—I imagine you want me to elucidate on the statement I made to Mr. Tavenner as to my understanding of the aims?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, please.

Mr. KOENIG. Of the Communist Party today.

Mr. DOYLE. Please.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, as I understand the aims of the Communist Party, they would in some way, shape, or form institute a form of government in the United States which would, I believe, abridge the rights of citizens to freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of conscience, freedom of belief and opinion, and I might add that I don't believe that those rights are light rights. They are very heavy, and the very basic foundation of our democracy depends on them, and in any way that any party or organization might tend to abridge those rights by the institution of any form of government, I would be opposed to that form of government.

Mr. DOYLE. That perhaps leads me to this question. I thank you for helping me to understand your answer partially. I know, because you have said you have been here several days and I have noticed you too, in the audience—I made up my mind that you were a very prosperous man, and I judge from your testimony that you are. Can you help us, then—if you are not in sympathy with the Communist aims and objectives, can you help us, as a committee of your Congress, with any suggestion you may have of how we can help fulfill our assignment by Congress, which is to investigate subversive programs? I wish to assure you that we are not intending to take the time of anyone, of ourselves, either, in the field of looking into people that might be termed—oh, small fry or incidental Communists, but major leaders.

What recommendation have you, sir, for us, as to how we might really be more effective, if you think we could, in the field of getting at subversive people and subversive programs? In other words, those that would knowingly engage in the revolution or engage in taking away our freedoms of worship and thought and speech which you have just spoken of? Is there anything you have to recommend that we can do, because the law under which we function says that we shall recommend to Congress.

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have no recommendations.

Mr. DOYLE. May I just make this statement and then I am through. You see, your own case—may I illustrate by your own case—is a sort of a closed door, and you have seen four or five or six other men and women who we know at one time to be Communists, and they have taken the very tack that you have taken, sir. You have said, "I am not a Communist today." Well, that leaves inferentially, at least, the proposition that you may be tomorrow or may have been yesterday or a week ago. How can we get at that problem?

Now, here you come and you claim the fifth amendment. We don't criticize you for doing it. Thank God, under our Constitution, you have the right, but what can we do within the framework of our Constitution, because we must follow that framework and stay within that, vigorously, sir. This committee is not interested in anything but staying within our own Constitution, I assure you, but what can this

committee do to meet the very problem that has been presented and you have heard it presented in these 4 or 5 days, and the very problem you present? We only see you a few minutes, you see, and you come and you say, "I am not a Communist today. I claim the fifth amendment," when we ask you if you were yesterday, and so you close the door in our faces. We can't get any help from you as to how the Communist Party has been operating in California from your own experience, assuming that we know that at one time you were a Communist. Don't you see the problem?

'How can we do that? How can we get, for instance, your cooperation, and successful men like you whom we have been informed were at one time a Communist and we believe, without limitation, that at one time you were? Now, you come and say, "I am not today." How can we, within the framework of the Constitution, get your cooperation so that you will tell us what, if in any way, the Communist Party is subversive, enough so that you, shall I say, got out of it, again, believing as we do, that you were a Communist?

In other words, you got out of it, shall we say. Why did you get out of it, a successful, prosperous man? You may not have been when you went into it, but you certainly are now, sir. You are out of sympathy with it, yet we can't get your help because you, sir—and I say it with all respect to you—you, sir, are following exactly the line, when it comes to the fifth amendment, that we know is followed by almost all the present Communists because you must know, sir, that when we ask you if you are a Communist, almost always we know the answer before we ask you. You realize that: of course you do, because we have very able investigators, former FBI men, former Secret Service men. Some 99 out of 100 of the gentlemen who sit in the chair where you are and tell us that "We are not today" or "I refuse to answer," we know what the answer is before we ask it, but we would like to get the picture of subversive people and subversive programs that are designed to undermine our form of government. Now, that is all. We are not interested in trying to put you in a position where you have a sense of fear or compulsion. Can you help us in that? How shall we get at that problem, specifically?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, I have no recommendations to make.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, will you think it over?

Mr. KOENIG. Sir, I have thought a great deal about this problem.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I can tell you have. I can sense that, sir.

Mr. KOENIG. And I am sorry, sir, that I have no recommendation to offer you.

Mr. DOYLE. May I say this to you: I don't think you are through thinking it over. I don't think you are through.

Mr. KOENIG. I don't understand you, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I mean that I believe you when you say you have no sympathy with Communist objectives. I am ready to believe you, and, believing you as I do on that, I don't think you are through. I think you are going to come clean some day before long and say, "Gentlemen of Congress, here, let me help you."

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. Mr. Koenig, what was your rank on discharge from the Army?

Mr. KOENIG. Master sergeant.

Mr. JACKSON. Where are you presently employed, Mr. Koenig?

Mr. KOENIG. Paramount Pictures.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you discuss the matter of your appearance before this committee with your employers?

Mr. KOENIG. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Have you any questions, Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Koenig, do you contend that the Communist Party of the United States is part of the international Communist conspiracy?

Mr. KOENIG. I don't know the answer to that question, sir.

Mr. POTTER. Well, to refresh your memory, I wish to take the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to refer you to a manual which was written by J. Peters, a manual that is entitled "The Communist Party—A Manual on Organization." Now, we have had testimony before our committee that this manual of the Communist Party serves as the Communist Party members' bible and it is used extensively as a pamphlet, a publication for the indoctrination of new members. Now, under a paragraph entitled "What Are the Conditions for Membership in the Communist Party," I wish to read you this paragraph:

The conditions for membership in our party are contained in the following pledge read by Comrade Browder to 2,000 workers who were initiated into the party in the New York district in 1935.

I quote the pledge that these 2,000 workers took:

I now take my place in the ranks of the Communist Party, the party of the working class. I take this solemn oath to give the best that is in me to the service of my class. I pledge myself to spare no effort in uniting the workers in militant struggle against fascism and war. I pledge myself to work unsparingly in the unions, in the shops, among the unemployed, to lead the struggles for the daily needs of the masses. I solemnly pledge to take my place in the forefront of the struggle for Negro rights; I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States.

Mr. Koenig, this is from the Communist Party's own manual, the Communist Party of the United States, and you, sitting in the witness chair, refuse to aid us to throw any light on a conspiracy that is dedicated to the what—to defend the Soviet Union. Your idea of citizenship is much different than mine.

Mr. KOENIG. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the question of Congressman Jackson, he said that I discussed this with my employers and I said, "No." I want to be absolutely sure that I have made my answer clear. I did not discuss this with anybody in the studio. The man to whom I report immediately—that is, the man who is supervisor in my work—was away, and I did inform his attorney, because I felt that that should be the case, and I just wanted to make the record clear for you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman and Congressman Potter, the manual that you have spoken of was introduced in evidence before this committee as one of the first documents, I think, that the committee introduced, probably as early as 1938. The document is probably out of print long since. I think it would be well to introduce that document in evidence, particularly inasmuch as it has been referred

to quite a number of times during the course of the hearings. I offer it in evidence and ask that it be marked "Koenig Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. WALTER. I notice some of the other papers were marked exhibits. Do you intend to offer them?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. All right, mark it and let it be received as an exhibit. (The instrument in question was marked "Koenig Exhibit No. 1.")¹

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask my distinguished colleague, Mr. Potter from Michigan, whether or not in that manual, with which he is so familiar, there is any pledge of allegiance to the United States?

Mr. POTTER. None whatsoever. None whatsoever.

Mr. WALTER. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

With further reference to this document, this is a document prepared by a person known as Alexander Stevens, and also known as J. Peters. He was identified by Whittaker Chambers as an agent of the Soviet Union and has been deported. But the committee has information that Alexander Stevens, known also as J. Peters, came to Hollywood in connection with Communist Party affairs here, particularly in connection with the raising of funds. I would like to ask this witness if at any time he met J. Peters.

Mr. KOENIG. I decline to answer the question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Koenig, what contributions have you made to any alleged charitable work in recent years?

Mr. KOENIG. Alleged charitable work, sir, or charitable?

Mr. WALTER. I said alleged advisedly, because after all if you refuse to answer the question as to whether or not you made any contributions to Mr. Peters' activity then I think I am justified in saying alleged, because Mr. Peters was only interested in milking the cows of Hollywood.

Mr. KOENIG. Yes, sir. I would be glad to tell you of any contributions I have made to charitable organizations.

Mr. WALTER. Let's hear about contributions that you have made to any cause.

Mr. KOENIG. The motion-picture industry, I am very proud to say, has one fund which covers a great many charitable organizations, the Community Chest and various—I guess 62 legitimate organizations which have been carefully investigated.

Mr. WALTER. And you—

Mr. KOENIG. I am very happy to say that I have authorized a payroll deduction from my check which is given to that organization weekly.

Mr. WALTER. You are very proud of the fact that you have contributed to that?

Mr. KOENIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then why do you refuse to answer the question about contributions to Mr. J. Peters?

Mr. KOENIG. Sir, the question would obviously involve me with an organization of which I have—

¹ See appendix printed in separate volume.

Mr. WALTER. Why would it obviously involve you?

Mr. KOENIG. Well, sir, as I understood the question, counsel said that the contributions were for the Communist Party and I have declined to answer questions regarding any possible or alleged affiliation or connection with that organization, sir. So I must decline to answer your question.

Mr. WALTER. All right, thank you.

Anything further, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. The witness may be excused.

Who is your next witness, or do you have anything further today?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Another witness that I believe you were going to call is ill?

Mr. TAVENNER. I received a report from counsel that he was not well enough to appear today but it was expected that he would be tomorrow. I agreed for his appearance tomorrow, subject to your approval.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes. If the witness is not well, why, of course, we don't want him to be here.

Then the meeting will stand adjourned until 10 in the morning.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 4:30 p. m., an adjournment was taken in the above hearings until the hour of 10 a. m., of the following day, Tuesday, September 25, 1951.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 5

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:10 a. m. in room 518, Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Francis E. Walter (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter (chairman), Clyde Doyle, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator; and John W. Carrington, clerk.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Tavenner, who is your first witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. George Beck.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Beck, will you raise your right hand?

Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BECK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE BECK

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. George Beck?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I saw you late in the afternoon yesterday and I made the comment to you that I was saving you until this morning. I believe you replied that you preferred if I would save you until Christmas.

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, Christmas has come. Mr. Beck, when and where were you born?

Mr. BECK. In New York City, March 7, 1907.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BECK. In Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Hollywood?

Mr. BECK. Since 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Briefly, what has been your educational training or advantage?

Mr. BECK. Well, the public schools of New York, elementary and high school, a couple of years of high school, and then I went to work for a year or two and decided I wanted to complete my education. I went back to high school, found myself to be a little older than the other kids and quit. I went to prep school, morning, noon, and night, for about 6 or 7 months, and took college-entrance examinations at four or five New York colleges, all of which I passed, and then found myself in a position where economically I couldn't take advantage of these high marks I had made, so I didn't go to college.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. BECK. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what your experience has been as a writer?

Mr. BECK. Well, prior to coming to Hollywood I had done some magazine stories, a couple of plays, sketches on Broadway. Then I decided I wanted to see what Hollywood was like and I came out here. Within a couple of weeks I went to work.

I wrote a picture at RKO, the name of which I have fortunately forgotten. This was followed by two or three others, and then I was unemployed for a little bit, did a couple of original stories on my own, which I was fortunate enough in selling.

From 1936 to about 1943 or 1944 or 1945, I was pretty consistently employed, either self-employed or by the studios. From about 1945 to 1948 I decided I wanted to pursue other pursuits, namely, the pursuit of happiness. I was unhappy in the studios. So I was not available for pictures. That's about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are some of the screen credits which you have received?

Mr. BECK. I think my very first was a thing called There Goes My Girl. Another one was Everybody's Doing It. They didn't say what they were doing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice just a little bit?

Mr. BECK. The second was Everybody's Doing It. I worked on a picture called Destry Rides Again; got no credit, however. Then I wrote a picture called Hired Wife, with Rosalind Russell, and another one. Take a Letter, Darling, with Rosalind Russell again. This is my last credit, although subsequently I had worked on numerous scripts that were in distress, many of which I could not cure, but I managed to give them decent burials. That is about all of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Beck, information has come to the attention of the committee that during a part of your experience as a screen writer you were a member of the Communist Party. Is that correct?

Mr. BECK. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee when and under what circumstances you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. BECK. Well, I am a little vague about this myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. First, let me ask you, have you withdrawn from the Communist Party?

Mr. BECK. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. About when?

Mr. BECK. This, again, I can't be too sure of. It was about 1946, possibly the early part of 1947. That is to the best of my memory.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Let us go back, then, to the period when you became affiliated with the Communist Party—

Mr. BECK. Well, my first—

Mr. TAVENNER. And tell us how you were recruited into the party and the circumstances under which you became a member.

Mr. BECK. Well, I think it was approximately in 1938 or possibly 1939, that I was asked to write a script, a radio show, and at this time Hitler and Chamberlain were playing footsie. I got a little angry at this and, ordinarily, I am known as a commy writer—

Mr. TAVENNER. By "commy," what do you mean, comedy?

Mr. BECK. Yes; funny stuff.

Mr. TAVENNER. The abbreviation is so easily misunderstood. That is the reason I mentioned it.

Mr. BECK. Well, as I say, I was approached to write a sketch for a radio show, and I didn't feel in the mood for writing comedy at this time, so I wrote a sketch which was written out of anger, emotion, and a pretty damn good sketch, because in it I could say precisely what I felt about war. Well, this went on the air and it apparently met with a great deal of approval throughout the country, and I got—oh, any number of letters from people who liked what I had said. I also found myself being courted by certain people out here, which is not to say that prior to this time I hadn't known some of these people; very nice people, wonderful people. I admired them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak a little louder, please? I heard you, but just speak a little louder.

Mr. BECK. Who saw that I was pretty articulate on paper, at least, and said that—well, they invited me—I can't say who they were at the time because there is a great deal of confusion in my mind right now and I would hate to say specifically who, what, when, where. They asked me to go to a cultural meeting. Well, I went to a cultural meeting. I can't remember where. A lot of people were there that I knew, a lot of people I didn't know, and there were speakers whom I don't remember, but what they had to say was precisely what I felt. Again, I can't tell you what it was that was said except at this particular time Hitler, Franco, Mussolini, all of this was being discussed wherever people sat down together. Well, I listened and I approved. I liked what was said, because it was articulated, possibly, to me much better than I could for myself.

I became interested and I went to three or four of these. Now, I do not recall whether I joined the party at this time, but if I did, I know it was a very short duration because in and around this time something happened with Finland, I think, or something, at any rate and—well, I had arguments—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you excuse me? Will you sit farther forward? I understand the press is unable to hear. Raise your voice a little as though you were speaking to me rather than speaking to the microphone.

Mr. BECK. I can't say just what it was at this time that brought me in and out, or whether I was in and then subsequently left, but I do know that in about 1943 I finally made a big decision and it was a cinch to recruit me. As a matter of fact, I sought membership in the Communist Party because I felt—

Mr. TAVENNER. You did what?

Mr. BECK. I sought membership. I felt that this was the only organization for me at the time. It seemed to be, well—it was active, and I wanted to be active, I wanted to do something positive. Unfortunately, however, I found that I had done better work as an individual, in my estimation, before I got into the party than during my party membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will want to ask you more about that a little later. Will you tell us a little more in detail the circumstances under which you became a member in 1943? I am not speaking now of the reasons which brought you into the party. You have apparently explained that. But I mean where did you go to join the Communist Party, who did you contact, and any other information such as that?

Mr. BECK. I didn't contact anybody. It is just that prior to this time there were some people, who they are I can't recall now—that is, I can recall a mass of people but I cannot select the individual who possibly was assigned to recruit me as a member. But I do recall this, that right around this time I saw a motion picture, I went downtown to see it, a picture called Professor Mamloch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. BECK. M-a-m-l-o-e-h, I think. And I was greatly moved by this picture.

I remember coming out in the lobby, there were people discussing it, and one was the then widow of a friend of mine who had lost his life in the service. Somebody said, "How the hell anybody can stay out of the party now I don't know." Well, I felt this way, too. It was suggested that I go to another one of these cultural meetings, and I did. I found it was Dick Collins' house. It was at this meeting when the coffee and cake was served, along with the invitation to join the party, that I accepted both. I signed.

From then on intermittently I was a party member. When I say "intermittently," I again have the memory of having dropped out of the party on two or three occasions, and whether I dropped out actually or just didn't function I can't say. I know that I was approached annually to reregister, even though I had not been at meetings, although I must say that I attended many, many meetings and tried very hard to be a good Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to a particular group or cell of the party upon signing up at the home of Richard Collins?

Mr. BECK. Yes. I don't know how this came about exactly, but I do have a memory of seven or eight or nine people meeting at my house out in the valley, and possibly at one or two other homes, although I can't recall—I don't even remember who the people were because I never subsequently came into contact with them in a professional or social way. So I believe that these were just citizens in the valley who were just anxious to do a good job in the way of bettering the community in which they lived.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned later to a different group or cell of the party?

Mr. BECK. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. BECK. Well, I wonder if I couldn't make a request of the committee at this point. It is simply this: Yesterday I heard Mr. Doyle offer another witness an alternative, saying he was interested only

that this witness knew about procedures of the Communist Party. Well, I must say that I know very little about it. But at the same time I have personal feelings about naming people, especially people who have already been named numerous times. Since I can only mention possibly six or seven or eight, I wonder if I could eliminate the mention of these names.

Mr. WALTER. I don't know why you hesitate mentioning the names of people whose names have already been mentioned.

Mr. BECK. It's a personal feeling.

Mr. WALTER. Particularly in view of the fact that many of those people, despite the announcement that Mr. Wood made, giving them an opportunity to come in and make a statement, have failed to do so. The inference, of course, is that they are still active members of the Communist Party.

Mr. BECK. Well, this is a personal feeling.

Mr. WALTER. I understand. But if the names have been mentioned I don't see why the reluctance to mention them again.

Mr. BECK. It is just that the majority of these people are very close and good friends of mine and I like them and I know very well, that is in my own mind, that these are not people who could by the furthest stretch of the imagination be considered bomb throwers.

Mr. WALTER. Unfortunately, you have the attitude that a great many other Americans have. I will confess that when I first became a member of this committee, against my wishes, I used to see these slimy individuals parade before our committee one after another and I wondered which one of them would have the courage to even fire an air gun, much less throw a bomb. But, after all, that isn't the danger. You see, they are always behind somebody who resorts to force. They haven't the physical courage to do it themselves, but you see, they supply the impetus.

Mr. BECK. Well, it is my feeling, Mr. Walter, that these are not the people who get behind things but rather these are the people behind whom the others get, if you know what I mean. People like myself.

Mr. WALTER. Well-meaning, frustrated idealists, I suppose.

Mr. BECK. Well, let's let it go at that.

Mr. WALTER. I mean, I said that in a hurry without weighing it, but on reflection I think it is pretty good. Mr. Tavenner, is there any reason why this witness should—

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I think the importance of giving a full statement of the names is a matter that should be insisted upon. There cannot be an investigation of communism without investigation of individuals. It is impossible.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know the names that are going to be mentioned?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am fairly certain I have heard the names.

Mr. WALTER. Are these people whose cards we have or know the numbers of their cards?

Mr. TAVENNER. It may be in some instances but—

Mr. WALTER. Well, I don't see any harm. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I doubt if that is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. BECK. Well, the later assignment—that is, the second group to which I was assigned had possibly a dozen or more people—I would say, rather, a dozen or so people, and the meetings—I can give a few names only. Jack Lawson.

Mr. WALTER. Certainly the mention of Jack Lawson's name doesn't come as any surprise to anybody, does it?

Mr. BECK. I should imagine not. This is why I felt that we would be taking the time of—

Mr. WALTER. I am sure that Mr. Lawson wouldn't be surprised that his name is mentioned.

Mr. BECK. Well, hardly.

Mr. WALTER. Go ahead.

Mr. BECK. Les Cole, Morton Grant. I don't want to hide now. It is just that I can't think of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you take your time and consider it, because I want you to be as accurate as you can.

Mr. BECK. Oh, Arnold Manoff.

Mr. TAVENNER. Arnold Manoff, you say?

Mr. BECK. Yes, and a lady who mentioned me, and I can do no less than mention her, Mrs. Wilson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson?

Mr. BECK. That's right. How many have I mentioned so far?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with John Wexley?

Mr. BECK. I was acquainted with him; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of that group?

Mr. BECK. Well, I once went to his house. He was not a member of this group. I went to his house, and I think it was a fraction meeting of some sort related to the Albert Maltz controversy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any others whose names you can now recall?

Mr. BECK. I think the very early group was presided over the first several meetings by Mrs. Ruthven.

Mr. TAVENNER. Madelaine Ruthven?

Mr. BECK. Madelaine, that's right. She came along the first several times because, to me, we were, I guess you would call us, novitiates, and none of us knew anything about the parliamentary rules of running a meeting, and there was an awful lot of jabber until she stepped in and kind of directed us in how to sit properly and discuss whatever we had to discuss. That's about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. If the names of any other persons occur to you whom you know to be members of the Communist Party, we would like that information.

Mr. BECK. Well, if they occur to me next week—if they should occur to me I will write you a letter.

Mr. TAVENNER. If, during the course of your testimony, any question is asked which might refresh your recollection—

Mr. BECK. Oh, of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would also like for you to mention it.

Mr. BECK. Well, I am here to cooperate with this committee as much as I can.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am certain you are. Now, will you tell the committee your experience as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BECK. Well, I think my first difficulty as a Communist was to become a Communist; not a member, but I mean, become a Communist.

In order to do so one apparently has to educate himself. I sat with the books, I slept with the books, I ate with the books, and nothing happened. I read and read and read in an attempt to understand what it was all about, and I guess it was the style of the writing, something I am not familiar with. I couldn't absorb any, and I complained of this difficulty, I think, to Mr. Lawson, and he smiled sympathetically and he said, "Well, we all had that trouble. It takes a lot of application." Well, I applied myself some more with negative results. I got some of the gist of some of the things, and there was very little dialogue, and none of it was sparkling. May I say that? Well, it was difficult. I do remember that early in my membership I had—

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt your testimony—

Mr. BECK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. At this point? Is counsel for Mr. Sidney Buchman in the room?

A VOICE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

Mr. BECK. Yes. I wish you would excuse me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if you will proceed, please, with your statement.

Mr. BECK. Yes. Well, almost one of my first difficulties was an attempt to understand why this was, and I accepted it as such, a legitimate party. I have reference to the Communist Party.

(At this time Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. BECK. I have reference to the Communist Party of America now. Why it was that I had—why it was that I was given a pseudonym. I don't have any constitution for conspiracy, and this, to me, was—well, it was childish. You know, it was—I guess you would call it kinderspiel, child playing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder.

Mr. BECK. Yes. I spoke of this once to Manoff and he smiled, too, about it, and he said, "But this is something you have really got to understand. When you become a thorough Marxist you realize that we are a minority party, and it may happen that one day the Republicans, who are the outs, will be the ins, and they are going to have to find somebody to pick on, and they can't pick on the Democrats because they are about as big as they are, so they will pick on us."

Well, I accepted that and I went along with it. It wasn't too important to me at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a party name?

Mr. BECK. I guess I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall it?

Mr. BECK. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. BECK. Well, the boys decided to do something because of my constant complaints because of my constant inability to absorb, and this I think is rather amusing, at least it is to me now in retrospect. Manoff suggested, "Look, since it is so tough for you to read this stuff, possibly by association it would help you." So, by association he meant that I became the book carrier or literary director of my group. It evolved upon me to go to the book store, pick up the literature, bring it to the meetings, try to sell it. and I did this for quite a period. I must say that I upped sales considerably.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you able to get up sales through the handling of the ordinary and accepted type of Communist literature, or did you sandwich in something of a different character?

Mr. BECK. You are stepping right on my jokes. I carried a lot of basic literature, we referred to them as the heavy stuff and the light stuff. The heavy stuff was the basic Marxist literature. This I carried and I carried. I also carried best sellers and plays and other things that interested me. Now, I consider myself no different from an awful lot of other people and what interested me would certainly interest them. This stuff, the heavy stuff, didn't interest me and didn't interest them, either. They would push it aside and say, "Now, what have you got that we can read?" And they bought the stuff that they could read. The other stuff I kept carrying to and from.

I developed, I guess—all I developed was muscles. Now, that's about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you a moment ago about your party name and possibly I can refresh your recollection. Do you recall the name of Joe Barton or Bert Benson?

Mr. BECK. They sound like pretty good names. I don't see that they—I don't remember that they had any particular connection with me. I think I can explain this simply by saying, "This is your name," this is what they would tell us on the card, which I wouldn't look at.

Mr. TAVENNER. What functions did you perform in the Communist Party other than that of carrying the literature?

Mr. BECK. None, except that I paid dues and I attended meetings. I also took—well, here you've got to understand that at this period I was trying to be a good citizen and there were many issues that would come up from time to time that the Communist Party per se would get behind. I remember the occasion of FEPC. Now, this I got behind. The antidiscrimination things, fair employment and stuff, I don't recall at the moment, but I know that I was in hearty accord with the objectives of these things and I went out and worked for them. I rang doorbells and solicited signatures to—what do you call them? Petitions. I did well. I apparently was pretty persuasive. I also sold many subscriptions to the People's World. That's about my function.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any sizable contributions to sustain the People's World or the New Masses?

Mr. BECK. Well, I made a kind of semivoluntary contribution once, I remember. There was a meeting once, a party to raise funds for the New Masses. This was a magazine that was always in need of money. At this particular party, just before we got down to the business in hand, I was asked, as some of the other people present were asked, by George Willner—

Mr. TAVENNER. George Willner?

Mr. BECK. Yes. Who was my then agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he also known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BECK. I would assume so. At this point, let me say that I feel I was the only member of the Communist Party in the United States from all the testimony that has been going around. I mean I can swear to myself being a member of the Communist Party. These people I saw merely at Communist Party meetings.

Willner was raising money, and he asked me before we sat down to the business at hand, and asked several other people, "Now, what can I put you down for so that I can hypo this thing along?"

I said, "50 bucks."

Well, he used me by saying, "Well—." Later on he said, "Beck offers 50. Is anybody going to match it?" Well, this was immediately matched. And then without my permission he says, "Now Beck tops that with a hundred." I guess I did. When this was met he said, "Beck offers 150." Well, I kicked in and I later kicked him. That is the contribution I made to the New Masses.

Mr. TAVENNER. What dues or assessments did you pay to the Communist Party, and how were they assessed, on what basis, if you recall?

Mr. BECK. Well, from what I recall here, my memory has been refreshed, I don't know what the percentage was, but I know the actual dues were nominal and the assessments, if that is what they were, were a little bit higher, a small percentage of salary. If you were employed you paid this, if you were not employed, well, you paid the dues, you paid the minimum fee. I imagine that I averaged about \$20 or \$30 a month. That's about all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any benefit parties for the New Masses at other times, so far as you recall?

Mr. BECK. I imagine I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall where those benefit parties were held?

Mr. BECK. No; I don't think I can. I mean I cannot differentiate now at this time with what was the New Masses party and what was the cultural and inculcation party, or what was just a plain social shindig.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Frank Tuttle?

Mr. BECK. I met him once at his house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a Communist Party meeting at his home?

Mr. BECK. Well, I was—

Mr. TAVENNER. Or was it a meeting that you attended at his home?

Mr. BECK. It was some kind of a meeting. Whether it was a cultural or indoctrination meeting, or whatever, I don't know. I know I did attend a meeting there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you remained in the Communist Party until 1946.

Mr. BECK. Yes; about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. About that time?

Mr. BECK. 1946 or 1947. I know I sold the house I was then living in in September 1947, and this was almost immediately after the boys got their invitation to attend this ball in Washington, and I know I was out by then.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the circumstances which led up to your termination of your Communist Party membership?

Mr. BECK. Well, my final termination, I think, was preceded by a gradual disinclination to attend meetings. I think the first puzzlement, real puzzlement, I had was on the occasion, as I see here, of the Duclos letter, which I read and must confess I couldn't understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak a little louder, please?

Mr. BECK. I say, which I read and must confess I couldn't understand, inasmuch as just prior to this time we had been allies with Rus-

sia, and I thought we got along pretty damn well with Russians and Russia, and here was Mr. Duclos, whom I had never heard about before, who wrote that this was impossible, that the United States and Russia could never get along in the same world. I differed with Mr. Duclos. That's about it.

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. BECK. This was my first differing with authority, shall I say? Subsequently, the Maltz thing. Now, this was, to me, the first real breach. There has been testimony here about Maltz and his famous article. Albert Maltz is, to me, a great writer, a fine man and possibly one of the best craftsmen in the industry. Mr. Maltz wrote an article which said, in effect, that the writer, the artist, cannot do his best work if he is proscribed; that art is a weapon it was hard to use in the writer's job and that he, for one, found he had to eschew it.

Mr. TAVENNER. He had to—

Mr. BECK. He had to discard it. Well, he had said in that pretty much what I had been feeling, only feeling but unable to articulate to myself, because during this period I found it difficult to write.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I, at this point, read to you just one or two sentences of what Mr. Maltz wrote?

Mr. BECK. Well, it was a wonderful article. I would love to hear it again.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

I have come to believe that the accented understanding of art as a weapon is not a useful guide but a strait-jacket. I have felt this is in my own work and viewed it in the works of others. In order to write at all it has long since become necessary for me to repudiate it and abandon it.

Now, that is the position which you were referring to?

Mr. BECK. Yes, precisely.

Mr. TAVENNER. As expressing what you, yourself, believed?

Mr. BECK. Yes. It seemed to me that there were—you see, I placed myself in a difficult position. Prior to this time I had been writing comedy and doing rather well at it in that we lived well. I then decided that, well, there is a war going on and I ought to be able to use my abilities as a writer for some better purpose than just comedy writing. Well, this is like any comic wanting to play Hamlet, I suppose, and they pretty soon become aware that they don't have the capability of it, but I stayed with it and got exactly nowhere, and I am happy to say that recently I have, in the past 3 years at any rate, gone back to writing comedy with, I think, rather good results.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you were describing this Maltz episode as another incidence of the basis for disaffection on your part with the Communist Party—

Mr. BECK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. So will you continue.

Mr. BECK. Well, I was bothered and disturbed, and the reason I was bothered and disturbed—I mean, I approved of the article. I thought it was great, and I told this to Mr. Maltz, and he was very grateful for my approval, although this—or rather, he said, "Well, I'm glad you like it, George," and I said, "Not only I, but an awful lot of other fellows do, too." This, however, was not

approved by a lot of people whom I had never heard of. A big meeting was called, and I think this was the occasion when I met at that house. I suppose it is called a fraction meeting; writers only were asked to attend. This was about the only fraction meeting I ever attended.

(At this time Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. BECK. Possibly another; I don't know. At this time some higher echelon people from downtown in the party and some people from New York came out for the express purpose of viscerating Mr. Maltz, and they did it. They chopped him up very finely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee just what happened in that proceeding. Was Mr. Sillen, from New York, one of those who came?

Mr. BECK. I wouldn't know Sillen if he walked in here. I remember the name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BECK. You see, it is difficult for me to attach names to bodies.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, this was a meeting in whose home?

Mr. BECK. This was that Wexley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wexley?

Mr. BECK. Home.

Mr. TAVENNER. The home of John Wexley?

Mr. BECK. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. The meeting was called for the purpose of straightening out Mr. Maltz?

Mr. BECK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I wish you would tell the committee just what occurred and how it occurred in that meeting.

Mr. BECK. Well, my only recollection of this is that I got there at night; it was crowded by the time I got there. I managed to find a seat, and already somebody that I didn't know was telling Mr. Maltz—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you talk a little louder?

Mr. BECK. Was telling Mr. Maltz how to write. Now, this I consider presumptuous in the extreme, coming from somebody I didn't know telling a man like Maltz how to write, whose writings I had approved of and enjoyed, and I never heard of this guy, I never read anything of his, so why he should set himself up as a critic, I couldn't understand. However, he pounded Mr. Maltz, and a lot of us who were sitting around there began to get pretty annoyed with this. I know I expressed the feelings of several people when I said, "Who the hell are these people? Never heard of them. This is our party. This is our group." As far as I was concerned, I was—I felt that it was just the area in which I operated—that is, my group—and the several people that I knew outside of the group in the industry, and I couldn't see why people from New York and people from downtown would take it upon themselves to indoctrinate Mr. Maltz, to tell Mr. Maltz how he should write.

Mr. TAVENNER. By "people downtown and people in New York," are you referring to Communist Party functionaries on a higher level?

Mr. BECK. Yes, I would say so. Sure, sure.

Mr. WALTER. Who were they?

Mr. BECK. I don't know.

Mr. WALTER. Give the names. See if that refreshes his recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sam Sillen is one of those, according to our information, who came as a special representative of the Communist Party of the cultural section from New York to straighten out this situation. Just who the functionaries were from the Los Angeles County Communist Party organization I am unable to say.

Mr. BECK. Well, I am, too. I mean, I had never met these people before, and—well, I just didn't know them. I had no occasion to meet them later on, so that is—

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any further description you can give of the occurrences at that meeting?

Mr. BECK. Well, a lot of us tried to get the floor to defend Albert Maltz, but some of us couldn't. Others did. I know I left—I started to leave, at any rate, and I tripped over somebody who was asleep.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that?

Mr. BECK. I think that was Leo Townsend, and he said, "What's going on?" And I said, "The same old"—four letter word. But that was about the gist of it, although I know that helped—immediately after this I made a trip with a very dear friend of mine down to Mexico to see the bullfights, and on the way down this man who, incidentally, is no Communist, was no Communist, never has been a Communist—I have many friends who have never been Communists. I complained bitterly to this man and said, "What the hell has happened to our little party? They are pulling it apart." And I complained. The net result of this was that he said, he says, "Either get up off your—get up on your feet and holler."

Well, I got up on my feet and I hollered, and everybody hollered with me. I mean, we all pretty much felt the same way, but nothing happened. I mean, some weeks later, in the same magazine, Maltz wrote what amounted to a retraction, a recantation of his first article, and this saddened me, and from here on I stopped going pretty much to meetings thereafter. I know I went to several to complain some more, you know, and wanting to find out what it was, what has broken us up here, you know.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you were unable to work under those conditions, conditions of having your thoughts in writing controlled by action of a higher level of the Communist Party?

Mr. BECK. Mr. Tavenner, nobody ever tried to control my thoughts, my writing. It is just that here I had seen an attempt. Well, I don't think they would have understood the kind of thing I write, so why would they try to control it. You know, why would they make an attempt at it?

Mr. TAVENNER. But you resented that effort to control the thought and writing of others.

Mr. BECK. Well, I resent anybody or anything that tends to control anybody or anything. I think a fellow is entitled to free expression if he has the ability to write it down and say it, provided it is within the borders of good taste.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to talk to Mr. Maltz between the meeting in which he was severely condemned and the time that he published his retraction?

Mr. BECK. Yes; I think I did, but purely on the condolence side, if you know what I mean. A fellow breaks his leg and you bring him

noodle soup, or something, and say, "Gee, too bad." You know, this kind of thing. My attitude was one of sympathy, "Gee, that was a hell of a way they butchered you." You know, that kind of thing. "I would have gotten up, Albert, to say something in your defense but I couldn't get the floor," something like that. He understood, he knows. Albert I consider a very dear friend, I hope, and he considers me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of John Sanford?

Mr. BECK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he in your group at any time?

Mr. BECK. Well, if so, very intermittently. I remember seeing him at meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dalton Trumbo?

Mr. BECK. Dalton Trumbo, I think, came to my house once to buy a book. He looked at it and it didn't suit him and he didn't buy it. The only other times I saw him, I think, was at this—that is the only time I can fix as a party function was at this same fraction meeting of which I spoke earlier.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lou Harris?

Mr. BECK. I know Lou Harris used to come over to my house to swim. I had a pool then that made me rather popular. A lot of other people came to swim. Now, meetings, actual meetings—I don't want to damn him to a spot. I think, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Beck, an investigator of the committee talked to you about this matter and you voluntarily looked up the checks that you were able to find that had any connection whatever with the Communist Party and you have voluntarily presented those checks to us.

Mr. BECK. Well, voluntarily but with reluctance.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you three checks and I will ask you to examine them and state what they were for, please.

Mr. BECK. This was party dues, check for \$100.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom is it payable?

Mr. BECK. Payable to cash.

Mr. TAVENNER. How is it endorsed?

Mr. BECK. Elizabeth Grant.

Mr. TAVENNER. Elizabeth Grant? Is she related to Morton Grant, a person you mentioned in the earlier part of your testimony?

Mr. BECK. I believe she is still his wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. She was a member of the Communist Party, I assume, and collected dues from you?

Mr. BECK. I would assume so. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed with the others?

Mr. BECK. Here are two checks, also to cash, one for \$60, dated June 7, 1944, and another for \$65, dated September 29, 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say they are payable to cash?

Mr. BECK. Payable to cash, both endorsed by Ann Froelich.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay those items to her as Communist Party dues?

Mr. BECK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the name "Froelich"?

Mr. BECK. F-r-o-e-l-i-c-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that after the difficulty with Mr. Maltz, after the effort made by the Communist functionaries in New York and on the higher level here in Los Angeles County, that you ceased attendance at meetings.

Mr. BECK. Well, I wouldn't say that I ceased abruptly. There was a disinclination to attend them, there didn't seem to be any point for me any more because I just—

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active at all in the work of the party after that time?

Mr. BECK. Oh, no. I was never active. The actual activity that I engaged in was getting out with petitions and lugging, as I say, the books.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it then that you consider that your connection with the Communist Party terminated?

Mr. BECK. Actually terminated, I know, before 1948, and certainly—well, this I can fix because in 1948 I was approached again to come back in, and this was one invitation I could decline.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee the circumstances under which you were solicited to come back in.

Mr. BECK. I was home writing, working, and a fellow came to the door, I knew him, and he says, "Can I see you?" He had called before, I think. I am sure he would have. Very polite. And we got to talking and he said, "How about coming back in?"

I said, "No, thanks." He didn't press me particularly. He did, however, rather sadly comment, "Gee, it's getting tough, everybody is leaving."

Mr. TAVENNER. When was this?

Mr. BECK. "And nothing will drag them back in." This was in 1948 when I had been out for at least a year, I'm sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the person with whom you had that conversation?

Mr. BECK. This was Morton Offner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mortimer Offner?

Mr. BECK. Mortimer Offner. He complained, as I say, it was very difficult to reregister people and couldn't understand, and finally decided, "Well, I'm not doing much good." This meeting ended with my not going, that is, not reregistering and I did, however, give him some money. This money was for either tickets to some theater party or something, for some cause or other. I don't know. But I gave him what money I had on me, which was about \$4 or \$6 or something. And that was, I think, the last time I saw the man. Since then there has been nobody that has ever come near me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has your break with the Communist Party been final and complete?

Mr. BECK. Well, I would say so, sure. I mean as far as I am concerned.

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

Mr. WALTER. Have you any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Beck, you stated a few minutes ago that you went into the party, the Communist Party, because it was active, and because, as I understood it, it represented what you were interested in.

Mr. BECK. Well, let me say this, Mr. Doyle—

Mr. DOYLE. At that time?

Mr. BECK. Yes, at that time. Earlier, I think even before I got into the Communist Party, I, like a lot of other people, were looking for a way to become instrumental and effective in the fight against fascism and nazism. At that time there was no organization other than, to my knowledge, the Communist Party, which was really doing a job.

Mr. DOYLE. Later on did you find that the Communist Party was—let me change that. Later on did you become disappointed in the lack of effectiveness of the Communist Party to fight what you were interested in fighting?

Mr. BECK. Well, let me put it this way, sir. During the period that I was a party member I felt that I was very ineffective. I am speaking now for myself, that at a period prior to my being a member I had done a couple of things that I thought were pretty effective as a citizen and as an individual. I felt, and I feel now, that is in retrospect I look at it, and I can say I was somewhat smothered, that I didn't function.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't mean that you as a Communist Party member, that your individual initiative was smothered?

Mr. BECK. No, sir; no, sir. It was just that—well, it took time to attend meetings, to discuss procedure, what we were going to do, what was next—what was the next big issue to be tackled. Whereas before that without discipline when I felt anything I would go to my typewriter and I would write it.

Mr. DOYLE. I notice you are here without counsel, without legal counsel. You stated a few minutes ago to our distinguished legal counsel, you said, "I am here to cooperate with the committee, Mr. Tavenner." Mr. Tavenner replied, "I am sure you are." What is there about the functioning of this committee of your United States Congress that gained for this committee your cooperation? What are we doing that got your desire to actively cooperate and come here without counsel and voluntarily, although possibly with some regrets, cooperate with us? What are we doing that you feel as an American citizen you could no longer do as a Communist?

Mr. BECK. Well, I'll say that this committee, in my estimation, is slightly different from the previous committee, and I think the public relations job that you people have done has convinced a lot of people that you are not out to smear, whereas I am frank to say the previous committee did not care at all. I am sure that you gentlemen are concerned about the security of the country, just as I am. I was subpoenaed. You are a legal group. A subpoena is not an invitation that one can decline. That is why I am here. I would like very much to have this whole mess finally dropped where it should be dropped and forgotten, and the industry permitted to go its way, to resume normal functions. There is an awful lot of fear about. I, at this point, cannot—well, I feel no fear, although I can understand others feeling fear.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you one more question?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle, you have consumed 8 minutes. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I have used my time so I will transfer to my colleague.

Mr. JACKSON. During the discussion over the Maltz affair, did Mr. Maltz take the floor in his own behalf?

Mr. BECK. I don't recall if he did. I imagine he would have, because Albert is not the sort that is going to be kicked around without—

Mr. JACKSON. Well, don't you think that in light of his complete repudiation of his previous statement that he did prove, ultimately, to be the sort who could and would take directions as to his artistic endeavors?

Mr. BECK. Well, I am not one to judge Maltz. I know that I respect him to this day. I like him.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, that is fine. I can understand your feelings, but I think the historical fact of his recantation must indicate that he did accept dictation from the Communist Party.

Mr. BECK. Well, one would assume that, of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak up?

Mr. BECK. He was given one of two alternatives, either recant or get out. He stayed in.

Mr. JACKSON. And recanted. Since your break with the Communist Party, have you come to the conclusion, personally, that the Communist Party is in the nature of an international organization, and that all of the national groups take their directives from the Soviet Union?

Mr. BECK. Actually, I wouldn't know about this, but from what is happening now, this is real and we are in a period of real and present danger and—because I don't like what has been going on. Nobody does. Finally, I should imagine that as Americans we must realize that we are Americans.

Mr. JACKSON. I hope there are an increasing number who will take your statement to heart and realize that many of us are convinced that today it is impossible to bear a dual allegiance to the Soviet Union and to the United States. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Potter, have you any questions?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Beck, at the fraction meeting when Maltz was criticized for his article, was John Howard Lawson in attendance at that meeting?

Mr. BECK. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. Did John Howard Lawson take an active part in criticizing his fellow writer, Maltz, for his article?

Mr. BECK. I don't recall, actually, because I know that the three or four speakers that I heard were rather long-winded and were strangers to me.

Mr. POTTER. They were outsiders?

Mr. BECK. I would say so.

Mr. POTTER. You don't recall of any of the local writers that took an active part in criticizing Maltz for his article?

Mr. BECK. Not writers of my acquaintance, let me say. There are an awful lot of writers in this town that I don't know. I mean, I see them. I see them at guild meetings, and I don't know their names. There may have been a few of these, but I would say that the tenor, the temper of the people that I knew was all in favor of Maltz and resentful toward this group saying what they had to say.

Mr. POTTER. At the time of the Duclos letter, did it not seem strange to you that many of the people who, one day, were loud in their praise of Browder and the National Party, the following day were equally severe in their criticism? I don't know whether you experienced that type of turn-about or not.

Mr. BECK. Well, I did. After having been in two or three wordy altercations with people who are not Communists—

Mr. TAVENNER. Please speak a little louder.

Mr. BECK. I used to find myself kind of in the middle of a sentence when the line would change. It wasn't really that bad. I mean, I say that, but it was difficult for me to—

Mr. POTTER. Make your mental adjustments and keep them with the party line?

Mr. BECK. Yes, which is—again, I want to say that I was not too concerned with party lines per se. What I was concerned about was the local picture. That is, here in town.

Mr. POTTER. But it must have impressed you that the group that you belonged to followed a definite party line. When the orders came down, they jumped. Maybe you didn't jump with them at the time, but your leaders of that group must have jumped. Maltz is an example which you have, yourself, used.

Mr. BECK. Well, Maltz was never in my group. I remember there were other people in my group who were just—

Mr. POTTER. I think that is true.

Mr. BECK. As puzzled as I was and didn't jump, as you say; who argued until—I don't know—they came around. Why I don't know. I probably did, myself, without understanding, but with the feeling that, well, gee whiz, let's forget this and do the job that has to be done here, like—whatever it was—the Sleepy Lagoon case, or something like that. We were concerned primarily with local issues. That is, I was concerned, and I think the other people were, too.

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

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Beck, I can understand why you were disturbed about the Duclos letter. Didn't that letter prove to you that the real aims of the Soviet were confusion, disorder, misery, strife, and chaos, and that all of this braying about peace was just simply window dressing?

Mr. BECK. Well, I don't know that the Duclos letter did this to me, because then we were just over a terrible war and we were all looking forward to the fruits of the peace and, as I say, I didn't know Mr. Duclos. I had never read any of his writings, and when I read this I was simply confused, because we had just been through a horrible war with Russia as our ally and, as far as I was concerned, they sure could sleep in the same bed, because we had done it under very trying circumstances. Certainly it could have been done under less trying circumstances.

Mr. WALTER. It could have been done and would have been done if there was any desire on the part of the Soviet to live in peace with the rest of the world.

Mr. BECK. Well, certainly. I accept that.

Mr. WALTER. Anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Beck, what you have done has not been pleasant. I appreciate fully how you feel about it, but it has been important. You have made a great contribution to the security of America. I would never go so far as to say that anybody who had ever been a member of the Communist Party was a great American. I don't know. I can't quite get up to that point, but I do think that you have

made as much a contribution, perhaps, as some troops in Korea or a bomber or a tank, and I am glad that you came here and testified, because people will know what you have said and that will give them the courage, not to come before this committee, but to, in their own way, take the steps that are necessary to be taken in order to eradicate this cancerous growth from our body politic. On behalf of the committee I thank you very much.

Mr. BECK. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will take a 10-minute recess at this point.

(A short recess was taken.)

(All parties being present except Representative Clyde Doyle, the hearings were resumed.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order. Mr. Tavenner, who is your next witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Karl Tunberg.

Mr. WALTER. Will you come forward, please?

Mr. Tunberg, will you raise your right hand, please. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TUNBERG. I do, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF KARL TUNBERG

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Karl Tunberg?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. TUNBERG. Spokane, Wash.; March 11, 1907.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. TUNBERG. I am a writer, a film writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any official position with the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. TUNBERG. I am president of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearing in March or April in Washington, the chairman of the committee received a telegram from Mr. Tunberg, as president of the Screen Writers' Guild, in which he requested the privilege of appearing before the committee in light of many of the statements that had appeared regarding the Screen Writers' Guild during the course of the hearing, and a wire or letter was directed to Mr. Tunberg then giving him that privilege.

I might say that—or I might ask the witness.

It is true, is it not, that upon the beginning of our work in Washington that you furnished the committee with a complete copy of the minutes and records of the Screen Writers' Guild for study by the staff in its work in this investigation?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. In any hearing involving communism it has been our practice to ask each witness whether or not they are now or have at any time been a member of the Communist Party. Without any inference whatever on the part of the committee, I want to ask you that question.

Mr. TUNBERG. No, sir, I am not now, I never have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose, Mr. Tunberg, in desiring to appear before the committee?

Mr. TUNBERG. My guild was upset and worried over the possible misconception which might be incurred among the public regarding the guild, and that is why the executive board instructed me to offer to appear here. I want to say now that I appreciate your having me here. I think it is indicative of the fairness with which these hearings have been conducted in your desire to get at the truth. Inevitably with a parade of witnesses, seemingly a large number of letters, some are being identified as Communists, people are bound to get the conception that there are more Communists among Hollywood writers than there really are.

I would like to point out that we have some 1,200 members in the Screen Writers' Guild and a very small fraction of these are Communists. I don't know what the exact percentage is but it is extremely small.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Tunberg, let me tell you at this point that this committee has always been perfectly willing to extend to anybody the privilege we have extended to you, and all that is necessary in order to appear before this committee to clarify the atmosphere if a person's name has been mentioned, is a request.

Mr. TUNBERG. I appreciate that.

Mr. WALTER. I renew that offer. If anybody's name has been mentioned in the course of these hearings, who feels that they have been hurt, and it is not the desire of this committee to hurt anybody, we are merely seeking the truth, all they need to do is request the opportunity to make a statement and they will be given that opportunity.

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, I can certainly testify to that, Mr. Chairman, and I do appreciate it. I would like to point out, if I may, that the complete lack of influence on our policy which the so-called left-wing group has had. I have statistics about that. Among the people who have been subpoenaed to appear before this committee in the past hearings, I think there are only two who have been successful in guild elections. Now, there were several hundred people who have run for office in the guild, and of that number only two from this group have been successful, and only for board positions. So you can see that they are completely at the present time devoid of any influence on our guild policy. I don't mean to infer that we have never had a Communist problem. We have had one, a serious one, as has the whole Nation, the whole world has had a serious problem. But we are very proud of the way we dealt with this, that we were aware of it early. I think the entire motion-picture industry was, being as sensitive as it is to public opinion, was aware of it quite early. And the industry has certainly done at least as good a job as any other industry in getting rid of this left-wing, Communist influence. I know our guild has been a spearhead in that fight, and we did have a serious problem, but we knew what was happening. I am not speaking of myself now but the membership in the guild, the leadership in the guild knew what was happening as far back as 1946 and 1947.

(Representative Clyde Doyle returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. WALTER. You say we had a problem, and I think we ought to start from that point. I think you ought to develop the problem that you had.

Mr. TUNBERG. I would like, if I could just continue for a moment, to say that in 1947, Mr. Emmet Lavery, who was then president of the guild, offered to turn over our records, our entire records to the FBI, so you know that at this time the administration of the guild was fighting, even then, the problem, but we did have this influence, and they exerted pressure on guild policy far beyond their numbers, just because of the apathy of the general membership. I know I was typical, a typical screen writer. I was busily engaged in writing, engaged in my professional work, and I paid my dues.

I didn't pay much attention to what was happening in the guild, and I think this is true of a great many writers, and it was along about 1947 that I was first alerted to this danger. Allen Rivkin called me saying he had formed something called the All-Guild Committee to fight the Communist influence in the guild. The All-Guild Committee was composed of people who were violently anti-Communist and were aware of the danger. He asked me if I would run for office. He said, "If you are worried about this problem, as I am, you will run for office," and I agreed to.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in what year?

Mr. TUNBERG. That was in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a question which occurs to me at this point. You said your membership consisted of 1,200?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right, approximately.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you stated that you had this problem of pressure brought upon your group by—I assume you mean by members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUNBERG. I assume they were. I must say here, I was never in their confidence. I wasn't in a position to know who was a Communist and who was not. All I know is the people who were against us, who seemed to be extreme left-wing influence.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, at that time did you have a bylaw of your organization which established the number of members which would constitute a quorum for the transaction of business?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, we did. It was 10 percent, I believe, at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ten percent, and 10 percent of 1,200 mean that business could be conducted with a membership of—I mean, with 120 persons present?

Mr. TUNBERG. Ten percent of whatever the membership was at that date, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then should there be 61 persons present at that meeting who were members of the Communist Party, they could control the action, if there was a bare quorum?

Mr. TUNBERG. That is actually what happened, Mr. Tavenner. We have really been through the mill on fighting these people, and they capitalized to the ultimate on the lethargy, on the apathy which kept people away from meetings. We found it very difficult to get people, who worked all day, to get out at night and sit around until midnight at meetings. They capitalized on that. They were disciplined, they were militant, they were vigorous. They came to a man to meetings and dominated them for awhile.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Now, in that connection, this investigation has disclosed, so far, I am told, 78—the number may not be exactly correct.

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes; that is approximately right.

Mr. TAVENNER. As far as our public hearings are concerned we have disclosed the fact that 78 writers in the Screen Writers' Guild were members of the Communist Party. Therefore, if you say that their membership turned out at these meetings and stayed there and outlasted other people by staying when the others had gone, they would be able to control any meeting that you had?

Mr. TUNBERG. They could do this and, also, they were very clever.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, any meeting where you had just a mere quorum present?

Mr. TUNBERG. Exactly. In many cases, they would attract other people to their banner, of course; liberals who didn't understand what was happening. They were very smart about espousing causes which could not be identified as communistic or political, and many times they would seduce genuine, honest liberals into voting their way, so in addition to the basic number, whatever it was, there were a few others who would vote with them on these occasions and, as you point out, they did outwait people. People would get tired and go home, and they would bring up the really important thing that was in their mind late in the evening when most of the members had gone home, but their hard core of members had remained.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did your organization take any steps to correct the situation with reference to your 10 percent quorum?

Mr. TUNBERG. We did. We increased it to 20 percent.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that action taken?

Mr. TUNBERG. I don't remember the exact date. I think it was in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I think it is very important for you to explain these matters, because the problem that you were confronted with is the same problem that any organization is confronted with which has either been taken over by the Communist Party or deeply infiltrated by the Communist Party. It might apply to parent-teachers association or any other group of people, so I think it very important that you outline these matters fully.

Mr. WALTER. Before going into that I think it would be interesting for us to know who the members of the All-Guild Committee were in making this fight against communism. You have given the name of Mr. Rivkin, I believe. Who were the other members?

Mr. TUNBERG. The members of this anti-Communist front?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. TUNBERG. They were prominently Emmet Lavery, who was president in the beginning who carried on this fight almost alone. Then he attracted men like Allen Rivkin, George Seaton, Valentine Davies—a great many people—Mary McCall, Irving Stone was one of the most vociferous members of the All-Guild Committee.

Do you want more names?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. TUNBERG. Charles Brackett, who is president of the academy. Richard Breen.

Mr. JACKSON. Adele Buffington?

Mr. TUNBERG. Adele Buffington, yes. Adele Buffington. Meehan was one.

Mr. JACKSON. Morrie Riskind?

Mr. TUNBERG. Morrie Riskind—I don't recall that he was in the All-Guild. I believe he was a member of this group, although I don't

remember meeting him at the meetings when I came in. I assume he was. I have heard of him. He hasn't been very active. In fact, he resigned from the guild some time ago, but I believe that he was in this group very early before he resigned.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Martin Berkeley a member of that group?

Mr. TUNBERG. I heard that he was. Not to my personal knowledge, but I believe that he contributed to it and did help in this campaign, anti-Communist campaign. Did I mention Leonard Spiegelgass?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. TUNBERG. He has been in the forefront of this fight, this anti-Communist fight, and still is. He is our vice president, but he has been through it for the last 4 or 5 years, to my knowledge. He came in with Emmet Lavery. He was one of the early fighters.

Mr. TAVENNER. We would like for you to give us the names of any persons that were probably omitted by you in your testimony here who were members of that organization.

Mr. TUNBERG. All right, I will endeavor to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. I know it is rather difficult to recall a large group of names.

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes; and it was a large group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you spoke of the remedy that you adopted of increasing the quorum from 10 percent to 20 percent. How did that operate?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, this forced more people to come out to meetings, or if they didn't come out it made the Communists unable to take any definitive action. Also, if people got tired and went home, it meant no official action or vote could be taken when there was not a quorum present. This is only one of the measures we took. The Communists, or, I should say, the left-wing influence in our guild had used the proxies. There is a provision in our constitution allowing proxy voting. We adopted that technique and used it against them. We went out and collected more proxies than they had. We conducted telephone campaigns before meetings, important meetings. We would—the board members, the members of the All-Guild Committee—would each take a certain number of names and call up people and impress upon them and urge them to be present at meetings. We tried to match their speakers. I mentioned before that they are extremely disciplined. They have extremely fine speakers on their side. They seem to go in for public speaking. They are polished orators. We had persons on our side whom we encouraged to talk, even when they weren't practiced orators, people that would be convincing by their sincerity and their honesty. We adopted—excuse me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us approach it this way. Will you tell the committee what were the principal strategies used by the Communists in endeavoring to control your meetings when you had important issues before you, and in doing that, try to describe what counteraction you took, if any, in opposition to the strategy used by them?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, as I say, we adopted their technique of proxies. We used them ourselves.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they oppose at any time the use of proxies at your meetings?

Mr. TUNBERG. They have been consistently against this, ever since we got more proxies than they had, although they intended to use them.

Mr. TAVENNER. So it was a rule that apparently was not intended to work both ways?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right, exactly. They also physically, in the control of meetings, even the placement of these people was important. They had what we call the diamond formation. That is, they wouldn't all sit on the left.

Mr. TAVENNER. The diamond formation?

Mr. TUNBERG. The diamond formation.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. TUNBERG. I mean not concentrating on one side of the hall, the meeting hall, but to spread out in a diamond formation. This has a number of advantages for a minority party, which they were. One is if they want to applaud, or if they want to boo or hiss, it sounds as though twice as many people are doing it, because they are all over the hall rather than in one group.

Now, it also means that the chairman, the presiding officer, has much more chance of recognizing them more frequently, because in trying to be fair the presiding officer will look around the hall and if they are in one place he won't recognize so many of them. But they would be staggered in this formation and it worked very well.

Another physical technique was the use of first and second teams. They would put—

Mr. TAVENNER. Wait a minute. Let's talk a little more about this diamond formation. Did it have the effect, also, of indicating that the strength, that the applause was coming from the audience as a whole rather than from just segments?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir; it did have that effect. It had the effect of twice as much applause.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that it had the effect of stampeding—

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those who had not made up their minds on an issue?

Mr. TUNBERG. Exactly. It was very effective.

Mr. TAVENNER. They used that tactic in your meetings?

Mr. TUNBERG. They still use it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do to counteract that, if anything?

Mr. TUNBERG. The only way to defeat a thing like that is to be aware of it. I know in my terms as presiding officer, when I am aware of it I can always not fall for it. As I say, we have speakers on our side and I try to be fair and distribute it so that they don't get the floor too often or dominate the debate to the exclusion of others.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the first and second teams. What do you mean by that?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, simply that they never shoot their bolt too early. They were too clever for that. They would put in their second-line speakers, the least persuasive speakers, and let them ramble on and on and wear people out, drive them out of the hall, drive people out. Then when it was late in the evening and they really wanted to put over something important they would bring out the big guns, the really persuasive, polished orators. We learned by experience not to shoot our biggest guns at their second team, but let them talk themselves out and wait for them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other technical or strategic principles that they followed in attempting to control, or of the minority attempting to control the majority at the meeting?

Mr. TUNBERG. Mr. Tavenner, I have jotted down several that have occurred to me. We adopted the practice of referring more important issues, especially constitutional issues, in the guild to a mail vote, where it couldn't be stampeded. As I say, we inaugurated a proxy campaign and gathered more proxies than they had. We adopted the practice of limiting our agenda at any membership meeting early in the meeting so they couldn't add to the agenda later on when people had gone home. I mentioned the telephone campaign, which was laborious but effective, because it did alert people individually.

The biggest weapon, I think, in fighting them is exposure. If you are going to fight them with democratic methods, and we have done that, and we are proud of the fact that we have defeated them by democratic methods, the only thing is to expose them for what they are, not as liberals but as Communists. I may say that I think that is the essential value of these hearings right here today. I mean the first step in a democracy is to make people understand what the issues are, who the enemy is, and any honest exposure will do that. We try to do that.

Mr. WALTER. I suppose that now all of your organization has a voice in its affairs, you are charged with being an undemocratic organization.

Mr. TUNBERG. We have from the start. The people I mentioned, those in the All-Guild Committee, anyone who opposed them has been charged with being a reactionary from the very start. This is one of their techniques, too.

Mr. JACKSON. Not a Fascist, just simply a reactionary?

Mr. TUNBERG. Fascist, reactionary.

Mr. POTTER. Warmonger?

Mr. TUNBERG. All the words have been used. Anybody who is against them is one of these things. I have been called that many times, although I fancy myself a liberal.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to the first and second teams. Can you identify here the names of any of those that you refer to as the big guns of the first team who were accustomed to doing the speaking?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, names familiar to all of us. John Howard Lawson was apparently the captain of the first team, and an extremely persuasive and polished speaker. Lester Cole was another; Albert Maltz, not only a brilliant writer but a brilliant speaker, a man much better at speaking than I, who can think on his feet, a quick, agile man. I have mentioned Lawson, Cole and Maltz. Trumbo was a splendid speaker, a member of their first team. Those are a few names that occur to me.

The second team would be men like Eddie Huebsch, Mike Wilson, that type of person.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the membership being 1,200, and we have through examination of your minutes and through the testimony of witnesses traced many of the issues involved in your meetings and the positions that different people took on those issues and particularly as to elections. I have asked the question here several times during these hearings as to whether different individuals supported Albert Maltz in the 1948 election, I think, or signed his petition. Now I would like to know a little about the method of election

of officers and how people become candidates and how campaigns are conducted for office.

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, Mr. Tavenner, according to the guild constitution, every year about this time our annual election, which is usually November 15, a nominating committee is appointed by the board of directors. The constitution provides that no more than three members of the board of directors may be on this committee. The nominating committee then is charged with selecting candidates for the various offices and board positions. The constitution of the guild instructs this committee to endeavor to find at least two for each office, or more if possible. The nominating committee then makes its report to the board and if it is accepted, this ballot goes out to the membership. This is a mail vote, and it is amplified at the annual meeting on November 15 by a vote in the meeting. Proxies are eligible, of course, here, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are candidates for office left free to circularize the membership?

Mr. TUNBERG. No, sir. Each year the then existing board determines its policy on that. In some years in the past the board has decided that there will be an open membership meeting at which candidates can state their platforms. In recent years the board has discontinued this, feeling that it was a waste of time and money and the people knew pretty much where the nominees stood anyway. It has always been intermittently the practice to send out campaign statements through the guild office, but these statements would be written out by the candidates and then sent out to the membership by the guild. Even this practice, however, in the last year or so has been discontinued.

(At this point Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice you said the letters would be sent out to the membership by the officials of the guild.

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could not a candidate for office send his own campaign literature directly to the membership?

Mr. TUNBERG. I don't see how that would be possible unless he had the official membership list of the guild. If he had that it would be illegal because we just don't give our membership list to anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, no one is supposed to have the membership list?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right. You can see the abuses that would be possible if this list were circularized. We just don't give it out. We never have. There have been attempts to authorize giving out the membership lists, we have never done it. Even in the case of charity drives we say to the charity, "We will handle the drive; we will circularize our members," and we do it. But we always do it through our office.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I were a member of your guild and would desire your address, for instance, and would telephone the guild headquarters, would I be furnished with your address?

Mr. TUNBERG. No, sir. You would be told that you could send your communication to the guild and they would forward it to me, or you would be told that I would be informed that you wanted to speak to

me and then I could use my own judgment as to whether I should talk to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is another effective method by which you can assure the will of the majority?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't that correct?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you say is the chief difficulty in successfully fighting the efforts of an infiltration group to take over control of an organization? What is the chief problem that you have confronting you?

Mr. TUNBERG. The chief problem, I think, is alerting the membership, alerting your citizens. Free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of expression is only half of it. You have to be eternally vigilant. If we are going to have free speech you must be very sure that the majority understands the issues and who the people are that are running it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, if the membership of your organization became apathetic, why, you have little chance of succeeding in fighting the inroads?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right. Then the rights that we all prize become abused and perverted, I think. It is only when these rights are exercised by a vigilant majority that you can make a democracy work. I think we have done that.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that the membership stays home and fails to vote, fails to express its opinion, you are in a weakened position and the outcome is almost certain to be that of successful infiltration of your organization?

Mr. TUNBERG. Exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is true of any organization which the Communist Party would endeavor to infiltrate?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other devices which you have not named which are of importance in attempting to successfully combat an effort to infiltrate your organization, that you may not have mentioned?

Mr. TUNBERG. I think—

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm not certain that I heard all of what you said when you testified.

Did you refer to a course of action to limit the time which any speaker may appear in support of a particular resolution?

Mr. TUNBERG. No, sir, I didn't. I am glad you mentioned it, because that is another device that we use to prevent their dominating the debate. We sometimes would limit the debate—limit the time of a speaker. I think I did mention that they were pretty experienced parliamentarians and knew when to interrupt a speaker that was pretty effective on our point, on a point of order, and they resorted to this kind of tactics frequently.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you did not have some limitation on their right of appearance on a particular issue your meeting might be protracted indefinitely?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Information has come to our attention that on occasion your organization in order to revise the efforts of domination has stayed in session as late as 5 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that correct?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's true. I don't remember the exact hour, but it was very early in the morning we have been in session several times.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it would only be because of the perseverance and loyalty of your members that would enable you to survive the attack?

Mr. TUNBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you whether or not the members of the Communist Party—I will strike that question. I will ask you whether efforts have been made to obtain financial support from your organization for enterprises which you considered to be the projects of the Communist Party.

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, a few that I recall were attempts to get us interested in certain strikes in the industry, to contribute to strike funds. The strike in 1945, the left-wing element in the guild attempted to get us to give \$10,000 in support of the CSU strike. They attempted to revitalize and reorganize the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization after 1945, when the need for it had gone. I think apparently their plan was to use it some way as a front organization, although it had not been started that way and, according to my recollection, has never functioned that way.

They did, however. When it continued, we were supporting them along with other guilds and organizations, by a donation of \$10,000 a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. That has been testified to by Mr. Richard Collins.

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes. There have been attempts to get us interested in the criminal proceedings of the so-called unfriendly 10, attempts to get the guild to furnish counsel for them. There have been informal attempts to get the members of the guild to support their wives and families. These are a few things that occur to me in attempts to get funds, all unsuccessful, may I say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any other efforts?

Mr. TUNBERG. These are the only attempts to get funds, that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall attempts to obtain action on the part of the guild which would aid in the promotion of any project of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUNBERG. There have been many such attempts, and I would like to say here, now, our records are still open to you. We are proud of them because we have defeated all of these attempts. We, some years ago, laid down the principle that this is a group dedicated to the interests of professional writers, that politics have no place in this, and we have defeated consistently their attempt to drag us into political matters. There have been many such attempts. As I say, the attempt to get us to put our resources at the disposal of the people who were cited for contempt is one example. The attempts to get us to go on their briefs before the Supreme Court—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Now, tell us more about that.

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, both Mr. Cole and Mr. Lawson appeared before our board on several occasions and attempted to get the guild

to endorse and sign, go on their brief before the Supreme Court, and in every instance we refused to do this. An example of that is the so-called Hugo Butler resolution, which is the resolution which was an attempt to get the guild to put its resources behind these people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hugo Butler is one of those who has been subpoenaed before the committee, and the committee is not aware of his whereabouts.

Mr. WALTER. Silent witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Silent witness. Now, about when was the Hugo Butler resolution presented?

Mr. TUNBERG. I can tell you exactly here. I have a few records here. January 13, 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may say that for the benefit of the record Mr. Hugo Black's name has been mentioned—Hugo Butler's name as well as Black's, but Black only in connection with his opinion, the opinion of the Supreme Court; but that Hugo Butler's name has been mentioned by witnesses during the course of the testimony, and that Communist Party meetings were alleged to have taken place at his home. Now, will you give us the date of the—

Mr. TUNBERG. January 13, 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have described these efforts that have been made. Are there others that you could mention?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, there are many efforts to—as I say, both Cole and Lawson appeared before the board to get us to go on their brief to the Supreme Court. I think there were two or three such attempts. There was a series of agitations in favor of these people, and some of them were rather appealing on the basis of charity and humane qualities. I mean, the one, for instance, to support their families is one difficult to deny.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those are all efforts made within your organization by persons who are members of it?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, have there been any efforts from the outside—that is, from persons who were members of your organization to control its policy or its action on projects or enterprises which you identified as being projects of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUNBERG. Mr. Tavenner, if I understand your question correctly, in our study of Communist efforts to infiltrate unions and guilds, we find that if they can't infiltrate, if they can't control the guild or union, they attempt to destroy it and discredit it. Now, I think recently, since they were unsuccessful in our guild, they have done all they can do to discredit our guild. I think right now, for instance, they would be very happy if the public impression was that we were honeycombed with Communists which, as you know and I know, is not true, but it would discredit that they couldn't control and, therefore, they would deny the use of this guild to us. They have done this: They have attacked us through other guilds. There was one case that comes to mind, which is the case of the Radio Writers' Guild. We recently were in negotiations for a minimum basic agreement with the major motion-picture studios, and one of the provisions for which we were negotiating was a hundred percent guild shop. According to the Taft-Hartley law, in order to negotiate for a hundred percent shop, you must have an authorizing election among the workers in the field. We applied for such an election. Now, also, according to

the Taft-Hartley law, the officials of a guild or union must sign non-Communist affidavits. We have always done this as a matter of course. The parent organization that we are affiliated with, the Authors' League of America, the parent organization, had done so, too, and in a ruling, the NLRB Board decided the members of the Authors' League Council were officers of the Authors' League within the meaning of the law.

Therefore, they, too, would have to sign non-Communist affidavits. This was a chance to attack us and to discredit us, and the 12 delegates in the Radio Writers' Guild refused to sign the non-Communist affidavits, and the effect of this was to deny us the election, the NLRB election. Later this ruling was reversed, but it is significant that the 12 refusals to sign the non-Communist affidavits came from—I believe 12 came from the Radio Writers' Group. I have always interpreted this—this is my personal opinion—as an attack based at least partly on political reasons. There was a recent such attack at a convention in New York at the Authors' League. Again the Radio Writers came to the attack and undertook to deny us television jurisdiction, but it is a campaign from within, which you mention, to attack this guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have mentioned the requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act with regard to loyalty affidavits, and you stated that you complied with the provisions of that act?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any difficulty in obtaining compliance by your organization, or any particular issue raised about it?

Mr. TUNBERG. No; there was never any difference about the Taft-Hartley affidavits. You see, these are required only of the officers of the guild—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TUNBERG. And during my experience as an officer, within the past 3 years, we have never had any difficulty with this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it at any time necessary to pass a resolution on the subject of executing a loyalty affidavit, a non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. TUNBERG. There was at one time, recently, about a year ago—I think a little over a year ago—considerable feeling in the guild that the entire membership should sign such an affidavit in the form of a loyalty oath. This came before the membership at a meeting one night, rather a sparsely attended meeting, and there was a filibuster against this thing. A great many people spoke against it from this left-wing group, and when it finally seemed this resolution would come up for a vote, they called for a quorum and then left the room. That is, the left-wing group left the hall as a body, so we had no quorum and could not vote.

Mr. WALTER. Wait a minute. Do I understand that the very people who raised the question of a quorum left a meeting in order to prevent the counting of a quorum?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. This was my impression. I couldn't prove this, but it seemed to me, from looking down from the dais that that is exactly what was happening, and we had no quorum a moment later.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that trick occur on any other occasion?

Mr. TUNBERG. Not to my memory. This was a new one. I thought I knew them all, but this was a new one.

Mr. TAVENNER. To break the quorum by leaving the meeting and then immediately come back?

Mr. TUNBERG. Then come back and speak some more; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. TUNBERG. Now, then, subsequently there was a resolution brought before the board. There was a debate about this. It was thought that the board should take a voluntary non-Communist—sign a voluntary non-Communist affidavit, and the board did this unanimously, even though not required by the Taft-Hartley law to do so. The board has signed such a non-Communist affidavit, every member of the board.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, was there any particular difficulty or dispute over the voluntary signing of the affidavit by members of the board?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, Mr. Tavenner, there was. There was a very heated debate about this. Some people objected on principle to a loyalty oath as a contingency, as a qualification for membership in the guild on purely—the grounds was that this was a professional writers' organization, and, as such, should never be a qualification for membership. Others objected on the ground that it wouldn't do any good, that a dyed-in-the-wool Communist would sign it very happily and go on about his way, and that it would not have the desired effect of flushing out the Communists. So there was, I think, an honest difference of opinion about this among several of our members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the circumstances surrounding the execution of it by Carl Foreman?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. We debated this thing for some time. As I say, there were some people who felt that the signing of such a voluntary oath would be useless. He was one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he sign it when the others signed it?

Mr. TUNBERG. No. No, he finally—he finally said that he would sign it. We then lined up to sign it, and when it came his turn he said he wanted to study it further and would take it home with him. He did, and, subsequently, sent it in by mail with his signature on it.

Mr. WALTER. It couldn't have been sworn to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was there a separate affidavit—I mean, separate oath given to him, if this were an affidavit and signed before a notary public?

Mr. TUNBERG. Perhaps I have given the wrong impression there. These were voluntary statements and were not signed. They were not notarized.

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm sorry.

Mr. TUNBERG. In the case of the Taft-Hartley affidavits they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Go on.

Mr. TAVENNER. These were just simply voluntary statements.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated in the earlier part of your testimony that to your knowledge there had been only two persons, within the period of time, and I do not recall what period of time—

Mr. TUNBERG. A period of—

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were officials of the organization and had been members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUNBERG. No, that isn't the impression I meant to give. I don't believe that is what I said. I said only two people, from among those

who have been subpoenaed, because I have no way of knowing whether they are members of the party or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. I see. I understand. Well, who were the two persons who have been subpoenaed here who have been officials of your organization?

Mr. TUNBERG. Harold Buchman was a member of the board in, I believe, 1948, and Carl Foreman, who is a member of the present board.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Sidney Buchman had ever been an official of your organization?

Mr. TUNBERG. Sidney Buchman was president, I believe, in 1940 or 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. William Pomerance?

Mr. TUNBERG. William Pomerance was executive secretary some time ago. I think it was about that period. I think he was executive secretary around 1944, 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. And Charles Page?

Mr. TUNBERG. I believe he was executive secretary before Mr. Pomerance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Ann Roth Morgan ever at any time hold an official position with the guild?

Mr. TUNBERG. After we got rid of Mr. Pomerance, she was executive secretary for a short time.

Mr. WALTER. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon an adjournment was taken in the above hearings until the hour of 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(Whereupon at the hour of 2:10 p. m. of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, the same parties being present with the exception of Representative Charles E. Potter.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Tunberg.

TESTIMONY OF KARL TUNBERG—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tunberg, you were asked this morning to furnish the committee with the names of those who were members of the all-guild committee and you did give the names of those whom you could recall at the time. During the recess have you been able to refresh your recollection as to the names of others?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. I'm sorry that I couldn't remember a more complete list this morning but I have a more complete list here now, and I would like to give it to you because I think that anyone who has been in the forefront of this anti-Communist fight should be publicly recognized. May I read it now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. TUNBERG. This is a rather complete list—not a complete list but a rather full list of those who fought with this committee. Sheridan Gibney, F. Hugh Herbert—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last names, please.

Mr. TUNBERG. Sheridan Gibney, the last name is G-i-b-n-e-y; F. Hugh Herbert, H-e-r—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice a little more.

Mr. TUNBERG. F. Hugh Herbert, Herbert H-e-r-b-e-r-t; George Seaton, S-e-a-t-o-n; Dwight Taylor, T-a-y-l-o-r; Arthur Sheekman, S-h-e-e-k-m-a-n; Harry Tugend, T-u-g-e-n-d; Robert Ardrey, A-r-d-r-e-y; Art Arthur, A-r-t-h-u-r; Stephen Morehouse Avery, deceased, A-v-e-r-y; Claude Binyon, B-i-n-y-o-n; Frank Cavett, C-a-v-e-t-t; Olive Cooper, C-o-o-p-e-r; Valentine Davies, D-a-v-i—

Mr. TAVENNER. Not quite so rapidly.

Mr. TUNBERG. Valentine Davies was the last thing, D-a-v-i-e-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the individual before Mr. Davies?

Mr. TUNBERG. Olive Cooper, C-o-o-p-e-r. After Mr. Davies, Richard English, E-n-g-l-i-s-h; Everett Freeman, F-r-e-e-m-a-n; Paul Gangelin, G-a-n-g-e-l-i-n; Dorothy Bennett Hannah, H-a-n-n-a-h; Milton Krims, K-r-i-m-s; Ernest Pascal, P-a-s-c-a-l; Leonard Spiegelgass, S-p-i-e-g-e-l-g-a-s-s; Brenda Weisberg, W-e-i-s-b-e-r-g; Robert Arthur, A-r-t-h-u-r; Graham Baker, B-a-k-e-r; Earl Baldwin, B-a-l-d-w-i-n; Sy Bartlett, B-a-r-t-l-e-t-t; D. D. Beauchamp, B-e-a-u-c-h-a-m-p; Edmund Beloin, B-e-l-o-i-n; Charles Bennett, B-e-n-n-e-t-t; Charles Brackett, B-r-a-c-k-e-t-t; Houston Branch, B-r-a-n-c-h; George Bricker, B-r-i-c-k-e-r; Oscar Brodney, B-r-o-d-n-e-y; Adele Buffington, B-u-f-f-i-n-g-t-o-n; Betty Burbridge, B-u-r-b-r-i-d-g-e; John K. Butler, B-u-t-l-e-r; James M. Cain, C-a-i-n; Roy Chanslor, C-h-a-n-s-l-o-r; Lewis Foster, F-o-s-t-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the first name?

Mr. TUNBERG. L-e-w-i-s Foster. Frederick Frank, F-r-a-n-k; Bert Granet, G-r-a-n-e-t; Kenneth Gamet, G-a-m-e-t; Howard J. Green, G-r-e-e-n; Norman Hall, H-a-l-l; Edmund Hartmann, E-d-m-u-n-d H-a-r-t-m-a-n-n; Agnes Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n; Sylvia Fine Kaye, K-a-y-e; John Larkin, L-a-r-k-i-n; Jesse Lasky, Jr., L-a-s-k-y; Emmet Lavery, L-a-v-e-r-y; Alan LeMay, L-e-M-a-y; Stephen Longstreet, L-o-n-g-s-t-r-e-e-t; Barre Lyndon, B-a-r-r-e, Lyndon L-y-n-d-o-n; Mary McCall, M-c-C-a-l-l; Elizabeth Meehan, M-e-e-h-a-n; Winston Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r; Peter Milne, M-i-l-n-e; Dudley Nichols, N-i-c-h-o-l-s; Walter Reilly, R-e-i-l-l-y; Allen Rivkin, R-i-v-k-i-n; Bradford Ropes, R-o-p-e-s; Leo Rosten, R-o-s-t-e-n; Barney Sarecky, S-a-r-e-c-k-y; Tom Seller, S-e-l-l-e-r; Irving Stone, S-t-o-n-e; Wanda Tuchock, W-a-n-d-a, Tuchock T-u-c-h-o-c-k; John Twist, T-w-i-s-t; M. Coates Webster, W-e-b-s-t-e-r, M. C-o-a-t-e-s; Clarence U. Young, Y-o-u-n-g.

That is not the complete list, but it is a rather full one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tunberg, in the course of the conduct of the business of your guild, are you called upon, or is the guild called upon by the Defense Department to furnish personnel to aid in defense projects of one kind or another?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. We are called on by the Defense Department and by the State Department to furnish writers for documentary films and for Government films and for training films.

Mr. TAVENNER. To furnish writers for documentary films?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that include also training films?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes; it has in the past.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just what do you mean by training films?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, film used by the Air Force, by the Army. I am not acquainted with their recent demands, but we have in the past supplied them writers to write these films.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, persons who are selected for work of that kind, from the very character of their work, must have access to various items of the military equipment, radar, fire control, and so forth?

Mr. TUNBERG. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the photographs of those articles?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any safeguard resorted to in the selection of the individuals who are to be furnished to the Defense Department for those important projects?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, informally, Mr. Tavenner. We, of course, are very careful about whom we suggest, but over and beyond that, once we give a list of available writers to such departments, they are then carefully screened, of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. They are screened by the Defense Department?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. They must be cleared. Their names, those available for such work, must submit their names some time in advance so that the screening which takes some time—it is a very rigorous screening—can take place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly I misunderstood you. Did you mean they are selected for the positions and then screened later?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do they enter upon the performance of their duties, and then are later screened?

Mr. TUNBERG. No, sir. They don't enter upon their duties until they have been cleared by the Government so-called loyalty check, I believe it is, but it is quite an exhaustive check.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe those are all the questions that I desire to ask you. If there is any further statement that you desire to make about the activity of the guild—

Mr. TUNBERG. There are a number of things I would like to say
Mr. Tavenner. One—

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly you should respond to the committee members.

Mr. TUNBERG. I wanted to correct an error in my testimony this morning first. I believe I said that Ann Roth had been executive secretary of the guild after Mr. Pomerance. I was wrong. She preceded Mr. Pomerance. In the interests of accuracy I wanted to mention that. I also left out a few tactics that we have used against these people. Perhaps you would care to ask me questions first.

Mr. WALTER. No, you proceed with your statement.

Mr. TUNBERG. One thing I neglected to mention, in our fighting the Communists, we restricted the membership meetings to members only. We found that the leftist elements would bring other people. They would bring their wives and their friends in order to create—even though they couldn't vote, to create the maximum uproar. One phase of our defense against this was to limit meetings only to qualified members. We also carefully screened our staff. You see, in working on a full-time basis for the guild we have a rather large staff of people and we found that we had to be more careful about whom we employed. There had been in the past several leaks in the office. We

think that these leaks have been stopped forever. The leftist elements—you have heard testimony about fraction meetings, cells. Information did come to us of these caucus meetings which they would have before every important membership meeting, to organize strategy. We adopted the same technique. We had our own caucus meetings to combat this.

Another thing, in a more general way I would like to say, is that it took a coalition to defeat them. I think this might be important to anyone else who has a similar problem. As I said, the guild, the 1,200 members of the guild, represent all shades of opinion, but it took a forgetting of individual differences. We all had to unite against this one element, whether Republicans, Democrats, what they were, and it finally took a strong coalition of people to defeat this, and I think this is true in all cases.

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Tunberg, under Public Law 601, by virtue of which this subcommittee of the main committee is here from Washington, Congress has directed that we not only look into the subject of the diffusion within the United States of subversive programs which may emanate from foreign countries or domestically, but we are expressly charged by the text of Public Law 601 to look into all other questions—and I am quoting—"in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

(At this time Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Now, therefore, I needn't say to you further that one of the heavier responsibilities of this committee, which you are cooperating with and helping—and we appreciate it—is that we shall think of these hearings objectively and report back to the United States Congress any additional legislation or remedial legislation which will help meet the problem of subversive influences and propaganda in our country.

Have you any suggestion or advice to this committee as to what we might recommend to the United States Congress in legislation?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, I have. It is my personal opinion that the Communist Party should be outlawed. I think it should be illegal.

Mr. DOYLE. Why?

Mr. TUNBERG. I think any party that has to meet in secret, in fraction and cell meetings, any party where people are afraid to say that they are members of it, where they have to resort to false names and where their aims are so manifestly un-American, should be illegal. I don't see the reason for quibbling over this, myself. There may be reasons that I don't know about. I don't know what they are.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the main objection we hear given is that if you outlaw the Communist Party, no matter if they do on the face of it seem to be meeting secretly, you will drive them further underground. Is that an appraisal that you agree with or not?

Mr. TUNBERG. No, I don't think you could drive them further underground. We had to dig and dig and dig to find them as it has been. They are underground anyway.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, not far enough, apparently.

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, I sometimes wonder, sir, if—I know you have done a great job of uncovering a great many of them; and, as I said earlier, I suppose yours is doubly important, especially in the demo-

cratic system like ours, because that is the only way. Only after exposure can we know how to vote and how to govern ourselves, but I wonder if we discovered them all.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do you feel from what you know, from your wide experience, that there is an element within the Communist Party that is definitely interested in the overturning and overthrowing, the ruining utterly, of our form of Government?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir; I do believe that.

Mr. DOYLE. Why do you believe that?

Mr. TUNBERG. On the basis of what I have heard in conversations that I have had with people I have suspected of being members of the party. That's about it. But I have heard enough—I have talked enough with these people to mistrust their motives and to mistrust their loyalty, may I say.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any other suggestion for us in the field of legislation?

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, this is a rather vague suggestion, but if something could be done to identify people—when you vote for a Republican, you know what he is. If you vote for a Democrat, you know what he is; but you never know what a Communist is. If the party is not outlawed, at least there should be some way of identifying him, letting people know what they are voting for and what these people stand for. I don't know how you could do this, but it is lack of knowledge that is the great danger. I am sure that the majority of people in this country are against this sort of thing, the overwhelming majority, but a lot of them don't know about it. A lot of liberals are confused, confusing what is a liberal issue with something backed by a more subversive group.

Mr. DOYLE. One more question. Do I understand from your answer just a minute ago to me that, based on your wide experience in the Los Angeles area, you are under the conviction that there are men and women in the Communist Party who would join in the forceful revolution or revolution by the use of force, if need be, to accomplish the overthrow of the American system of government?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. Mr. Doyle, I believe, number one, from what I have read—I have studied communism a little bit; I have studied Marxism in college, and I have talked with very few but with people that I had reason to think knew all about this movement. As I said earlier, I distrust them. I distrust their motives. I don't think they are really Americans.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

(At this time Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. WALTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Tunberg.

Mr. TUNBERG. Mr. Chairman, there is one further—

Mr. WALTER. Excuse me. Mr. Jackson, have you any further questions?

Mr. JACKSON. A couple of questions. With further reference to the Writers' Mobilization, the committee has had in the past members of the Screen Writers' Guild who, the evidence before the committee indicated, did work for the United States Government on some of these writing projects who have refused to answer the questions of the committee not only as to whether or not they were members of the Writers' Mobilization but the nature of the work upon which they were engaged,

refused to answer any questions in that connection. This fact, when taken with relation to the other evidence which was available with respect to the individual writers, would seem to indicate that some of the assignments were given to people who, if not actual members of the Communist Party, were certainly sympathetic toward its aims and goals. Is the procedure at the present time with respect to writers who are assigned to such projects the same as it has been in the past? Do you simply make a list of the entire membership or a portion thereof available to the Government, or do you do any screening at all in the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TUNBERG. We do a certain amount of it. The procedure has changed. You referred to the Writers' Mobilization. This does not come within my direct experience. I did not become active until 1947.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that.

Mr. TUNBERG. My understanding is that the Writers' Mobilization, which was started as a Government agency to help the Government in the writing of material, not only restricted material but unrestricted material for bond drives, for tours, I think practically every—this Mobilization was started, and practically every writer in Hollywood was a member of it. It was only later that the Communists saw the possibility of taking this over, and I think early in the history of the Writers' Mobilization there probably wasn't a screening of these people, especially when they weren't dealing with restricted material.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, could you set a figure on the present membership of the Screen Writers' Guild of admitted or known members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TUNBERG. I could only guess at it.

Mr. JACKSON. What would your best guess be?

Mr. TUNBERG. These are now people who have admitted publicly—

Mr. JACKSON. That's right, either on the stand or have been so identified.

Mr. TUNBERG. I should say probably 60.

Mr. JACKSON. Sixty?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. What is your present membership?

Mr. TUNBERG. Twelve hundred.

Mr. JACKSON. Twelve hundred?

Mr. TUNBERG. Twelve hundred; yes, sir, approximately. I think it is a few under that—1,180; something like that.

Mr. JACKSON. But your feeling is that the Screen Writers' Guild as of today has the situation in hand; that there is no chance of a repetition of what occurred when there appeared to have been a succession of secretaries—

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON (continuing). Who, if they were not members of the Communist Party, themselves, certainly lent every aid and comfort to the Communist Party? It is your feeling—is it, Mr. Tunberg?—that that situation is today in hand in the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. TUNBERG. It is indeed, sir. I feel that it is well in hand. I should point out here that after we got rid of Mr. Pomerance we then had an executive secretary by the name of Alice Penneman, who served us well for several years. She recently retired, and we now

have another executive secretary named Frances Engels. In both these cases, I think these secretaries are above reproach. As far as your asking "Do you feel that there is any chance of a repetition?" I think there is always the chance of a repetition if people don't remain vigilant. I think we have the situation well in hand. I think that it could get out of hand if we didn't watch it. I think it could get out of hand in this country if we didn't watch it. I think the clear and present danger is communism today.

Mr. JACKSON. I think that is pretty generally accepted, and it would certainly be my hope that other organizations which are under this attack would take a look at the experiences in the Screen Writers' Guild and realize that it is not sheer force of numbers that makes it possible to dominate and direct but, rather, a laxity on the part of the majority of the members of the organization who come late and leave early and allow untrammeled control of the operations of the organization. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Tunberg, we deeply appreciate your cooperation—

Mr. TUNBERG. Mr. Chairman, could I ask one further question?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. TUNBERG. In the testimony yesterday—I watched it on television; I believe it was yesterday—a certain editorial was read into the record. I think maybe some people may get the impression from this that people who have cooperated with the committee in the past in the form of so-called friendly witnesses may have been victimized by certain employers.

Mr. WALTER. I am wondering. I was just about to ask you do you know who the witnesses were—

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER (continuing). Who testified before this committee?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Who were they?

Mr. TUNBERG. I would like to say that at the beginning of this current hearing, the Motion Picture Industry Council did write a letter—and the Motion Picture Industry Council does represent all phases of the motion-picture industry, creative, crafts, management, producers, directors—pointing out that these people had not been victimized in any way by any employer in the motion-picture industry. I do have a list of these people who were mentioned who testified.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know what they are doing now?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir. I have—

Mr. WALTER. Well, will you give us the list and tell us what they are doing, whether employed, whether they have been employed since they testified in Washington.

Mr. TUNBERG. This is a list of people who testified on the so-called friendly basis, and in some quarters it has been said that they were kept out of employment. Morrie Riskind was one. Now, Mr. Riskind, I want to point out, has never really been, primarily, a film writer. He has written several pictures, but he was primarily a playwright and a very brilliant one, and I think for a period before his testimony he had not worked in pictures. He has not worked a great deal in pictures since then because he, as I understand it, is engaged in writing a play. Leo McCarey was one of the so-called friendly witnesses. I think he has been busy every day since

those hearings, at a very large salary. He is employed. He is under contract, I believe, to Paramount Studios and has been for many years. Also, I think he also had a contract with RKO. Sam Wood, up to the time he died, was under contract, I believe, to UI and to Metro. Certainly he always was employed and always worked at a very high salary. Walt Disney, another friendly witness, owns his own studio. Gary Cooper was a friendly witness. Gary has worked as much as he wants to at a very high salary; is working now; has made many pictures since then. Adolphe Menjou—the same applies here. Mr. Menjou, for a while, worked for a few months; didn't work. He has lately been in a series of pictures. I think he has more work than he can accept.

He is now, I believe, working at Metro, or finished at Metro. Jack Moffitt was one. Jack Moffitt, an excellent newspaperman, is conducting a column in the Herald Express. George Murphy was another friendly witness. He was under contract to MGM at the time. He is still under contract to MGM; has been consistently throughout this time under contract to MGM. Ayn Rand. Now, Miss Rand was a novelist, not a film writer. She has worked and is continuing to work in films, and since those hearings. They did a story of hers at Warner Bros. recently called Fountainhead. Since then she has worked for Hal Wallis who makes pictures for Paramount. Rupert Hughes, another friendly witness, is not a film writer. He is a historian, a novelist. He hasn't written films for many years. Robert Taylor. Certainly Mr. Taylor has worked, I think, every week since that time. He has been under contract, at least. There is more money tied up or invested in this actor than in any actor in Hollywood. He has just made a very expensive picture called Quo Vadis.

Fred Niblo, Jr., has worked since these hearings, another friendly witness. He worked for Eagle-Lion and RKO, Monogram, since those hearings. Ronald Reagan certainly has been very busy, as busy as he wants to be. He is president of the Screen Actors' Guild. Another friendly witness was Richard McCauley, who has worked at RKO since that time. Roy Brewer was a friendly witness, but he hardly fits in this category since he is a professional labor executive. James Kevin McGuinness—he worked for most of the time. He is dead now, but up to the time he died he, I think, had few periods of unemployment; worked most of the time.

Mr. WALTER. Did these people resume the employment they had prior to their testifying in Washington—

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Upon their return to Hollywood?

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. All right, proceed.

Mr. TUNBERG. Robert Montgomery did several pictures after his testimony. One was Ride a Pink Horse at Universal-International. He is now, by his own choice, working in the East on television and radio, I believe. Another friendly witness was Mrs. Lela Rogers. She was not—I don't believe she was a worker in the film industry but certainly her daughter has worked consistently since then. I thought in the interests of actors—

Mr. WALTER. Well, have you given us the names of all of the witnesses who testified before this committee?

Mr. TUNBERG. I believe that is all the group that was mentioned in this one hearing, yes. I believe these are the so-called friendly witnesses.

Mr. WALTER. Anything further, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this, Mr. Chairman. Will you tell me, please, what is the significance of this list, in your considered judgment?

Mr. WALTER. The witness has given us the names of all the witnesses who testified here before and their employment immediately after their testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, it shows that the friendly witnesses who have cooperated with the committee have not been penalized or lost employment as a result thereof.

Mr. TUNBERG. Exactly.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. JACKSON. I have a couple.

Mr. TAVENNER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. I have one more question. You have gone over the list of the friendly witnesses. What of the unfriendly witnesses? Do you have any knowledge of whether or not any material has been sold or, conversely, has been purchased from those witnesses who have refused to cooperate and answer the questions of this committee?

Mr. TUNBERG. I have no direct knowledge of it, no. I heard of rumors that some member—some of the unfriendly 10 have written scripts under other names which have been purchased unwittingly by studios. I have no proof of that.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no further questions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Tunberg, you have been very helpful, and I assure you that the entire committee appreciates your cooperation.

Mr. TUNBERG. Well, I appreciate your letting me come.

Mr. WALTER. More than that, I think you have given us some very fine evidence as to an effective way to combat the tactics employed in your meetings, the same tactics employed in labor unions and in meetings of other organizations, and it would seem to me that many people could learn a great deal from the very effective manner in which you have combatted this insidious movement.

Mr. TUNBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope it will be of value.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I clarify one matter?

You made reference to Mr. McGuinness.

Mr. TUNBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Mr. McGuinness' contract had been bought up and that, actually, he had not been employed?

Mr. TUNBERG. I don't know that his contract had been bought up. He had left the employ of one studio, but I know that he had offers to work in other studios. He received one offer, to my knowledge, from Paramount after leaving the studio.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all.

Mr. WALTER. Who is your next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sidney Buchman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Buchman.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am an attorney from New York City and I represent Mr. Buchman. As you probably know, Mr. Buchman

has not been well and I don't think he is fit to testify. However, I understand that this is the last day that this committee is in session. And Mr. Buchman, ill as he is, would like to have an opportunity to present his side of some of the matters you may be interested in.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Buchman has been subpoenaed and because of your representations as to his physical condition this committee had a United States Public Health physician examine your client. This physician has informed the committee that your client is in condition to testify; and, more than that, your client's own doctor has told us the same thing. So I see no reason why Mr. Buchman shouldn't testify in accordance with the usual procedure.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I take a moment, Mr. Chairman? He is here and of course he will testify if directed to do so. I simply wanted to say this, that I was not trying to interpose my opinion in opposition to that of any doctor.

Mr. WALTER. If I understood you correctly, he requested that he be permitted to make a statement.

Mr. SIEGEL. No, Mr. Chairman. I was simply saying that he does not appear to be fit to testify; however, I yield to medical opinion. I am not trying to oppose medical opinion by my own. If he is directed to testify may I make two requests, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of having him assist in the performance of his testimonial duty? First, can he appear here without being televised, in order to take any stress or strain off of him; and, secondly, in connection with the effort to appear here I have spent a great deal of time with him during the past week trying to probe his memory, his recollection and soul with respect to the things that I think you may require some information from him. Therefore, it may be necessary, in order to perform his duty; since he is not feeling too well, to look from time to time at notes which he has prepared and which I have helped him prepare.

Mr. WALTER. That's quite all right. I have no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you very much.

Mr. WALTER. If he requests that he not be televised, why, of course, the request will be complied with.

Will you raise your right hand, please. Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Sit down.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will it also be all right to have whatever photographs are taken, taken now so it won't interrupt the testimony?

TESTIMONY OF SIDNEY BUCHMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, R. LAWRENCE SIEGEL

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I record my—

Mr. WALTER. Let's get rid of this performance.

Yes, Mr. Buchman?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make the request that I not be televised, please?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir. And your wishes will be complied with.

From now on I request that the cameras, the television cameras, be not trained on the witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Sidney Buchman?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. BUCHMAN. I was born in Duluth, Minn., 1902.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now live?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I now live in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in Hollywood?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, in Hollywood and its vicinity for perhaps 20 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation or profession?

Mr. BUCHMAN. By profession I am a writer who has been elevated from time to time to a writer-producer status.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly for the committee your educational background and training?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I was reared in Duluth, Minn., finished grammar school and high school there in 1919, attended the University of Minnesota for 1 year. My family was then removed to New York. I then completed my education at Columbia University, taking my bachelor of arts there in the class of 1923.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, an outline of your work as a screen writer and as a producer during the past 20 years that you have been in Hollywood?

Mr. BUCHMAN. With the committee's permission, this is a long and complicated list, it involves in some cases my writing and in other cases my producing. If you don't mind—

Mr. TAVENNER. May I make this suggestion? In asking that question I did not expect that you give every detail of your employment.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Oh, I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you desire to file that we would be very glad to have it filed as part of your testimony, but if you will just narrate your employment in as much a way as to give the committee a good understanding of the time of employment you have had, that will be sufficient.

Mr. BUCHMAN. When I first came to Hollywood in 1931, in the spring of 1931, I was employed by Paramount Pictures. The credits of any importance were Sign of the Cross, written by me in collaboration for Cecil De Mille. Another picture called Thunder Below, I then transferred to RKO where I wrote an Ann Harding picture whose title I forgot. Then approximately 17 years ago I came to Columbia as a free-lance writer and wrote a picture called Whom the Gods Destroy; a picture starring Grace Moore called I Love You Always, or Love Me Forever. Then with Mr. La Cava in 1935, wrote a picture She Married Her Boss; a picture call the Music Goes 'Round; in 1936, a picture called Theodora Goes Wild; then the King Steps Out; Adventure in Manhattan; in 1939, Mr. Smith Goes To Washington; in 1940, the Howards of Virginia, from the book by Elizabeth Paige called Tree of Liberty; 1941, Here Comes Mr. Jordan; 1942, the Talk of the Town; 1944, a Song to Remember; Holiday; 1938, She Married an Artist; in 1937—this was the first time I had attempted or achieved a producer's status. I did not write the screen play.

Then in 1945 a picture called Over 21, an adaptation of Ruth Gordon's stage play. Following that To the Ends of the Earth; then as my own screen play and production, the second of two Jolson pictures, called Jolson Sings Again.

Completed at the moment are pictures called Saturday's Hero, an adaptation of Millard Lampell's book called the Hero.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Tavenner, did you also ask for productions produced under Mr. Buchman?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would be very glad to have them.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I have tried to make the difference as I went along, Mr. Tavenner. Maybe I didn't in each case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which of the pictures did you also produce, which you have just given us?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, of the pictures I produced, my first one was Over 21, when I was elevated to a writer-producer status.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date?

Mr. BUCHMAN. The date of that picture was 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the approximate time you became a director?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. I never was a director. I was a writer—

Mr. TAVENNER. I beg your pardon, I mean a producer.

Mr. BUCHMAN. A producer. A writer-producer.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the approximate time you became a producer?

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct. Under my production, again, it was To The Ends Of The Earth. I interrupted my own business to devote approximately 2 years to executive work in all departments of the picture, of the first Jolson story.. Then as a producer again, a writer-producer I made the second of the Jolson pictures as a producer. I have done the same as a writer-producer for Saturday's Hero; for a small subject called The Harlem Globetrotters, the basketball team. It was a rather cheap picture that was tossed off. And lately and lastly, and just completed, a picture called Boots Malone.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Tavenner, was it your purpose to have Mr. Buchman also give you the names of the pictures produced under his guidance and while he was the assistant in charge of production at Columbia Pictures?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have such a list prepared?

Mr. SIEGEL. In order to assist the committee we have prepared such a list.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest that it be filed with the committee, unless you desire to give the names of those pictures. I think you have given us sufficient narration of your activities so that the committee understands about your background, training, and your work.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Some time in this account, Mr. Tavenner, it may be pertinent, I don't know, I cannot anticipate your questions, to speak of the pictures I did at the time I was executive assistant to Mr. Cohn from the period of 1942—the end of 1942 to some time in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is that picture?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, there are several. Would you like me to enumerate them?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, yes.

Mr. BUCHMAN. They were called—there was a picture called What a Woman, starring Rosalind Russell; there was a picture called Cover Girl, produced by Arthur Schwartz and starring Rita Hayworth; there was a picture called Once Upon a Time, starring Cary Grant, produced by Mr. Louis Edelman; there was a picture called Sahara, the producer-director of which was Zoltan Korda; there

was a picture called Mr. Winkle Goes to War; there was a picture called Song to Remember, done, I believe, in 1943 or 1944: a picture for which I had written the screen play some 6 or 7 years earlier. It was revived. There was a picture called Counter-Attack, of which again Mr. Zoltan Korda was the producer-director. There was a picture—and then the principal occupation of that time was the last of those works called The Jolson Story.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1931, which was the date you came to Hollywood, how were you employed and where?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I beg your pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your arrival in Hollywood in 1931, when and where were you employed?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I had never been actually—well, yes, there were short periods of employment. I traveled abroad after finishing college, remained abroad and lived for perhaps a year or a year and a half. When I returned, through the influence, I might say, of a relative, I was in the story department of Warner Bros. in the east, their eastern story department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. BUCHMAN. In New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you there?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Approximately a year, year and a half.

I am trying not to say it immodestly—but I mean I am trying to say it modestly, that the work brought a recommendation of me to Mr. Mayer, Louis B. Mayer, who was traveling in the east, as a result of which Mr. Mayer employed me in Hollywood, brought me to Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer for a year term guaranteed, one of the usual 7-year contracts. I remained that year and, well, by mutual agreement we broke. I couldn't find my place in the studio.

I then began to write plays. I began writing here. It resulted finally in the completion of three plays, two of which were produced on Broadway, the third was bought but not produced, at my election. One of them was called This One Man, which came into the Morosko Theater in the fall of 1930, and starring Paul Muni.

It lasted several weeks. The second was a play called Storm Song, starring Frances Larrimer, which proved to be a dud and we closed it on the road in Washington. The third was called Acute Triangle. It was bought by the Froman office, specifically by Chester Erskine, who had become the producer-director. And after two very difficult experiences I declined a third production because it entailed some rewriting.

I might say that at the time my agent, by virtue of the previous plays, had offered me, or had secured for me a contract at Paramount Pictures. I decided to accept that contract and went to Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Buchman, during the course of the testimony during this hearing you have been identified by Mr. Martin Berkeley as having been a member of the Communist Party. Were you at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, Mr. Tavenner; I was. I was a member of the Communist Party from the years—it is difficult for me to fix, but I assume they are from the years 1938 to approximately 1942 or 1943, whenever the advent of the organization known as the Communist

Political Association. I can't fix the time exactly. And I was a member—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me assist your recollection there a moment. The Communist Political Association came into being in the latter part of 1944, or the early part of 1945.

Mr. BUCHMAN. And remained how long, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. About 1 year.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, that would have been my association with the Communist Political Association, until its dissolution. When that was, which could have been at the end of 1945—I have no recollection, actually.

Mr. TAVENNER. Rather than the end of 1945, the Communist Political Association really disappeared shortly after the receipt of the Duclos letter, which was in May 1945.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, then my leaving corresponded—the way to fix it myself, my leaving corresponded with the appearance of the Duclos letter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Buchman—

Mr. BUCHMAN. Pardon me, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Or shortly thereafter as the result of discussions on the subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Buchman, a person by the name of Carl Winter has been frequently mentioned in the course of the hearings on Hollywood as a functionary of the Los Angeles County Communist Party. There has also been information received by the committee to the effect that he was in New York functioning as a member of the Communist Party prior to his coming to Hollywood. Were you acquainted with Carl Winter in New York?

Mr. SIEGEL. May we take a second on that, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. I am sorry, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want you to have sufficient time.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Would you ask the question again, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether or not you were acquainted with Carl Winter in New York.

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you became a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood in 1938.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Approximately, yes. I can't fix the time. It may have been '37 or '38, or sometime late '38 or late '37. I'm sorry, I can't fix it. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. I feel certain that you are acquainted with the objects of the committee in the conduct of this investigation. We are anxious to learn the extent of infiltration into the moving picture industry by members of the Communist Party. We are interested in knowing the aims and objectives of the Communist Party in Hollywood, we are anxious to learn the methods by which it operated.

So I would like for you to tell the committee, first the circumstances which led up to your becoming a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I can't—

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Tavenner, is this all right? In order to assist in the conduct of this investigation and to make sure that you get the benefit of all of his thoughts and ideas on the subject, I have probed him to the fullest extent possible. We have jotted down some notes that I am wondering whether it will be all right for him to refer to.

Mr. WATER. It is entirely proper for him to refer to those notes, if they are his own notes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes, they are.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, we don't expect you to put words in the witness' mouth.

Mr. BUCKMAN. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that—

Mr. WALTER. That has been done, you know.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will not find us doing anything of the sort.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed.

Mr. BUCHMAN. You asked under what circumstances, Mr. Tavenner. Did you mean circumstances of conditions, my thinking, or the literal circumstances of how I came to be asked to join?

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to know what inducement the Communist Party gave to you to become a member of it and how it recruited you into the Communist Party. Those are the things I am chiefly concerned with.

Mr. BUCHMAN. May I say honestly, Mr. Tavenner, as a basis of perhaps many questions of this sort, that I am not a political theorist or political scientist, I don't believe that I ever cracked the work of the fundamental character on the subject. My entering the Communist Party was of an emotional character.

If you don't mind, I would like to refer to these notes.

I joined the party when the world was troubled by fascism, the rising tide of fascism abroad. We in America were worried about many problems dealing with economic inequality and political inequality. The Communist Party seemed to be the only political force, both concerned and willing, to take action to stop the threat of fascism abroad and to work for economic and political reform in this country. As I understood then, and the testimony of other witnesses before this hearing seems to bear it out, these factors were responsible for many other people joining the Communist Party.

Another reason was ideological. I placed this ideological matter in a certain emotional context, what I could call perhaps an instinctive context.

Communism seemed to be an ideal experiment in trying to achieve a state where all persons have greater democracy. I might add, like other persons here and elsewhere, I found myself concerned with the problem of increasing need for greater economic and political democracy for greater numbers of people. Dislocations of the First World War were evident all over and I was worried about the future for my cocitizens and myself. I was attracted to the philosophy, such as I knew of it, and idealism of communism, which at the time seemed to make a better way of life.

I hope that answers your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I noticed that you used the words, "which at the time seemed better." Did your study and understanding of principles of the Communist Party lead you to come to any other conclusion at a later time?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, it is obvious that it did, by the fact that in 1945, after certain arrestment of the principles preceding the Duclos letter, it would appear that I made my decision following the Duclos letter, after an experience of some—what I have recounted as perhaps 5 or 6 years within the party. I obviously came to a different conclusion.

Mr. TAVENNER. What conclusion did you come to?

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, may he refer to notes again?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you very much.

Mr. BUCHMAN. The Duclos letter and resulting deposition of Browder, there came a sudden return on the part of the American Communist Party to the ideology as it had carried it out, unsuccessfully carried out, as it had been attempted to be applied here. This ideology has already shown itself by its ejection by the American people and the condition of the Communist Party today, to be unworkable, very stupid and blind, and is unacceptable to the American mind. I felt that I could no longer understand or live with this position.

Feeling this way, to stay in the party and have anything but perfect freedom of thought, quite apart from any ideological base, was unacceptable to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever make any public renunciation of the party and your membership until this moment?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, I never have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us go back again now to the time when you first became a member. You stated your reasons for uniting with the Communist Party. How did you proceed to unite with the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. You mean how my literal membership became effected?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, it was not a recruitment as such. I heard Mr. Berkeley's testimony saying that Mrs. Buchman had recruited me. That is not true.

There were a few close friends around me, some of whom may or may not have been Communists. Undoubtedly one or two of them were. The suggestion was made and the recruitment, rather than being, "Will you be a member of the Communist Party?" or take any oath of allegiance or anything, was merely a suggestion to enter a group to be further informed until I could make up my own mind. This was in, as I fix it, 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did it take you to make up your mind?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I would say, Mr. Tavenner, that from that time I don't recall a decision. I recall the fact that I entered a group, a very small group, who were personal friends.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. We had no teacher. We met and among ourselves discussed matters fundamental in Communist ideology, but very little of that. More than that it was a discussion of current affairs and the activities within the motion picture industry, or the mass organizations at the time, their problems, financial and otherwise.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also discuss and consider the matter of increasing the size of the Communist Party, that is the recruitment of other persons?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I have no personal knowledge of that fact through the group with which I lived for a number of years. I can't deny, of course, that recruitment or the desire to have new members was prevalent, and there was obvious activity on that score. But I myself did not engage in it, nor recruit, nor to my knowledge did anyone else in my group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us more about this group. Did this group of yours have any special functions or duties?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, Mr. Tavenner, they didn't. They were a motley group. I was a writer, someone else belonged—someone else was a musician, someone else was unemployed in the business as a freelance writer, and that was the composition of it. All these people were known to me personally.

Mr. Tavenner, please, may I consult?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. In answer to your question, Mr. Tavenner, my counsel recalls to me my notes about the group, which was principally that in 1938 or 1939 my studio work was of such a nature that my attendance at such group was very infrequent.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the designation for the group?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, to the best of my knowledge it had no designation that I knew of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall ever having belonged to a group or cell in the Communist Party known as the "Y Group"—Y?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, Mr. Tavenner, I'm sorry, I never have.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in this first group to which you have referred?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, this first group remained the only group except it was amplified. I fix it—it was amplified by one or two other people or their wives. The occasions we met at the home of one or the other in that the occasions were as much social as political. I fix the attendance with such a group as from the time of my joining it, some time in 1938, to, I might say, 1940 or 1941. And thereafter I belonged to no other group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a group that was rather set apart—excuse me.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir? I'm sorry, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this not a group which was rather set apart from other groups or cells of the Communist Party in that the members were persons who were out of town frequently, or who for one reason or another did not want their identity to become known by having attended meetings regularly?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I don't want to be humorous about this deliberately, but it is not true, because these people were residents of Hollywood. There was nothing secret about them. As to rumors, I have heard about my being a secret or concealed member, which I have heard said—I have heard it said by Communists—this is not true, because I would fix the character of the group as I would fix my own entry into the party, which was that it was, so to speak, on a voluntary basis. I mean that my participation in party politics—I say this very consciously and under oath—my participation in party politics was as limited as I describe. And, by the way, as limited as it was,

when through later history in the party I associated myself with the ideas or public expression which could identify me with the Communist Party, I dare say that the concealment amounted to this, that every member of the Communist Party would have said I was, and perhaps a few thousand people in Hollywood making this association would have said the same thing.

I hope this answers your question. It is rather a roundabout thing.

Mr. SIEGEL. May we take a second, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. If you don't want it, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on—

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. What was your statement?

Mr. BUCHMAN. If I feel I was in any difficulty, I feel I would like to ask for—

Mr. SIEGEL. He wanted to know whether he could add to his statement. Is that all right with you, Mr. Tavenner, in response to your question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I have no objection.

Mr. BUCHMAN. No; I would not like to. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are perfectly free to make any explanation in answering you desire.

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. I'm sorry. I thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you made the statement that other members of the Communist Party had accused you of being a secret member of some character. When did that occur? When were you charged with being a secret member?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Will you excuse me? May I talk to counsel, please?

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, in answer to your question, Mr. Tavenner, all I intended to say and did say, I think, was that I had known or heard vaguely of such rumor.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was nothing vague about your statement. You said that you had been told by other members of the Communist Party—that they had said to you that you were a secret member. Now, I am asking you under what circumstances and when was that statement made to you.

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. If I made that statement, Mr. Tavenner, I would like to correct it. No one, to my best recollection, said "I hear that you are a concealed member of the Communist Party." I just know from rumor, that I can't fix, not said directly to me, that the habit is, you understand, Mr. Tavenner, to say about someone in this town, "Well, is he in," or something, you know, to which no one responded, and from his activities the question could be asked. I did not mean to say—if I did, I would like to correct it—that no Communist to the best of my knowledge ever came to me and said, "Are you," or "We hear that you are a concealed member of the Communist Party." I never was. I repeat that my entry, or rather, my disappearance from general activities had no more explanation than the fact of my inability to be active through a great amount of studio work and responsibility and, consequently, my infrequent attendance at any kind of meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting of any group, other than the one to which you were originally assigned?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I may have attended a large meeting during the time I was a member of the Screen Writers' Guild. I can very honestly fix in my mind but very vaguely two occasions. One could have been with the feeling—I had pretty good assurance that the people there were Communists. The other was an enlarged meeting of what would be called the progressive caucus that included Communists, the few that I knew and could identify by their statements to me, and other liberal people in the Screen Writers' Guild, so that the entire group amounted to what could be called a progressive caucus. That might have numbered 50 or 75 people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dmytryk, who testified in Washington during the course of our hearings, stated that on one occasion he met within a Communist Party group meeting at your home but that you were not present. Have you any explanation to make of that?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, may I consult a moment, please.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, I would like to answer that statement very honestly. During the Communist Party period there were people in the valley—as a matter of fact, humorously enough, there was a shortage of tires and gas, so that people who lived closely could get together easier. However, these were friends of mine, and there was a meeting at my house. Mr. Dmytryk said that, but I would like to make an explanation of that meeting. I want to make a very, very honest explanation of that meeting. I was present at that meeting, Mr. Tavenner. Mr. Dmytryk is in error. I don't recall whether Mrs. Buchman was there, but the point was that this Communist Party group, and this was the period—there was an attempt to form such a group. He said that Mr. Lawson brought him. That is incorrect. Mr. Lawson was not there that evening, not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was Mr. Lawson and Mr. Dmytryk there on any other evening?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Never.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. BUCHMAN. May I go on?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I have a certain principle that I will recite when we come to it, but I just want to make the exceptions of that evening. This was not a group—I could only read from Mr. Dmytryk's testimony that he said something about a Davis group and a very select group, implying again that this was a concealed group. Well, tires and gas are a pretty good explanation of that; also the fact that I was working some 12 to 15 hours a day at the studio, and I might tell you honestly that from 1942 until my break with the party in 1945, other than a period of 3 to 4 months when such a group met or tried to meet, I had no connection whatsoever with the party or any group.

Since 1942 I had not attended one. Pardon me.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, at the end of this question can we take a recess for 2 minutes in deference to the witness? Will that be all right?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I should like to place on the record about this meeting, Mr. Tavenner, that a person was named there—two people

were named there, called Mr. and Mrs. George Corey. I haven't the faintest knowledge that Mr. and Mrs. George Corey were ever Communists or, by the way, intended to join a CPA group. I have read in the testimony, I think, that Mr. Dmytryk said that it wasn't intended that he come to my house; that he went some place else and was sent to my house. Mr. Corey was a man who worked with me, and I knew him in the studio. He became a very good friend. He is a very good writer. When he came to my—he was often at my house; might have been there to meet me at dinner; might have come to meet me after dinner—I might—there can be any one of several explanations for Mr. Corey's presence. He said, among other things, that a man named Francis Faragoh was a Communist. I have heard this said by someone else in the course of testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I didn't hear it. I read it in the testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the testimony?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Of Meta Reis Rosenberg's testimony. I think she said that Francis Faragoh was a Communist. I have known Francis Faragoh since the first time I came on the Screen Writers' Guild in 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you this question: Have you met any—

Mr. WALTER. Let the witness finish.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, it is in connection with his statement about Faragoh.

Mr. WALTER. He is right in the middle of a sentence. Go ahead.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Faragoh, to the best of my knowledge and by statements from time to time—I can't place them exactly when or where, but I believe that Mr. Francis Faragoh is not a Communist and never has been.

Mr. WALTER. How do you spell his last name?

Mr. BUCHMAN. F-a-r-a-g-o-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time attend a Communist Party meeting at the home of Francis Faragoh?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I can say with fair accuracy that I did not, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you uncertain about it?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes; I am uncertain about it because—well, if I ever did, I have no recollection of Francis Faragoh being there, himself.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall having attended a Communist Party meeting at his home, regardless of whether or not he was there?

Mr. BUCHMAN. You say, did I ever attend a Communist Party meeting when Mr. Faragoh was there?

Mr. TAVENNER. At his home.

Mr. BUCHMAN. To the best of my memory, though I may have been at the Faragoh home—to the best of my memory I did not attend a Communist Party meeting at which Mr. Francis Faragoh was present.

Mr. WALTER. I think this will be a good time to take a 10-minute recess. The committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Mr. WALTER. The committee will be in order. During the recess Mr. A. L. Wirin, a well-known attorney in California, filed with the

committee suggestions and criticisms of the work of the committee, and let that be filed at this point.

Mr. WIRIN. Will you state that it was for the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. Mr. Wirin was speaking for the American Civil Liberties Union, and I assure you that this brief will be carefully considered, because this committee is a subcommittee which has been engaged for the last year and a half in studying procedures with the hope that out of our studies will come suggestions that will prevent any criticism whatsoever from any source coming to our work.

Mr. WIRIN. I shall be very proud if I have helped in improving the procedures of this committee.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you, Mr. Wirin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Buchman, you stated in the earlier part of your testimony that it was the practice to meet in the homes of the various members of the group.

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did you meet?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I should say the normal procedure was to meet at least once a week, but I have already said that my attendance was much less frequent than that.

Mr. TAVENNER. In whose homes did you meet?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, may I refer again to my notes, if you don't mind?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I would like to answer and explain this and some other questions. Most respectfully, I must decline to answer the question. There are several grounds. First, as to the person or persons involved. These persons, like others you may ask me about, never, to my knowledge, planned or committed or suggested an illegal act. Secondly, the names of such a person or persons already have been made public by you and I therefore, do not see how it will aid you if I repeat it. If this person or any person who may not have been mentioned by this committee is ever accused of subversion or any even comes to my attention linking this person to such an act, and if I have any knowledge which may be of interest to the authorities I will bring it to their attention. Thirdly, it is repugnant to an American to inform upon his fellow citizens. I refer you on that score to what Congressman Doyle said only yesterday in the interrogating of a witness when he explained that he wanted information only about the witness and did not want him to be a tattletale or snitcher. I realize my position may doom a career which has taken 20 years to build, but I have to take that risk.

If I may, I want to suggest, however, that it seems to me that the important thing in this investigation of subversion is that I, myself, love America; that I will defend it with my life against any foe, Russia or otherwise, if my country is ever at war, and that never for a second have I ever felt otherwise.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you consider that you were a member of an organization which was part of a Nation-wide conspiracy?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, on questions like that, at the time I belonged to such an organization I was and I still am faithful to the Constitution of the United States. I have always been opposed to illegal changes of our Government or the overthrow of its institu-

tions, whether by force or other illegal means. I have always believed in the democratic processes. If I had ever seen or heard any evidence or intimation of a plan or design or an intention to overthrow our Government whether by Communists or others, I would have taken it to the police, the district attorney, or the Federal authorities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you please answer my question?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question to him?

(The question was read as follows: "Now, do you consider that you were a member of an organization which was part of a Nationwide conspiracy?"

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, I do not, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now believe that you were?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. May I pause for a moment, please, to consult with my counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. SIEGEL. Sir, will you read the question?

(The question was read as follows: "Do you now believe that you were?")

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, in the course of thinking about this subject which is, of course, the burden of the whole testimony, I am aware of the decisions, both the majority and minority decisions, of the Supreme Court on the Smith Act case, and I respect the wisdom and authority of the court. I am also aware of the fact that there are here persons who hold the contrary view. I can only speak of my own knowledge. I never saw anything subversive and, therefore, cannot state in all honesty that I now think I belonged to a subversive organization.

Mr. SIEGEL. May we take a moment, sir? May we?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Congress of the United States, after 10 years of investigation through various committees, by enactment of both the House and the Senate, made certain findings of fact. Among them were these, that there exists a world Communist movement which, in its origin, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary movement, whose purpose is, itself, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, governmental and otherwise, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary to establish a Communist, totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world, through the medium of a world-wide Communist organization.

Mr. SIEGEL. Are you referring to the McCarran Act, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am referring to the findings by Congress—

Mr. SIEGEL. In the McCarran Act?

Mr. TAVENNER. Which is in the preamble to the McCarran Act.

Mr. WALTER. Internal security.

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Internal Security Act.

Do you disagree with the findings of the Congress on that subject?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, I must say honestly that I, as a person, am not in possession of the information which caused this statement. I will respect the findings of that committee or, rather, the body that made that statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then if you respect that finding by the Congress of the United States, arrived at after 10 years of investigation, and you feel that you are not in a position to dispute it, then will you not agree that it is important and necessary for this committee to know the names of those who are members of a world-wide Communist organization, or any branch of it?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I think I have answered that by saying that as a witness here, even respecting the statement that was made in that preamble, that according to my own knowledge of the people I associated with, I cannot say from any theoretical statement I heard or any act in practice that that was true, and I said that if it should come to my attention, if the facts caused such people to be prosecuted for acts that I have no knowledge of, that I would be very willing to report such action and, therefore, I stand on my previous statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you will not, I understand, cooperate with this committee in giving it possession of information within your knowledge relating to the extent of Communist infiltration into the moving-picture industry? Is that the position you are taking?

Mr. BUCHMAN. May I have a moment, please?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, as to this question, I, with respect to the preamble and assembled facts, do make such a statement. I assume they are responsible people. I have searched my memory, my best feelings on this subject; I have considered, and without desiring or intending in any way to be contumacious or disrespectful, I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. That ground is that not to do so might tend to incriminate you? You are not taking that position, are you?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard it so frequently that I want to make certain.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes; I have heard of it, Mr. Tavenner. I am not taking that position.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you tell us the names of those who were members of this group with you, the group to which you were assigned and which you were connected, that is those who came into the group as well as those who were in it originally from the period of 1938 to 1945, when you state you withdrew from the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I hold to my position with a very sincere feeling, that I cannot violate certain freedom of conscience. I hold my position.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession, Mr. Buchman, of information indicating that Alexander Stevens, otherwise known as J. Peters, came to Hollywood. As I referred the question to a witness the other day, or several days ago, he may have met with members of the Communist Party in the home of one or more of the persons who were in your group. Will you tell the committee whether to your

knowledge this J. Peters met in the home of any member of your group?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, to the best of my knowledge and memory I do not know a man by the name of Mr. J. Peters. If you can present any evidence to refresh my memory, I would like it to be on the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was also known by the name of Alexander Goldberger. Does that assist your recollection?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No; it does not.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have already stated ,also, the name of Alexander Stevens, that he was known by that name.

Mr. BUCHMAN. No; I do not recollect an Alexander Stevens.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give to the committee the names of the members of this group—I will ask you again—who were members of the Communist Party, and state whether or not a person by the name of J. Peters, under any of the aliases, as I have mentioned, was ever known to you to have been in their homes, any of them?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I hold to my position on the question of names and people, and beyond that I have no recollection of the attendance by this Mr. Peters at any kind of function in the home of any person where I also attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the witness should be directed to answer the question, because he has not based his declination on any recognized constitutional provision.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, that's true. However, as I understand the witness' testimony, he says he has no recollection of having attended a meeting anywhere with J. Peters, under that name or any of his aliases.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will let me put the question again.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, put the question again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please give us the names of all the persons who were members of the Communist Party cell to which you were assigned? That is my question.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I decline to answer—to give such names.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. On the grounds I originally stated.

Mr. WALTER. What are those grounds, please, Mr. Buchman?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I would have to reread them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, repeat them, because I want to be quite certain of what they were.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I said that most respectfully I must decline to answer the question. There are several grounds. First, as to the person or persons involved. These persons, like others you may ask me about, never, to my knowledge, planned or committed or suggested an illegal act. Secondly, the names of such a person or persons already have been made public by you, and I, therefore, do not see how it will aid you if I repeat it.

Mr. WALTER. That is why I ask you to repeat the reason because we didn't make public any names at all. The names that were made public came from the lips of witnesses.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, then I will correct that, Mr. Chairman, to say, such names as were mentioned here as having been members of the Communist Party.

May I continue?

Mr. WALTER. That is sufficient. I just want to get that straight in my mind.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask that the witness be directed to answer the question so that it may not be accepted as though we were agreeing with his refusal to answer on the grounds that he has stated.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, the witness will answer the question.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I respectfully decline, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the appearance in the homes of any persons who were members of the cell with you, or in your own home for that matter, of a person from New York who was a member of the Communist Party and arrived there for the purpose of discussing the raising of funds throughout the moving picture industry, or through the Communist members in the moving picture industry?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I beg your pardon. Do I know of such a man?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I say: Do you recall the appearance at one of those meetings of a person from New York who appeared there for the purpose of discussing the raising of funds?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated in the earlier part of your testimony that there were rumors to the effect that you were a secret member of the Communist Party. Did your employer ever confer with you regarding that rumor, or do you know whether or not he knew of the existence of that rumor?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I don't think he did; no.

Mr. SIEGEL. When you say "employer," will you please tell us who you are referring to?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am referring to the person between 1942 and 1944, which I think is Mr. Cohn, according to your testimony.

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to whom you were his assistant.

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this time? Is the same injunction with respect to television in force and effect? If it isn't, I appeal to you to have it so.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I am sorry, Mr. Tavenner. No, he did not know of such a thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you tell him you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No; I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why didn't you?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, I would like to answer that in my own way. If I were to be a member of the Communist Party tomorrow in Hollywood I think I would take a page ad in the trade paper announcing that I was. And I consider that the fact that one didn't say so, or didn't care to have it known was a mistake and was stupid. I asked on many occasions why that wasn't so and I never received a satisfactory answer, except to say that it was rather unpopular and might militate against getting employment, perhaps, if someone didn't agree with the philosophy. That is the only explanation I have ever had.

I make the explanation, because to say that one didn't is to give it a conspiratorial air that I have always resented, and resent today, as being, if not subversive, dishonest in the American mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yet you did not make that fact known until today?

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SIEGEL. May we have a moment, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I am advised——

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

Mr. BUCHMAN. I am advised that these legalities are confusing, that I used a phrase, "If I were to become." I would like for the record to supplement that by saying, it isn't possible because I repudiated communism as a philosophy for myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you repudiate it as a philosophy?

Mr. BUCHMAN. In 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't your repudiation born out of the injustice that you thought was brought about by the Duclos letter rather than any difference in your views regarding the principles of the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. I would say that it came about through the Duclos letter and the repudiation of communism or the philosophy as applicable to our way of life, to the American way of life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your repudiation become complete at that time, 1945?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I considered it so; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you notify the Communist Party of your intention to withdraw from it?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. Since I had originally not signified by direct statement or any allegiance to the party, or any signed document, and since I considered my membership voluntary, when I left or expressed myself within the group as to the Duclos letter, this was in effect considered a repudiation and a retirement from party activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you last pay dues to the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Tavenner, I have no recollection of paying dues as such, or carrying a party book. Perhaps members in my group did. I am not conscious of a registration as such. My dues were in the form of requests for money when needed, and I gave it. I did not pay regular dues.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay assessments of any character?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. What I have said applies also to assessments.

Mr. TAVENNER. What dues or assessments did you pay?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, as far as I can remember—I said, Mr. Tavenner, that from 19—late 1941 to 1942, sometime in 1941 and up through, well, from then on, which takes us back some 10 or 12 years, other than the short period which I have called the matter of 3 or 4 months in the CPA group, I have no recollection of—your question was what, please, exactly? I'm sorry, I lost it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I asked you to tell us what Communist Party dues or assessments you paid.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, therefore, going back some 10 years or so, I am not conscious of paying dues and assessments, that is to say, I

have read or heard that—that is, read in testimony that members of a group were assessed a certain amount of their salaries. I never did that particularly, not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. What contributions did you make to the party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, when I was asked—that is when I considered in anticipation of this testimony, what money I paid, I would say that roughly from the time I entered, which was 1938, to practically disappearance from the party activities in 1942, I would place the entire amount, consisting of requests for money from the party itself, some member of the party in Hollywood, contributions to such things as the Daily Worker—I beg your pardon, I didn't mean Daily Worker. I don't know the Daily Worker; nobody ever asked me about the Daily Worker. I mean the People's World, which was an institution on the west coast here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Similar to the Daily Worker on the east coast.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, all right; I will agree, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. WALTER. The Pacific coast edition of the Daily Worker.

Mr. BUCHMAN. So Daily Worker, People's World, New Masses, any party publication, a request for money through a mass organization. First of all by a contribution, dues, when they were in trouble, and always were about money, and how to pay secretarial fees; sometimes they were loans, and most times such loans were returned to me. I am speaking of amounts, Mr. Tavenner, of \$100, \$200—a sum of four or five hundred would have been a tremendous amount of money. And I now come back to a total. I said that, in reviewing all those years, sincerely I would fix the amount of all such contributions, dues, loans, as an amount not in excess of \$5,000.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I said over a period of time from 1938 to approximately 1942.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Tavenner, he means a total of \$5,000.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand.

What have you paid for the same purpose after 1942?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, the requests after 1942, I would say that to the best of my recollection I paid no special amount to the party itself, nor was I asked for any, but that the requests continued for the work in mass organizations, in the west coast edition of the Daily Worker, of, for instance, New Masses. I don't recall his name, but someone came out during those years, which were the war years, when things were fine, and made a request, for instance, for New Masses. He was here to collect money for the New Masses. On that occasion, as I recall, I may have given him \$50.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date?

Mr. BUCHMAN. It could have been some time in 1942 or 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you made any donations of any character for the support of the New Masses or the People's World since 1945?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Not to the best of my memory. I am sure not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall attending any art benefits for the New Masses since 1945?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, sir. I am positive I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to the fact a little while ago that while a member of the Screen Writers' Guild you attended meetings of the Communist Party. Did you refer to a meeting of a fraction of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BUCHMAN. As it has been known here, yes, sir; of men who I imagine all of them members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I would fix such meetings as having occurred in 1940 and 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose for the holding of the fraction meeting?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I am sorry to be verbose about these questions, Mr. Tavenner. You see, as far as the Screen Writers' Guild was concerned, which I was principally occupied with, the purpose of any fraction meeting was to consider the issues in the guild itself, principally to discuss the question never settled, either in such a fraction—are you having difficulty hearing me?

Mr. TAVENNER. A little; yes.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I'm sorry. The principal—there was no theoretical or political discussion; nobody attempted that in such a meeting. The preoccupation, as far as I recall, of two or three or four such meetings that I ever attended had to do with a question which bothered not only us but the entire Screen Writers' Guild body, and that was: Is the Screen Writers' Guild—or was the Screen Writers' Guild—a trade-union, or was it a guild of independent contractors? There is a difference about that, because in the philosophy, or in the theory of our group—by the way, in which I agreed to a certain extent, except as to how to carry it out, which I later found was impossible—the point was—

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an official of the Screen Writers' Guild at the time?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I think, if I recall, I was elected to the board in 1940. I think in the term of 1940 to 1941 I was vice president of the guild, and from 1941 to 1942 I was president of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the members of the fraction who attended the meeting with you?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I decline to answer on the previously stated grounds, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask the chairman to direct the witness to answer.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; the witness is directed to answer the question just propounded.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully decline.

Mr. WALTER. When you say, "I must," you mean you do?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I do; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BUCHMAN. From 1933 to 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what other activities did the Communist Party engage, or rather in what other instances did the Communist Party engage in an effort to influence the activities of the Screen Writers' Guild besides the instance you suggested?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, as far as I can recall, Mr. Tavenner, on the subject of trade-unions, perhaps the most important issue evolving out of that was our—an occasion of strike action within the community, as, for instance, in 1941. I think at the end of 1941, during my vice presidency, the question being whether the guild shall sup-

port the Walt Disney strike, which was occurring at the time. The other question was that as a guild, not being just an independent contractor, should the guild engage in any political activities, adopt any political platforms, take on any causes, and so forth, and express itself as a guild, whose survival depended upon its identification with the forces around it—with the social forces around it. The strike is one occasion that I recall. I'm very sorry, but it is an outstanding instance because I had to chair a meeting of some 500 people, and felt almost as badly as I did coming here today. I don't recall other issues, Mr. Tavenner, sufficiently to speak of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild at the time that the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization endeavored to extend its life and existence after the war?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No; sir; I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you cease to become a member of the guild?

Mr. BUCHMAN. In the fall of of 1942 when I assumed my duties under Mr. Cohn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under whom?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Under Mr. Harry Cohn at Columbia Pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I find that on July 26, 1944, you were a candidate for the office of a member of the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. BUCHMAN. That could not be accurate, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I hand you a photostatic copy of a ballot dated July 26, 1944. My attention is drawn to the fact that it is not the Screen Writers' Guild but that it is the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will you then rephrase the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you several questions about your membership in that organization. When did you become a member of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I could only affix it by this accidental reference, Mr. Tavenner. I don't remember. It must have been in 1943 or 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue your membership in it?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I don't recall that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any position in that organization?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Not that I recall; no, sir. I never recall attending a meeting of that organization. It may have been some large public function that I attended, but no board meeting or special meeting. Not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. That organization was changed. The name of it was changed to the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions in June 1945. Do you recall that?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes: I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become an official of the new organization?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I doubt whether I became an official, unless you can refresh my memory.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a newspaper clipping from the People's World of June 11, 1945, the heading of which is "Hollywood Democrats Choose a New Name. The Hollywood Democratic Committee went into an eclipse last Wednesday evening and merged a few

minutes later as the Hollywood Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions." Then the names of the new officers are given, and the names of other persons appear there, including yours, Sidney Buchman. You did continue your membership in that organization, did you not?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I believe I did. May I see that exhibit, please, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Did you become an officer in it at any time?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I don't recall ever having become an officer in it or ever attending meetings beyond the meeting at which it was formed.

Mr. TAVENNER. The article does not state that you were an officer.

Mr. SIEGEL. May we look at it for a moment, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you.

Mr. BUCHMAN. It does not say that I am an officer, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I stated that.

Mr. BUCHMAN. It lists me as one of perhaps 100 or 150 members at its formation.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Tavenner, it doesn't even do that. It describes a list of officers—

Mr. TAVENNER. I know exactly what it says.

Mr. SIEGEL. Then it has a list of names without any description whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; and I understand the witness has said that he was a member.

Mr. BUCHMAN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner, I honestly and frankly cannot tell you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you took a trip to Russia, didn't you?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in 1935?

Mr. BUCHMAN. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that trip to Russia have anything to do with your joining the Communist Party in 1938?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I doubt whether it had anything to do with it. A description of the trip, I think, would convince you.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period that you were a member of the Communist Party you were in the position, if you chose to do it, to favor in the moving-picture industry those whom you knew to be members of the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. BUCHMAN. That would be correct; yes; I presume.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Did you favor any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party—

Mr. BUCHMAN. Mr. Tavenner—

Mr. TAVENNER. In connection with your duties as a producer?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes. I don't want to make a speech about this. I will just say emphatically never, and there is no proof of such a fact. The standards for judging anyone hired were standards of professional competence. As a matter of fact, Mr. Tavenner, I would like the record to show, which is the truth, that when I took that job as assistant to Mr. Cohn, a writer contract, which had originated in 1937, remained in force through this so-called executiveship. I desired it so because I did not want the job, and Mr. Cohn offered me

an executive position with titles and executive favor and a rewritten contract, and I refused it because I did not want the job. That work, from 1942 until I left it some time in 1945, consisted of a lot of executive authority, it's true, but every bit of it—the selection of a piece of material, the hiring of a writer, the checking on that material—every bit of it was in the hands of Mr. Harry Cohn, and there was no occasion—if you were to know Mr. Cohn—when he would neglect his responsibility in his company. He is a man who works about 23 hours a day in his job, and there are no incidents, Mr. Tavenner, where, in that position, the confidence placed in me by Mr. Cohn was ever abused, nor did I ever make a choice on any occasion of a piece of material, the selection of a writer, or an actor, of a cameraman, of a star, that in any way demonstrates that I ever did. If anyone had ever come to me in my position to suggest that I do this, I would have thrown him out. I would be very proud to exhibit for the record, which I have compiled on all the pictures over which I had authority, even those that I produced independently where you might assume that I would have more authority as Mr. Cohn's assistant, although let me say in passing that, even as an independent producer, in my contract Mr. Cohn held all the artistic controls to the choice of material, the finished screen play, the material on the screen finally, the final editing of that picture; and he was consulted at every step.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, let me ask you this question: You having progressed to the point where you are now a producer and having the view which you state you now have regarding the Communist Party, would you put a person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party in the same position which you held from 1942 to 1945?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, that is a difficult question. May I pause a moment, Mr. Tavenner, if you don't mind?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. Consult your attorney.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Thank you.

Mr. SIEGEL. Do you have any objection?

Mr. TAVENNER. None in the world, or I would have expressed it long ago.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. SIEGEL. Would you read the question.

(The question was read, as follows:)

Now, let me ask you this question: You having progressed to the point where you are now a producer and having the view which you state you now have regarding the Communist Party, would you put a person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party in the same position which you held from 1942 to 1945?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, that is a tough one, Mr. Tavenner. As far as I am concerned, in my performance of my work, I can only refer you to Mr. Cohn who might say off the record—well, while I don't agree with him, maybe, give me some more Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. We assumed Mr. Cohn trusted you.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, but—

Mr. TAVENNER. But I am asking you now, with the knowledge that you have, would you knowingly put a person in charge of the administrative duties such as you had or, I might add, in the position that you now hold as a producer if they were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes. Well, I would first consider certain professional competence, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Certain what?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Professional competence. This would interest me first. After that, as to his views, this troubled subject of whether he is a subversive man and a dangerous man—

Mr. TAVENNER. You would ask him?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Or has committed an illegal act, I would wonder about it, but I think in view of public opinion and my feelings today, I would say, therefore, that I would not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you. That is all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Doyle, any questions?

Mr. DOYLE. One question. Mr. Buchman, I wrote this down substantially as I thought you gave it: "I repudiated communism as a philosophy for myself." I consider the philosophy of the Communist Party as not applicable to our American way of life." Do you remember volunteering that statement?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOYLE. In substance?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, what was there in the philosophy of the Communist Party, as you knew it, that made you construe that it was not applicable to the American way of life? What was there inconsistent, what was there destructive of our American way of life, if anything, that made you repudiate?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Pardon me, will you, please, Mr. Doyle, just a moment?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, indeed.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Doyle, I'm sorry to keep you, but it is a rather tangled subject that, in effect, explains my entry into the Communist Party and my reason for leaving it. I made a statement that when I left after the Duclos letter when Mr. Browder first talked about a great get-together in collaboration, and the rules were off, when the party, after flagellating itself—by the way, I would like to say in passing, it was a rather stupid thing to have happened to an American party and it touches on the fact of world conspiracy, too, on several occasions—in other words, whether Moscow delivered express orders for any action to the Communist Party or whether working from the ideology, itself, whether the leaders tried to make their own decisions, but I have said that my experience had been a personal one and, to my knowledge, there had been a lack of freedom of thought, a restriction, a certain rigidity in applying rules, in applying certain social rules.

I don't like to take your time, but it is a subject—

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead.

Mr. BUCHMAN. It is a subject that I have tried to think through very thoroughly. It touches on the whole matter of treason and the states of mind of such people as I know and it also accounts for myself.

Mr. DOYLE. That is why I asked you that. I felt that you must have recognized there was an inconsistency as far as you, sir, were concerned—

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. In being a Communist and an American at the same time.

Mr. BUCHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. That is why I asked you that, I think, very pertinent question, although it is personal to you.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, perhaps I haven't answered it yet, Mr. Doyle. Have I?

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking for you, sir—for I think that your answer might help many people—

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Doyle, I will attempt to answer, because I have tossed for about 2 or 3 days—the reason I have done what sounds like pleading illness—why it is so is that I haven't slept in many, many nights, and barbiturates—I was under that influence this morning when the doctor came, because I just tried to get an hour's sleep, and I have tossed with this question, because I have no glib answers and I want to be honest about it. I have to start from beginnings on this question. To begin with, the Marxist philosophy, as much as I know of it, and I said before, and it is true, that I have no theoretical knowledge—this is all gathered emotionally by me—always has been—is a perfect state is desired.

Well, under the American Constitution, and to quote Lincoln in a statement that these institutions belong to the people and they can change them, alter them to any degree they like if they do it peacefully if the majority are convinced of the decision, the majority, under a hundred years or 200 years of development in this country may eventually ballot a condition that would resemble what is the ideal of socialism. This is not, I don't think, too idealistic. As a matter of fact, I have seen the face of this country change in 25 years or 30 years. I have seen an equalization begin to develop; in inheritance laws, tax laws, laws for favoring trade-unions, protecting them, and so forth. All these are social changes. I said, I think, in a disputed picture called Mr. Smith [Mr. Smith Goes To Washington] that a democracy, when you find it, is not perfect. He complained of some dishonesty in the Senate at the time. He did it as a caricature at the moment, but he said that democracy does not stand still. If the condition of Government stands still, it just makes no sense and must die, so, therefore, the improvement within that democracy must be the greater and greater equalization of rights and opportunities to the people as those people grow up.

For instance, the underprivileged people, the trade-union—the union fight for many, many years in this country has advanced from 1892, when men fought to reduce a 12-hour or 14-hour day, to the present condition. This has happened in 50 years in our country. Anyone who assumes that this country is standing still is not a good American, or rather, he is an apathetic and dead one and makes no contribution to the society. I am, by nature, such a person and very emotional about it. I am a man who has made a great deal of money, and I haven't got a great deal. This is because I give it no value and a certain Christian precept is something to be lived by, and so forth.

Now, I am sorry. This sounds roundabout. A socialist state, therefore, in other words, to jump to the ideal immediately in terms of the Marxist ideology, is a utopian condition to be achieved in this country peacefully, which was my belief and the belief of people around

me, for this reason, Mr. Doyle, and this was the error: This had always been the error of the Communist Party, from my observation, within this community, until I have been raging mad at everything that was done and people in it who were bullheaded about it. To begin to know the philosophy of socialism, in backward countries where the class differences are great, very great, and terribly exaggerated over the conditions we know in this country, to overcome this, the theory of revolution, of force and violence, was necessary within those political conditions. It couldn't be anything else. Therefore, arguing from a set of backward conditions in all the countries, in Russia, and I saw Russia—I would love to have described what I saw; no American can conceive it as I saw it in 1935. It was pitiful. People had no shoes, no autos, no means of transportation. They couldn't get bicycles. To get bicycles they had to pay in advance on the installment plan, that is, for a year before receiving it, instead of the reverse as we know it.

Mr. WALTER. Actually, conditions are worse there today than the horrible conditions that you saw in 1935.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, I don't doubt it. Mr. Crankshaw, in a very interesting book called *The Walls of the Kremlin* or—

Mr. SIEGEL. *The Crack in the Kremlin*.

Mr. BUCHMAN. *The Crack in the Kremlin* has been a sober work on the nature of communism and Soviet Russia.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I think you have given me the fundamental thinking you have. I thank you for it. May I do this as a younger man than you are—

Mr. BUCHMAN. I beg your pardon, Mr. Doyle. Well, wait. You may be right. I am 49.

Mr. DOYLE. I will say, then, may I say this to you as an older man than you are, I want to urge you, sir, to fling into the American way of life vigorously and with vim and vigilance some of your marvelous capacity. I urge you to do that.

Mr. BUCHMAN. You will find me in a lot of causes, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I know, but you know what I refer to.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Because we must not, directly or indirectly, leave anything undone which will prevent the spread of the revolutionary idea amongst people who, whatever their reason, are subversive, even in the smallest way, Mr. Buchman. Let's not let that damnable thing grow through negligence on our part. Let's not leave it in the hands of people who would be subversive. I urge you to fling your life into it with us.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. WALTER. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. The witness is excused.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I make one observation, Mr. Walter. Will the record please show that since about 15 minutes before the recess and continuously since then this committee has functioned without a quorum and has had only two members present. I think for the purpose of the record, in view of the testimony given today, the position of the witness should be protected. Thank you.

Mr. WALTER. Your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I know the plans of the subcommittee are to leave, and I think it is going to unduly prolong you to put the next witness on the stand which we had planned to put on, Mr. Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler has made an examination of the bank accounts and financial records of the Hollywood League Against Nazism; the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League for Defense of American Democracy; Hollywood League for Democracy; Motion Picture Democratic Committee; Hollywood Democratic Committee; Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; Progressive Citizens of America; Arts, Sciences and Professions Council, but Mr. Wheeler can present that testimony to the committee as a whole in Washington, as well as here, for the purpose of using the material in such reports as the committee desires to put out, and I will state only for the benefit of the record here now that this investigation showed the collection by those organizations which have been mentioned in the course of the testimony here as aggregating \$926,568.36.

There is one matter in connection with the record which I would like to correct as a matter of record and to call to the committee's attention and to the attention of the press. It has just come to my attention that in the questioning of one witness, the name of Dr. Simson, S-i-m-s-o-n, Marcus, M-a-r-c-u-s, was erroneously referred to, or erroneously recorded as Dr. Samuel M. Marcus. They are two entirely different people, and the committee had no intention of referring to Samuel M. Marcus.

Mr. WALTER. Where did the error occur?

This has been the official record. I am sure it is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not been able to examine the record, so I want to make it plain that there was no intended reference to Samuel M. Marcus. The name was Dr. Simson Marcus.

We are also in receipt of another letter, and we thought possibly the sender of this letter, the writer, might be made available for testimony this afternoon, but we were unable to reach him. This is a letter addressed to Representative Francis Walter, chairman, and I would like to read it.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to know what was in the letter before you read it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You haven't seen it?

Mr. WALTER. No. Go ahead.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading) :

DEAR SIR: Since my name has been placed before your committee by Martin Berkeley, of whom I have no recollection, and since I understand your committee hearings come to a close Tuesday next, and since the metropolitan daily newspapers have carried my name, I am submitting this letter which I would appreciate your reading into the committee's records. My association with liberalism, and, subsequently, communism—

Mr. WALTER. Now, just a minute. Has he requested an opportunity to testify?

Mr. TAVENNER. He requests that it be read.

Mr. WALTER. We are not going to do that sort of thing. If his name has been mentioned, give him an opportunity to testify under oath.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is admitting in this letter that he was a member of the Communist Party. I see no real point in reading it, other than to state that.

Mr. WALTER. Is he in New York, you say?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; he is here in California. Here is a telegram received from Mr. Roland Kibbee, K-i-b-b-e-e, in which he states he desires the committee to be notified:

At best my recollection joined 1937 left 1939. No affiliation since then. Promise testify immediately on return. Scheduled late November.

ROLAND KIBBEE.

Who is now in Italy.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that is all.

Mr. WALTER. During the course of these hearings and the stay of this subcommittee in California, we have been treated very hospitably. I am not saying this for the benefit of the California members of the committee, I say this in all sincerity. The Police Department, the United States Government officials of all sorts, have cooperated, and I am particularly pleased, and we all are, with the manner in which the press covered these hearings. We have endeavored to avoid those sort of incidents that enable certain representatives of the press to resort to spectacular things and it has been most gratifying to see the coverage that we have gotten. I believe it has been fair.

The hearings are not completed, there are things that will be looked into further, not only in connection with the matter now under consideration but in connection with the infiltration by Communists into other industry. In addition to that there is a conflict as to whether or not witnesses who have testified before this committee have been penalized for so doing. That matter will be looked into further.

I believe that there will be a hearing on Friday in Washington—

Mr. TAVENNER. I might call the chairman's attention to the fact that there are numerous subpoenas outstanding for witnesses for hearings in Hollywood, and the committee has not as yet learned of the whereabouts of these individuals.

Mr. WALTER. If they are witnesses that have been evading service, why, of course, we will know how to deal with that situation. It may well be that their presence won't be required because I see no purpose in loading up a record with a lot of cumulative material.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon an adjournment was taken sine die.)

X

