

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 8 AND 21; APRIL 10, 11, 12, AND 13, 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

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

CLYDE DOYLE, California

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

	Page
March 8, 1951: Testimony of Victor Jeremy Jerome-----	55
March 21, 1951: Testimony of— Larry Parks----- Howard Da Silva----- Edith Holm (Gale) Sondergaard-----	 78 112 121
April 10, 1951: Testimony of Sterling Hayden-----	127
April 11, 1951: Testimony of— Will Geer----- Robert Lees-----	 177 194
April 12, 1951: Testimony of Richard J. Collins-----	217
April 13, 1951: Testimony of— Waldo Salt----- Paul Jarrico----- Meta Reis Rosenberg----- Victor Killian----- Fred Graff-----	 259 274 284 296 298

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The committee met pursuant to call at 10:30 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

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

Let the record show that Messrs. Walter, Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Velde, Kearney, Potter, and Wood are present, a quorum.

Mr. Attorney, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Whom do you have as a witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. We have as a witness this morning Mr. V. J. Jerome. Will Mr. Jerome come forward?

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

Mr. JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

Mr. Jerome, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. JEROME. Yes. I take this opportunity to ask the committee to take notice of the presence at my side of Mr. Powe, who is to represent me as counsel in this hearing.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Powe, will you give the reporter your full name and address for the record?

Mr. POWE. Ralph Powe, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York City.

Mr. Wood. Proceed.

TESTIMONY OF VICTOR JEREMY JEROME, ACCOMPANIED BY RALPH POWE, HIS COUNSEL

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, will you state your full name and present address?

Mr. JEROME. Victor Jeremy Jerome.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jerome, you need not stand unless you wish to.

Mr. JEROME (seating himself). 320 Second Avenue, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. JEROME. I was born October 12, 1896, in Poland.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. JEROME. I am, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and in what court were you naturalized?

Mr. JEROME. I was naturalized in January 1928 in New York City, southern district court.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under what name were you naturalized?

Mr. JEROME. Jerome Isaac Romain.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Romain?

Mr. JEROME. R-o-m-a-i-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe your name has been legally changed?

Mr. JEROME. My name has been legally changed in 1944, December 1.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you used any other name, other than your present legal name and the name of Jerome Isaac Romain?

Mr. JEROME. Yes; the surname of Roman.

Mr. TAVENNER. R-o-m-a-n?

Mr. JEROME. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state where you have resided since 1930 and for the approximate periods of time?

Mr. JEROME. My place of residence permanently has been the city of New York since 1930.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you reside temporarily at other places?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question in the exercise of my right against possible self-incrimination. I base myself on the privilege afforded me by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. How would your refusal to answer the question of where you had resided tend to incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. It might lead to an area involving possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to this committee your reasons for believing that it would bring you into such an area as you describe, so that the committee may have some information upon which to act or to judge whether or not it would tend to incriminate you, the answering of that question?

Mr. JEROME. I feel that the answering of that question would violate my right to exercise the privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you decline, as I understand it, to advise the committee in what manner or any circumstances which would enable them to determine whether or not your refusal to answer the question of the places of your residence would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. I am not motivated by any desire not to advise the committee, but I feel that I have the right to exercise the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, will you briefly outline for the committee your educational background?

Mr. JEROME. I had my grammar school education and my secondary school education in England. I had my college education in the United States. I am a graduate of the New York University.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you designate specifically the schools?

Mr. JEROME. I attended here the College of the City of New York, and later the Washington Square College of the New York University, where I graduated in 1930.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline briefly for the committee your occupational background?

Mr. JEROME. I was a bookkeeper for years. I was—

Mr. Wood. Bookkeeper, did you say?

Mr. JEROME. Yes. I was a tutor, private. For a time I taught in a high school, Erasmus High School, as a teacher in training.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is that located?

Mr. JEROME. In the city of New York. Is the question relative to education or general occupation?

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your occupational background?

Mr. JEROME. For a brief while I was also printing salesman, that is, soliciting printing.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you employed?

Mr. JEROME. I was not employed. I was really self-employed, on commission, in the main. For a brief while I think perhaps—I don't believe I ever was on salary. If I had a connection with a printer it was also on commission.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time were you so engaged?

Mr. JEROME. I would say about 1929-30. Since then I also have been a writer and an editor, which has been my major occupation.

Mr. Wood. Is that true now?

Mr. JEROME. That is true now.

Mr. KEARNEY. Writer and editor for whom?

Mr. JEROME. I must decline to answer this question on the grounds I have previously given, the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; but you voluntarily stated that you were a writer and, as I understand the law, you can't invoke privilege in order to avoid discussing the details of that which you volunteer.

Mr. JEROME. I believe that I am exercising my right as I see it and understand it in claiming the privilege.

Mr. Wood. And you still decline to answer the question for the reason given?

Mr. JEROME. For the reason given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged at any time in the teaching profession other than the teaching in the high school and the tutoring which you have already described?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer that question, claiming the privilege against possible self-incrimination.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Jerome, you stated a while ago that you were engaged for a time in teaching, tutoring.

Mr. JEROME. Other than that I have described, he said:

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

Mr. Wood. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. What subjects do you teach, specialize in?

Mr. JEROME. I do not teach now.

Mr. MOULDER. What subjects did you teach?

Mr. JEROME. It was English.

Mr. KEARNEY. What subjects did you write on?

Mr. JEROME. I want to answer the other question, please. The subjects that I refer to involve the teaching of English. The subjects I wrote on, I decline to answer that question, claiming the privilege against possible self-incrimination.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, the witness has already testified voluntarily that he is a writer and editor.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask what you are editor of, what magazine, what paper, what pamphlet, what book?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking my privilege afforded me by the Constitution.

Mr. DOYLE. When were you an editor, what years?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the same reason.

Mr. DOYLE. Where were you an editor, what city?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the same reason.

Mr. DOYLE. Where did you live when you were an editor?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the same reason.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Jerome, how could you possibly incriminate yourself by giving the committee the dates you were active as editor?

Mr. JEROME. The privilege I claim does not make it incumbent upon me to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this: How could it possibly incriminate you to tell your fellow Americans—because you were naturalized in 1928—how could it possibly incriminate you to tell us what books or papers you wrote? You have said you were an editor. I assume you were an editor in this country. How could it incriminate you to state what you wrote? I assume you are proud of them.

Mr. JEROME. The situation is not of my creation, members of the committee. I feel there is justification in the statement made recently by Justice Black, that to answer one question for the congressional committee is to rob yourself of the privilege afforded you by the Constitution.

Mr. WALTER. Of course in the position taken by Justice Black the rest of the Court did not concur.

Mr. JEROME. True, but I have a high regard for that position, and I would like to identify myself with the recognition of that situation.

Mr. KEARNEY. You have a high regard for that position because, in the first instance, it covers your own course. Have you ever written for any Communist publication?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer that question, claiming the privilege under the constitutional right.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you write any articles under any name other than your own?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you were an editor. Were you associated, in the early 1930's with the publication New Pioneer?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question in exercise of my right against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated in any capacity with the publication known as New Masses?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the editor of the publication the Communist?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated with the publication Main Stream?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your official position, if any, with the publication Political Affairs?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know if Mr. Joseph Fields was at any time editor of New Century Publishers, Inc.?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question in exercise of my right against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Lement U. Harris one of the editors of that publication?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you also an editor of that publication?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the given reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the organization known as the League of American Writers?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WALTER. And as I understand your reason, it is because this organization is Communist, and to admit association with it would incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. I have answered that to explain my reasons for invoking the privilege represents a violation of the principle involved in that privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. The question was whether he was acquainted with that organization, is that right?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. You know it is a Communist organization, do you not?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question for the reason given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an organization known as Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the ground of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state whether or not you know that the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization is an affiliate, or was an affiliate, of the League of American Writers?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the magazine Clipper?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, were you familiar with the School for Writers which was operated in Hollywood, Calif., first by the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers, and later by the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, claiming the privilege under the Constitution against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the People's Educational Center as an organization?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state, if you know, whether or not the Hollywood branch of the People's Educational Center took over the offices of the School for Writers?

Mr. JEROME. I have no knowledge of any such fact?

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss with the officers of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization the turning over of its facilities to the People's Educational Center?

Mr. JEROME. I have no knowledge of any such fact.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any knowledge concerning the activities of any of the organizations mentioned by counsel?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, in the business of solicitation on commission which you stated you had been engaged in, was that business carried on in any manner in connection with any of these publications which I have asked you about, or any of these organizations which I have asked you about?

Mr. JEROME. To the best of my recollection, no. In fact, I remember no such connection.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the type of your connection with these publications which I have mentioned?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. KEARNEY. For whom did you solicit printing?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, since it might entail the possibility of self-incrimination.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of the Elks' Club?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of the B'nai B'rith Lodge?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of any of the Masonic fraternities?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of any of the lodges identified with any religious organization in this country?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. If so, what ones?

Mr. JEROME. No lodge of any religious organization.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of any of the established automobile clubs in this country, such as the AAA?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of any lodge having its headquarters in the city of New York?

Mr. JEROME. I would like to understand the meaning of the word "lodge," sir.

Mr. DOYLE. A lodge as generally accepted.

Mr. JEROME. As a fraternal organization?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. DOYLE. You have just answered that you were not a member of the other lodges identified.

Mr. JEROME. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you a member of any organization or group that might be termed ordinarily, and is ordinarily termed, as a secret organization, in our country?

Mr. JEROME. I would like further clarification on this question, because to me I would have to have the definition of the word "secret." It may be secret to X and not to Y and maybe to Z. Therefore, it is hard for me to know what the intent of your question is.

Mr. DOYLE. Any organization that is secret to you, in your esteem, your judgment?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member of any organization that has for its aims or objectives the overthrow of this Government by force or violence?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

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

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. I understood in the early part of your testimony that at the time you were engaged in printing solicitation—was that around 1930?

Mr. JEROME. Around that period.

Mr. WOOD. That has been 20 years ago?

Mr. JEROME. Yes; 1929 or 1930.

Mr. WOOD. You understand, of course, that the statute of limitations protects you after the expiration of 3 years for any activity you may have engaged in that may be termed illegal.

Mr. JEROME. I still stand on the claiming of the privilege.

Mr. WOOD. With reference to the question counsel asked you about the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, have you ever made any literary contribution of any character that could in any sense be termed subversive or anti-American to that periodical?

Mr. JEROME. What is the name of the periodical, please?

Mr. WOOD. Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

Mr. JEROME. I have never written for that publication.

Mr. WOOD. At all?

Mr. JEROME. At all.

Mr. WOOD. Well, then, why did you refuse to answer counsel's question when he interrogated you about your connection with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization? Have you ever had any financial connection with it in any way?

Mr. JEROME. I have never had any connections with that organization.

Mr. WOOD. At all?

Mr. JEROME. At all.

Mr. WOOD. Well, then, your statement a while ago when you refused to answer counsel's question as to that organization on the ground of self-incrimination was erroneous, wasn't it? It wouldn't incriminate you, would it?

Mr. JEROME. The choice of that privilege is not an admission of incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. Do you mean to say you can invoke the protection of the fifth amendment and refuse to answer a question as to an organiza-

tion, the answer to which would be that you had no connection with it at all?

Mr. JEROME. When in my discretion it may lead into an area in which self-incrimination is possible.

Mr. Wood. I am glad we are getting ourselves identified. Then you take the position you can refuse to answer any question you wish by hiding behind the fifth amendment?

Mr. JEROME. No.

Mr. Wood. What do you mean?

Mr. JEROME. The fifth amendment is there to protect me against acting as a witness against myself, and when in my discretion I feel that answering a question put to me represents acting as a witness against myself and involves the question of self-incrimination I invoke that right.

Mr. Wood. You have invoked that right here today on a matter that cannot incriminate you, and you have just admitted it, haven't you?

Mr. JEROME. I have admitted what?

Mr. Wood. As to Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

Mr. JEROME. Is that the name of a publication or an organization?

Mr. Wood. This group has a publication.

Mr. JEROME. I said I have never written for that publication and I have no connection with it.

Mr. Wood. What is the name of the publication?

Mr. JEROME. I don't know, sir. I go by the name you mentioned to me and asked if I wrote for it.

Mr. Wood. How about the Hollywood Quarterly?

Mr. JEROME. What is that? Is that connected with that organization?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. JEROME. That is a new question to me?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. JEROME. What is the question?

Mr. Wood. Are you familiar with that publication, Hollywood Quarterly?

Mr. JEROME. By "familiar" you mean have I ever seen it or read it?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. JEROME. I have seen it.

Mr. Wood. Have you ever made any literary contribution to it?

Mr. JEROME. To that quarterly?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Jerome, in answer to Mr. Kearney's question, you said you do not belong to any organization which believes in the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. If the United States should become involved in a war with Russia, would you support the United States or Russia?

Mr. JEROME. I wish to answer that I consider this question no basis for any reply that I can make in the interests of truth and reality. I believe there is no basis in reality for that question. I think it is a suppositious, hypothetical, and provocative question that could only serve to promote war.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would it take you, as an American, to go into a long speech on a question like that?

Mr. JEROME. It would if the interests of the American people would not be served by breaking down all possibilities of establishing a relationship of amity between countries, and driving the mentality of our country into a war situation by that type of questions.

Mr. POTTER. So you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. JEROME. I do not refuse to answer the question. My answer to the question is, I am interested in helping bring about peaceful relationships between those countries and all countries.

Mr. POTTER. That does not answer the question, so you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. JEROME. I do not wish to be a party to answering a question that will just heighten a so-called war spirit in this country. I feel at this time, when a meeting is taking place to bring the Four Powers together, the hysteria raised by such a question cannot serve the good interests of the country.

Mr. WOOD. Don't you think you are in rather poor position today, in view of the answers you have given to questions of counsel and members of the committee, to take the position you take now?

Mr. JEROME. I do not. I believe the position I take is joined by most of the people of the country. I think they want peace and not war.

Mr. POTTER. None of us want war. If our security was at stake, would you support the United States or would you support Soviet Russia? You have refused to answer the question.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. There is a proposed "peace" march on Washington, I believe March 15. Are you connected with that movement?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. You do agree that this is a legally constituted committee of the Congress, do you not?

Mr. JEROME. I do, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you agree that we are attempting to determine what subversive forces exist in this country?

Mr. JEROME. I do, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you refuse to cooperate by answering questions as to those subversive forces?

Mr. JEROME. My position is to cooperate as best I can. I believe, however, I am entitled to invoke a constitutional privilege granted me against self-incrimination.

Mr. VELDE. Then you refuse to answer any questions pertaining to any organizations that you belong to that you might think are subversive or incriminating?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer any question that in my opinion would put me in a position of possibly incriminating myself, and in this I believe I am constitutionally protected.

Mr. WOOD. What I can't understand about your testimony, Mr. Jerome—and I am not trying to embarrass you.

Mr. JEROME. I understand.

Mr. WOOD. You admit you are a writer. From that we are to assume that you have written material for public consumption. Yet you

decline to tell us to what publications you have made such literary contributions. What is your objection to giving the committee the benefit of that information? How can that possibly incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. I can only repeat my answer to a similar question before, that I must exercise my discretion in understanding the applicability of the privilege to the situation and the specific question put to me.

Mr. WOOD. Of course we are going to have to accept that answer, or that declination to answer the question, but I think you must realize it places the committee in a very peculiar position of not being able to understand what is in your mind in declining to answer it. As to most of the questions, you would be protected under the statute of limitations, anyhow.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I believe you said, "I have been a writer, an editor. In fact, it was my main occupation." Do you remember that?

Mr. JEROME. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. In answer to Mr. Potter's question, or Mr. Velde's question, you said you believe this is a legally constituted committee of Congress. You said that?

Mr. JEROME. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. As one group of Americans talking to another American—even if you are naturalized—don't you think it is within the province of the representatives of the American people to go into the question of the main occupation of people as American citizens? You testified that was your main occupation—writing?

Mr. JEROME. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Wherein, then, are we in error in asking you what you did during the time you were in your main occupation? If so, where are we in error? How could it incriminate you to frankly and honestly tell us how you engaged yourself in your main occupation, which you have told us was writing? I am not assuming, in asking you that question, that you have been violating any law. I assume you have in all your writings been a patriotic American writer. But you do raise a question in my mind, if you refuse to tell us as one American to another American group, you cause a doubt in my mind as to whether or not you have told us the truth about what your main occupation was. Are you ashamed of it or is it because you have been in violation of law or committed some public wrong or what? Have you been associated with men and women who have been trying to overthrow our Government in their writings, have they been paying you, or what? I don't understand.

Mr. JEROME. Let me answer this way: Of course, this committee is entitled to pursue its questioning in terms of its best understanding of how to carry through its set task of this morning or any other occasion. But this committee certainly also realizes that it does this within the framework of certain constitutional guarantees that are open to Americans, and which we have a right to claim on certain bases. When I claim them I am not setting myself outside the range of Americanism, but I am exercising a right afforded me by the American Constitution.

Mr. WALTER. That goes to the possibility of being prosecuted criminally. If the statute of limitations has run, what possible danger

could you be in that would entitle you to invoke the provisions of the Constitution as a protection?

Mr. JEROME. I do not feel called upon to go into an explanation of my understanding of invoking the privilege.

Mr. WALTER. I was trying to refresh you on fundamental principles, that is all.

Mr. VELDE. If it should happen that later you were cited for contempt of Congress, would you still agree that this is a legally constituted committee of Congress?

Mr. JEROME. I would like to consult counsel on that.

Mr. Wood. You have the privilege of conferring with your counsel at any time you desire.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. POWE. Mr. Chairman, I have advised my client that in the light of the last answer—

Mr. Wood. The rule of the committee is that you can advise your client and let your client give the answer.

Mr. POWE. I thought the committee would like to know the reason why I advised him.

Mr. Wood. We are not concerned with that. You advise him and let him answer.

Mr. JEROME. Upon advice of my counsel I answer that question that an answer to this question involves legal opinion which I am not qualified at this time to answer, but if such a situation should arise as was here indicated as a possibility, I would then act upon the advice of counsel.

Mr. VELDE. But your answer to my question originally that you agreed that this was a legally constituted committee of Congress—

Mr. JEROME. That is right.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Was also on the advice of counsel?

Mr. JEROME. No. This is my understanding, and I believe it would be the advice of counsel if I consulted him.

Mr. DOYLE. I think the record should show that counsel was present at all times with the witness in all these questions and counsel made no objection.

Mr. Wood. Well, counsel is not supposed to make objections. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, did you assist in any manner in the formation of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Gordon Kahn, who was a member of the editorial board of the publication Clipper, and who was a member of the faculty of the School of Writers, now known as the Hollywood Branch of People's Educational Center?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Sam Moore, who, according to the August 1, 1944, issue of the Screen Writers' Guild Bulletin, was chairman of the subcommittee on radio of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another individual attached to the publication Clipper was Waldo Salt, S-a-l-t, an associate editor. Do you know Mr. Salt?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WALTER. Why do you think it would incriminate you to admit you knew someone in 1944?

Mr. JEROME. I stand on my right to claim the privilege on the basis of my understanding.

Mr. WALTER. Then it is your understanding that you can decline to answer any question, innocent as it may be as a matter of fact, because you feel that the answer to that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. I would like to consult counsel.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. JEROME. My counsel advises me that in regard to any question where I honestly feel that the answer may tend to lead to self-incrimination, I can avail myself of the constitutional right not to answer. I say this in the context of my desire to cooperate with the committee with this understanding of my right.

Mr. WOOD. And do you follow the advice of counsel?

Mr. JEROME. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you ever in the city of Hollywood, Calif., Mr. Jerome?

Mr. JEROME. I went to Los Angeles in 1946 on the occasion of my mother's death. I went to Los Angeles again in 1948 when my father was dying. I was in Los Angeles prior to that in 1936, part of 1936 and part of 1937.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you ever in the city of Hollywood?

Mr. JEROME. To me Hollywood represents Los Angeles. I was in Hollywood, yes. If I don't call it city it is because I don't understand it that way.

Mr. MOULDER. Was the purpose of your visits on those occasions that which you mentioned, to visit your mother and father?

Mr. JEROME. That was the purpose of my visits in 1946 and 1948.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you acquainted with any of the writers in Hollywood, any one of them?

Mr. JEROME. I must decline to answer that question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. You were there in 1946 and 1948 on account of deaths in your family. What was the purpose of your other visits in 1936 and 1937?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. Were those the only visits you made?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever work for any organization in Hollywood?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WALTER. Isn't it true the purpose of those visits was to organize the Communist Party, or help organize the Communist Party, in Los Angeles?

Mr. JEROME. I spoke of the purpose of my visits in 1946 and 1948. I stand by that explanation.

Mr. WALTER. Did you ever visit Los Angeles for the purpose of aiding in the organization of the Communist Party or a Communist cell in Los Angeles?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did I understand you a few minutes ago to say that you wanted to be helpful to this committee?

Mr. JEROME. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then will you tell us what you know about Actors' Laboratory in Hollywood?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know who the founders were of Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. WALTER. Perhaps you could refresh his recollection by giving the names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know J. Edward Bromberg, who was associated with Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you familiar with the Hollywood Chapter of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you.

Mr. JEROME. What does "acquainted" mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know of the organization?

Mr. JEROME. Of its existence?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of its existence.

Mr. JEROME. Yes. That is not my understanding of "acquaintance."

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent were you acquainted with that organization?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you aid or assist in any manner in the formation of that chapter, or counsel or advise others in regard to it?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of May 11, 1934, identifies you as a member of the National Agit-Prop, which is the expression for the Agitation and Propaganda Commission of the Communist Party. Was that a correct identification?

Mr. JEROME. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. If it weren't true it wouldn't incriminate you, would it, Mr. Jerome?

Mr. JEROME. I feel justified resting on my privilege against answering that question.

Mr. WOOD. But I am trying now to ascertain what your conception is of your privilege. Do you take the position that a question to which you could answer, as in this instance, "No," would incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. I have answered with my explanation of the expression given by Justice Black in the Rogers decision in the Supreme Court.

Mr. WOOD. I have it here before me.

Mr. JEROME. It would only be reiterating what I said before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in 1936 connected in any capacity with the cultural commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were identified as chairman or head of the cultural commission of the Communist Party by the Daily Worker of August 7, 1950, and the Daily Peoples World of January 24, 1951, and February 8, 1951. Will you state whether that identification was wrong or correct?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question, resting on my rights against self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. Again, would you say that an answer that that identification is wrong, if true, would incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. I have stated my understanding, that to answer that question—

Mr. WOOD. Would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. JEROME. Might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. DOYLE. You knew subsequent to the publication of those papers, those three occasions, that you were listed as that, didn't you?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. KEARNEY. If it was not true, did you take any measures to correct it?

Mr. JEROME. I must refuse to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the May 22, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker, at page 11, there is contained a tribute from the national cultural commission of the Communist Party to Bob Reed, signed V. J. Jerome, chairman, National Cultural Commission, Communist Party. Did you actually sign a tribute from that commission as its chairman?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question, invoking my right against possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bob Reed was a friend of yours, was he not?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already stated to the committee that you went to California in 1936. Is it not true that the purpose of your trip to California in 1936 was to organize a separate district of the Communist Party in Hollywood, or Los Angeles?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, resting on my privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was not Stanley Lawrence in charge of Communist activities among the Hollywood group prior to your going there in 1936?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in Hollywood in 1936 when you went there?

Mr. JEROME. All told I believe I was there about 9 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live during that period of time?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time while you were in California, or immediately prior thereto, was it determined by the national organization of the Communist Party that the Communist funds derived from the California area were so large that it was considered advisable to have them sent directly to the national organization instead of to the State organization of the Communist Party in California, and wasn't that the practice after your departure?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in California during this 9-month period, were you known within Communist Party circles as the theatrical instructor of the Communist Party for the Hollywood district?

Mr. JEROME. I know of no such designation, nor do I lay claim to such title.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were an instructor of Stalinism and Leninism among the Hollywood group, were you not?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question on the ground of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state you were not the theatrical instructor, but didn't you engage in work as an instructor in the theory of communism while you were in California in 1936?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. I would like you to define what you mean by "theatrical instructor." Do you mean theatrical director, or did I cast people into roles? I don't understand the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking if you were known by that title?

Mr. JEROME. No. I recollect no such thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. But if you were an instructor of a theatrical group in Hollywood, that title would be descriptive of your duties in that position, would it not?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in such activities while you were there?

Mr. JEROME. What activities?

Mr. TAVENNER. Instructing, lecturing, advising, the Hollywood group on the question of communism.

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you discharged the function I have described, the term "theatrical instructor of the Communist Party" would be an adequate description, would it not?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. The records of this committee reflect that the Hollywood League Against Nazism was established in California, and that

the name was later changed to Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Do you know the reason for that change?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you consulted with respect to the formation of the Hollywood League Against Nazism?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of that organization or the succeeding organization, the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not true that efforts to link communism and fascism caused dissension in the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, as a result of which you were directed to straighten out the trouble?

Mr. JEROME. I have no such recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with members of the Anti-Nazi League for the purpose of settling the disputes they had within their own organization?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Dr. Inez Decker?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege..

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Dr. Inez Decker was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know James Thorne as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know Eva Shaffron as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know Rudy Lambert as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know John L. Leech as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were these individuals whose names I have just asked you about members of the executive committee of the Communist Party in Los Angeles?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time meet with these individuals in the home of Dr. Inez Decker?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time, in the home of Dr. Inez Decker, discuss the reorganization of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you direct the executive committee of the Communist Party in Los Angeles to carry out an extensive campaign on behalf of the Communist Party and the Anti-Nazi League among the crafts in Hollywood, such as carpenters, electricians, technicians, Screen Writers' Guild, Actors' Guild, and other organizations?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you direct that the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League be used for the purpose of bringing into contact with the Communist Party Hollywood personalities who were not members of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, Donald Ogden Stewart was chairman of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Were you acquainted with him?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Marian Spitzer was vice chairman of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Did you know her?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Allen Campbell was secretary of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Have you talked to him about the affairs of the league?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question in the exercise of my right against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bern Bernard was treasurer of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Did you know him?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted in any manner with the organization known as the Hollywood League for Democratic Action? That is, did you know of its existence?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you registered under the Internal Security Act?

Mr. JEROME. I would like to consult my attorney, please.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. JEROME. I have not registered.

Mr. WOOD. Are you familiar with the so-called Internal Security Act?

Mr. JEROME. Yes, in a way. I have read about it.

Mr. WOOD. You know in a general way about its provisions?

Mr. JEROME. In a general way.

Mr. WOOD. And you have not registered under it?

Mr. JEROME. I have not registered.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. You have been very open about your affiliation with the Communist Party in the past; isn't that true?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. POTTER. The statement counsel made a little while ago concerning an article in the Daily Worker signed by you as chairman of the Cultural Commission of the Communist Party would indicate you had been open about your affiliation in the past. That being so, I will ask you now, are you a member of the Communist Party at the present time?

Mr. JEROME. I believe I have met that question before.

Mr. KEARNEY. I asked it.

Mr. POTTER. Your answer is the same?

Mr. JEROME. The same.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question: Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you made that award that has been referred to, to Mr. Reed?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you write that article that counsel cited from the Daily Worker?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question for the same reason.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you demand a retraction from the Daily Worker?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, I was asking you about the Hollywood League for Democratic Action. Is it not true that Mr. Fank Tuttle was vice chairman of that organization?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the basis of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss with Mr. Frank Tuttle the activities of that organization?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dudley Nichols was secretary of the Hollywood League for Democratic Action. Did you discuss the business of that organization with him?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bern Bernard, the same person about whom I asked you a moment ago, was also treasurer of the Hollywood League for Democratic Action. Did you discuss the business of that organization with him?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer that question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Garfield is a person alleged to have been active in the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Are you acquainted with him?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Counsel, has that organization been cited as subversive by the Attorney General?

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, and was cited in 1948.

We spoke of the School for Writers a little earlier in your testimony, which later became a branch of the People's Educational Center. An individual by the name of Robert Lees is alleged to have been a member of the executive board of the School for Writers. Are you acquainted with him?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, the officers of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization in 1942 were Robert Rossen, chairman; Paul Franklin, vice chairman; and Pauline Lauber Finn, executive secretary. Were you acquainted with any of these individuals, and if so, which ones?

Mr. JEROME. Acquainted means have I known them or heard of them?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you known them personally?

Mr. JEROME. Not to my recollection, none of those individuals.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, is it not true that the Politburo ordered the comrades who were in the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization organization to make plans for the holding of a Writers' Congress in 1943?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Marc Connelly, chairman of the Writers' Congress?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Information is in the hands of the committee that the faculty of the People's Educational Center included a person by the name of Charles J. Katz, attorney in Los Angeles; Herbert Klein; Ben Margolis; Earl Robinson; and Revels Cayton. Are you acquainted with any of those individuals, and if so, name those with whom you are acquainted.

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another member of the faculty of the People's Educational Center is alleged to be Carl Winter, Los Angeles County secretary to the Communist Party. Are you acquainted with Mr. Winter?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Also on the faculty was Eva Shaffron, alleged to be the director of the Workers' School for Los Angeles. Are you acquainted with her?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Viola Brothers Shore?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you appear as a speaker at the San Francisco Writers' Congress held in October 1943?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question in exercise of my right against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make suggestions, or did you in any way assist in drawing up the plans for that Writers' Congress?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where the Writers' Congress was held?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, claiming the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not true that members of the Communist Party or fellow-travelers in the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, acting under the directions of Alexander Trachtenberg and you, persuaded Dr. Robert Sproul, president of the University of California, to lend

you the campus for the meeting place for this Writers' Congress, and also persuaded him to let you use the university's name as cosponsor of the event?

Mr. JEROME. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. WALTER. Is that the Dr. Sproul who is connected with the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. JEROME. Is that question directed to me?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would not like to state without definite knowledge.

You state you had no knowledge of the making of those arrangements. Will you state to the committee what knowledge you did have about the holding of that congress?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. You and Alexander Trachtenberg, Joseph Fields, Lionel Berman, and Louis Budenz were members of a committee, were you not, within the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or were you at any time a member of the National Religious Political Commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a conference of the School of Jewish Studies at the Jefferson School of Social Science auditorium in New York, January 14 and 15, 1950, at which time you were elected a member of the board of directors of that organization?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the International Workers' Order?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever conferred with Steve Nelson on Communist Party matters?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. In October 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities subpoenaed before it members of the Communist Party from Hollywood, Calif. Did you discuss with the persons subpoenaed, their counsel or agents, the strategy adopted by that group in refusing to answer questions propounded by the staff and members of this committee?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Subsequent to these hearings a rally was held entitled "Keep America Free," which was sponsored by the Conference on Cultural Freedom and Civil Liberties and the Progressive Citizens of America. Did you discuss with anyone the formation of this rally prior to the holding of it?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who was the chairman of that rally?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Committee information is it was Dr. Harlow Shapley. Are you acquainted with him?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the days of the Hitler-Stalin pact, did the Communist Party establish a commission for the purpose of ascertaining the loyalty of Communist Party members during this period?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer the question on the grounds of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has the Cultural Commission established Communist Party groups within the respective guilds or trades of the radio and television industry?

Mr. JEROME. I refuse to answer the question, invoking the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Norman Louis Corwin assigned by the Communist Party to infiltrate and form Communist Party groups within the radio industry?

Mr. JEROME. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. Wood. The committee will take a recess until 2:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:25 p. m., a recess was taken until 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing was resumed at 2:40 p. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.)

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that there are present Messrs. Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Kearney, Potter, and Wood, a quorum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the question was asked this morning by a member of the committee about the citation of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. I think I should state for the benefit of the record that the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark on December 4, 1947, and again on September 21, 1948; and was also cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1945. The citation by the California committee is that it was a Communist-front organization whose "true purpose" was "the creation of a clearing house for Communist propaganda."

A publication which was referred to earlier in the testimony as Hollywood Quarterly was cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948 as a "Communist project" sponsored jointly by the Communist front, the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and the University of California at Los Angeles.

TESTIMONY OF VICTOR JEREMY JEROME—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jerome, do you have any knowledge of there having been in existence a list containing 300 names of persons in Hollywood which was used in obtaining funds for Spanish Aid activities?

Mr. JEROME. I have no knowledge of any list of 300 such names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of any list compiled for that purpose?

Mr. JEROME. I have no knowledge of any list compiled for that purpose.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know George Pershing, the former field secretary of the Committee for Spanish Aid?

Mr. JEROME. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you present to him or transmit to him by any method a list containing names of persons in Hollywood, for him to use in obtaining funds for Spanish Aid activities?

Mr. JEROME. To the best of my memory; no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make such a list, or any type of list, available to Paul Crouch for the purpose of soliciting funds for the publication of New South?

Mr. JEROME. What kind of list? Will you repeat that, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. A list of names of individuals in Hollywood to be used by Paul Crouch or any other person for the purpose of soliciting funds for the publication of New South?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer this question in exercise of my right against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are acquainted with Paul Crouch?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer this question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you furnish a list of names, or cause a list of names to be furnished, to Paul Crouch or any other person, to be used as a list of secret contributors to the Communist Party?

Mr. JEROME. I decline to answer this question in exercise of my right against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to question the witness regarding the names of persons appearing on an alleged list, and I think, because of the character of it, it should be in executive session, if you desire to consider that.

Mr. Wood. What is the pleasure of the committee?

(Members of the committee confer.)

Mr. Wood. Very well, we will resolve the hearing into an executive session. We will ask the people other than the committee and the staff to retire.

(Thereupon, at 2:50 p. m., the committee went into executive session.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10:35 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance as noted in transcript), Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, 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 H. Wheeler, investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. Let the record disclose that there are present Messrs. Walter, Doyle, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Wood, constituting a quorum.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement regarding the general purpose of the hearing?

Mr. Wood. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. As is well known, the Committee on Un-American Activities has succeeded to a marked degree in exposing Communists' infiltration into labor organizations, with the result in many instances that the organizations involved have rid themselves of Communist domination and influences, and likewise with the result that the Congress has been informed of many important facts as the basis for legislative action.

I need only remind you that the testimony of Matthew Cvetic virtually destroyed for the time being at least the power and influence of the Communist Party in western Pennsylvania.

Then there have been many witnesses who have frankly and openly told this committee of the circumstances under which they were duped into joining the Communist Party, the Communist Party activities observed by them while they were members, and the reasons for their breaking with the party. This has required courage on the part of these witnesses. But, in so testifying, they have performed a service of inestimable value to their country and in the end should and do receive the plaudits of their fellow citizens.

The hearing today is the first of a series designed by the committee to accomplish the same results in the entertainment field as have been accomplished in labor and other fields. In performing its statutory duty to investigate communism wherever it may be found, we shall endeavor to ascertain the extent of past and present Communist infiltration in the field mentioned.

It is hoped that any witness appearing during the course of these hearings, who made the mistake of associating himself or herself with the Communist Party, will have sufficient courage and loyalty to make an honest and complete disclosure of all they know about Communist Party activities.

These hearings, Mr. Chairman, have not been hastily conceived. They are based upon investigative efforts by staff members extending over a number of years. As you will recall, it was contemplated that these hearings be conducted in Hollywood by the subcommittee which was chosen to conduct the hearings in Hawaii; but, in view of the work required of the staff in the preparation of the Hawaiian hearings and other hearings, this matter was postponed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call, as the first witness, Mr. Larry Parks.

Mr. WOOD. Is Mr. Parks present?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

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

Mr. PARKS. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF LARRY PARKS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, LOUIS MANDEL

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

Mr. PARKS. Larry Parks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. PARKS. Yes, I am. My counsel is Mr. Mandel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel identify himself?

Mr. MANDEL. Louis Mandel, 1501 Broadway, New York City.

In the light of the testimony that Mr. Parks will give here, he has prepared a statement that he would like to read at this point. I think it is a proper background to the testimony he will give and be very enlightening to the committee as his testimony unfolds. May he read that statement?

Mr. WOOD. Is it your purpose, Mr. Tavenner, to ask the witness questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. At the conclusion of his testimony, if he desires to read the statement that has been presented to the members here, he will be given that privilege, or he can put it in the record, as he desires, after he has finished his testimony.¹

Mr. MANDEL. The only reason I asked for it at this point is because I think in light of the testimony it won't have the same effect after as it will when you connect it with the testimony. And I think there is

¹ See appendix at end of hearings printed under this title.

no harm. There is nothing in the statement that can't be connected with the testimony. There is nothing there except the simple statement of facts. And I would, in fairness to the witness, urge very strongly that he be permitted, because there is a connecting link to what he will testify here in this statement, because it is with that spirit that he will testify.

And I think, in proper consideration of the witness and what he will do, this opportunity ought to be given to him, and I urge it very strongly if the committee will consider it.

Mr. Wood. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Parks, when and where were you born?

Mr. PARKS. I was born on a farm in Kansas. I suppose the legal town would be Olathe. That was the closest town.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you relate briefly to the committee the details regarding your educational background?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I was born in Kansas on a farm. I moved when I was quite small to Illinois. I attended the high school in Joliet, Ill., and I also attended and graduated from the University of Illinois, where I majored in chemistry and minored in physics. I sometimes wonder how I got in my present line of work.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of the completion of your work at the university?

Mr. PARKS. 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what is your present occupation?

Mr. PARKS. Actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present address?

Mr. PARKS. 1737 Nichols Canyon, Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Parks, I believe you were present when I made a statement as to the purpose of this series of hearings.

Mr. PARKS. Yes; I was present, and I heard you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you understand that we desire to learn the true extent, past and present, of Communist infiltration into the theater field in Hollywood, and the committee asks your cooperation in developing such information. There has been considerable testimony taken before this committee regarding a number of organizations in Hollywood, such as the Actors' Laboratory; Actors' Laboratory Theater; Associated Film Audiences—Hollywood Branch; Citizens' Committee for Motion-Picture Strikers; Film Audiences for Democracy or Associated Film Audiences; Hollywood Anti-Nazi League or Hollywood League Against Nazism; Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; Hollywood League for Democratic Action; Hollywood Motion-Picture Democratic Committee; Hollywood Peace Forum; Hollywood Theater Alliance; Hollywood Writers' Mobilization; Motion Picture Artists' Committee; People's Educational Center, Los Angeles; Mooney Defense Committee—Hollywood Unit; Progressive Citizens of America; Hollywood Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; Council of the PCA; Southern California Chapter of the PCA; Workers School of Los Angeles.

Have you been connected or affiliated in any way with any of those organizations?

Mr. PARKS. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the names of those organizations which you have been affiliated with? To aid you, I will hand you the list from which I read, some of which I may not have read, most of which I did.

Mr. PARKS (looking at sheet of paper containing list). Well, most of them I'm not familiar with. I'm familiar with the Actors' Laboratory. It has it divided into two categories here. I'm familiar with the Actors' Lab. I believe these two should be just one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you hold any official position in that organization?

Mr. PARKS. For a time I was sort of honorary treasurer of this organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that in 1949 and 1950 or when was that?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I can't recall the exact date. I don't believe it was in 1950. I believe it was before that. I can't tell you the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed?

Mr. PARKS. Perhaps you could help me on this. The Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, does this or did this have any other name attached to it before or after?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. We are looking it up in our reference books.

There has been a finding that this organization grew out of the Independent Voters Committee of the Arts and Sciences. Does that help you?

Mr. PARKS. Well, no. This is my problem: Most of these things I'm not familiar with. Some of them I recognize the names. And I believe that I for a time was a member of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state again what it was that you were a member of?

Mr. PARKS. I say I am of the opinion—perhaps you could help me on this—that I was a member of the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

Mr. WOOD. We will have to ask the photographers to not block the view.

Mr. PARKS (continuing). Perhaps if you would like to ask me any questions about it, I'd be happy to answer you. I think maybe it would expedite matters if you would do that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall whether or not the Progressive Citizens of America was the outgrowth or successor to the Hollywood Democratic Committee or what was known as the Hollywood Democratic Committee? Does that assist you?

Mr. PARKS. I am of that opinion. I am of that opinion. I believe that's true. I think that was why I asked you the question in the first place. I didn't remember the name. I think that's true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of it?

Mr. PARKS. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any official position in the organization?

Mr. PARKS. No; I don't believe so. Not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other organizations listed there were you affiliated with?

Mr. PARKS. What do you mean "affiliated with"?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in which you have become a member or that you were active in support of, either by way of membership or by way of aid and support, by contribution or by work.

Mr. PARKS. Well, I don't—

Mr. TAVENNER. And if you aided in any way by entertainment, that I think would constitute affiliation or connection with the organization.

Mr. PARKS. Well, that's all. Those two are the only ones that I can think of at the moment. Perhaps if you could refresh my memory I would appreciate it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress in any manner?

Mr. PARKS. No; I don't believe so. I don't recall being affiliated with that at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you appear at any meeting of that organization to your knowledge?

Mr. PARKS. It's quite possible that I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., of the issue of November 3, 1947, you are reported to have been one of the speakers—

Mr. PARKS. As I say, it's quite possible at that particular time.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). At a reception given Gerhart Eisler. Do you recall that?

Mr. PARKS. No; I don't recall ever being at a reception for Gerhart Eisler. To the best of my knowledge I never met the man. I have never seen him. When I was in Washington last time I attended many meetings and many receptions. I'm not familiar with the names of these. If you ask me if I was at this reception, it's quite possible that I was. What the name of it is I can't recall at this time, and I probably didn't know at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, referring back to the Actors' Laboratory of which you were an officer, you were the treasurer I believe? Is that not true?

Mr. PARKS. In name I was treasurer; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by stating that you were treasurer "in name"?

Mr. PARKS. Well, this was more of an honorary position than an active one. Usually you think of a man that is treasurer having to do only with money. My job as the treasurer was to sign a batch of checks at a time, and that's the extent of my knowledge of the money matters of the lab.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not in your experience in Hollywood and as a member of these organizations to which you have testified there were to your knowledge Communists in these various organizations which I have referred to, particularly those that you were a member of?

Mr. PARKS. I think that I can say "Yes" to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who were these Communists?

Mr. PARKS. There were people in the Actors' Lab, for instance—this, in my opinion, was not a Communist organization in any sense of the word. As in any organization, it has all colors of political philosophy. And there were in these I suppose—I know nothing about who belonged other than myself to the Independent Citizens Committee of

the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This I won't say because I don't know. There were Communists attached to the lab.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were there Communists attached to these other organizations which you say you were a member of?

Mr. PARKS. This I'm not familiar with. I don't know. I don't know who else was a member of them besides myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your answer is because you do not recall who were members of those other organizations?

Mr. PARKS. I think that that is the gist of my answer; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you do recall that at the Actors' Laboratory there were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. That's true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did those Communist Party members endeavor to obtain control of the activities of the organization and of its various offices?

Mr. PARKS. No; I would not say that this was true at all. The lab was a school for acting and was also sort of a showcase for actors. I left the lab because I disagreed with the purpose. I was in favor of forming a permanent repertory theater. It was felt by the majority of the lab that they wanted it the way it was, as a school. I wasn't interested in the school. They wanted it as a showcase. I didn't want it as a showcase. I wanted a permanent repertory theater for a small group of professional actors, and it was on this basis that I left the Actors' Lab.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what was your opportunity to know and to observe the fact that there were Communists in that organization?

Mr. PARKS. I knew them as Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what had been your opportunity to know them as Communists.

Mr. PARKS. May I answer this fully and in my own way?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to.

Mr. PARKS. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hope you will.

Mr. PARKS. I am not a Communist. I would like to point out that in my opinion there is a great difference between—and not a subtle difference—between being a Communist, a member of the Communist Party, say in 1941, 10 years ago, and being a Communist in 1951. To my mind this is a great difference and not a subtle one.

It is also, I feel, not a subtle difference to be a member of the Communist Party and being a Communist. I do not believe in my own mind that this is a subtle difference either.

I would furnish you with—I guess you would call it an allegory as to what I mean so that you will see why I say it is not a subtle difference.

The President of this country is a Democrat. He is the head of the Democratic Party. They have a platform, certain aims. There are many people who call themselves Democrats. There are certain southern Democrats, for instance, that do not follow the aims and platform of the Democratic Party as we call it, yet they are called Democrats. Well, in fact, they in my opinion are Republicans really; at least, this is the way they work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, that could be said and a similar analysis could be given of the Progressive Party or any other party, but let us—

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Confine ourselves to the question of communism—

Mr. PARKS. Yes. Well, I'm drawing an allegory.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Rather than speaking in terms of allegory.

Mr. PARKS. Well, I felt that it was necessary so that you could see that this is not a subtle difference, you see.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; I think the committee can understand by speaking plainly—

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And to the point—

Mr. PARKS. I'm trying to.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). On communism.

Mr. PARKS. I'm trying to. As I say, I am not a Communist. I was a member of the Communist Party when I was a much younger man, 10 years ago. I was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would tell the committee the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party; that is, when and where and, if you left the Communist Party as you have indicated, when you did it and why you did it.

Mr. PARKS. Well, I will do this if I may. I missed one point that I mentioned—that there is also a difference I feel in being a member of the Communist Party in 1941 and being a Communist in 1951. In 1941—all right?

Mr. TAVENNER. Go ahead.

Mr. PARKS (continuing). Being a member of the Communist Party fulfilled certain needs of a young man that was liberal in thought, idealistic, who was for the underprivileged, the underdog. I felt that it fulfilled these particular needs. I think that being a Communist in 1951 in this particular situation is an entirely different kettle of fish when this is a great power that is trying to take over the world. This is the difference.

I became a Communist—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, just a moment. In other words, you didn't realize that the purpose and object of the Communist Party was to take over other segments of the world in 1941, but you do realize that that is true in 1951? Is that the point you are making?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I would like to say this: That this is in no way an apology for anything that I have done, you see, because I feel I have done nothing wrong ever. Question of judgment? This is debatable. I feel that as far as I am concerned that in 1941, as far as I knew it, the purposes as I knew them fulfilled simply—at least I thought they would fulfill as I said before—certain idealism, certain being for the underdog, which I am today this very minute.

This did not work out particularly this way. I wasn't particularly interested in it after I did become a member. I attended very few meetings, and I drifted away from it the same way that—I petered out the same way I drifted into it. To the best of my recollection, as I recall—the dates are not exact because at that particular time it wasn't an important step one way or the other; I feel as I say that the dates are approximate—it was in 1941, and to the best of my recollection I petered out about the latter part of 1944 or 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, we are not making here a distinction between the Communist Party and the Communist Political Association, but, as a result of investigation that the committee has done and information that it has, you apparently were registered for the year 1944 and 1945 as a member of the party. Is that in accordance with your recollection?

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I say, I am trying to recall it for you to the best of my ability, and I must say again that at that particular time it was not quite as important as it is today, and to the best of my recollection I became a member in 1941, and to the best of my recollection it was either in the latter part of 1944 or the early part of 1945—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if this information in the committee files would be of any value in refreshing your recollections: That your Communist registration card for the year 1944 bore the number 46954 and for the year 1945 the number 47344. Does that happen to refresh your recollection?

Mr. PARKS. No, sir; it doesn't, because to the best of my recollection I never had a Communist Party card.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do I infer properly from your statement that shortly after 1945 or, say, in 1946 you became disillusioned about the Communist Party and withdrew as a member?

Mr. PARKS. Well, let's go back. As I said before, to the best of my recollection it was in 1944 or 1945. This is to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. But by 1946 at least you had definitely broken with the party?

Mr. PARKS. I'm quite sure that that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you participated in any Communist Party activities since that date, 1946?

Mr. PARKS. Not to my knowledge. I don't recall ever having participated in a Communist Party activity since that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you state to the committee where you first became a member of the party?

Mr. PARKS. In Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who recruited you into the party?

Mr. PARKS. Well, a man by the name of Davidson, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Davidson's first name and what was his position?

Mr. PARKS. I can't tell you this because I really don't know. I don't remember his first name. I haven't seen him for 10 years, and I do not know what his position was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did he live? Do you know?

Mr. PARKS. This I have no idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his occupation?

Mr. PARKS. This I do not know either.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us some descriptive data of the individual?

Mr. PARKS. Average-looking man, young, dark hair.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you become acquainted with him and in whose presence did you see him?

Mr. PARKS. It's pretty hard for me to recall 10 years ago—something that at the time was not particularly important. I'm doing the best I can to recall what happened for you. I don't remember his first name, and I don't believe I ever knew what he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what were the circumstances under which you met?

Mr. PARKS. Well, this is hard for me to recall, too—the exact circumstances.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it at a meeting in your home or where?

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I say, I really don't remember. I'm being as honest as I know how. I really don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. I just wanted you to give the committee what information you recall about—

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). About how you got into the Communist Party.

Mr. PARKS. As I told you, I was a good deal younger than I am now, about 25, with certain liberal tendencies, idealism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you seek this individual out, or did he seek you out?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I certainly didn't seek him out. It's hard for me to say whether he sought me out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did others counsel you in regard to your uniting with the Communist Party before you were recruited by this individual by the name of Davidson?

Mr. PARKS. No; I did it of my own volition.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to a Communist Party cell?

Mr. PARKS. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of that cell, and where was it located?

Mr. PARKS. Well, it had no name that I know of. It was a group of people who were Communists, and I attended some meetings with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, you were a member of that particular group from 1941 up to possibly as late as 1945?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what you know about the organization of the Communist Party from your own observations during that period of time in Hollywood?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I'm afraid that I was a pretty bad member by their lights. I didn't attend too many meetings—maybe 10, 12, 15 meetings. And what I really know about the Communist Party is very little, really. If you will ask me some question that you would like to know, I would be happy to answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not the writers and actors in Hollywood were members of any particular branch or group of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. I know that certain actors were a group that met. This I do know. The other things I do not know.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., enters hearing room.)

Mr. Wood. Let the record show that at this point Representative Frazier has joined the hearing.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the group to which the actors were assigned?

Mr. PARKS. They had no name that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it have any designation of any kind?

Mr. PARKS. Not that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. By location or by the type of work they were in?

Mr. PARKS. Well, no name that I know of. The majority of the members of this particular group were actors.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were there several groups to which the actors belonged depending upon the geographical location of the actor?

Mr. PARKS. I don't believe so. I wouldn't say for certain. I'm not under that impression.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who was the chairman of the group to which you were assigned?

Mr. PARKS. Well, it had no chairman that I know of, that I recall—anyone that was chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who was the secretary of the group?

Mr. PARKS. This—

Mr. TAVENNER. Or treasurer?

Mr. PARKS. This I do not recall either. I don't know if there were any actual officers of this particular group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, to whom did you pay your dues?

Mr. PARKS. To various members. No one in particular that I can recall was the treasurer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, a person who was responsible for the collection of dues would certainly be performing the duty of a treasurer even if he did not go by that name; isn't that true?

Mr. PARKS. That's very true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who were those persons to whom you paid your dues?

Mr. PARKS. Well, this is hard for me to answer, too, because the few times that I paid dues, as I recall, were to different people. Just who they were I just can't answer this.

Mr. TAVENNER. You cannot recall the name of any one individual to whom you paid?

Mr. PARKS. No one individual can I recall that I paid the dues to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was Communist Party literature distributed to the members at any of the meetings or through any medium?

Mr. PARKS. Certain pamphlets were available if you wished to buy them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the individual who had charge of the distribution or sale of those pamphlets?

Mr. PARKS. This I don't know either, because the pamphlets were there and you could buy them if you wished.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was there any secret about who was handling the literature of the party?

Mr. PARKS. No secret at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the total membership of this cell in which you were a member?

Mr. PARKS. Well, it's hard for me to tell you the total membership, because, as I say, I attended meetings irregularly and not many of them. I would say that it ranged from certain meetings that there were as little as 5, and I think it went up to maybe, oh, possibly 10 or 12.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did the personnel change considerably between 1941 and 1945, or did it consist of the same members during all that period of time?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I do know that, as I say, I attended rather irregularly, and at some of the meetings I would see someone that I didn't know, I didn't recognize, and I would never see them again. So if this—this is the best answer I can give you to your question. There were people whom I did not know. I did not know their names. I

did not recognize them. And I did not see them again at any meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did speakers or organizers, Communist Party organizers, appear before your group from time to time—people from the East, let us say?

Mr. PARKS. No, I don't recall ever seeing anyone from the East, as you say, or any "big shot," if you will allow me to put it that way. I don't recall ever seeing any of those at any of these meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, are you acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

Mr. PARKS. No, I'm not; to the best of my knowledge, I have never met the man.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever seen him in Hollywood?

Mr. PARKS. I don't believe I have ever seen him. I certainly know I would not recognize the man if he walked into the room.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Lionel Stander?

Mr. PARKS. I have met him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever attended a Communist Party meeting with him?

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall ever attending a Community Party meeting with this Lionel Stander.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not or do you have personal knowledge of whether or not he is a Communist Party member, or do you have knowledge made available to you through Communist Party sources of his membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. No; I do not have this knowledge at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Karen Morley?

Mr. PARKS. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is she a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. Well, Counsel, these—I would prefer not to mention names, if it is at all possible, of anyone. I don't think it is fair to people to do this. I have come to you at your request. I have come and willingly tell you about myself. I think that, if you would allow me, I would prefer not to be questioned about names. And I will tell you everything that I know about myself, because I feel I have done nothing wrong, and I will answer any question that you would like to put to me about myself. I would prefer, if you will allow me, not to mention other people's names.

Mr. WALTER. Do you take the same position with respect to the obvious leaders of the Communist movement?

Mr. PARKS. I do, because I don't know any of the leaders of the Communist movement.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, you do know who was active in the movement in California?

Mr. PARKS. No; I only know the names of people who attended certain meetings that I attended, and these were not people who were—I know were not people who were active, big leaders of the Communist Party. These people I did not know, and I have never met them.

Mr. WALTER. Who directed the meetings that you attended?

Mr. PARKS. The meetings consisted mainly, if you will remember the time, consisted mainly of discussions of—we were in a war then—discussions of how the war was going, current events, problems of actors in their work. It was more of a social, really a social occasion than a stereotyped kind of meeting. Does that answer your question, Congressman?

Mr. WALTER. It's an answer.

Mr. PARKS. Hm-m?

Mr. WALTER. It's an answer.

Mr. PARKS. Well; I would like to answer your question if you're not satisfied with that answer.

Mr. WALTER. Somebody must have indicated a course of procedure. Somebody must have directed activity. Because you just didn't sit down in a polite discussion group without having an objective.

Mr. PARKS. Well—

Mr. WALTER. No; what I am interested in knowing is who directed the activities that this group were engaged in.

Mr. PARKS. And I repeat again that no one to my knowledge directed any kind of activities. You must believe me when I say that for all intents and purposes it was more of a social occasion than any kind of a usual meeting.

Mr. POTTER. Who would call the meetings together?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I don't really know. I can't really answer this.

Mr. POTTER. Did you have a set, scheduled meeting once every month or once every week, or was it upon the call of some individual?

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I recall, various individuals would call. I don't believe that there was any set—

Mr. POTTER. Certainly it wasn't run by mental telepathy.

Mr. PARKS. No; I didn't say that. I say certain individuals would call, and to the best of my knowledge there was no set schedule of meetings.

Mr. POTTER. Somebody had to issue a call?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. POTTER. Did you ever issue a call for your cell to get together?

Mr. PARKS. Did I?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. No, I didn't.

Mr. POTTER. Then, somebody would have to tell you when the meetings would take place and where they would take place; is that not true?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct. I would get a call from a member of the group and they would say, "Well, let's have a meeting tonight, tomorrow night."

Mr. KEARNEY. Were the meetings always held at the same place?

Mr. PARKS. No; they were not.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were they held in halls or in your own homes?

Mr. PARKS. These were held at homes. As I say—

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you ever have any meetings at your own home?

Mr. PARKS. Never.

Mr. KEARNEY. Where were some of the meetings held?

Mr. PARKS. If I might add as a word of explanation, that these were people like myself, small type people, no different than myself in any respect at all, and no different than you or I.

Mr. KEARNEY. Where were some of these meetings held?

Mr. PARKS. As I say, these were held in various homes in Hollywood.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can you name some of them?

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I asked the counsel and as I asked the committee, if you will allow this, I would prefer not to mention names under these circumstances: That these were people like myself who—

and I feel that I—have done nothing wrong ever. I mean along this line. I am sure none of us is perfect. Again, the question of judgment certainly is there, and even that is debatable. But these are people—

Mr. WOOD. Just a moment. At that point, do you entertain the feeling that these other parties that you were associated with are likewise guiltless of any wrong?

Mr. PARKS. The people at that time as I knew them—this is my opinion of them. This is my honest opinion: That these are people who did nothing wrong, people like myself.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Parks, in what way do you feel it would be injurious, then, to them to divulge their identities, when you expressed the opinion that at no time did they do wrong?

Mr. PARKS. This brings up many questions on a personal basis, Mr. Congressman, as an actor. If you think it's easy for a man who has—I think I have worked hard in my profession, climbed up the ladder a bit. If you think it's easy for me to appear before this committee and testify, you're mistaken, because it's not easy. This is a very difficult and arduous job for me for many reasons.

One of the reasons is that as an actor my activity is dependent a great deal on the public. To be called before this committee at your request has a certain inference, a certain innuendo that you are not loyal to this country. This is not true. I am speaking for myself. This is not true. But the inference and the innuendo is there as far as the public is concerned.

Also as a representative of a great industry—not as an official representative; I don't mean it that way—but as an actor of the motion-picture industry that is fairly well known, in that respect I am a representative of the industry. This is a great industry. At this particular time it is being investigated for Communist influence.

Mr. WOOD. Don't you think the public is entitled to know about it?

Mr. PARKS. Hmm?

Mr. WOOD. Don't you feel the public is entitled to know about it?

Mr. PARKS. I certainly do, and I am opening myself wide open to you to any question that you can ask me. I will answer as honestly as I know how. And at this particular time, as I say, the industry is—it's like taking a pot shot at a wounded animal, because the industry is not in as good a shape today as it has been, economically I'm speaking. It has been pretty tough on it. And, as I say, this is a great industry, and I don't say this only because it has been kind to me. It has a very important job to do to entertain people, in certain respects to call attention to certain evils, but mainly to entertain, and in this I feel that they have done a great job. Always when our country has needed certain help, the industry has been in the forefront of that help.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I make an observation?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are placing your reluctance to testify upon the great job that the moving-picture industry is doing or can do?

Mr. PARKS. Excuse me, Mr. Counsel. I really hadn't finished, and that was just part of it. If you'd let me finish, then—Is that all right?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. PARKS. That's one part of it. On the question of naming names, it is my honest opinion that the few people that I could name, these names would not be of service to the committee at all. I am sure that you know who they are. These people I feel honestly are like myself, and I feel that I have done nothing wrong. Question of judgment? Yes, perhaps. And I also feel that this is not—to be asked to name names like this is not—in the way of American justice as we know it, that we as Americans have all been brought up, that it is a bad thing to force a man to do this. I have been brought up that way. I am sure all of you have.

And it seems to me that this is not the American way of doing things—to force a man who is under oath and who has opened himself as wide as possible to this committee—and it hasn't been easy to do this—to force a man to do this is not American justice.

I perhaps later can think of more things to say when I leave, but this is in substance I guess what I want to say.

Mr. Wood. Well, I am glad, of course, to give considerable leeway to the range of your statement, because I for one am rather curious to understand just what the reasons are in your mind for declining to answer the question.

Mr. PARKS. I'm not declining. I'm asking you if you would not press me on this.

Mr. Wood. I'm not going to press the point with you, unless other members of the committee wish to.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, could I ask one question?

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Are any of the members that were in the particular Communist cell that you were in to your knowledge still active members in the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. I can't say this, Congressman, because I have divorced myself completely. I have no way of knowing this at all. I know what I think inside if that would—my opinion is that 99 percent of them are not. This is my opinion, that they are people like myself.

Mr. POTTER. If you knew people in Hollywood that were identified with the party then, would you be reluctant to cite their names if they were active members at the present time?

Mr. PARKS. I would be reluctant on only one score: that I do not think that it is good for an American to be forced to do this. Only on this score. But I feel that a man—the people that I knew—it is my opinion that they are not members of the Communist Party at this time. This is my opinion only. If they are, they shouldn't be.

Mr. POTTER. If you had knowledge of a man who committed murder, certainly you wouldn't be hesitant to give that information to the proper authorities?

Mr. PARKS. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Now, I assume that you share the belief that we share that an active member of the Communist Party believes in principles that we don't believe in, in overthrowing our Government by force and violence. Now, you say you would readily give information concerning a man you have knowledge has committed murder. Wouldn't you also give information to the proper authorities of a man you knew or a woman you knew or believed to be working to overthrow our Government by force and violence?

Mr. PARKS. I will say this to you. If I knew a man that committed murder, this is against the law of our land, and I'm not drawing a fine line for my own protection when I say this. I'm not doing this at all. I'm telling you honestly what I think. This is against the law of our land. This is a reprehensible thing to do to commit murder, and I certainly would name him immediately. The other question is—even now it is not against the law of our land, the legal law of the land. Do you understand the difference that I mean?

Mr. POTTER. So when we are drafting men to fight Communist aggression, you feel that it is not your duty as an American citizen to give the committee the benefit of what knowledge you might have concerning persons who are in the very opposite?

Mr. PARKS. Who are what?

Mr. POTTER. Who are in the very opposite as to what our men are fighting for?

Mr. PARKS. Well, yes; I wanted to do that. I think that there is a difference, Congressman, in my opinion. There is a difference between people who would harm our country and people who in my opinion are like myself, who, as I feel, did nothing wrong at the time—

Mr. POTTER. You don't believe a man today—

Mr. PARKS (continuing). And is guilty of bad judgment.

Mr. POTTER. Yes; I'm not questioning that point when you say that people like yourself and others may be misguided or because of faulty judgment were members of the party. But you don't believe today that anyone can be naive enough to belong to the Communist Party, be an active member of the Communist Party, and not know what he's doing?

Mr. PARKS. That is correct. That is correct. That is what I believe.

Mr. POTTER. For that reason I can't see your consistency in saying why you won't name someone who you know today is an active member of the party.

Mr. PARKS. But I do not know anyone today that is an active member of the party. This is what I said at the outset of this, Congressman.

Mr. POTTER. If you did know, you would tell?

Mr. PARKS. Yes; I think I would.

Mr. POTTER. That's all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Parks, it seems to me that your argument in substance is this: That this committee should investigate communism but not find out who it is that is a Communist.

Mr. PARKS. No, Counsel, that is not my—

Mr. TAVENNER. In the final analysis, isn't that your argument?

Mr. PARKS. No; this is not my argument at all. Not at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are taking the position that in your opinion it is not important to find out who may be in communism in Hollywood—

Mr. PARKS. No—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Rather than for this committee to determine what its obligations are under the statute which created it to investigate communism?

Mr. PARKS. No, Counsel; I didn't say this at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. But isn't that the result of your argument?

Mr. PARKS. No, Counsel, I do not believe that this is the result of my argument at all. What I say to you and what I believe is that the few people that I knew at that time are people like myself who are as loyal to this country as you or anybody else is.

Mr. TAVENNER. And if every witness who came before this committee were permitted to take that position, then the extent of the investigation that this committee could conduct would be limited entirely by the attitude of the witness, wouldn't it?

Mr. PARKS. But I told you the circumstances surrounding my small activity with the Communist Party, you see. And this makes quite a difference. This makes quite a difference.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your judgment?

Mr. PARKS. In my judgment, yes. Not only in my judgment. I know—at least inside of myself—that these people were like myself, and the most that you can accuse them of is a lack of judgment. And even this—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you—

Mr. PARKS. Even this I will say again: I say none of this in apology for what I did, because a young man at 25, if he's not a liberal, if he is not full of idealism, is not worth his salt. And if you make a mistake in judgment like this, I don't particularly, myself, believe that it is serious. If you arrive at certain conclusions after this—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but if every witness who took the stand before this committee would be the final judge of when a thing was serious and when it was not, and the committee would be limited accordingly, how could this committee carry out its statutory duty?

Mr. PARKS. But I'm asking you as a man, having told you and opened myself to you, that—

Mr. TAVENNER. And I'm only asking that you see the other side of it.

Mr. PARKS. I do see the other side.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you have placed Hollywood on a very high pedestal here.

Mr. PARKS. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. But there has been testimony here involving the scientific professions, persons in Government, persons in numerous industries, and I take it that there is no distinction or no preference of any kind that should be allowed to your profession over that of the scientific professions or any other calling in life.

Mr. PARKS. That is true. But I have told you and, as I say, opened myself as wide as I know how to you and told you the extent of my activities as a member at one time of the Communist Party as a young man. What little I know, as you can judge for yourself—as I told you, and it's the truth—I was probably the poorest member of the Communist Party that has existed. And the few people that I knew, you probably know their names. I can see no way that this would be of additional help to this committee. And, Counsel, I am sure that you realize that if this was really consequential, I would do it. But you must realize the position.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pardon me.

Mr. PARKS. I say you must realize that, as inconsequential as I was in it, the few people that I knew, that it is very distasteful to me to be forced into that position.

Mr. TAVENNER. I recognize that. There certainly can be no difference in opinion about that. It is a distasteful position to be in.

Mr. PARKS. And I—

Mr. TAVENNER. And you have avowed here that because of the difference in the situation with regard to the party now from what it was in 1941 you have withdrawn because you now understand the purposes of this organization which you joined years ago. Now, if you would be equally frank with regard to other people who are connected with this organization, then this committee would be permitted to function in line with its organization, with the statutory duty that rests upon it.

And, therefore, I am going to ask you who it was who acted as secretary of this group. You expressed some doubt about it a while ago. But do you now know who was the secretary?

Mr. PARKS. And I can honestly say to you that I do not know, to the best of my remembrance, and I am as honest as I know how. I do not know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Elizabeth Leech?

Mr. PARKS. I do not believe I know Elizabeth Leech. I don't recall ever meeting an Elizabeth Leech.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know a person by the name of Elizabeth Glenn?

Mr. PARKS. No; to the best of my knowledge I do not know any person by that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know a person by the name of Marjorie Potts?

Mr. PARKS. To the best of my knowledge I do not know anyone by the name of Marjorie Potts. I don't recall ever meeting these people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you know Karen Morley?

Mr. PARKS. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Karen Morley a member of this group with you?

Mr. PARKS. And I ask you again, Counsel, to reconsider forcing me to name names under the circumstances, when I told you that I was a member only for a short time and at that particular time in my opinion the people I knew were like myself. And I ask you again to reconsider and not to force me into this position. I don't think that under the circumstances this is really American justice to force me to do this under these circumstances, when I have come to you 3,000 miles and opened myself as I have.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask counsel a question? How can it be material to the purpose of this inquiry to have the names of people when we already know them? Aren't we actually, by insisting that this man testify as to names, overlooking the fact that we want to know what the organization did, what it hoped to accomplish, how it actually had or attempted to influence the thinking of the American people through the arts? So why is it so essential that we know the names of all of the people when we have a witness who may make a contribution to what we are trying to learn?

Mr. PARKS. May I answer your question?

Mr. WALTER. No; I am directing my question to counsel.

Mr. PARKS. I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. My answer to that, Mr. Walter, is that although there is information relating to some of these individuals as to whom I had expected to interrogate this witness, some of them have evaded service of process, so that we cannot bring them here. That is one point.

Another is that this committee ought to be entitled to receive proof of information which it has in its files as a result of its previous investigations relating to a matter of this kind. There would be no way to really investigate Communist infiltration into labor without asking who are Communists in labor. And the same thing is true here in Hollywood.

Those are the reasons I think it is material.

Mr. WALTER. But isn't it far more important to learn the extent of the activity and what the purpose of the organization actually was than to get a long list of names of bleeding hearts and fools, suckers, hard-boiled Communist politicians? I don't know as it makes too much difference. As long as we have a witness willing and anxious to cooperate in carrying out what I conceive to be our purpose, I think the rest is all immaterial.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to the other information—

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAVENNER. May I make one statement?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to the other information, as to the purposes and objects of the various organizations, that was the subject of the testimony of about 20 witnesses or more here. I have referred to those organizations, as organizations as to which there has been considerable evidence before your committee.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask this witness a question, Mr. Chairman, at this point?

Mr. Wood. Yes. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Were you instructed to attempt to influence the thinking of the American people through various exhibitions on the stage or on the screen? Was that the purpose of your organization?

Mr. PARKS. I was never instructed at any time to do this, and I think that if you are a follower of the motion-picture industry—that is, if you go to the movies is what I mean—if you are familiar with it, I think that it is almost evident that this was not done in pictures.

Mr. WALTER. Well, was it talked about? Was it the purpose of the Communist organization to attempt to set up a hard core in Hollywood that would slant pictures and performances so as to influence the thinking of the American people?

Mr. PARKS. Not to my knowledge, Mr. Congressman, at all. As I say, I was with a small group of actors. But as a person who is close to the industry, I think that this is almost an impossibility. If you are familiar—you probably aren't—with the making of pictures, first of all it's impossible I feel, as an actor, to do this as an actor. I was never asked to do it. It was never discussed. And I think it is impossible.

A script that is written is the important thing about making a picture. You can only make a stinker if you have a poor script.

Mr. Wood. On that point, wouldn't it be true that the writer of that script is in a position to very decidedly slant—

Mr. PARKS. No, sir; I don't believe this is true. I really and honestly don't believe that this is true. Because every studio—You see, there are, I think, on the average of about 400 pictures made in Hollywood, approximately. I don't know the exact number. I think it's something like that. This is divided up among a number of studios. A script passes through usually—and unfortunately—as an actor I think this—through too many hands. My personal opinion is that a script should be written by one man and it should be directed by the same man. But this happens hardly ever to my knowledge. It passes through several writers usually. They think if one man is good for jokes, they put him in for jokes. And another man, if they want a tear-jerker, they will assign him to that particular portion of it.

It goes to an associate producer, a producer, the heads of the studios. And I think you are familiar with the men that are the heads of the studios in Hollywood. And it is my opinion, it is my personal opinion, my studied opinion, that this is an impossibility. And to bear me out—

Mr. WOOD. And didn't happen?

Mr. PARKS. I do not believe that this has ever happened.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. Now—

Mr. PARKS. In my opinion.

Mr. WOOD. Now, you're leaving a very decided impression on my mind that in your thinking there was nothing, no attempt to influence the character of the pictures or other entertainment that emanated from the studios that your group was connected with, and that there was nothing off color about the action or the conduct of any of the people that belonged to it. Then, how could it possibly reflect against the members of this group for the names to be known, any more than it would if they belonged to the Young Men's Christian Association?

Mr. PARKS. May I answer this, Congressman?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. I'm asking you.

Mr. PARKS. Yes. As a finish to what I said before, and I think to bear me out on what I said before, you may or may not like the picture that comes out, and I am not saying that each picture is an artistic or a commercial masterpiece. This is not true. Everyone knows this. But I think this is the proof of what I say: That you cannot find one picture that has been slanted adversely deliberately. This I do not believe.

Again, a man can make a mistake in judgment, Congressman. A man can make a mistake in judgment.

Now, to answer your last question, I must—I feel as I do about it because myself I am a good example, I think. As I said before, it's not easy personally for me to be here. Anybody who thinks it is is out of their mind. Over and above that, it is doubtful whether, after appearing before this committee, whether my career will continue. It is extremely doubtful. For coming here and telling you the truth.

You see, there were other things open to me that I could have done. But, feeling that I have not done anything wrong, that I will tell you the truth. There were other things that were open to me that I could have done, and I chose not to do them.

Mr. WALTER. Actually, the producers, particularly in recent years, have been very careful to examine scripts so that they would not be slanted. Is that not the fact?

Mr. PARKS. I think that this is correct. I think this is correct.

Mr. WOOD. I believe Mr. Doyle wanted to ask you a question. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Parks, have you any knowledge of the extent to which the movie industry, if it has, has made a conscientious effort to clean out any subversive influences in the industry either on the part of the actors or otherwise? Are you conscious of any fixed determination since 1946?

Mr. PARKS. Yes, there certainly—I think that this is common knowledge.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, is it part of your knowledge?

Mr. PARKS. Yes, of course. When I say "common knowledge" I mean mine, yours, everybody's. I believe that everyone knows that there has been a conscious effort to be absolutely free of any kind of communism.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this? A few minutes ago you said you were for a time honorary treasurer of one of these two groups that you stated you believed you were a member of. I think you said the extent of your duty as honorary treasurer was to sign a batch of checks all at the same time.

Mr. PARKS. That's right.

Mr. DOYLE. To whom were those checks written or for what purpose?

Mr. PARKS. Well, these were written to pay the office help, the secretaries, the clean-up man, the teachers, electric company, the utility bills, bills for lumber and paint for scenery, et cetera.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I noticed just now you said these checks were paid for secretaries and office help. What secretaries? How many secretaries and what office help for what organization?

Mr. PARKS. For the Actors' Lab.

Mr. DOYLE. How many secretaries did you have?

Mr. PARKS. Well, it varied from none to one to at certain times when a show was being given and tickets were being mailed out to—I don't really recall—possibly three, four.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, with reference to the cell which you said you attended some 12 or 15 times to the best of your recollection—

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Was that attendance spread over from 1941 to 1945?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Inclusive?

Mr. PARKS. That's—

Mr. DOYLE. I think you said your attendance averaged from 5 to 12 or 15.

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I recall, it averaged from 5, 10, 12, in that—

Mr. DOYLE. Were the majority of those in attendance men or women?

Mr. PARKS. I would say it was—I had never thought about it. I suppose equally divided.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you recognize at each meeting at which you were in attendance some actors and some actresses?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. About what proportion of the attendance, when 12 or 15 were in attendance, were members of the actors' or actresses' group?

Mr. PARKS. Well, when I say 12, this as I recall—I'm using this number. I don't recall the exact number. I think that probably was the largest meeting. And these were all in the acting profession.

Mr. DOYLE. Then, am I to understand that the entire attendance was, as far as you knew, members of the actors' profession?

Mr. PARKS. I believe that this is true.

Mr. DOYLE. Was this one cell limited to members of the actors' profession?

Mr. PARKS. To the best of my knowledge, I believe it was limited to that.

Mr. DOYLE. It was limited?

Mr. PARKS. I believe it was, yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And I think you said you more or less had a social affair. Did you have refreshments?

Mr. PARKS. Yes, we did. Coffee. Well, I'm serious when I say that. Coffee, doughnuts.

Mr. DOYLE. Did the cell have dues?

Mr. PARKS. It did.

Mr. DOYLE. How much were the dues?

Mr. PARKS. Well, again, it's difficult for me to say. As I recall, I think—

Mr. DOYLE. How much did you pay?

Mr. PARKS. Well, during—

Mr. DOYLE. And how often?

Mr. PARKS. Well, during the course—I must explain to you a little about myself: That I'm not, I don't think, a stingy man, but I'm known as a close man with a dollar, and I'm serious when I say this. And, to the best of my knowledge, I think during the short time I was connected with this organization that I could not have contributed more than 50, 60 dollars during this entire time.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean you were connected with this one cell from 1941 to 1945, inclusive; yet you only paid a total of 50 or 60 dollars in those 4 years?

Mr. PARKS. Well, the dues, as I recall, when you weren't working were about 75 cents a month, as I recall, and if you were working I think you paid some percentage. I didn't.

Mr. DOYLE. To what organization did you pay the dues as a member of the cell?

Mr. PARKS. I gave them to—right at the meeting.

Mr. DOYLE. In check?

Mr. PARKS. No; I believe I gave them in cash.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you get a receipt for it?

Mr. PARKS. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Didn't ask for one?

Mr. PARKS. Didn't ask for it.

Mr. DOYLE. You mentioned that the cell members during the war discussed how the war was going. What did you mean by that?

Mr. PARKS. Well, at that particular time, this I think was the major topic of conversation for most people in the country, and this was certainly true of myself and the actors that were at these particular meetings.

Mr. DOYLE. Were there ever any resolutions submitted to the cell for consideration and action? I mean, were ever any communications read to you in the meeting from any other segment of the Com-

munist Party, the Communist organization? Did you ever listen to any communications read to you in any cell meeting those 4 years? If so, what?

Mr. PARKS. I honestly cannot say that I ever heard any such communication. I don't believe so.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, did anyone ever give you a report of any kind on Communist Party activities in those 4 years at any of these cell meetings? If so, what report? Weren't you interested in the progress of the Communist Party? Didn't anyone send you reports or give you an oral report?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I think that certain things were mentioned at some of these meetings that a certain number of people had been approached as far as our particular group was concerned, and this was about the extent of it as I recall.

Mr. DOYLE. That was going to be my next question. Basing this question on the fact that you deliberately laid the groundwork that you were idealistic, liberal, and progressive at the age of 25, and so forth, and that is perhaps one reason you joined the Communist Party, or at least you gave it as one reason for your joining it—

Mr. PARKS. No; that is the reason.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, of course—

Mr. PARKS. I gave it as the reason.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this? You have just stated now that reports were made as to people being approached. Now, you made an effort—didn't you?—as a member of the cell—didn't that cell make efforts to increase its own membership in Hollywood?

Mr. PARKS. I personally, to the best of my knowledge, never made such an effort.

Mr. DOYLE. No; but you heard reports of what was being done by the cell?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, what reports were given as to the activities of the cell?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I don't remember. It's been a long time ago as I told you. And I'm not trying to evade this question at all. I'm honestly not. But a minor report was probably made. I don't recall substances of any of these. That—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, you notice, Parks, I'm deliberately avoiding at this time asking you names of any other person.

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. For the purpose of my questioning, I am assuming you want to be helpful to the committee and tell the activities of the cell that you were in.

Mr. PARKS. That's correct, and I am doing this.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, manifestly, the cell was trying to increase its membership, wasn't it?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. And you were a member of the cell?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. You testified that you heard reports—

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I say—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). —of what the cell was doing to increase its membership.

Mr. PARKS. Well, you're really going a bit further than I said, Congressman.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you go as far as you honestly can and tell us what activities the cell participated in to increase its membership.

Mr. PARKS. Well, I think that certain members of the group approached people about becoming a member of the Communist Party. I myself never did this. I have never—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, names were submitted of other prospective members in your presence; were they not? Names of prospective members were read off or possibilities were read off or submitted to the cell membership; weren't they?

Mr. PARKS. It's possible that this was done.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, was it done?

Mr. PARKS. As I say, it's been a long time ago. I'm not evading the question at all. But, as I told you, I attended a very few meetings. I was not considered a good member. I'm not clear and articulate about everything that happened, because I know very little of what happened.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, was any difference in philosophy between communism and our form of government ever discussed in the cell? What did you discuss besides drinking coffee?

Mr. PARKS. Well, we didn't discuss drinking coffee; we just drank it. As I told you, at that particular time the war was going on, and this was of major importance to every American at the time; and this, as I recall, was the major topic of conversation most of the time.

Then, the discussions also evolved around current events of the time. They also had to do with conditions of actors, as we were, as I recall, all actors—how we could get more money and better conditions.

These were the major topics of conversation as I recall them.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, was it discussed among you that you could get more money as a member of the Communist Party than you could just being a plain Democrat or Republican or member of some other party or not being a member of any party?

Mr. PARKS. No; this was never discussed to my knowledge at all. And, as a matter of fact—

Mr. DOYLE. What was the Communist Party membership in this cell going to do for you in Hollywood? What were the benefits of it? Why did you join the cell? What did you get out of it or hope to get out of it?

Mr. PARKS. As I told you, as a young man of 25, with ideals and a feeling for the underdog, I felt at the time that this was a legitimate political party, like you would join the Democrats or Republicans, and—

Mr. DOYLE. When did you first begin to feel—I don't mean to interrupt.

Mr. PARKS. Excuse me. Could I just continue?

Mr. DOYLE. I think you gave that answer a few minutes ago, the same answer you are giving now.

Mr. PARKS. No; I really didn't. I felt at the time that this was the most liberal of the political parties of the time. You might be interested to know that all of this time I was a registered Democrat. I still am. And I have voted from that time and before it the straight Democratic ticket, because this was the practical thing to do. The other was an idealistic thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, may I ask you this, my final question I think for now: You were in that cell from 1941 to 1945, inclusive, as I understand your answer?

Mr. PARKS. As I said, from 1941, as I recall, to 1944 or 1945.

Mr. DOYLE. Approximately.

Mr. PARKS. Approximately that.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many years were you in that cell before you began to be disillusioned—the proposition that perhaps the party you joined was not the answer to your idealism? How long did it take you to come to that conclusion before you dropped out?

Mr. PARKS. Well, "disillusion" is not the exact word that I would choose, I don't think, at that particular time.

Mr. WOOD. Do I understand from that answer, sir, that you are not yet disillusioned about it?

Mr. PARKS. No, no. Don't bend it. Because I don't mean it that way at all. I am answering this Congressman's question to the best of my knowledge that it wasn't a question of disillusionment really at that time. It was a question of lack of interest, of not finding—you may call it disillusionment if you want, but not finding the things that, as a young man with those particular feelings, I thought I would find.

Mr. DOYLE. Were most of the 12 or 15 occasions on which you attended in 1941, 1942, and 1943, or were most of them in 1944 and 1945? How would you estimate?

Mr. PARKS. Well, it would be hard for me to estimate that, because when I was—I began to work more, and when I worked I didn't go. And it would be hard for me to say, through this lack of interest in not finding what as a young man I was looking for, whether these were at the beginning or the end. I do know that it just petered out like a spent rocket.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I just want one more question:

Mr. PARKS, of course, you were well acquainted with some of the members of the cell?

Mr. PARKS. Could I just explain one other thing when I say "when I worked I didn't go"? If you know anything about an actor's work, it goes from 6 in the morning till 7:30, 8 at night, and when you do work you really don't have much time for anything else. And I have finished my forty-first picture in 10 years. And this means I have been working pretty hard.

Mr. DOYLE. I greatly respect the dedication of you artists to your profession and the diligence with which you work at it. Now, let me ask this further question: You, of course, in these 4 or 5 years became acquainted with some of the members of the cell?

Mr. PARKS. With what?

Mr. DOYLE. You became acquainted with some other members of the cell, so you had a talking acquaintance at least?

Mr. PARKS. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, did you ever discuss with some other members of the cell the fact that you were becoming less satisfied or not satisfied? That is, that you didn't find in the Communist Party membership that which you had hoped?

Mr. PARKS. I believe that I did.

Mr. DOYLE. With men or women?

Mr. PARKS. This I cannot recall. But I am sure—I don't recall the conversations, but I am sure that these did take place.

Mr. DOYLE. What was the substance of their expressed attitude to you? Did they agree with you or did they disagree with you?

Mr. PARKS. Well, as I recall, many times people agreed with what I felt, how I felt. This is one of the reasons that I feel as I do about the people that I knew at that particular time, because I don't recall any time anyone giving me a really serious argument about the way I felt.

Mr. DOYLE. While you were a member of that cell from 1941 to 1945, did it come at all clearly to you that the Communist Party was part of an international conspiracy against our form of government? Did you ever come to that conclusion while you were a member of the cell?

Mr. PARKS. No; not while I was a member of that particular group. As I told you, I didn't find the things that I had hoped to find.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask this last question. I appreciate your generosity, General.

Did you, while a member of that cell, come to the conclusion either in part or in whole that the Communist Party program was aimed at world domination?

Mr. PARKS. Not at that particular time; I did not.

Mr. DOYLE. When did you come to that conclusion, if at all?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I think the way most everybody has come to that conclusion, with the recent and not so recent events in the history of the world, in the history of our country.

Mr. DOYLE. One more question.

Mr. PARKS. This what is happening now. I think this is self-evident to most everybody.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you make any effort yourself, Larry Parks, as a member of this cell, to increase its membership?

Mr. PARKS. I do not recall ever making an effort to increase—

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever see or observe any other member of that cell do any act designed to increase the membership in the cell?

Mr. PARKS. I personally don't recall ever having seen this, and this is an honest and truthful answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Wood. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr Parks, there was one portion of your testimony that I cannot understand. I cannot understand your lack of interest in the Communist Party, when, from your own testimony, no member of the Communist Party ever appeared at any of the meetings attended by yourself and spoke.

Mr. PARKS. I don't understand the question. Would you repeat it?

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, you testified some few minutes ago that no member of the Communist Party ever appeared and spoke before any of the meetings that you attended.

Mr. PARKS. No; I don't believe I said this. I don't believe I said this at all.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is my strong recollection of your testimony.

Mr. PARKS. What I said, that to my recollection no—I think I used the words "big shot."

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, were there members of the Communist Party who appeared at your meetings and spoke to your group?

Mr. PARKS. We were all at that particular time members of the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. I mean from other cells outside of your own.

Mr. PARKS. There was one instance that I do recall when this did happen.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can you give his name?

Mr. PARKS. Again I wish you would not press me.

Mr. Wood. I will state for the benefit of the members we are going to take a recess perhaps for a very short time for lunch, at which time I ask the committee to assemble back in the room for the purpose of determining this matter of policy, and after we resume the witness will be advised what the disposition of this committee is with reference to his apparent disinclination to answer questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. I don't propose to prolong this discussion very much further. But, as I remember it, you stated that you now believe that the Communist Party of the United States is a subversive organization. Is that true?

Mr. PARKS. I thought you were going on. Is that the end?

Mr. VELDE. Is that true?

Mr. PARKS. Yes; I do.

Mr. VELDE. But at that time that you went into the Communist Party, you felt that it was not a subversive organization?

Mr. PARKS. That is quite correct.

Mr. VELDE. Well, do you now know that at the time you belonged to the Communist Party it actually was a subversive organization—at that time?

Mr. PARKS. Again this is only a personal opinion. What I observed at that time, I cannot say that this was true. What I observe personally, the experiences that I had with the small group of people that I knew, this is the only way that I can judge.

Mr. VELDE. Well, you have a pretty strong feeling, though, even at that time that you were duped, that you didn't actually know the purposes of the Communist Party? Isn't that true, Mr. Parks?

Mr. PARKS. No. Again I say I will make no apologies, you see, for what I did except the mistake in judgment, and it's debatable.

Mr. VELDE. Well, your judgment was at that time that it was not a subversive or disloyal organization?

Mr. PARKS. This is my considered judgment.

Mr. VELDE. And you realize now that that judgment was wrong? That it actually was a subversive organization at that time?

Mr. PARKS. I can only give you what I experienced myself, you see, what little I knew about it, and this is the only way that a man can judge.

Mr. VELDE. I'm asking for your judgment at this time as to whether or not you were mistaken in your judgment and actually that the Communist Party was a subversive organization at that time.

Mr. PARKS. Well, this is very hard for me to say. It really is. Because I honestly don't know. What I felt about it during that time, what I observed—that nothing wrong was ever done, you see.

Mr. VELDE. It's not what you felt during that time, Mr. Parks. It's what you feel now about the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. PARKS. What I feel now is entirely different than what I felt then.

Mr. VELDE. In other words, now you feel that it was a subversive organization at that time?

Mr. PARKS. I think a great change has occurred in this particular organization. That is my opinion.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, you feel that the "do-gooders" have gotten out of it and there is nothing remaining now except the hard-boiled politicians?

Mr. PARKS. I would say that in substance I agree with this perfectly.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Parks—

Mr. PARKS. There possibly can be exceptions to this, but certainly not in the major part at all.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Parks, how could you possibly know how other members of your particular cell felt about the purposes of the organization—that is, the Communist Party organization?

Mr. PARKS. Well, at this particular time during the war, a common purpose united all of the people of this country—practically all of the people of this country.

Mr. VELDE. I don't think you are answering my question, Mr. Parks. I realize your reluctance in telling the membership of your organization.

Mr. PARKS. Would you repeat the question then? I didn't—

Mr. VELDE. Just a moment. Let me finish, please. We had a witness down here last year, Lee Pressman, who was likewise reluctant to answer questions concerning his association with members of his own Communist Party cell, but eventually he did, and the committee received his testimony, and it did the committee a lot of good to realize that he would give the testimony. We realize that is true, and I understand your reluctance, but I think you will agree that the committee is a legally organized committee and has a function to do.

Mr. PARKS. I agree with this perfectly.

Mr. VELDE. And as such it has the right to inquire as to the names of members of the Communist Party during the past.

Mr. PARKS. This is your right.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counsel, did you have one further question before we adjourn?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to ask just one or two questions.

Mr. PARKS, you are no doubt acquainted with Mr. Samuel G. Wood, a motion-picture producer and director, or at least you were acquainted with him?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I don't believe that I have ever met the gentleman. I'm quite—if this is the man that died a year or two ago—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. PARKS (continuing) : I'm an admirer of his work as a director. I don't believe I have ever met him. I don't recall meeting him.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you know of whom I am speaking?

Mr. PARKS. Yes, I do. Sam Wood? Right?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Now he testified before this committee with regard to the Laboratory Theater as follows:

Well, in the old days we used to have youngsters who had a chance to study to become actors and actresses through the stock companies. Every city had two or three stock companies. But now most of them have been eliminated. They have to go to these schools. They put on plays. They get parts. They study and become efficient, and we see them in the theaters or see them in some Pasadena Playhouse or something like that. But the Laboratory Theater I think is definitely under the control of the Communist Party and the people that teach there. Any kid that goes in there with American ideals hasn't a chance in the world.

Do you agree with his statement?

Mr. PARKS. I disagree with this emphatically. I disagree with it emphatically.

Mr. TAVENNER. But do you agree that Mr. Wood is a man of honor and integrity?

Mr. PARKS. I agree that Mr. Wood is a man that turned out many fine motion pictures. I don't know the gentleman. I never knew him, and I don't recall ever having met him. But I disagree with this emphatically.

Mr. TAVENNER. But do you still feel that in light of that testimony regarding Mr. Wood you should be the judge as to whether or not you testify as to who were connected with the theater—

Mr. PARKS. No. At no time did I say that I was to be the judge. I was explaining my position to you. I have opened myself to you. And I am asking you gentlemen to be the judge, because this is not my duty here. I am a witness. You gentlemen must be the judge of this.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you see there is a vast difference apparently between your opinion of the activities of that organization and the opinion of others who have testified before this committee.

Mr. PARKS. Well, let me tell you then about the activities of this organization, and then you form your own opinion. This I think would be the only fair thing to do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. PARKS. The activities of the Lab I think were admirable. I didn't happen to agree with certain of the objectives from a professional point of view. This was my disagreement. The work of the Lab I think has been very fine. I think that from a standpoint of—Mr. Wood was quite correct when he said that there is no place, hardly, today where an actor can get his training as he used to, except nowadays recently the summer theaters have come up.

I feel that the Actors' Lab as a training ground for actors was probably the finest of its kind, with the finest courses and the finest directors. It had the cream of the talent appearing on its stages and for the Army. I personally, for instance, appeared in three shows that we toured all over the Army camps, like *Three Men on a Horse*, *Arsenic and Old Lace*, *Kiss and Tell*. They had the greatest casts. You couldn't possibly have afforded these kinds of casts on Broadway. No producer could be this rich. Because these people from the bits to the starring parts were giving of their time.

These are the reasons. I think the record of the lab speaks for itself as far as its activities are concerned and the good that it has done. And I can't prove to you that it was a good acting school. This is impossible. But in my opinion as an actor, this was a fine acting school.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not questioning the skill of the group that were working there.

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am talking about the influences—

Mr. PARKS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Through Communist Party circles.

Mr. PARKS. The only way that you can influence through an organization like the lab, in my opinion, is by the kind of material and the way it is done. Now, if you go down the list of the plays and the classics and the modern plays that the lab has done, everything from Shakespeare and before, playwrights of all countries, this is the only way I think that you can judge the worth of an organization like this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you agree that it was the object and purpose of the Communist Party to exert an influence through the professionals in Hollywood in the advancement of the cause of communism?

Mr. PARKS. No; I cannot agree with this at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the report on the National Convention in Relation to Cultural Movement by V. J. Jerome, delivered in 1938?

Mr. PARKS. No; I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let me read this paragraph to you:

And further we must more than ever impress the professions, our friends and sympathizers, that we have a positive approach also to their work. It isn't just a question—they shouldn't imagine that they are just brought into the party as though to be turned into instruments apart from their work, but on the contrary that their coming into the party was their being friends of the party and sympathizers as in terms of their actual work. We do not always make this clear. The party increasingly cherishes and values specific qualities that the professionals bring into our midst. Gone is the day when we just took a professional comrade and assigned him to do nondescript party work. We say, on the contrary, "Comrades, you have something specific to give. You have the general contributions to make in your loyalty, in your dues payment, your attendance and your various duties and tasks to perform, but you have also a different contribution to make, whether you are a writer, a film artist, a radio performer. We need this, no matter how valuable you are to the party on the picket line, and if in your turn you do not contribute you would not really be valuable to us." This is important to register. And we must also register the fact that the party is not satisfied with anything save the best in terms of quality and caliber and talent that the comrades can produce. Our motto is nothing is too good for the working class, and not, as some say, and possibly by their inferior work, not because they are unable to do better but a sort of sloppy arrangement. that anything is good enough for the working class. We want quality. We want good leaflets, splendid posters such as the Communist Party of Germany used to put out when artists such as Kathe Kollwitz gave of their best to poster production, and, of course, murals and everything that is good. We want our basic agitational work to reflect that we have talented professionals in our midst, good sketches, good plays. In fact, unless the form is there the content is not there.

Doesn't that indicate to you a very definite and determined plan and perfected plan on the part of the Communist Party to use its Communist Party cells in the advancement of its program in Hollywood as well as elsewhere?

Mr. PARKS. That would be my impression from listening to you read that.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the entertainment field?

Mr. PARKS. I can only give you what I personally know and what my particular knowledge is on this, what my opinion is about certain things.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question before we adjourn?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Parks, why in your opinion were you solicited for membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. Well, I imagine I wasn't working at the time so it was not from a standpoint of getting any kind of working actor. I imagine that it was because I was young and probably, as I said, idealistic, and my views on the underprivileged and the underdog were probably known at the time, and I imagine that this was the reason.

Mr. JACKSON. You think it had nothing to do with your potentialities as an actor? That you were solicited just as someone down on Skid Row might have been taken into the party?

Mr. PARKS. Well, perhaps not quite to that extreme. I hope it wasn't quite to that extreme. But at the time—I started to say I hate to admit it, but I really don't—I was not considered to have much talent as an actor by many people. As a matter of fact, I'm rather proud now of a certain progress that I have made I think as an actor myself. I always thought I had possibilities, but I was practically the only one that thought this. And I don't think that it was from that viewpoint that I was approached at all. I don't mean to give you a facetious answer, because it's not; this is true.

Mr. JACKSON. You say that today you are entirely out of sympathy with the Communist philosophy and with its outward manifestations as they have appeared in recent years since your separation from the party?

Mr. PARKS. I certainly am. I think that any power that is trying to, in my opinion, take over the world in this manner, I think is wrong.

Mr. JACKSON. I think a concomitant of that would be, then, that in case of armed conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union you would bear arms in defense of the United States?

Mr. PARKS. Without question.

Mr. WOOD. We will take a recess at this time until 2:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:35 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m. this date.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The committee reconvened at 2:30 p. m., pursuant to the recess.)

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that the members present are: Messrs. Walter, Doyle, Frazier, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, Potter, and Wood.

Mr. MANDEL (counsel for the witness). Mr. Chairman, Mr. Parks would like to make a further application and talk to the committee about the question of naming names. He would appreciate it if the committee would hear him out a few minutes, what he has to say on the subject.

Mr. WOOD. I thought he expressed himself pretty fully this morning. We are taking a good deal of time on this hearing. I think counsel has a few more questions. Maybe they will bring out what he wants to say.

Mr. MANDEL. What he has to say, I think, is very pertinent at this point. I don't think we can judge it until he says it. It will only take

him 3 minutes or so to say it. In view of the fact he has cooperated so completely with the committee, I think he should be granted 3 minutes to say what he has to say, then he is willing to be guided by the committee.

Mr. WOOD. I see no objection to it. Make it as brief as you can, Mr. Parks.

Mr. PARKS. I will, Mr. Chairman.

**TESTIMONY OF LARRY PARKS, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
LOUIS MANDEL—Resumed**

Mr. PARKS. To be an actor, a good actor, you must really feel and experience, from the top of your head to the tip of your toes, what you are doing. As I told you, this is probably the most difficult morning and afternoon I have spent, and I wish that if it was at all possible—you see, it is a little different to sit there and to sit here, and for a moment if you could transfer places with me, mentally, and put yourself in my place.

My people have a long heritage in this country. They fought in the Revolutionary War to make this country, to create this Government, of which this committee is a part. I have two boys, one 13 months, one 2 weeks. Is this the kind of heritage that I must hand down to them? Is this the kind of heritage that you would like to hand down to your children? And for what purpose? Children as innocent as I am or you are; people you already know.

I don't think I would be here today if I weren't a star, because you know as well as I, even better, that I know nothing that I believe would be of great service to this country. I think my career has been ruined because of this, and I would appreciate not having to—don't present me with the choice of either being in contempt of this committee and going to jail or forcing me to really crawl through the mud to be an informer, for what purpose? I don't think this is a choice at all. I don't think this is really sportsmanlike. I don't think this is American. I don't think this is American justice. I think to do something like that is more akin to what happened under Hitler, and what is happening in Russia today.

I don't think this is American justice for an innocent mistake in judgment, if it was that, with the intention behind it only of making this country a better place in which to live. I think it is not befitting for this committee to force me to make this kind of a choice. I don't think it is befitting to the purpose of the committee to do this.

As I told you, I think this is probably the most difficult thing I have done, and it seems to me it would impair the usefulness of this committee to do this, because God knows it is difficult enough to come before this committee and tell the truth. There was another choice open to me. I did not choose to use it. I chose to come and tell the truth.

If you do this to me, I think it will impair the usefulness of this committee to a great extent, because it will make it almost impossible for a person to come to you, as I have done, and open himself to you and tell you the truth. So I beg of you not to force me to do this.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Parks, there was a statement you made this morning in the course of your testimony which interested me a great deal. This is what you said:

This is a great industry—
speaking of the moving picture industry—

and I don't say this only because it has been kind to me. It has a very important job to do, to entertain people; in certain respects to call attention to certain evils, but mainly to entertain.

Now, do you believe that the persons who are in a position to call attention to certain evils ought to be persons who are dedicated to the principles of democracy as we understand them in this country?

Mr. PARKS. I certainly agree with this completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you believe, on the other hand, that the persons who are in those responsible positions should be people who are antagonistic to the principles of democracy and our form of government, and who are members of a conspiracy to overthrow our Government?

Mr. PARKS. Most assuredly I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what is your opinion as to whether or not members of the Communist Party should be in positions of power and influence in the various unions which control the writing of scripts, the actors, and various other things which we have mentioned during the course of this hearing relating to the great industry of the moving pictures?

Mr. PARKS. I thought I had made myself clear, my feeling about this, that I certainly do not believe that those people should be in any position of power to be able to direct this. Of course, I don't believe that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or to influence the course which it takes?

Mr. PARKS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then we will ask your cooperation, before this hearing is over, in helping us to ascertain those who are or have been members of the Communist Party, for that particular purpose which we have mentioned.

Mr. Parks, it is generally known and recognized that the Communist Party, in order to function, must raise money by various methods. Will you tell us what you know of the methods by which money was raised to promote the objects and purposes of the Communist Party while you were a member?

Mr. PARKS. Well, unfortunately, I don't believe I am able to answer that, because I don't recall any occasion of that kind of raising this kind of money that you speak of. When I was a member of the Communist Party I paid dues to it, as I told you, and rather meager contributions. I don't believe I can help you on this, because I really don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take any part in fund-raising campaigns which were engineered by the Communist Party or by organizations known to you to be Communist-front organizations?

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall at the moment. This is like asking a man what he did in 1941, and he says, "I don't remember." If you say to him, "Did you go fishing up on the Oregon River?" he will say, "Yes, yes, I did." If you would accommodate me in this way perhaps I can answer your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make contributions to any organizations which you knew at the time or have known since to be cited as Communist-front organizations?

Mr. PARKS. I believe that before the Independent Artists' Committee, whatever it is called, was cited, I contributed to them \$2 a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time?

Mr. PARKS. A year or so, I guess. At the time it was to my mind a perfectly legitimate organization. It has been cited since, I believe, by the Attorney General in his list of organizations. Others might be. I don't recall them at the moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in any benefit performance, benefit celebration, on behalf of Communist-front organizations?

Mr. PARKS. As an actor, Counsel, I have taken part in many benefits for many organizations over the last 10 years. If you could be more specific, perhaps I could answer better.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you taken part in any such celebration where the proceeds would go to a Communist-front organization which you knew had been cited as a Communist-front organization, or which you later found out had been cited?

Mr. PARKS. I don't remember at the moment, but if you could be more specific.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I am asking if you recall.

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall at the moment. If you could be more specific, perhaps I could answer better.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know anything of Communist Party plans for raising money for various purposes in which the Communist Party was interested?

Mr. PARKS. No; I can't honestly recall knowing about this. Again, if you could be more specific, perhaps I could answer you more specifically, if you could give me an instance of what you want to know, or what you are driving at.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am merely asking what you know about the raising of Communist Party funds.

Mr. PARKS. At the moment I don't recall knowing anything about it. As I just told you, I have appeared in many benefits over the past few years for many organizations, and if you could be more specific perhaps I could be more specific. I am not trying to avoid the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no trick question here through which I am attempting to lead you into denial of something we know about.

Mr. PARKS. I have come here and have been as open and aboveboard as I can. I think the testimony will bear me out. I am willing to help you all I can if you could be more specific. As I told you, I have appeared at many benefits over many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. As far as you know, were any of these fund-raising benefits conducted for the benefit of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. I don't recall any at the moment. But again I say, I have been to many benefits over many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your statement that you made at the beginning of the afternoon session, you made a statement which I cannot let go by without challenging it. You said you were subpoenaed here because you were a star. Mr. Parks, you were subpoenaed here because the committee had information that you had knowledge about Communist Party activities and that you had been a member.

Mr. PARKS. I did not mean any inference by that, Counsel. All I meant was that I think you know, even better than I, that I know nothing of any conspiracy that is trying to overthrow this Government. You know this even better than I. And my point was that I think if I was working in a drug store, I doubt very much whether I would be here.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have had many people before this committee who have been engaged in very menial forms of making a livelihood, and that will be so in the future.

Mr. PARKS. Please don't take that in the wrong spirit, because it was not meant in the wrong spirit.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am glad it was not.

I did not fully understand your reference to the possible destruction of your career by being subpoenaed here. You did not mean to infer by that that this committee was bringing you here because of any effect it might have on your career?

Mr. PARKS. No, I didn't infer that at all. What I meant, and what I said, was that because of this, in my opinion, I have no career left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't you think that that question might be influenced to some extent by the fullness of the cooperation that you give the committee in a situation of this kind?

Mr. PARKS. I have tried to cooperate with the committee in every way that I feel that I can, but I think the damage has been done. This is my personal opinion.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those are all the questions I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. Don't you think that more than the damage that possibly has been done you by this committee, which, after all, is an expression of the will of the American people and operates under the mandate of the people—don't you think the great damage occurred when you became a member of an organization which has been found to advocate the overthrow of every constitutional form of government in the world? Is this committee more to blame than your own act in affiliating with that organization?

Mr. PARKS. As I told you, Congressman, when I was a good deal younger than I am now, 10 years ago, I felt a certain way about certain things. I was an idealist, I felt strongly and I still do about the underdog, and it was for these reasons that this particular organization appealed to me at that time. I have later found that this would not fulfill my needs. At that time, this, I don't even believe was a mistake. It may have been a mistake in judgment. This is debatable. But my two boys, for instance, I would rather have them make the same mistake I did under those circumstances than not feel like making any mistake at all and be a cow in the pasture. If a man doesn't feel that way about certain things, then he is not a man. The thing that I did—I do not believe that I did anything that was wrong. Judgment, this is debatable. This I agree.

Mr. JACKSON. You say, Mr. Parks, that your association at best was haphazard, and, in your own words, you are afraid you were not a very good Communist.

Mr. PARKS. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Upon what do you base the opinion that the people whose names you have in your possession probably have severed their

relations with the Communist Party or are not today members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PARKS. In my opinion, the few people that I knew are people like myself and feel the way that I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, of course, that is merely your judgment of the matter. Have you discussed their party affiliations with those with whom you were affiliated in the party?

Mr. PARKS. I have not, but these people I knew, and this is my honest opinion. You know these people. You know them as well as I do.

Mr. JACKSON. I will point out to you that in a recent case here in Washington some of the highest officials in Government testified on the stand to their honest belief that a man with whom they had been associated had never been a member of the Communist Party, and in no way constituted any threat to our institutions, but every man who reads the newspapers knows how fallacious that opinion was. I merely point out that after all, in all good faith, you might conceivably be entirely wrong as to the present status of membership in the Communist Party of some people whose names you evidence hesitancy about disclosing.

Mr. PARKS. These men you speak of did not act as informers in any sense of the word. I told you about these people. You know who the people are. And I have told you my opinion of them. And I have told you that I think to force me to do something like this is not befitting this committee. I don't think the committee would benefit from it, and I don't think this is American justice to make me choose one or the other or be in contempt of this committee, which is a committee of my government, or crawl through the mud for no purpose, because you know who these people are. This is what I beg you not to do.

Mr. JACKSON. This is also problematic, Mr. Parks. I know who they are, maybe you are entirely right, but I still think it is within the province of the committee to determine how far they will go in this respect.

Mr. PARKS. I am asking the committee not to do it. I am not setting myself up as a judge. I am asking you to judge.

Mr. VELDE. I think you are wrong in assuming we know all of the activities in which you were engaged and all the people you were engaged in those activities with. I am satisfied you are wrong in that, and possibly you could furnish us with a lot of information we do not have, and I feel sure you would be willing to do that to serve the best interests of the United States, of which you are a citizen.

Mr. PARKS. I have told you to the best of my ability of my activities. You say you don't know mine. I have tried to tell you to the best of my ability of my activities.

Mr. Wood. We will ask at this time to break in the testimony of this witness to make an announcement concerning his release from the subpoena. I request that he not leave the jurisdiction of the committee until later this afternoon.

Mr. MANDEL. You want us around the rest of the afternoon?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. MANDEL. Thank you.

(Witness temporarily excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Howard Da Silva.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Da Silva, will you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

Mr. KENNY. My name is Kenny. I am a Los Angeles attorney. As you recall, we sent a wire. I would ask that that motion be disposed of before he is sworn.

Mr. Wood. The witness will be sworn. I won't interfere with any motion.

Mr. KENNY. The motion was to quash the subpoena. If he is not properly subpoenaed, if the motion is denied, of course the record has been made, but as it now stands there is a motion pending before the committee that the subpoena be quashed, on the ground that Mr. Da Silva is not a witness but rather a defendant in a proceeding which may have the effect of depriving him of his livelihood, and as such a defendant he cannot be called at all to testify against himself. That is why the motion was addressed to the subpoena. I suggest the logical way to handle that would be to grant or deny the motion to quash the subpoena, then if the motion is denied the record will be made and the witness will be available to be sworn.

Mr. Wood. I don't think this committee has authority to rule on a legal question as to the subpoena. We have the power of subpoena, but that is a question that will have to be raised in court at the proper time.

Mr. KENNY. If the record discloses the motion has been made—

Mr. Wood. Let the record disclose that this telegram, in the nature of a motion, has been presented to the committee and will be placed in the record.

(The telegram above referred to is as follows:)

CHICAGO, ILL., March 20, 1951.

HON. JOHN S. WOOD,

Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please take notice that the undersigned as counsel for Gale Sondergaard and Howard Da Silva will at the opening of their scheduled examination before you Wednesday, March 21, 1951, move to quash the subpoenas previously served on each of them. This motion will be made upon the grounds that our clients have not been subpoenaed merely as witnesses but rather they occupy the position of defendants charged with political heresy in a proceeding which can result in deprivation of their livelihoods. No one in such a position can be called to the stand and compelled to testify against himself. (See first and fifth amendments, United States Constitution. *Adamson v. California* (332 U. S. 46); *Boyd v. U. S.* (116 U. S. 616)). This motion presents a serious constitutional question and we request an opportunity to present oral argument in support thereof.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS, Los Angeles.
Washington, D. C., address, the Shoreham.

Mr. Wood. You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DA SILVA. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HOWARD DA SILVA, ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS, AS COUNSEL

Mr. DA SILVA. I should like to voice an objection, if I may.

Mr. Wood. Just have a seat, please.

Mr. DA SILVA. May I voice an objection?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the telegram to which you referred was presented to the committee in executive session yesterday, and I understood it took action on it at the time.

Mr. Wood. Are you represented by counsel here?

Mr. DA SILVA. I am.

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

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, 250 North Hope Street, Los Angeles.

Mr. MARGOLIS. I am also appearing on behalf of Mr. Da Silva. My name is Ben Margolis, 112 West Ninth Street.

Mr. Wood. At any time you are asked a question by either counsel for this committee or any of its members, you have the privilege of conferring with your counsel to your entire satisfaction before making answer, and you are given that right at any time.

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

Mr. DA SILVA. I would like to voice my objection now, if I may.

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

Mr. DA SILVA. May I not voice my objection?

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not yet been identified in the record.

Mr. DA SILVA. My name is Howard Da Silva. I was born Howard Silverblatt. I was born in Cleveland, Ohio, May 4, 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you furnish the committee, please, with a brief résumé of your educational background.

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement which I would like very much to make. It has been announced in the press that this committee has as its purpose complete objectivity, and I think in the face of that it is quite important that I present my own statement here for clarity and for objectivity. Here is the statement I would like to present [handing statement to counsel].

Mr. TAVENNER. Is this the same statement that counsel sent in to the committee a while ago?

Mr. KENNY. No; I don't think we sent a statement in. It may be a statement of which you have seen a copy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a statement that was given to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. It was given to the press.

Mr. Wood. This is a statement that you released to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. What is that?

Mr. Wood. This statement you now desire to read is a statement that you released to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. Simultaneously with my appearance; yes.

Mr. Wood. Let's see if I understand you correctly. When did you release this statement which you now propose to read?

Mr. DA SILVA. I was called here at 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr. Wood. When did you release the statement to the press?

Mr. DA SILVA. Shortly after I arrived here.

Mr. Wood. Shortly after 10, and it is now after 3. In the light of the fact it has been given this wide publicity, I see no purpose in burdening the record with a repetition of it.

Mr. DA SILVA. My purpose is not to burden the record. My purpose is to achieve the kind of objectivity which was originally stated to the press by this committee.

Mr. Wood. Proceed with the questions.

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't follow you. Did you say my statement was not to be read?

Mr. Wood. Yes, sir.

Mr. DA SILVA. It is not to be read.

Mr. TAVERNER. My question was, Will you please furnish the committee a brief statement of your educational background?

Mr. DA SILVA. At this point, may I object to being called to testify against myself in this hearing. I object because the first and fifth amendments and all of the Bill of Rights protect me from any inquisitorial procedure, and I may not be compelled to cooperate with this committee in producing evidence designed to incriminate me and to drive me from my profession as an actor. The historical—

Mr. Wood. Would an answer to that question incriminate you? You were asked to furnish a statement of your educational background. Would a true answer to that question incriminate you? If so, you have a right to protect yourself.

Mr. DA SILVA. You want me to make this objection at a time when I think an answer to the question will incriminate me?

Mr. Wood. If a true answer to any question asked you by counsel or any member of this committee would tend to incriminate you and you so swear, you have a right to claim it, as I understand the law.

Mr. MARGOLIS. It is our position that this witness is in the same position as a defendant, and I think he should be allowed to complete this objection.

Mr. Wood. He is not a defendant here. He is a witness.

Mr. MARGOLIS. It is our contention that he is and will suffer the consequences and pains in many respects.

Mr. Wood. He will suffer the consequences of testifying falsely, if he does so. If he refuses to answer without valid ground, he is subjecting himself, as you well know, to a proceeding for contempt of Congress. It is a matter you can advise him about. You have that privilege any time you want.

Mr. TAVERNER. Now, will you answer the question, please?

Mr. DA SILVA. I attended the public schools of New York City; Bronx High School; and for a term, City College of New York.

Mr. TAVERNER. When did you spend a term in City College of New York?

Mr. DA SILVA. I was born in 1909. I was about 17. That would make it about 1926.

I also attended Carnegie Tech in Pittsburgh for a short semester, working through college by working in the Jones & Laughlin steel mill.

Mr. TAVERNER. What is your present address?

Mr. DA SILVA. My present address is 936 North Stanley Avenue, Hollywood 46, Calif.

Mr. TAVERNER. And what is your present occupation?

Mr. DA SILVA. My present occupation is acting.

Mr. TAVERNER. Have you ever held the position of vice president of the Civil Rights Congress, that is, the New York chapter of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, it is very clearly the object of this committee to tie me in with organizations which are in its disfavor, and therefore I object, and now I will tell you my objection.

Mr. Wood. We are not interested in your objection. We are interested in knowing whether you will answer the question.

Mr. DA SILVA. I refuse to answer the question on the following basis: The first and fifth amendments and all of the Bill of Rights protect me from any inquisitorial procedure, and I may not be compelled to cooperate with this committee in producing evidence designed to incriminate me and to drive me from my profession as an actor. The historical origin of the fifth amendment is founded in the resistance of the people to attempts to prosecute and persecute individuals because of—

Mr. Wood. Will you please wait a moment? Please ascribe to the committee the intelligence to determine these questions for itself, and don't argue about it.

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't care to argue about it, but I wish to clarify my position.

Mr. Wood. You need not teach this committee a class in law.

Mr. DA SILVA. It is not my position. It is my position to uphold the law and to make sure the committee does.

Mr. Wood. If you say you decline to answer for the reasons given, it will be understood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. DA SILVA. I refuse to answer the question on the basis of my statement here, on the basis that my answer might, according to the standards of this committee, tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go to the State of California for employment, how long ago?

Mr. DA SILVA. I think for the first time in 1939, when I appeared in Abe Lincoln in Illinois.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1939 how were you employed and where?

Mr. DA SILVA. I was an actor on Broadway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what length of time were you an actor on Broadway?

Mr. DA SILVA. I served my apprenticeship in 1929 with the Civic Repertory Theater, so from 1929 to 1939 I served as an actor on Broadway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected at any time with the Federal Theater project in New York?

Mr. DA SILVA. Yes, I was and I was very proud to be. That was the advent of a magnificent period, and I think some of the greatest work that ever came out came out at that time; truly a people's theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. How large an organization was it?

Mr. DA SILVA. In the Federal Theater?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DA SILVA. I think it is a matter of record, but there were many hundreds of actors in the Federal Theater all over the country. The audience was many millions of Americans, who for 55 cents could see plays they had never seen before and would not have had an opportunity to see otherwise.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it privately financed, or Government financed?

Mr. DA SILVA. It is a part of the public record that it was Government financed.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time, while you were a member of it, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the most vital concern of this committee is to really control every concept of free thought throughout the country, to do it by attacking Hollywood, and—

Mr. Wood. This committee is not interested in your opinion. Do you decline to answer the question, or will you answer it?

Mr. DA SILVA. It is necessary that I answer it in my own way. It seems vital to say that the object of this committee is a smoke screen. Nobody, either in Washington or Hollywood, thinks there is a group in Hollywood dedicated to overthrow southern California by force and violence.

Mr. Wood. You were asked a very simple question, whether at the time you were a member of the organization you were asked about, you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. DA SILVA. Because the very clear intention of this committee is to tie me in with an organization in its disfavor, I refuse to answer the question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. Wood. Let it be understood this committee is not trying to tie you in anywhere. We are endeavoring to find where you tied yourself.

Mr. DA SILVA. I have a function as a citizen, but I think in this period of war hysteria it is the purpose of this committee to pull the wool over the eyes of the people.

Mr. Wood. The committee is not interested in your opinions. We are anxious to get the facts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attempt to recruit persons into the Communist Party from the Federal Theater project while you were a member of the Federal Theater project?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. After going to Hollywood, did you become affiliated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee there?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, there is a rumor that those who have been anti-German in the last war will be brought before this committee. I must decline to answer the question for reasons previously given.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, cannot the witness be made to answer "Yes" or "No" or to decline to answer on the grounds he might incriminate himself, without going into a speech.

Mr. Wood. It would certainly be appreciated by the committee if he would not air his views and would answer the questions more directly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been affiliated with the Actors' Laboratory in Hollywood?

Mr. DA SILVA. Once again, because it is the purpose of this committee to link me with an organization it considers unfavorable, I decline to answer this question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. Wood. Any further comment by you as to the object of this committee will be ignored by the reporter.

Mr. DA SILVA. I didn't hear you, sir.

Mr. Wood. From now on I order stricken from the record any comment by you as to the object of this committee.

Mr. DA SILVA. They seem to me à propos, sir.

Mr. Wood. I will permit it to remain so far, but I will not permit you to continue to repeat that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign a statement which appeared in the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949, which defended the 12 Communist Party leaders who were convicted of conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer for reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you register as a member of the Communist Party in 1944 and in 1945?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer this question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you married when you went to California, I believe you said in 1938 or 1939? When did you go to California; what was the date?

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't recall the specific date that I went to California; but is the matter of my marriage or my personal relations pertinent to this inquiry?

Mr. TAVENNER. It certainly is.

Mr. DA SILVA. In what respects, may I ask?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you married while you were in California, and was your wife's name Evelyn?

Mr. DA SILVA. I still don't understand in what respect this question is pertinent to the inquiry of this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Do you think an answer to that would incriminate you?

Mr. DA SILVA. I should think I would be entitled to find out if it was pertinent or not.

Mr. WOOD. You have competent counsel, I assume. In fact, I know you have.

Mr. KENNY. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Just advise your client.

Mr. KENNY. I have advised him that the protection of Jones against SEC—

Mr. WOOD. Please advise your client.

Mr. KENNY. He has asked the committee to state wherein this question is pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. WOOD. It is a matter of your advising your client and letting him make up his own mind as to what course he wants to take.

Mr. DA SILVA. Apparently any answer which I make has to be specifically pertinent, is that correct? In other words, I can't answer the question in my own way.

I will answer that question. I think I was divorced from my first wife when I went to California in 1939. I believe that to be the fact. To the best of my knowledge I think that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether she is now living in Norfolk, Va.

Mr. DA SILVA. No. I don't know anything about her. I haven't been in communication with her for a long time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether she has since remarried?

Mr. DA SILVA. I have heard somewhere that she was remarried; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you know her husband's name if I mentioned it?

Mr. DA SILVA. I don't think I could say what her husband's name is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she engaged in any Communist Party activities at any time prior to your divorce or since, to your knowledge?

Mr. DA SILVA. I have many relations, and the activity which they have engaged in I have in no way made my concern, but I can tell you once again it obviously is your purpose to tie me in with any activity of hers and through us both with associations which are in your disfavor. I must decline to answer this question for the same reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You declined to answer the question as to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party when you were in New York between 1936 and approximately 1938. Have you been a member of the Communist Party since then, and are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. DA SILVA. I decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You appear here in response to a subpoena which was served on you on February 24 by James A. Andrews, investigator for this committee?

Mr. DA SILVA. Yes.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Da Silva, you in your statement said you felt that you were a loyal American; is that true?

Mr. DA SILVA. You mean in my statement?

Mr. POTTER. Yes. I believe in your statement you made some reference to loyal Americans and you included yourself as being a loyal American; is that true?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, my specific statement, which has not been returned to me and which is here, says specifically that my love for this country is deep enough for me to be able to distinguish between its people and its policies of the moment. I will always identify myself with the interests of the American people, but I will support or oppose my Government's policies to the extent that I understand them to serve or harm the people of the country.

Mr. POTTER. Then you feel that our Government's policies today you cannot support?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, I think the overwhelming majority of people in this country are—

Mr. POTTER. That is a simple answer.

Mr. DA SILVA. This is a simple answer which I must answer in my own simple way. I feel—

Mr. WOOD. Make it brief.

Mr. DA SILVA. Are you about to time me? I feel it is very essential I make this statement.

Mr. WOOD. Please. Let us get along with the hearing. You were asked simple questions, whether or not you could support and feel like you can support the policies of the Government of the United States. That is a question you can answer very simply, without giving us a lecture here on the subject.

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WOOD. Do you or don't you?

Mr. DA SILVA. My opinions are my own. My opinions belong to me. My opinions, present, past, and future, belong to me.

Mr. POTTER. Then you refuse to answer?

Mr. DA SILVA. Your question again is what?

Mr. POTTER. Do you feel that you can support the policies of our Government at this time, or do you support the policies of our Government at this time?

Mr. DA SILVA. Which specific policies, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. POTTER. For example, if the Soviet Union should attack the United States will you support and would you bear arms for the United States?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Chairman, the prime issue of the day is peace, not ways of waging war. Your obvious intent once again is to tie me with organizations that you consider subversive. Any word "peace" today is considered subversive by this committee and by those who prefer war to peace.

I decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. POTTER. If the witness could confine his acting to Hollywood I am sure the committee would progress much faster.

Mr. DA SILVA. Is it the committee's object here to uphold the law? It is the committee which is seeking publicity.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you in favor of the Communist-inspired peace marches on Washington?

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Kearney, my opinions on peace have been many, and I have made them over a period of many years.

Mr. KEARNEY. No further questions.

Mr. DA SILVA. But today, when the purpose is to link the word "peace" and the word "subversive" all over America, I refuse to answer this question on the basis previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Do you think this is a legally organized committee of Congress?

Mr. DA SILVA. A legally organized committee of Congress?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. DA SILVA. I think its actions have been decidedly illegal. I think its actions have been for the specific purpose of pulling wool over Americans' eyes.

Mr. VELDE. Do you think the Congress has a right to inquire into subversive activities in the United States of America?

Mr. DA SILVA. I think that Congress has many rights. The least of its rights are the freedom to wage war today.

Mr. VELDE. I would appreciate a specific answer.

Mr. DA SILVA. Would you voice your question again?

Mr. VELDE. Do you believe that the Congress has a right to inquire into subversive and disloyal activities in the United States?

Mr. DA SILVA. Well, this is obviously what this committee is doing at present.

Mr. VELDE. Do you believe that we have that right?

Mr. DA SILVA. I think that the overwhelming majority of the American people want peace and don't want to drop an atom bomb. I think that is the most pressing issue of the day. I think that any attempt to investigate so-called subversive organizations is an attempt to pull wool over the American people's eyes, the old Army game, to say, "Look what is happening there, and meanwhile we pick your pockets and drop atom bombs." That is the real function.

Mr. VELDE. I think you are not answering the question.

Mr. DA SILVA. I am answering the question as specifically as I can. It has been said before. This is part of the same thing. I heard Mr. Walter say it sounds like the Daily Worker. I recognize that every statement made which is on peace or on any issue that you find in your disfavor is called an issue that sounds like the Daily Worker or an issue that is subversive or an issue that is questionable. To me the question of peace today is not a subversive issue.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I think in view of this witness' statement that this committee is not interested in peace that I want to challenge that statement. I challenge it publicly and say to this witness that this committee is interested in peace, and I as a member of this committee am interested in peace. But I am not interested in protecting Communists or subversives in connection with their alleged peace program. I want this witness to know that I as an American very much resent his statement to this committee that this committee is not interested in peace, because we are, Mr. Da Silva.

Mr. DA SILVA. Mr. Doyle, you are from California. What program of peace are you in favor of? What kind of peace do you want, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman from California yield to me?

Mr. DOYLE. I do.

Mr. KEARNEY. I will say the gentleman from California is not in favor of the Communists' plans for peace.

Mr. DA SILVA. Would you tell me what plans for peace you are in favor of in this country?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes, I could, but not here, because you have made many a speech here and you are not going to make any more as far as I am concerned.

Mr. DA SILVA. I see.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, any further questions?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. One further question, if you please. The Daily Worker dated July 8, 1937, at page 5, announced that Howard Da Silva would be a member of the cast of a play to be presented at the seventy-fifth birthday celebration of Mother Bloor. Did you take part in that celebration?

Mr. DA SILVA. Your purpose is very clearly indicated, to link me with organizations or people that you find in disfavor. I decline to answer this question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Will Geer?

Mr. DA SILVA. Will Geer? He is a fine actor. I have known him for years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he direct the play on the occasion that I mentioned?

Mr. DA SILVA. Which one again?

Mr. TAVENNER. The seventy-fifth birthday of Mother Bloor.

Mr. DA SILVA. Once again your purpose is to link Will Geer and me through an association that you find in disfavor with you. I will not

support that. I decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. Wood. The answer of the witness is that he declines to answer for the reasons stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Very well.

Mr. MARGOLIS. We would like to have this made a part of the record. This is merely a request that this objection which this witness started to read and which the committee did not permit him to complete be made a part of the record, so that it may be clear as to what grounds he stands on in refusing to answer these questions.

Mr. Wood. I have no objection to that.

(The statement referred to was filed in the records of the committee.)

Mr. Wood. That will be all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Gale Sondergaard.

Mr. Wood. Will you be sworn.

TESTIMONY OF EDITH HOLM (GALE) SONDERGAARD, ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS, AS COUNSEL

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

Miss SONDERGAARD. I do.

Mr. KENNY. For the record, the same objection to the witness being called at all which was made at the outset of the witness Da Silva is repeated in behalf of Miss Sondergaard at this time.

Mr. Wood. It will be included in the record.

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

Miss SONDERGAARD. My name is known professionally as Gale Sondergaard. I was born Edith Holm Sondergaard in Litchfield, Minn.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might be allowed to read a statement. I find it difficult to express myself, and I have worked this up.

Mr. Wood. Not until you have been examined. If you have a statement you want to file with the committee for the record after you have answered the questions that are asked you, you can leave it with the reporter.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are an actress by profession, I believe.

Miss SONDERGAARD. I am an actress by profession.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your married name?

Miss SONDERGAARD. My married name is Mrs. Herbert Biberman.

Mr. Wood. You are represented by the same counsel that represented the previous witness. We will dispense with the necessity of further identifying yourselves.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you are here in response to a subpoena as served on you on March 21, 1951, are you not?

Miss SONDERGAARD. That's true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please relate to the committee briefly your educational background?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Yes. I went to high school in Minneapolis, Minn. I graduated from the University of Minnesota. I attended the Minneapolis School of Dramatic Art.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief résumé of your employment background?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Yes. I began on a touring Shakespearean company. As a matter of fact, I began acting when I was still in college, during the summers. Then I would go back to school. Then I went on a Shakespearean tour. I worked with Jessie Bonstelle in Detroit for 2 years as her second lady and then her leading lady. I worked with the Theater Guild for a number of years as one of their acting company. I worked in many Broadway plays. I went to Hollywood and I have been there for the past 6 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What guilds or associations have you been identified with in Hollywood?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Guilds or associations?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Miss SONDERGAARD. Would you be a little more specific on that question, because I think the two names mean two different things.

Mr. TAVENNER. What organizations have you belonged to in Hollywood?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Chairman, before I came here I followed a great deal of the testimony of this committee, and I have read a long, long list of organizations which you on the committee and which other committees of our Government have branded as subversive organizations. I have a feeling if you will ask me what organizations I belonged to that you probably would like me to tie myself into one of these, and there I must refuse to answer this question on the grounds of the fifth amendment, that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Screen Actors' Guild?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I am a member of the Screen Actors' Guild. All actors must belong to the Screen Actors' Guild. It is a trade-union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there to your knowledge members of the Communist Party in that guild?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Chairman, I don't know anything about personnel of our guild. I know that we are all trade-union people. We belong together because we are professional workers in the motion-picture industry.

Mr. Wood. You were asked if to your knowledge there were any members of the Communist Party that were members of this guild since you belong to it.

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Chairman, obviously that question is designed to involve me, to incriminate me. I shall have to refuse to answer that question on the basis previously stated.

Mr. Wood. Do you so refuse?

Miss SONDERGAARD. What was that? Do I refuse? For the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you observed during the course of your membership in that guild an organization on behalf or on the part of the Communists to dominate or to advance the Communist Party within that organization?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Prosecutor, I know that there are a great many people—

Mr. Wood. Just answer the question.

Miss SONDERGAARD. I must refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Do you refuse to answer?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I said I did refuse.

Mr. WOOD. You must say you refuse to answer.

Miss SONDERGAARD. I am sorry. I didn't hear you.

Mr. WOOD. When you say you must refuse to answer, it isn't an answer. The question is: Do you answer?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I am sorry. I do mean that.

Mr. WOOD. For the reasons that you have given?

Miss SONDERGAARD. For the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with an organization called the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Chairman, again I must refer to your long list of organizations and refuse to answer that question on the basis previously stated. May I say something while we are waiting here about this business of suddenly branding every progressive and every progressive organization in our country, organizations which have done wonderful and fine work in the past, branding them as subversive? This I find very shocking and very saddening.

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

Miss SONDERGAARD. I refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Sondergaard, the committee is in possession of information which discloses that on December 1, 1944, you were registered as a Communist, and your card bore the number 47328 for the year 1945; that is, the card bore that number for the year 1945. Do you wish to deny or affirm that information or explain it?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you making a distinction in your own mind about this business of suddenly branding every progressive and every because those terms are often used interchangeably?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I refused to answer that question on the terms previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your Communist Party number in 1944 the number 46943?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are familiar, I assume, with an organization called the Motion Picture Artists' Committee?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that is on the long, long list of what are now known as subversive organizations, and I refuse to answer it for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a sponsor at any time of the League of Women Shoppers?

Miss SONDERGAARD. I refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to ask the witness this question, and I think that it calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer.

Do you believe a committee of Congress should investigate subversive activities or the security of our country?

Miss SONDERGAARD. Mr. Congressman, I do believe that a committee of Congress could and should do investigating work, but I do feel that this committee at this time is doing incriminating work much more than investigating work, and that is the reason I wish to object.

Mr. KEARNEY. You wouldn't like to go over some of our files, would you?

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Sondergaard, the records of the committee disclose that you served as a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Congress for World Peace which was held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, March 25 to 27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Is that correct?

Miss SONDERGAARD. It is a very odd thing that whenever the word "peace" comes up people begin to tremble. I must refuse to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of June 23, 1950, states that you were scheduled to speak at the rally on June 28, 1950, in Madison Square Garden under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress. On June 29, 1950, the newspaper stated that rally was staged in behalf of the 11 national Communist Party leaders who had been convicted of conspiracy to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, as well as in behalf of Eugene Dennis, Communist Party national secretary, who was jailed for contempt of Congress.

Other speakers on the program, according to the newspaper account, were identified as Gus Hall, who was one of the 11 convicted Communist Party leaders; the avowed Communist, Ben Gold; Paul Robeson, Vito Marcantonio, Ring Lardner, Jr., and Earl Coward.

I would like to ask you to tell us all you know about the selection of the speakers on that occasion and your participation in the program, if you will.

Miss SONDERGAARD. Is that a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. That is a request for you to give us that information.

Miss SONDERGAARD. There are many things I would like to say in regard to a thing like this, but because you have already branded this kind of a meeting, this kind of an organization, I refuse to answer for the reasons previously stated. I wonder if I could interpolate here the fact that I am the wife of Herbert Biberman, as you asked me before. Herbert Biberman was one of the Hollywood 10 who has very recently come out of prison for defending the first amendment before this committee. In my statement I have said that in 1937—may I go on?

Mr. Wood. No.

Miss SONDERGAARD. No? I just wanted that in the record.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions?

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

Mr. Wood. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MARGOLIS. May we also file with the committee a more complete statement of the objection or the basis for the refusal to answer these questions, in order that it may be a part of this record?

Mr. Wood. If you have the paper, you may file it with the committee.

(The statement referred to was filed with the records of the committee.)

Mr. Wood. The committee will resolve itself into executive session at this point. There will be no further open hearing this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 4 p. m., the committee met in executive session.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

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

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney (appearance as noted in transcript), 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, Courtney E. Owens, and James Andrews, investigators; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

It must be obvious to everyone here that the committee is operating under rather cramped conditions. I hope the audience will cooperate with us in maintaining order, without the necessity of calling it to your attention too often.

The quarters here are small and the space is very limited, and it will be very greatly appreciated if people in the audience will refrain from smoking, and certainly from audible conversation.

I will ask the members of the press and photographers taking pictures here to try to disturb the proceedings as little as possible.

Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are ready to proceed this morning with the continuance of the Hollywood hearings.

Mr. Wood. Let the record disclose that there are present members of the committee Walter, Moulder, Doyle, Velde, Jackson, Potter, and Wood.

Who is the first witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call at this time Mr. Sterling Hayden.

Mr. Wood. Is Mr. Hayden in the hearing room?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. Wood. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF STERLING HAYDEN

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Sterling Hayden?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. March 26, 1916, Montclair, N. J.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. HAYDEN. 10731 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 24.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state for the committee your educational background, just briefly?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, I went to public schools in Montclair, N. J., up until the time I was 10 years old. After that we started moving around, and I finished about half of my second year high school at various places in New England, and then quit and went to sea.

Mr. TAVENNER. How old were you when you went to sea?

Mr. HAYDEN. Fifteen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Fifteen?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean, you "went to sea"?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, I simply left home and started working on ships, and worked 7 years sailing vessels, fishing boats, and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. You followed that occupation for 7 years?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. That was my trade.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you become master of a ship?

Mr. HAYDEN. When I was 21 I finally got a master's license and took command of a ship and started making long voyages.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you become acquainted with a Capt. Warwick Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I met him when I was 14, in Boston, Mass. He had a schooner and I wanted to go to work on it, but he said I was too young. I never got to know him too well personally at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. After the completion of your experiences at sea, when you became ship master, what calling did you follow?

Mr. HAYDEN. Another fellow and I tried to operate a schooner. We didn't have much success. We lost the ship, finally. I was broke and in New York, and through accident I met a producer with Paramount and made a test and got a contract May 1, 1940, as an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you follow that occupation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, ever since, except for the war years. I left Hollywood in the fall of 1941 and returned to Hollywood under contract in the spring of 1946, so I was away for 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you were in Hollywood under your first contract between 1940 and 1941?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee how you obtained your first contract with Paramount?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, I was pretty much of a fluke. I had never given a thought to going into the acting profession, but the seafaring

thing was washed up, and I simply met a correspondent in Boston who knew a producer, and he told the producer about me, and he contacted me in New York and made a test, a very bad test, but it got me a contract with Paramount and I went to work as an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were on the west coast serving under this first contract, was Capt. Warwick Tompkins on the west coast also?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. He had at that time, I believe in 1938 or 1937, he had shifted his base of operations from Boston to San Francisco, therefore he was in San Francisco in 1940 when I first got out there.

I felt kind of lost in Hollywood, not really being an actor by inclination, and one time when I was feeling particularly low I decided to pay him a visit. I went to San Francisco and saw him. He at that time, or previously, had become, I believe, an open and avowed Communist. He made no bones about it. He talked about very little else, and he started to deluge me with propaganda.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It had never entered my head.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall meeting any other persons at that time who you either knew then or have found out since were members of the Communist Party, through your connections with Captain Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. On one of those visits, I believe probably that it was in 1941, while he was in San Francisco living on his ship, he said he wanted to introduce me to what he called, and I quote, "an old warrier in the class struggle," "Pop" Folkoff. I met him at a luncheon. I thought he was a retired tailor at that time. What he was, I don't know to this day. Who else I may have met that year, I don't remember too clearly.

Mr. TAVENNER. During your first contract in Hollywood, did you join any particular unions or groups?

Mr. HAYDEN. I joined the Screen Actors' Guild, as every actor does. That was all.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the way in which Captain Tompkins went about consulting with you regarding communism? Tell us a little more in detail about that.

Mr. HAYDEN. All right, sir. If I may change the word, I wouldn't say he consulted with me. I think he recognized I was at a peculiar stage in my life. I was sort of betwixt and between. The sea had always been my calling. This was now denied me, or I had denied myself it. I was feeling restless and dissatisfied in Hollywood. He used the device of talking and talking and asking why I didn't read more. I had never thought in political terms at all. That was another world, which I am not particularly proud of today.

Mr. TAVENNER. As I understand, your work in Hollywood was interrupted by your service during the period of the war?

Mr. HAYDEN. That it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us the circumstances under which you left Hollywood?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. But before doing that, have you been engaged in the production of any particular movies prior to your leaving Hollywood?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I made two pictures. I had only been in Hollywood 2 weeks when I was cast in second lead in *Virginia*, and a short while later in *Bahama Passage*.

All during the summer of 1941 I was churning inside, thinking about the war. I would like to claim, but I can't claim, I knew this country was in danger, but I knew something was going on, and I wanted to get in it.

In August 1941—I have the date here so I can give it to you exactly—it was September 15, 1941, I went to the heads of Paramount and said I would like to break my contract and leave for an indefinite length of time. They wanted to know why. I didn't know what to tell them. I said I didn't want to act, I didn't know what I wanted to do, I just wanted to leave. So I did leave. I went east.

I contacted Colonel Donovan, who was then Coordinator of Information. I knew him through his son, who had sailed around the world with me in a schooner. He said he was setting up an organization in which men would be needed to train American troops, or volunteers, because this was prior to Pearl Harbor, in guerrilla warfare, and one of the men thought it a good idea to go to England or Scotland.

I went to Scotland and trained with the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders 3 months, went to England, went to a parachute school, broke my ankle on the sixth jump, and came back to the United States. I was unable to continue with the training because of my broken ankle, and I did not want to be placed in some administrative capacity, so I went to the Elco Boat Works in Bayonne, N. J., and worked with test crews.

Then I was offered a commission as ensign in the Navy, which I declined because I thought I should have a higher rank, since I had been master of ships. I thought I could operate a schooner to the West Indies, because of the shortage of cargo vessels.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that during the period when the waters in that area were infested with German submarines?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there were quite a few down there, yes. So I went to the west coast, bought a half interest in a schooner, and hauled freight for the War Shipping Administration through the late summer and fall of 1942. This was rather a lucrative thing, really.

Mr. TAVENNER. How lucrative was it?

Mr. HAYDEN. If things went smoothly and efficiently, without any trouble, which was not all of the time, we stood to gross between \$8,000 and \$11,000 per voyage. We were taking detonators and explosives, the theory being it was better to put them on a small vessel, so if it was lost it wouldn't make much difference, rather than put them with the cargo on a large ship.

In October of that year I met with a bunch of marines in the West Indies, and it entered my head to enlist. I sold the schooner, went to New York, enlisted, and went to Parris Island. That started another phase. Shall I continue?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I would like a full statement of your record.

Mr. HAYDEN. I went through boot camp at Parris Island. At that time two men were selected out of each company for OSS at Quantico. I changed my name to John Hamilton. I changed it because I wanted to get away from Hollywood as much as possible. When I was in boot camp there seemed to be a good deal of curiosity about Hollywood. I changed my name. I was commissioned as second lieutenant. I went back to OSS. I don't know the exact date that the Coordinator of Information became OSS.

The OSS shipped us first to Cairo. We were supposed to go to Greece, but we were shipped to Bari, Italy. I went to Bari, and then began a long term of duty with the Yugoslav partisans there.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general character of your work with Partisans of Yugoslavia?

Mr. HAYDEN. It varied a good deal. They claimed they wanted supplies. The first assignment I had, the first day I arrived in Bari, was to coordinate the handling of a fleet of 28 or 30 schooners. Two weeks later I was placed in charge of the port at Monopoli, Italy. We built up the staff and operated these schooners across the Adriatic. I don't remember the exact dates, but we would frequently go off on reconnaissance expeditions along the coast, along the mainland, trying to get new routes. We got up to Trieste on one trip.

Along about the middle of spring—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt a minute. Will you go back and try to fix the date when you began your assignment at Bari and took over control of the port of Monopoli?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would say that was the 1st of December, the first week in December, let me say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what year?

Mr. HAYDEN. 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then try, as nearly as you can, to coordinate the narrative with dates.

Mr. HAYDEN. All right, sir. I would say we were in Monopoli 6 weeks to 2 months, and during that period of time I made 2 or 3 reconnaissance expeditions over into Yugoslavia.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of those?

Mr. HAYDEN. To find a more efficient route of supplies to the Partisan forces in the interior, to get the supplies through the German blockade to the forces fighting in the mountains.

Mr. TAVENNER. That means you had to pass a German sea blockade as well as a land blockade?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And your work was behind the German lines?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, it was, particularly later on when we were working in the interior. At that time we were operating along the periphery of the coast; more or less.

Before I got in the work on the interior, I was put in command, told to take a small fishing boat and operate it across the Adriatic. We could carry 5 to 6 tons of supplies, medical and other supplies, into Albania, islands off the Greek coast, and Yugoslavia. I think we made 18 or 20 trips before the E boats patrolling the coast really got wise to what was going on, and it became unhealthy. That operation was abandoned probably early in the summer of 1944.

The next step seemed to be to supply them by air, so we were flown in to various places in Bosnia, in Slovenia—I beg pardon. We never could get into Slovenia by air, so we were ordered to march into Slovenia. We had guides and they would take us through swamps where there was no liaison, and we tried to lay out an airfield to bring supplies through.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue in your work with the underground in Yugoslavia?

Mr. HAYDEN. Until late in November of that year, when I was sent home for a 30-day leave in the States.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period when you operated with the underground in Yugoslavia, will you tell us just how close your relationship was with the leaders and the rank and file of that movement?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, of course, being a very junior officer myself, I was a second lieutenant at that time, most of us were lieutenants, we didn't actually come in contact on an operative level with the so-called brass. We established a tremendously close personal feeling with these people. We had enormous, I would say unlimited, respect for the way they were fighting. I think that respect was reciprocated. We tried to do the best we could. We got quite steamed up by it. I myself was steamed up considerably by it. I had never experienced anything quite like that, and it made a tremendous impression on me. We knew they were Communist-led, we knew they had commissars, but there was very little discussion of that. We couldn't discuss those things very much because we didn't know the language.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were fighting a common foe at that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. That we were, and I think we conducted ourselves fairly well.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say your relationship with the Partisan movement had a deep effect upon you. What do you mean by that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Precisely this: As I have, I believe, mentioned, in 1940, when I was still an actor, and in 1941, I had had conversations with this man Tompkins. I wish I could describe my first reaction, because I think it would be typical of the experience so many people have had. I was appalled at the idea of what he was telling me about, but I did listen. He would give me literature, propaganda, and I would scan it briefly and burn it up.

When this Yugoslavia thing came up, I wrote to him. I began writing, "Maybe you were not so wrong. These people are doing a magnificent job." I thought I had better figure this thing out.

He, in turn, reciprocated by, I would say, bombarding me with Communist literature—People's World, Daily Worker, New Masses, and others I can't remember. I was impressed by the fact that the reports of that thing printed in the United States in this literature were accurate as regards the Partisans in Yugoslavia. Apparently the people in the States knew this. This had an effect on me because it made me conscious of what these people knew that apparently the rest of us didn't know. That was about the size of it at that time.

I engaged in quite a lot of correspondence with Tompkins at that time. I was all steamed up. We all were. I can remember in the interior of Yugoslavia when the crews of planes would leave their shoes, anything they could spare, with the Partisans, they were that impressed, and I don't think a GI impresses too easily as a rule. This had a strong emotional impact on all of us.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have political discussions with the Partisans or any groups of them?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I would honestly say not at all; not at all. Once in a while when we were back in Italy we would sit around and a few at Bari headquarters would talk a little bit about what was going on, but we never got very much involved in it. I remember a couple of times when I would have a story in some of this literature Tompkins sent me, I would show it to them, and they were very pleased.

There were no involved or detailed political discussions at all; not at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the final result and effect was upon you of the correspondence you were having with Captain Tompkins and the experience that you were undergoing in Yugoslavia in working with the underground?

Mr. HAYDEN. The final effect?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The net result?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us put it this way: What was the effect at that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. At that time—I am glad you put it that way—there was a sort of thing churning inside me that I didn't know how to handle, but it seemed there was something in this world that I ought to find out about. That was the net result of the whole thing.

When I got home on leave in December 1944, one of the first things I wanted to do, on a purely emotional basis, was go back and see Tompkins and talk to him about this thing, which I did. I flew out to the coast and basked in the reflected glory of the Partisan movement. Tompkins sort of showed me off as an exhibit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before leaving the Yugoslavian section of your testimony, were you recognized in any way by the Government of Yugoslavia or by the Partisans for your services in working with the underground?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was given a decoration called the Order of Merit. I haven't picked it up yet, but I have the citation. I guess it is at the Embassy. I don't know where it is. The medal itself, I don't know where it is, but I have in my files the citation, the Order of Merit, which I think came for the same operation for which I got a Silver Star.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the second highest decoration that could be awarded to a person of a foreign country, foreign to Yugoslavia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not sure of that. I have heard that it was, but I am not sure at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you received a Silver Star as a decoration?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in addition to the other decoration which you mentioned?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. On your return to the United States for your 30-day leave, did you again see Capt. Warwick Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the first thing I did. I didn't know where I was going to be sent. The Yugoslav situation seemed to be more or less under control at that time. They had gotten the Partisans a great deal more equipment and built them into some semblance of strength, so some of us were sent back to the States, and I was anxious to get in the same kind of work somewhere else. I didn't know where, but I hoped it would be possible to get into guerrilla outfits, because it is very interesting; it is stimulating; it is better than a lot of duty could be.

So I contacted Tompkins. Subsequently, through him, I contacted people in New York who I thought would know about guerrilla outfits elsewhere, as they had had accurate dope about Yugoslavia.

I flew out to San Francisco, met Tompkins, and for 5 or 6 days I was on a merry-go-round. He took me around and I talked ad nauseam about Yugoslavia, but they were apparently interested. I met a great many people, some of whom may or may not have been Communists. Some I know now were. At that time I wasn't paying too much attention to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you several questions in detail about that. You were the guest of Captain Tompkins on your trip to the west coast at that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether, on the day after your arrival there, you had dinner with three individuals, including Captain Tompkins, one of whom was Isaac Folkoff?

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember having dinner or lunch with this fellow called "Pop" Folkoff, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember where that lunch was held?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there some other person present at that luncheon with the three of you?

Mr. HAYDEN. I vaguely recall that there was, but I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his name?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know a person by the name of Baroway?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard the name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Leo Baroway?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard the name. You mean at that time, was this the man in question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I could not say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Isaac Folkoff was a functionary in the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not. I had the idea that he was in some way retired from the "struggle" at that time, as they put it, but from what I have heard since, this is open to question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe what else occurred on that trip, where you went and what you did while you were a guest of Tompkins'?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, I wish I could remember everything. I can remember a few incidents, but I don't mean to convey the idea that this is all that happened. We were on the go all the time. We went from place to place. Either at that time or on a subsequent visit he took me to the offices of the Daily People's World. I remember meeting Bill Schneiderman and Harrison George. I don't remember anyone else. We went to San Francisco and went aboard a Russian vessel and had a drink. It was all on a social basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you on that occasion meet a person by the name of Steve Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. I met Steve Nelson. I don't remember if I met him then or after the war. I know I met him either in December of that year, 1944, or after the war when I saw Tompkins again.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it was either the latter part of 1944 or the latter part of 1945 or early 1946?

Mr. HAYDEN. Or early 1946, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That you met Steve Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Regardless of which may be the correct date, will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you met Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was at a party, or rather a group get-together or gathering in someone's home in Oakland or in San Francisco one evening. There were 10 or 15 people sitting around. Nelson was one of them. I remember being introduced to him because he was supposed to be an outstanding figure.

Mr. TAVENNER. An outstanding figure in what capacity?

Mr. HAYDEN. In their world. I don't remember exactly what I was told he had done that made him outstanding, but I remember Tompkins saying to me in the car, "Steve Nelson will be there. He is quite a guy," or something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was the organizer for the Communist Party for Alameda County at that particular time?

Mr. HAYDEN. I didn't know that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall in whose home you met Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. Usually it was at the home of Tompkins' brother-in-law, a doctor whose last name slips me this minute. I can't think of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it Dr. Lyman?

Mr. HAYDEN. Dr. Lyman is right. Frequently when I was in San Francisco visiting Tompkins we would go see Tompkins' sister and brother-in-law. .

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Dr. Ellwood W. Lyman?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know it is Ellwood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember anything that took place at that meeting attended by Steve Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. I vaguely recall that they asked if I would say a few words about Yugoslavia, and I did. What I said was in the same vein as what I have said here today except at that time I was fresh from the place and was talking on that basis, you might say.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain as the guest of Captain Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think 5 or 6 days.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you returned to the east coast?

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I returned to Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you returned to Washington did you bring any Communist Party literature or documents with you?

Mr. HAYDEN. I may have. I think every time I ever saw Tompkins I would end up with, if not an armful, at least a handful of pamphlets, so I probably had some with me that I was going to read in the plane or carry with me; I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee your best opinion as to the effect of this trip upon you, that is, the trip when you were the guest again of Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, I was at that time, I think, trying to look ahead, figure out what I wanted to do after the war. I didn't know if I wanted to go back to Hollywood or not. I felt a sort of reluctance to accepting what seemed to me to be the very lucrative and easy life

Hollywood had offered me before and probably would again. I think the main thing was, it planted a seed in me that said if I could do something about the conditions of the world I could probably justify my position as an actor with a good salary and good working conditions. This wasn't concrete, but it was something boiling inside of me.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do when you went back to New York?

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember I went back to OSS headquarters, and my future assignment had not been determined, and it seemed to me that inasmuch as the Communist press had analyzed Tito accurately, they might know of other guerrilla outfits such as the Partisans.

I wrote or wired Tompkins asking who I could contact in New York, and he wired me to contact V. J. Jerome in New York. I picked up the phone and called the Daily Worker office and I said, "This is Lt. John Hamilton, United States Marine Corps. I would like to talk to V. J. Jerome."

There was some consternation at the other end of the line, and I was told if I was in New York later to call again, which I did. Jerome said we could meet at the Golden Eagle Cafe on West Twelfth Street just off Fifth Avenue.

I went in and sat at the bar. About half an hour later a man scuttled through the back room and I thought, "This must be Jerome." I looked at him. He looked at me. I walked up, introduced myself, and sat down. My purpose was to find out if he had any idea where there were other guerrilla movements going on. He wouldn't talk to me. I think he was suspicious. I got nowhere that day.

I called and talked to a man named Joe North, whom he had mentioned to me. I went up and talked to him in this building that I guess was headquarters for the whole caboodle. There was general conversation. Nothing constructive came out of it whatsoever, as I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also go see a person by the name of Allan Chase, who is an avowed Communist, having been a candidate for Congress on the Communist ticket?

Mr. HAYDEN. I met him. I think even prior to my trip to see Tompkins I had met him. I didn't know until you told me that he was an open Communist. I didn't know he was a Communist. I thought possibly he was. He was particularly interested in the situation in Spain. He talked about that angle of it, the fact there was a movement there, the remnants of a movement in there, and I met friends of his at his apartment near Central Park, and so forth and so on.

As nearly as I can recall, I went back to Washington and talked to someone in OSS, and talked about the possibility of going to Spain. They said there were already men in Spain. They said I would be sent to Paris. I went to Paris and was attached directly to the First Army Headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to having met a number of Allan Chase's friends. Was communism discussed with his friends?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. Communism was never discussed. Communism per se was never discussed to the best of my recollection. There was a discussion of the war going on and the role in it of the guerrillas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet any other Communists while you were in New York?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to my knowledge. The only two I met that I considered Communists were V. J. Jerome and Joe North. I thought possibly Chase was connected, but I didn't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any connection, or attempt to make any connection, with the underground in Spain after you arrived in Paris?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. When I went overseas I had two or three letters of introduction from friends of Chase to be used in case I got into Spain. I don't remember what I did with these letters. As soon as I got to Paris I was told to get into a jeep and go to Belgium, which I did, and I guess I threw the letters away or burned them; I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your work in Belgium?

Mr. HAYDEN. OSS detachment, G-2 headquarters. The work at the detachment was in two levels: First, on an operational level, to infiltrate German civilians or German prisoners who had indicated a desire to work with the Allies back through the lines; and the thing I became particularly active in was—Col. B. A. Dickson was anxious to find out if there were any guerrilla anti-Nazi elements that were liberated as we went along that we could contact. I had a team of six or eight men, American Army personnel, who spoke German. We worked together quite closely, and went to Marburg, Germany, which is where we were on VE-day. We didn't meet many anti-Nazis that I remember.

To follow chronologically, after VE-day I returned to Paris and was told to take a photographic team, consisting initially of two or three photographers, and make a photographic study of all the ports of northern Europe, including Germany, Denmark, and Norway, which we did. This occupied us for quite a long period of time. We covered almost all of Norway, all of Denmark, all of Germany, and at that time I was sent back to the States and discharged.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the time of your second assignment on the German front, what was your connection with Capt. Warwick Tompkins? Did you continue to obtain Communist literature and propaganda from him?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I kept in touch with him. I think I kept writing to him. I was still fired up by the Yugoslav thing and so on. I kept up a desultory correspondence with him, and I presume he continued to send me Communist newspapers and literature. I don't remember, actually.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was your assignment terminated?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, let's see. I was discharged the 24th of December 1945. I think I returned to the States the end of November. Actually, I tried to find a record of that and couldn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do upon arriving in the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. As soon as I was discharged I sort of cast about for something to do. At that time I remember there were two forces working inside me. One was to go back to sea; and the other was this political thing. At that time, I would like to say—and this is accurate to the best of my recollection—it had never occurred to me to join the Communist Party. It had never occurred to me. It seemed this whole

thing had introduced me to a new world that up to that time I had never known.

I tried to raise money to get a schooner. I couldn't raise the money. Then someone in Paramount contacted me to sign a new contract. I said, "O. K. Here we go."

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Russell Holman, of Paramount's New York office.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that prior to your leaving the east coast for the west coast?

Mr. HAYDEN. We made the deal in New York. I then went out to Nevada, where I got a divorce from my then wife, Madelaine Carroll, and then went to San Francisco and spent 6 weeks with Tompkins, and then reported to Paramount in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Holman know of your past associations and connection with Capt. Warwick Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. I doubt that he did. He may have. I don't think he did. I don't know. I am sure that everybody I saw at that time, I talked to them about this Yugoslav thing. What came out of the conversations, I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time of your second employment by the moving-picture industry, did your employer have any knowledge, as far as you know, of your associations with other Communist functions in California, such as William Schneiderman and Isaac Folkoff?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I think that was more or less lost in the shuffle of the war. There was so much going on, and I was fortunate enough to come out of the war better, publicitywise or otherwise, and they felt I had done pretty well in the war and let it go at that. There was no detailed analysis of what happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of your signing the contract in New York, you went to the west coast. At that time, did you see Capt. Warwick Tompkins again?

Mr. HAYDEN. I saw him as soon as I left Nevada. I returned to Hollywood by way of San Francisco and spent some time with him on his schooner there. I don't remember how long.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would say it was approximately the last week in March 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. What occurred on the occasion of this visit to Captain Tompkins?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't remember anything in particular. Yes; one thing. He said he wanted to write a book about me. He was a very good writer. He had written for yachting magazines and had written several books with no political content whatever, and he thought it would be a good idea to write a biography of my life, and the slant he wanted to give it was, "The development of a typical nonpolitical American youth into a militant participant in the class struggle," something like that. I said O. K.; O. K.

So I went down to Hollywood and purchased a boat which I lived on, made my home on. Shortly thereafter, I would say in April, possibly the latter part of April or first of May, for 3 weeks he came on the schooner with me and took notes copiously. He followed me wherever I went on the boat, and eventually he got 75,000 words written on the story before I "came to" sufficiently to call on him one day and call the whole thing off.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it you called it off? It was quite sometime later, I suppose?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it was a long time later; a long time later.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before we go into that, I would like to know what occurred in the meantime. After your arrival in Hollywood, did you become associated with any particular organizations there?

Mr. HAYDEN. I joined the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You joined the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances leading up to your actually becoming a card-carrying member, or dues-paying member, of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I will. As I began to operate around and move around Hollywood, I continued to talk, I would say almost incessantly, about this thing built up in me in Yugoslavia and the feeling I wanted to do something for a better world. That is a cliché expression, but I think it is accurate.

Through Tompkins I was put in contact with a woman, Bea Winters. One day she said to me, "Why don't you stop talking and join the Communist Party?"

I clearly remember my first reaction, which was, "This is ridiculous." However, I went ahead. She had a paper which I signed. I don't know whether I signed Sterling Hayden or John Hamilton. John Hamilton was my legal name. I know I signed one of the two names, and was almost immediately accepted into the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Bea?

Mr. HAYDEN. B-e-a.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed?

Mr. HAYDEN. She was a secretary in the office of my agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of your agent?

Mr. HAYDEN. Berg-Allen Berg, Inc.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that agency in existence today?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has since become amalgamated or merged with the William Morris office.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Bea Winters' membership in the Communist Party was known to the agency?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is safe to say it was not, or she wouldn't have been employed there.

Mr. TAVENNER. How is she employed now, do you know?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard she was secretary to a producer. I can't think of his name.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, will you fix the date when he joined the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Can you fix the date when you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. As nearly as I can remember—and I have no record of it at all—it was approximately between the 5th and 15th of June 1946, but that may not be accurate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time were you acquainted with Bea Winters?

Mr. HAYDEN. Prior to this?

Mr. TAVENNER. Both prior and subsequently.

Mr. HAYDEN. I had known her before the war when she was with the Berg-Allen Berg Agency. Nothing political was ever discussed.

I saw her again after the war, and I believe it was Tompkins who told me she was very active politically. Then began the political phase of the association, you might say.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you acquainted with her after you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. She was a member of the cell or group that I was assigned to up until the time that I broke with them, which was in December of that same year, 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what group of the Communist Party were you assigned upon your first joining the party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was told that for security reasons I should not be with any prominent people in any phase of endeavor at all in the motion-picture industry, but should be with people known as back-lot workers, carpenters, electricians, and so forth, and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain that a little further, about security? Security for whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. Security for me, I presume. It was never discussed very much. I believe this cell was composed primarily of people from Universal, RKO, Columbia, and Paramount, but these people were never known to me by their last names. It was only first names. Everybody called everybody else comrade.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many composed that cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know what the official membership was, but an average meeting would have from 10 to 22 or 23 people. I think they were happy if they had more than 8.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the officers?

Mr. HAYDEN. When I first joined there was a man who functioned as secretary, whose last name I do not know, whose first name was Hjalmar.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell it?

Mr. HAYDEN. H-j-a-l-m-a-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know. I don't know how he was employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know by whom he was employed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I couldn't say for sure, no. I was going to say I thought he was at Paramount, but I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he lived?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no idea, although I may have gone to his house. I went to different houses by address. I don't know if I ever went to his house, though it is likely I did. He functioned as secretary. He kept records, collected dues, and so forth and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom did you pay your dues?

Mr. HAYDEN. To him.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your dues?

Mr. HAYDEN. The same as everybody else. They were computed on a percentage of salary, but I was not included in the percentage deal. I paid what everybody else paid. It seems to me it was \$1.75, \$2, or \$2.50 a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of anybody else who were members of that group?

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember the names Bernie and Frank. I never knew their last names. I knew Bea Winters, of course.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of that same group?

Mr. HAYDEN. She was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how Bernie was employed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he lived?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know that. I don't think I ever went to his house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say a person named Frank?

Mr. HAYDEN. Somebody named Frank.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you able to identify any of these people by any manner to the committee, as to how they were employed and where, or where they lived, that might lead to a discovery of who they actually are?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only the man named Bernie, from the way he conducted himself; I would say he was employed in a white-collar capacity. He was more of an intellectual type than the others. He frequently would hold a discussion on the dialectical phases of communism, and so forth and so on.

(Representatives Doyle, Velde, and Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. HAYDEN (continuing). All the rest seemed to me to be employed as back-lot workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of any of the persons in whose homes the meetings were held?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, because when a meeting broke up somebody would say, "We will meet next Friday night at such and such a time at such an address." I would write down the address. I wasn't sure whose house it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know an individual by the name of Abe Polonsky?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The meetings were frequently held at Abe's house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of this group?

Mr. HAYDEN. He was later. About the time I terminated he began to show up at meetings. In the early stages of the proceedings he did not sit in on these meetings as I remember it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you as a member of the Communist Party, from your association with him?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he currently a writer for Twentieth Century-Fox?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know who he is writing for. I don't know anything about him.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Counsel, will you suspend for a moment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Let the record disclose that the number of committee-men in attendance has been reduced, and that there are now present members of the committee Walter, Moulder, Potter, and Wood, being less than a quorum. By virtue of authority vested in me under the resolution creating this committee, I hereby establish a subcommittee to proceed with the hearing until a quorum returns.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give any further information you have as regards Abe Polonsky and his activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. In all honesty, I know little on that score. Initially, I had the feeling he was involved elsewhere. While the meetings were held at his house, he was seldom present until 2 or 3 months had elapsed, after which he began to appear fairly regularly,

and after that functioned as sort of head of the group. Outside of that, I know nothing of his activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Robert Lees?

Mr. HAYDEN. Robert Lees was a member of this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he meet on more than one occasion with this same group?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. How often do you think he was there while you were there?

Mr. HAYDEN. I could only guess, and I don't like to guess on things like this. I would say 10 or 12 times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether you met at his home on any occasion?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think we did on one occasion.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of the holding of these meetings for this particular group that you were assigned to?

Mr. HAYDEN. The over-all purpose was simply that these people were Communists and they met to discuss what was going on. In a meeting the discussion would usually be split up into what was going on in the industry that concerned them, and then part of the meeting would be devoted to the world situation, theoretical diagnoses, and so forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, part of the time was devoted to the study of the principles of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue in that cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the only cell I ever belonged to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any particular assignment while you were a member of that cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. After about—and here, again, I do not remember the date. It wouldn't be hard to fix it, because sometime the latter part of that summer or early in the fall the Conference of Studio Unions, which is a sort of amalgamation of locals in the industry, went out on strike. At that time the focal point of interest became the prosecution of this stand that these people had taken.

I was told that it would be very helpful and important if the Screen Actors' Guild could be swung into line in support of this strike.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were told that by whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know; somebody in this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was a Communist order or suggestion?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the way it came to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. It came to you in a Communist meeting by members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. So I went first—and I don't remember who told me to go to it—to a large cocktail party where 60 or 70 people interested in this phase of endeavor, you might say, were present, and through this initial meeting I began to meet a group of actors and actresses who all felt the same way. This was a very loose category of people, however.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the group with whom you were directed to work?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I still attended meetings with this same group, but they told me I should be concerned primarily with actors, and they thought I should contact the Screen Actors' Guild for support of the

position of the Conference of Studio Unions, and I was told to associate with these people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were working for the same purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. It coincided. I would like to say at this point, there were a great, great many people involved here. I don't know what percentage of the actors and actresses involved were a long, long, long way from being Communists in any sense of the word, so far as I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have given a list of the persons connected with that movement to the investigators of this committee, have you not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I have; to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any of that group whom you can identify as members of the Communist Party, to your knowledge? I am not asking you for names of people generally who were with you in this project, unless they were known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand. I wouldn't hesitate to say Karen Morley, inasmuch as in 1947, a long time after I had completely severed any and all connections with any form of Communist activities or endeavor, she came to me and asked me to come back, so I certainly think it is safe to assume that she was a member. Over and above that, it would have to get into the realm of conjecture, which, frankly, I am somewhat doubtful of.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want you to go into the field of conjecture.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

(Representative Doyle returns to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I want to ask you a few more questions about this meeting which you were directed to attend in carrying out your Communist Party obligations. You said there were 50 or more people present, as I understood you?

Mr. HAYDEN. There were 60 or 70 people there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that group narrow down to a comparatively few who actually functioned?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would say there was a nucleus that would attend meetings more regularly. When there were gatherings to see what could be done, there were certain people who would appear more regularly. There were people on the periphery, on the edge, who would be there sometimes; and other people were there more regularly.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did you meet to work on that enterprise?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would say once or twice a week.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Karen Morley meet with you?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these meetings held?

Mr. HAYDEN. Some were held at Karen Morley's house. Some were held at a house owned by a man named Morris Carnovsky, who, I might say, was never present. And others were held at homes which I only knew at that time by address.

(Representative Jackson returns to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Lloyd Gough?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. G-o-u-g-h, is that the correct spelling of the name?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he attend those meetings?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge on your own part as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, I would say it would probably be safe to assume that he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want you to assume it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have absolutely, categorically, no knowledge that he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Howard da Silva?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he attend those meetings?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any personal knowledge as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only in his behavior before this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that you withdrew or terminated your connection with the Communist Party the same year in which you joined it?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what led up to the termination of your relationship with the Communist Party, and whether your break was an actual break and a final break with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Thank you very much. That I would like to do.

As I think is abundantly clear—and I don't make any apology—I do not mean to imply that I was dragged into the thing in any way, shape, or manner. I went into the thing voluntarily. Certainly I think it was the stupidest, most ignorant thing I have ever done, and I have done a good many such things, but I did go into it with a very emotional and very unsound approach. I hadn't been in very long—I would say it took me 3 or 4 months to realize the true nature of what I had done.

I would like to say at this time, without launching into a long dissertation on this thing, that one thing that decided me once and for all against the whole business was the manner in which everything is predetermined. I think I had become susceptible to and, in a sense, perhaps, a victim of the idea that they had a form of democracy in mind. That was in my mind during the Yugoslav days and the time I joined. I found the belief is that they have the key, by some occult power, to know what is best for people, and that is the way it is going to be. I think any Communist or pseudo-Communist who pretends it is other than this is falsifying the fact.

When I learned about this and began to think about it and digest it a bit, I decided to get out, and I got out.

I would like to take this opportunity, if I may, to briefly state for the record a sort of synopsis of my complete association with anything that was Communist or might be construed as Communist front. I would like to lump it and say categorically that is all there is to it, and anybody who insinuates it is not, is mistaken.

I belonged to this cell that I mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. First let me ask: Have you become a member of any other organizations since you terminated your relationship with

the Communist Party which has been cited as a Communist front, or has had Communist Party leanings, so far as you know?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know of one instance, and I would like to set that straight. There was an outfit in Hollywood, the Committee for the First Amendment, formed in October 1947. I broke once and for all with the Communist thing in December 1946. Actually, the break coincided with the fact I was living on my boat in Santa Barbara.

That summer my wife and I went East, on the coast of Maine, and when we came back I had a call from Alexander Knox saying this Committee for the First Amendment was being formed, and would I join. I said I would think it over.

I was told who was sponsoring it, spearheading it. I thought it over very carefully, and I assured myself—I may be wrong, but my conclusion was that this was in no way a Communist front at that time.

So I joined, and I came to Washington in the fall, I think, October of that year, 1947.

I would like to go on with the people who did join. I think you are probably familiar with the membership list of that organization, and if it has since been determined that this thing was spearheaded by Communists, believe me these people didn't know it. The people who lent their names and gave money to this Committee for the First Amendment, to the best of my knowledge certainly had no idea that it was a Communist front, any more than I had.

That is the one thing which, as you said, has been cited.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were those who spearheaded the Committee for the First Amendment, to your knowledge?

Mr. HAYDEN. The first name that comes to mind is Humphrey Bogart, and his wife. It would be hard for me to remember. I wish I had a list. I know it runs into hundreds of so-called Hollywood names. I know there was a tremendous gathering at Ira Gershwin's house at which a couple of hundred people were present. The spokesmen were John Huston and Phil Dunne. It is common knowledge all the people who flew East at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you in the course of your statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would like to go on and sum this thing up once and for all, if I may.

I did belong to the Communist Party from June until the middle of December 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you joined the Communist Party, were you advised by anyone that to do so would improve your chance of promotion in Hollywood?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I was not. On the contrary, I had certain reservations in my mind and I kept pretty quiet, I kept completely quiet, about my association with the Communist Party. I didn't think it would help me in any way, shape, or manner; on the contrary.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of your experience in Hollywood, did you at any time become acquainted with any Communist activity on the part of any high official of the motion picture industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, there was one instance. Shortly after I joined, I would say in July, Bea Winters said there was an important man who would like to come and talk with me. We met at the restaurant Victor's on Sunset Boulevard. He came in. I don't know the name

by which he was introduced to me. After reading certain newspaper stories subsequent to this event I figured his name was John Stapp. I know he was introduced as John.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-t-a-p-p?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I think he has other names. He asked what made me think I wanted to be a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Hollywood motion picture industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, possibly from my question it might have been misinterpreted. He was a high functionary in the Communist Party!

Mr. HAYDEN. I was told he was an important man.

Mr. TAVENNER. But not in the Hollywood motion picture industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't think he was in any way employed in the industry; not in any way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Go ahead with your experience.

Mr. HAYDEN. With John Stapp?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. He asked why I had joined, and I went into the Yugoslavia thing. He asked if I had any militant trade-union background, and I said I did not. The conversation was more or less parallel with the conversation I had with Jerome, where I figured he was doing some calculating. He didn't say anything to me at all. I think he said he doubted that I would make a good Communist, but I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Going back to my original question, did any knowledge come to you at any time of activities on the part of any high-ranking official in the Hollywood motion picture industry that would indicate Communist Party membership on the part of any such individual?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I think of nothing whatsoever in connection with that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Edward G. Robinson?

Mr. HAYDEN. I met Mr. Robinson backstage at a rally for Israel one evening, and chatted with him a couple of minutes before he made a speech.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he attend any Communist Party meetings which you attended?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Please proceed to sum up what you had in mind saying.

Mr. HAYDEN. I mentioned the cell, which lasted for 5 or 6 months.

There was the activity in this minority group within the Screen Actors' Guild.

As soon as I got back in Hollywood I joined the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, HICCASP. I paid dues through December. I never participated in a single thing in their behalf.

I joined the American Veterans' Committee at the same time. I made two speeches for them on Yugoslavia, one in Pomona and one in Santa Barbara. I spoke on the fighting in Yugoslavia.

Then there is the Committee for the First Amendment, which I suppose could be construed as such since it has since been cited as a front organization.

And as I indicated earlier, this is the total, without reservation or limitation.

I have a brief list of contributions which I wanted to put in.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the organizations to which you contributed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I contributed \$100 to HICCASP.

Three hundred dollars, one check, to Abe Polonsky. As I remember, this was for the families of the strikers in the CSU. That may be wrong. It may have been for the Communist Party.

I paid my Communist Party dues.

I paid my AVC dues, \$2.75 per month.

I paid my HICCASP dues.

I once gave Tompkins \$75 for the People's World when they were trying to keep on printing.

That was the total.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were all these contributions made prior to your leaving the party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Except for \$100 to the Committee for the First Amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have indicated that after your relationship with the Communist Party was severed, that Karen Morley came to you and asked you to come back into the party.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee the entire transaction as it occurred?

Mr. HAYDEN. She came to our house. I had remarried in June of that year. She came to our house, I believe, right after or before the Committee for the First Amendment was formed. She came and said she wanted me to consider coming back in, and I said, "There is nothing to be considered. This is it. There is nothing to discuss" and so forth and so on.

As she left the house I took her out to the front hall, and she said, "I hope you realize that having made that decision, it will be extremely hard for you to ever get back in." And I said, "Nothing will please me more." That ended it.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the conversation, was anything said about your becoming a passive member?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I forgot that. She said, "Since you don't want to be an active member, will you contribute money?" I said, "No."

(Representative Velde returns to the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, in Hollywood there is such a thing as a passive membership, or a contributing membership, without attending meetings and so forth?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any instance in which that type of membership is being maintained?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have cooperated with the committee by telling the investigators, in advance of this hearing today, what you have known of communism in your own life and in Hollywood. Have you

taken any other action besides that which would indicate good faith on your part in the break which you claim you have made with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe I have. One month after South Korea was invaded, through my attorney, a letter was sent to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, in which was set forth the fact that for a period of 5 to 6 months I had been a member of the Communist Party, and with the world going the way it was, it seemed entirely probable that a conflagration would develop, and I hope, if that was the case, my services would not be denied, if the Marine Corps could use me, on the basis of this mistake I had made.

I have a photostatic copy of that letter I would like to produce or read for the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Suppose you produce it and read it into the record.

Mr. HAYDEN. (Reading:)

JULY 31, 1950.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention Mr. J. Edgar Hoover)

DEAR SIR: This office has a client who has discussed with us a problem which I believe can only be answered through your organization.

In June of 1946 this young man, in a moment of emotional disturbance, became a bona fide member of the Communist Party in the State of California. In November of 1946 he decided that he had made a mistake and terminated his membership and his association with the Communist Party. Ever since November of 1946 this client has had no connection whatsoever with the Communist Party or with an organization affiliated with it.

The gentleman in question is an American-born citizen with a distinguished war record. He enlisted in the Marine Corps as a private and received his termination as a captain. Because of his distinguished services he received the Silver Star medal with citation from the commanding general, Mediterranean Theater of Operations, United States Army. The citation recognized his gallantry in action in the Mediterranean Theater of Operations with the United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Our client is not engaged in any activity where security is involved. However, since the commencement of the operation in Korea, he has felt that the time may come, in the near future, when his services might be of aid to the United States. He is concerned with the fact that his brief membership in the Communist Party, as aforesaid, may operate to prevent the use of his services.

In addition to the foregoing, he is married and has young children. If his services are not needed by the United States, conditions may develop so as to require an answer in connection with ordinary employment to the query: "Are you now or have you ever been a Communist?"

Our client can, of course, answer honestly and frankly that he is not now a member of the Communist Party. He could not answer the rest of the compound question without (a) either lying, or (b) if he told the truth he would probably find himself unable to earn a living.

While it must be admitted that a mistake was made in 1946, it does appear that justice requires some method by which one mistake does not operate (a) to prevent the United States from making use of the services of our client, (b) to prevent our client from earning a living.

He is perfectly willing to submit to any interrogation or examination by the Federal Bureau of Investigation so that that organization may be convinced of his sincerity and of the truth of all the statements related herein.

The purpose of this, of course, is to permit our client, if the compound question is asked him, to say in answer to the question, "Please inquire of the Federal Bureau of Investigation." The Federal Bureau of Investigation could then notify the prospective employer that there was no reason for not employing our client.

We would appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

GANG, KOPP & TYRE,
By MARTIN GANG.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was a reply received from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I have that here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read it into the record?

Mr. HAYDEN (reading):

AUGUST 15, 1950.

Mr. MARTIN GANG:

401 Taft Building, Los Angeles 28, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of July 31, 1950, has been received and I want to thank you for making these facts available to me. I have given your letter careful consideration and I am fully cognizant of the problem which confronts you and your client.

I regret to inform you, however, that it has been a long-standing policy of this Bureau not to grant a clearance to any person and I am, therefore, unable to assist you in the manner which you suggest.

May I suggest, however, that inasmuch as this Bureau has primary investigative jurisdiction of matters concerning the internal security of our country, it is considered advisable that your client furnish our Los Angeles office with details concerning his membership in the Communist Party together with the nature of the party activities during that period.

In order to comply with this request may I suggest that you contact Mr. R. B. Hood, special agent in charge of our Los Angeles office, 900 Security Building, Los Angeles 13, Calif., in order to arrange for an interview of your client.

Very truly yours,

(S) J. E. HOOVER,
JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, Director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you report as requested in that letter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I did. I don't remember just how soon after we received this letter from Mr. Hoover. I believe it was early in August. And subsequently I met with them on two other occasions and discussed the thing in complete detail as I have today.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you anything further you desire to add?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think we have covered the ground pretty well. I would like to say that I appreciate very much, very, very much, the opportunity to appear here today. I think that there is a tremendous service to be rendered, not only to the country at large but to the motion-picture industry and also to those individuals who find themselves in a similar position to mine.

I have heard that there are many, many thousands—I have heard there are hundreds of thousands—of ex-Communists who don't know what to do about it. I would like, if it is not presumptuous, to suggest in all humility that perhaps some provision could be made by law to permit people who had had a similar experience to make their position known and clear, so that they could get this thing off their chest, because, believe me, it is a load to carry around with you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I might say, in that connection, that the chairman of this committee, in a broadcast not along ago, invited those who were in this category to make that fact known to this committee, and they would keep it in confidence if that was desired, but to make known their participation so that it would be a matter of record now as to just what their participation had been, and there has been a very fine response to that.

Mr. HAYDEN. I didn't realize that.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to ask a question about this Committee for the First Amendment. What representations were made to you

concerning the need for an organization to protect the first amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. HAYDEN. As I recall it, the basic premise of the organization was that a man was entitled to whatever political beliefs he might have, and that nobody could inquire into them. I think that this was the idea they had in mind at the time.

Mr. WALTER. That is all.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Hayden, in reference to your last statement, I believe you said you are very, very grateful to the committee for the opportunity to get this thing off your chest. Then you added, "Believe me, it is a load." What did you mean by that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, conditions, of course, it seems to me, from my personal experience, were a great deal different in 1946 than today. As I have indicated, I went into the thing of my own free will, impulsively, stupidly, but I did get into it. When I realized I was wrong, I got out.

Mr. DOYLE. What happened to cause you to come to the conclusion you had committed error?

Mr. HAYDEN. One of the prime things was taking refuge in certain amendments to the Constitution. At that time I was pretty much of a greenhorn, but as soon as I realized the Communists were taking refuge under the amendments to our Constitution that they under no circumstances would permit others to take—

Mr. DOYLE. Taking refuge from what?

Mr. HAYDEN. Taking refuge in the fifth amendment or the first amendment and considering that their political connections could not be questioned.

Mr. DOYLE. What led you to believe they were taking refuge in the first and fifth amendments?

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe in this investigation certain people have stood on the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. That is only in the last year or so.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. And you resigned from the Communist Party in 1946.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. That is 4 years ago. What did you discover prior to the time you resigned which caused you, if anything did cause you, to come to the conclusion that you could not consistently continue longer as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. One thing was when I became aware of the totalitarian idea of communism, which had been obscured by the fog in the war years.

Mr. DOYLE. I believe you testified when you accepted Bea Winters' invitation to join the Communist Party, the meetings of the cell indicated, did they not, the totalitarian nature of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; they did; but, unfortunately, it took some time for my awareness of this to overcome the initial headway I had built up.

Mr. DOYLE. When you say you discovered the totalitarian nature of the Communist Party, what do you mean by that? What does "totalitarian nature of the Communist Party" mean to you that caused you to resign?

Mr. HAYDEN. That a very few people, or a certain group of people, know what is best for the majority, and the will of the majority has no bearing on what is done for the majority. That, I believe, is wrong.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you discover at any time that the Communist Party was encouraging devious ways to upset or overthrow or overcome, by force if necessary, the republican form of government that we have under our Constitution in the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly believe that to be the case.

Mr. DOYLE. When did you come to that conclusion?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't remember the exact time.

Mr. DOYLE. Approximately?

Mr. HAYDEN. Approximately at the time I severed my connection.

Mr. DOYLE. That was when? You might have testified to that when I was out of the room voting.

Mr. HAYDEN. December 1946.

Mr. DOYLE. As I say, I had to go out of the room to vote, so I didn't have the benefit of hearing your full testimony. I left the room just at the time you were testifying that Bea Winters was a member of a cell with you. So I don't know if you told the names of other members of that cell, or those whom you know as Communists.

Mr. HAYDEN. To the best of my knowledge I did.

Mr. DOYLE. Was that question asked, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, and his answer was he knew them only by their first names with the exception of two, Abe Polonsky and Robert Lees, whom he identified.

Mr. DOYLE. Were the members of this cell all men?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; men and women.

Mr. DOYLE. About what proportion?

Mr. HAYDEN. Two-thirds men and one-third women.

Mr. DOYLE. How many members in the cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. There were from 10 to 23 or 25.

Mr. DOYLE. How often did they meet?

Mr. HAYDEN. Weekly.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they have a regular meeting place?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was at a different house almost every week. Several meetings were held at the house of a man named Abe Polonsky.

Mr. DOYLE. Were members of the cell all actors or actresses?

Mr. HAYDEN. None of them were actors or actresses.

Mr. DOYLE. You were an actor?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I was. As I said, I was told when my application was accepted that I would be put in a cell of back-lot people.

Mr. DOYLE. I believe you said they were carpenters, electricians, and so on?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Didn't you recognize some of them by name? They were all in the industry, weren't they?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, they were all in the industry, but it is a large industry. There are 20,000 to 30,000 people in the industry, I believe.

Mr. DOYLE. And you associated with those people in that cell from what date?

Mr. HAYDEN. About the first week of June.

Mr. DOYLE. Until December 1946?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Then it is your testimony that from June 1946 to December 1946 you associated weekly with members of the cell at meetings, and you only know the names of two members of the cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. We met 2 to 3 months on this basis, at which time I was put in touch with a group of actors and actresses trying to swing the Screen Actors' Guild in line with a strike then in progress. I then met very infrequently with this initial cell.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever receive any literature from Tompkins or anyone else which, in printed form, made any declaration or stated any policy or objective that caused you to conclude that the Communist Party, of which you later became a member, was interested in revolution against the American form of government?

Mr. HAYDEN. As I recall, it was always couched in other terms. I think a more perceptive person would have seen it. I did not at the time.

Mr. DOYLE. You believe the literature you received from Tompkins did advocate the overthrow of the American form of government?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that was the ultimate objective; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you have any of that literature now?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know where any of it could be had?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I know it used to be out in plain sight in some of the book stores.

Mr. DOYLE. Can you identify any of those book stores by name or location?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot offhand.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you think your memory could be refreshed?

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your question?

Mr. DOYLE. My question was whether or not the witness now recalled the name or location of any book stores which carried Communist literature which the witness states he now realizes advocated the overthrow of our American form of government.

Were any of them in Hollywood?

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember a book store, I don't know if it is in existence any more; the Lincoln Book Store, I think it was. I don't know where it was.

Mr. DOYLE. When was that?

Mr. HAYDEN. 1946.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever receive literature from that book store?

Mr. HAYDEN. I went in there once or twice.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they ever hand you some literature for free distribution?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a lot of throw-away stuff on the table, as I remember it.

Mr. DOYLE. You stated you came to think there was a great service to do the country and the industry. I suppose you were referring to the moving-picture industry. Does the moving-picture industry, in your judgment, need any service in connection with who are and who are not Communists and who were Communists previously, and if so, what service?

Mr. HAYDEN. My thought on that was simply, as I guess is common knowledge now, there is a great furor in Hollywood about the whole situation. My idea was that if ex-Communists, or people who had been affiliated with Communist fronts, felt they could stand up

and be counted and be judged on the facts, it would clarify the situation.

Mr. DOYLE. Is it or not a fact that the moving-picture industry or colony has been pretty actively endeavoring to clean up the situation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that would expedite it.

Mr. DOYLE. You haven't answered my question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry.

Mr. DOYLE. I will ask it this way: To your knowledge has the moving-picture industry been endeavoring to clean up its own house?

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly think it has.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you think it is doing a pretty good job of it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it is; so far as I know.

Mr. DOYLE. I take it your voluntary testimony this morning is what you feel should be done by other former Communists who happened to be engaged in the art of acting?

Mr. HAYDEN. That it is. That is up to them, but that is my reaction.

Mr. DOYLE. As you testified, I quickly made notes of this part of your testimony:

I was boiling inside. If I could do something about conditions, it might justify my being an actor with high income and pleasant working conditions.

Do you recall stating substantially that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What were the conditions that you were boiling up inside about, that you wanted to help correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it was a peculiarly personal thing with me. I came into the industry with an irregular background, with no background in the conventional way of earning a living, having always been at sea. I suddenly found myself making a lot of money and not doing a great deal of work for it, and I felt a responsibility I should have had earlier as an American citizen. I had never thought politically before. All of this came to focus at one time, and, unfortunately perhaps, the increment that set it off was my experience in Yugoslavia.

(Representative Kearney enters hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. At that time you were not interested in any economic conditions facing our country; it only involved your personal boiling up inside?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is very close to being correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Am I correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. You are very nearly correct.

Mr. DOYLE. It was a personal matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. When Bea Winters in June 1946 handed you an application and asked why you didn't join the party—I believe that was your testimony?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. And then told you you could not be a member of a cell where all members were actors, for security reasons, didn't it then occur to you there was something phony or dangerous about the

Communist Party, when, for security reasons, you could not belong to a cell where actors belonged?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it did.

Mr. DOYLE. What occurred to you?

Mr. HAYDEN. As I said before, it was a rash move, an impulsive move, but I was under such a head of steam at the time I simply did not think the thing out very carefully. I went ahead anyway.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you were so enraptured with the Partisans of Yugoslavia, their bravery and heroism, and you had so tied yourself up with Tompkins and others, that you could not immediately withdraw from the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I could have withdrawn, but I couldn't see clearly at that time. I think that is accurate.

Mr. DOYLE. Did it ever occur to you, between June and December 1946, what the security reasons were? What security reasons did you discover, if any?

Mr. HAYDEN. My feeling on that was simply that at that time I was employed by Paramount, and I felt that had it been known to Paramount that I was a member of the Communist Party, that I would no longer be employed by Paramount.

Mr. DOYLE. You stated Captain Tompkins got some 75,000 words written on your biography before you "came to" sufficiently to go to him and call the whole thing off.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is the substance of your testimony?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What was it that caused you to "come to" sufficiently to go to this long-time friend of yours, adviser. He had been an adviser, I take it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What gave you the backbone to go to him? What did you discover about the 75,000 words?

Mr. HAYDEN. The first draft he had knocked out actually fell by the wayside when I realized what I had done. It was not the book. I never read the book.

Mr. DOYLE. Was the book published?

Mr. HAYDEN. Heaven forbid. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Was it ever reduced to typewritten form?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only the first draft. My wife has frequently suggested I get it back. I don't know what happened to it.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you feel if you made a demand on Tompkins for it you would get it back?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no idea.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you accept money or anything of value for the script?

Mr. HAYDEN. Nothing whatever. I have heard since he has been expelled from the party. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder, do you have any questions?

Mr. MOULDER. Not at this time.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. I want to preface my questions by stating that, speaking for myself only as a member of the committee, I certainly appreciate your cooperation with the committee in giving us so many de-

tails as you have concerning your affiliation with the Communist Party. However, it occurs to me that the names of your associates in the Communist Party are, for some reason, a little bit obscure, and I can understand why that is so. I know you have been through a lot of questioning, both by our very able investigators and by FBI agents, and the questions I ask you are for the purpose of prodding your memory and not for doubting your testimony.

I wish you would go back and review your associations in Yugoslavia, and name the persons you were associated with there who were in the Partisan movement at that time.

Mr. HAYDEN. The first names that come to my mind are Colonel Manola, who at one time functioned in some executive capacity in Bari headquarters in Bari, Italy; and Col. Sergei Mackiedo, who was the man who notified me I had received this decoration from the Yugoslav Government.

Mr. VELDE. Were they American citizens?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. These are Partisans. Do you want American citizens?

Mr. VELDE. I want both.

Mr. HAYDEN. These two are Partisans. I can remember a man named Ivosevich, who was first mate.

Mr. VELDE. I wonder if you would spell that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I-v-o-s-e-v-i-c-h, I think. There may be a "t" in it. And Nikolich, N-i-k-o-l-i-c-h.

Mr. VELDE. Did you meet Tito?

Mr. HAYDEN. I never met Tito.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't think of any other names.

Mr. VELDE. What about Americans?

Mr. HAYDEN. American OSS officers in Bari, Capt. Haus Tofte; Lt. Bob Thompson; Lt. Ward Ellen; Lieutenant Benson; Sgt. John Harnicker, Marine Corps; Major Koch; Maj. Linn Farish, who was killed in Greece. I guess there are a lot of others. Their names don't come to my mind.

Mr. VELDE. For the purpose of clarifying the record for people who may believe you are listing members of the Communist Party, if any of those you have listed are known to you to be or to have been members of the Communist Party, so state.

Mr. HAYDEN. To my knowledge, none of them had any connection whatever. These were simply fellow officers or enlisted men with whom I worked.

Mr. VELDE. Was there an OSS officer from Pittsburgh?

Mr. HAYDEN. There were a number from around the Pittsburgh district. There are only three I recall, though there are lots of others.

Mr. VELDE. Were they members of the Communist Party? Can you identify any of them as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I have heard subsequently that one of them, George Wuchinich, was in some way connected with the Communist Party. The others were strictly anti-Communist.

Mr. VELDE. Will you tell the committee how you felt, or know, that George Wuchinich was associated with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know when or how I heard it, but at some time since the war I have heard that mentioned.

Mr. VELDE. Scuttle butt?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let's say scuttle butt.

Mr. VELDE. When was it you made your first trip back to the States after being in Yugoslavia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think late November or early December 1944.

Mr. VELDE. Will you again review—I was gone part of the time you testified, for a vote—will you again review in more or less detail who were on the boat you came on, where you went, and what happened during the time you were back in the States in 1944.

Mr. HAYDEN. The boat I came on was a transport. Ninety-nine percent of the people on it were Regular Army and Air Force personnel coming on some rotation, I imagine. A few from OSS were coming home.

At the time I came here, or shortly afterward, I flew to the west coast to visit Tompkins.

Mr. VELDE. What port did you enter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Staten Island. I reported in, came to Washington, got my leave papers, flew to San Francisco, and spent 5 or 6 days with Tompkins.

Mr. VELDE. Have you seen Mr. Tompkins recently?

Mr. HAYDEN. The last time I saw him was 2 years ago when my wife and I were living on a boat at San Pedro and he and his wife and son, who had worked for me once, strolled by. We discussed nothing.

Mr. VELDE. You had no conversation with him?

Mr. HAYDEN. No conversation except about boats.

Mr. VELDE. Will you proceed.

Mr. HAYDEN. After that 5 or 6 days I flew back to Washington, contacted Tompkins about who I could contact in New York, who would know about guerrilla movements in the world.

Mr. VELDE. Will you go back to the 5 or 6 days you spent with Tompkins.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was just meeting people all the time, people coming to the boat, and we got in the car and visited people's homes. Different evenings we would go to people's homes, sit around, and talk to them. The only name brought out in the testimony was Dr. Ellwood Lyman, who to the best of my knowledge was not a Communist.

Mr. VELDE. I believe you mentioned it was during this time you met Steve Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Where was this meeting?

Mr. HAYDEN. It may have been at the home of Dr. Lyman. It may have been at some other person's home.

Mr. VELDE. How many people were present?

Mr. HAYDEN. From 15 to 20 people.

Mr. VELDE. And the only one you remember, as I understand, is Steve Nelson?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. VELDE. What was the subject of the conversation so far as Steve Nelson was concerned?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yugoslavia. He asked questions about it and I talked about it. It was just a general conversation.

Mr. VELDE. Can you give in substance the conversation as you remember it?

Mr. HAYDEN. In capsule form, I would simply say I was the fellow who was home from the wars, and I was a first-hand connection with

it, and therefore I was more or less the focal point of attention, and this did not displease me, I must admit, and I went on and on about what I had seen in Yugoslavia.

Mr. VELDE. I guess Steve Nelson was particularly interested in your story?

Mr. HAYDEN. He didn't seem to be too much.

Mr. VELDE. Who did the most talking, Steve or you?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it was split up among the entire party.

Mr. VELDE. Do you remember anybody else who was present at all, their first name?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry; I do not. No names come to my mind. I think this was a very haphazard gathering, though I may be wrong about that.

Mr. VELDE. I may have forgotten your testimony about "Pop" Folkoff. Where did you meet him?

Mr. HAYDEN. In a restaurant.

Mr. VELDE. Was anybody else present at that meeting?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think we decided somebody named Baroway.

Mr. TAVENNER. Leo Baroway?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think so.

Mr. VELDE. Anybody else?

Mr. HAYDEN. Tompkins, Folkoff, this missing link, and myself.

Mr. VELDE. Was the restaurant on Marcus Street?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't remember.

Mr. VELDE. What was the subject of the conversation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Just general conversation. We weren't discussing the weather.

Mr. VELDE. I don't want to put you through the grill. I am interested in finding out what the facts are.

Mr. HAYDEN. I appreciate that. I shouldn't have said general discussion.

Mr. VELDE. In your associations with the Communist Party, what did they ask you about? You had important information.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was more colorful than anything else.

Mr. VELDE. What was the general nature of the conversation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am afraid of being redundant here. I can only say it was a description of what I had seen in Yugoslavia. Folkoff maintained a very distant approach to the whole thing, smiled as though he knew all about it. There were no points made; no line was followed that I can recall in any way.

Mr. VELDE. Did he ask you about your experiences in Yugoslavia?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I don't think I needed to be asked at the time. It was like pressing a button and I was off to the races.

Mr. VELDE. How did you happen to make contact with Mr. Folkoff?

Mr. HAYDEN. Tompkins told me he wanted me to meet him.

Mr. VELDE. Where were you staying at that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. On Tompkins' schooner.

Mr. VELDE. Was Tompkins the sole owner of the schooner?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think he and his wife.

Mr. VELDE. Is he a wealthy man?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would say he is anything but wealthy. I think that—well, that is getting into the realm of conjecture again.

Mr. VELDE. There are degrees of being wealthy, like everything else.

Mr. HAYDEN. He is a man who had led a rather spectacular career in the South Seas, in Europe, in Paris, as an artist and writer, and he attempted to make the schooner pay and the schooner never paid.

Mr. VELDE. You mean by taking passengers?

Mr. HAYDEN. College boys in the summer; yes.

Mr. VELDE. You said he was one of those who influenced you to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. He forged the first link, you might say.

Mr. VELDE. Did you attend any other parties or meetings while you were in San Francisco?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I may have, because all the time I was there there were meetings going on, group gatherings and get-togethers.

Mr. VELDE. I mean in the schooner?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. People would come in the evenings and sit and talk.

Mr. VELDE. Do you remember any of those people?

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember one man who was apparently a close friend of Tompkins. I subsequently heard he was in disrepute with the party and had broken with it. He was a merchant seaman in the war. I would remember his name if I heard it.

Mr. VELDE. Did you have occasion to meet Bernadette Doyle?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. VELDE. Louise Bransten?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know for a fact that Louise Bransten was not present at the meeting at the time you went to Dr. Lyman's home?

Mr. HAYDEN. She may have been. I know nothing about the name. It means nothing to me one way or the other.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Some few days ago there was testimony given by Larry Parks, and as I recollect he definitely stated that no writer could color a picture for propaganda purposes. Do you agree with that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly do.

Mr. KEARNEY. That no writer could?

Mr. HAYDEN. At the present time, with the feeling the way it is, I don't see how he could.

Mr. KEARNEY. How about the past?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there would be more chance in the past.

Mr. KEARNEY. It has been done in the past?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it has.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know if any of the 10 convicted Hollywood actors have again been employed by the motion-picture industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no idea. I assume they are not.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understood you to say in the meetings you attended there was discussion, indirectly, of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a discussion of what they called dialectics.

Mr. KEARNEY. Were any well-known leaders of the Communist Party ever in attendance at any of the meetings you attended?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to my recollection.

Mr. KEARNEY. The name of Karen Morley has been injected here in your statement. Do you know whether she is still a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no idea.

Mr. KEARNEY. You do know she was a member?

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume she was, because she tried to get me back into the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. Only Communists would do that?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my view.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know where Captain Tompkins is at the present time?

Mr. HAYDEN. He is in Los Angeles somewhere.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you received any communication from Captain Tompkins since you severed your connection with the party in 1946?

Mr. HAYDEN. Except for that time he came by the boat that Sunday afternoon, I have had no word from him at all.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you had any communication with Bea Winters since you severed your connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I met her in a market when my wife was in the hospital with a baby. We had small talk there.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you had communication with Folkoff since you severed your connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. JACKSON. In your original contract with Paramount in 1940 and 1941, who handled the negotiation for Paramount?

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume Holman did.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was head of the contract department?

Mr. HAYDEN. Hiller Innes.

Mr. JACKSON. When did you do *Virginia*?

Mr. HAYDEN. *Virginia* began in May 1940.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the producer of *Virginia*?

Mr. HAYDEN. Edward H. Griffith.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the director?

Mr. HAYDEN. Edward H. Griffith.

Mr. JACKSON. Who did the script?

Mr. HAYDEN. *Virginia Van Upp*.

Mr. JACKSON. And on *Bahama Passage*?

Mr. HAYDEN. The same people.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you say those people in the motion-picture industry who have for some reason or other associated themselves with the Communist Party or with front organizations, either as active members or as fellow travelers, lend their efforts to the party knowing the ultimate goal of the front organizations for which they appear?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that covers a lot of ground. I certainly think no, that the majority did not.

Mr. JACKSON. The majority did not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I think that is particularly true of the Committee for the First Amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you do a picture in 1949 or 1950 called *Asphalt Jungle*?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the producer?

Mr. HAYDEN. Arthur Hornblow, Jr.

Mr. JACKSON. Who did the script?

Mr. HAYDEN. John Huston and Ben Madow.

Mr. JACKSON. Who directed it?

Mr. HAYDEN. John Huston.

Mr. JACKSON. After your discharge from service, did you at any time go to the Communist Party headquarters in New York?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, I did not.

Mr. JACKSON. Or on the west coast?

Mr. HAYDEN. I never did.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you at any time discuss politics with Russell Holman?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I think Mr. Holman and Mr. Frank Freeman both figured I was in the midst of a kind of—well, I don't want to overwork the word "emotional," but that I was upset, and I think Mr. Freeman was concerned, but thought it would dissipate itself.

Mr. JACKSON. Was Captain Tompkins personally acquainted with people in the movie colony?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to my knowledge. He once visited me on the set.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you attend any parties or affairs with Captain Tompkins in Hollywood?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; never did.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it ever intended that the story he was doing on you was to be made into a script?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to my knowledge; not to my knowledge. He has had no experience in screen playwriting at all. I think he had one idea in mind, which is the one I outlined. I have read random remarks in trade papers that certain phases of my activity would make a good story.

Mr. JACKSON. But whether he had that in mind, you don't know?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, I don't.

Mr. JACKSON. You say Bea Winters is presently employed by a producer?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard she is.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know the producer's name?

Mr. HAYDEN. I will think of it before I get through. I don't think of it now.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know at what studio the producer is working?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think he is an independent producer.

Mr. JACKSON. At what studio?

Mr. HAYDEN. No studio. They move around.

Mr. JACKSON. During the period when you were a member of the party, how many meetings would you say you attended?

Mr. HAYDEN. One a week for 3 months, which would give us 12, and probably after that 6 or 8.

Mr. JACKSON. During the period covered by your membership you are only able to identify 2 members of the cell by name?

Mr. HAYDEN. By name. I never knew their last names. That is the gimmick in this thing. That was a thing that was carefully guarded.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know Herbert K. Sorrell?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know him. I never met him. I know who he is.

Mr. JACKSON. Were representations ever made to you regarding the strike in Hollywood, representatives to assist in any way?

Mr. HAYDEN. The whole focal point of the activity of this group of actors and actresses was to swing the Screen Actors' Guild in favor of Sorrell's CSU.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you ever personally active in support of the strike?

Mr. HAYDEN. I made a contribution to Polonsky which might be construed in support of it. Or it may have been for the party.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you ever attend meetings of any other cells of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Excuse me. Is the name of the producer you were speaking of, who is the employer of Bea Winters, Sam Spiegel?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you think the goals of the Communist Party were in any way different at the time you were a member than they are today?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the ultimate goal is the same.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you consider, Mr. Hayden, that in your own mind you have been completely fair and completely frank with the committee, and that you have named for this committee every member of the Communist Party in the moving-picture industry of whom you have personal knowledge?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Hayden, has any member of your family, either by blood or marriage, at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they certainly have not.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Hayden, I was interested in the influence that the Partisan movement had on you, and I am wondering what your observation would be of that same influence on other Americans who happened to be in OSS aiding the Partisan movement in Yugoslavia. Do you believe you were an exception or that other individuals closely identified with the Partisan movement would also be susceptible to the Communist ideology through that association?

Mr. HAYDEN. I can only say that to the best of my knowledge I know of no one else affected similarly. We were all deeply moved, but I have no way of knowing that anyone else had a parallel experience.

Mr. POTTER. Through your contact with other American military personnel, did any of them at that time feel, or did you discuss among yourselves, that communism was a political star which we should tie onto?

Mr. HAYDEN. We never got into any of that.

Mr. POTTER. You never discussed that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not that I remember, not at all. All our work and conversation and thoughts seemed to be filled with just what was actually going on.

Mr. POTTER. Do you have any knowledge at all of any effort during the last war to recruit military personnel into the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I have had no experience along that line.

Mr. POTTER. If I recall your testimony correctly, your cell instructed you to contact this group, much larger group, of actors and actresses, to get the guild to support the strike. Is that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. In the cell meeting, did they tell you to go over and to make certain contacts in the other organization and work through them? Did they give any names of persons you were to work through?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't remember exactly. I know it was suggested I attend that cocktail party, at which a large number of people were present. The suggestion was simply that I devote myself to this activity rather than the weekly meetings.

Mr. POTTER. Did you report back to the cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would go back once a month or so.

Mr. POTTER. To report your progress?

Mr. HAYDEN. What was going on; yes.

Mr. POTTER. How successful were you with the other group?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure, as a matter of fact, the move was very unsuccessful. It ran into the board of directors of the Screen Actors' Guild, and particularly into Ronald Reagan, who was a one-man battalion against this thing. He was very vocal and clear-thinking on it. I don't think many people realized how complex it was. I know I didn't. There was very little headway made.

Mr. POTTER. I know I would, and I assume the rest of the committee would like to know the activities of a cell. We have had testimony to indicate it is a coffee-and-doughnut society. You have indicated part of it was devoted to a discussion of Communist Party principles. What did you discuss? Did you discuss, for example, membership, how you could increase your membership?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was frequently a subject of discussion, whether anyone had ideas about new recruiting; who were near those being recruited; and things like that.

Mr. POTTER. What criteria did you have for knowing whether a person was ready for the cell, or ripe to be plucked?

Mr. HAYDEN. I never recruited anybody. I assume whenever they found somebody receptive to their theories, they would get him to come to an open meeting, and in that way ask him to become an active member.

Mr. POTTER. Would you say it is difficult to be a half-hearted member when you are a member of a cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. One of the most impressive things about that group was the dedication of the people to it.

Mr. POTTER. Was that through discipline?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't know how to answer that. As far as I know, there was little or no discipline.

Mr. POTTER. At the meetings of your cell group, did you discuss at any time means of financing front organizations?

Mr. HAYDEN. I never heard that discussed.

Mr. POTTER. You never heard that discussed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I never heard it discussed.

Mr. POTTER. And you have given the committee a list of contributions that you have made?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. I assume you have been solicited for many other contributions for organizations that are front organizations or Communist organizations, to which you did not give?

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume that is true. An actor is solicited for contributions all the time.

Mr. POTTER. An actor and a politician.

Mr. WOOD. Is that all, Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Did you have questions, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. MOULDER. Referring to your testimony of the Communist movement having a tremendous effect on you following Yugoslavia, as I understand, that was caused not because of your sympathy with the Communist philosophy, but was stirred by the struggle of a minority group seeking to achieve economic security?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The only thing we were struggling against was the Nazi occupation forces. We knew many of those people had been underground for years, but the one struggle we saw was against the Germans.

Mr. MOULDER. You were a member of the Communist Party only 4 or 5 months?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let's say 6 and be on the outside.

Mr. MOULDER. That was as a result of continual solicitation of an acquaintance of yours, and followed the exciting period you had encountered while in Yugoslavia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that is right.

Mr. MOULDER. During the period of your membership in the party, you decided that the philosophy they were discussing was not in accord with your philosophy of government?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. In the first place, if I may say so—and I say it because probably a good many people have been in a similar position—I never understood it. I was constantly told if I would read 40 pages of Dialectical and Historical Materialism I would understand communism. I never got beyond page 8, and I tried several times.

Mr. MOULDER. You resigned?

Mr. HAYDEN. I quit.

Mr. MOULDER. And severed all connections with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. That I did.

Mr. MOULDER. That was several years ago?

Mr. HAYDEN. Over 4 years ago.

Mr. MOULDER. It is my understanding that the request for your appearance before this committee was not in the spirit of any reflection on or any doubt of your loyalty to our country, but it was an effort on the part of the committee to secure information regarding Communist activities.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the way it seems to me.

Mr. MOULDER. I believe your courageous services in the Marine Corps and in the OSS deserve commendation, and your testimony in my opinion has been straightforward and honest.

Mr. HAYDEN. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. From the testimony adduced here before this committee, I can reach only one conclusion, so far as I am concerned, and that is that you have joined with us in our efforts to expose the evils of communism; that you are an intensely loyal American citizen and you deserve commendation for the services you have rendered as a Marine Corps soldier and for your testimony before this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle, do you have further questions?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. May I be permitted to ask three or four more questions that I deferred asking before so that my colleagues could ask their questions?

I think you said in 1944 "It built up a tremendous curiosity. Something was going on in the world that I wanted to find out about." Do you recall so testifying?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. What was there going on in the world that you wanted to find out about that built up such a curiosity? Did you find out?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I found out to my complete satisfaction. I simply had never thought of the conflicting forces in the world before.

Mr. DOYLE. What did you find out that satisfied that curiosity that had come to the surface, I think you said, in 1944?

Mr. HAYDEN. You mean the curiosity arose in 1944?

Mr. DOYLE. I think that was the substance of your language. You said one time you went to see Tompkins and it built up a tremendous curiosity that something was going on in the world that you wanted to find out about.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Why did you go to Tompkins to find out what was going on in the world?

Mr. HAYDEN. It so happened he came to me. I think it is one of the characteristics of our country and of all democracies that as a rule we don't endeavor to impress upon people—I think we don't attempt to do it enough—the things we believe in. Communists are the opposite. They give you no peace. When a Communist like Tompkins finds anyone at all susceptible, the pressure is on unremittingly.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you find anything going on in the world as to the activities of the Communist Party in relation to what was going on in America or other freedom-loving nations, and if so, what?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only that this whole totalitarian Communist move is a tremendous force in the world.

Mr. DOYLE. When you refer to this totalitarian movement, what is that movement, in your judgment?

Mr. HAYDEN. An endeavor to take over the entire world.

Mr. DOYLE. Are you testifying now that the intention and purpose of the Communist Party of the United States is to, by force, take control of the United States of America Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I do.

Mr. DOYLE. What was your answer?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You haven't been a member of the Communist Party since 1948?

Mr. HAYDEN. 1946.

Mr. DOYLE. Since 1946. Was that your firm conclusion and opinion at the time you resigned from the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it was.

Mr. DOYLE. Is it still your opinion?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it is.

Mr. DOYLE. But you were solicited in 1947 to rejoin the Communist Party, were you not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was.

Mr. DOYLE. What inducements, if any, were given you at that time to rejoin the Communist Party? What arguments were put up to you?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was very little argument. One thing I learned was that you can't argue with a Communist. His mind is made up, and you can talk from now to breakfast and it won't do any good.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you been solicited by anyone but Karen Morley since 1947 to rejoin the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not; not at all.

Mr. DOYLE. I am going to ask you this question. I don't know if it was asked by any other member of the committee when I went to the floor to vote or not. You are here before a committee of the United States Congress, a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives, every Member of which is elected every 2 years by the American people. What is your opinion of the jurisdiction, the purpose, the functioning of this committee, before which you have testified 3 hours today? Is it, in your judgment, serving a useful purpose? Is it serving a necessary purpose? If so, to what extent, and if not, why? Is that a fair question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I am really asking for your honest-to-God truthful opinion. I have never asked that question before, but I think in view of the manner in which you have come before this committee, and the apparent frankness with which you have answered questions, if you have any criticism of the manner in which this committee functions, I would like to know what that criticism is. You have now been before us 3 hours.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think of no criticism whatever.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any suggestions to make of ways and means in which we might be more helpful in meeting this problem of the determination of the Communist Party of the United States to overthrow, if necessary by force, our Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that the request and suggestion that was made by the chairman of the committee, of which I was apprised by the counsel of the committee, that people come up and speak up, is the thing I came here today thinking it was an extremely fine thing, a constructive thing.

I don't mean to attach any importance to myself as an individual who is out of balance, but I have had the feeling that my appearance before the committee could serve a very useful purpose. I hope it does.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde, did you have additional questions?

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Referring back to your trip back to the States when you said there were several parties in San Francisco, do you now recall any other people that you met at these parties?

Mr. HAYDEN. I thought of the name of this merchant seaman I said was expelled. His first name is Jim.

Mr. VELDE. He has been expelled from the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I heard he was, subsequently.

Mr. VELDE. Did you ever meet Steve Murin?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not by that name.

Mr. VELDE. Did you ever meet Dwight Freeman?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that name. Did he have another first name? I know a man named Freeman.

Mr. VELDE. I think he is also known as James Freeman. This was brought out in the prior Hawaiian hearings. Do you feel that the Freeman you met in San Francisco, or knew, was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I really don't have any idea. Tompkins got me to see a man named Freeman who, I think, was a lithographer, or engaged in printing of some kind, in some way. It seems to me his first name was Bud, but I have no opinion at all on the question which you ask.

Mr. VELDE. Did you meet Freeman's wife Pearl?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. VELDE. I believe you said you came in to New York and then came to Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Did you contact any member of the Communist Party, or did any member of the Communist Party contact you, here in Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all that I know of.

Mr. VELDE. How long were you here?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the total leave was 5 weeks.

Mr. VELDE. I mean here in Washington.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suppose half of that time, 2½ weeks.

Mr. VELDE. You spent some time in Los Angeles, too, didn't you?

Mr. HAYDEN. I came through Los Angeles and made a couple phone calls. I called Mr. Freeman at Paramount, just to say hello. I never left the airport, as I remember it.

Mr. VELDE. Going back to the Yugoslavia operations as a member of the OSS, what do you feel was the general attitude of the OSS toward the Partisan movement?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is an involved matter.

Mr. VELDE. I realize that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The feeling was high and strong. I was only associated with the Partisans. One man, named Gov' Muslin, I met him on leave, and he was pro-Mihailovitch. There was every shade of opinion.

Mr. VELDE. Did OSS members, including yourself, have any contact with the Chetniks?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. What was the attitude of the OSS toward the Chetniks?

Mr. HAYDEN. Until Tito merged, I think we were following the British dictate, which was to support Mihailovitch and the Chetniks.

Mr. VELDE. Wasn't the attitude of the OSS members at that time to belittle the efforts of the Chetniks?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. There was a certain element of OSS officers who, I believe were pro-Mihailovitch and stayed that way. Others started that way and swung to Tito.

Mr. VELDE. Have you ever met a man named Eric Cogill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have never heard the name.

Mr. VELDE. Have you ever met, to your recollection, any member of the Soviet consulate at San Francisco, or the Soviet consulate at Los Angeles, or the Soviet Embassy in Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly not of the Soviet Embassy in Washington or of the Soviet consulate in Los Angeles, though it is possible I met a member of the Embassy in San Francisco, though I do not remember.

Mr. VELDE. Would you remember if I mentioned his name?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is only one way to find out. If the name rings any bell I will say that it does.

Mr. VELDE. Have you ever met Gregory Kheifets?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. VELDE. Then to the best of your recollection you have never met a member of the Soviet diplomatic force in the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to the best of my recollection.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. I have just been informed that counsel is going to straighten out what I had proposed to question him about.

Mr. WOOD. Anything further?

Mr. JACKSON. Were any representations made to you to appear before the committee and give testimony?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was subpoenaed to appear before the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. There were no representations made by the industry or anybody in the industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Were any representations made to you at any time not to appear before the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You have not been approached by any person to appear or not to appear before the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not in any way.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Have you been in contact with, or have you met, any of the members of your particular cell since you left the party?

Mr. HAYDEN. Outside of the day that I bumped into Bea Winters in the market, I don't believe I have ever even seen a member of that cell.

Mr. POTTER. How does it happen that Bea Winters was the one who talked you into becoming a member of the party when your good friend, Captain Tompkins, was the one who constantly advocated the Communist cause? Why didn't Captain Tompkins approach you to become a member instead of Bea Winters?

Mr. HAYDEN. I can only imagine he was waiting for a tactical approach. And he was living in another district.

Mr. POTTER. You stated that you were the only actor in your cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Did you have any liaison with other Communist cells in Hollywood?

Mr. HAYDEN. None whatsoever.

Mr. POTTER. You knew that other actors were members of the Communist Party? You didn't feel you were alone?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have some comment on that. When I joined I was under the impression, perhaps erroneously, that there were a good many name actors in the party. Now, what is "name"actor?

Mr. POTTER. Your cell was composed of technicians?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I heard it said once that it was too bad a small, select group of actors could not be formed, but for some reason it could not be formed.

Mr. POTTER. From the testimony that you have given before the committee, and the forthright manner in which you have given the testimony, do you expect any reprisals from this testimony by the motion-picture industry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not. I have thought about that. I will be frank, I have thought about it. Whether it is natural wishful thinking or confidence, I don't know, but I feel that when the mistake of 5 months is weighed against other things, I really don't see any justification for it.

Mr. POTTER. And I assume from that, that the people in the motion-picture industry knew about it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I would disagree with that. I was subpoenaed to appear before this committee approximately 5 days before I started working in the picture in which I am now engaged. At that time there was considerable consternation on the part of producers, simply because I had been subpoenaed. They asked that I issue a statement denying past or present affiliation. I issued a statement denying present affiliation.

Mr. POTTER. So you think it came as a distinct surprise to them?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think today's testimony will come as quite a surprise.

Mr. POTTER. When Mr. Parks was here recently he said he belonged to a select group of actors. You had no knowledge of that while you were a member of the party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was under the impression no such group existed.

Mr. POTTER. And you were surprised when you heard that testimony of Mr. Parks?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was. I never had a firm opinion about Larry Parks. I did not know. I know in these meetings of actors occasionally it would be suggested that perhaps Parks would support something, and it was always said, "No; he would not." I remember that clearly.

Mr. POTTER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Hayden, what, if anything, do you know about any fund-raising activities in Los Angeles for the benefit of the Communist movement, while you were connected with it?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know nothing about that except there was one check I wrote for Abe Polonsky, but on whose behalf, I have no information on that.

Mr. Wood. Through Communist channels have you any information?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, none.

Mr. Wood. You never heard that discussed at any meetings you attended?

Mr. HAYDEN. I never did.

Mr. Wood. I believe you said that during the time you belonged to the party you had weekly meetings, at least for 3 or 4 months of that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. Wood. And that those weekly meetings were attended by from 10 to 20 or more people?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Those meetings were not publicized?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; on the contrary.

Mr. WOOD. They were surreptitiously held?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. And you knew other people were meeting surreptitiously and discussing whatever matters were discussed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. And you are telling the committee that notwithstanding these meetings of three or four times a month with that group of people, meeting in secret at the homes of individuals, you never got sufficiently familiar with the identity of any of those people to be able to enlighten the committee as to the identity of any but the two or three you have stated?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the case.

Mr. WOOD. It never occurred to you to make any inquiry about it?

Mr. HAYDEN. It did not. I think I can say, in regard to that, that shortly after I began to proceed in this, I became aware of the fact that I had to set my own house in order, that I had to get myself out of it, and my feeling was quite strong on that until I got myself under control.

Mr. WOOD. But you did realize, before your separated yourself from the movement, that it was not the character of movement you wanted to be connected with?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. And even so, you leave with this committee the impression you did not get sufficiently curious about your associates to inquire as to who they were?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. And you cannot tell us a single name of others in that cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot.

Mr. WOOD. Anything further?

Mr. VELDE. Did you attend a Progressive Party rally at Madison Square Garden in 1947?

Mr. HAYDEN. At which Mr. Wallace spoke? Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Whom did you go there with?

Mr. HAYDEN. My wife, who is here today.

Mr. VELDE. Was there anyone else in your group?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am strongly of the impression we went alone.

Mr. VELDE. Did you meet any persons at that rally you can identify as being members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. To the best of my recollection we went in, sat down, got out of the meeting, and left.

Mr. VELDE. How long did you stay in New York on that occasion?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think we stayed 2 or 3 days. It was on our way home from the coast of Maine to California.

Mr. VELDE. During that time you didn't meet or talk with any members of the Communist Party who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAYDEN. I don't think I met anyone of any political nature at all.

Mr. VELDE. Can you tell the committee what prompted you to attend that rally?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I can. As I said, the entire year of 1947 I was not working. I was under contract, but I did not work. I stayed on the boat in Santa Barbara. I was married in May of that year and my wife and I went East for 4 months. Then I began to feel a desire to at least participate in something of a constructive nature. We were in New York on our way to the west coast when this rally was being held.

Mr. VELDE. Where had you come from before you went to the rally in New York?

Mr. HAYDEN. Maine. Then we went out to California, and it was that same feeling that motivated me in joining the Committee for the First Amendment when I was approached. It was a desire to talk about something outside the weather, which was what we had been talking about all summer in Maine.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. The law under which this committee functions, as far as jurisdiction is concerned, provides that we may inquire into the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States. Have you any information which you can give this committee which you have not already given on that subject? If you have, will you give it to us, please? Do you understand my question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I believe that I have covered just about everything I possibly have access to in my own mind.

Mr. DOYLE. The law also provides that we shall inquire into the distribution and diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated by and comes from foreign countries. Have you any information on that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no information on that whatsoever.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you acquire any information on that while you were a member?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not.

Mr. DOYLE. Or before or at all?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. You have testified twice, in answer to my questions, that you are satisfied one of the objectives of the Communist Party of the United States is to forcibly overthrow, if necessary, the form of government set out by our American Constitution. Have you anything to add as to the ways and means they would undertake to accomplish that objective?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to make certain that your testimony is clear in regard to one matter. I asked you to name those whom you know to be members of the Communist Party who were connected with the Screen Actor's Guild with which you worked, and you named those that you knew?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you named several others, members of the Communist Party, with which you had come in contact. Then, in the course of your testimony, you indicated that you could name others, but it would be a matter of conjecture, and I stated to you that I did not want you to testify from conjecture. Have you given to the in-

vestigators of this committee a list of names of those to whom you have referred?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. By that I understand that the list of names you have given the investigators are in addition to those you have named before this committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, they are.

Mr. WOOD. And do I understand those names have been furnished the investigators by you only upon some conjecture you have that they may have been members of the party?

Mr. HAYDEN. My feeling is that the only ones I know to have been members are those active in the cell and Karen Morley. Any others would have to be conjecture.

Mr. WOOD. That is not entirely responsive to my question. Do I understand that the list of names you have furnished the investigators, that you have no knowledge as to whether they have ever been members of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true. I do not know.

Mr. WOOD. But your purpose in furnishing the list of names to the investigators was that by proper investigation on the part of the investigators of the committee and the committee itself, that their connection with the Communist Party might be revealed with reference to some of them?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think if they were asked it would be developed.

Mr. WOOD. Was that your purpose in furnishing to the staff of this committee that list of names?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was.

Mr. WOOD. And no other reason?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one more question: Did you testify that Karen Morley was a member of the cell?

Mr. HAYDEN. She was not a member of the cell.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 1:15 p. m. on Tuesday, April 10, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, April 11, 1951, at 10 a. m.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:15 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, 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; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. I will ask that the people in the audience please refrain from audible conversation during the hearings.

Mr. Counsel, are you ready to proceed?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give Mr. Martin Popper, an attorney from New York, an opportunity to make a motion before the committee at this time.

Mr. POPPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I represent Mr. J. Edward Bromberg.

Mr. Wood. For the purposes of identification, will you give your name and address?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York.

Mr. Bromberg has been subpoenaed to appear before this committee tomorrow morning. I have submitted to the counsel for the committee a number of medical documents indicating the serious condition of Mr. Bromberg's health, and at his suggestion I am now making a formal application to have Mr. Bromberg's subpoena vacated on the ground of serious physical condition.

Mr. Bromberg is a victim of heart disease, having suffered a heart attack within the past month, and as the medical certificates submitted to Mr. Tavenner indicate, Mr. Bromberg would be in serious danger of suffering another heart attack under any kind of anxiety, under any kind—

Mr. Wood. Have you the certificate?

Mr. POPPER. Yes; I do. I have already submitted photostatic copies.

Mr. Wood. Suppose you read the certificates you have.

Mr. POPPER. There are two. The first is from Dr. Walter Modell, a distinguished heart specialist of New York, under whose care Mr. Bromberg presently is, who says:

Mr. J. Edward Bromberg has asked me to write to you. Mr. Bromberg has rheumatic heart disease. He first visited me because of this in August 1944, and since he has taken residence in this city I have attended him regularly for it. Mr. Bromberg discovered that he had rheumatic heart disease in his youth. The exact time it developed has not been established. Since its discovery and until recently his heart disease has been well compensated and he has required no treatment. Since December of 1950 he has complained of symptoms of cardiac dysfunction. This was treated with mercurial diuretics with relief. In March 1951, in Philadelphia, he suffered a frank attack of congestive failure. This was treated with digitalis and mercurial diuretics. This form of treatment has been continued, and Mr. Bromberg is now symptom free. Treatment and dietary restriction will be required for an indefinite period. I have also advised Mr. Bromberg to refrain from emotional upsets and to avoid tensions and anxieties. There is the possibility that unless this practice is followed there will be further attacks of heart failure.

I also have a certificate from the physician at Philadelphia who treated Mr. Bromberg at the time of his heart attack within the past month, and if the committee wants me to, I shall be glad to read that as well, but it merely confirms that fact and indicates the course of treatment.

I am also ready to present to the committee the electrocardiographs taken of Mr. Bromberg's condition in March of 1951 at the time of the heart attack, for which attack and general symptoms he is still under treatment.

I would under these circumstances suggest that reason and safety itself would indicate the correctness of vacating the subpoena, a course which is followed even in its most normal sense even in judicial proceedings of a kind which don't bring in this kind of anxiety.

Mr. WALTER. Do those affidavits go so far as to express the opinion that if your client appears his health and his life would be endangered?

Mr. POPPER. There is no question but that—

Mr. WALTER. Do the affidavits say that?

Mr. POPPER. First of all, they are not affidavits, sir. They are medical certificates. It says that any kind of emotional upset or anxiety create the possibility of a further heart attack at this time. There is no doubt in my mind that any inquiry of any of these physicians, because they have already been asked this question, would indicate that an appearance before this committee at this time leads to the definite danger of a heart attack, with whatever serious and terrible consequences may come therefrom.

I should imagine, Congressman Walter, that under these circumstances the gravity of the responsibility on any public body is immeasurable.

Mr. WALTER. We realize that, except I know, having practiced law for a great many years, that you can get doctors to make statements as to almost anything, and even though those statements don't go so far as to indicate that this man's health would be endangered by an appearance here—

Mr. POPPER. Not quite. I mean as far as these certificates are concerned. In the first place, I offered to the committee the electrocardiographs of Mr. Bromberg, and as a matter of fact I have already indicated to Mr. Tavenner that we haven't the slightest objection to

any check being made on this by anybody that the committee sees fit.

Mr. WOOD. Let's see if I get that statement correctly. Say it again.

Mr. POPPER. I have already indicated to Mr. Tavenner at the time of the submission of the certificates that we haven't the slightest objection to your making your check as to the accuracy of these certificates.

Mr. WOOD. If the committee approves, we will continue the subpoena in force for 30 days, to give us an opportunity to make a further investigation about it.

Mr. POPPER. By all means. I have no objection at all. Does the committee want the document?

Mr. WOOD. File it, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think I should ask counsel a question or two, since he has appeared here. I would like to know whether or not the witness is employed and working at the present time.

Mr. POPPER. He is not.

Mr. TAVENNER. I should state to the committee what I have done in connection with this matter, which of course has been very little, in view of the work that is piled upon the staff at the present moment.

I have had copies of these certificates since Saturday, and I was called on the phone by counsel a day or two prior to that and I made the suggestion at the time that in a matter of this kind I would want to make a very thorough investigation, and he cooperated in every way about the making of that investigation. We have not had the opportunity to make it. However, at the time of service on March 7 the witness was engaged in the production of a play and was served at the theater.

Mr. DOYLE. Nighttime or daytime?

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't know the hour, but it is the play, Springtime for Henry, which was playing at the time. Effort has been made to serve him at his home, unsuccessfully, and I want to investigate all the circumstances about that, as well as the medical situation.

Mr. POPPER. By all means. However, Mr. Chairman, I think there are one or two implications that are unfair. In the first place, Mr. Bromberg is an actor. In the second place, he couldn't have been served at his home, since he was opening in a play at Baltimore, where he was served at that time. The heart attack of which these certificates speak, occurred after the time of service. They occurred several weeks thereafter.

Mr. RUSSELL. He was served in Wilmington, Del., at the DuPont.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was served in Wilmington after several attempts over several days in order to make the service. We have here the investigator to testify if necessary.

Mr. POPPER. I think it is fair to tell the committee the place in Wilmington where he was served.

Mr. RUSSELL. Put Mr. Jones, committee investigator, on. He served him at the DuPont Hotel in Wilmington, Del.

Mr. WOOD. I don't think it is necessary to go further into it. In light of the statements here, I feel that the staff should make further investigation, and we will undertake to designate some physician. I assume that you, Mr. Popper, will be cooperative with us in having him examined.

Mr. POPPER. Of course. I have already indicated that to counsel.

Mr. Wood. If it develops he is unable to come here for that purpose, the committee will take under advisement the question of sending a subcommittee up to his place to take his testimony.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Marc Lawrence.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Murdaugh S. Madden, a Washington attorney, 1830 Jefferson Place NW. I represent Mr. Lawrence. He is under subpoena to appear today and is presently in a sanitarium in Alhambra, Calif.

I first contacted the committee through Mr. Tavenner on that matter about 10 days ago, and at that time I had not myself verified his condition. I went out there and satisfied myself that he physically could not appear at this time and checked with his doctors and got doctors' statements, which I have with me today.

I am not asking that the committee vacate the subpoena. The man's condition is such and can readily be verified as such that if it would be possible for the committee to take testimony there at the sanitarium or at his home, if he is in his home, within a reasonable time in the future, that is the request that I would like to make now.

Mr. Wood. How long in your opinion would it be before he would be able to come here?

Mr. MADDEN. When I left California 4 days ago the doctors thought that it would be maybe 2 to 3 weeks. I got word yesterday that he had since been sent to the sanitarium, and the doctors now will not say when he might improve. His is a mental and physical breakdown that is bordering on complete breakdown at this time, as I understand it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, when counsel got in touch with me about it, we endeavored to have our investigators who were then in California make some check of this matter. They were unable to locate the physicians at the time, or the witness. We have found out later that the witness had gone out into the country where he could be alone, but we have not been able at this time to make a check of the medical facts reported here or to interview the doctors in the short period of time which we have to work on it. For that reason, we feel that we should have a sufficient amount of time to investigate it.

Mr. Wood. Supposing we continue the subpoena in force for a period of 2 weeks and in that time get some definite statement from the physician if we possibly can and submit it to counsel for the committee here, and we will be able to take appropriate action and notify you what is desired.

Mr. MADDEN. Thank you. I would like to repeat the request that if it appears that he will then be in no condition to come if it would be possible for a subcommittee or some other type of questioning to be taken out there. He is fully prepared to answer completely and honestly all the questions of the committee.

Mr. Wood. I am sure the committee will explore that possibility and take whatever action it thinks the circumstances will warrant.

Mr. MADDEN. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman, of counsel: Would his doctors stipulate that he was physically able to testify out there, or would we be confronted with a surprise statement by a doctor out there that he wasn't physically able to testify there either, if his health was so bad?

Mr. MADDEN. No, Mr. Doyle. I think that it is possible that the questioning might be similar to the questioning that I had to conduct last week, which was very tenuous and took a great deal of time, but I am sure that if the man is alive he will submit to questioning.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call Mr. Will Geer.

Mr. WOOD. Is Mr. Geer present?

Mr. GEER. Which one is the hot seat?

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

Mr. GEER. I do, sir.

Mr. KENNY. Do you wish counsel to identify themselves again, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment, please.

SWORN TESTIMONY OF WILL GEER, ACCCOMPANIED BY ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS, AS COUNSEL

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. GEER. My name is Will Geer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. GEER. I am, sir.

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

Mr. KENNY. My name is Robert W. Kenny, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis, 112 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Geer, when and where were you born?

Mr. GEER. I was born in Frankfort, Ind., Clinton County, March 9, 1902.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. GEER. My present place of residence is 1015 Fourth Street, Santa Monica, Calif., for the past 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. GEER. I am an entertainer, actor, in the theater and screen and in television.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee briefly your educational background?

Mr. GEER. High school; University of Chicago, Ph. B.; graduate work at Columbia University and, of course, at Oxford, England.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete that course of educational training?

Mr. GEER. I finished about 1926, but I am still a student.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, we all are. But what is the subject of which you are a student?

Mr. GEER. Philosophy, but my main hobby is agriculture and horticulture.

Mr. TAVENNER. How have you been employed since 1926?

Mr. GEER. Since 1926 mainly in the in theater in stock, small shows in stock, and all around the country on tour with people like Otis Skinner, Minnie Maddern Fiske, Ethel Barrymore; radio when it came along; and television when it came along, and the last 2 years

I have been doing some motion pictures on the side, and I teach agriculture and victory gardening.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

Mr. GEER. I am unemployed at the present moment. I would have been employed. This interferes with spring planting.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

Mr. GEER. My last employment—I just finished a picture called the Tall Target or the Man on the Train, written about Lincoln's coming to Baltimore and the attempt of his assassination in 1861.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom did you do that work?

Mr. GEER. M-G-M.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. GEER. Just about during the month of March—February and March, I would say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who employed you to engage in that work?

Mr. GEER. My agent got me the job.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is your agent?

Mr. GEER. Paul Wilkins, 9006 Sunset Boulevard.

Mr. TAVENNER. With whom did you contract?

Mr. GEER. Contracted with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you negotiate yourself with any of the officials?

Mr. GEER. We have agents in the business. They do all the negotiating. We are just entertainers, and they sell us and get 10 percent of us. Our ashes we will them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not participate in the negotiations for that transaction?

Mr. GEER. No; not at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment prior to that picture to which you referred?

Mr. GEER. A picture called Lights Out, at Universal Studio, which is about a blind war veteran. I played the father—the boy's adjustment to coming back to life after being blinded in the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. What studio was that?

Mr. GEER. Universal Studio at Universal City, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of that employment?

Mr. GEER. The date of that employment was—let's see, would be roughly, well, that would be about October, I guess. After that I did a picture at Columbia.

Mr. TAVENNER. October of what year?

Mr. GEER. Of last year. After that I did a picture. I am mistaken. I did a picture called Barefoot Mailman at Columbia Studios along about Christmastime, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. With whom did you contract in the performance of those two pieces of work?

Mr. GEER. Columbia Pictures and Universal Pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you deal directly with them?

Mr. GEER. Not at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Through your agent?

Mr. GEER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it the same agent?

Mr. GEER. The same agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not personally take part in the negotiations with those studios?

Mr. GEER. Just to make an appearance and see whether they thought I was a fit subject for the particular role they had in mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you furnish any references of any character to those studios in connection with your employment?

Mr. GEER. References?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. GEER. I don't understand that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I said did you furnish any references to those studios in connection with your employment in those two contracts?

Mr. GEER. I have been in the theater for about 25 years, sir. I think I am well enough known to all of them from the roles I have played.

Mr. TAVENNER. You felt that was not necessary?

Mr. GEER. I don't believe so; no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever furnished references to the studios with which you sought to make contracts?

Mr. GEER. No. I think a person's work is usually the judge of whether you get a part or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; after 25 years; but you have to have a beginning place, some place along the line. So I am asking you if at any time you did that.

Mr. GEER. Well, I don't believe so. It is always a question of which comes first, the hen or the egg, about an actor getting a job. You get the job or the egg or the hen which hatches first.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer my question as to whether or not you furnished references to any studio in connection with your employment?

Mr. GEER. No; I never felt it necessary, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you do it?

Mr. GEER. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whether you felt it necessary or not, did you?

Mr. GEER. No. We just make an appearance and we are sold like—

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

Mr. GEER. The last 2½ years, in Santa Monica.

Mr. TAVENNER. And prior to that time where did you live?

Mr. GEER. I have a farm in Rockland County, in the Hudson Valley, New York State.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you live in New York State?

Mr. GEER. Ten years. Long enough to get the farm, the home. It is a blueberry farm.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in the State of New York in the theatrical profession?

Mr. GEER. Well, I would say off and on. Of course, New York is a center of show business, so we naturally gravitate there for jobs. I imagine since the year 1924 I have gone to New York off and on. Sometimes you would go on tour all over the country, and again we would be in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. First I will ask you whether you were living in the State of New York in 1942?

Mr. GEER. 1942. I imagine so: Let's see. I was campaigning for Wendell Willkie along about that time. I don't know whether it was 1942 or not. No, Wendell Willkie died.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you also interested at that time in the Communist Party, as indicated by your signing of a Communist Party independent nominating petition July 23, 1942?

Mr. GEER. 1942?

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of what purports to be such a petition.

Mr. GEER. Well, that, gentlemen, is an emotional, hysterical question based on the date. I stand on my rights, the fifth amendment, on the grounds it might incriminate or degrade me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask you again to look at the Communist Party nominating petition which I hand you and state whether or not the name Will Geer appears on that petition, and if so whether or not it is your signature.

Mr. GEER. I stand on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to file the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Geer Exhibit No. 1."

(The document referred to above was marked "Geer Exhibit No. 1.")¹

Mr. GEER. 1942? This is 1951. Actors are so gabby, I beg your pardon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1942?

Mr. GEER. I stand on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean you stand on the grounds of the fifth amendment?

Mr. GEER. Well, it might incriminate or degrade me. The word "Communist" is an emotional, hysterical word of the day, like the word "witch" in Salem.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you refusing to answer the question because you consider it an emotional and hysterical matter? Is that the grounds of your refusal, or is it some other ground?

Mr. GEER. On the grounds of tending to incriminate.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you are refusing to answer the question because to do so might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. GEER. Incriminate.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you place your refusal to answer squarely upon that ground?

Mr. GEER. Upon that ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee the basis for your refusal to answer that question or give the committee some information upon which it may judge whether or not to answer that question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. GEER. I answered that question on the advice of counsel and refused it.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you refuse to furnish any information to the committee upon which it may act or judge—

Mr. GEER. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). The requirement of your answering that question?

I have before me an issue of October 20, 1936, of the Daily Worker, in which there is an article under the title "Miner Talks in the Bronx Tomorrow." In the body of this article appears this language:

All the members and friends of the Jewish Bureau of the Communist Party and the Furriers Union which have endorsed Gold's candidacy have been asked to attend this meeting, the Bronx County Committee of the Communist Party announced. Chairman of the meeting will be Harry Yerris, county secretary,

¹ Retained in committee files.

who will open the gathering with brief introductory remarks. In addition to the speaking, an elaborate program has been arranged, featuring Will Geer.

Do you recall that meeting?

Mr. GEER. I refuse to answer the question on the same grounds of the fifth amendment, because it is an emotional question, out of date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is your answer based upon the date of the document? Is that the basis of your refusal?

Mr. GEER. On the grounds of the fifth amendment, as I have already stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then place your refusal on the grounds that you actually rely upon.

I have before me the September 25, 1945, issue of the Daily Worker, in which there appears an article entitled "Thousand Artists, Writers Back Davis," and I read as follows:

Formation of an artists, writers, and professionals group for the election of Benjamin J. Davis was announced yesterday by Paul Robeson, chairman of the new group. More than 1,000 citizens, including some of the most outstanding in the theater, radio, and motion pictures, fine arts, dance, publishing, literature, educational and allied fields have already joined the division which will actively campaign for the reelection of Davis.

And then further in the article appears the statement of those who were connected with the formation of that group, in which this language is used, "also Howard De Silva"; and then naming numerous others. And finally in the list the name of Will Geer appears—

Mr. GEER. Among a thousand.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). As a signer.

Did you participate in the formation of that organization?

Mr. GEER. I claim the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. What privilege?

Mr. GEER. On the grounds of incrimination. Fifth Amendment. Incrimination, fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you entertain at any meetings of the Communist Party or branches of the Communist Party other than the matters I have already referred to?

Mr. GEER. Ancient history. I stand on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the grounds of the fifth amendment or ancient history?

Mr. GEER. Well, on the amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. To answer the question might tend to incriminate you? Is that what you mean?

Mr. GEER. Correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since so much emphasis has been placed by you on the question of ancient history, are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. GEER. I refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ancient history?

Mr. GEER. No; same grounds.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Geer, we can get along a lot faster if you will make your answers responsive to the questions that are asked you.

Mr. GEER. I will try to, sir.

Mr. WOOD. It will help the committee a lot and save a lot of time.

Mr. GEER. I will do my best.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Geer, I have before me an April 27, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker, in which under the column "Broadway Beat" there is an article relating to you entitled "Actor's Reply to Columnist." I will read the first paragraph and then go down into the body about a matter which I want to ask you about.

Will Geer sounds off in a letter to the editor of a theater publication.

We see that a certain columnist has attempted to slough off unemployment in our theater by attacking what he calls the censorship of the artist in the Soviet Union. He tells a discouraged actor to beware of casting envious glances at the good employment of the Soviet actor because some Soviet composers have just been criticized by the Soviet state.

Then in the body of the article appears this statement attributed to you:

The clucking that has gone on about control of the Soviet composer has been largely hearsay. He is unaware apparently of the Soviet cultural program. As an American who has worked in the Soviet theater and cinema, I am all for government participation in show business. Over a period of 25 years the Soviet theater has given infinitely more variety than has been evidenced in the London or New York stages. It has given year-round work for the artist, vacations with pay, free day's salaries to young students of the theater. Whenever I write to the young would-be artists of the theater that have given up probably or have been unable to afford study, I am reminded of the young actor I talked to in Moscow before the war. He was to enroll as a student at the Trade Union Theater, a theater of repertory that was largely supported by trade-unionists of a ball bearing factory. I asked him if he was just starting out. "Oh, no. I have spent one season already in the Realistic Theater and one in the Molle Theater"—

and so forth. Were you correctly quoted in that article?

Mr. GEER. I stand on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that article correctly reflect your views about government participation in the show business—

Mr. GEER. Thanks for reading it, but I stand on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). At the time it was alleged to have been made by you?

Mr. GEER. I stand on the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. That you refuse to answer?

Mr. Wood. The reporter can't get your indication.

Mr. GEER. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you in Russia?

Mr. GEER. I went on a theatrical tour to see the Moscow Art Festival in 1935.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the first time that you had been to Moscow?

Mr. GEER. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first time you had been in the Soviet Union?

Mr. GEER. It was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it the only time you have been there?

Mr. GEER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of your trip?

Mr. GEER. To see the theaters. Our theater was in a pretty bad state at this time. It was a repertory theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go alone?

Mr. GEER. I went alone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go in a representative capacity of any character?

Mr. GEER. No; just the theater festival tour.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you pay all of your own expenses, or were part of your expenses contributed?

Mr. GEER. Paid my own expenses.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Harold Ware in Russia at that time?

Mr. GEER. Not that I know of, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Harold Ware your brother-in-law?

Mr. GEER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you related in any manner to him?

Mr. GEER. No, sir; not related.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your wife's name?

Mr. GEER. Herta Ware.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she related to Harold Ware?

Mr. GEER. I imagine she was. He has been dead for a number of years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her relationship?

Mr. GEER. I hadn't met the lady at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the relationship would be just the same, wouldn't it, then?

Mr. GEER. It would be an in-law relationship. I don't call an in-law a relative.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you whether he was your brother-in-law.

Mr. GEER. Brother-in-law?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. GEER. No; he is not my brother-in-law.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of Harold Ware to your wife?

Mr. GEER. I would call him an uncle-in-law.

Mr. TAVENNER. An uncle-in-law?

Mr. GEER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of your wife to Mother Bloor?

Mr. GEER. My wife is the granddaughter of an 88-year-old lady known as Mother Bloor to many people who have no truck with communism.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did Harold Ware have any connection of any kind with your trip to Russia.

Mr. GEER. I have never met Harold Ware. I hadn't met my wife at the time either. I had not met my wife.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a passport application which was obtained by the State Department by subpoena duces tecum of a person by the name of Thomas Gilbert, where you appear or the name Will Geer appears as the identifying witness. Will you examine it, please?

Mr. GEER (after examining document). What was the question you wanted to ask of me, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't recall how the question was worded, but I will now ask you whether or not you were a witness to that application.

Mr. GEER. I recognize the picture. I don't remember the name, but I certainly signed the application.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it is your signature?

Mr. GEER. Yes. People frequently ask for favors of that sort, recommendations.

Mr. TAVENNER. The man's name appears as Thomas Gilbert in the application. You say you recognize the photograph?

Mr. GEER. I recognize the photograph but not the name.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know him by the name of Thomas Gilbert?

Mr. GEER. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whose photograph is that if that is not Thomas Gilbert?

Mr. GEER. I wouldn't remember the—oh, well, I might. It has been a number of years ago. What date was that? I might have remembered the name, but we meet so many people that it is impossible for me to connect the name with the picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have just told us that you did not remember him by that name. I want to know by what name you did know the individual whose picture appears there.

Mr. GEER. I just don't recognize that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. But who is the man?

Mr. GEER. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know the man?

Mr. GEER. I know the man's face, but I do not know his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Never heard the name Whitey Roland?

Mr. GEER. I never heard that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Never heard the name Whitey Roland?

Mr. GEER. Never heard the name—1937 is the date?

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated in your affidavit that you had known this individual, Thomas Gilbert, for a period of 4 years.

Mr. GEER. At that time. That's 1937. At that time I probably did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce this photostatic copy into evidence and request that it be marked "Geer Exhibit No. 2."

(The document referred to above was marked "Geer Exhibit No. 2.")¹

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you another application for passport, purporting to be under the name of Thomas Gilbert, a photograph attached, in which Isabel S. C. Wright appears as the identifying witness. Will you examine that application and look at the photograph of Thomas Gilbert?

Mr. GEER. I have never seen that man before.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is an entirely different photograph from the one in the application which you signed as a witness, is it not?

Mr. GEER. I would say so, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the person whose photograph appears on the application?

Mr. GEER. I have never seen—

Mr. TAVENNER. On the application just handed you?

Mr. GEER. I have never seen this face before to my knowledge. I have never seen his face before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever confer with the party whose photograph appears in exhibit No. 2, which was the first copy I handed you—

¹ Retained in committee files.

Mr. GEER. To my knowledge—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. About his acting as a witness to an application for passport by you?

Mr. GEER. As far as I can recollect, never, to the best of my memory. I don't believe I really understood that, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. To simplify the question, did you ever talk to the person whose photograph appears on the exhibit 2 and ask him to act as the identifying witness in an application to be filed by you?

Mr. GEER. To the best of my knowledge, I have never seen the man.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me hand you again exhibit No. 2, which contains the photograph of the individual whose photograph you recognize.

Mr. GEER. This is No. 1? Is this exhibit No. 1?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, it's exhibit No. 2, but it is the first of the photo-stats which I handed you.

Mr. GEER. You've got me all mixed up on 2's and 1's. I'm sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. That's easily understandable. So I am handing you now the application which is marked "Geer Exhibit No. 2" and contains the photograph of the person known the application as Thomas Gilbert, and I ask you whether you at any time made an arrangement with the individual whose photograph appears there by which he was to act as the identifying witness for you if you acted as the identifying witness for him.

(At this point Representative Charles E. Potter left the hearing and Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing.)

Mr. GEER. I believe, to the best of my recollection, sir, when I applied for a passport in 1935 my witness was a woman and had nothing to do with this person at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I know, but will you answer my question as to whether or not you ever had conversation with the individual whose photograph appears there of the character that I mentioned to you?

Mr. GEER. To the best of my recollection, never.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many passports have you obtained?

Mr. GEER. In 1935, the year I went to the festival, and in 1920 I went over in a cattle boat, one of Harold Swift's cattle boats, after I got out of school, but I don't think I had to have a passport then as I remember. Maybe I did. That's about 1920. It's when I was just a kid. I remember I worked over on a cattle boat. And I have forgotten if we had to have passports or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you signed this application which is exhibit No. 2 as an identifying witness?

Mr. GEER. It's entirely vague in my mind. Someone just asked me they wanted to get a passport. People frequently come by—

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you known the individual for 4 years?

Mr. GEER. Yes. I think he was something to do with the merchant marine or something or other.

Mr. Wood. Counsel, we are going to have to suspend here for about 20 minutes so the members may answer this call, and we will resume at 11:30.

(Thereupon, at 11:10 a. m., a recess was taken until 11:45 a. m., at which time the following proceedings were had:)

Mr. Wood. Come to order, please.

By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have designated Mr. Doyle, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Wood as a subcommittee to continue this hearing.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Geer, do you know the purpose for which Thomas Gilbert sought permission to travel abroad?

Mr. GEER. To the best of my recollection, no. Just he wanted to go. He's a merchant seaman. I think I should add, if you would permit me, that I worked as a merchant seaman in between jobs on shore and naturally I met a great many seamen at that time, and there would be dozens and dozens—hundreds of people, in fact—that I couldn't recall the name of and still at the same time I'd be perfectly willing to help them out on getting a reference for a job or anything of that sort.

(At this point, Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing.)

Mr. GEER. (continuing). At the same time, you wouldn't remember their name but you'd know their face.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't mean that you would sign an identifying affidavit that you had known a person for 4 years if you hadn't known him, would you?

Mr. GEER. I certainly wouldn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, can you state whether or not the person whose photograph appears on exhibit No. 2, which I will hand to you again, is a person who was known to you by the name of Roland?

Mr. GEER. No, I have no recollection about the name whatever. The face does look familiar. Just as the face of a lady in the back court there I hadn't seen for 20 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer in evidence the second passport application and ask that it be marked "Exhibit Geer 3."

Mr. Wood. It will be admitted. I thought it was admitted already.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit Geer 3.")¹

Mr. TAVENNER. And also the other excerpts from the papers which I read in evidence, namely, the issue of the Daily Worker of October 20, 1936, [p. 4], which I ask be marked "Exhibit Geer 4," and of the Daily Worker of April 27, 1948, [p. 16], which I asked be marked "Exhibit Geer 5."

Mr. Wood. They may be marked.

(The documents referred to were marked "Exhibits Geer 4 and Geer 5," respectively.)²

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Geer, were you a member of or affiliated in any way with the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. GEER. Well, there are about four or five hundred organizations listed as being here, and I'd have to really consult this book to find out.

Mr. TAVENNER. To find out whether you were a member?

Mr. GEER. No. To find out whether it's—what it's listed. There are several hundred organizations. It is difficult to remember the

¹ Retained in committee files.

² See appendix following conclusion of hearings printed under this title.

names of them, as it is difficult to remember the names of people. So I ask the privilege of looking at this book to find out whether that is one so listed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What difference does it make, in answer to the question of whether or not you were a member, as to whether it's listed in a book?

Mr. GEER. I simply list all things like this as an—emotional words used in a time that is altogether—it is like—

Mr. TAVENNER. That doesn't change the fact of your membership or nonmembership, does it?

Mr. GEER. No. I just simply stand on the grounds of the amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to answer on the grounds that to do so—

Mr. GEER. Might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. GEER. Those things are years ago.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is again a period of ancient history, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEER. Yes. At the present time, hospital benefits. I play veterans' hospitals. A little group goes around and plays veterans' hospitals. For all I know they might be listed in another 6 months as something altogether out of order. Things change very rapidly nowadays.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace?

Mr. GEER. The name doesn't sound familiar, but I'd like—I really don't recall the name of that one, sir. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. It was held on March 25, 26, and 27 of 1949 in New York City under the sponsorship of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. WOOD. What is your answer?

Mr. GEER. The name sounds unfamiliar to me, but I would stand on the grounds of the same privilege.

Mr. WOOD. You mean you decline to answer the question?

Mr. GEER. On the ground of the same privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of or affiliated with the International Workers Order?

Mr. GEER. I would stand on the same privilege.

Mr. WOOD. That isn't an answer, Mr. Geer. Do you answer the question?

Mr. GEER. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the same privilege. That is the correct wording? Thank you, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of or affiliated with the International Labor Defense?

Mr. GEER. I refuse to answer the question on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time affiliated with the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. GEER. I would decline to answer that on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time affiliated with the Theater Arts Committee?

Mr. GEER. I would decline to answer that question on the same grounds, sir, on advice of counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time affiliated with the Workers Alliance of Greater New York either as a sponsor of any of its programs or policies or activities?

Mr. GEER. I would decline that answer tending to incriminate me. I couldn't be responsible for the use of my name.

Mr. Wood. Well, now, which?

Mr. GEER. May I link them together, sir? I'd appreciate it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are a member of the Screen Actors' Guild?

Mr. GEER. I am, sir. I pay dues. I am a life member of the Actors' Equity Association and AFRA, radio organization. Those are the only organizations I can think of I paid dues to in my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever paid dues to the Communist Party?

Mr. GEER. Decline on the grounds it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever questioned by officials of the moving-picture industry regarding your alleged activity in Communist-front organizations—that is, organizations which have been cited as Communist fronts by the Attorney General of the United States and this committee or other committees?

Mr. GEER. No. They simply told me they didn't believe everything they read.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, they discussed the matter with you prior to your employment?

Mr. GEER. Just casually. People around the studio. I wouldn't remember the names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it said to you they didn't believe everything they read or heard?

Mr. GEER. That's an old saying of mine too. I don't know which one.

Mr. TAVENNER. You quoted some official of the moving-picture industry as having made that statement.

Mr. GEER. I wouldn't recall who it was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, whom did you talk to on the subject of Communist-front organizations within the industry?

Mr. GEER. I can't remember. There are many people that discuss the subject, but they would probably be in the hundreds. I couldn't possibly remember their names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss it with them at the time of your employment on any of the projects that you undertook?

Mr. GEER. To my recollection, no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed by any of the people with whom you had discussed that subject?

Mr. GEER. I imagine so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. GEER. I wouldn't recollect offhand, sir, but I would presume so because I have done 15 pictures with 4 major studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did any of those producers talk to you about your activities either within—alleged activities within the Communist Party or in Communist-front organizations? That is, organizations cited as being Communist-front organizations?

Mr. GEER. I discussed it with one director perhaps, and he asked me just what I was anyway, and I told him I was a conservationist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Conservationist?

Mr. GEER. Conservationist, sir. That is my philosophy. I believe in returning the land to the same shape we found it in. I believe also in conserving the things that one-world Wendell Willkie talked about and F. D. R. got for us. That's my philosophy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, did he ask you about communism?

Mr. GEER. No, not to my recollection. He asked me what I was anyway. That was my answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Who was that director? What was his name?

Mr. GEER. I can't recollect the name of it, the particular occasion, but I do remember making that statement, because the man happened to be opposed to F. D. R., and he didn't think much of it, whoever it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you did not tell him that you had been connected with Communist-front organizations?

Mr. GEER. I stand on the grounds of the fifth amendment in answering that question, sir, because I already said that that's a hysterical word.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not see how it could tend to incriminate you to state whether or not you discussed the subject with an employer, or an employer with you.

Mr. GEER. Well, I'm—I really—that's just something casual that happens in everyday life. I have really—that's all the conversation I happen to recall on it. I say that would happen, oh, an average of once a day during the past few years, discussions with people about philosophy.

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm speaking of your employers. Did your employers discuss your activities with you daily?

Mr. GEER. Never in connection with employment to the best of my knowledge. I would be quite willing to discuss it with them any time.

Mr. TAVENNER. More willing than you have been with this committee?

Mr. GEER. I should say so, sir, because this is a peculiar atmosphere we are living in today. And the citizen has to see clearly all the time how important it is to preserve individual rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. You would answer then questions propounded to you by your employer as to whether or not you had been or are at the present a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GEER. I should think I would, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. GEER. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Do you consider yourself to be a patriotic citizen?

Mr. GEER. I do indeed, sir. I love America. I love it enough to want to make it better.

Mr. VELDE. In the event of an armed conflict in which the United States would find itself opposed to Soviet Russia, would you be willing to fight on the side of the United States?

Mr. GEER. Factually, I would grow vegetables for victory for the Farm Bureau as I did before and play hospitals. It would be a wonderful idea, in fact, if they put every man my age in the front lines and in Washington fellows on the other side. I think wars would be negotiated immediately. I approve of that.

Mr. VELDE. You say you would be willing to join the Army?

Mr. GEER. Indeed I would, sir, if they could take me.

Mr. VELDE. That's all.

Mr. GEER. My function is growing vegetables and entertaining, however.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Geer, there is one thought running through my mind on your various answers here, and I wish you would explain to me because I just can't get your reasoning. Will you tell this committee as to membership in these various organizations that have been asked you by counsel, and that you have declined to answer on the ground it might incriminate you: How would such an answer incriminate you?

Mr. GEER. Well, in my opinion it is something set up outside. It is the committee set-up. And you yourself or this committee has made these stipulations. It is something that has been set up and to my mind created artificially.

Mr. KEARNEY. You mean to say that this committee has set up the fact that if you said that you belonged to any one of these particular organizations asked by the counsel that we would have you in the position where you have incriminated yourself?

Mr. GEER. I don't quite understand that, but so far as this committee is concerned I believe so, sir. That's my feeling today in 1951.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you think that this committee is a persecuting committee?

Mr. GEER. To my mind there's great similarities between the Inquisition and people like in our country that have been persecuted, like Mormons.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that yours or your counsel's?

Mr. GEER. That's my own opinion.

Mr. KEARNEY. I see counsel advising you on your answers there.

Mr. MARGOLIS (attorney for the witness). I will be glad to give you my opinion, Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. You're not testifying.

Mr. MARGOLIS. No, but I'd be glad—

Mr. GEER. I'd be glad to answer that question.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you believe, Mr. Geer, that the Congress of the United States has the right to set up a committee such as this is to search out subversive activities in this country?

Mr. GEER. I'm an entertainer and not a lawyer. I wouldn't know whether it would be right or not.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, you seem to have enough answers on all other subjects here, questions. Can't you answer that question "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. GEER. As an entertainer simply and not a lawyer, I really couldn't answer that question, sir. In my opinion, I think it would be more important right now to investigate inflation and the high cost of living. That's my own opinion.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I think you've got something there too.

Mr. GEER. We all of us have to appear in a turkey once in a while. I don't think the public is seriously interested in the fact—

Mr. KEARNEY. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Geer, you say you appeared in a picture called The Tall Target in February or March?

Mr. GEER. February or March of this year, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I should preface this for the record that the introduction of names I shall mention has no particular connotation. Who was the producer of *Tall Target*?

Mr. GEER. The producer of the picture was I believe Mr. Richard Goldstone.

Mr. JACKSON. Who did the script?

Mr. GEER. I wouldn't know about that, sir. I met a man named—on the set—but I couldn't recollect his name.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the director of the picture?

Mr. GEER. The director of the picture was Anthony Mann.

Mr. JACKSON. And on *Lights Out* who was the producer?

Mr. GEER. The producer on that picture was a man named Buckner, a very brilliant producer, and the director was an exceptionally remarkable director named Marc Robeson, who has had several successes.

Mr. JACKSON. Who did the script on *Lights Out*?

Mr. GEER. I imagine the producer did. He usually does his.

Mr. JACKSON. On *The Barefoot Mailman*, who was the producer?

Mr. GEER. The producer on that, Mr. Cohn I think. He's the son-in-law of Harry Cohn. I believe that's the name. Robert Cohn.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know who wrote the script on that?

Mr. GEER. No. It was a western laid in Florida. That's about all I recollect about it.

Mr. JACKSON. And the director?

Mr. GEER. The director of that was quite a brilliant young director named Earl McAvoy from Boston.

Mr. JACKSON. What is your agency, Mr. Geer?

Mr. GEER. My agency is Paul Wilkins, 9006 Sunset Boulevard.

Mr. JACKSON. On the "strip," is it?

Mr. GEER. Yes. On the "strip," sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I stress again that the names given by the witness in answer to my questions are not necessarily connected with the subject of the committee's investigation.

That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEER. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Geer, did I understand you to say in response to counsel's question a while ago concerning the conversations that you had had with the employers that some one of them had told you that he didn't believe all he read about your connection with—

Mr. GEER. Yes. And I added I don't believe all I hear either.

Mr. WOOD. Well, in connection with the organizations about which you have been interrogated by counsel, particularly concerning your affiliation or membership with them, don't you think that it would be enlightening to the party, whoever it was in connection with your employment that made that expression that he didn't believe all he read in the paper, to set him completely right about it now by answering the questions frankly here?

Mr. GEER. I think there is too decided an atmosphere of fear nowadays and hysteria to answer that, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Don't you feel now that your declination to answer questions here leaves you in the position of either giving false testimony or of tacitly admitting your membership therein?

Mr. GEER. I don't feel so, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You don't?

Mr. GEER. No; I don't really.

Mr. WOOD. If you're not a member of such organizations, to say so wouldn't incriminate you, would it?

Mr. GEER. I'd appreciate it so much, Mr. Wood, if you'd ask me questions about the thousands of other benefits I played.

Mr. WOOD. I'm asking you about the questions I'm concerned about and that this committee is concerned about.

Mr. GEER. That's why—

Mr. WOOD. And I would very much appreciate a frank answer. I ask you the question: If you are not a member of a single one of these organizations about which you have been interrogated, do you admit that it wouldn't incriminate you to say you are not a member of them? Don't you admit that?

Mr. GEER. Mr. Wood—

Mr. WOOD. I'd like an answer to that question if I may.

Mr. GEER. I frankly don't know how to answer that question.

Mr. WOOD. You don't know how to answer it?

Mr. GEER. I don't know how in this day, 1951.

Mr. WOOD. I will try to make it a little more explicit. You are asked particularly about membership—well, in the Communist Party. Now, if you are not a member of the Communist Party and have never been, do you think it would incriminate you to say so?

Mr. GEER. At this particular time, although the Communist Party is a perfectly legal one, I think they should—

Mr. WOOD. I'm asking if you're not a member would it incriminate you to say you're not a member?

Mr. GEER. I'm standing on the Constitution. I believe that they're being persecuted now like the Mormons, the Jews, the Quakers, the Masons—

Mr. WOOD. That isn't responsive.

Mr. GEER (continuing). Even radical Republicans in Lincoln's day.

Mr. WOOD. That's not responsive to my question.

Mr. GEER. I'm trying to answer directly, sir.

Mr. WOOD. I want to know what your conception is about what incriminates you to tell the truth before this committee, if it is the truth, that you are not a member of the Communist Party. That wouldn't in any sense incriminate you, would it?

Mr. GEER. I really believe, sir, that the best answer to that, that I'm just allergic to meetings and things of that sort, and I stand on the advice of my counsel that—

Mr. WOOD. And decline to answer that question?

Mr. GEER. In this particular day, April 11, 1951, I do, sir, with the situation of the world as it is. It's a hysterical situation.

Mr. WOOD. That's all.

Mr. GEER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I have one more question. Did I understand you to say that you felt the Communist Party was a legal party?

Mr. GEER. I understand so. I believe that.

Mr. VELDE. You understand it is?

Mr. GEER. To my understanding.

Mr. VELDE. Would it be any crime to admit your membership in a legal party, then?

Mr. GEER. In this day of hysteria it is, sir.

Mr. VELDE. That's all.

Mr. GEER. Because they're like—

Mr. WOOD. Then you want to leave it before this committee then that in your opinion it would subject you to the danger of self-incrimination to either admit it or deny it?

Mr. GEER. I think so, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Even if your denial was true? If you should deny it and it should be true, that would still incriminate you? Is that the way you want to leave it?

Mr. GEER. Well, I'm just simply an entertainer, and I'm not a lawyer, sir, and I can't testify.

Mr. WOOD. Is that all the answer you desire to give the committee?

Mr. GEER. That is, sir. We don't get the training in law that you do down in Athens, Ga.

Mr. WOOD. You have a couple of very astute counsels. You can confer with them.

Mr. GEER. I trust lawyers even when they back shows I'm in. I have had some bad experiences in one called Tobacco Road.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't ask your opinion about lawyers. I'm just commenting on the fact you have one on each side of you.

Mr. GEER. I trust the lawyers, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Did the lawyers advise you to say that it would tend to incriminate you to deny your membership in an organization to which you have never belonged?

Mr. GEER. Well, I take a lawyer's backing if he backed a play, but in this situation—

Mr. WOOD. I asked if they advised you—

Mr. GEER. Mr. Wood—

Mr. WOOD. You said you answered on the advice of counsel. I want to know if the counsel have advised you that that is a correct answer and bona fide, straightforward—

Mr. GEER. I think we're getting out of bounds, Mr. Wood, about the lawyers and things. I'm just simply an entertainer and like to entertain for the public.

Mr. WOOD. Then do you want to decline to answer that question as to whether or not the attorneys advised you?

Mr. GEER. I think it would be advisable, sir. I'm sorry.

Mr. WOOD. All right, if you want to leave that cloud on them.

Mr. GEER. Oh, there are lots of clouds, war clouds, all sorts of clouds.

Mr. WOOD. That's all.

Mr. GEER. Thank you, Mr. Wood and committee.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robert Lees.

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

Mr. LEES. I do.

Mr. WOOD. For the purpose of this investigation, Mr. Reporter, let the record disclose that there is a quorum of the full committee present—Mr. Jackson, Mr. Velde, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Doyle, and Mr. Wood.

**TESTIMONY OF ROBERT LEES, ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS**

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

Mr. LEES. Robert Lees.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. LEES. Yes; I am.

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

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

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis, Los Angeles.

Mr. LEES. I happen to have a statement here I would like to introduce at this time if I may.

Mr. Wood. When counsel has finished his examination, we will be glad for you to file any statement with the clerk for the record.

Mr. LEES. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lees, will you state when and where you were born, please, sir?

Mr. LEES. I was born in San Francisco, July 10, 1912.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. LEES. Los Angeles. 742 Schumacher Drive, Los Angeles 48.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. LEES. I am a screen writer.

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

Mr. LEES. All my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been engaged in the practice of your profession elsewhere or solely in California?

Mr. LEES. Only once, sir, I believe I would say was outside of California, when I came to Washington to write a film for General Sommervell called Substitution and Conversion during the war. It was a film that was necessary for conservation of critical materials at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your educational background and training?

Mr. LEES. I was in grammar school in San Francisco, Lowell High School, San Francisco. I came to Los Angeles and started at U. C. L. A., and unfortunately there was a depression on at the time and I couldn't finish my freshman year, and that's the conclusion of my education formally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief account of your employment record?

Mr. LEES. I started writing—well, let me put it this way: I started acting in an extra capacity, bit capacity, for the years 1930 to 1934. Starting in 1934 I became a writer at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, where I did some 55, roughly, short films—Robert Benchley, Pete Smith, Crime Doesn't Pay. Quite a few shorts, two of which won Academy Awards at the time.

Then I started writing features. And they were primarily comedies. There was one, No Time for Love, with Fred MacMurray, Claudette Colbert.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. LEES. It's going to be very difficult for me to get exact dates on these things. I think that roughly was about 1942 I believe, 1941,

something like that. I can't really recall exactly the dates of these films.

But then I worked at Universal-International and did quite a few films for them, mostly Abbott and Costello comedies; I think about five or six of them. Hold That Ghost, Meet Frankenstein, the present one, Meet the Invisible Man, Widow of Wagon's Gap. I can't recall them. Must have been five or six of those.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the last production that you worked on?

Mr. LEES. The last production released?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. LEES. Or the last employment?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us say the last employment.

Mr. LEES. The last employment I had was at Republic Studios where I was employed to write a picture for Judy Canova.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. LEES. I don't quite know, but it was about—I would think about a week or two before I received my subpoena, and I remember attributing the fact that I was suddenly let go to the fact that maybe my appearance before this committee was responsible.

Mr. WOOD. You were just asked when it was.

Mr. LEES. Well, I couldn't understand why I was not working in the middle of the assignment was all. I wanted to explain the reason, Mr. Wood, as I understand it.

Mr. WOOD. Well, now, will you now answer the question when it was?

Mr. LEES. I say about 3 or 4 weeks before—oh—I received my subpoena. It was the beginning of this year sometime.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment prior to that?

Mr. LEES. My last employment prior to that, at Universal-International Studios where I was working on a picture for Jimmy Durante and Donald O'Connor.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was the last production that you worked on?

Mr. LEES. The last production was The Real McCoy for Abbott and Costello, which hasn't been released, and the one before that which is now playing the theaters is Meet the Invisible Man.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was the date of your work on those productions?

Mr. LEES. It's going to be very difficult.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean the date of your employment let us say.

Mr. LEES. Well, it's hard for me to say this, for the simple reason that some of these pictures have been written I would say maybe a year before they were released. The latter part of 1950 I was working on the Jimmy Durante-Donald O'Connor film. The Abbott and Costello film I guess was at the beginning of that year approximately, 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the circumstances and the details of your employment for those two pictures, The Real McCoy and—what was the name of the other one?

Mr. LEES. Meet the Invisible Man. The circumstances I believe are similar to the circumstances of any writer in Hollywood who's employed. You're called up by your agent and told to go out to the

studio, that you have a job. If you're not called by your agent, you're not working.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was your agent?

Mr. LEES. My agent is the Sam Jaffe Agency. It's on Sunset Boulevard. I don't know the exact address.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with your employer before accepting the employment, or was that done entirely through your agent?

Mr. LEES. No; sometimes there would be a discussion as to the story and whether or not we felt like—whether I felt the story could be done or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was prior to your employment?

Mr. LEES. Sometimes. Usually you would have the script to examine to see whether you felt suitable as a writer or that you liked the story or that you thought you could do the job. If you felt that you could and the studio wanted to hire you, you said that you could and you were hired.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you represented by any other agency other than the one you have mentioned?

Mr. LEES. I was represented by two other agencies in the time that I have been working in films. I was represented for a great number of years by the Paul Kohner Agency. I was represented a short time—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the name again, please?

Mr. LEES. Paul Kohner, K-o-h-n-e-r. The Paul Kohner Agency. And for a short time with the Nat Goldstone Agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was a person by the name of George Wilmer your personal agent in connection—

Mr. LEES. He was the agent in charge of writers for Nat Goldstone, and on that basis he represented me along with others in the agency who were assistants in the literary department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has that representation continued on to the present time?

Mr. LEES. That representation was terminated. I don't know exactly what day it was or what date it was, but I believe I have been with the Jaffe Agency for over 2 years or something like that. Two years I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for the termination of your relationship?

Mr. LEES. I felt, as when I left Mr. Kohner, that I was not getting the story sales and the jobs at the time. Whether it was the agent's fault or whether it was the fact the industry was in a slump because of the world situation some 2 years back—it's picked up since. I left anyhow and have been working with the Sam Jaffe Agency. I have been represented, rather, by the Sam Jaffe Agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did others leave that agency at the same time that you did?

Mr. LEES. I don't know who left or who didn't leave, but there has been a great number of circulations among agents and their clients. You stay with an agency for a while, and if you don't like the jobs you're getting or if you don't think you're getting jobs, you change. You change for reasons that maybe a new agency would want to make an impression with you and get you a job because you're fresh, and you might feel like you're an old "has been" if you have been

with an agency too long. There's a constant movement around. Some are satisfied for a while with their agents, but I have known writers to leave one agency and go to two or three others and come back to the original one.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the practice of conferring with officials of your various employers about the story—

Mr. LEES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Prior to your employment—

Mr. LEES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. (continuing). Which is a reasonable and natural thing.

Mr. LEES. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who are some of those with whom you have conferred?

Mr. LEES. Robert Arthur has been the producer of quite a few of the Abbott and Costello's I have worked on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what movie company?

Mr. LEES. At Universal-International.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Will you name others?

Mr. LEES. Let me see. Sidney Pickert was the producer at Republic on our last picture—my last picture. I can't—I worked for Jack Chertok originally in Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer shorts department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that, please?

Mr. LEES. C-h-e-r-t-o-k, I believe, is the spelling. Let's see. My mind has suddenly gone blank. I can't recall any other producers, but I know there are quite a few. I'm trying to think of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. I'm not asking for the names of producers generally. I'm asking for those with whom you had discussions of your script and the story.

Mr. LEES. Oh, that's very hard to say in the sense that I don't know what you'd call discussions. Sometimes there would be no discussion. The script would be taken to me by the agent. I'd say I would want to go to work on this. And, if the studio had already made up its mind that I was the man to write the film, the job was done and the discussions took place after I was hired. There have been many interviews I have gone on in which no one has been hired because of a feeling of mutual dissatisfaction perhaps with story and concepts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have there been any instances in which there was refusal for other reasons?

Mr. LEES. I don't know what you mean by "other reasons."

Mr. TAVENNER. Reasons other than story concept.

Mr. LEES. Not particularly that I know of. There might have been reasons of maybe a personality problem, but that's whether the producer felt he could get along with you. That might be a reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. In any of the instances in which you were not employed, were you questioned about your affiliations with the Communist Party or any Communist-front organizations? That is, organizations which had been cited by the Attorney General of the United States or this committee or other organizations, Government organizations?

Mr. LEES. Was I questioned?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. LEES. One moment, please.

I wanted to be sure about my legal ground on this. The reason—there has been no question of political affiliations in terms of my employment that I have discussed or have been asked to discuss by any of the people I have worked for. Even up to the very last time I was hired, the general concept seemed to be that a man was hired on his ability as a writer and not on any kind of political affiliations he might have, and simply as to whether he could do the job or not do the job.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were employed by Universal and various of the other groups, who within those groups were actually responsible for your employment?

Mr. LEES. I really don't know how the ladder of studio officialdom works, whether the individual producer could make the decision or whether the story department could make the decision or whether it had to travel all the way up to Mr. Yates or whoever it might be who was in charge of the studio. I never quite know where these decisions come from. I believe that most producers have an autonomy to hire within their own story problems, their stories they have been assigned to.

Mr. TAVENNER. With whom did you deal?

Mr. LEES. Oh, sometimes with the story editor and mostly with the producer directly in charge of that production. And sometimes, well, naturally, after you have been at work on a picture, you do talk with the director; you do talk with the executive producer, and sometimes you might even have conferences, I have heard, with the head of the studio.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have an associate writer or partner?

Mr. LEES. I think that's a matter of public record, the associate that I have worked with. I have been a member of a team for a great number of years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, who's on the team?

Mr. LEES. I think you could find that out very simply by consulting the public records. It's on the screen and so forth and so on.

Mr. Wood. Well, do you know? You know who it is; don't you?

Mr. LEES. Well, I just simply say that this is something that the committee is asking me about which, as I said, is a matter of public record, and I think that the committee could find out very simply by consulting those records. It probably knows by consulting those records already. I'm curious as to—

Mr. Wood. You're asked to name them.

Mr. LEES. What's that?

Mr. Wood. You're asked who they were. Do you know?

Mr. LEES. I say that this is a matter of public record. I know who I collaborated with.

Mr. Wood. Well, would you mind telling the committee? I don't know.

Mr. LEES. Is there any particular reason in regard to this question?

Mr. TAVENNER. A very definite reason.

Mr. LEES. Could you clarify that?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I'm asking you to answer the question.

Mr. LEES. On this question I'd like to first give you my reasons why I might be claiming this privilege at a future date, and I think the ground should be put in the record. I'm claiming the right not to answer that question on the grounds of the first amendment, which

I believe guarantees freedom of belief and expression, and the fifth amendment, which says that a man is not required to testify against himself. And for this reason I decline or do not wish to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you contend that it might tend to incriminate you to state before this committee who are engaged in the writing profession with you?

Mr. LEES. Well, I do know this: That there are a great number of organizations that this committee has deemed to be subversive, and my connections with any individual that can be connected with these organizations can tend to incriminate me, and for this reason I have declined to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You didn't hesitate to answer as to the names of producers and various other persons with whom you had conferred in connection with the employment for the writing which you have done. I can't understand why you claim that to name the individuals who assisted you in the writing might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. LEES. Well, I believe this is a problem that is up to me as an individual to decide what will incriminate me and what won't, and I so decide at this moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you have your counsel to advise you, but it is certainly outside the law, at least in my personal opinion.

Mr. LEES. What was that again?

Mr. TAVENNER. I said in my personal opinion it's certainly the weight of authority that a witness has not the sole right to determine that question; that it is a duty resting upon him to give information to the tribunal, in this case the committee, upon which it might base a decision as to whether or not you should be asked to answer the question. You have counsel there. I suggest that you confer with them.

Mr. LEES. Well—

Mr. Tavenner, on the advice of counsel I stand on the reasons previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Even though you previously stated this was a matter of public record?

Mr. LEES. Well, I said—

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you state that?

Mr. LEES. What's that, sir?

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you state that?

Mr. LEES. I stated—

Mr. KEARNEY. That the names of your associates were public record?

Mr. LEES. That's true.

Mr. KEARNEY. And even with it being public record, you decline to answer on the ground that it might incriminate you?

Mr. LEES. Well, that's true, because of the fact that this committee can make me testify against myself. This is something I refuse to do.

Mr. KEARNEY. How is that testifying against yourself?

Mr. LEES. This is my feeling and the feeling of my counsel, and I have taken that advice and I have considered that as correct advice.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the witness one question there, please?

Mr. Lees, will you direct my attention to where in the public record the names of all our associates with whom you associated may be found?

Mr. LEES. You can consult the—

Well, I—what I was trying to point out, Mr. Doyle, was the fact that the committee could find this information, and that drawing this information from me—the right to find out what the reasons were—and I found out instead of definite reasons I had a feeling that this was something that required my standing on the fifth amendment, which I did. In talking that way previously, I merely want to say this was no information I felt that was being withheld from the committee's examination that way.

Mr. DOYLE. I can understand that; but now will you answer my question? You say it is a matter of public record. Where? As a member of this committee and fellow citizen, I am not familiar with where your name has appeared with your associates. Apparently your name appeared with your associate writers voluntarily on your part. You're rather proud of them, of the fact that you have made a great success in the profession, and I compliment you on your success. But where may I go if I want to find that record, please? You're not ashamed of the names of those associates, I presume, or they wouldn't be with your permission a matter of public record.

Mr. LEES. I do decline to answer it because I believe that's the same question I declined to answer before, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, very frankly, I figured it was an honest-to-God way, my question, to ask you a frank, open question. I'm not trying to trap you. But when you voluntarily allow your name to be associated in the public record on a film or script and tell us that it is a public record, why then you hesitate to tell us the names of those people or where the record is, I don't savvy.

Mr. LEES. Mr. Doyle, I think you just answered the question yourself. You said where the names can be found.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, where can they be found?

Mr. LEES. You just said so.

Mr. DOYLE. Where?

Mr. LEES. It's in the record at the moment, I believe, if you want to reexamine the question you just asked.

Mr. DOYLE. What record?

Mr. LEES. I think you answered the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't know any record. I haven't seen any record where your associates are listed.

Mr. LEES. Well, Mr. Doyle, I do feel that I have answered the question as clearly as I can, and I have stood on my privilege, and that's the best I can do.

Mr. KEARNEY. If you were given the names of those associates, would you admit them?

Mr. LEES. I have claimed the privilege on that reason.

Mr. WOOD. Further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

You state that you refuse to answer because to do so might tend to incriminate you. Do you mean that to answer the question as to who was your associate in writing any of these words, these productions, that to divulge that name might subject you to criminal prosecution of some kind?

Mr. LEES. I explained my reasons when I first declined to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you consulted or collaborated in any of your work with an individual by the name of Fred I. Rinaldo?

Mr. LEES. I refuse to answer the question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an individual by the name of Elizabeth Leech?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sometimes referred to as Elizabeth Leech Glenn?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Carl Winter?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Waldo Salt?

Mr. LEES. Waldo Salt happens to have traveled across the country with me. I know him as a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a meeting in September of 1943 with Waldo Salt—rather, at the home of Waldo Salt—which was attended by Carl Winter and Elizabeth Leech?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lees, the committee is in possession of information indicating that you were issued a registration card No. 47172 in 1944 in the Communist Party. In fact, it was—yes; I think that is right—for the year 1945. Were you issued that card, that registration card?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner, on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1944 were you the holder of Communist Political Association Book bearing number 4607?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there issued to you a 1943 Communist Party book bearing number 25136?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer on the previous grounds, previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was testimony given here before this committee yesterday by Mr. Sterling Hayden. Do you know Mr. Hayden?

Mr. LEES. I was in the room at the time Mr. Hayden made that statement, and I recall him saying something to the effect that he was a member of some sort of cell that contained back-lot workers, and the only white-collar worker he knew about was someone named Bernie. And I was surprised when he mentioned the name "Robert Lees" in this hearing. And the committee declined or didn't seem to bother to question further Mr. Sterling Hayden on that question.

Mr. WOOD. You are asked now if you know him.

Mr. LEES. What was that?

Mr. WOOD. The question was asked you by counsel if you know Sterling Hayden.

Mr. LEES. Well, I have seen him here at this meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know that wasn't my question. Are you acquainted with Sterling Hayden?—not whether you have seen him.

Mr. LEES. Well, on the basis of what happened here the other day and the name and the questions you're asking me, I decline to answer that question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you heard his testimony here. Is it true you were a member of the Communist Party? Is that true or false?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Tavenner, I have told you, on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that statement, Mr. Tavenner.

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

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that statement, Mr. Tavenner, on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever attended meetings of any kind at the home of Abe Polonsky?

Mr. LEES. What do you mean by "meetings"?

Mr. TAVENNER. Meetings. Have you ever been at the home of Abe Polonsky when other persons were there?

Mr. LEES. Well, since I had been in the hearing room the other day and heard the gentleman mentioned by Mr. Hayden among others, I decline to answer that question for the reason I have given in declining to answer anything about Mr. Hayden previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a subscriber to the Daily People's World, The Worker, and the Daily Worker, or any of them?

Mr. LEES. I believe that there is an addition to a list of organizations that have been deemed subversive quite a number of publications that are also deemed subversive. I believe these publications are on that list, and I refuse to answer that question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you made contributions to any of the organizations which you have referred to as having been cited as Communist organizations, including specifically the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. LEES. That—

Mr. TAVENNER. As one of them?

Mr. LEES. Mr. Tavenner, is that on your list?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; it has been cited.

Mr. LEES. If it's on your list, I decline to answer that question for the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you made contributions to the People's Educational Center?

Mr. LEES. I see it's on your list, Mr. Tavenner, and I refuse to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a delegate to the State—

Mr. WOOD. Just a moment, Mr. Tavenner. Other members of the committee may be better advised on this subject than I am. I didn't know that you had a list, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. LEES. This list that I am looking at here is prepared and released by the Un-American Activities Committee, United States House of Representatives: Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (and Appendix).

Mr. WOOD. You're talking about a list of Mr. Tavenner's.

Mr. LEES. Oh, I'm sorry. I included Mr. Tavenner in this committee. I considered that it was the committee's list. I'm sorry.

Mr. WOOD. I believe the list to which you refer embodied in this publication issued on March 3, 1951, is the list of organizations that have been cited by the Attorney General—

Mr. LEES. Oh.

Mr. WOOD (continuing). As Communist-front organizations, as well as by this committee.

Mr. LEES. I'm talking about the list of organizations that is in this publication.

Mr. WOOD. Is it because of the fact that it is listed there that you decline to answer the question?

Mr. LEES. Well, it says "subversive" on the cover of the book. It calls these organizations subversive.

Mr. WOOD. I asked you is it because it's listed there that you refuse to answer the question.

Mr. LEES. I refuse on the ground previously stated—on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the board of trustees of the People's Educational Center in Los Angeles?

Mr. LEES. I refuse to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a delegate to the State Conference on Civil Rights held in San Francisco on August 27 and 28, 1941, which was sponsored by the Northern California Civil Rights Council and the Southern California Branch of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties?

Mr. LEES. I understand that that organization is also on this long list of organizations, and I decline to answer for the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a political rally of the Fifty-ninth Assembly District Victory Council of the Communist Club of the Los Angeles County Communist Party—

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wait a minute. [Continuing] On March 12, 1944, at Marketville in Los Angeles?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer that question for the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know a writer by the name of E. Y. Harburg?

Mr. LEES. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall having attended a benefit party for the People's World at his home in 1944?

Mr. LEES. Since that paper is on the list and I have told you that it has been and my reasons for it, I decline to answer the question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. If the People's World had not been listed in the Guide to Subversive Organizations to which you referred, would you answer the question?

Mr. LEES. I would then seek the advice of my counsel under those circumstances, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall an instance in which the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was denied the use of the hotel premises by the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles in February 1945?

Mr. LEES. Would you repeat that again, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I say do you recall the occurrence when the Ambassador Hotel at Los Angeles refused the use of its hotel premises to

the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee? If it's a question of refreshing your recollection, I can tell you something more about that.

Mr. LEES. Well, since the organization you refer to is on that list, I decline to answer for grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you protest at the action of the Ambassador Hotel?

Mr. LEES. This is connected with the previous question, and I decline to answer for the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. LEES. There are so many organizations down here, Mr. Tavenner, that make it impossible for any other answer but the fact that I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. Wood. He's only asking you about the one.

Mr. LEES. What's that, Mr. Wood?

Mr. Wood. He was only asking you about the one.

Mr. LEES. I know. It's down there. I looked through this.

Mr. Wood. Well, confine your answer, please, specifically to the organization about which you were asked.

Mr. LEES. Yes, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Do you decline to answer as to that organization?

Mr. LEES. I decline to answer as to that organization on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LEES. The Screen Writers' Guild today has a 100 percent guild shop, and every writer who works in Hollywood is a member of the Screen Writers' Guild or almost all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then do I infer you are a member?

Mr. LEES. I am.

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

Mr. LEES. I was a member of the Screen Writers' Guild, I guess, from almost the time that it was made a Screen Writers' Guild by the NLRB election which finally allowed many unions to come into being. I think that was in 1936 the Screen Writers' Guild was founded as it is today.

Mr. TAVENNER. You recall that a number of personalities in Hollywood were subpoenaed before this committee back in 1947. After that date were you a candidate for election to the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LEES. I have been a candidate for the board for the Screen Writers' Guild on several occasions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate in 1948?

Mr. LEES. I think—I might have been. I don't know whether that was the year I was nominated by the nominating committee of the Screen Writers' Guild, but I have been nominated, as I say, for the board of the Screen Writers' Guild on several occasions. It might very well have been in 1948 I was also nominated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you sought election to that board since 1947?

Mr. LEES. Since 1947?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. LEES. I don't know. Actually what happens is the nominating committee puts your name up, and if you're willing to run you run, and if you're elected you're elected. I don't know if the nominating committee has had my name up since then or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, at least you have not been elected to the board since 1947; have you?

Mr. LEES. No. I have never been elected to the board actually.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was an organization brought into being during the period of the war; was it not?

Mr. LEES. Well, the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization is on that list, and I decline to answer further questions about that organization on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You refuse to state what your connection was with that organization?

Mr. LEES. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds previously stated, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write a script on the subject of atomic energy for the Atomic Energy Commission of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization which was intended for a transcontinental radio program?

Mr. LEES. This is connected with the previous question concerning the organization, and I decline to answer for the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You decline to answer whether you prepared a script for that organization?

Mr. LEES. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Actors' Laboratory Theater?

Mr. LEES. That organization is also listed, and I decline to answer for the ground I previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe there was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo a brief in behalf of Alexander Meiklejohn and certain other persons as amicus curiae. - Were you one of the persons in whose name this brief was filed?

Mr. LEES. Will you repeat that question again? An amicus curiae brief?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. LEES. I think, as I recall, I might have been. Will you repeat that question again, please, Mr. Tavenner? Amicus curiae brief to the Supreme Court?

Mr. TAVENNER. That's right.

Mr. LEES. That's right. I believe I did sign it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who sought your signature to that brief?

Mr. LEES. I actually don't recall who sought my signature to that brief. I know that it was about, and I was very anxious to ask the Supreme Court to render a decision in the case of the Hollywood 10, which the Supreme Court has not done. And I feel that the questions of the first amendment that were involved in that case really should have been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any Communist Party connection as far as you know with the movement to present that brief?

Mr. LEES. This question involves an organization which is on your list, and I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Albert Maltz was one of the individuals who appeared before this committee in 1947 and was a defendant in a con-

tempt proceeding. After that time, namely, in 1949, were you the signer of a petition to have him elected to membership on the board of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LEES. Yes. I signed that petition.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he elected?

Mr. LEES. No; he was not that I recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has the Screen Writers' Guild to your knowledge made an effort to remove not from membership but to curtail the activities of persons thought to be members of the Communist Party within its group?

Mr. LEES. I don't know how, in what way, I could know about this, whether they have curtailed or tried to curtail. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know?

Mr. LEES. Not that I know of. I might say that there is a statement of policy in the Screen Writers' Guild which says that anyone can be a member of the Screen Writers' Guild without any ban because of race, creed, religion, political beliefs, something similar to the first amendment. Nobody is required to be anything but a writer to join the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has there at any time in the past been a group or groups within that organization which from your viewpoint were endeavoring to influence the action of that guild along Communist Party lines or in Communist Party interests?

Mr. LEES. Well, the question that you have asked involves an organization on the list that I have before me here, and I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not by your reply mean to indicate that the Screen Writers' Guild has ever been listed as a Communist organization?

Mr. LEES. I simply answered the question as you represented it, and I don't know what implication—can you repeat it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, let us make certain as to what you mean, because I understood you to say you refused to answer because the organization appeared on the list of subversive organizations.

Mr. LEES. Oh, I see what you mean. No. The organization that you have mentioned along with the Screen Writers' Guild in the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, by reason of my reference to the Communist Party—

Mr. LEES. That's—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). You would not answer?

Mr. LEES. I refer to that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not mean to imply—

Mr. LEES. I certainly do not mean to imply—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). That the Screen Writers' Guild is a Communist organization?

Mr. LEES. I don't think it's been listed in any of your organizations, but anything is possible in this day and age.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, do you mean that it's possible that the Screen Writers' Guild is a Communist organization?

Mr. LEES. It's not a Communist organization, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you certain?

Mr. LEES. As I understand it.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you did not mean to infer that it was by your answer?

Mr. LEES. I do not mean to infer that it was, but I did mean that it's possible for any labor union or any organization at some future date perhaps to be listed. That's all I meant.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you any reason to believe that this organization would ever be listed as a Communist-front organization?

Mr. LEES. I have no reason to believe that. Neither have I had reason to believe that some of the organizations or other organizations that have been listed could have been listed. Since that's been possible, almost any organization can become suspect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, will you refer by name to any organization which you did not have reason to believe would be cited and which has been?

Mr. LEES. I decline to get into the discussion of organizations that have been listed, because I cannot, unfortunately, because of involving myself and incriminating myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Referring again to the play Meet the Invisible Man, is it not true that Frederick I. Rinaldo was a joint writer with you in that screen play?

Mr. LEES. I refuse to answer that question on the ground previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Even in view of the fact it's public knowledge?

Mr. LEES. I think this is all a matter of record.

Mr. KEARNEY. I didn't ask you what you thought. Will you please answer my question?

Mr. LEES. I mean I was referring to earlier questions on this subject where I have claimed the privilege, and I am claiming the privilege on exactly the same basis that I claimed it before.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to ask one more question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. KEARNEY. To your knowledge, are any of the convicted Hollywood 10 writers now working for the motion-picture industry?

Mr. LEES. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. KEARNEY. No.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Lees, is it L-e-e-s?

Mr. LEES. That's correct.

Mr. VELDE. You have refused to answer quite a number of very pertinent questions on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate you. I wonder if you honestly feel that you are more in danger of being incriminated by refusing to answer than you would in answering truthfully?

Mr. LEES. Would you repeat that again, please? I'm sorry.

Mr. VELDE. Do you honestly feel that you would be more in danger of being incriminated by refusing to answer these pertinent questions than you would be by answering them truthfully?

Mr. LEES. May I point out that as I understand the use and the privilege of the fifth amendment is such that drawing inferences as to guilt or nonguilt by claiming the privilege is something that is not correct.

Mr. VELDE. Well, you realize, of course, Mr. Lees, this is not a court of law. I mean we can't possibly prosecute you as a defendant.

This is an investigative body of the Congress, and as such it is charged with the duty of gathering information about subversive, disloyal activities of the United States. You realize that, don't you?

Mr. LEES. I realize that the committee is functioning along its lines of investigating what it considers subversive. These are the opinions of the committee. And I have opinions about subversion or nonsubversion or what is democratic or what is patriotic, and those are my opinions. I think we're getting into a matter of opinion.

Mr. VELDE. Apparently you have an idea that admission of Communist Party membership would tend to incriminate you. You have so refused to answer questions about your membership on that basis. Do you want this committee to assume that there is something more subversive or that you know of other activities that are more subversive than being a member of the Communist Party, or do you know of activities that the Communist Party is engaged in that are more subversive?

Mr. LEES. I have just stated I don't think it is correct for this committee to assume on the basis of the fact that I have taken a stand on this amendment, and that is what I said, and you have just pointed out that you're assuming something which I don't want to be assumed.

Mr. VELDE. It's a question of whether or not you feel that there is actual danger of you being prosecuted as a result of your truthful answers here.

Mr. LEES. Well, I believe that in claiming the privilege on the basis of self-incrimination or on the basis that I might tend to incriminate myself makes that quite clear.

Mr. VELDE. Well, can you mention anyone who has been incriminated by this committee by answering questions truthfully?

Mr. LEES. I think this is a matter of personal feeling on the subjects and, as I say, I don't think you should assume from my answers anything other than what is said.

Mr. VELDE. There have been quite a number of cooperative witnesses who admitted to this committee that they have been members of the Communist Party and have answered the questions to the best of their ability. Have any of those in your knowledge been prosecuted for any type of crime whatsoever?

Mr. LEES. I don't know actually what's happened in prosecution, but I do know that there has been a great deal of reaction generally to people who have come before this committee and have cooperated with it. I know that there has been all kind of problems. I know that people who are simply subpoenaed by this committee have found themselves blacklisted or no longer able to work. I figure there's all kinds of jeopardy involved in this committee, either whether you're friendly or not.

Mr. VELDE. There's quite a difference between incrimination by public opinion and incrimination by a court of law.

Mr. LEES. I'm not a lawyer on that subject. I don't know. But I do know I have claimed the privilege in the way I understand it, and that's why I have claimed it.

Mr. VELDE. Do you state whether or not you know Abraham Polonsky?

Mr. LEES. Could I be refreshed by counsel?

Oh, I declined, I gather. I declined.

Mr. VELDE. And do you now decline to state whether you are acquainted with him?

Mr. LEES. I still decline to state on the basis that I have previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. Was Abraham Polonsky engaged in some kind of disloyal or subversive activities that would cause your admission of acquaintance with him to make you refuse to answer on the ground of self-incrimination?

Mr. LEES. Well, as I said, when we discussed this previously or when this subject was brought up, that that name was brought into this committee by an informer. I believe that puts me or anyone else involved in connection with this person in a position whereby he can be incriminated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did I understand you to say "brought before this committee by an informer"?

Mr. LEES. Well, as I feel—

Mr. KEARNEY. Or by someone who was telling the truth?

Mr. LEES. Well, I don't know how to get into this discussion as to what is truth or what is informing or what isn't, but I do know—

Mr. KEARNEY. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman testifying that the whole line of testimony of all these witnesses who have appeared before this committee seems to have a particular pattern with reference to the word "informer."

Mr. VELDE. I just have one more question. Are you acquainted with Sylvia Morrow?

Mr. LEES. What was that name again?

Mr. VELDE. Sylvia Morrow.

Mr. LEES. I don't—

Mr. VELDE. I think she's the former wife or possibly at the present time of Abraham Polonsky.

Mr. LEES. Well, if this is connected with the same question that I have refused to answer for reasons I have stated previously, I refuse on the same basis.

Mr. VELDE. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Lees, you feel you're really informed and acquainted with the purposes of this committee before which you're a witness now? Do you really feel you are?

Mr. LEES. Informed on this committee?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. LEES. In what way?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, do you feel you know what the purpose of this committee is? Let me ask it this way: If you feel you are informed of the purpose of this congressional committee, tell me, please, what you think the purpose of this committee is under the law. What are we trying to do? What is our purpose?

Mr. LEES. Well, I don't know why you're asking me what you're trying to do. Actually I think that is something you know—what you're trying to do. If it's a matter of information on this, I have fine legal advice here that would be—

Mr. DOYLE. I know, but they are both brilliant lawyers, I happen to know. I happen to know that you are a very brilliant writer apparently and a very brilliant witness.

Mr. LEES. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. And you and I were born in a great State, by the way.

Mr. LEES. We were.

Mr. DOYLE. But I'm wondering if you are under any misapprehension as to the purpose, objectives or good faith of this committee. I'm kind of under the impression that perhaps you don't know what the purpose of this committee is, and I'm not asking that, Lees, to embarrass you, to try to trick or trap you. I'm talking with you as one American to another. But I'm wondering if you really know what we are trying to do as a committee.

Mr. LEES. Well, Mr. Doyle, I'm glad you have asked me this question as one American to another—

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. LEES (continuing). Because as an American I have very definite views about certain policies in the past and what has been said about this committee, the activities of this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. I mean, What is the purpose of it as this session in Congress?

Mr. LEES. I know what has been listed organizationwise. I know the number of people who have been blacklisted. I know the number of people who no longer can work. I know the number of careers that have been completely destroyed. I know a great number of things that have happened.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that due to the company they kept?

Mr. LEES. All I know is that these people are respected citizens, and I have been living a very respectable and very, very upright life. I have been born in a great State and lived in that State, as Mr. Doyle has just pointed out. And I feel that 17 years of work in the motion-picture industry of which I have devoted my time and my effort has been destroyed by this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I would assure you that as a member of the committee there is no purpose or intent to destroy the career of any person nor harm any person. But as long as it appears you rely upon your counsel because you haven't had the time or taken the time to read the law and the jurisdiction of this committee, let me just quote the purpose of it, if I may, to you and see if you are in accord with this sort of purpose.

Under Public Law 601 the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized—

to make from time to time investigations of the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States.

Do you or do you not feel that that is a worthy purpose?

Mr. LEES. Mr. Doyle, I have my opinion on what constitutes disloyal activities, and I base my opinion on the first amendment, and I consider disloyal activities that abridge anyone's right to speak or to join organizations of his free will, any rights of religion or beliefs, and I know some organizations that do persecute people because of their religion or their beliefs. I know of organizations that have persecuted people because of their race.

Mr. DOYLE. So do I.

Mr. LEES. I believe that these organizations infringe on the rights of the American people in the first amendment, and I feel that any infringements on the rights of the first amendment must be defended and the organizations that do these things must be attacked.

On this basis I clearly see the right of this committee to attack those organizations and to ferret those organizations out, as I understand the first amendment and the right of the people under the first amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. A few minutes ago you stated, "I have opinion of what is subversive and what is not." Do you remember so stating? And, of course, perhaps we all do that, try to be patriotic citizens. We are trying to arrive at some fair conclusion as to what subversive is and what it is not.

Now, let me ask you again, Mr. Lees. I don't think you answered my question. I don't want to be unfair with you nor press it unduly, but in view of your voluntary statement a few minutes ago, and I quote, "I have opinion what is subversive and what is not"—you weren't pressed for that statement. You volunteered that statement just a few minutes ago. I wrote it down. I think I wrote it down verbatim. Do you remember so stating?

Mr. LEES. I believe that's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. If we are in agreement on that, I will ask you again. The law says that we are authorized by the Congress of the United States to examine into the extent, character, and objects of un-American activities in the United States.

Mr. LEES. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, assuming, therefore, that we are today examining—

Mr. LEES. Are you asking me to assume that, Mr. Doyle, I mean?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; I'm asking you.

Mr. LEES. Because why I said my opinion was on the first amendment is that I felt that there were a great number of things under the first amendment that were being infringed upon by organizations, and because these organizations were not attacked, were not brought here, were not exposed by this committee, I do not feel that this committee was doing the thing that you say that they should be doing.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you don't feel to date we have done a thorough enough job? Is that correct?

Mr. LEES. I feel that for a great number of years that this committee has failed to go ahead and do the job that the—

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. LEES (continuing). That the statement you make there is, according to my interpretation, of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Now, Mr. Lees, do you feel that that statement in the law, just the statement I have read you, to examine and investigate into the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, is a worthy objective?

Mr. LEES. According to the way I see it, I think that the exposure of any infringement of the first amendment is a worthy objective.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, is that your final answer to that question?

Mr. LEES. Yes; that is the final answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, let me go to the next section. This committee then is also charged with examining, investigating the diffusion with-

in the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda as instigated from foreign countries. Do you feel that is a worthy objective of the committee of the Congress or not?

Mr. LEES. Un-American propaganda in terms of what?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you said you had your opinion of what is subversive.

Mr. LEES. I base my opinion on what I can clearly see is subversion of the Constitution, which is the rights, as I understand them, of freedom of religion, speech, thought, press—

Mr. DOYLE. Well—

Mr. LEES (continuing). Rights of trial by jury. I could go on if you want.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, in your opinion what is subversive conduct?

Mr. LEES. Well, I think actually if you ask my opinion on this, which you have, I think where subversion becomes a matter of opinion or the fact that a man has said something that you disagree with, I don't think that disagreement should put a man in a position of not being an American, because I feel that disagreement is the only way that this country has ever grown. There has been disagreement, for example, with General MacArthur today, and what's happened has been the result of a discussion back and forth and conclusions made through disagreement. I believe if no agreement was made or disagreement allowed to be had—

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask: You don't think for one minute that this committee or any member of it is interested in holding subversive a person just because we disagree with that person?

Mr. LEES. I don't know about that. That's what bothers me.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to set you right. That's a lot of baloney.

Mr. LEES. I'm glad to hear that. I'm still somewhat bothered.

Mr. DOYLE. As one American to another, I want to tell you it's a lot of baloney when somebody tells you that this committee of Congress is interested in persecuting or holding a person subversive just because they differ with that person. I have one more question.

Mr. LEES. All right, Mr. Doyle. I would like to give you an opinion on that.

Mr. DOYLE. I asked you for your opinion.

Mr. LEES. I'd like to continue.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, one step more. I'm reading from the law, trying to get an honest-to-God answer from you.

Mr. LEES. I'm giving you that, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE (reading) :

* * * or subversive propaganda of a domestic origin and which attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Now, don't you feel that is a worthy objective and a necessary function in the United States Congress that we investigate into ways and means which are devised and used to upset if need be by force the form of American constitutional government? Aren't we justified? Aren't we charged with that duty as American Congressmen?

Mr. LEES. I think the upholding of the Constitution is not only the job of a Congressman; it is the job of every citizen in this country.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, you would agree with me that we should go every honest-to-God limit within the law to find out who is subversive and what organizations are subversive and what are not, wouldn't you?

Mr. LEES. As I defined very clearly, I hope, what I consider subversion, and since you're asking me my opinion, Mr. Doyle, I can only give you my opinion.

Mr. DOYLE. That's all I want.

Mr. LEES. My feeling is that subversion involves abridgments of the first amendment. When there is no abridgment of the first amendment, where it comes an area in which there is no question of a matter of free speech or certain rights guaranteed by the American people, I believe there becomes a very clear line between what is—

Mr. DOYLE. Wouldn't you feel—

Mr. LEES (continuing). Abridging one's right.

Mr. DOYLE. Wouldn't you feel, Mr. Lees, that if there was any person or organization which propagandized that it was O. K. if necessary to upset the American constitutional form of government by force, that that person or organization was subversive and ought to be smoked out and be stamped for what they are, or not?

Mr. LEES. Well, the point is in this question what involves force and violence and what's being said here by this question in terms of—let me put it this way: I think that any action of force or violence against this country should be treated and is treated as a breaking of the law by the forces that are in charge of the law.

Mr. DOYLE. You have heard Mr. Hayden on yesterday. You said you were in the room here. I think you said you had been here a couple of days and heard all the testimony. That's good, because it gives you the benefit and the committee the benefit of your testimony in light of the fact that you have heard all the testimony for a couple of days.

I am now reminding you that you heard the testimony of Mr. Hayden, an actor from Hollywood, in answer to my question I think it was. I asked him in substance whether or not it was his opinion that the Communist Party in the United States had as one of its objectives the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the United States by force if necessary. Do you remember that question?

Mr. LEES. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Your answer is "Yes." You remember he said that his answer was "Yes." Do you remember that?

Mr. LEES. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Would you feel that in view of that sort of testimony from a former Communist and admitted Communist that this committee is doing any less than its full duty toward the American people to go every legal limit to ferret out every member of the Communist Party in the United States and to smoke out the ways and means which they devise and use to overthrow the constitutional form of government by force if necessary, as Hayden testified?

Mr. LEES. Mr. Doyle, you're now getting onto a question which I feel throughout the testimony here I have claimed the privilege, because of this kind of organization and other organizations being branded as subversive, and I feel, although I would like to discuss these questions with you at length, that this in a sense can be self-incriminating, and I decline to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Lees, this is my final statement or question. One reason I have asked you these questions involving more or less the philosophy of certain thinking is that I wanted to try to convince you if I could as a much younger man that this committee is not interested

in persecuting anybody, not you, not even the Communist Party. We are interested in fulfilling our responsibilities to the American people, which charges us with ferreting out and discovering and bringing before the law, as you stated, every person and every organization that is interested, has an objective in upsetting by force if necessary the American form of government. And I hope you will go back to Hollywood and to my native State with a firm knowledge of the fact that this committee is not apparently functioning the way you thought it was functioning when you came here as a witness. In other words, we are not interested in persecuting.

Mr. LEES. Well—

Mr. DOYLE. I want to try to convince you of that as a much younger man.

Mr. LEES. Mr. Doyle, I would like to go back to California and believe that, but I am going back to California and I know other witnesses and other people who have been before this committee maybe can't go back to California because there's no point in going back there because they can no longer work in the motion-picture industry, and they might try to find a job somewhere else. I don't know how you term this, as persecution or what, but I feel that this certainly comes under the heading of some kind of pressure that can be termed "blacklist," if you will, and that I don't feel that a blacklist denying people employment for whatever political beliefs they might hold is American.

Mr. DOYLE. Not even if those people directly or indirectly are interested in using force and violence to upset the constitutional form of government in this country as testified to yesterday by your fellow actor Hayden?

Mr. LEES. I said this—I have to make myself very clear about this. I said that anyone who uses force or violence should be treated by the proper authorities.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. LEES. I also stated that matters of opinion are sacred under our first amendment, and when you go into the area of thought—and, believe me, I as a writer make my living in the area of thought—in the matter of research, in the matter of reading, in the matter of all these things, I feel that any infringement on perhaps opinions or thoughts which this committee or some other future committee might deem suddenly un-American becomes a very dangerous thing in this country. Very dangerous.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, one question more. Don't you think, in view of your statement, that you felt that persons who had the philosophy of overthrowing this Government by force if necessary should be brought before the bar of the law and prosecuted within the law, in view of that statement by you, don't you think it is our duty as American Congressmen charged with this responsibility by all of the Congress to find out who those persons are in a public session like this and then see to it they are prosecuted within the law? That's what you have just stated, isn't it?

Mr. LEES. I stated a matter of action. As far as getting into the realms of what people believe, if a matter of advocating these things, of trying to talk about these things in terms of destroying our Constitution, as I have said before, I'm a great upholder and believer in our Constitution.

Mr. DOYLE. Then do I understand that a courteous answer to me, and I appreciate your courteous answer—do I understand then that you feel that if members of the Communist Party, as an American, as testified to by your fellow actor Hayden, just talk about overthrowing the United States of America by force, that is O. K. as long as they don't take any action to do it? You differentiated just now in action and talking. Do I understand that that is your—

Mr. LEES. Mr. Doyle, I did get into this discussion with you before, and you have now gone again to that area where discussion becomes impossible, and I'm sorry I must claim my privilege not to get into that discussion, in the same way I have claimed my privilege all through this hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

I want to say again, Mr. Chairman, and I want to emphasize this, that I think that some of these folks from Hollywood, my native State, as well as other places, are under a firm conviction, whatever the reason is, that this committee is interested in persecuting rather than protecting our Nation. I want to say to you again, Mr. Lees, I hope wherever you go that I have a question mark in your mind as to the accuracy of that, because it's damnably false. And I wouldn't be on this committee for 30 seconds if I felt the objective of this committee was to persecute any person or any group of persons in America.

But I am also firmly under the conviction that it is the duty of this committee and it is your duty as an American citizen to help this committee ferret and smoke out any person that is interested in using force to overthrow the constitutional form of government of the United States.

Thank you very much.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will recess until 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. KENNY. Is the witness excused, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

(Thereupon, at 1:35 p. m., the hearing was adjourned, to be reconvened at 10 a. m., Thursday, April 12, 1951.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:15 a.m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde (appearance as noted in transcript), 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; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that the members present are Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the full committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Richard J. Collins.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Collins, will you raise your right hand, please? You solemnly swear the testimony you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COLLINS. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD J. COLLINS

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Richard J. Collins?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. COLLINS. New York City, July 20, 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. COLLINS. 123 North Swall Drive, Los Angeles 48, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. COLLINS. Screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee, briefly, your educational background?

Mr. COLLINS. I went to Browning School in New York. I went to the Lycée Janson de Sailly, Paris. I went back to Browning; then

to Beverly Hills High School; and a winter and a half at Stanford University. That is about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. How have you been employed since the completion of your educational training?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I worked as a clerk at Bloomingdale's in 1935, I think it was. Then as an outside reader for Columbia Pictures in New York. Then junior writer for Twentieth-Century Fox the end of 1936 and 1937. Then for Universal, Selznick's, Paramount, about 1939, for a year. Then for RKO for a short time. Universal for about 6 months. M-G-M about 3 years, I guess that was 1941 through 1944, no, 1942 through 1949. Then James B. Cassidy, an independent. Then Twentieth-Century-Fox again. Then United States Pictures. Then Warner Bros. Then for Robert Rossen Productions. Then for Roberts Productions. Then for Sidney Buchman Enterprises. Then again for Roberts Productions.

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that where you are now employed?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee what particular screen plays you have worked on in the past 3 or 4 years?

Mr. COLLINS. I haven't worked on any produced screen plays in the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the last?

Mr. COLLINS. They go way back to 1943 or 1944, to *As Thousands Cheer* and *Song of Russia*.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living in 1935?

Mr. COLLINS. In New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. And how long did you live there at that time?

Mr. COLLINS. About a year, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you come to New York from the west coast?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you been employed on the west coast prior to that time, or had you been in school?

Mr. COLLINS. I had been in school.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your reason for coming to New York?

Mr. COLLINS. My family moved to New York and I moved with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you continue any course of training while in New York at that time?

Mr. COLLINS. I went to the New Theater League School in New York. The New Theater League School was a theater school, and, unlike most schools of the theater, it didn't cost very much to go to it. It was a left-wing theater group, and it was kind of active, open to young people, and there was a great deal of experimentation in it of various kinds, and I was pretty excited by it and went to school there about 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a scholarship?

Mr. COLLINS. Toward the end of the time I think I did. I used about a month of it and then came back to California.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in attendance at that school, did anything occur as a result of which you became a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. I signed an application blank for this scholarship and said I was interested in the Young Communist League, and someone, I don't remember who, got in touch with me, and I went to one meeting of the Young Communist League in New York. That was the full extent of my experience in the Young Communist League.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you went to the west coast after the completion of that training?

Mr. COLLINS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Upon arriving on the west coast, did you resume your affiliation with the Young Communist League or with any Communist Party groups or individuals?

Mr. COLLINS. No, I didn't get in touch with the Young Communist League, but I was introduced to a class in Marxism. I don't remember the nature of the class. It could have been political economy or something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us how that occurred.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, there was a man that I met who had been in Russia and was very enthusiastic about it. His name was Budd Schulberg.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't get the name.

Mr. COLLINS. Budd Schulberg.

Mr. VELDE. Will you spell that, please?

Mr. COLLINS. It is S-c-h-u-l-b-e-r-g, I think. He had been, as I say, in Russia, and was very interested and excited by what he saw, and he introduced me to a class which met in a small frame house behind somebody's house. I think the house belonged to a man named Mullins. What his first name was, I don't know. Mullins was a man who used to go around studios with books and pictures. I stayed in this class a while, was interested, and that was the extent of the class.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was a study group on Marxism?

Mr. COLLINS. That is right, and I imagine they were mainly non-Communists. It was a class, I presume, to bring people closer to the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. About how many composed the class?

Mr. COLLINS. I think four or five.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember the names?

Mr. COLLINS. No, outside of Mullins I don't remember. I don't even remember the teacher's name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you come in contact with any of them in connection with Communist Party activities at any later date?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time how were you employed?

Mr. COLLINS. I am not sure that I was employed at that particular moment, or, rather, that particular 6 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your first employment?

Mr. COLLINS. My first employment was as a junior writer, Twentieth Century-Fox. That didn't occur until late in 1936, I think about the last month of 1936 or beginning of 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date of your arrival in Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. The summer of 1936. So, therefore, you see, I started this class before I was employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you had been in this class a period of time, did you become associated with a group of writers?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, no. That came, I think, probably, out of the fact that I went to work as a writer. I did then become associated with a group of writers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us what the occasion of that association was.

Mr. COLLINS. In order to tell you that I would have to tell you something about the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. COLLINS. The Screen Writers' Guild, as I understand it—this was before I came to Hollywood—was smashed by the Screen Playwrights, a right-wing group of writers. The Screen Playwrights broke the guild up on the charge that it was becoming dominated by the Authors' League, which, according to Screen Playwrights, was a Red-dominated group. So the cry of eastern domination was the thing that broke up the Screen Writers' Guild.

In order to break it up the Screen Playwrights, the right-wing group, had full support of the studios. With the pressure of the studios and the fear of blacklisting, the Screen Writers' Guild was smashed, but the majority of writers didn't support the Screen Playwrights and weren't very happy with them. The Screen Playwrights got a contract as a company union, and, therefore, they were the representatives of the writers in Hollywood at the time.

There was a group of people, as I understood it at the time and as I believe today, Communists and non-Communists, who met under the leadership or guidance of V. J. Jerome. And I think it is interesting, because I have seen it happen since, that the right wing in this case, the extreme right wing, made it possible for the left wing, for the Communists, particularly, to take advantage of a situation that already existed. As a matter of fact, unless a situation exists, I don't think Communists or anybody else can take advantage of it.

This group met for the purpose of reconstituting the Screen Writers' Guild. And I think I ought to make it very clear that the reconstitution of the Screen Writers' Guild was a dangerous thing at that time because the fear of blacklisting was very strong.

The group had met before I came. How long, I don't know. They met for about 3 months afterwards. As I remember, these meetings were very long, very drawn-out. Tremendous arguments took place in them, although I don't remember what about, and usually V. J. won, because he had more energy than anybody else.

Mr. TAVENNER. By "V. J." you are speaking of V. J. Jerome?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. He was able to outlast us all so far as his arguments were concerned. He was the most persistent of all of us.

Mr. TAVENNER. These meetings to which you refer were meetings composed of persons who were both Communists and non-Communists?

Mr. COLLINS. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And, as I understand, they were meeting under the direction and guidance of V. J. Jerome?

Mr. COLLINS. The point is that the writers had no background for organizing a union, and presumably V. J. Jerome had a lot of experience along this line, and he was the logical man to lead the organization, especially in view of the pressure from the employers. This was something that V. J. knew something about, so he was the logical man for people to turn to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say the group was organized because of the efforts of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. You mean the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, it was. The Screen Writers' Guild, as I remember it, I think that John Howard Lawson took V. J. Jerome's place, and after he took his place there were a series of 8 or 9 meetings called at various people's houses the same night, and to each of these meetings 20 or 30 writers were invited, and therefore the Screen Writers' Guild was organized the same night with about 200 people, enough writers so that the fear of reprisals from the producers could in some degree be abated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not certain I understand clearly the method used to get the Screen Writers' Guild organized through the separate meetings you spoke of. What do you mean by separate meetings, and what was the purpose of holding separate meetings?

Mr. COLLINS. I find it difficult to remember what the purpose was, but I presume the idea was to have small enough meetings so that there wouldn't be a great deal of publicity about it, which there certainly would be if you pulled 200 writers together. So instead of having 200 writers meet at one point, they came together the same night at different houses. With each group I imagine there was one who had been in the meetings with V. J. Jerome, who knew what the demands were and therefore was able to present something to reform the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of the group and therefore one of the initial members of the reorganized Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am going to question you about this further later, but I want at this moment to ask you a question as to whether or not the Communist influence within the Screen Writers' Guild, which resulted in its reorganization, has continued on to the present time with the same force and effect?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, no. I think one of the things that I was proud of in those days as a Communist, and that the other Communists were proud of, I suppose, was that we had recognized the Screen Writers' Guild, and that the majority of the screen writers wanted the Screen Writers' Guild, and therefore a noncompany union that really reflected the desires of the screen writers was set up. In subsequent years it is true the Communists had something to say about how the guild was run, because there were Communists on the board and in the guild, and because the line they pursued was not too far from what the members wanted, they were able to exert some influence. This influence has been pretty much finished since 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your opinion, do I understand that the influence of the Communist Party in the guild has been dissipated?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I would say that is true since the 1947 election, which occurred after the first hearings here, or during the hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you more questions about that later. You have told us about the reorganization of the guild under the leadership of V. J. Jerome. You mentioned the name of John Howard Lawson. To what extent did he participate in the management or the operation of the guild, and how did he figure in the picture?

Mr. COLLINS. John Howard Lawson is an extremely forceful man on his own, as a speaker and as a man who spreads opinions. For a great many years he had a great deal of weight with the membership of the guild. He was also, I think, accepted, whether he was in all cases officially or not, as a leader or the leader of the Communist Party in Hollywood; so, therefore, he had some influence. And he had influence because of his own personality, courage, intellectual capacity, and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he supplant any other person in leadership in the Communist Party in Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't know what the leadership of the Communist Party was prior to Lawson's coming to Hollywood, because I didn't come into the party until about 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was V. J. Jerome's status in the party, as far as you know, from information you obtained then or later?

Mr. COLLINS. As of that time I understood he was a representative of the Central Committee of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are speaking now of the national organization of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. COLLINS. What is now called the National Committee of the American Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that you took part in the reorganization of the Screen Writers' Guild, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you subsequently become a member?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee the circumstances which led up to it and the manner in which you became a member?

Mr. COLLINS. I understand that in most cases there was a formal date of entrance into the Communist Party, but in my case this was not so. What happened was that I was asked to come to a meeting, which could have been a class or a meeting of this committee on the guild, and it turned out to be a branch meeting, or whatever it was called in those days, of the Communist Party. I think it was called no objection to being there. As a matter of fact, I think I was quite not objection to being there. As a matter of fact, I think I was quite satisfied to be there, and I never questioned it. I was a member by having come to that meeting. Subsequently I found out that it was intended that I be asked, but somehow I never was, but it all worked out all right in the end.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was instrumental in having you attend that meeting?

Mr. COLLINS. It could have been Budd Schulberg. I think he was still in the party at that time. Or it might have been Ring Lardner.

Mr. TAVENNER. It might have been Ring Lardner?

Mr. COLLINS. Ring Lardner, Jr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were both of those individuals, Budd Schulberg and Ring Lardner, Jr., members of the Communist Party cell to which you were assigned?

Mr. COLLINS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you know about the continued Communist Party activities of Budd Schulberg, if anything?

Mr. COLLINS. It is my understanding he left the party right after his book came out, *What Makes Sammy Run?* There was very, very sharp criticism of this book in the party and in the party press, and I think he was handled rather ferociously, and he left the party, as I understand, at that time. I haven't seen him for many, many years, but my understanding was that he had quit at that point, whenever it was, 1939 or 1940, I don't remember exactly, but it was about 6 months after *What Makes Sammy Run?* came out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Ring Lardner, Jr., continue in his Communist Party relationship for a period of time?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I would say up to 1946 or so. After that, I don't know what happened to him.

Mr. TAVENNER. You remained in the party until approximately what time?

Mr. COLLINS. I refused to pay dues at the end of 1947 for the year, and I left for New York in 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want to go into the details at this time.

Mr. COLLINS. I see. Just as there was not a formal date of entrance, there was even a less formal date of exit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee the names of persons, in addition to V. J. Jerome and John Howard Lawson, who were active in the reorganization of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. COLLINS. There were many writers active in the reorganization of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly I didn't make my question clear. I mean those who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. COLLINS. At that time there was practically no one known to me to be a member of the Communist Party, because I didn't join the Communist Party until after the Screen Writers' Guild was reorganized. A great many of those who met in those reorganization meetings I never heard of being members of the party. I would have to discuss that as of a later period.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will defer my questions about members of the Communist Party until a later period in your testimony. You were a member of the Communist Party for some years. How frequently did you attend meetings during the period of your membership?

Mr. COLLINS. I attended, speaking of all meetings, not only meetings of the party, which were maybe once or twice a week, but meetings of whatever organizations I believed to—I attended 4 or 5 a week for 3 years, then about 3 a week. I figure it comes to close to 5,000 hours. I had about 5,000 hours of meetings, and I think at this point that is enough for a lifetime. I don't know that I will have to go to any more.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did you attend strictly Communist Party meetings?

Mr. COLLINS. It would depend. It might be once a week; it might be twice a week; it might be only once every 2 weeks. The branch met every 2 weeks, and I think during the war once every 2 weeks would be it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the period of your membership, and in the important field in which you were engaged in connection with the Communist Party, I should think you would be in a position to tell this committee what, in your own opinion, was the real purpose of the Communist Party in organizing itself within Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, of course I can't speak officially about that, since I was not responsible for the decision to organize it, but I would assume that, first, the Communists have a certain respect for cultural workers, like writers and so on, and therefore being in a field in which there were a great many writers, some with some prestige in the country, would be one reason.

Then I think there was a feeling that the content of films could be influenced to some degree, that there might be films on the question of discrimination against minorities, and so on. These films were made later, but I think when they were made, Communists had nothing to do with them.

Then, also, there was a feeling they could stop or abate to some degree anti-Communist films. Actually, I don't think this was necessary, because anti-Communist films have had an enormous record of being unsuccessful, like Red Salute, and so on, but there was a feeling this could be abated to some degree.

Then I think also there could have been some feeling that it was a part of the country in which a certain amount of money could be achieved as far as the party was concerned, on the basis of people who were workers and yet made larger salaries than are made generally.

But I think that there was a real feeling that the concentration of frustrated or partially frustrated artists or creative people would be useful in the sense of prestige and many other things, and that these people would make a valuable contribution to whatever aims the Communist Party had at various times.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask questions more or less in detail about each of those reasons which you have assigned as being the purposes of the Communist Party as far as you were able to judge from your experience.

You spoke of the use of influence with writers of prestige. Can you give us any instances in which the Communist Party did exercise its influence in the direction of a writer's work?

Mr. COLLINS. It is very hard to answer that question, because during the late thirties and the war period, the whole period, which was a period of social change, I think that the Communists worked together, and most writers, since it is part of their field to look ahead, were concerned with the future, and that certain questions the Communists used as day-to-day questions, such as the question of race discrimination, were of concern to writers. And furthermore, the writers felt they had some contact with the labor movement which they would not feel in a small town like Hollywood just writing there.

There was a general attitude of interest in social questions, questions such as the Spanish civil war, the anti-Nazi feeling, and things like this that writers would normally be concerned with and that the Communists were also concerned with, so it was not much of a trick for Communists to be concerned with the things that most writers were thinking about, and in some cases, I suppose—but this gets into my own history.

The reason that it seemed reasonable to me to become a Communist was that, being anti-Nazi and for Loyalist Spain, the Communists seemed to be, both in the United States and in Europe, the most active opponents of the Nazis and of Franco and Mussolini and Hitler at that time, and it seemed a perfectly natural gesture to become a Communist.

What we have subsequently learned about both Communists and the whole international Communist question was certainly not apparent to me in those days, though I admit there were people in those days who seemed to know something about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. To be a little more specific, were you acquainted with Albert Maltz?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of the instance in which he was required by Communist Party dictation to change his views and attitude in regard to his method of writing?

Mr. COLLINS. Albert Maltz wrote an article for the New Masses in 1945 or 1946, I think it was, in which he made a plea for more freedom for left-wing and Communist writers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Albert Maltz a member of the Communist Party to your knowledge?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. COLLINS. He made a plea for more freedom for left-wing and Communist writers, and for a more reasonable attitude toward their work, and he cited certain examples, as, for example, Watch on the Rhine, which I think was attacked at one period and praised at another, and he claimed it must have been a good play at both times; and he made what seemed to me at the time, and still does, a completely reasonable plea as far as any creative work.

I know he was attacked chiefly by the Daily Worker and also by certain members of the national committee of the Communist Party. There was also a meeting of writers in Hollywood—I think there were several but I only attended the first—and at this meeting Samuel Sillen came out from New York and led the discussion.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the person who came from New York?

Mr. COLLINS. Samuel Sillen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. COLLINS. S-i-l-e-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. I gather he was, although I don't know. He spoke at this meeting, I presume, as a Communist. He led this discussion, which was an attack on Maltz, and certain other people, particularly certain men who apparently were not too concerned with creative problems, were in the forefront of this attack on Maltz as being incorrect, not understanding the class struggle, et cetera.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you to read one thing Maltz stated, which I believe was the subject of that controversy, and which I believe may clarify your answer somewhat.

Mr. COLLINS. O. K.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this article Mr. Maltz stated:

I have come to believe that the accepted understanding of art as a weapon is not a useful guide but a strait-jacket. I have felt this 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.

That is the article you are discussing?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. That, I presume, came out of Maltz' guts, since it was something he had to do to write, as he says. There are men

who don't have that problem, and who are not so concerned with writing as Maltz, and therefore these men find it easy to accept any policy. Since they don't really care about writing, they don't care what they are told to do. These were in the forefront in the attack on Maltz.

There were several other meetings, but I had had enough, and subsequently Maltz changed his mind. He wrote another article repudiating what he had first said.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you at a time when you were speaking of the representative from New York who came to address your group. I do not know if you completed your testimony in regard to that or not.

Mr. COLLINS. I don't remember what he said. I just remember the general feeling, which was that this cry that Maltz had raised for freedom—well, it gets to the question of what is freedom in writing, and since I have a biased view on it, I don't think I should express what Sillen said.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. COLLINS. Maltz repudiated this first article, and whereas the first article came out of his own conviction, the second article obviously came out of a rehash of other people's convictions.

That was the end, as far as I know, of the Maltz controversy, although I presume after that there was a good deal of fear on the part of Communist writers, especially those connected with things officially Communist, of making a mistake such as Maltz had made.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, as a result of Communist Party dictation, he entirely reversed his stated views?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. He did it voluntarily.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was one specific instance, was it not, in which the Communist Party could and was interested in using a writer of prestige?

Mr. COLLINS. That is right. I guess you could call it that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall an instance in which a writer of a history was required to revise his viewpoint with regard to his work?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, you probably got that out of Maltz' article, in which he mentions a friend, or at least a writer he knew, who had to rewrite a book in order to meet the terms of Communist Party policy. This was true, so far as I know, of John Howard Lawson and his history book. I remember that no sooner would Lawson get a draft done than some new development in Communist Party policy would occur and he would have to rewrite a part of it, or several chapters of it, in order to make it conform to the new policy. I think this was true in Lawson's case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any more specific information regarding that instance?

Mr. COLLINS. I was present at a meeting with Mr. Lawson and a representative of the county at that time, Carl Winter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was Carl Winter?

Mr. COLLINS. He was the county organizer in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Of the Communist Party. And at that time there was a discussion—

Mr. POTTER. Will you bring out the dates?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. What was the date of this instance?

Mr. COLLINS. It is hard for me to localize it, because I have no records. I think it was around 1943 or 1944, somewhere around there. This discussion was not like the Maltz controversy, however. Maltz was really hit over the head. The suggestions to John Howard Lawson were suggestions which he was eager to accept.

Mr. TAVENNER. In referring again to this general proposition of the purpose and aim of the Communist Party to use writers of prestige, can you say to what extent the Communist Party, in that connection, endeavored to control the organizations to which the writers belonged, or to influence them?

Mr. COLLINS. The word "influence" is a much better word than "control" in most cases, because I don't think the Communists controlled any organization except maybe the Writers' Mobilization, toward the very end of its life when nobody belonged to it, that is, nobody functioned in it for the Communists.

But we always tried to influence any organization to which we belonged, whether there was one Communist in it or a hundred, in that a policy would be presented which the Communists believed of prime importance.

As a rule, in my experience, as in the Screen Writers' Guild no policy was suggested that the membership could not at least consider as reasonable.

The only time this was done was during the strike period, when the painters' union was on strike in 1945 or 1946. The Communist Party had at one time said that we should go through the picket lines because the Communist policy during the war was a no-strike policy, and therefore we went through the picket lines.

Then when the war was over and the policy changed, we tried to swing the trend around to supporting the secretaries and the painters who were out on strike. We were not successful for the simple reason the writers did not understand why they could walk through the picket lines in February, and not in June. They had a point there, and they wouldn't go along with us.

Some would speak of the policy of supporting the strike even though they knew it was unpopular, because they felt 10 years later the members would remember that they had said this and that perhaps they were right, that time would prove they were right, and therefore they would win support a decade hence that they didn't have at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that was an instance where the Communist Party endeavored to control the writers through the Guild?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, the word "control" stops me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or to influence?

Mr. COLLINS. To influence I think is right; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall after 1947 the occasion of an election within the guild when the so-called progressive slate was prepared and again the Communist Party endeavored to influence the action of the guild in a particular matter?

Mr. COLLINS. Around the 1947—the 1947 elections were held in the heat and passion of the former hearing, the hearing in 1947 of this committee, and there was a great deal of feeling on both sides at that time, and the progressive slate was defeated. And since that time, it is probably true that no Communists have been on the board of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. The progressive slate to which you have referred was a slate composed of both Communists and non-Communist members?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. The Communists in any policy—or except perhaps very recently—would have the support of a great part or at least a sizable portion of the membership.

Mr. TAVENNER. And without that support which they were able to gain, the Communists wouldn't be able to accomplish much, would they?

Mr. COLLINS. Or nothing. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that slate as supported by the Communists was defeated?

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, can you recall any other instances when the Communist Party used the Screen Writers' Guild for its purposes in endeavoring to influence writers in Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, there were two incidents that I remember. One was a matter of influence. The other was a matter of—it would have to be termed something else. The first incident occurred right after the Screen Writers' Guild had been reorganized. There were—I don't know that there were any Communists on the board of the Screen Writers' Guild after it was reorganized, but there were at least people who were in favor of advanced policy in the Screen Writers' Guild or a left-wing policy, and it looked very much as if these people would be defeated in the election of 1937, I guess.

Now, I think that it's interesting here that the Communist Party had done a really fist-rate job of setting up the Screen Writers' Guild, and a very useful job, and must have been quite proud of it. This part of the coin looks pretty nice.

Now, on the other hand, this incident points out that if you believe in the correctness of your cause, you will be willing to do almost anything to win.

There was a caucus or a fraction meeting—a fraction is a Communist faction of the general whole; in this case the Screen Writers' Guild whole—and in this caucus we discussed the fact that our opponents had more proxies than we did by far and perhaps would swamp us. This looked like a very unfortunate situation.

Lester Cole had the notion of suggesting that the old board on which we had at least some people who would listen to us should be reelected by unanimous acclamation. So, at the proper point in the meeting, when it really looked as if Johnny Gray, who was the right-wing treasurer at that time and who held an enormous number of proxies, with Maury Riskin, where it looked as if they were winning—they were handing over so many proxies—someone, and I don't remember who, got up and said, "Let's reelect the old board who served us so well in this first year of our trouble by unanimous acclamation."

So, I rose to my feet, as did the others. We cheered and applauded. Other people cheered and applauded, and the board was returned by unanimous acclamation.

Mr. TAVENNER. All as a result of the plan and design of the Communist Party members?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. At the time I thought it was quite a shrewd notion.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you refer to Lester Cole—

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). As being one of the moving parties in that—

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Transaction. Is Lester Cole known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state who were instrumental and active in endeavoring to impart the Communist Party line to the guild with reference to no strikes during the war period and strikes after the war period to which you referred in your testimony a little while ago who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I think actually that I have named all of them. There was Lawson—John Howard Lawson, Lester Cole, Ring Lardner, and myself—and I think that in the main we carried on these struggles. We also tried to keep the Writers' Mobilization going—tried to get the \$10,000 that had been given yearly—

Mr. TAVENNER. I'll come to that in just a moment. Now, were there any others you can recall now who were active as Communist Party members in the effort to impart the Communist Party views with regard to strikes?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I remember particularly the meetings of the board, you see, and on this, as I remmeber, I was there with John Howard Lawson and Ring Lardner and Lester Cole.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I want to ask you at the present time to state whether or not the Communist Party was interested in the organization to which you just referred—the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization—

Mr. COLLINS. Well, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And how that occurred. But before doing so I believe you should tell us what the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was and what its purposes were.

Mr. COLLINS. I intended to. The purpose of the Writers' Mobilization was to help win the war. Every writer in Hollywood belonged to it. It was an amalgamation of the Screen Writers' Guild, the Radio Writers' Guild, and several other guilds in which either information could be gathered or writing could be done for the war. It was actually its sole purpose during the war years.

It turned out an enormous amount of material in terms—for the USO, the Red Cross, for any war agency, the armed services, and so on—of films, sketches, speeches, radio skits, everything for the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. And during that period of time there was really no material or substantial divergence between the Communist Party views in promoting the war effort and those of other persons?

Mr. COLLINS. None. No divergence. The Communists, because they had been acquainted, because they had had a more international viewpoint perhaps than some of the other writers, were in a good position to help in many cases where there were sketches that had to do with our allies, Britain, China—under Chiang Kai-shek at that time—Soviet Russia, the underground movements, and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, upon the termination—

Mr. Wood. We will take a recess for 30 minutes in order to give the members of the committee an opportunity to answer this call [Quorum call on floor of the House]. We will reconvene in 30 minutes.

(Thereupon, at 11:10 a. m., the hearing was recessed until 11:55 a. m., at which time the following proceedings were had:)

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

By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of this committee, I now set up a subcommittee composed of Messrs. Walter, Doyle, Jackson, and Wood for the purpose of continuing this hearing, and all four of those members are present.

You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Collins, at the time of taking the recess, I was asking you about the method used by the Communist Party to control in certain instances or influence in certain instances writers in Hollywood through the guild, and you were at the beginning of your testimony regarding the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. You have already explained the purpose of that organization during the war period. Now we have arrived at the termination of the war, so I want to ask you whether there was any real purpose or whether the purpose for which this organization was formed ended with the close of the war.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, there was a difference of opinion on that. The Screen Writers' Guild, most of the membership, felt that the purpose of the organization had ended, and the Communist Party felt, I think, that it could be useful in the postwar period.

Mr. TAVENNER. Useful to whom?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, useful both I suppose to the party and its objectives and in the general—whatever the problems of the postwar period were going to be, which at that time I think were not discernible, clearly discernible.

The mobilization had been supported by I think \$10,000 a year from the Screen Writers' Guild, plus money from the Community Chest or the USO, and also money in smaller amounts from the other union members of the mobilization. A fight developed over the continuation of this \$10,000. As I remember, we—that is, the Communists—believed that the guild should continue to support it. There was a great deal of opposition to this. And finally in a membership meeting the members voted to discontinue the money for the mobilization.

Mr. TAVENNER. About how long did the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization continue?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, that's hard—I don't remember exactly, but I'd say it was about a year or a year and a half after the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. And during that period of time this contest or issue was being fought out as to whether or not it should be continued?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, it continued for a while on the grant for that year—for instance, in 1945. Then I imagine in 1946 the question came up again.

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered hearing room.)

Mr. COLLINS (continuing). And at this time I think it lived on a little bit longer after the \$10,000 was withdrawn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, why was the Communist Party interested in the continuation of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, it had become an excellent vehicle for the presentation of material, political material, cultural material, and I think

they felt it could probably be used for the same purposes in the post-war period. The difference was, of course, that during the war everyone was in complete agreement, and after the war the fissures began to develop internationally and also, therefore, in the mobilization, in the guild. So, they couldn't—there was not the unanimity as to what the mobilization should do, and a great many writers obviously were just as happy to forget about it. They felt that it had finished its purpose, and they didn't want to do anything with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was there any project which the Communist Party was particularly interested in which might be projected or put into effect through the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization

Mr. COLLINS. Well, the Communists were interested in any project that was originated in the mobilization. I don't remember all those projects. I think many of them never came to fruition. I remember a great deal of discussion at the time about what the mobilization should do, what its program should be for the future, and so on, but—

Mr. TAVENNER. Discussion among whom?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I remember discussions with Jack Lawson on this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Jack Lawson the same person as John Howard Lawson?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, John Howard Lawson. But the content of these discussions and what was arrived at I don't really recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what were some projects?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, there was a project that I remember very vaguely called Counterattack, which I think was an anticensorship, anti—well, I don't—I remember it but there again I don't remember the content.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that aimed in part at this committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I think it predated this committee. It was aimed at the—I suppose in a general sense, yes, it was aimed at this, the kind of activity that the committee represents, that this committee represents.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was that project a project that the Communist Party was interested in?

Mr. COLLINS. Of course they were interested in it; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And was the Communist Party responsible for the projecting of that idea into the organization of Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I guess it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, can you recall any other?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, there was a subcommittee I think or a committee which met with some of the physicists from California Tech for the purpose of acquainting the public with the nature of atomic energy and, you know, what the dangers were in the atomic bomb and what kind of weapon it was, and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was there set up within the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization what was known as the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. COLLINS. That might have been the name of it. There was such a committee set up. It was to acquaint the—you see, the mobili-

zation had carried on various meetings all during the war with many people. For instance, a physician came from Birmingham Hospital, gave a seminar on the problems of the men at Birmingham. And there were seminars on many, many subjects in which people would come from the outside and discuss them during the war, especially relating to any war activity.

So, therefore, this seminar which was supposed to be set up on atomic energy was in line with these previous seminars which had been discussed, and there was such a committee set up with some scientists from California Tech.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Communist Party interested in that particular project?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, insofar as the Communist Party was interested in the mobilization, it was interested in this project.

Mr. TAVENNER. What use did the Communist Party plan to make of this particular group? In what way did it expect to put this particular group to work or influence it to work?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I think that the Communist Party was honestly concerned with the question of peace, and since the Communist Party members honestly believed that the danger to peace comes from the United States and since the atom bomb was the United States weapon primarily—certainly at that time—they felt that since the scientists were also concerned with the terrible nature of the atom bomb that there could be a natural union between the concern of the scientists over the terror of the bomb, of its nature, of its misuse perhaps, and the fear of the Communists of war at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in what way did the Communists plan to make use of that union of effort between scientists and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization

Mr. COLLINS. Well, the scientists had the knowledge concerning the terror of the bomb, and they had the fear of it. But they didn't have the know-how as far as getting it out to the public was concerned. And the Writers' Mobilization did have that know-how. So, therefore, it seemed like a natural union between the concerned scientists and the experienced, in this case, publicists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, was it the interest and purpose of the Communist Party to disseminate that information as fear information to the American public?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, I think that's right. It was the normal conclusion you could draw—that the scientists were fearful and could probably make, since they knew a lot about it—I think they still are fearful—could probably make other people fearful if they could get to them, and the mobilization would get to them.

Mr. TAVENNER. And it was a part of the Communist Party plan to disseminate that information to the public?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, here again I was not responsible for formulating the Communist Party plans in the sense that they were formulated undoubtedly, if they were, from another source, but as far as I understood it I guess that's a reasonable presumption that they were interested in a certain amount of fear on the part of the people and that they thought this was a reasonable project. And at that time it's true I think, in the main, Communists were the center of the mobilization after the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. You made reference to the holding of seminars. Were seminars held on the subject of atomic energy?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, there was one. There may have been others but I only remember one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did various scientists address the meeting?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. It was a broad meeting. I think that people were invited as well as the mobilization people. Anyone could come and probably did. And I remember Coinog, who was one of the scientists whose name stuck in my head.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the full name?

Mr. COLLINS. No. But, at any rate, he spoke as a physicist, and he made particular care to mention when he would come to a certain point that it was impossible to pursue it further because it was restricted. I had the feeling the scientists were very careful and very conscientious men.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the commission—first, of all, were you a member of that commission?

Mr. COLLINS. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the commission endeavored to assemble scientific information from the scientific departments of various universities—

Mr. COLLINS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And other places?

Mr. COLLINS. Not to my knowledge; no. No, I don't think—I doubt that. I mean my feeling is that the most of the people who were involved in it would not really believe that they could get anything very useful in terms of information about atom science from a casual acquaintance with a few scientists who came over with some concern.

There was a time at which the Federation of Atomic Scientists had been set up and were publishing a magazine and were really concerned with getting their problem to the public, and so the idea they could perhaps get writers to help them with speeches or perhaps make a film or something like that was of great interest to the scientists.

But I really don't believe that anyone of my acquaintance was naive enough to believe that these scientists would divulge anything, that as writers we could influence them on the basis of meeting with them two or three times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, aside from the question of influencing the scientists in any manner, did they assemble, to your knowledge, any scientific information relating to the atomic bomb?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, they might have, but it would have been like the Smyth report or whatever it's called. You know. That was fairly—that anyone could pick up. I doubt if they went beyond that, although I don't even remember that. I suppose if a man wanted to find out something about it he would have read what was available. But the real thing is, as far as we were concerned in terms of our program, we didn't really have to know much about atomic energy in terms of, you know, how a bomb is made. All we had to do was to pursue the policy that the atom bomb was a dangerous weapon, which you can certainly write about without having any inside information as to how a bomb is made. All you have to know about is Hiroshima and so on, and you can do a pretty good job.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what disposition was made of any material or information that was obtained as a result of the seminars or as a result of scientific persons furnishing information to the group?

Mr. COLLINS. No. We were going to write a series of radio programs dealing with atomic energy on a kind of creative literary basis. But, as I say, those programs, as I remember them—I don't remember a couple of them—didn't really deal with any scientific aspects of atomic energy.

Mr. TAVENNER. They just dealt with the terror aspect of the bomb?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I remember one of them was about—one of them dealt with a man who has the bomb in a suitcase, similar to this British film. I suppose you could call that terror, which it was. And one of them dealt with—it was called "Happy Birthday, Dear Earth Star," which was about some people on another planet who have gone through this before and who watch the earth join—you know—the other stars.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of the atomic bomb explosion?

Mr. COLLINS. As a result of atomic energy; that's right.

So, you see, in order to do this you need perhaps some creativity and imagination, but you don't really need much information about the atom bomb.

Now, I never knew of any assemblage of material. I mean I can't say the fact there wasn't any, because I don't know, you know. But it certainly was outside of my purview.

Mr. TAVENNER. Earlier in your testimony you stated that another reason why the Communist Party was interested in organizing communism within Hollywood was the possibility of influencing films. Now, as a practical matter, was that possible of accomplishment?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, not to any—no. It was possible of accomplishment only in terms of the whole tendency of the country, so I think, as I said before, if the proper presentation, let's say, of a Negro on the screen has been accomplished since then and not by Communists, but certainly Communists who would have been handed a Negro character would have tried to give him a certain dignity let's say. In this sense they would have affected the content of films.

But, since the basic policy isn't in the hands of the writer or the director but in the hands of the owners of the studio, who are not at all interested in this propaganda, the chances of any real presentation of Communist material or what is termed Communist material in terms of Communist Party or foreign policy are I think extremely unlikely.

(Representative Bernard W. Kearney entered hearing room.)

Mr. COLLINS (continuing). Now, at one time I think that Communist writers felt that the inclusion of several progressive lines might be a happy thing, but finally it was realized that this didn't mean anything to anybody unless you had the code book with you that told you what those lines meant, so this policy was dropped and was considered no longer reasonable.

I think I discussed the fact that there would be an attempt made not to have anti-Communist or anti-Soviet films made in this early period. I'm not talking about now, because I don't know anything about the present time. I remember one example of, I think it was Lester Cole wrote a film about a boys' school, and at that time there was a statement of Dolores Ibarruri, who was called "La Passionara" in Spain. She had said a famous—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the title, please?

Mr. COLLINS. "La Passionara"? I don't know. I would rather not attempt it.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. COLLINS. At any rate, she had said, and it was a famous slogan during the Spanish Civil War, "I would rather die on my feet than live on my knees." And Cole I think in some speech of one of the coaches in the school had him give this line. Now, I felt, and I think most people did, that this wasn't—that you could scarcely call this propaganda. I mean it was just I think he was perhaps pleased with the line, but it really didn't mean anything.

I think a better example of the difficulty—of the way in which a picture is handled is Song of Russia about which there has been a great deal of discussion. Do you want me to discuss that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any connection with the Song of Russia?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. Paul Jarrico and I wrote it or did the screen play on it, that is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; we would like to hear the incident.

Mr. COLLINS. Well—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name "Jarrico"?

Mr. COLLINS. J-a-r-r-i-c-o. We had this picture, Thousands Cheer, for M-G-M, and M-G-M had bought a story about Russia called "Scorched Earth," and the same producer was making this Scorched Earth film as had made Thousands Cheer. They were both musicals. And we got the assignment on Song of Russia, wrote a first draft of it, corrected the first draft on the basis of—as any first draft is corrected, on the basis of what could be helped in it from a writing standpoint. And then the script with which apparently the studio was pleased was sent to David Selznick so he could borrow—so Metro could borrow Ingrid Bergman.

Selznick objected to the script on the basis it was too favorable to Soviet Russia, and there was a conference held with Mr. Mayer, Mr. Mankiewicz and Mr. Katz, Gregory Ratoff who was the director—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you begin the list of those names over again?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. Louis B. Mayer and Joseph Mankiewicz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. COLLINS. No. You can find that. Sam Katz. And Gregory Ratoff. The producer, Joe Pasternak. Mr. Jarrico and myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. About when was this?

Mr. COLLINS. 1942. Somewhere around there. 1943. I don't know exactly. At any rate, Mr. Mayer said—I'm not quoting him directly—he didn't understand what the problem was, that he certainly didn't want—that he wanted to make a picture about Russia because Russia was in the news, that they had made pictures about England, France, and so on, and that it seemed reasonable to make a picture about Russia, but, on the other hand, he didn't want to make any Communists—and that if the picture couldn't be made—so if it was going to make trouble he'd just as soon not make it.

I think, as I remember, that the picture was saved by Joe Mankiewicz who said there was no reason why it couldn't be made and made without any trouble. I think that was the complete feeling at

the time, because actually in 1943 what Song of Russia said about Russia was far less glowing than what Winston Churchill was saying or Douglas MacArthur or President Roosevelt or General Eisenhower or anybody else. I mean this was the period in which Russia was a great country.

So that the picture actually in those terms was pretty lukewarm compared to the statements, to the feeling of the time. However, it was decided that there were certain things such as the collective farms that should be omitted. Now, of course, this is really kind of a ticklish point, because if you show the farmers on collective farms you're in trouble, but, on the other hand, if you show that they own individual farms of this nature then you're in trouble, too. So we decided, for better or worse, not to mention what kind of farms these were. And then we took out words like "community" and did a general job of cleaning it up on this level.

We did, in short, what we were instructed to do on the film, and no one suspected when it came out—it seemed rather innocuous—that it would ever—you know, that 5 years later anyone would ever remember it.

But, nevertheless, there was a complete discussion as far as its content was concerned, and it was felt that in view of the times there was—the basic part of the picture was that this Russian girl who represented the Russian people was patriotic and believed in her country and was set against the Nazis, and that she and the American had the common purpose which was to defeat the Nazis and do the best they could each for their own land, which at the time was an extremely reasonable position and was pleased, as I say, by everyone present.

I doubt if any picture could be made without the front office O. K.'ing it, and this would mean that it would be—especially nowadays but I think certainly even then—viewed pretty carefully.

A great many things that seem in retrospect to be left wing were really part and parcel of the times, and this was certainly one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify Paul Jarrico more definitely for us? How long had you known him?

Mr. COLLINS. About 5 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. How closely had he been associated with you in your work during that period of 5 years?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, we first started working together I think in 1940, and we sold a story to M-G-M and then one to Universal.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many screen plays did he work on with you?

Mr. COLLINS. Three.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the writing of this screenplay influenced by the membership of yourself and Jarrico in the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I suppose it could have been to some degree, in that we probably knew more about the country than one would know if you had never read anything about it or looked at anything about it. We had seen Soviet films and read material about the Soviet Union, and I imagine we had a certain amount of knowledge about it. Nothing first-hand, but at least second- or third-hand. But in terms of what we said in the picture I doubt if it had anything to do with

our being Communists except that we were pleased with it. We were pleased with the assignment.

But at that time we were—as I said before—we would have been pleased with a picture on the resistance movement in Europe. We would have been pleased with anything of that nature that we felt would help the war. And we certainly felt that this picture would. And also we believed, as I think many, many millions of people hoped, that the relations between the United States and Russia would be friendly and that this couldn't hurt it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, the individuals you have mentioned as representing the moving-picture industry who took part in those discussions, will you state what positions they had in industry?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, Mr. Mayer was the—

Mr. TAVENNER. And whether or not any of them were members of the Communist Party to your knowledge.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, Mr. Mayer to my knowledge is not a member of the Communist Party, and he was the boss of the studio. Sam Katz was the executive in charge of a number of producers, of which Pasternak was one. I would say that he in my knowledge was not a member of the Communist Party. And Mr. Joe Mankiewicz was, I suppose, one of the brightest boys at the studio, and he was not a member of the party. And Gregory Ratoff is a White Russian, as I understand it, and consequently I would presume he would not be a member of the party. So that outside of Mr. Jarrico and myself, I would say that there were no other Communists present at this meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, were there instances that came to your attention when the Communist Party was interested around the other way, interested in checking the production of plays which it considered to be anti-Communist?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, no; I don't know of anything like that in my experience. The only picture that we were concerned with in checking my memory was I think a picture called Tennessee Johnson. Wasn't that the name of it? I don't know Tennessee Johnson—it had a very biased, from our point of view, picture of Thaddeus Stevens.

(Representative John S. Wood left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was protest made by the Communist Party to the production of the picture, in which I believe you were probably one of the protesters?

Mr. COLLINS. I think that the Communist Party nationally may have done something about it as far as the press was concerned, and I think that we tried to persuade the studio that this picture was a distortion of history; yes, but that's the only instance I know of. It wasn't very effective, either. I think the picture was made precisely as written.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in order to influence by propaganda any screenplay, you would have to be successful in putting the plan over on not one but more than one responsible representative of the industry, wouldn't you?

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, about how many representatives of industry would be involved in passing upon a screen play which was written?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, you would have to pass firstly your own producer, and then the chances are the director would have to go along with it, and then the front office, and at different studios the front offices are set up differently. Now, at M-G-M in those days it really had to go through four or five people. Some studios might be run on a more singlehanded basis, as, for instance, Twentieth-Century Fox. I imagine if you could get it past Mr. Zanuck you would be in business.

But also then you have to get some actor, the star, who is very important, who will also have to say O. K. Now, Bob Taylor as it was, I think, objected to Song of Russia and to line in it, and so on, and, as I remember, they had to be in some cases changed so that you would have to get by a great number of people in order to make the picture.

But the point is, you see, that after all the Communists don't try to get in—what is called Communist propaganda—I don't think Communists would try to get in, because they would know beforehand that it wasn't successful. If a Communist, as I say, writes a Negro with some dignity, the chances are he will get that, you know—in the main, that might get through, because no one would see, would feel that that was necessarily Communist propaganda. If he writes a picture about the resistance movement, let's say, during the war, in which somebody in the resistance movement is a hero, and there were such films, no one would object to that, because they wouldn't feel that it was necessarily any more Communist than their own position.

So that in terms of—you know perfectly well that if all the Communists got together now and wrote a pro-Soviet film it wouldn't be made. So I doubt if Communists are spending much time working on this kind of project. I mean they have a certain amount of reality as regards this. You can only do what's possible within the framework of the period and what other people feel, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have stated that another purpose of the Communist Party in organizing communism in Hollywood was from the financial viewpoint. What did you mean when you referred to that?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I think that just in terms of dues or assessments rather than there was at one time during the war period when there were I think more Communists than at any other time—I mean as far as this section was concerned—a fair amount of money received from these people. I don't remember. I think the assessment when I was last in the party was about 4 percent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Four percent of what?

Mr. COLLINS. Of your salary after the agent's deduction. You deduct the agent's commission and then you take 4 percent of that. That is as I remember it.

Mr. VELDE. What agent?

Mr. COLLINS. The professional agent's commission. Four percent probably amounted to in those days quite a good deal of money.

Then also I think in terms of certain other things, certain other specific projects, that people would contribute money, and since there was money in this community, and that in that sense it was useful.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee what was the extent of your contributions to the Communist Party while you were a member of the party—say monthly or weekly?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I don't know exactly what it was. The assessments, I think I probably paid them up to, except toward the end, pretty regularly. I don't know. I suppose that during the period I was at Metro, which was the war years, it was around \$185 a month, something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. You paid \$185 a month?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, around that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time was that?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I don't know. Three or four years I guess. Maybe more.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did other persons who were members of the Communist Party to your knowledge pay on a like proportion with you?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, yes. That was understood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, those payments which you made, were they the ordinary dues that you were expected to pay, or did you—

Mr. COLLINS. No, no. The dues, I don't remember what they were, but they were nominal. This was an assessment above your dues based on the fact that—on the idea that—since you made a higher salary than the average party member in the country you could afford to pay more money. So this assessment was in addition to the dues, which, as I say, were nominal, whatever they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom were those dues paid? How were they paid?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, they were paid to the financial secretary of the branch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the branch of which you were a member?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. It's on the honor system in a sense because no records are kept. You'd pay what you believed you owed.

Mr. TAVENNER. But the financial secretary would have an idea of how much you owed?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; they certainly would. He or she would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the financial secretary to whom you made payments?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I don't remember any time except at the very beginning when I was the financial secretary, the first group. The only one I remember, I don't know. I don't really remember who used to get the money, because, you see, the group didn't remain constant. There were probably in my time quite a few groups. And this is a job that nobody particularly wanted, so that—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, when you were a financial secretary, when you first entered the party, what disposition did you make of the funds which you received as the financial secretary?

Mr. COLLINS. I turned them over to Madelaine Ruthven.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. COLLINS. R-u-t-h-v-e-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ruthven?

Mr. COLLINS. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her official position?

Mr. COLLINS. She was the organizational secretary I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have asked several witnesses, including V. J. Jerome, who appeared before this committee a few weeks ago, whether or not it was true that the national organization of the Communist Party refused to permit these dues to be paid or these assessments

to be paid to the Communist Party of the State of California and from a certain date directed that those payments be made directly to the national organization of the Communist Party of the United States in New York due to the fact that it was such a tremendously large figure into which these assessments ran. Is that correct or not?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I don't know much about that. I remember that the—I never had much to do with it, but I remember that there was a split between the national office, the State, county, and the section itself, in which I think the national office got the greatest amount. But what the split was or precisely what it was I wouldn't know, because it really wasn't in my field.

Mr. VELDE. The greatest amount of what? Dues? Or your special assessments?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, no. The special assessments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the special assessments go directly to the national office?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I don't think in toto. I think that the section in Hollywood broke off, you know, what was supposed to be the percentage that was supposed to be sent and sent the largest sum directly, as I said, to the national office. But here—I didn't send it. I think—you know, this isn't really—this is my understanding, but I certainly wouldn't be held to it, because I never had really anything to do with it.

Mr. TAVENNER. The payments were not made directly to the national office, but through—

Mr. COLLINS. Through this section.

Mr. TAVENNER. Through the section official who had charge of the particular matter?

Mr. COLLINS. Uh huh. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I failed to ask you a little while ago, in speaking of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, who was the organizer of it or its first president. Let us put it that way.

Mr. COLLINS. Bob Rossen was the first president.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bob who?

Mr. COLLINS. He was the first chairman. Robert Rossen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Robert Rossen? R-o-s-s-e-n?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. I don't know who organized it. I don't know it was necessary to organize it in the sense that it was a normal wartime set-up.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how he is employed now?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I think he is a producer at Columbia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he is?

Mr. COLLINS. No. I talked to him about a picture about 2 months ago. He was in Hollywood for a while. I think he had been in Europe and then he had been in Mexico making The Brave Bulls. He told me in 1947 that he had sent a note to Harry Cohn—I guess it was 1948—that he had sent a letter to Harry Cohn saying he was not a Communist, by which I presume that he has disaffiliated himself.

Mr. TAVENNER. To Harry—?

Mr. COLLINS. Harry Cohn.

Mr. TAVENNER. K-o-h-n or C-o-h-n?

Mr. COLLINS. C-o-h-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. C-o-h-n?

Mr. COLLINS. Who was the president, I think, of Columbia Pictures. I gather he's disaffiliated himself, but that is as much as I know. At the time, at any rate, he was in the party, and he was the chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you know he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I had meetings with him. I had a meeting at his house—well, one or several at his house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee any idea of the number of Communist Party meetings that you attended at which Robert Rossen was present?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, in order to say that a man was a Communist I would have to remember out of my 5,000 hours precisely what the meeting was about, that it was a Communist meetings, what room it was held in, and who was present, you know, so that I would remember specific—I could only—I can't remember how many. I remember sitting in his house, that it was a Communist meeting, and that Rossen was present.

Unless I can remember the place, the nature of the meeting—because, after all, these 5,000 hours were mainly not Communist meetings—I just don't see that it's possible for me to say that he was a Communist, because you know I may have some feeling about it but I don't think that that warrants this kind of label. So that I remember, however, specifically in this case seeing him.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this case you do remember specifically?

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the secretary of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization when it was first formed?

Mr. COLLINS. The executive secretary was Pauline Lauber.

Mr. TAVENNER. L-a-u-b-e-r. Is that the spelling?

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is she also known by the name of Pauline Lauber Finn?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. F-i-n-n?

(Mr. Collins nodding affirmatively.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall discussing among members of the Communist Party any arrearage in dues of Robert Rossen?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, I think he was in arrears; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You think he was in arrears?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember the extent to which Robert Rossen was in arrears in the payment of his assessments?

Mr. COLLINS. It was a considerable amount of money, but I couldn't tell exactly. It was a handy sum.

Mr. VELDE. Could you put any limits on that in dollars and cents?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, it was in the lower registers of four figures I would say. One of the tests of being a good Communist was to pay your dues so that there must have been some criticism of Rossen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you name other persons who were connected with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, John Howard Lawson was one of the prime movers. I don't offhand—No, I don't remember anybody else.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is he doing any writing in Hollywood at the present time?

Mr. COLLINS. I doubt that very much.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are any of the 10 convicted Hollywood writers doing any writing at the present time that you know of?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, no. I think these men were just recently released, just in this past week, from jail, and, you know, I doubt that they are doing any writing in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any other plan for raising funds by the Communist Party used in Hollywood to your knowledge besides the payment of dues and special assessments?

Mr. COLLINS. I think that people were asked, who might have been sympathetic but not so sympathetic that they were party members. They might have been asked for contributions. I have heard of such things, although I don't know from my own experience.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left hearing room.)

Mr. COLLINS (continuing). I don't know from my own experience, but I heard that people were asked if they would contribute money even if they were not in, and I imagine that in the resistance movement days that people would have contributed money who were really not particularly sympathetic with the aims of communism at all but who admired the struggle that the Communists were making in the resistance movement against Nazi Germany.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were benefits held to which actors and writers were invited?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, but these were not Communist Party benefits. I mean they might have been benefits for Loyalist Spain or benefits for any cause which a great many people supported.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, let us go back for a few moments to your first membership in the Communist Party. I believe you stated that in 1938—

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). You united with the party.

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, were you assigned to a cell, a particular cell?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe to the committee the organizational set-up as you found it to be?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, a group has a chairman and a literature director who's responsible for selling the innumerable pamphlets, books, and so on, on the subject and is supposed to give some little résumé of what the most recent material is and to sell it; the membership director, whose job is not only what kind of work the membership is doing in the party or in organizations, various outside organizations, but also he's mainly concerned with recruiting, with the organizer of the branch or the chairman of the branch.

And then the dues. The financial director. This would be called the executive of the branch. They would prepare an agenda for the

meeting which would take up perhaps some general political education and in some cases a specific question which might have to do with the work, the mass organization work, of one or more of the members.

(Representative John S. Wood returned to hearing room.)

Mr. COLLINS (continuing). These meetings are, as a rule, fairly long and not terribly interesting. And they, you know, are very mild in terms of content. They would discuss day-to-day questions, you know, whatever those happened to be, the political questions of the day.

Now, for instance, I imagine that today, like everybody else in America, a Communist branch would be discussing the Truman-MacArthur dispute. This would be the topic of discussion or one of the topics of discussion. It might not be discussed precisely from the perspective of the rest of the country, but it would be discussed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean by that it would be discussed from the standpoint of the interest of the Communist Party—

Mr. COLLINS. And of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). And of the Soviet Union?

(Mr. Collins nodding affirmatively.)

Mr. TAVENNER. At the meetings did you also discuss the ways and means of carrying into effect the influence which you desired to be exerted upon the various groups that you were members of, such as the Writers' Guild?

Mr. COLLINS. No. The chances are this wouldn't be discussed in a branch meeting; that this would only be discussed in the prewar years in a fraction meeting, and in the war years, if at all, in a progressive caucus—that is, a group of Communists and many non-Communists.

During the war years, during the so-called Browder period, the Communists tried not to have separate meetings. They—I mean of a mass organization. They tried to do away with the fractions on the theory that there were no interests of the mass organization that were in any way different from the Communists' and, therefore, anything that could be discussed in a Communist meeting could be discussed outside of it.

With the end of the Browder period, I think this changed, and what is going on now I wouldn't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee who were members of this first group to which you were assigned as far as you can recall?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I have named almost all the members of this group so far. There was Ring Lardner, Budd Schulberg, and Paul Jarrico. This was the basis of the group. There were other people, but I don't know that I ever saw them subsequently, and consequently I don't really remember them.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many of those persons did you collect dues and assessments from?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, I guess all of them, but at that time the assessments amounted to quite—didn't amount to a great deal of money. We were all young writers and all beginning, and it was a very small amount of money, as I remember, a month. About a hundred dollars, I think; a little over or a little under.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in that particular group or cell?

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I find that hard to answer, because I don't remember, because it could have been a year and a half or a year, somewhere around in there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you then transferred or assigned to some other group?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee about that.

Mr. COLLINS. It was another group, and some of the same people came along, and I can't remember much about it. It met at the house of a man called Martin Berkeley who was a screen writer at the time and who I think subsequently left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Martin Berkeley?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. B-e-r-k-e-l-e-y. And I remember from that group only Sam Ornitz, Samuel Ornitz, O-r-n-i-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER. Samuel Ornitz was one of the 10 who appeared before this committee in 1947?

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to any other branches or units of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, yes, I must have been assigned to several subsequently, but I don't really remember the dates or I mean the—You know, it's not only a great many years ago but a great many other meetings were going on, and I don't remember the precise dates or what the groups were.

There was a group I belonged to somewhere in there, and I remember a couple of fresh faces, but that's about all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what were the names of the new faces?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, a man called Herbert Blaché and his wife, B-l-a-c-h-é. I think he had been a silent movie actor. I don't know. And a woman called Nora Hallgren.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could you spell the last name?

Mr. COLLINS. H-a-l-l-g-r-e-n. And I understood she had once worked for Lenin or been his secretary or something.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Russia?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how she is presently employed?

Mr. COLLINS. No, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed at that time?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't know that she was. I think that her husband worked somewhere, but he wasn't—I don't recall him as in the group. See, after all, the Communist Party, for reasons that are now evident, was not anxious to have everybody know who everybody else was, and there was, in the efforts of security, a certain amount of holding the same people together, especially when the work—as for instance, my work—was in specific mass organizations. I mean in the Screen Writers' Guild, in the mobilization. So, therefore, I would know only except by hearsay the Communists in those particular organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I have been asking you about the names of various Communists here. I understand your reply is that in each instance you know of your own personal knowledge that they were members of the Communist Party and you're not relying upon hearsay testimony.

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I find that hard to answer, because I don't remember, because it could have been a year and a half or a year, somewhere around in there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you then transferred or assigned to some other group?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes, I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee about that.

Mr. COLLINS. It was another group, and some of the same people came along, and I can't remember much about it. It met at the house of a man called Martin Berkeley who was a screen writer at the time and who I think subsequently left.

Mr. TAVENNER. Martin Berkeley?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. B-e-r-k-e-l-e-y. And I remember from that group only Sam Ornitz, Samuel Ornitz, O-r-n-i-t-z.

Mr. TAVENNER. Samuel Ornitz was one of the 10 who appeared before this committee in 1947?

Mr. COLLINS. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to any other branches or units of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, yes, I must have been assigned to several subsequently, but I don't really remember the dates or I mean the—You know, it's not only a great many years ago but a great many other meetings were going on, and I don't remember the precise dates or what the groups were.

There was a group I belonged to somewhere in there, and I remember a couple of fresh faces, but that's about all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what were the names of the new faces?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, a man called Herbert Blaché and his wife, B-l-a-c-h-é. I think he had been a silent movie actor. I don't know. And a woman called Nora Hallgren.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could you spell the last name?

Mr. COLLINS. H-a-l-l-g-r-e-n. And I understood she had once worked for Lenin or been his secretary or something.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Russia?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how she is presently employed?

Mr. COLLINS. No, I don't.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was she employed at that time?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't know that she was. I think that her husband worked somewhere, but he wasn't—I don't recall him as in the group. See, after all, the Communist Party, for reasons that are now evident, was not anxious to have everybody know who everybody else was, and there was, in the efforts of security, a certain amount of holding the same people together, especially when the work—as for instance, my work—was in specific mass organizations. I mean in the Screen Writers' Guild, in the mobilization. So, therefore, I would know only except by hearsay the Communists in those particular organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I have been asking you about the names of various Communists here. I understand your reply is that in each instance you know of your own personal knowledge that they were members of the Communist Party and you're not relying upon hearsay testimony.

Mr. VELDE. Is that her first name or last name?

Mr. COLLINS. That's a first name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Abe Polonsky?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What connection did he have with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, if any?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, similar to Lawson's connection, which is that Polonsky, like Lawson, is a man of undeniable intellectual capacity, is very sharp, quite talented, and he had a certain influence in the mobilization on this level. He had had, I think, as I remember, he had been overseas in the war, and I can't tell precisely when he came home, so that, if he was in the mobilization, it must have been in its latter years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. COLLINS. He could have been. I don't remember exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with John Bright, B-r-i-g-h-t?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Now I only remember him way back in the late thirties. He was a member in those days. But what's happened to him in the last decade I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Millard Lampell, L-a-m-p-e-l-l?

Mr. COLLINS. I can't say I was ever in a meeting with Lampell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gertrude Purcell was a member of the board of the Screen Writers' Guild in 1938 and 1939. Were you acquainted with her?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I knew her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. I didn't really—I didn't recall that. She might have been, but, as I say, I have got to remember the precise room and place and person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gordon Kahn, K-a-h-n—

Mr. COLLINS. I remember—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Was a member of the board.

Mr. COLLINS. I remember Kahn was in.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you mentioned in the course of your testimony the name of Leonardo Bercovici?

Mr. COLLINS. No. I worked with Bercovici on a film that was supposed to be about the San Francisco conference for the OWI.

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

Mr. COLLINS. B-e-r-c-o-v-i-c-i.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. At that time he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Dorothy Tree Uris?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; but I never knew her in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with an individual by the name of Sam Moore?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; but I never knew him in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with an individual by the name of Elizabeth Leech or Elizabeth Leech Glenn?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. She held an official position in the Communist Party and was also connected with the Hollywood section at one time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she hold any position in Hollywood as far as you know other than as a functionary of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. She may have worked at a studio. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her position in the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I think she took Madelaine Ruthven's job after Ruthven left, but I'm—she had some such job.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that you mean she collected dues or—

Mr. COLLINS. Well, she was a secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. A secretary?

Mr. COLLINS. I think she was an open Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with her husband, Charles Glenn?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; I think he was an open Communist also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he serve as a functionary of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't know. I think he served as some kind of functionary in the Hollywood section at one time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know an individual by the name of Margaret Potts?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Frank Tuttle?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party? Tuttle? T-u-t-t-l-e?

Mr. COLLINS. He was in the early days. I went to a meeting—several—at his house. I haven't seen him in a decade either. I don't know what happened to him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever have occasion to meet William Schneiderman?

Mr. COLLINS. No. I saw him, but I never met him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you see William Schneiderman?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, at one of these State conventions of the party he made a 4-hour speech, I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is a good place for a break.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will take a recess now until 3 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 1:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 3 p. m. this date.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing was resumed at 2:15 p. m., the members of the committee present being Representatives John S. Wood (chairman),

Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.)

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD J. COLLINS—Resumed

Mr. WOOD. The hearing will come to order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Collins, at this time I would like to ask you questions regarding certain organizations which we understand you were from time to time affiliated with.

Were you at any time a member of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you name any other members of the Communist Party who were members of that league along with you?

Mr. COLLINS. No. I belonged to the Anti-Nazi League before I became a member of the Communist Party, and never had much influence in it. I was just a rank-and-file member. So that I wouldn't know who was a Communist in it and who wasn't. The fact is that the Communists in it must have been an infinitesimal fraction of the membership, because thousands of people against Hitler were eager members of the Anti-Nazi League.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not V. J. Jerome was active in that organization, directly or in any indirect manner?

Mr. COLLINS. I wouldn't know that either. It was before, as I say, my real experience.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the League of American Writers?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; around 1938 or 1939; but outside of the Spanish civil war I don't really remember what the issues were of the league, and I wouldn't want to go into it. I don't remember the content of the league's program at all, although I think it is all a part of the public record.

The point is that anything that had to do with loyalist Spain, I joined, as I would join today, because I believe in loyalist Spain. So if there are any organizations like the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee, I undoubtedly was a member of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated in any way with the Progressive Citizens of America?

Mr. COLLINS. It is very possible. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your chief activities were confined to the Communist Party itself and to the Screen Writers' Guild and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, rather than to Communist-front organizations generally; is that true?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, yes; I guess it is true. I mean, since I don't really know the history of many of the organizations I joined, I would have to go along with you in saying they are Communist-front organizations, although I am not sure in most cases. Anything that seemed to fulfill the program that I was interested in, I would have joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you understand by a Communist-front organization, in the experience that you had in the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, it seems to me that in some cases a Communist-front organization, I couldn't give you my own definition, but I assume the meaning today is a front in which Communists are active or in which they organize the basis for the committee or group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you include those instances also in which the Communist Party gains strong influence by infiltration of its members into the group?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; if they have some influence in it I suppose you could call it a Communist front, but there is an enormous difference between being a Communist and belonging to two or three organizations, especially when you take them out of the context of the years and go back to them.

I remember in a Gallup poll around 1938 that 74 or 75 percent of the people said they favored the Loyalists over Franco, so that to belong to an organization that was in favor of Loyalist Spain at that time was a logical position. If you were against Hitler, you might have joined the Anti-Nazi League, and others.

Coming up as late as the peace conferences, it seems to me there is a mistake made when the peace conferences are labeled "Communist fronts" and you let it go at that, because people joined the peace conferences not because they were Communists, but because peace is very alive. The way to get Communist fronts out of the way is not to abolish them, but to have different kinds of organizations people can belong to that will represent different issues which people believe in very strongly.

Undoubtedly there were Communists who, for some reason or other, did not join any of those organizations, while a man might feel that since Communists at one time or other were associated with almost every liberal organization in the United States, you couldn't avoid at some time being associated with Communists.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am very glad to hear you say that. With reference to the signatures on the "Stockholm peace petition," don't you agree there are a lot of fine people in this country who, because the word "peace" was on it, signed that petition?

Mr. COLLINS. I think that is absolutely true. I read an article in the New Yorker which said the conservative members of boroughs in Switzerland and in France had signed it because they felt it was a pledge of some kind, and when they heard the Russians had signed it, they felt perhaps the Russians were pushing it along.

To say everyone who signed the petition was a Communist, would be a serious mistake, in my opinion. The question of peace is a very serious question.

I think also, if you go back 10 years, the situation has changed. Take American-Russian friendship. In 1942-43 it looked like a reasonable thing. So people who belonged to that in 1942-43 would be in a different category from people who would belong to it now.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to read from testimony given by J. Edgar Hoover on this subject on March 26, 1947:

For the most part, front organizations assumed the character of either a mass or membership organization or a paper organization. Both solicited and used names of prominent persons. Literally hundreds of groups and organizations have either been infiltrated or organized primarily to accomplish the purposes of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States, the promotion of Soviet war and peace aims, the exploitation of Negroes in the United States, work among foreign-language groups, and to secure a favorable viewpoint toward the Communists in domestic, political, social, and economic issues.

The first requisite for front organizations is an idealistic sounding title. Hundreds of such organizations have come into being and have gone out of existence when their true purposes have become known or exposed while others with high-sounding names are continually springing up.

I would like to ask you about two other organizations. Were you a member of the People's Educational Center in Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. I taught a class at what was either the People's Educational Center or its equivalent. I don't know if it was called School for Writers or what it was called, but I taught a class a couple semesters. Paul Jarrico and I taught it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to Paul Jarrico, were there others known to you as Communist Party members who taught at that center?

Mr. COLLINS. There was a class in screen writing. We came in on Tuesday night and we worked out a schedule, and the students did some work and there was discussion of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any compensation for your work in teaching?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Jarrico?

Mr. COLLINS. No. It was a work of love.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Peace Mobilization Committee?

Mr. COLLINS. I never was active in it, but I might have had a membership in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to meet Communists from foreign countries?

Mr. COLLINS. I met a man who was foreign editor of the French Communist paper, L'Humanité, and he gave me the Duclos letter, or what was going to be the Duclos letter, before it was printed. And I met an Indian railroad union official.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean an official of the Government of India?

Mr. COLLINS. No; he was an official of the Railway Workers Union, as I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. In India?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. He was visiting here. He spoke about the conditions in India, the living conditions of the people in India, which are quite severe; the fact that they eat flesh, as he says, perhaps once a year, and many millions of people are born, live, and die in the street without ever being under shelter.

He was enormously impressed with the amount of energy Americans must have since they eat so well, and he was dissatisfied with the working class of America because he didn't see how they would ever be militant men. He had looked over the country and didn't see any chance for a class struggle.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was discouraged about the prospect of communism among the working class in America because of the good conditions in which they worked?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. He said in relation to his own country it was impossible. He said that in his country the people had to do something, but in the United States he despaired of their interest.

That is about it. I found him interesting and I remember the conversation.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to question you a little further about your experience in the Communist Party. In our study of communism in various areas of the United States and in various fields, such as labor, we have found that a very exact type of discipline is required within the Communist Party. Was that true in Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. No. I would say that the discipline of the intellectuals in Hollywood is quite gentle. It is probably not possible to handle these people on the same basis as perhaps workers in other industries are handled. In the main, a man in Hollywood feels a very gentle party hand. There is a feeling in the party, anyway, that intellectuals are unstable, and I think Sartre puts it very well when he says, "Thinking brings them in and thinking can take them out." The fact it comes out of thinking and not absolute need is the thing that makes it not possible to put such a clamp on the membership as may be true in other places.

On the other hand, I discovered when I started to disagree violently I was not popular. But I could disagree as I did in the Maltz controversy, where I supported Maltz, without anyone discussing it with me or any discipline at all. There is a fair freedom. I don't think the party could keep the people if there wasn't. But on basic questions they have to accept the policy of the party. On small points there can be arguments and disagreements.

It also depends on how strong the party is. In 1946 and 1947 they were very gentle, because their position was poor and they didn't want to get rid of people who disagreed; but in the days they were going well, I think they would have asked a man who was difficult to leave. Later on they didn't like to lose anybody.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state that in major matters of policy you were required to carry out party lines and instructions?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. In a thing like the German-Russian Pact, you would have to accept the policy of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any instance in which party discipline was attempted of any member of the cell or branch to which you were attached?

Mr. COLLINS. You might call it discipline; it came out of the Duclos letter. After the Duclos letter, it revised the Communist Party's thinking of how postwar America would be. Browder thought there might be some peaceful transition to socialism, and so on. Mr. Duclos apparently didn't agree with this, and sent a letter to the American Party saying that Browder had strayed from the Marxist position, and it caused a great furor in the party.

This was one of the things which I suppose was the turning point in my party life.

Mr. VELDE. Will you place a date on that incident?

Mr. COLLINS. That was June 1945. The situation was that a man who loved Browder on Monday hated him on Thursday. Once the national committee of the Communist Party said he was no good, the chorus filled the room. The party indulged in what was termed "self-criticism." I could not quite accept the self-criticism. It seemed absurd, since in order to have been a member of the party previously it was necessary to go along with the Browder position, and in order to stay in the party subsequently it was necessary to change that position and so therefore the confession of error was not individual but mass, and as such seemed to me to have no value.

The whole situation was reviewed, and John Howard Lawson was reviewed as well, and he was relieved of his position of responsibility.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that position at that time?

Mr. COLLINS. Whatever it was, in fact it was the leadership of the section. The leadership was then given to other people, I think to

Waldo Salt and Charles Glenn, and much to our surprise we discovered that Jack Lawson was the liaison between the county and the section, having been given the job by the county, which made him once again the leader of the section.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us be certain that we get that in an understandable way. As a result of the Duclos letter, there was initiated a proceeding to oust him from his position of leadership?

Mr. COLLINS. There was a review of the entire leadership, nationally. Then in all the local committees this presumably took place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who initiated this action?

Mr. COLLINS. In a new committee, I think, each branch had one representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part did you take in it?

Mr. COLLINS. I was the representative from my branch. Another committee had prepared this document on Lawson after talking to him. They prepared documents on others, too. I went downtown when Nemmy Sparks was in charge and presented my position regarding Lawson, and Nemmy Sparks listened to it quite coldly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was Nemmy Sparks?

Mr. COLLINS. Organizer in Los Angeles County. He listened closely and I was subsequently stripped of my epaulets and I held no position in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. After taking action which you thought removed Lawson from the position he then held, he was placed in the same position, though known under a different title?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. As I look back, I think Nemmy Sparks was right in supporting Lawson instead of supporting me, from the Communist Party point of view.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other instances concerning Communist Party discipline?

Mr. COLLINS. Not that I remember.

I think a great many people like me were profoundly disturbed by the events following the Duclos letter—the Maltz incident was after that—and I know people who are either out or thinking of going out of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you repeat that, please?

Mr. COLLINS. There were a good many people after the Duclos letter and after the Maltz incident who were dissatisfied and wanted to get out of the party. Some have gotten out and some have not.

It is hard to get out, not because anybody tells you you can't but because you have associations of many years, and you have liberal question that you believed in together, and probably still do, and you have many hours of energy and time invested, and it is only when issues become sharp that decisions are made.

Mr. TAVENNER. It requires more courage to get out than get in?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't know. I think it takes something to get out. I don't know what it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were in a position to observe the various switches in the Communist Party line during the period you were a member. Will you give the committee the benefit of your knowledge regarding certain outstanding instances of Communist Party switches?

Mr. COLLINS. One of the main switches prior to the Duclos letter was the Nazi-Soviet pact. Prior to the Nazi-Soviet pact, the Soviet

Union's position of collective security against Nazi Germany was a good position and had my support. The Soviet Union also helped Loyalist Spain.

When the Nazi-Soviet pact occurred there was great consternation on the part of many people. It didn't seem reasonable for this pact to have been made. The explanation was given to me by Sam Ornitz, the great explainer—

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he one of the 10 who appeared before this committee in 1947?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you have already identified him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. COLLINS. Ornitz explained right away what was subsequently the position taken by the party, that this was a delaying tactic on the part of Soviet Russia because they were not prepared at that time to go to war.

It was about June 21, 1941, when the Soviet Union was attacked by Nazi Germany.

Mr. TAVENNER. What propaganda efforts were made during that period to support the various lines of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. I don't remember that we did. I remember the slogan, "The Yanks are not Coming," and so on. A lot of organizations were smashed during that period.

Next was the Finland question. The Finland question did do a lot of harm to the Communists so far as mass organizations and so on.

What had happened when Germany attacked Soviet Russia was explained again by Sam Ornitz in a social gathering, and he explained it by saying it was now a good war, because the entrance of the Soviet Union had changed the character of the war. Before then it was a bad war. Now it was a good war.

Mr. TAVENNER. This individual took the position it was a good war between Russia and Germany, but a bad war between the United States and Germany?

Mr. COLLINS. At that time the United States was not officially in the war.

The last switch was the switch surrounding the Duclos letter, and it was the switch that brought about my exit, which I will admit took me a long time. It took me a long time to get in and it took me a long time to get out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any change in direction about the use of names for branches after the Duclos letter?

Mr. COLLINS. I also recall that a cute instance was that the branches were to take the names of Communists who were heroes, but it was explained they should be dead.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dead Communists?

Mr. COLLINS. Dead Communists, because, as in the case of Browder, you never could tell. Therefore they were given names of dead Communists.

I was going to go into the question about the Screen Writers' Guild. We had no fraction meetings and had to rely to some degree on Lawson's leadership on the guild board.

This was the period the policy had changed from a no-strike policy to a support of the strike. There was a tremendous amount of shilly-shallying, so that when I got to the board I didn't know how I would vote. Lawson made a speech, and then we voted. For the first time I was getting very uncomfortable with this kind of procedure.

Mr. TAVENNER. In that connection, the Communist Party has made an effort to claim it is democratic in the conduct of its business. Are you commenting now upon that claim of democratic type of action?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, it was democratic in the sense that if we did discuss it there would be general agreement, presumably, and if you disagreed you went with the majority.

To go back to this, Dudley Nichols—

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. No. Spoke for support of the secretaries. We beat him down. We had a no-strike policy. Six months later John Howard Lawson was saying to the Screen Writers' Guild board that we should support the strike. And Frank Partos, also on the board, said, "Please, I ask you, are we saying what we said 6 months ago."

I found it was hard to take. In 1947 I decided I was not going to run for the board. I wanted to withdraw. I must say the party was not against my not running as I had disobeyed several directives.

I think that covers the switches.

Mr. TAVENNER. That all led up to about the time you terminated your relationship with the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. In 1947 I was subpoenaed to come here to Washington before this committee. I found myself with a group of Communists and non-Communists. I found I didn't have the guts to break with men I knew and liked personally. I went to New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in going to New York?

Mr. COLLINS. It was to get out of political activity. It was not the courageous thing to do; but I did it.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is, to break with those you had been associated with in the Communist Party.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. I came back at Christmas time in 1947 and was asked for my dues for the year and I refused, but I didn't refuse on a clear-cut basis. I kind of weasled out of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who demanded the payment of the dues?

Mr. COLLINS. Nobody demanded it. Jarrico suggested it, and I said no.

In 1948, toward the end of 1948, I came back—no, it was about the middle of 1949 that I came back. When I came back Jarrico asked me whether I was going to come back to the party, and for the first time I said no. I still did not explain my position completely. I said no I wasn't. This state of affairs lasted until 1950.

In 1950 I was beginning to be extremely uncomfortable with my position, which was that I was considered a Communist by almost all of Hollywood, and I was considered a renegade by my ex-associates. Also, I had the fear, which became a nightmare, that in the event of a war with the Soviet Union I would be considered a friend of the Soviet Union.

By that time I had made steps to being anti-Soviet, in the sense that I did not believe the Soviet's presentation of the state of the world, nor did I believe it was a paradise. I had a real fear that I would be

considered, in the event of such a war, a friend of the Soviet Union, when actually I was an enemy.

Accordingly, I went in February 1950 to the Federal Bureau of Investigation with a note in which I said I had been a Communist, was one no longer, wanted my loyalty to the United States understood, but at that time I didn't wish to discuss my former associates. They honored that. We discussed the workings of the party, however.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any Communist Party activities since your break with the party in 1947 to 1949? I think the break occurred during that period?

Mr. COLLINS. I did do what could be called, I suppose, Communist activity, although I did not think of it as such at that time. I participated in the organization of a peace meeting in 1948. I also signed for personal reasons, whenever I could, such as the amicus curiae brief, for men with whom I had been associated. As far as I recall, that is about it. I did go along with the peace movement for a certain length of time. I went to the peace conference at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, and went to Madison Square Garden and listened to the speeches. I remember those things.

Mr. TAVENNER. Other than the things you have mentioned, have you engaged in any other Communist Party activity?

Mr. COLLINS. I have engaged in no Communist Party activity at all, nor do I intend to.

Mr. TAVENNER. You consider that your break with the party is definite and final?

Mr. COLLINS. I consider it irrevocable, and I imagine the party does too.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was the subpoena to appear here before this committee served upon you, do you recall?

Mr. COLLINS. About 5 weeks ago, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. The subpoena shows the date February 28, 1951.

Mr. COLLINS. That is probably right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has any effort been made, since the service of that subpoena upon you, to dissuade you from making a full disclosure to this committee of all you know regarding communism?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, there was one effort made; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee about it?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, a couple weeks ago, or 10 days ago, I received a phone call from Paul Jarrico, who said he would like to see me. I asked him to come over, which he did, after dinner.

He said he understood I had made some arrangements with this committee, and I should be careful with such arrangements. I don't think he realized the depths of my perfidy at this point.

He asked if I would give my personal assurance that I would not give any names. He understood I was out of the party, but he wanted my personal assurance that I would not give any names. I didn't give that assurance.

We then had a long political discussion. Paul Jarrico feels the justice of his position, and he went over the situation that he believes the Soviet Union is devoted to the interests of all people and is peace-loving as well.

I said to him, "It is not for me. It may be a fine country, but it is not for me."

He said, "How can you be so sure?"

I said, "I can be sure because I was in the Communist Party almost 10 years, and having lived through that I can tell that is not the kind of country I would like to live in."

I looked at my watch and it was a quarter of 12, after 4 hours of discussion, and he said, "I think on the basis of 14 years of friendship I have the right to ask for your personal assurance that you will not give any names."

I said, "I will give you my personal assurance that I will not give any names if you will give me your personal assurance that in the event of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union you will do nothing to help the Soviet Union."

Paul said, "You know my answer to that." He didn't explain the answer, but it was that if it was an aggressive war of the United States he would not support it.

I said, "I am not interested in whether it is aggressive. I want your personal assurance that if there is war between this country and the Soviet Union you will do nothing to help the Soviet Union."

Since he could not give me this assurance, I would not give him mine, and since we would not lie to each other, we had no further conversation.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. In these days of disclosures of disloyalty, it is refreshing to find someone who has the courage to make a contribution to the security of the United States, and I trust you have made an example for other people who must by this time know that the aims of the United States are for peace.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I have quite a few questions, but in view of the short time remaining, I wish to ask the witness only one or two short ones.

Have you ever had time, or have you ever read, the law under which this committee operates? Have you ever had that called to your attention?

Mr. COLLINS. No, I don't think so.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me read it to you.

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

Have you any suggestion to Congress as to any remedial legislation which might be considered fairly within our Constitution to meet this problem of subversive misconduct and un-American activities?

Mr. COLLINS. I can't say I have. That is a field way outside my knowledge and experience.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your answer to this question: Do you feel, then, that this committee, functioning as it has, say with you today, and as you have known it to function by written report and by hearsay, is serving a valuable function to meet this problem?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, it has served a valuable function as far as I am concerned in that it has given me an opportunity to clear myself, and it gives that possibility to other people. Insofar as its other activities, I still could not comment on it because I am not familiar enough with it.

Mr. DOYLE. I call your attention to the common understanding of term "subversive" and the technical definition of the term "subvert." I took occasion to look it up several days ago, and it means, "To overturn from the foundation; to overthrow; to ruin utterly; to destroy; also, to upset, uproot, or the like."

Is it your opinion that the Communist Party of the United States, as you knew it when you were a member of it, was favoring the subversive destruction of the constitutional form of government as we know it in this country?

Mr. COLLINS. Well, I suppose in the sense that it favors the Soviet regime, it favors the destruction of the Constitution, but insofar as my activities were concerned, I could scarcely say that is true. The activities I was engaged in until the time I left were not disloyal to the United States. They may have been misguided, but disloyal they were not. Since the aim eventually is a Soviet state, that certainly would not be constitutional government as we have it.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much. I get the difference. In other words, your experience had no such purpose?

Mr. COLLINS. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Whereas the purpose of the Communist Party of the United States, as I take it from your last statement, is to set up a Soviet form of government in the United States, in the world?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. But it is a long step between an eventual goal and possibilities. In other words, the people who become Communists, at least in my time, didn't join because the Communists were going to overthrow our form of government by force and violence.

Mr. DOYLE. Was there any change later?

Mr. COLLINS. No. Now, because of the worsened conditions, no one can be on the side of the United States and the Communists at the same time. During the earlier period there didn't seem to be a divergence between the position of Soviet Russia and of the United States, not until 1946, when the cold war became sharper.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Due to the shortness of time I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank Mr. Collins for coming before the committee and answering questions frankly and openly, as it appears to me, and giving this valuable information to the committee as to the techniques of the Communist Party in organizing the underground, and I hope this will serve as an example to others called before the committee.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. I want to add my personal thanks to the witness for coming here and testifying today.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. In all, how many active members of the Communist Party did you know in Hollywood?

Mr. COLLINS. I knew, I suppose, about 20, but I understood that there were many, many more.

Mr. JACKSON. What would your best estimate be as to membership at its peak during the war?

Mr. COLLINS. Several hundred.

Mr. JACKSON. Several hundred. And of those of whom you have personal knowledge, how many have broken with the party so far?

Mr. COLLINS. About one-fourth.

Mr. JACKSON. About 25 percent?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Have broken with the party?

Mr. COLLINS. Broken in various degrees. Some have broken in that they don't go to meetings, and some have broken because they don't believe in it.

Mr. JACKSON. In varying degrees, 75 percent might be considered to belong actively or to be in the fellow-traveler classification?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. In the event of a real show-down it is hard to say how many would stay. I have detected signs of disturbance in people in whom I never detected it before.

Mr. JACKSON. I join with other members of the committee in saying I feel you not only have rendered a service to yourself, but I believe you have rendered a distinct service to the country.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. You stated that if you had appeared before the committee in 1947 you would not have testified?

Mr. COLLINS. I would have taken the line taken by the other members.

Mr. POTTER. What was the reason for that?

Mr. COLLINS. It would be because at that time it seemed to me that purely on American democratic constitutional grounds there was a question of the propriety of asking a man his political beliefs. Without going into the question of its propriety today, there has been a marked change in the world situation since 1947, and there has been as great a change in me. It is hard to tell where one thing begins and the other ends.

Mr. POTTER. That is all. You have been a very willing witness.

Mr. WOOD. There has been testimony indicating that individuals have been approached on the proposition of being passive members of the party, contributing to it in the form of dues or otherwise, but not taking active part. Do you know of any such approach?

Mr. COLLINS. No. That would have been a recent development, when people might feel it is too hot, or because they might have slight disagreements, but would still be willing to contribute money. But I would say that when one leaves the party, as has been said, they start out a little ways and then they go a long ways. Once they live in a different world, it is very hard for them to go back.

Mr. WOOD. I join with other members of the committee in expressing appreciation for your cooperation and for the very frank and full manner in which you have given information, and unless the committee determines at some future time to ask your appearance, you will be excused, and the committee stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 4:30 p. m. on Thursday, April 12, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Friday, April 13, 1951, at 10 a. m.)

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 1

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1951

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

PUBLIC HEARING

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

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde (appearance as noted in transcript), Bernard W. Kearney, 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 and Courtney E. Owens, investigators; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Mr. Walter, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the full committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call as the first witness Mr. Waldo Salt.

Mr. Wood. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please? You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. SALT. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF WALDO SALT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Waldo Salt?

Mr. SALT. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. SALT. Yes; I am represented by Mr. Margolis and Mr. Kenny.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe counsel have already identified themselves for the record.

(Counsel had previously identified themselves as Robert W. Kenny, Los Angeles, Calif.; and Ben Margolis, 112 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Salt, will you please state the date of your birth, your present residence, and occupation?

Mr. SALT. I was born in Chicago, Ill., October 18, 1914. My present residence is 1221 North Kings Road, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief statement of your educational training?

Mr. SALT. The period of grammar school, I went to a British private school in Victoria, British Columbia. High school was in the San Raphael Military Academy; the Menlo School for Boys, Menlo Park, Calif.; and I took my A. B. at Stanford.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment since you completed your education?

Mr. SALT. I spent one school year as instructor in dramatics and music at Menlo Junior College, and from then on have been employed in the motion-picture industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you employed in the industry at this time?

Mr. SALT. Not exactly at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your last employment in the industry?

Mr. SALT. I was at work on an original screen play for Norma Productions, which is an independent with Warner Bros.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the company?

Mr. SALT. Norma, as in the girl's name.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other employment have you had in Hollywood besides that? What are some of the principal pictures in which you have worked as a writer?

Mr. SALT. From present to past, or past to present?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you begin either way you desire.

Mr. SALT. I started as a junior writer. Shall I give a history?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I believe that would be more satisfactory if you would start from the beginning and tell about your experience and career in Hollywood.

Mr. SALT. I began as a junior writer, I believe I was 20 years old, at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer; worked there for 5 years, 5½ years.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when was that?

Mr. SALT. I think it began in 1936 and ran through to 1941, as I remember. During that period I had credit on Shopworn Angel; in a picture called Wild Man of Borneo in collaboration—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you speak a little louder?

Mr. SALT. I am sorry.

Mr. WOOD. The members of the committee can't hear you up here.

Mr. SALT. I am very sorry. The picture Shopworn Angel and the picture Wild Man of Borneo, for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. The picture Tonight We Raid Calais, for Twentieth Century Fox. Mr. Winkle Goes to War, for Columbia. Rachel and the Stranger, for RKO. And the most recent, The Flame and the Arrow, for Warner Bros. and Norma Productions.

Mr. TAVENNER. The last picture to which you referred, The Flaming Arrow—

Mr. SALT. The Flame and the Arrow.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing).—The Flame and the Arrow was based upon the book of Albert Maltz, was it not?

Mr. SALT. No; it was an original screen play.

Mr. TAVENNER. By you?

Mr. SALT. By me.

Mr. TAVENNER. What agency has represented you in the past 4 or 5 years, if any?

Mr. SALT. I think that I have been represented by 2 in the past 5 years. I am not sure. I am now with Sam Jaffe Agency. Before that I was with the M. C. Levee, L-e-v-e-e, Agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of the change from one to the other?

Mr. SALT. I think that may have been 4 years ago. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of having been engaged in the teaching profession at one time. Were you a member of the faculty of the School for Writers in Hollywood?

Mr. SALT. Which School for Writers is that?

Mr. TAVENNER. The school that was conducted under the auspices of the League of American Writers.

Mr. SALT. At this point I think that we might as well be very clear. I am going to claim the privilege of the fifth amendment here, as other witnesses have, because a number of organizations, their membership, individually and collectively, have been incriminated already by publication of lists without sufficient evidence, chance to cross-examine the witnesses against them; have been printed up in leaflets and in publications such as this; and—

Mr. WOOD. Suppose you just make your answer responsive to the question asked. If any question is asked you that you think would incriminate you by giving a truthful answer to it, you have the right to claim that privilege if you want to claim it. I want to say to you that to the question asked, a truthful answer could not possibly incriminate you under any law in existence today, but if you want to claim the privilege, it is all right with this committee. There can only be one of two connotations. So please make your answers responsive to the questions asked and we will get along faster and save a lot of time.

Mr. SALT. I am extremely anxious to get along fast.

Mr. WOOD. Make your answers responsive.

Mr. SALT. I would like to make quite clear the legal grounds on which I am proceeding.

Mr. WOOD. We understand the provisions of the fifth amendment and also the first amendment of the American Constitution. If it is on those grounds, that is all you need to say.

Mr. SALT. I would like to add this qualification, Mr. Wood, that I have sat through several days of your hearings here, and in particular I noticed you did not object when one of your witnesses, Mr. Hayden, said to claim the privilege of the fifth amendment implied guilt. I know this is not true. I am sure you know it is not true.

Mr. WOOD. If it is not true, then your claiming it is a false statement on your part.

Mr. SALT. No. I think there may be a very serious misinterpretation of the fifth amendment here.

Mr. WOOD. Just answer the questions, please, without undertaking to lecture the committee, and I think we will get along faster.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand you have refused to answer the question?

Mr. SALT. I have not yet. I was stating my grounds. In relation to the organizations listed in addition to the 643 already labeled as subversive by your committee, I feel that I must claim the privilege of the fifth amendment, refuse to answer that on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of the board of directors or other governing body of Actors' Laboratory, Inc.?

Mr. SALT. I am sure that the Actors' Laboratory is included there. It was investigated by Jack Tenney.¹

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

Mr. SALT. Therefore I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make an announcement in the Daily People's World of January 20, 1944, supporting the formation of a group in Los Angeles to work for the release of Morris U. Schappes?

Mr. SALT. Again I am sure that it is obvious that I would claim the privilege—

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that he answer "yes" or "no," and if he feels it is going to incriminate him, to so state, instead of going into a long harangue?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. SALT. I will repeat my last answer. Again I must claim the privilege. I am sorry if that is a harangue.

Mr. TAVENNER. Morris U. Schappes was the teacher at City College in New York who was indicted and convicted for perjury in connection with an investigation of his alleged Communist Party activities at this institution, and I want to ask whether or not you organized or assisted in organizing a movement in California to petition Governor Dewey to commute his sentence?

Mr. SALT. Again I decline on the grounds that this requires me to give evidence against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate for the executive board of the Hollywood Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council of the Progressive Citizens of America in 1947?

Mr. SALT. I must decline on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you also a candidate for the executive board in 1951?

Mr. SALT. That is the same question; same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a sponsor of the State-wide Conference on Civil Rights which was held in San Francisco, September 27 and 28, 1941?

Mr. SALT. I am sure that this question falls into the same category as earlier questions. I decline to answer on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you testify under oath before the California State Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944?

Mr. SALT. Is that the Tenney committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. SALT. I believe yes. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you testify under oath at that time and before that committee in 1944 that you were a member of the Hollywood Democratic Committee?

¹ State Senator Jack B. Tenney, of the California State Legislature.

Mr. SALT. Again, in the context of today, I must refuse to answer that on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You take that position notwithstanding you testified under oath to that fact in 1944, if you did so testify?

Mr. SALT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also testify under oath before that committee in 1944 that you attended a surprise birthday party for Carl Winter at his home on September 24, 1944?

Mr. SALT. Again, in the context of today, I must decline to answer that on the grounds that it might tend to be self-incriminating.

Mr. TAVENNER. How could it incriminate you today to advise this committee regarding the facts of a matter which you did testify to under oath in 1944?

Mr. SALT. I don't want to go into any harangues. As a taxpayer, I am as anxious to see these hearings end as soon as possible. I disapprove of this entire tendency of government toward government by quiz show. I think it is rather obvious, as the witness yesterday said, that the world situation has altered radically between even 1947 and now.

Mr. TAVENNER. But my question to you, how could it incriminate you now—

Mr. SALT. The world situation and the—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). To make a statement of fact regarding a matter which you have testified under oath about at a previous time before another committee?

Mr. SALT. The world situation and the laws and the situation of this country have changed quite radically since then.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of the signers of the nominating position of Albert Maltz in November 1949 for a position on the executive board of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. SALT. I believe that is a matter of public record; not public, but I think it is a matter of record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that what was known as the so-called progressive section or part of the Screen Writers' Guild? Was that in connection with the slate presented by that group?

Mr. SALT. May I consult with counsel for a moment on this?

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

(Witness and his counsel conferred.)

Mr. SALT. The fact is that I signed for Albert Maltz, petitioning that he be a nominee for the Screen Writers' Guild, as an individual, because I felt that Albert Maltz would make a very fine representative of the writers.

Mr. WOOD. You were not asked for your reason for doing it. You were asked if you did do it.

Mr. SALT. I will testify to the fact that I signed for Albert Maltz. However, I think that when it goes beyond this into the question of any organizational activity within the Guild, since yesterday and the testimony of your witness, that again I must claim the privilege here on the ground of the fifth amendment, as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he defeated in that election?

Mr. SALT. As I remember, and with my memory refreshed by testimony, I believe he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the agricultural aid committee of the United Cannery, Packing and Allied Workers of America, of which committee you were alleged to be the chairman?

Mr. SALT. I am quite sure that the United Cannery, Packing and Allied Workers of America is one of the trade-unions that you have seen fit to include in your list as subversive, and on this ground I will decline to answer as previously justified under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Salt, the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Pace was held in New York City from March 25 through March 27, 1949, and this conference was attended by delegates from foreign countries as well as from this country. Did you endeavor to establish a comparable conference to be held in California—or in Hollywood, to be specific—at which you planned that many of these foreign delegates would appear as speakers in the Cultural and Scientific Conference which you desired to hold there, that is, "Conference for Peace," so called?

Mr. SALT. You have a special report on the so-called "Communist Peace Offensive," so I will have to, obviously, decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Well it isn't obvious to me. I don't know if it is obvious to the other members of the committee or not. Do you decline to answer?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend a meeting at which a person by the name of Alexander Stevens, or J. Peters, was present?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Lionel Berman?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you met with John Stapp in your home?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have a meeting with Alexander Trachtenberg in Los Angeles in the year 1943?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information, Mr. Salt, that you were issued in 1945 Communist Political Association registration card bearing number 47232. Were you the holder of such a card?

Mr. SALT. Decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the holder of a membership card in the Communist Party for the year 1945, or rather in the Communist Political Association for that year?

Mr. SALT. That is a rephrasing, isn't it, of the last question, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not entirely.

Mr. SALT. It is similar.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is related, of course.

Mr. SALT. It is related; therefore I similarly decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you issued a registration card for the year 1944 bearing number 47182, by the Communist Party?

Mr. SALT. Similarly, this is a related question, and in claiming the privilege of the fifth amendment I would like to say that this and a number of other questions could undoubtedly be answered proudly "yes" or "no" in many countries of the world today, most of the countries outside of this, Spain, Argentina—

Mr. WOOD. You are asked to answer in this country, now.

Mr. SALT. Yes; and in this country, again, I must decline to answer under the protection of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. WALTER. The countries in which you feel that this question could be answered proudly are the countries behind the iron curtain. Was that your meaning?

Mr. SALT. No; that was not my meaning.

Mr. KEARNEY. Those countries are the countries where they do not have the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SALT. I was referring to most of the countries of the world who are still operating on the basis of the example originally set by this brave, proud, fine country of ours, who have patterned their system of freedom and justice and political liberty on our own country's, which I think we are slipping away from now, which makes it quite impossible for a man to answer freely, to speak up freely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the year 1945?

Mr. SALT. Again this seems to me to be a rephrasing of a previous question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an employee in the Office of War Information during the year 1945?

Mr. SALT. Yes. Yes; I was employed by the Office of War Information.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us when that employment began and when it ended.

Mr. SALT. I can't be surely specific about this. I believe it began in the early months of 1945 and ended with the summer of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your duties and your assignment?

Mr. SALT. I was assigned on what was called the writer-director classification. I worked on a film called The Cummington Story.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the story?

Mr. SALT. The Cummington Story. It was a film based on a group of European refugees received in a town of Cummington, Mass., I believe. Following that I worked on the film called San Francisco 1945, which was a film expressing our point of view toward the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whose point of view?

Mr. SALT. The United States'.

Mr. TAVENNER. In obtaining employment in the Office of War Information, did you take an oath?

(No response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you?

Mr. SALT. Is that a question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly. I asked you if you took an oath in obtaining your position with the Office of War Information.

Mr. SALT. The word "obtained" confused me. I thought it had to do with seeking it. I did not seek it. I was invited.

Mr. TAVENNER. The emphasis is on the oath.

Mr. SALT. I think I probably did. As I remember, there is some form of an oath included in one of the applications, is there not?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the oath? Do you recall it?

Mr. SALT. No; I am not sure that I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not you signed an oath that you were not a member of any political party or organization that advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States?

Mr. SALT. I don't recall the specific wording of that oath.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, were you in April of 1945 a member of any political party or organization that advocated the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. SALT. Well, again, quoting Mr. Collins, the world situation has changed a great deal since 1947. The legal rights and the political rights of the individual of this country have changed a great deal since 1947. Various individual interpretations, definitions, have been written into law since then. I believe that this question, again, takes me into an area which might lead to or tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Incriminate you in what way? What do you mean by tending to incriminate you in the answer to the question as to whether or not, at the time you took the oath which you say you took, you were a member of a political party or organization that advocated the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. SALT. Same answer, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you executed an oath in April 1945 that you were not a member of a political party or association that advocated the overthrow of the Government, was it true or false?

Mr. SALT. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have made reference several times to the testimony of the witness who appeared here yesterday, Mr. Richard Collins. Mr. Collins testified that he brought you into the Communist Party. Is that testimony true or false?

Mr. SALT. Same answer, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. What answer is that?

Mr. SALT. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what ground?

Mr. SALT. On the ground of the fifth amendment, that such an answer might tend to incriminate me, or, put more specifically within my understanding of the law, might lead to the possibility of prosecution—not conviction or guilt nor any presumption at all of conviction or guilt, but might simply tend to lead to the possibility of prosecution. This, I believe, is the actual legal status of the fifth amendment, the claim to the privilege. I am sorry Mr. Velde is not here, from Illinois, because I am a native of the State of Illinois, and I am informed by counsel, and rather proud of the fact, that in Illinois the courts have ruled that the claim of the privilege of the fifth amendment is not only a right but a duty of the citizen, and that any tendency to say that the claim of the privilege against self-incrimination is in itself incriminating, would be to distort, to stand on its head, and twist beyond any possible reasoned meaning the intent of the Constitution as

written by our founding fathers, who intended particularly to protect individuals against political inquiry, against inquiry into heresy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that all?

Mr. SALT. Yes.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. You have testified that in 1945 you were invited to become associated with OWI. Who was it that asked you to take that position?

Mr. SALT. I was asked by the OWI representatives. I don't know exactly which one. I believe that the official in charge responsible at that time was Mr. Robert Riskin, who was head of the Overseas Film Division.

Mr. WALTER. Did you know Mr. Riskin?

Mr. SALT. I have never met him.

Mr. WALTER. Was it Mr. Riskin who interviewed you when you obtained your position?

Mr. SALT. No; I believe not. Mr. Riskin was at that time, I believe, in New York. I was in Hollywood.

Mr. WALTER. Who interviewed you in Hollywood?

Mr. SALT. A man named Smith whose first name, unfortunately, escapes me, and I realize his rather poor identification, although I think if you go to the records of the OWI Overseas Film Unit—

Mr. WALTER. Yes; we will find out who it was. Where did this interview take place?

Mr. SALT. In Hollywood.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know who it was that recommended you to Riskin?

Mr. SALT. No; this I don't know. I think this is rather like employment in any other sense in Hollywood. The OWI information program had rather extensive needs, as you know, and required the services of a great many writers-directors. The full and clear statement of this country's position required all kinds of services. It was not easily done in film. So that I believe a great many writers from time to time did participate on a volunteer basis and in many other ways, and the hiring and firing of people was done on rather the same basis it would be done in a studio, on the basis of reputation, background, motion-picture credits.

Mr. WALTER. You declined to answer the question as to whether or not Mr. Richard Collins recruited you into the Communist Party. If he did not, why don't you just say "No; he did not"?

Mr. SALT. This is the same question put in another way.

Mr. WALTER. No; it isn't the same question. I don't like to take a lot of time, but after all, we realize the difference in world conditions. It certainly seems to me that as of today those who applauded the efforts of Russia a few years ago might well take the position that, "At that moment I was entirely justified in doing whatever I did. Today conditions are so obviously different that I feel I owe it to this country, that has given me so much, to indicate the activities so that the Congress of the United States may intelligently legislate in the field of national security."

Mr. SALT. That is a rather complicated question as you put it, Mr. Walter, and I think would require a rather complicated answer.

I don't want to make harangues. If you are asking me for my opinion on this—

Mr. WOOD. As I recall the question, he simply asked if Mr. Collins' statement yesterday that he was instrumental in recruiting you in the Communist Party is true or false.

Mr. SALT. If the question is that simple, then the framework of the question, I think, should also be that simple, without an elaborate prejudgment of guilt.

Mr. WALTER. We are not interested in convicting anybody of anything. That is not our function. We are seeking information because we feel we are confronted with a very serious menace to the security of our Constitution that you have seen fit to get behind.

Mr. SALT. Or stand in front of.

Mr. WALTER. Or stand in front of, as you like, but nevertheless you are using it for the purpose of not aiding this committee. Did Mr. Collins recruit you into the Communist Party?

Mr. SALT. Well, again, Mr. Walter, put in that very simple form, the answer must be the same. I must decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, which I choose to stand in front of.

Mr. WALTER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Committee counsel, Mr. Tavenner, asked you about an individual—was it John Stapp?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. How do you spell it?

Mr. TAVENNER. S-t-a-p-p.

Mr. MOULDER. I am not asking if you are acquainted with him, but do you know who the gentleman is?

Mr. SALT. Same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. SALT. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. The fact you may know who he is or what he is engaged in, your knowledge of that might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. SALT. Perhaps. I just realized Mr. Moulder was not in the room when there was testimony relative to the individual John Stapp. I think if the Congressman had been here he would understand.

Mr. MOULDER. You have heard of him before?

Mr. SALT. I have heard his name in this room, and therefore decline to answer any questions concerning him.

Mr. MOULDER. Is that the extent of your knowledge of John Stapp, just what you have heard in this room?

Mr. SALT. Same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. As I understand, you are a resident of what State?

Mr. SALT. California, Mr. Jackson's district.

Mr. MOULDER. What is your age?

Mr. SALT. Thirty-seven.

Mr. MOULDER. Thirty-seven. Were you in the military service during the last war?

Mr. SALT. No: I was deferred as 4-F.

Mr. MOULDER. The question was asked you about a certain number of a Communist card. I want to ask you whether or not you are now a member of the Communist Party. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SALT. I think that the same answer must be given to this, which is that I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. In the event of an unprovoked military attack upon this country by the Soviet Union, would you feel your allegiance to this country and join the defense of our country against such an attack?

Mr. SALT. This is another question that would tend to lead into a harangue, I am afraid.

Mr. MOULDER. That is a simple question.

Mr. SALT. No; I don't believe it is a simple question at all. I think it is probably the major question facing the country today, don't you, Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to answer the question, or do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. SALT. I would like to answer the question if I may. My answer requires some qualifications, because I do think it is an extremely serious question.

Mr. WOOD. Do you mean it would take a lot of explanation to answer that?

Mr. SALT. Yes; because it is a presumptive question. It presumes a war, and I think the presumption of war is the psychological equivalent of advocating preventive war.

Mr. MOULDER. My question was, in the event of an unprovoked military attack by the Soviet Union against this country, would you fight in defense of this country, the United States of America?

Mr. SALT. Again I say this is a highly speculative question, Mr. Moulder, and I think it is the kind of speculation—

Mr. MOULDER. I don't care to argue with you. Do you believe in or now advocate the overthrow of or a change in our present form of Government by force and violence?

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room.)

Mr. SALT. The gentleman on the wall at my left [indicating picture], Mr. Lincoln—

Mr. MOULDER. That is evading my question.

Mr. SALT. No; I don't think it is. You have asked a question that touches certainly to the deepest part of myself, a question that touches my deepest loyalty to my country—

Mr. POTTER. To our country, you are referring to, the United States?

Mr. SALT. If you are an American citizen, which I presume you to be, being a Congressman here, then it is "our" country, obviously.

Mr. POTTER. Then why can't you respond to the gentleman's question?

Mr. SALT. I am responding to the question. It enters the largest possible political field, which is the field of advocacy.

Mr. MOULDER. You have stated that in some countries you could proudly answer the questions propounded to you by counsel of the committee, such as whether or not you are now a member of the Communist Party, have ever been, and many other questions. You stated that in some countries you could proudly answer those questions, but that you couldn't in this country that you purport to have so much devotion to. In what country or countries could you proudly answer the questions?

Mr. SALT. I am not speaking of myself. I said those questions could be answered by the citizens of those countries. I am a citizen of this country.

Mr. MOULDER. You would have no hesitancy in answering the question in the Soviet Union, would you?

Mr. SALT. I don't know. I have never been there. I have no plans to go there. I was thinking in particular of a country like France, a country like Britain, our allies.

Mr. MOULDER. And Russia?

Mr. SALT. I was not thinking of Russia.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you heard the testimony of the witness yesterday. You were here throughout the hearing yesterday, I believe?

Mr. SALT. I believe so.

Mr. DOYLE. And the day before?

Mr. SALT. I believe I was here. I didn't hear everything, but I was here.

Mr. DOYLE. The reason I asked the question, then you heard my question on each day to some of the witnesses, in which I called attention to the law under which this committee operates. Did you hear my question on that point?

Mr. SALT. I have a written statement I would like to read.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please answer my question?

Mr. SALT. It would have bearing on your question.

Mr. DOYLE. I haven't asked the question yet. Were you in the hearing room and heard my question?

Mr. SALT. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. It doesn't call for a written statement, does it?

Mr. SALT. No, but I have a written statement and I think it might be in order—

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask the next question as long as you have answered that you were present in the hearing room the last couple of days. I call to your attention that under the law under which Congress has asked this committee to operate and make report about, it provides that we shall investigate and examine into "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States" which disseminated either from foreign countries or within this country.

And I think I called attention yesterday to the fact that the commonly accepted definition of "subversive," and the definition given by Mr. Webster in his dictionary, is "To cause utter ruin, destruction; to overthrow from the foundations."

I will ask you as an American citizen whether or not you feel it is in any way improper, or not to the best interests of our Nation, that this committee should undertake in good faith to examine into the extent of any activities by any person or any group of persons who may be interested in subversive activities designed to overthrow the foundations of our American form of government? Do you understand my question?

Mr. SALT. I believe I do. It is rather long, but I think I followed it. The undertaking in good faith by the Nation and by the people's elected representatives to search out and punish the acts of subver-

sion, I think is one of the highest and most worthy things that could be done. I think it has been done in the past, and I think that Congress has certainly accomplished very important things. I am thinking particularly of the La Follette committee under Roosevelt.

I think this question of good faith that you put is a very serious question. I remember the debate on the law that you read from, and in that debate I recall that I believe the author of the legislation, Mr. John Rankin, said that the vote showed that the Members of Congress are in favor of having a vigilante committee. "I," Mr. Rankin said, "took up this fight where he left off."

Mr. DOYLE. You are reading, in part, from the sheet that you pulled out of your pocket awhile ago that you wanted to read?

Mr. SALT. No. I am reading from a small note.

Mr. DOYLE. I put that term "good faith" in my question for your benefit and for the benefit of the committee, because we are seeking good-faith answers by patriotic American citizens. So I deliberately put that phrase in it, "in good faith," the same as I did the other day, because I sort of gathered the inference from what you have said and from what some of the other witnesses have said before, that they had an idea this committee was not acting in good faith in trying to uncover the subversive activities of persons or groups. Is that your opinion, that we are not acting in good faith?

Mr. SALT. Well, I would not like to go into the motives or advocacies of this committee any more than I want or believe this committee has the constitutional right to go into my advocacies. I can only discuss what I believe to be the fact of the actions of the committee over its history, the witnesses that it has called, their character and kind, and the results of the committee's activities.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I don't know whether to assume that you are not willing to answer the question of whether or not you feel the committee is in good faith in its work?

Mr. SALT. If you insist on my personal opinion, I would be happy to give it to you.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I stated frankly to you that I am under the impression, and some of the other witnesses have felt, that the committee is not in good faith.

Mr. SALT. Then I will give you my direct answer, Mr. Doyle. Based on the entire record of this committee, which has been rather supported than repudiated by the present membership, based on the kinds of witnesses that from time to time have been brought forward here and their testimony accepted without any serious cross-examination—such as the known perjurers, Larry Doyle and Harper Knowles; a murderer called McCuiston; Gerald Smith; the members of the Motion Picture Alliance in Hollywood—on that basis I can only say that I must draw my own conclusion for myself that the investigations are not in good faith.

Mr. DOYLE. Then my assumption is correct. I assumed from the very start as you began to testify today that you were testifying, in part, at least, as you did because you felt this committee was not in good faith; and apparently I was correct in that assumption; wasn't I?

Well, I just wish to say this, Mr. Salt. There was a time, as I understand it, when this committee did not allow witnesses before it to have their own counsel. I was one of the Members of Congress that

strenuously opposed that procedure in this committee when I first came to this Congress, and I would still oppose if it the committee undertook now to deny witnesses the right of counsel in the hearing room, as you have today.

I state that to you simply because I want you to realize that I am one of the members of the committee that has undertaken—and I am sure all of the present members of this committee have undertaken—in good faith to be factual and to establish the truth, whatever it is.

We are not undertaking to persecute. I don't know of a single member of this committee that is interested in persecuting any citizen; but, on the other hand, I will state frankly to you as a resident of the State of California that I am interested in this definition of Webster, and under the law as it is written to help ferret out any person or any group of persons who are interested, either presently or past or in the future, in subversive misconduct or propaganda.

That is what this committee is designed to do and what it will do.

I heard yesterday and the day before witnesses of your own profession testify that in their judgment the Communist Party of the United States was interested in the overthrow of our form of constitutional government, and in the face of that sort of testimony, which has not been contradicted by you or any other person, who claims the privilege of the fifth amendment and is unwilling to state whether or not you have been or are now a member of the Communist Party—in the face of that attitude toward you men and women who may or may not be members of the Communist Party, but at least claim the privilege when we ask you about it, I am constrained to conclude that the Communist Party in the United States of America is interested and has been, according to their own testimony as members of the Communist Party, in the forceful overthrow, if necessary, of the American form of government which has borne you and which has borne me.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Wood. Any further questions? Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I have just a couple of questions.

Mr. Salt, you are employed by Norma Productions; is that my understanding?

Mr. SALT. No. That was terminated as soon as my subpoena was made public.

Mr. JACKSON. Who is the head of Norma Productions?

Mr. SALT. Norma Productions is an independent company, I believe, made up of Harold Hecht and Burt Lancaster.

Mr. JACKSON. When was your last employment at R-K-O, Mr. Salt?

Mr. SALT. It was just before I went to work on this. I would say that it was 3 or 4 months. I am not exactly sure of the date. I was rushing to finish one screen play to move over to another.

Mr. JACKSON. Was that in 1950?

Mr. SALT. I think it probably was; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. What script were you engaged on at R-K-O?

Mr. SALT. I finished the screen play of *The Day They Gave the Babies Away*.

Mr. JACKSON. Who hired you at R-K-O?

Mr. SALT. Eddie Granger.

Mr. JACKSON. Now, during the period of time that you were with the OWI, who was your immediate responsible superior, Mr. Salt? Who supervised your work generally?

Mr. SALT. That is a very difficult question to answer. I am sure that you all have some memory of the complications in those years. I think that the responsible Government man who was a civil-service representative was Mr. Smith. The chief of production was Robert Riskind, who left during the period that I was there, because the war ended in Europe. He was followed by his assistant, whose name I don't remember.

Mr. JACKSON. To whom did you hand your completed work on a day-to-day basis or week-to-week basis? Who received the script?

Mr. SALT. Well, it couldn't be done that way. I would have to explain the actual process and work of production. A documentary film is quite different in its production form than an entertainment film, at least the documentaries made there. Usually it is based on film already taken which is there that is being put together, put into some kind of, hopefully, artistic entertaining form. The writer goes along with this, helping to suggest arrangements of the film and preparing commentary to go with it. At several stages along the way, in each of the projects we were on on the San Francisco Conference picture, for instance, we were in New York. The Conference was in San Francisco. The film came to us 3 days later. We naturally read all of the daily teletype releases and tried to plan a picture on a conference while it was going on, because the office in Washington was very anxious to have some kind of a picture at the end of the Conference for use.

So that there was no immediate day-to-day supervision, but there would be rather frequent discussions of the material, supervision of the material, in a projection room, by either Mr. Riskind or the man who followed him. We brought the print to Washington for general approval and discussion. There was an advisory board of policy who also would move in from time to time to discuss this. There was the whole OWI staff, which was on Fifty-seventh Street. We were on Forty-fifth Street.

So that I would say that the number of people who were in day-to-day contact with the film, every few days or every week, were more people than you would find in Hollywood, actually.

Mr. JACKSON. That is not an unusual situation in Washington.

In common with some of the other members of the committee, Mr. Salt, I am sorry that you have seen fit to stand upon your unquestioned right to refuse to answer many of the questions which have been asked this morning in many of which I see no possibility of self-incrimination.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I feel that when Mr. Salt walks out of this committee room, if he is in any manner incriminated by his refusal to answer many of these questions, that that incrimination will be a direct result of his refusal to answer the many questions which have been asked and to which truthful answers could in no way have incriminated him.

Mr. SALT. Well, I don't know. It has been an old family tradition that you don't try to lay blame but seek out the root of the problem.

Mr. JACKSON. That is precisely what this committee is attempting

to do. If we simply sit here and thumb non-cooperative witnesses on their way to courts of proper jurisdiction from whence they continue on to jail, we are not fulfilling our function of obtaining information.

I personally should hate to see this committee become a whistle stop on the way to jail, because we are not going to find out anything. The only things we find out are from these people who come in here and talk.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter, do you have any questions? I want to give the members a chance to answer this call.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Salt, do you belong to the Ku Klux Klan organization?

Mr. SALT. No; I do not, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Do you belong to the Communist Party or are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SALT. I am sure that the Congressman understands the very wide difference there.

Mr. POTTER. You answered my first question very easily, and the second question can be answered just as easily.

Mr. SALT. Well, as a witness, I feel that I am in a rather unfair situation here because it is a trick question. I would like to be able to answer it honestly. I do have to claim the privilege on the last half of the question.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, you claim the privilege of the fifth amendment to my question as to whether you are now a member of the Communist Party. Is that correct?

Mr. SALT. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. You are a young man and you have done fairly well in this country of ours. Many men have had to give a lot more than you for the freedom which we are interested in, and many men today of your age are giving a lot more than you have ever given.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. The committee will take a recess for 30 minutes. Unless there are further questions, you may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon, at 11:25 a. m., the hearing was recessed until 11:55 a. m., at which time the following proceedings were had:)

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Paul Jarrico.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Jarrico, will you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

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

Mr. JARRICO. I do.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL JARRICO, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Paul Jarrico?

Mr. JARRICO. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. JARRICO. Yes; I am. By Mr. Margolis and by Mr. Kenny.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state your full name, place of birth, and your age.

Mr. JARRICO. Well, my full name is Israel Paul Jarrico, though I am known personally and professionally and legally as Paul Jarrico. I was born in Los Angeles, Calif., on January 12, 1915, and I reside at 320 South Sherbourne Drive, Los Angeles 48, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief statement of your educational background?

Mr. JARRICO. I was educated in the public schools of Los Angeles. I attended the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of California at Berkeley. I graduated from the University of Southern California in 1936 with a degree of bachelor of arts.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you now employed?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, until 2 weeks ago I was a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

Mr. JARRICO. I was employed at RKO Radio Pictures until the day I received a subpoena from this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a statement of your employment record, please?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, it is a rather long one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Briefly.

Mr. JARRICO. I will try to summarize it. I first obtained employment in the motion-picture industry in 1937, and have been employed more or less continuously since by practically every studio in Hollywood, except for a brief time I spent in the merchant marine and a short time I spent in the United States Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the last screen play on which you were employed?

Mr. JARRICO. The last screen play on which I was employed was The Las Vegas Story, which is currently shooting in Hollywood, with Jane Russell and Victor Mature. I urge you all to see it.

Mr. TAVENNER. By what company were you employed?

Mr. JARRICO. RKO Radio Pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who employed you?

Mr. JARRICO. I was employed by the studio.

Mr. TAVENNER. The studio must have had an official representative, of course, in making the employment. Who was he?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, my immediate producer was Mr. Robert Sparks. However, I must protest at this point. It seems to me an attempt to create the basis for a blacklist in Hollywood, on the basis of guilt by employment, guilt by the mere fact that you employ a man. Mr. Sparks, a conservative gentleman, I am sure, employed me because he thought I was the best man to do that particular job, and not because of my politics.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you engaged in screen-play writing along with Richard Collins?

Mr. JARRICO. Yes. He was my collaborator for several years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time was he a collaborator with you?

Mr. JARRICO. From the fall of 1941 until the summer of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were present, I believe, at this hearing room during the giving of his testimony yesterday?

Mr. JARRICO. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suppose you heard his testimony, in which he stated that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JARRICO. I heard his testimony in regard to a great many things. I heard him attempting to purge himself before this committee and perjuring himself before this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he perjure himself in regard to his statement that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what did you mean by stating that he perjured himself in his testimony here?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question, also, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is that ground?

Mr. JARRICO. That it may tend to incriminate me. That doesn't mean that it would incriminate me. It just means that it might tend to; that it might subject me to prosecution, not to conviction.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, for you to answer the question would put you in fear that you might be prosecuted for some criminal offense?

Mr. JARRICO. It might place me in jeopardy; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your subpoena to appear before this committee?

Mr. JARRICO. I believe the date was March 23. I am not completely certain. I believe that is the correct date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with Mr. Collins about his appearance—Mr. Richard Collins, about his appearance before this committee after you were served your subpoena to appear here?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you referred to Mr. Richard Collins "perjuring himself" before this committee, were you referring in any way to his testimony as to the occasion when you visited him with regard to his testimony before this committee?

Mr. JARRICO. I have already refused to answer the same question, phrased rather differently. I believe it is the same question. At any rate, to make it clear, I refuse to answer this question also, on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. You refuse to answer in what particular? You have in mind with regard to Mr. Collins' testimony when you said that he perjured himself before this committee?

Mr. JARRICO. That's correct.

Mr. VELDE. Counsel, is the word "perjured" or "purged"?

Mr. JARRICO. I used both words. I used "purge" and "perjury." I think the line between them is very thin.

I wonder if I might at this point introduce a statement, Mr. Chairman. I have sat here all day yesterday and heard my patriotism maligned, my loyalty impugned. I wonder whether I might read a fairly short statement, which states quite concisely my attitude toward my country and toward this committee.

Mr. Wood. We are giving you the opportunity to answer whatever questions are asked you here, which are intended to reflect on that very subject matter. At the conclusion of your testimony, we will be happy

to have you file for the record here any statement that you desire to make.

Mr. JARRICO. I can only answer the questions that are presented to me when I am being cross-examined. However, in my statement I am able to make a more considered statement of my position.

Mr. Wood. Following the custom and practice of the committee, you will be given the privilege of filing that statement with the committee for the record when you have finished your testimony.

Mr. JARRICO. I would like to reply publicly.

Mr. Wood. In this connection, sir, I would like to, if I may, Mr. Counsel, interpose at this point this observation: Perjury is a rather grave offense, not only under our law but under every moral code that I know anything about. Now you have leveled a charge against a man that you say was your collaborator for several years in the same industry that you are in; that he has deliberately committed that offense here before this committee yesterday.

Don't you think, when you make that charge yourself, that you owe it to yourself; you owe it to Mr. Collins; you owe it to the American people, and particularly the people in your industry, to inform this committee as to just how and in what manner you contend that he swore falsely before this committee yesterday? Don't you think, in fairness to every conception of decency and common justice and honesty, that you owe it to the people of America, and particularly in your industry, to let them know in what particular you claim he swore falsely?

Mr. JARRICO. I shall issue a statement and otherwise communicate.

Mr. Wood. You are under oath now. Under your oath you have sworn that he committed perjury. One or the other of you is swearing falsely. He has pin-pointed his testimony. Don't you think you ought to pin-point yours?

Mr. JARRICO. This is not my forum, Mr. Chairman, and this is not the place for me to discuss my differences with Mr. Collins. I don't choose to do it here.

Mr. DOYLE. May I suggest this: I think, Mr. Jarrico, you were not being questioned by our counsel or by anyone else as to whether or not it was your opinion that Mr. Collins had perjured himself. You volunteered the statement to this committee. We were not asking you whether or not he perjured himself. You yourself volunteered the charge that he perjured himself.

Mr. JARRICO. I was asked a question based on an assertion that Mr. Collins made here yesterday. I answered that question by saying that I refused to answer that question, and that I refuse to consider Mr. Collin's testimony here as truthful. Now, that is my position. I don't intend to discuss with you wherein it was untruthful or wherein it was truthful.

Mr. DOYLE. The only reason I brought it to your attention is that you volunteered the charge that he had perjured himself. We had not asked you whether or not he perjured himself or testified falsely. I just wanted to make that suggestion to you.

Mr. JARRICO. My answer stands, sir.

Mr. Wood. Continue the questioning.

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

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me, as I shall refuse to answer any question regarding my political affiliations or activities.

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

Mr. WOOD. Any questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I think I have one or two for the gentleman. The statement that you were born in Los Angeles means that you are also a native son, as I am, of California.

Mr. JARRICO. I am very proud of it, Mr. Doyle, as you are.

Mr. DOYLE. I note you also graduated from USC, and so did I. We are both American citizens. I assume, Mr. Jarrico, that you would be interested in helping this committee to uncover any person or any group of persons who were subversive in their attitude toward the constitutional form of government in our Nation. Is my assumption correct?

Mr. JARRICO. Mr. Doyle, I should be happy to help this committee uncover subversion, but one man's subversion is another man's patriotism. I consider the activities of this committee subversive of the American Constitution.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I assumed you did when you refused to answer a minute ago.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. Now, as long as this is a committee in good faith undertaking to serve our Nation, I am going to ask you a frank question. I think no member of the committee has asked quite this kind of question.

Why do you feel this committee's function is subversive of American rights and citizenship? You have made a statement that we are un-American. That means that under Webster's dictionary we are undertaking to overthrow the foundation of our constitutional government. You realize that; don't you?

Mr. JARRICO. I certainly do.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way is this committee undertaking to overthrow the constitutional form of government of this Nation?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, if I might read my statement, I think it covers that point very specifically.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am not asking you to read a statement. As long as you prepared a statement, you certainly are qualified to answer my question briefly, not to read a dissertation.

You made a pretty serious charge, under Webster's definition of "subversiveness," when you say this committee is subversive in its conduct.

Mr. JARRICO. Sir, I believe this country was founded on the doctrine of freedom, the right of a man to advocate anything he wishes—advocate it, agitate for it, organize for it, attempt to win a majority for it. And I think that any committee that intimidates people, that makes it impossible for people to express their opinions freely, is subverting the basic doctrine of the United States and of its Constitution.

Mr. DOYLE. And does your philosophy go to the point of feeling that the United States Congress, when it created this law, Public Law 601, and set up this committee, was controveering and destroying the rights of American citizens?

Mr. JARRICO. I am certain that Congress had no such intention. However, 10 of my friends, very dear friends, have gone to jail for coming before this body and saying that Congress may not investigate in any area in which it may not legislate, and since the Constitution of the United States specifically states that Congress shall make no law restricting the freedom of speech, and since countless decisions of the courts have held that this provision of the Constitution means that Congress cannot investigate into areas of opinion, of conscience, of belief, I believe that in asking that those men be cited for contempt of Congress and in successfully sending these men to jail, that this committee has subverted the meaning of the American Constitution; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Those 10 men were cited and convicted under the laws of our country, and when the courts held them guilty, were the courts subversive, in your opinion?

Mr. JARRICO. The Supreme Court never ruled on the basic doctrine involved. I would like to think that some day it will, and that the stand that the 10 took will be recognized historically along with the stand that Jefferson took against the alien and sedition laws.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, let me ask you this question: Do I understand your testimony correctly then that when the Federal court held these 10 men guilty that you hold that that court was subversive of the rights of American citizens?

Mr. JARRICO. The courts have made errors before.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you a fair question.

Mr. JARRICO. I do not blame the courts. I blame this committee for its attempt to deny people the right to their opinions.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, but this committee was not the Federal court. I am asking you a frank question, whether or not the Federal court was guilty of subversive conduct when it held these men guilty.

Mr. JARRICO. The courts also upheld the alien and sedition laws. The courts also in the famous Dred Scott decision upheld slavery.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you a fair question, am I not? If it is not a fair question, tell me so and I will ask you another question.

Mr. JARRICO. I have said that the courts in upholding the contempt citations against these men, in my opinion, contributed toward the general destruction of liberty in this country.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Mr. WOOD. Just a moment. Let the record show that Mr. Jackson, a member of the committee, has departed the committee, but there is now present Mr. Velde, which still constitutes a quorum of the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. I will ask you another question, Mr. Jarrico, and if you think the form of my question is not fair I want you to tell me so, because I am trying in good faith to be fair. I am not trying to take any advantage of you or lay any groundwork for any persecution.

I think you said that you believed that the American citizen had the right to advocate anything he wished to?

Mr. JARRICO. That's correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand, therefore, that you think an American citizen has the right to advocate the forceful overthrow of our constitutional form of government?

Mr. JARRICO. I believe he may advocate it. I believe that it is unlikely he will get a great response to such a thing. I want to make it clear that I am personally opposed to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence and to the use of force and violence. However, President Lincoln said that the people of this country have the right to revolution, if necessary, if the democratic processes are clogged, if the people can no longer exercise their will by constitutional means.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know of any organization in the United States that is regulated from within the United States that advocates the forceful overthrow of the constitutional form of government? Do you know of any organization that does?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, the McCarran Act, the Smith Act—

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you about an organization. Do you know of any organization?

Mr. JARRICO. I am answering that question, sir. I am saying that various acts passed by the United States Congress have defined certain organizations as organizations which advocate the overthrow of this Government. I do not necessarily agree with these definitions.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking you whether you agree with the definition or not. I am asking you as man to man in good faith whether or not you know any such organization. I am assuming that you as an American citizen are interested in protecting our American form of government against forceful revolution. If my assumption is wrong, of course the basis of my question is wrong. I am not asking you whether or not you are a member of any such organization, you notice. I am not asking that question. You have stood on your constitutional right under the fifth amendment. I am not asking you in that area. But I am just assuming as man to man that you, if you know of any organization in America that favors that policy, in good faith will come out and tell us so.

Mr. JARRICO. Well, sir, this committee—

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know of any such organization?

Mr. JARRICO. According to this committee, every organization that has advocated peace in this country—

Mr. DOYLE. Just a minute. That question can be answered "Yes" or "No." We have other witnesses from Hollywood here. We want to have them be heard, too, so they can get home over the weekend.

Mr. JARRICO. By your definition, sir, every organization that has stood for decency and progress, the New Deal, against discrimination, for peace, and so on—these organizations are all allied with an organization which advocates the overthrow of this Government. I do not accept that definition.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you don't accept the definition of Mr. Webster's dictionary.

Mr. JARRICO. Yes, I do accept the definition of Mr. Webster.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you whether or not, under the definition of Mr. Webster, you know of any organization in this country that advocates what Mr. Webster says is subversive conduct, that's all. That is what I am asking you. I am assuming that you want to help protect the American Government.

Mr. JARRICO. If I knew of such an organization, sir, I should help you to expose it.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know of any individual that is interested in that?

Mr. JARRICO. If I knew of such an individual, sir, I should help you to expose him.

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Now, one more question. In answer to our counsel you stated that you believed that our functioning as a committee was to form the basis of a blacklist. Why do you believe this committee is interested in blacklisting people so they can't get employment, if they are honest, patriotic citizens. Is that your statement?

Mr. JARRICO. You are not interested in that end, but you had better revise your methods, because your methods have had that end. I know of many people who are blacklisted in Hollywood as a result of the hearings in 1947, and I know that today the basis is being laid for an increase of that blacklist, so that anyone who has advocated anything progressive is going to be a suspect. And the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals, quaintly named, is going to be the organization in Hollywood that decides who shall work and who shall not work, what pictures shall be made and what pictures shall not be made, and this is an organization that upholds this committee and thinks it is doing a splendid job in exposing so-called "Keds."

Mr. DOYLE. What is the name of that committee?

Mr. JARRICO. The Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals. You should know it very well, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. But I don't happen to know it, sir. You see, there are many of us, Mr. Jarrico, in spite of your assumption, that are just as much interested as you are in protecting the rights of American citizens and are just as progressive and just as patriotic toward liberal thinking, whether you believe it or not.

I wish to state—I know for myself, and I state it for myself and I state it for every member of the committee—that we are not interested in blacklisting anyone. I wouldn't be true to my duty as a citizen if I allowed you to charge that we are without denying it. But I will say this: My own belief is that you gentlemen who come to this committee and unalterably claim the fifth amendment and the first amendment when we get into the area of questioning you about the organizations you have been or are members of, are making it very difficult for this committee as a committee of Congress to function.

Mr. JARRICO. I feel I am defending the Constitution, sir, and not hiding behind it. I feel that sincerely. And I feel that if you were sincere in your declarations against blacklisting that you should make it plain that people who claim their constitutional privileges should not be discriminated against in Hollywood, because Hollywood has the impression that you intend everyone who is called before this committee and who does not cooperate with this committee to be driven from the industry.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jarrico, I must at this point challenge that statement, in the interest of the members of this committee, with whom I have served for some time and for whom I have the highest regard.

No man has ever come before this committee yet and answered truthfully and frankly the questions that have been put to him who has ever, to my knowledge, been injured thereby. If people are being deprived of any rights or privileges of employment because of their appearance before this committee, it has been because of matters that

they themselves have brought out, and not this committee. If being a member of a subversive organization and admitting such causes a man to lose some employment rights, that is his responsibility and not this committee's. If he declines to answer whether he has or not and thereby loses employment rights, that likewise is his responsibility and not this committee's. This committee has never yet been responsible for any man being a member of any organization, subversive or otherwise.

The only thing on earth that this committee has ever attempted to do or is attempting to do now is to ascertain, under the functions it is charged with carrying out by the very act of the Congress that created it, what activities in the realm of subversiveness in this country are going on and who is being responsible for it.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to thank my distinguished chairman for making that clarification.

May I ask you one more question, Mr. Jarrico? The law states that the purpose of our investigation is to report to Congress any necessary remedial legislation in the field of subversive conduct. Have you any suggestion of any remedial legislation that we should report to Congress? It states that in the law. That is why I am asking you in good faith.

Mr. JARRICO. Well, I have one. You might revise your guide to subversive organizations and publications issued by this committee. It includes, for instance, the Hollywood Democratic Committee, and without wishing to embarrass you, Congressman Doyle, perhaps you remember that that committee contributed to your campaign and wrote speeches for your campaign. It is listed here as a subversive organization.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't remember that. I don't think I had any knowledge of it. I have many friends in Hollywood, both in and out of the industry. But be that as it may, have you any suggestion as to how the functioning of this committee should be remedied? That is what I am asking you. How shall we revise the list if we can't get the help of people like you that are informed? How can we get the help to remedy the legislation?

Mr. JARRICO. Well, I think that if you made it absolutely clear that you were defending the first amendment and the fifth amendment and the people who defended those amendments, instead of subjecting them to blacklisting and other liability, that you would be doing a great service to the country.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I wish to state this, and this is my final question. I am very sure, Mr. Jarrico, that no member of this committee is interested in any way less than you are in protecting the rights of the American citizens under the first and fifth amendments. But apparently your considered opinion and conclusion differs with that of members of the committee as to ways and means in which we are charged with doing that.

Mr. JARRICO. Well, I can't see where you can pretend for a moment that you are protecting the first and fifth amendments when everything you have done is directed toward abridging them, curtailing them, limiting them, subverting them.

Mr. DOYLE. This is my final question, Mr. Chairman.

Do you mean then that this committee in calling you, for instance, as a typical case—that when this committee subpoenas you to come

and be questioned about what you know, if anything, about subversive people or organizations, that we are controverting your constitutional rights under the first and fifth amendments?

Mr. JARRICO. I certainly do.

Mr. DOYLE. Then you take the position that the Congress has no right to call people before it and to question them as to their philosophy and whether or not it favors the forceful overthrow of our Government?

Mr. JARRICO. Congress has no right to legislate in this area. It cannot pass any law restricting the freedom of speech, and therefore it has no right to investigation in this area. It cannot inquire into a man's opinions, his attitudes, his beliefs of any kind. That is my firm position; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the reason I pressed you for your opinion is that I feel that the committee should have considered opinion. As long as you stand on the first and fifth amendments, I wanted the basis upon which you stood.

Mr. JARRICO. You have it, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can you tell me the name of the producer of Outrageous Story?

Mr. JARRICO. I already have introduced that name into the record under protest. It was Robert Sparks.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can you tell me who the script writer was?

Mr. JARRICO. I was.

Mr. KEARNEY. And the director?

Mr. JARRICO. Robert Stephenson. Again I wish to say that you are trying to intimidate these people.

Mr. KEARNEY. Just a moment. I want to ask a question. To this question I want a "Yes" or "No" answer.

Do you believe the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence?

Mr. JARRICO. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Do you want to hold the witness for further questioning later or should he be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest he be excused.

Mr. JARRICO. May I introduce my statement now, sir?

Mr. WOOD. File it with the reporter.

(The statement referred to was filed with the records of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg.

Mr. WOOD. Raise your right hand. You solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Be seated, please. For the purpose of examining this witness, let the record show that the same number of the committee are present: Mr. Doyle, Mr. Velde, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood.

TESTIMONY OF META REIS ROSENBERG

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spell your middle name R-e-i-s?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Rosenberg, will you state where you were born?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. In San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your educational background?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, we moved to Los Angeles when I was very young, and all of my early education was in Los Angeles public schools, and I went to Hollywood High School in Hollywood. That is the extent of my educational background.

Mr. TAVENNER. By the way, are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you desire to confer with them, you may do so at any time.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. How have you been employed, Mrs. Rosenberg, during the period in which you were engaged in professional work?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, originally, about 1933 or 1934, I was employed by Fox as a reader, and then in 1935 and 1936 I was in New York representing a motion-picture agency by the name of Small Landau, and I went back to Hollywood and worked for Warner Bros. as a reader in 1937 and part of 1938, when I quit my job to get married. Then I resumed working in 1940 for Paramount as a special reader.

Mr. TAVENNER. You began that assignment when?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1940 at Paramount?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Paramount. And then I became head of the reading department at Paramount, and then I became assistant story editor at Paramount.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become the story editor at Paramount?

Mr. ROSENBERG. Well, I imagine it was about—it must have been around 1942. I must have been there 2 years before I became one of the story editors. I was assistant to a man called Bill Dozier at Paramount. Then I stayed at Paramount until 1945, when I asked to be released from my contract, and I went to a motion-picture agency by the name of Berg-Allen Berg. There I became head of their literary department, where I was until 1949, in February. And I haven't worked since. I have been a wife and mother.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you became a member of the Hollywood group, we may say, when you returned from New York about 1937?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you returned from New York, was there an organization in Hollywood by the name of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I believe there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there also an organization known as the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes; there was. Of that I am sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of these organizations?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend their meetings?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes; I did, their public meetings. Since I was not a member of the organization, I didn't attend any of the board meetings or committee meetings, but I did go to their public meetings; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you interested in the particular programs of those groups?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I was very interested; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your interest?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, during the Spanish Civil War I had a very strong feeling for the Loyalists, and I was interested in hearing the point of view of any organization or finding out any information that I could regarding the Loyalist fight. As far as the Anti-Nazi League is concerned, I felt that it was terribly important at that time to make the American people aware of the nature of the fascism in Germany and the menace to peace and people over the world.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you follow up your interest in the Anti-Nazi League by becoming interested in any other organization which seemed to make its cause the same cause of the Anti-Nazi League?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, as a matter of fact, I did. I had gone to a number of meetings of the Anti-Nazi League or an organization—I don't remember the name of it. I think it might have been called the Motion Picture Artists Committee, which people like Bob Montgomery and Freddie March and Melvyn Douglas were associated with for Spain. I was also very interested in the reelection of Roosevelt and in the continuation of his policies at that time.

I met a woman who was known to me then as Madelaine Ruthven.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. R-u-t-h-v-e-n. And she told me that she was a member of the Communist Party, and she explained to me that the Communist Party—which was something I already understood—that the Communist Party was backing the Loyalists in Spain. The Communist Party was very active in support of Roosevelt, and the Communist Party was the most militant organization in the United States in terms of their opposition to Hitler in Germany, and in terms of educating the American people to this. And she told me that since I already believed in these things, which I did, and that the Communist Party was the most effective organization to work for and against those things I believed in, that she thought I should join it, because she felt it was perfectly ridiculous for someone to have these strong beliefs and not do anything positive about them, that one must make a positive step. This seemed perfectly reasonable to me, and I did join the Communist Party in 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. You joined after your conversation with the person you just referred to—

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). As Madelaine Ruthven?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what position she held within the Communist Party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or what function she performed?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I am not absolutely sure. She was some sort of an executive of the party. That I understood. But the party structure has never been terribly clear to me, so I am not absolutely sure. I think she might have been what is known or what was known at that time as an organizational secretary, but I am not sure. I think that is probably what she was, sort of in general charge of personnel and detail.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, as a result of her invitation to you to unite with the party, were you received into the party and assigned to a cell or group of the party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes. I went to a meeting, the first meeting I ever attended, where a man by the name of John Howard Lawson was in charge of the meeting, and I understood that he was also in charge of the Hollywood group of the Communist Party. And I was assigned to a group of people. I mean I was assigned to meet with a group of people, with whom I did meet.

I must qualify this by saying that I only met with them for a while, because this was in 1938, and in July—I don't know what month this was. It was probably early in 1938—but in July of 1938 I got married to a man called Irving Reis, who was not then nor to my knowledge has he ever become a member of the Communist Party. And so when I got married to him I sort of became inactive. I was more interested in my marriage than I was in party activities, and for a long time I didn't go to any meetings nor did I even join any outside organizations during this period or before it. I had never been a member of any of these organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, will you tell us the names of the persons in the group of Communist Party members to which you were assigned when you first joined the party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. As I remember it, there was a Frank Tuttle—Frank and Tania Tuttle. He was married to her at that time; he isn't now. Waldo Salt, Paul Jarrico.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paul Jarrico?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Waldo Salt?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. He is the same Mr. Salt who testified here this morning, or were you present?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I wasn't present, but I assume that he is the same. Paul Jarrico.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you see the witness on the stand who immediately preceded you?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it the same person?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Sam Ornitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sam Ornitz?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. O-r-n-i-t-z. Herbert Biberman, Dorothy Tree and her husband, Michael Uris, and a man called Francis Faragoh, F-a-r-a-g-o-h, who is a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the woman Madelaine Ruthven also attend the group meetings?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes; very often. As a matter of fact, I should have mentioned her. I met often in her home. I left her out. She did attend. She was active.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom did you pay your Communist Party dues at that particular time?

Mr. ROSENBERG. At that time I believe I paid them to Madelaine Ruthven.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you were only with that group a few months before you retired temporarily.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many meetings do you think you attended during that period?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Oh, I really couldn't say. I attended some meetings and then I got married, and for a while I was inactive, and then I began to go to meetings again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did all of these persons whose names you have mentioned attend one or more of those meetings with you?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Oh, yes; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long was it before you returned to the attendance of meetings?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. What happened was that in 1940, when I went to work for Paramount as a reader and eventually became assistant story editor, which put me in touch with most of the writers in Hollywood, since this was part of my job involved in stories and writers, when war was declared the following year, after war was declared by the United States, an organization was formed called the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization about 1942. I think this must have been early in '42. And I undertook an assignment for this organization which was directly in sympathy with the organization, and so was I, not only with the Government at that time but with the Communist Party at that time. There was no conflict in my mind in terms of the attitudes of the party toward the war effort and the attitudes of the Government toward the war effort. There was no conflict at all. There was a no-strike clause. There was every interest in the party in seeing that people did as much work as possible for the war effort.

So I joined this organization in a capacity in which I felt I could be of most value, which was to—I was in charge of getting all the material, not all the material but a good deal of the material written for those stars who went on camp tours and hospital tours in this country and overseas. This was mostly comedy material, as you probably remember, and I was a kind of liaison between the Writers' Mobilization and two organizations, one called the Victory Committee, which was the producers organization for such activities, headed by Eddie Manix, Charlie Feldman, Kenneth Thompson—all very conservative men, I hasten to add—and the USO Camp Shows organization, headed by a man named Abe Lastfogel, who was in charge of the William Morris office. And what they would do was they would say Olivia De Haviland was to go on a camp tour in this country. "Would you get some kind of little routine worked up for her?" I would call a writer and I would get the writer together with De Haviland, and we would discuss what was best suited to her personality and her type of talent, and something would be written for her. It would be given directly to either USO Camp Shows or to the Victory Committee, and that would be the end of it. Off she would go.

There were hundreds and hundreds of actors and actresses who entertained during the war, as you know, and there had to be a great deal of material written, and I was in charge of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now that was immediately after this country became involved in the war?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time were you attending Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I did attend some during that time; yes. I attended a few, simply because I felt that since I was doing what I could for the war effort, and since that thing was the primary issue in the party at the time, there wasn't any particular reason for me to go to all those mobilization meetings, that I had to go to meet with all those people that I had to meet with, and also go to Communist Party meetings where they were discussing the same things, as far as I was concerned. So I attended meetings, but not very many.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those meetings of the same group that you had formerly been assigned to or a different group?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. No; they were different people than during the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, tell us about your assignment to the second group and when that occurred.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, I don't exactly remember, Mr. Tavenner, when it occurred, but was probably sometime around 1941, and it was in connection with the Writers' Mobilization work, because most of the people in the group had some connection with the mobilization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a minute. You say, "most of the people in the group"?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What group?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. In the second group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Communist Party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had some connection with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Tell us who were in this second group and, in giving us the names of them, state also whether or not they were connected with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and if you can recall, in what capacity.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, the first one that comes to my mind, the most natural one, of course, is Robert Rossen, who was the second chairman of the mobilization. There was Abe Polonsky. I don't know that he had any special job in the mobilization. He did a good deal of work. He is a very brilliant writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Abe Polonsky?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes; Polonsky. There was Albert Maltz. I don't remember whether Maltz worked in the mobilization or not, but I remember him in the meetings. There was Lester Cole. There was Richard Collins. There was a man named Carleton Moss, who made a film for the Capra unit, an excellent film, as a matter of fact, on the Negro soldier in the war effort—the Army unit known as the Capra unit, headed by Frank Capra. Gordon Kahn. I don't remember

whether Kahn was active in the mobilization or not, but I remember him in these meetings.

The point is, you see, it is difficult for me to remember about the mobilization. The mobilization was an organization made up of all officially recognized writers' groups in the industry, which meant that every writer in the industry was a member of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization and was working for them, and the mobilization did work for the OWI, for the Navy, for the Army. They did propaganda work for all the Government agencies engaged in this type of work. And I am trying to restrict now my memory to those people I knew as Communists, and I think those are the only ones that I can mention.

Mr. TAVENNER. Those are the only ones?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Those are the only ones I know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were members of your cell and who were also members of the Writers' Mobilization?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Those are the people that I saw in Communist meetings; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you if you knew an individual by the name of Edward Biberman.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes; I did. I was in meetings with him. He was not a writer, and as far I know had no connection with the mobilization. He was an artist, painter. He is Herbert Biberman's brother.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, can you recall the name of any other person who was a member of this group who was not connected with the Writers' Mobilization?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. The only other person I can remember that might have been a member of this group—and I don't hesitate to say that I knew him as a Communist. It was just simply in one group I knew him, and I think this is not terribly important—is a man by the name of George Willner, who was an agent, a literary agent, with a company called Nat Goldstone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you spell that name?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. W-i-l-l-n-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his first name?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. George.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with these individuals prior to your being assigned to the group with them?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Some of them, yes; because of my work in the mobilization, and some of them I had simply known as writers in the industry. After all, I was in contact with most of the writers in the industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like you to state to the committee just what transpired at the meetings in as general a way, with such particulars as you can recall, relating to any things that would indicate the type of control that the Communist Party had over its members.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, at that time, Mr. Tavenner, the control was more over its members in terms of general attitude than it was on any issue of politics, because, as I have said before, there was no conflict between the people who were in the party and the people who were not in the party as to the issues of the day.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are speaking now of the war period?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I am talking of the war period, between '41 and '44. There was, however, a general attitude on the part of the more vocal people in the party to hand down decisions which were never really discussed. In other words, the discussions which were held would end pretty much as they started, and it took me a long time, I am afraid, to finally understand that this was the type of discipline that was entirely, in my opinion, undemocratic and which I could not uphold or agree with, either in its principle or in its policies.

For instance, I was one of the people who was confused and bewildered and somewhat shocked in 1939 by the Nazi-Soviet Pact. I had joined the party on the basis of being anti-Hitler. Naturally, this came somewhat as a surprise to me, and it was explained to me that this was an expedient measure on the part of the Soviet Union to gain time; that there was never a question in their mind but what they were going to fight the Germans. It was just a question of gaining time. I accepted this.

There were other switches of this sort, as you are all well aware, from time to time; and I found it more and more difficult to accept, simply because if you are thinking independently it is very difficult to go from one opinion to another quite so quickly.

Finally in 1944 or '45, I think it was, the Duclos letter was issued. This was another shock to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. D-u-c-l-o-s?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes. Duclos was a French Communist who didn't question but who challenged the policy of the American Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was his challenge that was accepted as the proper Communist Party line to be adopted in this country?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That's right. Now one of the things—and it will probably sound naive—that disturbed me most, since I really had no really great political understanding of these things—one of the things that disturbed me most was that here was a group of people who had felt that Earl Browder was a very great and important man one minute, and after the Duclos letter they didn't say, "Here is a man who has made a mistake. We cannot any longer accept his leadership, so we will replace him," in what would seem to me to be legitimate terms if that is the way they felt. They turned one minute from thinking this was a very great man to the next minute of tearing him limb from limb and practically crucifying him. This was the kind of thing I couldn't understand.

So finally I felt that it was about time in my life that I thought for myself, and I realized that in the party this is not really possible.

I would like to illustrate this with what is to me a particularly pertinent quotation. There is an Italian by the name of Ignazio Silone, who is a very great Italian novelist, who was an important party member up until around 1929 or 1930, who was in fact a member of the Comintern with Togliatti, who is presently the head of the Communist Party in Italy. Silone left the party in 1929 or 1930, and I recently read a statement of his on why he was in it and why he was out of it, and he said this. He said that in the Communist Party there is no such a thing as an adversary in good faith; that even with a man of the stature of Lenin, whom Silone obviously considered a man of great stature, one could not really disagree with any reasonable intelligent terms. The minute you disagree they begin to call

you names, and this is a form of intimidation, this is a form of fear, and people have a dreadful desire to belong once they belong to something. And this is in my opinion a very bad and a very dangerous policy of any organization. I consider it one of the most dangerous policies of the Communist Party—that there is no really independent thinking among the rank and file.

This was one of the most decisive reasons for my leaving, outside of the fact that, when I left in 1945, I not only disagreed with the procedure in the party but I disagreed with their policy.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, will you tell the committee just what induced you to leave the party and how you left it?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well I have already told the committee to the best of my ability what induced me to leave. I felt that I could no longer belong to an organization which I had joined for what seemed to me the highest motives, and then I found out that—I had always believed that if an organization was anti-Fascist in the best possible sense that it must naturally then be prodemocratic in the best possible sense, and when I found out that it was not I was naturally disenchanted, shall we say. I was no longer interested.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you go about terminating your relationship with the party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well I hadn't been going to meetings for a long time. I had been going to meetings irregularly during the war, not for reasons of politics but simply because I was so busy with war work; and after that I just began to skip meetings one after another around 1944, and I asked for my release from Paramount in 1945—my release from my contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall when that was in 1945?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. It must have been around August. I had a couple of years to go on my Paramount contract, but I felt that I had gone as far as I could go in the organization, because it isn't really possible for a woman to be a front-office executive in a major studio, and I felt that I would rather be in an agency where there is really no discrimination against women, where a woman can be as important an agent as a man. So I left Paramount and went to an agency called Berg, Allen Berg, which I have mentioned before, in 1945. I must have gone there around September, and not very long after I went, a man whom I had never met, whom I had never seen, came to see me, a party functionary by the name of John Stapp. He asked me why I had not been coming to meetings for so very long and what I intended to do about it, and I told him I intended to get out, that I didn't intend to come to meetings at all any more; and that was the end of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall about how long that was after you took the employment with the agency?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. It must have been a very short time, I think. Probably not more than a month.

Mr. TAVENNER. When do you consider you had actually withdrawn from the party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, spiritually I had withdrawn before that; but I had not actually said so to them. I simply hadn't gone to meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to go back a little and ask you more detailed questions about your experience while in the party. You have spoken of the procedure in the meetings and the imparting of the Communist Party line to the group.

Now, how was that line imparted? Were there ever occasions when high functionaries of the party addressed your group?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes. For one thing, I remember very early in my experience in the Communist Party around 19—you will have a record of this date. I wouldn't, because I didn't keep records. About 1939, it must have been, a man called Carl Winter, who was a party functionary from New York as I understood it, a member of the central committee, came out and addressed a meeting at which I was on party matters. I don't actually remember the issues that were discussed at that time. I simply remember that I did meet him at that meeting. I never saw him again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any others whose names you can recall?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, John Howard Lawson very often would come to the meetings, even if he were not a member of the particular group, in order to explain certain problems that had arisen, of certain projects which they felt were important.

Mr. TAVENNER. What in your opinion was the thing in Hollywood which the Communist Party was really after?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, I think there were two things, mainly. I think the first one was that they felt that by getting important writers, actors, producers, and so forth, important people in the motion-picture industry who were well known to most people in the country, or at least whose names are seen on screens all over—I think that they felt that by getting the complete sympathy and support and activity of these people that they themselves would gain prestige in the country.

I also think that because these people earned large sums of money they probably felt that it would be a very important thing to be able to get money, because they solicited funds all the time. They asked for money all the time, not only in terms of dues but for special things. If the New Masses were in trouble, which it seemed to be constantly, they were asking for money, and I think that probably the Communist Party in Hollywood was able to give them quite a good deal.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about your own party dues?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. At the time I was in the party I was working at Paramount. I wasn't making a great deal of money, and I didn't pay much in dues. Originally when I joined the party I was a reader. I was making very little money, and I paid very little amount, and for a while I didn't pay any, because I had no money of my own and my husband, not being a member of the party, was not particularly interested in supporting it. He didn't disagree with those anti-Hitler, pro-Roosevelt, anti-Franco sympathies of mine, but he was not interested in the Communist Party. So I couldn't honestly ask him to support it.

When I went to work for Paramount I earned a little more money, but it never was much at any time. When I went to Berg-Allen Berg I wasn't a member of the party any longer.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you virtually withdrew from the party at the time—

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). That you went to your new employment?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, at the time that you were in Paramount and while you were in the Communist Party, did you meet a person by the name of Bea Winters?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Oh, yes. Bea Winters was hired at Paramount, not by me, but she was hired at Paramount. She had been a secretary in the industry for a long time, an executive secretary, with an excellent reputation, and she was hired in the story department. Her job was to reorganize the story files, which were badly in need of reorganization at that time, and she did a really magnificent job of it.

When I was head of the reading department I was automatically in charge of those story files for a while, and consequently she and I worked together. She was my secretary. When I became assistant story editor she was no longer my secretary.

When I left Paramount to go to Berg-Allen Berg, Berg-Allen Berg had not for a long time had an official story department. They wanted to establish one again. They had writers, but they didn't have a real story department, and I felt that their files were badly in need of reorganization. The first person I thought of was Bea Winters, because she was awfully good at this. She was also a good secretary and I hired her.

I read the testimony of Sterling Hayden saying that Bea Winters had recruited him into the party. Now, during this time she was my secretary at Berg-Allen Berg I did not know of her affiliation with the Communist Party. I had never seen her in a meeting. I did know, however, of her leftist sympathies, because this was the sort of thing that was discussed in general, and she felt the same way as a lot of other people I knew, no more, no less. However, when I hired her at Berg-Allen Berg it was on the basis of merit rather than her political opinions. She left. She must have worked for me for about a year and a half there, or so; and then she left to retire because she didn't want to work any more at that time. She is working again now. I, however, had no knowledge of Sterling Hayden's membership in the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, I didn't know about Larry Parks either. It was interesting, because I was story editor at Berg-Allen Berg, and they were both clients. I couldn't have been more surprised. But of course I was out of the party then.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in the party and while working for Paramount in charge of the reading department, were you in a position where you could, if you chose, favor any particular writer's work in the work that you did?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Not as head of the reading department, but I was in a position of some influence when I was assistant story editor. However, there are several things that have to be considered in this light. One is that I had a very good reputation as a story editor, and I was very jealous of that reputation, and if I were to recommend writers because I thought their politics were similar to mine and they didn't turn out good scripts, I would not only not have a good job, but I would not have a good reputation.

Another thing was that in no major studio is it possible for anyone in such a position to really exercise very much influence, because, for

instance, in Paramount, Y. Frank Freeman was the head of the studio, and at the time I worked there Mr. Da Silva was under him, and also Mr. Ginsberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. What Da Silva?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Buddy Da Silva. He has since died. And Henry Ginsberg after him. And there are producers; there are directors; there were two front office executives above me. There was Mr. Freeman, and there was Mr. Ginsberg, all of whom were very concerned about what writers were hired and what stories were bought and knew as much as I did about these things.

My main interest was in doing a good job, and there was no reason for me to hire people for political reasons. I was doing a war job, which I felt was enough for the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually, during the period of the war when the Communist Party was interested in promoting the war effort, there was comparatively little occasion for the exercise of preference?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. There was no occasion for it. There was really no occasion for it. I haven't got the records, but the committee could certainly get them, I am sure, from Paramount. If you will go over the list of writers who were hired and who worked at Paramount during that time, you will find no preponderance at all of "left" people. They were hired on the basis of could they fill the assignment or couldn't they.

We made such pictures as Wake Island, The Story of Dr. Wassel, Double Indemnity, Lost Weekend. These were pictures which might be considered propaganda, but hardly subversive.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your employment with Berg-Allen Berg, you were then in a position of greater importance and greater responsibility, were you not?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes, I was; and I represented writers of every possible political color. I represented people like Sinclair Lewis, James Hilton, Richard Llewellyn, Clement Dane, Laura Hobson. I sold books such as Belvedere, which was made into a Clifton Webb picture called Sitting Pretty, and subsequently into several sequels; a book called East River, by Scholom Asch, and I sold Gentlemen's Agreement to Zanuck. I was very proud again of the fact that I had a reputation as an agent, which was unique in the sense that I never represented anybody I didn't believe had talent, and many people came to me whom I refused to represent.

I don't feel that it is my place to explain this to you, but I think if you will check with other people in the industry you can find this out for yourselves.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have named a number of individuals there as persons for whom you have sold pictures or writings.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of those persons whose names you have mentioned members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Oh, no; I don't believe so. Certainly not to my knowledge, and I would be very surprised to hear it.

I also represented Dalton Trumbo, who had been a client of Berg-Allen Berg's for many years before I came there, as was, for instance Ayn Rand. They represented anybody they felt was talented and that they could do a job with. My association with Dalton at Berg-

Allen Berg was entirely professional. He had a contract at that time at Metro, and there was actually very little to do for him.

Mr. TAVENNER. The point that I want for the committee is whether or not at any time, even after you left the Communist Party, you knowingly favored any Communist writer in the promotion of his particular writing or script.

Mr. ROSENBERG. Not to my knowledge.

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, I think not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned that the Communist Party line represented controlled thinking, or words to that effect. In your opinion, who controlled the Communist Party line? How did you get the Communist Party line?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, the people naturally—this is partly a question of leadership and partly a question of personality, because a man like Herbert Biberman, who was not necessarily to my knowledge in any high position of leadership, talked a great deal; and when a man talks a great deal and with a certain eloquence he can control other people. But aside from that it was obvious to me that the person who really did most of the thinking or of the deciding for the group was John Howard Lawson.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. I haven't any questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. Mrs. Rosenberg, when you were working with writers preparing the scripts for various USO personalities, you stated that it was difficult to actually influence the script; is that true?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, they weren't really scripts, you see. They were just little comedy sketches. It wasn't even a question of influence. It was a question of what was the sort of thing that Ingrid Bergman could best do to entertain soldiers. Could she dance or sing or could she recite a poem? It was that sort of thing. It was a question of the capacity and personality of the stars.

Mr. POTTER. Was any effort made by Communist leaders in an effort to have you influence it? You said it wasn't done, but I am wondering if that was ever suggested. Was it brought to your attention that this would be a good thing to do?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. No. I must honestly tell you, Mr. Potter, that this was never done. Either I was in a field where it didn't seem advisable or, as Mr. Tavenner has helped me explain, this was in a period where there was no conflict between the political policies of the party and of the Government.

Mr. POTTER. For my own information, what is a reader?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Well, a reader is somebody who takes a novel, whether it is in galley form or an original story written for the screen, reads it and does a synopsis of it, ranging anywhere from 1 page to 50 pages, for those people who are in executive charge of the studio who haven't time to read the whole thing, because there are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of such books and stories and plays sub-

mitted monthly to studios. The people in charge simply haven't the time to read everything themselves, and they need someone to boil it down for them, to say to them, "This is something you should look into," or "Don't bother about this."

Mr. POTTER. I will say that you brought a great deal of charm to our committee.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Thank you, Mr. Potter.

Mr. Wood. I wish to express on behalf of the committee our deep appreciation for your coming here and the very frank manner in which you have answered the questions which were asked you.

Unless there is some reason why she should be retained, we will excuse the witness.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I have a wire which I don't think should necessarily be introduced into the record, but it rather adroitly represents the attitude of some of my friends in Hollywood about my political activities, and I will leave it to the discretion of the counsel as to whether he wants to read it or not. It comes from a man called Nunnally Johnson, who is a producer and writer at Fox.

Mr. Wood. Suppose you leave it.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Let the counsel decide.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will certainly read it, Mr. Chairman, perhaps to save the witness a little embarrassment:

Mrs. META ROSENBERG,

Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

I trust this will convince you that politics is no business for a fetching girl. Politics is for flat-chested girls. [Laughter.]

Mr. Wood. Thank you very much. You may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Victor Killian.

Mr. Wood. You do solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KILLIAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF VICTOR KILLIAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Victor Killian?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. KILLIAN. I am.

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

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, Los Angeles.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state your age and place of birth.

Mr. KILLIAN. I was born in Jersey City, March 6, 1891.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. KILLIAN. I am an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly for the committee your educational training.

Mr. KILLIAN. Very brief, indeed. I went to 4 years of public school, and that's all.

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

Mr. KILLIAN. You mean Hollywood or—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us confine it to Hollywood.

Mr. KILLIAN. I went out there in 1935. I was under contract to Columbia Studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been there ever since?

Mr. KILLIAN. Well, not entirely. I made my residence there ever since, but I did go to New York on occasion to do an occasional play in New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your last employment?

Mr. KILLIAN. My last employment was in a picture called—I believe it is going to be called The Tall Target, done at MGM. A story of the attempted assassination of Lincoln.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who employed you?

Mr. KILLIAN. The producer, who is Richard Gladstone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other pictures in which you have participated?

Mr. KILLIAN. I have been in something like one hundred and twenty-five or thirty pictures. I can jump around. I cannot keep them chronological.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us state some of the principal ones within the past 3 or 4 years.

Mr. KILLIAN. The past 3 or 4 years? I was in The Flame and the Arrow. I was in a picture not yet released, something about going down into the bowels of the earth to escape atom bombs. I think that was called under production Night Without Stars. I was in a picture with Bob Hope. It was called The Lemon Drop Kid. It is not yet released, to my knowledge. I find it hard to remember them. I can't offhand remember any. I know they are there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Killian, the committee has information that you were issued a Communist Party registration card in 1945, bearing No. 47342. Is that correct?

Mr. KILLIAN. I am going to stand on the fifth amendment. I am not going to spell it out for you, but I merely say I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

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

Mr. KILLIAN. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

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

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know, Mr. Killian, of any organization in our country, the United States, which has for one of its objectives the subversive overthrow of our form of government? I am not asking if you are a member of any. I am asking you if you know of any.

Mr. KILLIAN. If I knew of any such organization, I would report it to the proper authorities.

Mr. DOYLE. One of the objectives of this law under which we serve is to make reports to Congress as to remedial legislation and connect it with subversive misconduct of persons or organizations. Do you have any suggestion as to any remedial legislation?

Mr. KILLIAN. I am not equipped to do that at all. As I say, I am a person of very little education, and certainly no legal knowledge.

Mr. DOYLE. We all receive education, of course, other than that which we acquire in the classroom.

Mr. KILLIAN. Well, I hope so.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that's all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You are excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Fred Graff.

Mr. WOOD. You solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GRAFF. So help me God.

TESTIMONY OF FRED GRAFF, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ROBERT W. KENNY AND BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Fred Graff?

Mr. GRAFF. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. The proper spelling of your last name is G-r-a-f-f?

Mr. GRAFF. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. GRAFF. Two very able ones, I hope.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel again identify themselves for the record.

Mr. KENNY. My client has a right to hope. Robert Kenny.

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Graff, will you state when and where you were born?

Mr. GRAFF. I was born in New York City, 1920, June 2. Spent most of my life there. My father died in 1941. I was an only child. I had the support of my mother, who wasn't well, and we moved to California—Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to California?

Mr. GRAFF. That would be approximately June 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. GRAFF. A semiemployed free-lance actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee what your employment has been since you went to Hollywood in 1942, briefly. For what companies have you worked?

Mr. GRAFF. Before 1942?

Mr. TAVENNER. No since 1942.

Mr. GRAFF. Oh, since 1942. Under very peculiar circumstances as these things work, I found myself with a contract with Columbia Pictures in 1944. I think it was February. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was your next employment, or did you still remain under contract with that concern?

Mr. GRAFF. Well, I remained under contract for the remainder of the year, at which time I was called to serve my country. I was inducted into the United States Infantry, served, went overseas, returned, and was honorably discharged in 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your discharge, what was your record of employment?

Mr. GRAFF. I had found 6 weeks remaining on my contract, and I filled them out at Columbia. I must say that during the time I was there I had gotten very little work. They had a plan for me when they first signed me on, possibly a starring moving picture. It fell through in the first week, and I hadn't worked since at the studio. I returned. They had no plans for me. I finished my 6 weeks, at which time I was suddenly out of work, dropped, no money, and having spent a little over a year at Columbia, I hadn't advanced in my career. I had invested time there. They paid me, and meanwhile I had been still an unknown actor, unperformed.

At that time I was very conscious of my rights as a returning GI, and felt honored to exercise those rights. And I found that in my being discharged, 6 weeks after my returning, that the bill of rights was in existence and it guaranteed 52 weeks' employment at the studios, any place you worked, for any returning GI. I talked to my union about it. There was some hesitancy at first, but they finally agreed to discuss it with the studio. The attorney got in touch with the studio. They had a conference, and as a returning soldier they still didn't recognize the principle in the studio that I was entitled to the remainder of the 52 weeks, but they made the concession that they didn't recognize it, but since it was right after the war they weren't going to test the case of a returning GI being entitled to begin his career again.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you return to the west coast?

Mr. GRAFF. Return?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, from the service.

Mr. GRAFF. 1946. When I was discharged, I returned to my mother, who was alone, to take up the support. She wasn't well, and I went back to work. February of 1946. Is that what you wanted to know?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am trying to understand the dates.

Mr. GRAFF. Oh, the dates. Is that what you want? I was discharged on February 1, 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter the service?

Mr. GRAFF. I entered the service in December 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you between 1944 and 1946?

Mr. GRAFF. I spent 6 months in infantry training at Camp Roberts, Calif. I was then assigned for overseas duty as an infantry replacement trainee.

Mr. TAVENNER. About when did you leave the United States?

Mr. GRAFF. I left the United States—I can't remember the exact date. It would be, I guess, in the early part of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me, I didn't understand you.

Mr. GRAFF. In the early part of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the early part of 1945?

Mr. GRAFF. Forty-five. I left on a transport and arrived in the Philippines and was assigned to a replacement depot.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when you left, of course, you left from California for the Philippines?

Mr. GRAFF. Yes, that's right. That's correct. We boarded, I believe, near San Francisco on a troopship.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you been in San Francisco prior to your leaving for the Philippines? Were you stationed there?

Mr. GRAFF. Oh, no. I have had no stationing in the United States, except for the training.

May I say something? Would this gentleman [indicating news photographer] like a picture? You are just making me nervous. You keep looking at me, and I am trying to concentrate here.

Mr. TAVENNER (addressing news photographer). I think you should go ahead and take your photograph.

(Continuing to address the witness.) Now let us see if we understand each other. When was it you left the United States for service overseas?

Mr. GRAFF. Didn't you get that?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I didn't.

Mr. GRAFF. Approximately—it must have been around April or May, perhaps, of 1945, I left this country. That's right. Didn't I say that?

Mr. TAVENNER. You said early in '45, I thought.

Mr. GRAFF. I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Immediately before your leaving this country for overseas service, where were you stationed?

Mr. GRAFF. I was stationed in the Philippines, outside of Manila about a hundred miles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I have again misunderstood you. I am sorry. I thought you left this country for the Philippines in early 1945.

Mr. GRAFF. Where was I stationed? Didn't I say I had 6 months' infantry training at Camp Roberts?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Were you still at Camp Roberts up until the time that you left for the service overseas?

Mr. GRAFF. Yes, that's right. I had gotten a leave, you know, prior to overseas. I got my leave, which was for approximately 10 days, and I had gone overseas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Camp Roberts is in the southern part of California, isn't it?

Mr. GRAFF. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. A hundred or so miles from Los Angeles; possibly 150 miles?

Mr. GRAFF. I think it is more than that. I used to spend my weekends practically doing all traveling to get home. It was approximately 400 miles each way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Each way, but week ends you went to your home in Los Angeles?

Mr. GRAFF. Went home just about to sleep, eat, and go back.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information, Mr. Graff, that on December 9, 1941, there was issued to you a registration card of the Communist Political Association which bears number 47363. Did you receive such a card?

Mr. GRAFF (after consulting counsel). I believe in the principle in relation to the Constitution. I am always ready to defend it, and I must state that I feel that it is my duty as an American to claim this privilege that was invested in this country by people who have fought for it, and that is the right to not testify to such questions because they might tend to incriminate me today.

Mr. TAVENNER. To incriminate you?

Mr. GRAFF. That's correct. And I might add that this right does not commit anybody to assume whether there is any guilt involved or whether it is incriminating or not. I am sure you gentlemen are well aware of that.

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

Mr. GRAFF. Well, it is the same question. You are trying to obviously now—

Mr. Wood. Please just answer the question or decline to answer.

Mr. GRAFF. All right. I am sorry. I am trying to answer it my way. I think I have done everything to do that. I just must state that as a beginning young actor my coming all the way here from California to answer this question before this committee is pretty—I am pretty indignant about it.

Mr. Wood. Do you answer it or not?

Mr. GRAFF. I refuse to answer it, because it is the same question. I stated why, and on those grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Walter?

Mr. GRAFF. Incidentally, I have thought a lot about it, and I have learned a lot. May I say something?

Mr. Wood. I am giving the members of the committee an opportunity to ask questions. If you have a prepared statement you would like to file with the committee, please hand it to the reporter.

Mr. GRAFF. May I hand it to the press also?

Mr. Wood. Anybody you want to after you get off the witness stand.

Mr. Walter, do you have any questions?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. Wood. Does counsel know of any reason why the witness should be detained further?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. The witness may be excused.

Mr. GRAFF. May I say something to this committee?

Mr. Wood. Your statement is in the record.

(The statement referred to was filed with the records of the committee.)

Mr. Wood. I would like to announce for the record at this point, as has been previously announced by this committee, that any person whose name has been given in these public hearings as having been affiliated with the Communist Party, or any other organization that

may have been cited by either the committee or the Attorney General of America as being a subversive or front organization, who desires to do so, we will certainly welcome their presence here at such time as the committee may be able to make the proper arrangements, to make whatever reply or response they desire in connection therewith. And in this connection the committee has received a telegram today from one person whose name has been used here by a witness that has previously been on the stand, and he is requesting and will be accorded that privilege as soon as the committee can get around to it.

Is there anything further today?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand in recess until Tuesday of next week at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 1:45 p. m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 17, 1951.)

×

ADDITIONAL PART FOLLOWS