

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 9

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

AUGUST 19 AND SEPTEMBER 29, 1952

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



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
August 19, 1952, testimony of Bernard C. Schoenfeld-----	4249
September 29, 1952, testimony of Roy Huggins-----	4264

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 9

TUESDAY, AUGUST 19, 1952

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

PUBLIC HEARING

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

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman) and Harold H. Velde.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. Come to order, please.

Let the record disclose that for the purposes of this hearing I have set up a subcommittee composed of Messrs. Velde and Wood, who are both present.

Whom do you call, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bernard C. Schoenfeld.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand, sir, and be sworn?

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

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I do.

TESTIMONY OF BERNARD C. SCHOENFELD

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

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I am not.

Mr. WOOD. Do you desire counsel?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to explain that when Mr. Stanley Roberts testified in open session before the committee regarding his open participation in Communist Party activities in Hollywood as a screen writer, he identified Mr. Schoenfeld as a person who collaborated with him in regard to his joining the Communist Party.

On the following day, an attorney from New York called me and stated that Mr. Schoenfeld had been to see him, and that Mr. Schoenfeld desired to appear before the committee in response to the general

invitation which you have from time to time issued, namely, that whenever a person or an organization has been mentioned in the course of the testimony before the committee, he or it should have the opportunity to appear and give such explanation or denial as he or it desires to make.

In response to that telephone communication, I arranged for Mr. Schoenfeld to interview a member of the staff; which was done, and finally, as a result, Mr. Schoenfeld, at his request, appears here today.

Before giving him an opportunity to make the statement that he desires to make, I would like to ask him a few preliminary questions.

Mr. Schoenfeld, when and where were you born?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. In New York City, August 17, 1907.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your educational background for the profession of which you are a member?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Harvard University, from which I graduated in 1928, and then post graduate course in the Yale School of Drama at Yale, from which I graduated in 1930.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you tell the committee, please, what your experience in your profession has been?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, upon graduation from the Yale School of Drama, I wrote plays, one of which was introduced on Broadway, then another which was produced on Broadway.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are those plays?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. The first play was called Shooting Star, in 1933 or 1934, and the other one was called Hitch Your Wagon, which was produced in 1936.

In 1936, I left playwriting and came to Washington, where I worked for 7 years in Government service.

From 1936 to 1938, I was a radio writer for the Office of Education, and then in 1938 I became chief script writer for the Radio Section of the Department of the Interior.

In 1940, I was appointed Chief of the Radio Section of the Office for Emergency Management.

In 1942, I was editor of the Radio Bureau of OWI.

It was in 1943 that I became a screen writer in Hollywood, and have been a screen writer since, writing for motion pictures. Those are Phantom Lady, Dark Corner, Caged, C-a-g-e-d, and Macao, M-a-c-a-o.

That is the extent of my career.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you worked for the Government between 1936, I believe, and 1943, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I was not, sir.

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

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I became a member of the Communist Political Association, as it was then known, in April or May of 1945, in Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you are at liberty to make any statement that you desire to the committee regarding your alleged participation in the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, sir, until 1944, the words "Communist" and "communism" had absolutely no meaning to me, save that I knew them as any layman, but was completely disinterested, and I had always, in Washington, been connected with the New Deal and with the liberal policies of President Roosevelt, and upon his death Mr. Stanley Roberts and I, wishing some participation in what we considered the liberal cause, accepted what was told to us about the Communist Political Association and joined, after the death of Mr. Roosevelt.

I joined believing what I had been told, what I had been told by Mr. Albert Maltz, John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, Henry Myers. These four gentlemen had, previous to April 1945, at various times talked to me about the Communist Political Association. They knew me to be a follower of Mr. Roosevelt's policies, and they kept explaining to me how the CPA had backed Mr. Roosevelt in the last election. They pointed out to me that the association had no candidate of its own, since it was not a political party. They emphasized that the association believed in gradual social change and was working and would continue to work within the framework of the existing Democratic Party.

Mr. Roberts and I kept discussing the pros and cons of joining, and it was only with the shock of President Roosevelt's death in April 1945 that he and I agreed that the CPA was a group where we could best function as liberals.

I got in touch with Mr. Maltz, who arranged for me to attend a meeting, and Mr. Roberts and I joined at approximately the same time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there. How long had you known Mr. Maltz?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, Mr. Maltz, I had known personally since the Yale Drama School, where he had been a fellow student, but I had not seen him until the fall of 1944. I had not seen him at all. And because we were both screen writers, I met him at a meeting, and subsequently was invited to his house, where he then began to talk about the Communist Political Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, in the conversations that you had with Mr. Albert Maltz, Mr. Dalton Trumbo, Mr. John Howard Lawson, and Mr. Henry Myers, were those discussions of a character which were designed to induce you to become a member of the party?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they solicit your membership, in the course of the conversation?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, it took, you see, from the early fall of 1944 until April 1945 for me to be convinced. They emphasized the way in which—how the association had a program of gradual political change. And since in Washington I had been a stanch follower of the liberal doctrines of the administration, and here I was in Hollywood with no activity, I finally believed them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to the time of your becoming a member of the party, or the Communist Political Association, had you united with organizations which you later found out were Communist-front organizations?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes, sir. Two organizations.

When I arrived in Washington, I became a member of the Screen Writers' Guild automatically, and almost the entire membership of the guild at that time, in the war years, almost the entire membership, with other guilds and unions, belonged to what was called the Hollywood Mobilization. This was the joining of these unions and guilds to work for the war effort.

I joined, and I believe I wrote probably a half dozen Red Cross radio messages and a few skits for the USO. That was my participation there.

Mr. TAVENNER. In referring to the Hollywood Mobilization, did you mean the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes; the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, sir. And at that time thousands of writers, directors, and technicians belonged. The Writers' Mobilization was part of the larger Hollywood Mobilization, I believe.

And with hindsight it now becomes clear, when you read the names of the leaders of the guild at that time and the leaders of the mobilization, Lawson, Maltz, that it was a front group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the League of American Writers?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes, sir; I was a member of the League of American Writers for approximately 6 months. I believe it was the fall of 1938, or perhaps the beginning of 1939. Somewhere in 1939, when I was still here in Washington, I sent a letter of resignation and resigned from the League of American Writers because I was incensed by the attack of the U. S. S. R. on Finland. At that time, the League of American Writers sent me some kind of document standing by the position that it was not an invasion, and I sent such a letter of resignation to the league in, I think, 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who was the national president at that time?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the name of any official of the League of American Writers to whom you addressed your letter of resignation?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No, sir. I am positive that all I did was send the letter to the League of American Writers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive an acknowledgment of your resignation?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No; I do not remember having received one.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Writers' Congress of 1943?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I was, sir. That was the second front organization, or I believe it to have been a front organization. It wasn't an organization that you joined. It was merely, if I remember, a week of seminars on the University of Southern California, at which technicians in all media of communication gave lectures. And I was asked—I cannot remember by whom, but I was asked—if I would one afternoon give a lecture with Norman Corwin and Arch Oboler

on documentary radio. I did, and that was my one and only participation in the Congress.

Again, with hindsight, I am positive that the Writers' Congress was a Communist front, and that my name and my reputation were being used with those of other liberals as come-ons. And, as I say, it was just one afternoon that I spoke there.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was before you became a member of the Communist Political Association?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. It was, sir; by a year and a half.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether this Congress was conducted by the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I believe it was. I wouldn't swear to it, but I believe it was. At least, remembering back there, I believe that there was some linkage there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any recollection at all of how your participation in the program was solicited and obtained?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. If I remember, Mr. Oboler, Mr. Corwin, and myself, and others, being notified of the hour and the afternoon that we were to speak—and I don't know who it was. I am sure that whoever it was, if I knew the person, I would remember. It might easily have been someone from the mobilization, since it was the same period, I believe. It was 1943, if I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what other front organizations did you join?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. The League of American Writers. Those three. And I am not at all certain that I ever joined the Hollywood Independent—

Mr. BEALE. —Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Thank you, sir.

I attended two meetings in 1948, and I remember giving a check for \$10 at the Hotel Roosevelt, and that was my entire extent of activity in HICCASP, which I am certain, because of the roster of names which since have come out as members of the Communist Party, must have been a Communist front.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever affiliate with the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I did not, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other organizations which you have reason to believe were Communist-front organizations, which you joined prior to your membership in the Communist Political Association?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. One, sir, which I remember. I was asked for the People's—can't remember the name—School.

Mr. BEALE. People's Educational Center?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is right—to give in the same year a course in radio, war radio, documentary radio, which once a week I did for a half dozen times, and that was the last I ever had anything to do with it. That was not an organization, but, looking back again over the same names, the constant repetition of names, Lawson, Maltz, Dalton Trumbo—

That was some girl in the guild who asked me to teach there. And when I had arrived in Hollywood, I knew no one, and I was alone, and I wanted to help as I had helped in Washington with the war effort.

In all this speaking at the Writers' Congress and the Hollywood Mobilization and lectures on radio, there seemed to me to be the ways by which I could help the war effort. But at that time I had no thought of or identification with or really understanding of the Communist Political Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, I interrupted you. You were telling the committee of your joining the Communist Political Association in 1945.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would tell the committee just what your experience was in the Communist Party, where you met, the names of persons who met with you.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, at the meetings which I subsequently attended, I met the following members. I have them written down here, if I may read them:

Michael Uris, U-r-i-s, Dorothy Tree, T-r-e-e, Hugo Butler, Frank Tuttle, Tanya Tuttle, Edward Huebsch, H-u-e-b-s-c-h, Bernard Vorhaus——

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that name?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Vorhaus, Vo-r-h-a-u-s, Stanley Roberts, Herbert Biberman, Michael Wilson, Paul Trivers, Jane Trivers, Meta Reis, M-e-t-a R-e-i-s, Hetty Vorhaus.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the first name?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. H-e-t-t-y, I believe.

Jack Berry, Gale Sondergaard, Richard Collins.

Between the time I joined, in April or May 1945, and October 1945, I attended no more than a dozen meetings. I took no political assignments.

At those meetings there were discussions mostly about the role of the cultural worker, and I would sit and listen, and was a passive member, inasmuch as I was given no political assignments of any kind. I attended no fraction meetings. I paid only the basic dues. And I refused even to be assessed according to salary.

Then, in October 1945, I left for New York City, and I remained there a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, just at that point: Where was your meeting place?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. The first meeting that I ever attended, in the spring of 1945, was at the home of Michael Uris in Hollywood, and geographically, the meetings were held in homes adjacent to or around that district, where Mr. Uris lived, and those homes belonged to Edward Huebsch, Frank Tuttle, Herbert Biberman, Jack Berry, Paul Trivers, and Hugo Butler.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet in the homes of each of those persons whose names you have just mentioned?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean by that statement also to say that each of those persons were members of your group or unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I do, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And these meetings to which you referred: Were they Communist Party meetings?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, they never mentioned, until 1947, I think—they always spoke of the association, but they were definitely Communist Party meetings, each and every one of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. You state that at those meetings they discussed the role of the cultural worker. Will you define that a little more? In what direction was the role of the cultural worker being aimed?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, Mr. Roberts and I used to fight constantly on this, because it was obvious after the first half dozen meetings that we attended that the role of the cultural worker was to obey whatever the party told you to do as a writer. You were supposed to have no creative thoughts of your own. You were supposed to use your talent for, let us say, a strike.

If there was a strike, you were told to write something pro or con, whatever the party position was at that time. In other words, the individuality of the creative writer was to be stamped on, and your own individual position was never taken into account. And this was always discussed in rather abstract terms, too, because they gave you pamphlets to read. And not being very talented in political science or in economics, I couldn't make them out, and from the very beginning I would be rebuked for my inability to read or comprehend the material that they gave me to read. I was in a group which never concretely told me to write anything, but would discuss the role of the cultural worker over and over again until, frankly, I didn't know what the devil they were driving at, because they would never pin it down except philosophically. It was intellectualized constantly. I had joined thinking that there would be concrete liberal activities which, as a creative writer I could help, even as I had in war work. I thought there would be work for me to do. And they did nothing except sit and discuss pamphlets on the role of the cultural worker constantly, these first 12 meetings, before I went to New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you consider that the way in which the role of the cultural worker was discussed and taught was an effort to influence you in your thinking?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I certainly did.

This is a gradual disillusionment, of course, and a gradual technique of superimposing a whole philosophy and a whole ideology on the individual member, so that whatever he thinks gradually works in a vacuum and no longer obtains, so that he has no longer any ideas of his own.

And this I kept sensing, and hoping that it was not so. Because, having made this step, idealistically, and believing that the association was following Roosevelt's policies, and since they were very smart and used many of the liberal phrases, and spoke of Mr. Roosevelt for quite a while, I kept giving them that second chance.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, if the Communist Party, through its efforts in these meetings, could be successful in influencing the screen writers in their thinking, that would be the best way to influence the context of films, would it not?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I don't think it could be done, sir, for two reasons. One, the vast majority of screen writers are highly individual, and most of the ones I know, including myself, have always wanted to think for themselves. And the second reason is that the way the

motion-picture industry is organized, there would be too many factors which would not allow this material to be infiltrated into a movie.

I myself, in these groups, never heard discussed, for instance, the way in which the party could take over the ideology of the industry. This I never did hear.

Mr. TAVENNER. But if they were successful in influencing the thinking of some of the individuals, that naturally would affect their writings.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is true, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And although the Communist Party could not, because of the mechanical difficulties and because of the fact that many of you were independent in your thinking, succeed in actually producing a Communist film, yet if they influenced the writer's thinking they could influence the content of his work. It would be bound to influence the content of his work, would it not?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is true, sir. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, did you observe anything of the same character in the work of the League of American Writers?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, no, sir. Because I never attended any meetings. It was while I was in Washington. I was merely a paid-up member; that is all; and never attended any meetings or knew anyone here who at all belonged. I had no activity whatsoever in that league.

Mr. TAVENNER. You indicated a resentment toward the effort of the Communist Party to influence the way in which you would carry out the work of your own profession.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have in mind any particular instances in which either you or other members of your profession were influenced or attempted to be influenced in any particular way?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No, sir, I can't remember any specific illustration of it; merely, as you said, sir, the hope that from these discussions their philosophy would so be superimposed on yours that automatically, I presume, as you wrote you would orient yourself in this way.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were telling the committee that you went to New York.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes, sir; in October 1945 I left for New York City, and I remained there a year. I had not asked for a transfer. I paid no dues while I was in New York. I had no contract whatsoever with the association, personally or by mail. I saw no association members while I was in New York. I was working on a play during that time, and I had no political activity of any kind.

I returned to Hollywood in October 1946, and between October 1946 and the spring of 1947, I attended, oh, at most I should say five meetings. I had no political activity within the group, and continued to just remain a passive member.

I do remember that these meetings pertained to the breaking off, the change, from the association into the party again, the Duclos-Browder conflict. And this was the beginning of the straw that broke the camel's back as far as I was concerned, because I, from the very beginning, championed Browder's attempts at collective security, the way he had identified with what I thought was a philosophy of gradual social change, the united front, and I remember Mr. Biberman and Mr. Butler attacking Browder as the party chief. And I became con-

fused about it. I argued the point and again was rebuked. I talked with Mr. Roberts constantly about this new step; because we had felt that Browder had tried to continue Roosevelt's liberalism. And since this had been the reason, the continuance of liberal ideals, that we had joined in the first place, we were pretty upset by now.

It was either the second or third meeting when once more I was given pamphlets to read.

I remember one, I believe, was by Duclos. I know there was one by Foster and one by Stalin. And again, I went home and tried to read them, and came back, and they asked questions, as one would do to a pupil in school, and must have considered me an idiot, because they rebuked me for my inability to have comprehended them. They were statistical in nature, and dealt with political science. And they tried to make me once more agree that Browder, in some way, had committed some kind of a sin, and I fought them on that. And, oh, weeks and weeks went by before I attended the last meeting.

It was the spring of 1947. And by that time I was pretty disillusioned and disgusted with what had occurred. And in May, I left Hollywood again, to travel through the Pacific Northwest, which I did, and returned in the last part of September or the beginning of October of 1947.

I was pretty convinced by this time that there was nothing any longer that I could identify with, nothing that I believed that they were telling me.

And I think it was Mr. Huebsch who called me up, hearing I was back in town, and I attended one meeting. This was my last meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you at that point.

You stated that you refused to pay assessments. Will you tell us more about that? What effort was made to have you pay assessments, and what assessments?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, I don't remember the percentages. I do remember, however, that where I believe the basic dues were \$2, they would want a portion of my salary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you remember what portion?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No, sir, I do not. No, sir, I don't know the percentage. Because I was adamant about it, and merely paid the basic dues, because I was in and out of town and so seldom in studios by this time working.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who attempted to collect assessments from you?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, I remember, Mr. Huebsch, and I remember Tanya Tuttle and Michael Uris. I think those three kept the moneybags.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom did you pay your dues, your \$2 dues.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. The treasurer. I am not sure who these three must have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the discussions that took place, who were the leaders?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Herbert Biberman, certainly, I would call the discussion leader. After that, I suppose Paul Trivers would be the next most vocal member of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that literature was given you to read at the time that the role of the cultural worker was being discussed.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you remember what type of literature it was, or the names of the pamphlets that were given you?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I don't know who wrote it, but I remember a pamphlet just called the Role of the Cultural Worker. That I remember. And I remember a pamphlet by Gorki on writing, one by Browder, and, yes, one by—am I correct—Magil.

Mr. BEALE. A. B. Magil.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is right, sir.

And is that the same as V. J. Jerome?

Mr. BEALE. No.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Because there was one by that gentleman, too. I remember those.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any representatives of the Communist Party from higher levels meeting with your group?

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

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how your particular group or cell of the party received Communist Party instructions?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, I heard of fraction meetings, but never attended any.

Lawson's name was constantly being mentioned. It was he who I always assumed was the spearhead. Because whenever any point of discussion between Biberman and Trivers or Michael Wilson came up, it would be, "Let's see Jack."

So I presume that Mr. Lawson at that time must have been the spearhead.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now if you will return to your narrative statement, you stated that you returned in 1947.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. From the Pacific area.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is right. And I attended, as I say, one meeting, and one last meeting. And I remember being surprised, because, having been away all this time again, instead of the large group there were only five or six members present.

I believe, I know, that Michael Wilson was there, Jack Berry, Edward Huebsch, Dick Collins—Richard Collins—and I am not sure, but I think so was Michael Uris. To the best of my recollection it was held at the Jack Berry home in Hollywood.

I was rebuked again for having gone away and written on things that I wanted to write on, not having stayed in Hollywood, and I paid little attention to that before the meeting began. And there was a blast at the United Nations. I remember that. And the Marshall plan. And throughout the meeting, I sat silently and disgusted, until the meeting was over, and then Edward Huebsch came over to me and asked me why I had been away, and I told him, and then I was rebuked because I had been delinquent in dues while I was gone, and I told them I wasn't paying any, and I also told them that I was planning to move to the beach to write a novel, and that I was not going to attend any more meetings; that I felt that the time had come when what they believed in and what I believed in were mutually exclusive by now, and it was over, as far as I was concerned.

I did move to the beach in May in 1948, and in those months in between I would get phone calls by unfamiliar voices, contact voices, I would suppose you would call them, to come to meetings, and "What

was the matter?" And I would say I had told Mr. Huebsch I did not intend coming to any more. And I didn't do so.

I moved to the beach to write my novel, and some time in the spring, not too long after I had moved to the beach, someone whose name I do not recall, but I think is the son-in-law of a writer called Sonya Levine—I don't know his name, and I may even be wrong, but I think that is who it was—visited me at the beach and asked me why I hadn't attended meetings. Once more I repeated that I had no intention of doing so.

He asked me for back dues. I refused. I remember he asked me for a check for the People's World. I refused that, and I told him I was no longer in the party, and that my novel was going to take up all my time, that I was completely against what the party now stood for. And he argued, and he got nowhere, and he left, and that was my last contact with any member of the association or party, in the spring of 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did this cell or group have a name?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. If it had, sir, I never heard it. I don't believe it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that you were reprimanded for writing things that you wanted to write about.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes. For instance, if I wanted to write of anything that had no what they loved to call "social content."

And a writer would like to write about, oh, almost anything, whether it is a story about marriage or a story about a dog or anything else.

But it was always: "You are wasting your time. You should be writing as a cultural worker. You should be writing"—what they would suggest you write. And they would criticize very often at meetings those well-known writers, for instance, who at one time had written of social change and now were doing so no longer, you see. And any creative artist worth his salt can't put up with this kind of superimposition very long.

Mr. TAVENNER. What reply did you receive, or what reaction did you receive, when you advised Ed Huebsch that you would discontinue your membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, he spent about 10 to 15 minutes after that last meeting was over trying to give me every intellectual reason why I shouldn't, and said that he would meet with me. I told him it wouldn't do any good, and he never did. All I got were the telephone calls.

And then this chap who came down to the beach tried to argue; never on an emotional level, always on a kind of—I don't know why, a high intellectual and philosophical line.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe your name appeared in the *amicus curiae* of the brief.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes; it did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the Dalton Trumbo case.

Will you tell us the circumstances under which your name was used?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Well, I went to a guild meeting, and I learned that Judge Arnold had been hired to represent the guild itself as a friend of the court. And since the guild itself appeared as *amicus curiae*, I saw no reason for not signing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the Committee for the First Amendment?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes, sir. One night, I think in 1947, I joined some writers and helped prepare a coast-to-coast broadcast.

Mr. TAVENNER. At whose solicitation did you join in that effort?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I think—I am not sure, but I think it was at the solicitation of Millard Lampell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in the work of the Stockholm peace petition drive?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No, sir; I did not, nor did I sign it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Waldorf Conference?¹

Mr. SCHOENFELD. No, sir; I had nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there anything else that you wish to advise the committee or that you can advise the committee?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes.

Since 1948, I have actively done nothing except use my time and energy for creative writing, and I have repudiated the party, because I want to remain an individual in the meaning that that word has attained in a democracy. And I would recommend that the Communist Party be outlawed and also that in order to keep liberals and people of good will from having my experience, a greater and greater vigilance be made in finding out what Communist-front organizations still exist and publicizing such Communist-front organizations.

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

Mr. Wood. I would like to say, sir, that I personally, and I am sure the other members of the committee who are not present here now, join in these sentiments: We are very grateful to you for taking advantage of our invitation to come here and talk to us out of your heart as you have about your experiences in this organization.

I have been very much interested in your reaction and particularly in your present views, which, in the main, coincide with the recent practices of this committee.

For the very valuable information you have given us, we are also grateful, as are the American people. Because, after all, that is what we are trying to do here, aid the American people and the American Government and our way of life to maintain themselves and not yield to subversive outside influences that seek to destroy us.

We appreciate very much your expression, and if there are no further questions from counsel——

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two questions I would like to ask in executive session.

Mr. Wood. We will ask you to remain for a few minutes in executive session after we adjourn here, then.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a. m., Tuesday, August 19, 1952, the committee proceeded in executive session.)

¹ Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 25-27, 1949.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 9

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1952

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

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to notice, at 1:30 p. m. in room 518, Federal Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., and Donald L. Jackson.

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

Mr. Wood. Let us have order, please.

Mr. Reporter, please let the record show that acting under the authority of the resolution establishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States, I have set up a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings beginning in Los Angeles today and composed of the following members: Representatives Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, and Donald L. Jackson, and myself, John S. Wood, as the chairman, all of whom are present with the exception of Representative Velde, who is expected to arrive later in the day.

In this connection, I desire personally to express my very deep appreciation to these members of this committee who have left their respective districts in this election year where the general election is so near at hand, to come here and aid in the discharge of this very important task and responsibility the Congress of the United States has placed upon us.

I feel that I bespeak the sentiments of the law-abiding American citizens of this community.

During the course of the hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives a little more than a year ago in this room, Mr. Harold Ashe, who has been downtown section organizer of the Communist Party in Los Angeles and a State chairman of the State Central Committee of the Communist Party testified that he convinced the Communist Party

that a professional unit of the party should be organized in Los Angeles. Mr. Ashe, according to his testimony, organized the Communist Party unit, known as "The One Hundred," from which another Communist Party unit designated "The One Hundred Fifty" was formed.

The members of various professions were recruited into these professional units of the Communist Party on the basis that their identity would not be exposed. One of the purposes of this hearing is to ascertain whether this organizational work begun by Mr. Ashe has developed into an organized effort on the part of the Communist Party to establish Communist Party cells within various professions in the Los Angeles area, the extent and nature of such alleged Communist Party penetration into the various professions, and the purpose and objectives of the Communist Party in such alleged activities.

Testimony will also be introduced at this hearing relating to the motion-picture and radio-entertainment field. Two public statements have come to the attention of the committee which it is felt are deserving of public mention at this time, and incorporated into the record of this proceeding. I will read from a public release as follows:

Following is an official statement by the Hollywood American Federation of Labor Film Council:

"The Hollywood AFL Film Council, composed of American Federation of Labor unions and guilds representing more than 27,000 workers in the Hollywood motion-picture studios, condemns in the strongest possible terms certain widely circulated statements by the so-called Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms and the so-called Southern California Council To Abolish the Un-American Committee.

"These two groups are attempting to fool the public into thinking that A. F. of L. unions, and specifically A. F. of L. unions in the motion-picture industry, are supporting their attacks on the House Un-American Activities Committee. The unions are doing no such thing. These A. F. of L. unions are strongly anti-Communist.

"The same interests which try to use the name of the A. F. of L. are planning a picket line on Tuesday, September 30, to protest the hearings which will be conducted at the Federal Building in Los Angeles by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The hearings seek to help our Nation fight Russian imperialistic communism in all its aspects.

"No A. F. of L. union in the motion-picture industry will support nor be represented in the picket line. None of our unions and guilds will have anything to do with any picket line or any other line which seeks to undermine our America in the interest of Stalinist Russia."

I read also a statement made by the Motion Picture Industry Council. The heading of it is "Once and for All."

Once and for all, let it be made clear that the guild, union, and management groups of Hollywood, represented in the Motion Picture Industry Council, repudiate any attacks upon the House Committee on Un-American Activities made by the alleged Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms or any other organizations seeking to give the impression, directly or indirectly, that—by opposing those who would expose Communists wherever they may be—they speak in behalf of the motion-picture industry.

This so-called Citizens' Committee has implied, in a trade-paper advertisement, that it seeks Hollywood support in its attacks upon the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We denounce the actions of this Citizens' Committee. We condemn its tactics. We repudiate its view, as we have repudiated similar views in the past by the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council.

Representing virtually all of the major guild, union and management groups of Hollywood, the MPIC, through them, speaks for the overwhelming body of local American citizens who compose the motion-picture industry.

On March 21, 1951, the full membership of the MPIC gave its unanimous approval to a statement which declared:

"The MPIC offers its strength and support to any legally constituted body that has as its object the exposure and destruction of the International Communist Party conspiracy.

"The MPIC hopes that all members of this industry who have been subpoenaed will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It deplures those who stand on constitutional privileges to hide that truth, or those who refuse to recognize the authority of Congress.

"To those men and women of this industry who are former members of the Communist Party and who openly admit such membership and conclusively prove that they have repudiated utterly and forever that relationship, the MPIC offers its commendation and encouragement. * * *

"On September 17, 1951, the MPIC reiterated that statement, declaring that the industry 'has no sympathy' for those who stand on the first and fifth amendments and again commending those who give the House Committee on Un-American Activities their sincere cooperation in its task of opposing communism.

"Those were the views of the MPIC on March 21, 1951, and on September 17, 1951.

"Those views have not changed one iota.

"As in the past, we support the House committee, hopeful that through and as a result of its hearings, ways and means will be provided which will enable the Nation fairly, legally, and effectively to deal with the problem of Communist or subversive elements."

Signed:

The Motion Picture Industry Council for: Association of Motion Picture Producers, Hollywood A. F. L. Film Council, Independent Motion Picture Producers Association, Independent Office Workers, Screen Actors' Guild, Screen Producers' Guild, Screen Story Analysts' Guild, Screen Writers' Guild, Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, Society of Motion Picture Art Directors, Unit Production Managers' Guild.

I would like also at this time before beginning the hearings to make this announcement to the public. We are here at the direction of the Congress of the United States trying to discharge the duty and obligation that has been placed upon us by the Congress. No one who is present here or who will be present in this room during these hearings, except the witnesses who are subpoenaed, are required to be here. You are here by the permission of the committee and not by compulsion of the committee. This committee will not countenance any attempt to make a demonstration, either favorable or unfavorable, toward the committee's undertaking or to what any person called as a witness may have to say.

I do not say this in any spirit of threat, but if such conduct should occur, I am going to promptly ask the United States marshal to eject those who start or participate in any demonstration in this hearing room, and if necessary, clear the entire room.

Mr. Counsel, who will you call?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Roy Huggins.

Mr. WOOD. Will Mr. Huggins come around, please, sir? Will you have the chair right up here, please, Mr. Huggins. Will you hold your right hand up? Do you solemnly swear the evidence you shall give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HUGGINS. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat, sir. I shall ask the photographers to please refrain from taking pictures while the witness is being sworn. Do

you have any objection to the photographers taking your picture at this time?

Mr. HUGGINS. No, I don't.

Mr. WOOD. Very well, gentlemen. You will proceed and then let us get along with the testimony.

TESTIMONY OF ROY HUGGINS

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

Mr. HUGGINS. Roy Huggins.

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

Mr. HUGGINS. Lytle, Wash., in 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HUGGINS. Malibu Beach.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, in a general way what your educational training has been?

Mr. HUGGINS. I went to UCLA, and graduated in 1939, and did 2 years of graduate work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could you speak a little louder?

Mr. HUGGINS. I did 2 years of graduate work from 1939 through 1941 and that is all at UCLA, the graduate work.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what field did you do your graduate work?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, my major in college was political philosophy, but my graduate work was done in public administration.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you tell the committee briefly how you have been employed since the termination of your graduate work?

Mr. WOOD. Will you pardon me for a moment? I neglected to ask the witness, do you have counsel representing you?

Mr. HUGGIN. No; I don't.

Mr. WOOD. If you desire to have counsel at any time, during the progress of your interrogation, please let me know.

Mr. HUGGINS. All right. I have forgotten the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you to tell us the field in which you specialized while in college.

Mr. HUGGINS. Political philosophy.

Mr. TAVENNER. You answered that question, I believe.

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then my question was: How have you been employed since completion of your educational training?

Mr. HUGGINS. I was employed by the city of Los Angeles as a personnel technician, and I——

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you give the approximate dates, please?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think it was in 1941, just after I left UCLA. I became a special representative of the United States Civil Service Commission from 1941 to 1943, I believe it was, or 1944. I was an industrial engineer in 1944, I think it was, until the end of the war. At the end of the war, I started writing, and I have been a writer ever since.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated since the period of the war you have been engaged in work as a writer. In what general field have you been a writer?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I wrote about 100,000 words of fiction for the Saturday Evening Post, and I have written three novels, and several screen plays.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are the screen plays which you have been given credit for?

Mr. HUGGINS. Too Late for Tears, The Lady Gambles, Woman in Hiding, Sealed Cargo, story credit on the Fuller Brush Man, and the Good Humor Man, and there were others but I can't remember now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Huggins, this committee has been engaged for some time in the investigation of Communist Party activities in the field of entertainment, especially in that field which relates to the moving-picture industry. The committee has information that your connection in the past has been such that you could enlighten the committee on some of the Communist Party activities in that field. So, I wanted to ask you, first of all: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUGGINS. No; I am not.

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

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; I have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee, first the circumstances under which you became a member?

Mr. HUGGINS. In detail, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that it should be in detail, at least in detail enough to give the committee a clear picture of what transpires when persons in your position are induced or led to become members of the Communist Party.

Mr. HUGGINS. I became a member of my own volition; but, if I can state it in detail, I think that the story should go back several years before I became a member of the Communist Party. I was, I suppose, a typical American citizen when I started school. I came from a Republican background, and a very conservative background, and I was very indefinite myself to politics until I read in the papers about a group called the Nazis, who had taken power in Germany, and I guess I began to read it in 1934 and 1935.

My first reaction was simply disbelief that any recognized state could be using as an instrument of national policy persecution of a minority group. Even though I was not myself a member of that minority group, I still thought it was appalling and unbelievable, and when I started college I made it a point to find out what it was about, a state that could lead it to that kind of despicable policy in which it exploits the very worst in human beings.

I took political science, and I suppose that was one of the reasons I took political science, because it did strike me as being a terribly important problem, and I came to understand, I thought, the nature of the German state. It was fascism. I think I could have been classified as a premature anti-Fascist, and I can't understand how anyone could possibly have failed to be a premature anti-Fascist myself, after seeing what was happening in Germany.

I went to UCLA in 1937 from a junior college, and changed my major to political philosophy. At that time my politics were middle of the road, and I just had a great faith and love for the democratic system, which struck me as being the opposite of fascism, and I did not know very much about communism.

I took courses from a professor who was a Marxist, and I took several courses from him, and all of his courses, not only in political

theory but in anything else, whatever courses he gave, were all given from the Marxist point of view.

By that time I had made up my mind I was going to be a teacher, a college professor. So, I was a serious and hard-working student, and this professor took me under his wing, as it were, and made me his reader and gave me special attention. He was a very good teacher, and very sincere, and he was not a Communist that I know of, but he was a Marxist. This was in 1937 or 1938 or 1939, and I think the whole world was pretty troubled, and Marxism has a wonderful thing about it, in that, being a closed system of thought, if you feel great despair about the world or are having difficulty understanding it, Marxism does something for you. It suddenly allows the whole universe to fall into a nice simple pattern. There are no unanswered questions once you become a Marxist. It is a nice feeling, particularly if your field is political philosophy, and you like to feel that you do know all of the answers.

I became a Marxist, I guess, sometime in 1938 or 1939, and I was a very hard-working Marxist, and I did a lot of reading, not in Lenin and Stalin; I was not particularly interested in Lenin and Stalin, but I did a lot of reading in Marxist theories, and especially in his methodology, his approach to all phenomena, in which he had an answer for everything.

About that time, at that time of course, I was also interested in politics, as everyone was in that day, and my politics, I guess, were just democratic, and I was in favor of Roosevelt's foreign policy of "quarantining" the aggressors as he stated it in 1937, and I was often asked to speak at big student meetings. There is a yearly peace meeting in UCLA, and I was chairman one year, and the chief speaker another year. I did not know at the time, but I suspect now that the people who asked me to speak and the people who had organized and sort of taken over these things were members of the Communist Party. But I knew no Communists, and I was stating my beliefs which were pro-American and anti-Fascist and pro-Roosevelt.

I graduated in 1939, and I applied for a fellowship and so I could go on and get my Ph. D. I received a card, mimeographed card, telling me my grades were not good enough for a fellowship, and that they were sorry. This was the awakening, because I had graduated a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and I have a diploma that says "summa cum laude" in a class of several thousand, and I didn't get it. So, I took my little mimeographed card up to the political-science department, and I found a graduate student up there whose name I have forgotten, but he and I knew each other, and we went down to Kirkhoff Hall and had a Coca-Cola, and he told me I should know better than to think I was going to get a fellowship when I was also a Communist. And I did not believe it, but I made a few other little inquiries from the professors who were not very clear on the subject, but I gathered from what they did not say that I was refused a fellowship because I was a Communist.

Now, all through 1939 I had been getting little hints from people that I really ought to become a Communist. I don't know whether it was Miss Celeste Strack, who was a well-known Communist, who was talking to me at that time or not, but I know whoever it was, they kept saying, "Look, you are a Marxist, and therefore you should belong to the Communist Party." And I remember that one of my

answers was that Sidney Hook was a Marxist, and he did not belong to the Communist Party and, in fact, he wrote articles every week condemning it.

Well, he was a different kind of Marxist. Well, at that time I had discovered the differences, and I read Sidney Hook right along with all of the other Marxists, and found them to be, as far as I could see, in basic agreement about what Marxism was all about, and so I did not join the Communist Party and I knew no Communists, and I didn't associate with Communists, and my friends were all fraternity brothers, or fraternity boys, at least, who lived with me down at the beach. But I was a Communist to the faculty of UCLA, and I was refused a fellowship on those grounds.

I was already fairly despairing of democracy at that time, but I did not do anything about it, but in 1940 history had moved also, and I think every democracy in any large industrial nation, except England and America, had now fallen to fascism, and I began to despair of the thing that I had felt so deeply about, the democratic system. I had been a victim of undemocratic treatment, and I was just naive enough to believe that it was impossible that this could not really have happened, but it did happen, and I knew it. So, when I got back to school in 1940, the campaign took up again, and, through Celeste Strack working on me to join the Communist Party, I joined the Communist Party sometime in 1940. I think that I attended three meetings. I can't remember the meetings very well, but I do remember that I was being asked to picket war plants and being asked to engage in other activities which were hindering our preparedness program and to do what I could to oppose draft laws, and so on and so forth.

Well, I didn't like that. I found, having gotten into the Communist Party, that I did not agree with the Communist Party line. I was a Marxist, but apparently not a Communist; and so, after attending three or four meetings, I quit, and I wrote an article, which appeared on the front page of the daily college paper, condemning the Communist Party position in toto.

War was declared later, and the Communist Party line changed, and I didn't pay any attention to it; but, with the declaration of war, I left college and I tried to join the Marine Corps, and I was rejected because of my bad eyesight. I think I tried the Navy, too—I am not sure—and I was rejected there. And so I got a job working for the city, transferred to the Federal Government, and became special representative in charge of recruitment for the national war agencies here.

I was still a student of Marxism, and I hoped when it was over to go back and get my Ph. D. in political philosophy, and I was still a Marxist. So, around 1943, the political climate had changed rather severely, and Russia was our ally, and I wish I could remember those quotes verbatim, but I think I remember them well enough to state them here, without contradiction, that it was in 1943 or maybe 1942 that General MacArthur made his statement that the hope of the world rests upon the valiant Red army, and I think it was in 1943 that Eddie Rickenbacker, whose love of country is hardly questioned, said—and this was quoted in Time magazine in 1943: "When the war is over, Russia will emerge as one of the world's greatest democracies."

Patrick Hurley, Gen. Patrick Hurley, in 1944, said in regard to China that the Communists are not Communist at all, but just a type

of democrat, or fighting for a type of democracy, or something of that sort, and I think that was quoted in the New York Times.

Drew Pearson rounded up all of these quotations just for fun one time to show that, when you thought something was rather important.

There were others. There was one from Admiral Standley, to the effect that Russia was a great democracy.

While I began to wonder perhaps if I had gotten into the Communist Party and gotten out without giving it a chance, it looked to me as if I were wrong about their attitude toward democracy and the rest of it, and so I rejoined the Communist Party in 1943. As far as I could see, there had not been any changes, except that they were now, at least—I could not oppose what they were doing and saying because they were selling war bonds, and they were talking about how to prevent strikes in the factories, and they were a very patriotic group.

I attended a couple or three meetings, and then stopped attending meetings, because I think that I felt, as a Marxist, I really ought to get into this thing and see what was happening, and it seemed to me being a Communist was a part of being a Marxist, and this I think was my motivation; but somehow or other, after doing it, I couldn't stay with it, and so I attended very few meetings. In fact, I suppose not more than five or six meetings in the next 2 or 3 years. I suppose I retained my membership accordingly.

In 1946, I became a writer, and I became a member of the Authors' Guild, and I think it was the first time I ever joined anything besides the Communist Party. I became a member of the steering committee of the Authors' Guild here on the coast, and the chairman of that committee was Albert Maltz.

After a meeting one night, after a meeting of the steering committee of the Authors' Guild, Albert Maltz asked me to have a drink with him in the bar of the hotel, and we talked for a while, and it came out that he understood that I was in some way still a member of the Communist Party, and not attending meetings or anything, and why didn't I. I gave him my reasons: that it didn't mean anything to me; that I saw no reason why I should. He asked me if I were a Marxist, and I said "Yes," and he asked me if I would allow him to transfer me to the Hollywood group. And I said "I didn't think so." We had meetings, I guess fairly regularly, of the Authors' Guild, and after each meeting Albert Maltz would ask me if I had changed my mind, and he gave a glowing picture of the stimulation and understanding and the new understanding I would have of Marxism if I came into this group, which was made up of highly intelligent people, and finally, sometime toward the end of 1946, I said: "All right; tell me where to go, and I will come to one of your meetings."

Well, he said, "It will take a little time," and so I think it was a few weeks later I was told to attend a meeting of the Communist Party in Hollywood, which I did, and for the first time in my connection with the Communist Party I started attending meetings fairly regularly. I think in the period of 9 months or so that I was a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood I must have attended a dozen or two dozen meetings. It was sufficient to know something about the Communist Party at last.

I discovered the usual things: That there was certainly no democracy in the Communist Party; decisions were brought down and

rendered or we found out about them by having to read the [Communist] press, which I could not bear reading, and I was supposed to read the Daily Worker, and I think I took it for a while, but I do not read it, and I was also supposed to read Political Affairs, or something like that, which was on a little higher level, but still was opinionated and without much force, I felt.

Discussions in the group seemed to be or to consist of restatement in slightly different wording of things that were appearing and the things I was being asked to read. Any difference of opinion was immediately pounced upon with name-calling and all of the rest of the things that you have heard about so many times before. But no one ever disagreed really. They might tentatively disagree, and then immediately withdraw it, very quickly withdraw when they got pounced upon by the chief intellectual of the group.

At the same time history was moving forward, and I was making a big change in my basic philosophy.

In 1947 a lot of things were happening; the cold war had started; the U. N. was a total loss because of Russian vetoes, and I think that by the time I got out of the Communist Party they had used the veto about two dozen times on crucial issues, and I had great faith in the U. N. It looked to me as if it were being destroyed. Russia was refusing to have anything to do with control of the atomic bomb, which appalled me, and then sometime late in 1947 they suddenly reformed the Communist Internationale, and I quit the Communist Party.

This time I quit no longer a Marxist, for reasons both that I could have found in the first place if I had read with less of an eager eye, and for reasons of history. The historical reasons were now it became pretty obvious that the Soviet Union was not the hope of the world or the hope of democracy or anything else, but was an imperialist power. I used to believe in the early days, in 1943, when I went back in, that the only reason that the Soviet Union was not democratic was because it was surrounded by enemies like Germany and Japan, and so on, and it was on a wartime footing, and that was the reason for it. But it got worse as we all know after the war was over, and it had no enemies surrounding it at all. Its attacks on every kind of freedom of thought increased, its attitude toward other peoples became clear in its dealings with all of its border nations, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary, and the six so-called satellite states, and it had moved in and destroyed all freedom and had shot several leaders of those nations.

There were a good many things happening at that time, all of them seemed to be building up and I can't even remember them all, but it was obvious to me that there was no hope that the future was held in the hand of the Soviet Union.

It is a terrible thing when you finally realize the great gap between the grim realities and your vision of an ideal future. It is hard to realize it, and it takes a little time. But I did finally realize it, and when I realized it on a historical level, I also realized it on a theoretical level, and I realized finally what the basic flaw in the Marxist philosophy was, and it is simply this. I think it might be important to get this on the record, and I think it is clear.

Marx states, first Marx sets up a methodology which is fairly sound and he made a lot of predictions which came true. Then Marx gets into the way of the future, away beyond his time, with statements

about the nature of the Communist state, and the foundation stone, the moral foundation of Marxism was the Marxist theory which I believe was scientifically founded, and I believe that Marxism was a science, and that Marxist theory called the withering away of the state, was founded on scientific principles, which Marxism I thought was.

Well, it is obvious to anyone who wants to look that the state is not withering away, in the Soviet Union, that it is getting more tyrannical every day, and it seemed obvious to me then finally in 1947 that Marxist theory of the withering away of the state was just a mystical and metaphysical thing, and had no foundation whatever in scientific fact. It seemed, too, if you accepted all of his a priori conclusions about the economic determination of history and the reason why there were states, and Marx said the reason why there are states is because there are classes, and when there are no more classes there cannot be more states, because there is no need for a state, and all of this, if you accept it, then you go right on and say that it must be true, and the Soviet Union will some day be a great democracy. But it is obvious that it is not. It is obvious that Marx's statements are simply unfounded, and that it isn't true and it isn't proved that if you have no classes that you won't need a state, and, in fact, the contrary has been proved by the Soviet Union, where I don't believe they do have any classes, they have just one class, but they have a state in the Soviet Union, and that state is getting more and more powerful and more and more tyrannical every year.

I can't see how it can possibly cease to be that. It must go on getting more and more tyrannical until finally it is lost in some way or other. So I left the Communist Party in 1947 finally, no longer a Marxist nor a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you there a moment. Do you attribute your present disagreement with Marxist theory to your experience within the Communist Party?

Mr. HUGGINS. No; it is partly that, because certainly the fear and the complete absence of any kind of integrity was made clear to me in the Communist Party. A man cannot think for himself in the Communist Party. He must abrogate that privilege, and do it willingly on some theoretical ground. They seldom state it so coldly as that; but actually that is what is behind it. They are in a constant state of crisis, and they recognize that in a crisis certain attitudes must be taken, and you don't have time to argue, and the way they get around the fact that it is always like that is that there is always a crisis. But it was not the experience in the Communist Party that convinced me or made me cease to be a Marxist. It was history, and I suppose it is just the fact that one day I woke up and decided to think about something else, you know. Once you get into a closed system of thought it takes more than fact to get you out of it, and it takes something else, and it takes a real jarring experience of some kind to get you out of it, and then once you are out of it a lot of things become obvious that should have been obvious in the first place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then from history and from your experience in the Communist Party you concluded that there were flaws in the Marxist theory, which finally resulted in your disillusionment on that subject?

Mr. HUGGINS. Right. I suppose there was a positive side to this thing. One is, in 1947 I realized that the Marxism was not a science,

but that it was actually based upon some a priori assumptions, which if you accept then you accept all of Marxism, and if you accept the theory that almost all social phenomena of our world stem from the existence of classes, if you accept that, and if you accept his theory that all phenomena, even thought, is determined by the economic structure of the society, if you accept that, then you go ahead, and you accept the rest of Marxism.

I realize, like all closed systems of thought, once you find a hole in it, then you realize that it is all wrong, because that is the nature of a closed system of thought. You must either accept it all without question, or you do not accept any of it, and this is recognized by the Communists.

There are no Communists who say, "Well, I am a Marxist, but I don't accept this particular theory of Marx," and if you don't accept that theory, you are not a Marxist, and you are not a Communist if you don't go along with every bit of the theory.

So I think it is in the nature of the things that once you find one big flaw, then you suddenly realize that that is just a resultant flaw of other flaws.

I think it has been proved that you don't need classes in order to have a tyrannical society, a society that is like a class society, as Marx would describe class society.

The other thing on the positive side is this, that as I said when I started talking, my reason for first joining the Communist Party was a great despair for the democratic system. I began to think that the choice might be not democracy versus fascism, but maybe fascism versus communism. This is how it began to look to me. That is because, as I said, every nation except England and America had fallen to fascism, every industrial nation. I had myself been victimized and called a Communist when I was not one, which seemed to me without a hearing highly undemocratic, in an institution where you expect it to be very democratic, and that is a state university. So I was in a great state of despair for the democratic system in 1940, as a good many people were.

I think in 1948 and 1949 and 1950 it is becoming ever more clear that democracy has a heck of a lot more vitality and strength than a lot of people thought in 1940, when so many nations had fallen to fascism.

I am now of the firm belief that we have just witnessed the first act in the history of free democracy, and that it has a long way to go.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your views, then, with regard to your former despair for democracy have changed materially?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; because of what has been happening in the world.

Mr. TAVENNER. In speaking of the flaw of Marxism, what was the flaw which you discovered, and which changed your basic thinking on the subject?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, the basic flaw was the theory that I would say is basic to Marxism of the withering away of the state. He stated that once the proletarian revolution has come about the state will begin to wither away, and you eventually get great free democracy in a pure kind of democracy.

Well, here it was 1947, and I don't know how many years after the Communist revolution that was, but the state was going in the opposite

way yet, and it had always been going that opposite way, toward a tighter and tighter dictatorship, and a greater and more medieval kind of tyranny, and it was still going that way and it still is today. That was the major flaw. It was obviously a flaw and obvious that Marxist theory was mystical and not founded upon scientific fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you observe during your experience in the Communist Party that the Communist Party program or line followed that of the Soviet state, or was dictated by the Soviet state?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; I think it is obvious. Every change of the party line has always come immediately after a change in foreign policy of the Soviet Union. When the Soviet Union decided, and, of course, this was before my time, but I know now from history, that when the Soviet Union decided to try to form an alliance against fascism that the Communist Party line immediately changed to one of supporting whatever government in whatever country they existed, whatever government was willing to go along as an ally of the Soviet Union.

Then when the Soviet Union signed a pact with Nazi Germany, the nonaggression pact, the line immediately changed overnight. I was not a member then, either, but I can remember very well I was studying in summer school up at Berkeley, and I remember very well that some of the people that I had met up there were busy running around trying to pick up pamphlets that they had laid on doorsteps calling for a third term for President Roosevelt, and they were trying to get them back again. The line had changed as they put them on the doorsteps.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not correct to say in the line of what you have just stated that if a person were a devout member of the Communist Party he would sooner or later have to take a definite stand in behalf of the Soviet Union and against the United States?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I think that is obvious now. When I joined, in 1940, it seemed to me that that is what I was being asked to do, and that is why I quit, after such a very short membership, because I was unwilling to make that choice, or even to grant that that choice was necessary.

My feeling about Marxism was that it was a great methodology, but as far as any revolutions went I thought they would come when my grandchildren were around, if they came at all, and I didn't look upon it as a thing that was going to happen tomorrow on Seventh and Broadway. I was interested in Marxism as a methodology, and when I went into the party and I was asked to make what I felt was to take a position that I felt was contrary to the best interest of this country I quit. Of course, it was—their position then was—"Let us not help anybody, and, in fact, let us help the Germans," and I had a vision of our being left alone to fight the Nazis.

I think today that same thing exists, and in fact I would say that with the reestablishment of the Comintern in 1947, which is the part where I got out, I would say from that point on membership in the Communist Party automatically constituted a subversive position.

Mr. DOYLE. What year would that be?

Mr. HUGGINS. In 1947, that is the year they reestablished the Comintern, and they called it the Cominform.

Mr. WOOD. Membership in the Communist Party means enmity to the United States Government?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think that that is obvious. I don't think that there is any question that the Communist Party line is dictated by the needs of the Soviet Union, and history proves it all along the line. If that is true, then it seems to me that today you cannot be a loyal American and be a member of the Communist Party. It is impossible.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard a great deal said by the Communist Party about a so-called form of democracy within the party, that is in the way of procedure. They call it democratic procedure, and freedom of thought, notwithstanding these hearings have developed many, many instances where it has been demonstrated that thought control is a specialty of the Communist Party.

What are your views on that subject from your experience in the party?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, they claim that there is in the Communist Party a thing called democratic centralism, which means that discussion takes place about a problem and reports are made, and I suppose on up the line, that is the theory, and as a result of those discussions a decision is made, and once the decision is made, there is no more discussion or argument. You accept the decision. I didn't see it work. I imagine altogether I attended 30 meetings of the Communist Party in all of my membership in it, and in none of those 30 meetings did I ever hear anything discussed before it became a policy. It was only after it became a policy, and then it was a matter of being sure everybody understood it right. That is all.

So I would say that there is no semblance of this so-called democratic centralism in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you have any personal knowledge of how those decisions were reached at the top, and handed down to the rank and file members?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I don't know how they were reached. I think the method of handing them down was just through the press. As far as I could see, during my time here in Hollywood and in the Hollywood group, they got it all from the press, from their magazines that were brought to the meeting and you were asked to read them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Considerable evidence has been heard by the committee as to the part that the Daily Worker and other organs of the Communist Party played in handing down the directives received from foreign sources. It was a corporation, according to the testimony, set up in New York City which received cables and which were in turn printed by the Daily Worker. I assume they were printed by the other organs of the Communist Party, and through that method it was that the Communist Party directives were handed down.

Mr. HUGGINS. I have no personal knowledge of that, Mr. Tavenner.

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

In that connection, is it not true that following on such world moving or party moving events as the denunciation of the Nazi-Soviet nonaggression pact, and the Duclos letter, that a vast pall of silence would fall on the comrades for several days until they were able to determine just exactly what the word was?

Mr. HUGGINS. Exactly. There would be, as you say, just a silence, and no one knew what to say, and apparently everyone was afraid to say anything, because I was asked to come to a meeting, and I hadn't been to a meeting for a year or so, but I think about the time of the

Duclos letter someone called me and said, "We would like you to come to a meeting. We are going to discuss this thing." No one knew what to say. They were just waiting to be told. Once they were told, those who had previously been so outspoken along this line were now just as outspoken along this line. They always seemed to have a ready answer as to why they made the mistake, which I was never able to follow.

Mr. JACKSON. That is democratic centralism?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you familiar with any instances such as that which occurred to Budd Schulberg, when Charles Glenn published the very complimentary article that this is the novel that Hollywood has been waiting for, and then within a week was compelled to reverse his entire line, and destroy all that he had built up?

Mr. HUGGINS. No; I know the Maltz situation was similar to that, but that was before I went in there. By the time I got in, no one was talking about that any more. They did seem to be a little displeased with the sort of thing I wrote. As a matter of fact, I think one of the members implied once that my stuff was sort of Fascist writing, and I wrote hard-boiled novels, so-called hard-boiled novels, which they did not like very well, and they wanted to know why I didn't write something good. I said, "Well, you bring me into this thing, you know, and then you ask me to write something good, and it is like recruiting a house painter and then handing him a palette and some oil paints and saying, 'Here, paint canvases now.'" That is about how I felt about it.

My writing, I felt, was a commercial type of writing, and I didn't consider myself to be an artist, and so they gave up, but there was a good deal of propaganda within that Hollywood group about the time I was there, to get all of the members to write proletarian novels, and this seemed to be the line. They took no political stands on anything in the Hollywood group, and the other groups that I belonged to during the war were just interested in selling war bonds and stuff like that. The Hollywood group was interested only in Hollywood, and they never, as far as I know, had a discussion of world politics.

Mr. TAVENNER. Incidentally, you referred to your membership in the Authors' League or the Authors' Guild. Was it guild or was it league?

Mr. HUGGINS. The Authors' Guild, which is a member of the Authors' League.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask a question? As I understand from your association and experience with the Communist Party, the Communist line is antidemocratic; is that so?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; it certainly is. As a matter of fact, it is admittedly antidemocratic in the terms of what we mean by democracy, but they then claim to have their own type, which will come later.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of your early training at the university and the professor who was a Marxist. I understood you to state that in your opinion he was not a member of the Communist Party. Is that correct?

Mr. HUGGINS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he had associated with him in that work a person who has been the subject of considerable testimony before this committee?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; when I was a student at UCLA, an assistant in the department was Bernadette Doyle. I worked with her; that is, she was reading papers in some of the courses that I took, and now and then she would give a lecture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she ever appear before Communist Party meetings at which you were present?

Mr. HUGGINS. She never mentioned the Communist Party. She may have. She may have asked me a couple of times why I didn't join the Communist Party, but I don't even remember it actually, and she may have. But that was left up to other people.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you became a member of the party on the first occasion, while you were at the university, did you belong to a group or cell that was organized within the university or on the campus?

Mr. HUGGINS. About the only thing I remember about that group is that it was not a university group. It was apparently a neighborhood group of some kind, but I attended only—I can't even remember—I remember two meetings, and I may have attended more, and I may have forgotten one or two more.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us how Albert Maltz was instrumental in bringing you back into the Communist Party in 1946, and having you assigned to a group of intellectuals within the party. Will you give us the names of the members of that group?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, they have all been named many times. Albert Maltz, Harry Carlisle, Robert Lees, Philip Stevenson and his wife—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Stevenson's wife's name?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think it was Janet. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. While I was speaking, I believe that you mentioned the name of Ben Barzman.

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you name his wife or not?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is his wife's name?

Mr. HUGGINS. Norma.

Mr. TAVENNER. The name Stevenson is S-t-e-v-e-n-s-o-n; is that correct?

Mr. HUGGINS. I really don't know. Some of the others were—

Mr. TAVENNER. Barzman. Do you know the spelling of Barzman?

Mr. HUGGINS. No; I don't. I don't know whether there is a "z" or not in the name.

George Sklar was a member of the group. Guy Endore, E-n-d-o-r-e, I think. There were a half a dozen others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall who was the dues secretary of the group?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; that was Robert Richards and Ann Morgan.

Mr. TAVENNER. Robert Richards and Ann Morgan?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the person that was considered to be the head of this group or cell?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I suppose that changed, and the only one I remembered—that is another name, Elliott Grennard, and I think he was the nominal head at one time or another.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Grennard?

Mr. HUGGINS. I don't know. I have no idea. But the Harry Carlisle I mentioned, and there are two Harry Carlises, apparently, in the Communist Party, one of them was recently tried, and the other one is waiting to be deported to England, and that is the one that was in this group, the one that is now up for deportation. Harry Carlisle was the one apparently looked to as the theoretical leader of this particular group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Leslie Edgley?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; he was a member of the group. I don't know how to spell it.

Mr. TAVENNER. E-d-g-l-e-y?

Mr. HUGGINS. Probably.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Val Burton?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. B-u-r-t-o-n?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party and of this group?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wilma Shore?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-h-o-r-e?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she known to you personally to be a member of this group?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; she was a member of the group for a short time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Lillith James?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. L-i-l-l-i-t-h James?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; some of the meetings were held at her house.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of other persons in whose homes—

Mr. HUGGINS. George Sklar, I believe is the name, and the Stevenson home was used on occasions, and I think that is it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Dan James?

Mr. HUGGINS. Only by hearsay. I think I met Dan James at non-Communist functions on occasion.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at the time you entered the Communist Party back in 1943, I believe it was?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. The second time.

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of the group that you were assigned to on that occasion?

Mr. HUGGINS. I guess it was a semiprofessional group as far as I have been able to figure it out.

Mr. TAVENNER. What professions were represented in that group, if you can tell us?

Mr. HUGGINS. There was a doctor—Dr. Abowitz and his wife were members of that group, Murray Abowitz, and——

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell it?

Mr. HUGGINS. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand you to mention his wife's name?

Mr. HUGGINS. She was a member of that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her name?

Mr. HUGGINS. I don't know.

Mr. WOOD. Was she also likewise a doctor?

Mr. HUGGINS. I don't think so.

Mr. JACKSON. Was her name Ellenore?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; that is it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall other professions that were represented in that group?

Mr. HUGGINS. There was an optometrist named Howard Davis and his wife, and there was a lawyer whose name I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the wife of the optometrist?

Mr. HUGGINS. I don't remember it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether her name was Shirley?

Mr. HUGGINS. I don't think so. It may have been. Really, as I say, I attended very few meetings, and I do not know. These are the only members whose names I remember, and it was a large group, and there must have been 40 or 50 members of that group, and I only remember 4 people in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you recall a lawyer. Do you know his name?

Mr. HUGGINS. No; I have forgotten his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall where that group met?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think it was at the Davis house. I am not certain of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the circumstances under which you united with the party on that occasion; that is, whether or not you were requested to come into the party, or whether you did it entirely on your own initiative, and, if so, to whom did you make your application?

Mr. HUGGINS. I think as in the first place, when I finally took the action, it was my own action taken on my own initiative. I don't know how I found out where to go, but I went downtown in Hollywood somewhere, and I went upstairs and found a man named John Stapp—S t a p p—I think, and asked him to assign me in a group in the Communist Party, which he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, in stating the fallacies of Marxism and the other views that you have expressed regarding the Communist Party, I assume that those matters played a great part in your withdrawing from the Communist Party; but, if there is anything else that you desire to state with regard to your withdrawal from the Communist Party I would like to hear it now.

Mr. HUGGINS. No; I think that the basic reason for my withdrawal was the same reason that I withdrew when I first went in: That I felt that the party had finally reached a point where you simply could not

be a member of the Communist Party and consider yourself to be an American citizen. It was that simple. To me, instead of my being wrong about them in 1940 and right in 1943, it turned out to be the opposite.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter, do you have any questions?

Mr. WALTER. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed your voluntary statement that the Communist Party is admittedly antidemocratic. In connection with that statement, you said "but they claim to have a type of their own which will come later."

Now, what type of democratic process do they claim will come later; and, if that is a fair question, when do you think it will come?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I think it is something they don't talk about very much any more. It is something that Marx and Lenin talked about a great deal; at least, I think Lenin did and I know Marx did. That was the type of democracy that you would have in a stateless society, or in classless society. According to Marx, that is a pure kind of democracy, in which there would be no state at all.

Mr. DOYLE. Then I take it that that answer is the one you explained before?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; that this is the so-called withering-away-of-the-state theory, which history is every day proving to be wrong.

Mr. DOYLE. Three or four times you stated that the Communist Party in America is such that you cannot be a loyal American and a member of the Communist Party in America. I am not sure that I grasp the ultimate conclusion yet. Why can you not be?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, it is based on two things. One, I think it is abundantly proved that the Communist Party line always reflects Soviet foreign policy. If you accept that, as I do, that is the basis for the assumption.

Now, there are other bases for it. A member of the Communist Party must take discipline and must do as he is told to do, and this is another clear-cut fact about communism.

Mr. DOYLE. Then you mean that the Soviet foreign policy is contrary to the best interests of the policy of the United States. Is that why you cannot accept it and still be a loyal American?

Mr. HUGGINS. Soviet foreign policy turns about, or Soviet propaganda, let us say, which is the basis for the Communist Party line here, turns everything that this country does upside down. We aid democracy in Europe, and it is called warmongering. We come to the aid through the United Nations of the South Koreans, and we are called again warmongers, and the world is even told that the South Koreans started the war, and not the North Koreans at all, and we are just trying to put a yoke on the peoples of Asia.

This is the line of the Soviet Union.

Mr. MOULDER. Or the world revolution, would you say?

Mr. HUGGINS. I did not hear that question.

Mr. MOULDER. I will wait until Mr. Doyle is through.

Mr. DOYLE. You stated it appears democracy has a lot more vitality than was thought. What vitality has democracy that you did not think it had, and what have you discovered it has?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, as I said, in 1940, how many democracies were there in the industrial nations of the world? There were just two. There were only two. Fascism had a complete grip on the world. Now today there are a lot of democracies, and they are fighting almost as if it were a new thing. It has tremendous vitality and spirit, and it is a new world today.

Mr. DOYLE. I was interested in your comment that any difference of opinion was immediately frowned upon by the chief intellectuals of the group. I think that was your correct testimony. What do you mean by the chief intellectuals of the group? Who were they and how were they chosen?

Mr. HUGGINS. I suppose what I mean was that there were certain people in the group who were simply recognized by others as saying more than the others, and saying it with a better choice of communistic jargon, and there is a special Communist jargon, which I was never able to master, but I would say these are the people that I referred to. The response always for any man who gets out of line is to start implying that something is wrong with him, and they start calling him names, you know, "You are guilty of bourgeois deviation, comrade," and that sort of thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Was there any act or omission which you participated in, directly or indirectly, as you look back at it, which in your judgment should have labeled you as a Communist at the university, and caused you to be denied a fellowship?

Mr. HUGGINS. None at all; not one.

Mr. DOYLE. You certainly were, according to your Phi Beta Kappa record and other statements of scholarship made by you, you were a diligent thinker and an intellectual.

Mr. HUGGINS. I was what is known as a premature anti-Fascist.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you any suggestions to make to this committee in the functioning of our responsibilities to the American people, through the United States Congress—do you know what our responsibility is? It is to uncover wherever possible subversive activities of people who would advocate or use force and violence to overthrow the Constitution of the United States. Have you any advice for us or suggestions or criticism, even? I have never talked with you, sir. I have never talked with you, have I, and I realize in asking you this question I am doing it right out of a clear sky to you.

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes, that is true.

Mr. DOYLE. And yet I feel that if you have a statement, I would like to get it.

Mr. HUGGINS. I think that you are in a spot, because there isn't any question in my mind at all but there is a great need for democracy to do something about the subversive drives which intend to overthrow it. This is one of the things that disturbed me deeply about the Communist Party, is that they do not believe in individual freedom, and yet they shout to the housetops in defense of individual freedom in all of the democratic countries in which they exist. They become champions of complete political freedom. The moment they get power, they will destroy political freedom. It seems to be one more evidence of their complete lack of integrity or scrupulousness or anything else.

So I think that to the Communist, capitalism is going to be in a sense an easy thing to overthrow, eventually, I suppose, because we do have a tendency to fail to fight our enemies properly, but I suppose one of the reasons for that is that it would be a terrible thing if we were to fight tyranny by becoming a tyranny ourselves, isn't that so? This would be a terrible thing if we are anti-Communist because we feel that Communists destroy individual freedom and liberty, and in fighting communism, we destroy individual freedom and liberty. This would be a fight in vain.

So I think that is why I say this committee is in a terrible spot, because I think that subversive elements must be fought, and I think democracy has to fight for its life, and it can't just sit back and say, "Well, history will take care of us." It has got enemies and it has to fight those enemies but it has to fight them within the framework of the democratic system, or it might as well not fight at all, because it loses the battle in the means it chooses to use to fight that battle. I don't know whether that answers your question or not.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it does, sir. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Huggins, we are talking about this pall of silence that falls upon the party immediately following one of these abrupt right-angle turns in foreign policy of the Soviet Union. What physical steps then follow on the part of those who are responsible for the rationalization of this situation? There must be a lot of unhappy, disgruntled comrades who have been caught in the middle of a breath.

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I wasn't in the party when it happened in 1939, and I wasn't attending meetings when it happened in 1946, I think, the Duclos letter, or in 1945, so I wish I were more of an expert. I have an opinion on this, but I can't say that I observed it first-hand. What I have seen is this, that a few seem to get lost, at every one of these turns, a few fall off, but most of them just sit back and say nothing, and are very quiet about it until a few weeks have passed, and then they start talking the new line, and it is just not mentioned, that is all. It is like the family with a drunken uncle, you know. The uncle comes home drunk and they have to put him to bed, but they don't talk about it after they get him to bed.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, the party has had more than its share of uncles with respect to these abrupt turns.

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Would you consider that there is any thinking individual who seriously believes the Soviet Union to be a classless society today?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I suppose yes, in a theoretical sense, it is a classless society, and I know what you mean, and it actually has a huge burdensome bureaucracy, and then a working class, and that is it, and they are two very distinct classes in the Soviet Union.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, of course, so far as the Communists themselves are concerned, there are 2 million out of the entire population of the Soviet Union who actually belong to the Communist Party, and that would seem to me to be prima facie evidence of a lack of any classless nature.

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; I would say that they are the new Czarist aristocracy of Russia, and they act exactly the same way.

Mr. JACKSON. To what do you attribute the violence of the Communist attack upon this committee, and the other committees of like nature? Is it that the Communists are seriously concerned, let us say, with constitutional government as we know it in this country, or is it possibly that the fact that exposure is to be avoided? Is that true? I do not know.

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I think there are two things; both questions can be answered "Yes." I don't recall the exact source, but I know that even Marx himself wrote that the Communist Parties must be prepared to make use of democratic freedoms; that this is one of the greatest weapons they have. That is why you have a real problem.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, is the utility of a Communist who is exposed publicly, in any way affected so far as the party is concerned?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I would say it depends on what his role is in society. I am sure that if a man is highly placed in Government, it is in the interest of the Communist Party not to have him exposed, or if a man is placed in any position where as long as he is unexposed can do something that the Communist Party thinks is worth while.

Mr. JACKSON. Then from the standpoint of America, exposure is an excellent idea?

Mr. HUGGINS. Yes; I would say so.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you make any distinction in your own mind, Mr. Huggins, as between a Communist in the city of Los Angeles, and a Communist in the North Korean or Chinese Red armies philosophically? Do they have the same goal, or is there any material differences in what they are seeking? I am assuming now the North Korean or the Chinese Red is an intelligent man who is well read. What is the material, the fundamental difference, if any, between his counterpart in this country and him?

Mr. HUGGINS. Well, I don't know much about it. I would not know how to answer that, because I just haven't any idea what a Korean Communist thinks about, you know, what he is a Communist for. And I don't know. I have a suspicion that they are very much alike in that they are both the dupes of the Soviet Union, and they are both being used for the purposes of the Soviet Union, and in that respect they are very much alike.

Mr. JACKSON. Mao Tse-tung and William Z. Foster studied the same text.

Mr. HUGGINS. I am sure that they have basically pretty much the same goals, which are to further the interests of the Soviet Union.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Huggins. Your testimony is greatly appreciated.

Mr. MOULDER. You do not know of any Communists in our Government; do you, Mr. Huggins?

Mr. HUGGINS. No; I don't.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you. That is all I have.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counsel, have you any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

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

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; but I would like to make just one comment, to follow up the question that was asked by Representative Jackson,

in regard to Communists in Korea and in the United States, and just call the committee's attention to the testimony of General Willoughby, who testified that the procedures back in 1929 and 1930 in China were identical with those of the Communist Party as used in this country to capture organizations and people. So the procedure has been the same regardless of what the individual himself may think.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I at this point, possibly, if it is appropriate for me to say to Mr. Huggins, in view of Representative Jackson's question and Mr. Tavenner's additional statement, that I have just returned from South Korea. Two weeks ago Gen. Mark Clark and General Van Fleet told me that there was no question but that the aggressive communism and subversive communism that we have in America and in South Korea emanates from the Soviet Union, and they told me that 2 weeks ago.

Mr. WOOD. From one and the same source.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. I was there 2 weeks ago.

Mr. HUGGINS. I am convinced of that.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Huggins, I have been very much interested in listening to your testimony, and it has been most enlightening in many respects. I also feel a very keen sense of appreciation for the contribution you have made to the work of the committee in thus being willing to come before us, and frankly give the committee the information that you have on this subject. I believe it will be most helpful to the committee, and I think I bespeak the sentiments of the entire committee when I say we are most grateful to you for coming here.

If there is no further question by any of the committee or its counsel, I take the liberty of excusing you from further attendance.

Mr. Counsel, whom do you have next?

Mr. TAVENNER. We have no further witnesses this afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. In that connection, it might be well, I believe, to announce that following the setting up of these hearings and the designation of today as the beginning of them, it came to the attention of the committee that this session today would most likely interfere with a certain religious holiday, and therefore the committee saw fit to recognize any requests that were made by witnesses under subpoena to come before the committee on this day for the postponement of their testimony until a future time, and they so indulged every request that was made, and for that reason it is the only witness that we will be able to hear.

The committee will stand in recess until 9:30 in the morning.

(Thereupon at 3:15 p. m., a recess was taken until 9:30 a. m., Tuesday, September 30, 1952.)